

Mount, Gail

From: Sarah Rachel <sarahrhoward1@gmail.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, December 30, 2015 7:13 PM  
To: Statements; tim.dodge@psncuc.nc.gov  
Subject: DOCKET NO. E100, SUB 141 Optout smartmeters

Dear North Carolina Utility Commission and Public Staff,

I am submitting a letter regarding case record: Docket No. E-100, SUB 141

I see that Duke Energy is proposing to charge a fee to people who refuse smart meter installation or who wish to replace their smart meter with an analog meter. In addition to this charge, Duke Energy plans to implement a monthly meter reading fee. None of these fee details is available to the public. I find all of this offensive!

First of all, I would like it to be noted that my family's health suffered tremendously after the wireless "smart" meters were installed on our home. This created a serious financial hardship for us. I have reported this in great detail already to several North Carolina agencies.

I have some things that I would like you to consider regarding the fees and dangerous wireless utility meters that Duke Energy is trying to implement:

1. Wireless Meters and Smart Meters have been labeled a Class 2b Carcinogen by the World Health Organization. It is not legal to experiment upon and cause health ailments to the population, let alone extort fees for doing it, or extort fees from customers who wish to protect their privacy and health.

2. If Duke insists on having an official reading done by a meter reader, why does it have to be done every month? When Duke still employed meter readers and we weren't home to let them in, they estimated the bill until the next time we were home to let them in. Why can't they just leave a card for us to call in the numbers ourselves?

3. In many areas, it is not mandatory that a meter reader make an official reading for 6 months. It shouldn't be necessary for a meter reader to make a visit every month especially for customers in good standing.

4. In many areas, customers are allowed to take pictures of their meters and send them directly to the utility companies by email. Have you thought of this?

5. Pictures can be taken of the meter on the required "Read Date" and the camera used would have the date stamp as well as the ID of the meter. These could be emailed, faxed or mailed in! Has Duke Energy considered creating an "app" for people who have cellular phones to take pictures of their meters to submit directly to the company? There are apps which take pictures of checks so that money can be withdrawn immediately from a bank without a personal visit. Why not an app for a meter reading? People who don't have the capability to take and submit these pictures could have it done by neighbors, friends, family or social workers and Duke Energy would not have to hire meter readers at all.

6. Last but certainly not least (which was briefly mentioned above): There are countless research studies documenting the adverse health effects of wireless or "smart" meters:

"...the exposure to microwave and radio-wave radiation from these (smart) meters is involuntary and continuous. The transmitting meters may not even comply with Federal Communications Commission (FCC) "safety" standards (see <http://sagereports.com/smart-meter-rf/>). However, those standards were initially designed to protect an average male from tissue heating (cooking) during a brief exposure. These standards were not designed to protect a diverse population from the non-thermal effects of continuous exposure to microwave and radio-wave radiation. Therefore, these "safety" standards were not designed to protect the public from health problems under the circumstances which the meters are being used. The American Academy of Environmental Medicine has called for a moratorium on the installation of transmitting utility meters on the basis that:

*"Chronic exposure to wireless radio-frequency radiation is a preventable environmental hazard that is sufficiently well documented to warrant immediate preventative public health action."*

These harmful wireless meters are being forced on us by the utility companies and this is creating a financial hardship for all of us who have been or are becoming sick. Now the utility companies want to charge customers fees to protect ourselves from these wireless "smart" meters?

The people who can afford these fees shouldn't be expected to pay them. And the

FILED  
DEC 31 2015  
Clark's Office  
N.C. Utilities Commission

government shouldn't be expected to pay these fees for an ever increasing population of people who won't be able to afford this but want to protect themselves. **The government is already paying the medical bills for people receiving assistance who have been sickened by the wireless "smart" meters. The only ones who don't seem to be losing money in this wireless "smart" meter venture are the utility companies.**

The Energy Policy Act of 2005, Section 1252, "smart meters", states that electric utilities shall provide such meters to those customers who request them. Therefore, people should have to "opt in."

We should not have to "opt out."

<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-109publ58/html/PLAW-109publ58.htm>

I know I am not the only person who has had adverse health reactions from these wireless "smart" meters. There is too much documentation that confirms this. I shouldn't have to pay additional money to protect myself and neither should anyone else. Thank you for your consideration.

Sarah Howard, BA, LMBT

✓  
Mount, Gail

---

**From:** Howard Jacobson, PhD <howard@trianglebewell.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 30, 2015 8:29 PM  
**To:** Statements  
**Subject:** DOCKET NO. E100, SUB 141

OFFICIAL COPIED

DEC 31 2015

Clerk's Office  
N.C. Utilities Commission

Those of us who don't want smart meters bombarding us with electromagnetic radiation (and especially those among us who suffer from exposure to such radiation) should not be forced to pay an opt-out fee. Please rule that Duke Energy may not pass on the costs of its slight inconvenience to the most vulnerable in our state.

