

Mount, Gail

From: rpuri.inapp@gmail.com on behalf of Rakesh Puri <rpuri@inapp.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 7:33 PM
To: Statements
Cc: Ellen Whitaker
Subject: DOCKET NO. E100, SUB 141

FILED

JAN 20 2016

Clerk's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission

To Whom it may concern:

Energy companies and utilities provide a very useful service to the public. While they have every right to become more efficient and try to reduce their costs, it must not be done at the expense of the health, well being and by threatening the life longevity of their customers. While a vast majority of customers may not be affected by the radio or wireless waves, some are severely affected, to the point of getting very sick.

It would be unjust to enforce a penalty on people who wish to opt out and have medical grounds for doing so. A very easy fix is to allow customers to self report the meter reading (something very common in the UK) and bill on that basis, if needed supplemented by a once a year reading. It could also be done with an iphone app, which can take a picture and translate the reading.

Please do not impose any fee or penalties on opt out. Should you need to explore the details of any of the idea, feel free to ask.

Rakesh Puri
650 283 7833

Chapel Hill, NC

Mount, Gail

OFFICIAL COPY

From: Susan Chapek Pochapsky <schapek@mindspring.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 20, 2016 8:19 AM
To: Statements
Subject: DOCKET NO. E100, SUB 141

FILED

JAN 20 2016

Clerk's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission

To the Commissioners:

I would like to add my voice to object to any tariff or surcharge for Duke Power customers who decline to have the untested so-called "smart" power meters installed on their premises.

The installation of the smart meters (for households that accept them) will result in the laying off of many meter readers. That will mean significant cost savings for Duke Power.

Why, then, does Duke Power need to charge MORE to keep the greatly reduced number of meter readers they will need?

The only apparent reason to charge a tariff or even a monthly fee to such customers is to penalize them, or to force them to accept the meters. (Indeed, what should happen instead is that people who accept the smart meters should get a rebate to account for the smaller payroll Duke Power will have.)

The sole reason for the Commission's existence is to protect North Carolinians from this kind of power company tyranny. Please remember that Duke Power has clearly demonstrated itself in recent months to be a bad corporate citizen--profit being placed over service and over safety.

So I urge the Commission to veto all tariffs, surcharges, and penalties for power customers who decline to accept the "smart" meters.

Mount, Gail

OFFICIAL COPY

From: Natalie Sadler <nataliesadler17@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 20, 2016 11:30 AM
To: Statements
Subject: DOCKET NO. E100, SUB 141

FILED

JAN 20 2016

Dear Chairman Finley and Public staff,

I am writing to ask that you oppose any opt out fee that Duke Power wants to impose for smart meters. I am a physician with a sensitivity to wifi and had to move my office to a place where I can work in a wifi free area in the past six months. I get headaches, nausea and insomnia. I do not want to experience smart meters, which are shown to have stronger effects than wifi. I think forcing me to pay a fee to opt out is not protecting my health and my livelihood.

I would ask you to align with me and the experts who have sent you the research about smart meters and recommended for you not to allow an opt out fee.

Thank you for listening.

Natalie Sadler
101 Beechwood Dr
Carrboro, NC 27510
919.968.6921. .

✓
OFFICIAL COPY

**NOTICE OF NO CONSENT FOR PURPOSE OF INSTALLING A SMART METER
AND
NOTICE OF LIABILITY TO DUKE ENERGY**

FILED

JAN 20 2016

**To: North Carolina Utilities Commission
4325 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-4300**

E100 SUB 141

Clerk's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission

Dear Duke Energy and all officers, employees, agents, and other interested parties:

I received your notice of plans to install a wireless Smart Meter or Smart Grid operation at my place of residence. You are denied consent for this installation and use of any monitoring device and Smart Grid operation on or at 1146 Franklin Thomas Pl, Charlotte, NC 28214.

There have been thousands of reports of adverse health affects caused by the Smart Meters because of the radiation emitted. Firefighters in numerous states have also requested the halt and investigation of these devices as the primary culprit causing fires once they are installed. The devices are also preprogrammed to be smart and interact with appliances and other electrical devices, thus serving as an unconstitutional invasion of privacy for the purposes of monitoring activity where they are installed. There are also numerous Class Action Lawsuits, which are expected to ultimately halt the installation of these dangerous meters. As a consumer, I must protect myself.

