

Mount, Gail

From: Susanna <susannastewart@embarqmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 23, 2016 10:17 AM
To: Statements
Cc: tim.dodge@psncuc.nc.gov
Subject: Duke's Order for approving smart grid technology

FILED

JAN 25 2016

Clark's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission

Subject: DOCKET NO. E100, SUB 141
January 23, 2016

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission and Public Staff:

I am writing to object to Duke Energy's lack of definitive advanced metering system (AMI) opt out procedure information in its 2015 Smart Grid Technology Plan (SGTP) update, as required by the North Carolina Utilities Commission (UC) in its November 5, 2015 Order for Approving Smart Grid Technology Plans. With Duke Energy planning to install almost 200,000 AMI meters, with deployment now underway, it is imperative that citizens understand the financial repercussions that they may be facing once Duke receives approval for a tariff levied against those who do opt out. People opt out for a variety of reasons, all of which should be honored without penalty of a monthly tariff or an excessive onetime tariff such as those proposed by Duke for customers in Ohio. Those who opt out for health reasons especially should not be penalized. It is imperative that the Public Staff and the UC require Duke Energy to immediately make public their monthly and onetime tariff proposals for the reasons discussed below, and the UC is urged to reject any proposed monthly tariffs or unreasonably high onetime tariffs against North Carolina's citizens.

AMI and Health Concerns Duke Energy has repeatedly stated that there are no health concerns related to AMI and the associated radiofrequency (RF) output, and that RF output falls within FCC guidelines. The first assertion is patently false based on the published literature authored by researchers not affiliated with the energy sector, and the second assertion is correct but profoundly flawed.

Everyone experiences physical impacts from electromagnetic fields (EMF), or radiofrequency (RF) fields. For some people, those impacts are not noticeable, but for others they are debilitating to the point of physical collapse and inability to function. For those like myself who experience noticeable impacts, EHS is a serious problem and we take measures to reduce our exposure, such as avoiding wireless internet communication, cell phones, cordless phones and more. As an individual with EMF issues, fighting with Duke to prevent this health AMI hazards would be difficult and probably futile. An AMI meter would be devastating to me.

The U.S. Government takes EHS seriously. EHS is becoming more common as the intensity of EMF/RF exposure grows. The United States and Sweden, for example, recognize EHS as a disability. A person such as myself who is already struggling with EHS should not have the added burden of protecting their lives and their homes from the utility companies and paying what amounts to extortion to avoid an AMI meter. Paying to avoid an AMI meter, as proposed by Duke Energy, is unfair.

State legislatures are taking the health threats of smart meters seriously. A number of state legislatures are considering various types of AMI meter opt out legislation. Vermont's legislature is the first to eliminate any type of fee or tariff associated with AMI meter opt out, including removal.

There is growing evidence from nonenergy sector researchers that EMF/RF can cause profound harm. While published literature is given heavier weight, citizen registered reports of adverse health impacts and objections to AMI meters can't be ignored. While these concerns are considered anecdotal data, there is so much anecdotal data that heightened scrutiny of the health impacts of AMI meters, and the appropriateness of tariffs, must be viewed from that point of view.

Duke Energy is the largest electrical provider in the world, and the only protection that North Carolinians who suffer from EHS have from AMI meters is the Public Staff and the Utilities Commission. Accordingly, I request that the UC please add me to any mailing lists or other public communication mechanisms you have regarding AMI and Duke Energy. Further, please notify me of any opportunities for public input and inform me of other interested offices or personnel at the UC to which I should submit my comments. North Carolinians desperately need an agency that will not just blindly accept the FCC's standards and electrical utility desires.

Thank you for your consideration on this important matter.

Susanna Stewart
337 Bent Tree
Pittsboro, NC 27312
susannastewart@embarqmail.com

Mount, Gail

From: Richard Conrad <rconrad999@hawaii.rr.com>
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2016 5:37 PM
To: tim.dodge@psncuc.nc.gov; Statements
Subject: Add'l comments on Opt-out fee, should be OPT-OUT CREDIT

Edward S. Finley, Jr., Chairman
North Carolina Utilities Commission
4325 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-4300

FILED

JAN 25

Clerk's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission

Subject: DOCKET NO. E100, SUB 141 - Oppose Smart Meter Opt-Out Tariffs

FILED

Dear Chairman Finley and Public Staff:

JAN 25 2016

I wrote a letter to you yesterday to oppose smart meter opt-out fees. + I have a Ph.D. in Biochemistry, and am very familiar with the problems with smart meters, which are manifold (see my article: [Nine Reasons Why Today's Smart Meter Systems are a Mistake \(5/9/14\)](#)) Anyone who wishes to opt-out for any reason, whether it be privacy, cybersecurity, overbilling or health reasons should be able to opt-out without a fee. None of the reasons utilities give for opt-out fees are valid, and they neglect to mention the real reason, which is to discourage opting out. This is unfair to customers. Utilities want as many people on smart meters as possible, not only to supposedly save energy through control of home appliances (an intrusion of privacy), but also to maximize their profit from the sale to marketing companies of detailed personal usage data gleaned via the smart meters.