Sincerely  
Howard Jacobson, PhD  
TriangleBeWell.com

✓  
Mount, Gail

From: laura combs <lcombs@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, December 31, 2015 6:28 AM  
To: Statements; tim.dodge@psncuc.nc.gov  
Subject: SUBJECT: Docket E-100 Sub 141

OFFICIAL COPY

FILED

DEC 31 2015

Clark's Office  
N.C. Utilities Commission

SUBJECT: Docket E-100 Sub 141

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission and Public Staff:

I am writing to urge the Public Staff and the Utilities Commission to reject any proposed tariffs by Duke Energy Carolinas. My concerns center on the adverse health effects of electromagnetic/radio frequencies (EMF) emitted by these devices. In my case, EMF disrupts my sleep, causing me to wake at 1:00 a.m. and stay awake. I discovered that this waking stops when I unplug my wireless router and my cordless phone base. If I go to sleep before my husband or son and they fail to turn the router off (such instances are unknown to me because I am asleep), I wake at 1:00 a.m. Currently, I am able to control my environment, turning off my EMF emitting devices at night. The attachment of a smart meter to my home will be out of my control and devastate my sleep and health, and I should not have to pay a tariff to stop installation and protect myself.

Duke Energy is the largest utility provider in the world, and as such, they should be able to absorb the costs of reading meters for those who want to opt-out of smart meter installation. Duke's earnings estimates are increasing and expected to continue to increase (see Earnings Estimates). The citizens of North Carolina desperately need the Utilities Commission and Public Staff to protect us from Duke's tariff plans, the details of which frustratingly remain confidential in North Carolina but indications are clear based on what is proposed in other states (see below). Based on Duke's self-serving, destructive and callous behavior related to:

1. their coal ash ponds in NC
2. their slow adoption of green energy alternatives, and
- 3. their crippling proposed opt-out tariffs in Ohio (initially over \$1,000 to opt out and over \$40 a month to have the meter read) and the way they seem to be misrepresenting Ohio government staff**

I am very concerned that Duke will continue to try to kick their North Carolina customers in the teeth when it comes to smart meter opt-out tariffs. Vermont has taken a stand and rejected any opt-out tariffs. Other states have more reasonable tariffs (my Aunt pays \$9 a month to have her meter read after she opted out). I don't agree with the tariff she pays (she has a heart condition and minimizes her EMF exposure), but at least it won't crush her financially. Even so, she shouldn't have to pay to protect herself.

The National Conference of State Legislatures reported this in 2013, making the case that citizens need to be able to opt-out of Smart Meters without a financial burden:

In the midst of controversy over how smart meters affect health and the possibility of smart meter malfunction or overbilling, seven states (Iowa, Massachusetts, New York, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Michigan) have pending legislation to enable consumers to opt out of residential smart meter installation. **These bills typically require a form of written customer consent and prohibit utilities from providing financial disincentives to those who refuse smart meter installation.**

According to the NCUC's website, "...the Commission is required by law to perform its duties and responsibilities in securing for the people of the state an efficient and economic system of public utilities." Given that Duke Energy projects that only 0.06 percent of its NC customers will request to opt-out (that is only 6 out of every 10,000) and that its earnings are projected to increase, the impact to Duke Energy's bottom line, as the largest utility provider in the world, can reasonably be expected to be minimal at worst, and people who wish to avoid adverse health effects should not be penalized by a corporate megagiant for opting out of their smart meter plan. Penalizing those who opt-out would be contrary to the NCUC's economic directive.

Duke Energy and the NCUC may argue that smart meters will create an efficient and economic system of public utilities on a large scale. That claim is unfounded, as we are learning around the world. This 2014 Daily Telegraph article, for example, argues that smart meters won't save money and in fact may cause greater expense: Will a smart meter save me money? Almost half of the European countries see the writing on the smart meter wall and they have rejected smart meter installation because it is not economically sustainable: Smart meters are poor value, find 10 EU countries. Here is Germany's rationale for rejecting smart meter installation Costs for smart meters exceed benefits for low-power consumers, study finds.

On a related note, and contrary to Duke Energy's power generation methods, Germany now gets almost 80 percent of its power from renewable resources. The NCUC's efforts to secure an "efficient and economic system" of utilities would yield greater results from health, environmental and economic perspectives by incentivizing green energy instead of focusing on outmoded and dangerous energy production as promoted by Duke Energy. Looking at their September 2015 Power Generation Portfolio, Duke Energy appears to be creating only 0.0186 percent of its energy from renewable sources, which is a far cry from Germany's 80 percent. Clearly, stronger efforts focused on more green energy incentives and production would have greater benefits to North Carolina's utility customers than allowing unduly burdensome tariffs on people who are trying to protect their health.

Please stand strong, reject Duke Energy's proposed tariffs and protect North Carolina's citizens. We physically and financially can't afford to play Duke's games.

Sincerely,

Laura Combs  
Raleigh, NC