

From: judy Vick <venturemind@hotmail.com>

Date: January 31, 2011 5:55:54 PM PST

To: <loralee@ccst.us>

Cc: <jenny.callaway@asm.ca.gov>, Lawrence Cooper Assistant to Jared Huffman <lawrence.cooper@asm.ca.gov>

Subject: Response to CCST Report: The Precautionary Principle Should Be Applied

To The California Council on Science and Technology:

I submit this letter to the CCST and for the public record, in response to the CCST report on SmartMeters:

Experts in the scientific community, both nationally and internationally, disagree whether or not there is evidence of health and environmental risks from chronic, non-thermal, RF radiation exposure. Many say there are not health and environmental effects, and *many say there are health and environmental effects*. **The CCST report admits (pg 15): "While the FCC guidelines appear to provide a large factor of safety against known thermal effects of exposure to radiofrequency, they do not necessarily protect against potential non-thermal effects, nor do they claim to."**

The Bioinitiative Report (an international working group of scientists, researchers and public health policy professionals: bioinitiative.org/report/index.htm), concludes there are health and environmental effects from chronic, non-thermal RF radiation exposure. Cindy Sage, co-editor of the Bioinitiative Report, states the World Health Organization (WHO) does not give an assurance of safety for current RF radiation exposure limits set by the U.S. Federal Communications Commission (FCC). The WHO is determining whether RF is a carcinogen or neurotoxin and will issue a report next year.

A recent study of wireless SmartMeters shows they are likely to violate FCC safety limits in some instances where they are installed and operated close to where people spend time in their homes and back yards. Further, the study found it typical to have excessively elevated radio-frequency radiation levels in rooms adjacent to the meter (sagereports.com/smart-meter-rf/).

I recently introduced San Luis Obispo County Supervisors to a woman named Rebecca, who was living in a condo in San Diego, where 16 meters were installed on her condo wall. In addition, the office building where she maintained her professional practice, had 50

meters installed together. Prior to these installations, Rebecca was in decent health. After the installations, she became very ill, electrically sensitive, and she now sees a cardiologist. Rebecca has two letters from her doctors addressing symptoms associated with RF radiation exposure. Rebecca is now living in San Luis Obispo County, for the sole purpose of finding housing that does not yet have wireless technology. Rebecca is financially struggling as she continues to pay her condo mortgage and 5 year office lease in San Diego. I have her contact information if you would like to meet with her.

The Precautionary Principle should be applied to the wireless SmartMeter issue. We need to base environmental and health risk decisions on protecting the most vulnerable among us, infants, children, the elderly and medically fragile persons.

The United States President's Cancer Panel 2008–2009 Annual Report - "President's Cancer Panel Reducing Environmental Cancer Risk, What We Can Do Now" advocates adoption of the Precautionary Principle as a replacement of the current reactionary and failed risk-assessment method used to protect people from environmental contaminants(http://deainfo.nci.nih.gov/advisory/pcp/annualReports/pcp08-09rpt/PCP_Report_08-09_508.pdf).

The Precautionary Principle: "Take prudent action when there is sufficient scientific evidence (but not necessarily absolute proof) that inaction could lead to harm and where action can be justified on reasonable judgments of cost-effectiveness (Treaty of Maastricht, quoted by WHO 1999)."

"... the precautionary principle is neither a politicisation of science [nor] the acceptance of zero-risk but that it provides a basis for action when science is unable to give a clear answer... (Precautionary Principle, European Commission, 2000)"

In the abstract called, "The Precautionary Principle and EMF, Dr. Leeka I Kheifets (World Health Organization), states the following:
"...Because the epidemiologic evidence for EMF effects has been strongest for childhood leukemia and because children are often afforded extra protection, some proponents of the precautionary principle have suggested that special consideration be given to schools and day-care facilities (as, for example, in Sweden)...."

"...Formal policy analysis, which includes cost-effectiveness calculations, **would also tend to give more weight to exposure to children because of the increase in potential lost years of life** (Graham and Wiener, 1995)."

"...**Finally, voluntary and involuntary sources of exposure carry different risk perception implications**(Slovic, 1987); **if an exposure is viewed as involuntarily imposed, perceived risk increases.**" (Dr Leeka I Kheifets, World Health Organization, Tel: +41 22 791 49 76, Fax: +41 22 791 41 23, Email: kheifetsl@who.int ,http://www.who.int/peh-emf/meetings/southkorea/en/Leeka_Kheifets_principle_.pdf):

Prudent Avoidance of EMF exposure has been adopted in California (as well as Colorado, Hawaii, New York, Ohio, Texas, Wisconsin, and Australia and Sweden). Ratepayers who are paying in the neighborhood of 2.2 billion dollars for the SmartMeter program, should not be forced to have wireless Smart Meters mounted on their homes. They should have the choice to take precautions on behalf of their children and/or medically fragile family members or themselves. Consider the many children who live in apartment buildings where multiple meters may be mounted on the other side of their bedroom walls. What if the scientists that do not recognize the harm are wrong? Imagine the emotional, physical and financial costs to our society.

We demand the option to opt out of the installation of wireless SmartMeters. The Smart Grid goals can and SHOULD be accomplished with **wired** SmartMeters (such as cities like Chattanooga, TN have done).

Sincerely,

Judy Vick, M.S.
Atascadero, California
San Luis Obispo County
venturemind@hotmail.com