(The reason usually given for an opt-out fee is that the fee is to compensate for utilities having to pay salaries to meter readers. But there are a variety of automated systems already being used for this purpose, including customers sending in a monthly postcard, or dialing up the utility computer and entering the meter reading via their telephone keypad, etc.)

Furthermore, persons who opt-out should not have to bear the burden of participating in the high costs (initial, operation, maintenance, upgrades) of the smart meter network and associated systems. Customers will eventually be charged for this via higher electric bills. Persons who do not participate in the smart meter network should not have their electric bills increased to pay for it, but instead should be given an opt-out credit via reduced rates on their bills.

So, instead of opt-out fees, there should be an opt-out credit. This is not a radical proposal, this is simply fair and logical.

Thank you,
Richard H. Conrad, Ph.D.

Mount, Gail

From: Lucinda Davis <Lucinda@pureoilsforlife.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 23, 2016 3:14 AM
To: Statements; tim.dodge@psncuc.nc.gov
Subject: DOCKET NO. E7-100, SUB 141

FILED

JAN 25 2016

Clerk's Office
NCUC

Dear NCUC –

Due to today's ice storm my power and phone lines were out for several hours at different times, and as a result I was not able to write you earlier in the day. I went ahead and sent the email below given the 12 midnight, January 22nd deadline but think a few personal EMF-related experiences will provide you with helpful insight to the condition of EMF hypersensitivity / EHS. Given my lack of normal email access due to area power outages, I ask that you include the information below in the appropriate docket for NCUC's consideration.

1. 2004 – BellSouth provided a wireless Westell Versalink WiFi modem / router for my town home. Within a few hours of setting it up, I experienced an intense "heavy" headache, hazy cognition and exhaustion. It felt like the swift onset of a very bad cold or flu. I made no association between the symptoms and the new WiFi set-up as I had never heard of anything negative associated with WiFi, and so did nothing to dismantle my new wireless set-up. After five or so days at home with a miserable, very peculiar "flu" and 5 nights of very non-restorative sleep, I was not getting any better. Too, it was not flu season nor did I know of family / friends with bad colds at the time. Realizing the only major change in my environment that I knew of was the addition of WiFi, I called BellSouth and they assisted me in stopping the WiFi signal from my new modem, and I reconnected to the internet using an Ethernet cable. Within several hours, my symptoms cleared.

Three weeks ago (January 2016), I had a specific need to use WiFi in my home to install an app on an iPad. I called AT&T (formerly BellSouth) to ask how to temporarily turn on my WiFi (the same Westell Versalink modem as above) as I had no recollection how to do so. I went to a special URL address, and they walked me through the steps. Within 10 – 15 minutes I began feeling very sick: headache, nauseous, impaired cognition, weak / shaky limbs. Thankfully, I was still on the line with the CS service agent who showed me how to reverse the steps, and I promptly turned the WiFi off. The negative effects from the 15 minute exposure were so pronounced and the onset so swift, I asked if my modem was usually strong as it was such an old model. The agent remarked it was atypical for a home to have this type of modem as they are most frequently used for business purposes. I learned the signal strength of my modem in WiFi mode is 130 "Bits" and the typical home model is 20-40 "Bits". It took close to two hours for the symptoms to subside and my system to recalibrate.

2. 2006-2010 – In my work as a real estate broker I spoke on my Treo Smartphone 1500-3000 minutes every month. In 2006 I configured my phone to automatically "pull" my emails every five minutes vs. manually downloading them a few times a day. (Note: for over a decade I've worn a leather waist pack from morning to evening each day which holds my essential "tools" including calendar, wallet and cell phone.) Literally, the email retrieval change brought me to my knees. I became very weak, developed an intense headache, cognition became fuzzy and I felt nauseous. Again, I did not associate these symptoms with the program change on my cell phone. I had zero knowledge about cell phones / microwave radiation contributing to such issues, so it simply did not register as a potential factor in how I felt. After two miserable days, on a "why not try it" hunch, I reprogrammed my phone to the original manual "pull" format and the symptoms abated within a several hours. (In 2010, I learned the SAR (Specific Absorption Rate) for my Treos ranked at the upper ceiling of the FCC limit for radiation).