Duke Energy has reached an agreement with the North Carolina Utilities Commission so that consumers who do not wish to have these devices installed on their property have the right to opt-out of installation. I am exercising this right to refuse consent.

Because of the nature of the monitoring capabilities, these devices are deemed surveillance and therefore require consent where they are installed. Because of both health and privacy concerns, I deny consent of any installation and use of surveillance devices at my place of residence. Please be advised that, should any attempt be made to install these so-called Smart Meters against my consent, it shall constitute trespass and unlawful surveillance. These are all violations of law.

This notice of No Consent applies to any and all parties named or representatives of Duke Energy and any notice to interested parties also serves as notice to Duke Energy.

Sincerely,

Harold and Dara Weaver, January 15, 2016

Harold and Dara Weaver
1146 Franklin Thomas Pl
Charlotte, NC 28214

Mount, Gail

From: Larry Burk <lburk@nationalrad.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 20, 2016 2:03 PM
To: Statements; tim.dodge@psncuc.nc.gov
Subject: DOCKET NO. E100, SUB 141
Attachments: SmartMeter.Burk.letter.docx

FILED

JAN 20 2016

 Clark's Office
 NC. Utilities Commission

DATE: 1/19/2016

TO: North Carolina Utility Commission and Public Staff

RE: Case record: Docket No. E-100, SUB 141

As a radiologist specializing in MRI, I have made my living for 30 years reading scans produced by the non-thermal effects of short-term exposure of the human body to RF and EMF. These dramatic pictures are generated from resonant interactions with the hydrogen protons at the cellular level below the thermal threshold. As a member of the National Safety Committee for MRI from 1987 to 1994, I began investigating potential health effects of these fields and determined that there is little evidence for hazard related to short-term exposures such as those experienced by patients in MRI.

However, I subsequently joined the Bioelectromagnetic Society and discovered there was an entire academic discipline devoted to studying the effects of long-term exposure to these fields which was largely unknown to most physicians and electrical engineers. These scientists, many of whom now participate in the IARC, found rigorous and repeatable evidence for non-thermal physiological effects and hazards including potential carcinogenicity. The initial data were limited to power lines and radar, but have now expanded exponentially to include cellphones, Wi-Fi, and smart meters. The situation with smart meters reminds me of the early days of radiation safety when the short-term clinical use of X-rays for patients seemed to have no downside. It wasn't until the 1930s, 40 years after Roentgen's discovery, that radiologists started to report the long-term effects of chronic exposure. These early radiologists, feeling falsely reassured by the lack of apparent effects on patients, would focus the beam by putting their own hands in it. When enough radiologists lost fingers due to radiation damage and developed leukemia and other blood diseases, radiation protection policies were implemented.

I'm afraid we are in serious danger of making a similar mistake with regard to RF/EMF long-term exposure safety issues. This analogy is particularly pertinent now that actual DNA damage has been documented by Dr. Henry Lai in the Bioinitiative 2012 report. As a Consulting Associate Professor of Radiology at Duke, I am well versed in evaluating clinical research. For that reason the systematic review below by Anke Huss et al. in 2007 showing that the studies funded by industry were far less likely to find evidence of hazard than those funded by public agencies or charities is particularly important.

North Carolina is no stranger to the concept of industry influence and bias with regard to research results, as the denial of tobacco health hazards is still a shameful legacy. It was made very clear that tobacco executives were quite aware of potential lethal risks due to their products and actively covered them up, and I think there is reason to believe that the same holds true for this industry. Let's make a more responsible choice here in our state this time and prevent Duke Energy from charging a fee to people who refuse smart meter installation or who wish to replace their smart meter with an analog meter.

Sincerely,
Larry Burk, MD. CEHP
 Larry Burk, MD, CEHP
 President, Healing Imager, PC
 Durham, NC
 www.nationalrad.com

Anke Huss, et al., "Source of Funding and Results of Studies of Health Effects of Mobile Phone Use: Systematic Review of Experimental Studies," Environmental Health Perspectives 115 (2006): 1-4.