3. From 2005 through August 2009, I had an ideal office environment for me: quiet room with a large window in small suite of offices with easy access to all necessary technology for real estate purposes. However, when I worked there for over 20-30 minutes, I'd begin to feel poorly – weird, intense headache (beginning each time in the middle of my forehead, an inch or two below the surface, and then cascading out), marked fatigue, fuzzy thinking, sugar / starch cravings and then exhaustion. On multiple occasions I had to stop working and lie on the floor of my office in an attempt to recuperate. Not only were these rests not restorative, I would awake groggy – feeling drugged, exhausted, miserable. Again, at the time I did not correlate these symptoms with my specific office environment. I had no idea why I felt so badly.

Over this same four year time span I made the "odd choice", while in the office building, to conduct the majority of my work activity from the "bullpen" (a dedicated work area for new real estate agents) whenever I could find a spare desk there. It was an unusual choice given I work best in a quiet environment, and the bullpen is a bustling, windowless area right next to the kitchen / coffee machine. Agents as they passed by would regularly query, "Why are you working here?" Indeed, I had a great office, and working in the bullpen was unusual - except I'd well learned I felt markedly better in the bullpen than in my office or any other area in the building. There I could focus on and accomplish the real estate tasks at hand.

In August of 2009 my specific office was tested and the WiFi (microwave) reading was very high – both in signal strength and in pulsed data through the airwaves. A major router serving an entire wing of the office building was located immediately outside my office door. I had never taken notice of the "small box" before and would not have known what it was had I seen it. (Too, the room adjacent to my office wall held the computer server for multiple real estate offices in the Triangle area and was the electrical utilities hub for the office building.) The bullpen area was also tested and the readings came back less than half the strength of those in my office. It was actually the "quietest" area per actual microwave radiation readings in the entire office. The walls are concrete in the bullpen and apparently serve either to block or absorb the radiation. Over the years I had naturally gravitated to a safer and far more productive work area for me, though I had no understanding why it was so.

Today, January 2016, my system is less reactive to microwave radiation than in years previous – and I am deeply grateful. The recovery is a direct result of my specific daily choices to minimize my exposure to EMFs. Yet, as became imminently clear from the WiFi incident in my own home three weeks ago, microwave radiation can still have significant negative effects - from both short bursts of intense exposure, and as I've learned, from prolonged exposures at lower levels. I am keen to live as healthfully and productively as I can and keeping my exposure to EMF levels as low as possible, particularly in my home environment, is crucial to same.

Smart meters operate on the same frequencies as WiFi and wireless phones, and as such, pose a significant risk to the health and well being of all those with EHS. It is patently unfair and discriminatory for tariffs to be imposed on those who opt out of having smart meters in order protect their health and ability to function normally on a daily basis. NCUC's first priority per your mission statement is to provide fair regulation of public utilities *in the interest of the public*. I ask you to protect my expressed interest, and the interest of those who now are and those who will become EHS, by stalwartly OPPOSING any smart meter opt-out tariffs proposed by Duke Energy.

Again, I am glad to speak with any member of the Commission if you have any questions or need additional information.

Respectfully submitted,

Lucinda Davis

Lucinda Davis
(919) 789-8900

From: Lucinda Davis
Sent: Saturday, January 23, 2016 12:01 AM
To: statements@ncuc.net; tim.dodge@psncuc.nc.gov
Subject: DOCKET NO. E3-100, SUB 141

Dear NCUC –

I ask you to OPPOSE any smart meter opt-out tariffs proposed by Duke Energy.

Electromagnetic frequencies (EMFs) such as those produced by smart meters are deleterious to the health, well being and daily functioning of those who are sensitive to them. Please be aware and educate yourself that reported cases of electromagnetic hypersensitivity (EHS) are increasing in the US and around the world. It is a very serious problem for those affected and can have dramatic negative effects on both neurologic and immune health.

I am adversely affected by EMFs such as those emitted by smart meters and other “every day” EMF devices. For this reason, my home is equipped with landlines for phone calls and an Ethernet cable for internet access. I use my 3G cell phone (all 4G models I’ve tried give me pronounced headaches) as a back up mode of communication if the need to make a phone call is urgent / pressing and a landline is not available. At all other times, I keep my cell phone off or in “airplane mode”.

A fundamental responsibility of the state is protect its citizenry. I earnestly ask NCUC to do everything in your power to ensure that I, and others who are sensitive to EMFs, are not discriminated against by smart meter opt out tariffs here in North Carolina. Unequivocally, I should not have to pay to protect myself from the known negative effects of smart meters.

I am glad to speak with any member of the Commission if you have any questions or need additional information.

Respectfully submitted,

Lucinda Davis

Lucinda Davis
(919) 789-8900

Mount, Gail

From: Rich Wasch <rswasch@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2016 5:08 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Comments re: Jan 26, 2016 Hearing on Duke Energy Asheville Gas Units Application

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Duke Energy's application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity to build three new natural gas units in Asheville, NC.

The retirement of the coal fired plant is long overdue.

Replacing it with an over-sized gas plant and some solar does not have enough solar and builds more gas fired capacity than is necessary.

Duke's proposed 15 MW of solar is a good first step, but needs to be larger.

In addition, North Carolina should allow homeowners to install photovoltaic with third party finance and thus decentralize the investment, installation and service of a much greater solar capacity to add to our grid, thus reducing the need for increased utility capacity.

The utility regulations should also be revised to separate Duke and all utilities into two business units: the grid and generation. This way, everyone can pay for the grid and kWh separately.

The proposed 5 MW of storage is an excellent forward-thinking investment.

Before the Utilities Commission approves more gas generation capacity than required, Duke Energy must publicly disclose its models regarding future energy needs for western North Carolina. Historically, Duke has overestimated electricity demands, as compared to actual experience, and has favored building new power plants which drive profits for its shareholders.

We need to reduce energy demand through energy efficiency programs. 30% of the energy used in our buildings is wasted from air leaks, poor insulation, outdated appliances and inefficient or malfunctioning equipment.

It is premature to Include a third natural gas unit in the application since this unit is not needed until 2023 and may not be needed at all if the energy efficiency programs Duke has promised are successful.

Duke should include concrete energy efficiency programs in its filing and revisit any future need for additional capacity at a later date.

I urge the Commission to scale back any new natural gas generation and require investments in clean energy and energy efficiency for our region.

Sincerely,

Richard Wasch, 637 Upper herron Cove Rd, Asheville, NC

Mount, Gail

From: Lucinda Davis <Lucinda@pureoilsforlife.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 23, 2016 12:02 AM
To: Statements; tim.dodge@psncuc.nc.gov
Subject: DOCKET NO. E0-100, SUB 141

Dear NCUC –

FILED

JAN 25 2016

Clerk's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission

I ask you to OPPOSE any smart meter opt-out tariffs proposed by Duke Energy.

Electromagnetic frequencies (EMFs) such as those produced by smart meters are deleterious to the health, well being and daily functioning of those who are sensitive to them. Please be aware and educate yourself that reported cases of electromagnetic hypersensitivity are increasing in the US and around the world. It is a very serious problem for those affected and can have dramatic negative effects on both neurologic and immune health.

I am adversely affected by EMFs such as those emitted by smart meters and other "every day" EMF devices. For this reason, my home is equipped with landlines for phone calls and an Ethernet cable for internet access. I use my 3G cell phone (all 4G models I've tried give me pronounced headaches) as a back up mode of communication if the need to make a phone call is urgent / pressing and a landline is not available. At all other times, I keep my cell phone off or in "airplane mode".

A fundamental responsibility of the state is protect its citizenry. I earnestly ask NCUC to do everything in your power to ensure that I, and others who are sensitive to EMFs, are not discriminated against by smart meter opt out tariffs here in North Carolina. Unequivocally, I should not have to pay to protect myself from the known negative effects of smart meters.

I am glad to speak with any member of the Commission if you have any questions or need additional information.

Respectfully submitted,

Lucinda Davis

Lucinda Davis
(919) 789-8900

Mount, Gail

From: mom Karlhofer <daintygirl@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2016 7:55 PM
To: Statements
Subject: DOCKET NO. E100, SUB 141

FILED

JAN 25 2016

Clerk's Office
N.C. Utilities Commission

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission and Public Staff:

As a conservation-minded individual I happily embraced smart meter/AMI technology and requested the installation of a smart meter on my home approximately 1.5 years ago. Monthly, my bills appeared similar to previous usage amounts and cost. My most recent bill gave the usual readout for the loss or saving and I discovered for the month a \$6 increase. The increase in cost compared to having used the conventional energywise program previously was \$80 more for the year as documented on my last bill and as I discussed with Duke-Progress personnel.

I was very conscientious and timed my electrical use (such as showering, heating, cooking and air conditioning) with the lowest rate portions of the day. Clearly, smart meters do not save money but cost money, even for those who are purposefully using them.

Consequently, I have requested that my smart meter be removed so that I can reduce the size of my electricity bill.

As studies have shown, very few people purposefully use smart meters as intended, energy useage has not declined, and it is likely that many people are losing money, possibly far more than I. Please do not allow Duke Energy or any other utility company to charge a smart meter opt-out fee. It is unacceptable that people are forced to either pay more money because they are forced to accept a smart meter or because they are charged a tariff to opt out. Either way, North Carolinians lose.

Thank you for your consideration,

Linda Rogers

Keep the memories and love rolling on. Linda R