



April 25, 2013

Ms. Erica Hamilton
Commission Secretary
British Columbia Utilities Commission
Sixth Floor - 900 Howe Street
Vancouver, BC V6Z 2N3

Via email: Commission.secretary@bcuc.com

Re: FortisBC Inc. (FortisBC) – Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for the Advanced Metering Infrastructure Project (AMI Project)

Dear Ms. Hamilton:

This is the Final Submission of the West Kootenay Concerned Citizens with respect to the above-noted matter.

The difference between a wired circuit and a wireless circuit are important for consideration in implementation. In a wired circuit, there are insulated wires (conductors) and the EMFs in the wires cancel each other out unless the conductors are singular.

In a wireless circuit, there is no insulation and everything in the EMF coverage is in the circuit. That is why electrical professionals are very careful before considering a wireless circuit.

FortisBC has applied through the regulatory process of the BC Utilities Commission to install wireless smart meters. Although there are wired options, the utility has chosen a wireless meter to be cost effective. An analogy in a Wi-Fi application in schools are the costs to construct and install 30 wired computer stations versus one Wi-Fi Router covering the entire classroom with wireless frequencies. The indirect costs and far outweigh the perceived wireless savings.

If FortisBC even needs the smart meter program, wired is the only option. Wireless coverage of 17,000 sq. Km to simply communicate with meters puts everything in the coverage area in the circuit. Everything in the coverage area being electrical at the atomic and molecular level is isn't insulated or compatible with these man made frequencies.

The federal guidelines for limits of human exposure is Health Canada's Safety Code 6. Provinces, BCUC, BC Hydro, FortisBC, municipalities and the Canadian Wireless Telecommunication's Industry all have to comply with Safety Code 6. The purpose of the code is to establish safety limits for human exposure.

Safety Code 6 is a unique code by admitting proposed effects have been reviewed but are not sufficiently well understood. A lack of evidence of causality, biological plausibility and reproducibility greatly weaken the support for the hypothesis of such effects.(Exhibit B1, Appendix B-6, page 11 of 30, paragraph 2, sentences 3, 4 & 5) A safety code missing causality requires the greatest caution.

Building Codes as an example don't refer to missing data, buildings falling down but allow for further construction within the code. It is engineered science. Electrical Codes as another example don't refer to people being electrocuted, not knowing cause but allowing electrical engineers or contractors to carry on completing electrical construction.

With causality missing linking the frequencies to adverse health effects, Safety Code 6 states **“Health Canada scientists consider all peer-reviewed studies, on an ongoing basis, and employ a weight-of-evidence approach when evaluating the possible health risks of RF energy.”**(Exhibit B1, Appendix B-6, page 9 of 30, paragraph 3, sentences 2)

Energy absorption of the frequencies is described as SAR or Specific Absorption Rate and the name of the test itself is an admission of energy absorption of the frequencies.

Responses to FortisBC's Final Submission

Page 1, #2: Through the AMI Project, FortisBC would join utilities across North America and internationally in adopting advanced metering technologies.¹ By 2015, 250 million smart meters will be installed worldwide.² In Ontario alone, over 4.7 million AMI meters were installed as of April 2011.³ Within this province, BC Hydro is moving forward to install over 1.8 million smart meters, with deployment having commenced on July 4, 2011.⁴ In the United States, 38.3 million AMI meters have been installed, with a further 18.2 million installations planned, for a total of 56.5 million.⁵ Installations are expected to continue to grow over the next few years as several large utilities begin system wide deployments.⁶

Response: Safety Code 6 and all recognized standard-setting bodies use the same scientific data(Exhibit B1, Appendix B-6, page 9 of 30, paragraph 3, sentences 7&8) With causation missing and now reported, FortisBC should not join other utilities in a wireless smart meter program. The utilities above will have liabilities. Here is a link to the SAR Model showing the science used and a diagram of the smart grid showing how the frequencies hit people from head to toe. http://www.bcuc.com/Documents/Proceedings/2012/DOC_32604_C19-6_WKCC-Submission-RDCK-Nelson-Creston_Suspension.pdf Page 4.

Page 1, #3: As FortisBC set out in its application, developments in technology enable utilities to deliver electricity more cost effectively to customers, while at the same time providing customers with improved electricity consumption information and rate structure flexibility.

Response: This wireless application isn't an advancement in technology, it is the result of BC Hydro bypassing regulatory process. (Page 3, #6 of FBC Final Submission).

It isn't improving electrical consumption and rate structure, FBC is providing energy responding to energy waste and billing the customer for it. Air conditioning is refrigeration requiring 1000s of watts per hour/building responding to the symptoms of solar EMFs causing buildings to exceed BC Building Code. FBC's rate structure is charging the customer a higher rate for the extra energy consumption.

http://www.bcuc.com/Documents/Proceedings/2012/DOC_32604_C19-6_WKCC-Submission-RDCK-Nelson-Creston_Suspension.pdf

Page 2, #4 Response: The Clean Energy Act(CEA) will not strengthen environmental stewardship and reduce GHG emissions. BC Buildings are wasting significant energy and solar EMFs interacting with building exteriors is causing building development to super heat the atmosphere. http://www.bcuc.com/Documents/Proceedings/2012/DOC_32604_C19-6_WKCC-Submission-RDCK-Nelson-Creston_Suspension.pdf

Page 3, #6 Response: It is alarming to read the legislature “entrusted” BC Hydro as the technical experts. Bypassing the regulatory process bypassed all other experts associated with the coverage areas. Everything the wireless smart grid EMFs interact with or touch requires input from those particular professionals.

Page 4, #7 Response: FBC employing the same wireless system as BC Hydro isn't a positive. BC Hydro's smart grid frequencies as applied are illegal. http://www.bcuc.com/Documents/Proceedings/2013/DOC_33322_C19-8_WKCC_Evidence.pdf

Page 4, #8 Response: Causation missing linking the frequencies to adverse health effects has been found and reported. That changes the safety of wireless exposure from cordless phones, baby monitors, wireless networks and mobile phones. http://www.bcuc.com/Documents/Proceedings/2013/DOC_33322_C19-8_WKCC_Evidence.pdf

Page 7, #11 Response: FBC Panel 2 under cross examination were evasive, dismissive and protective of an Exponent Report that was incomplete as well as missing critical science with respect to the 17,000 sq. Km coverage area.

Page 12 #29 Response: FBC refers to the wireless network extending from the customer to the utility but during cross examination always referred to a short distance from the meter making people safe. The frequencies are consistent from the utility to the customer, short distances from the meter making you safe is referencing the meter only as an end use device.

Page 13 #32 Response: The higher costs of fibre optics will far outweigh the costs and liabilities of electromagnetically radiating everything in 17,000 sq. Km.

Page 29 #79 Response: Dr. Bailey was accepted as an expert by the Commission specific to bio electromagnetics and exposure to EMFs. During my cross examination in Volume 6, pages 1141, 1142, 1143, 1144, Dr. Bailey admits the Exponent Report left out critical bio electromagnetic information related to health and frequency interactions.

Page 132 #413 Response: Between Safety Code 6 leaving out critical science related to safety, Dr. Bailey leaving critical electrical information out of the Exponent Report, the application should be denied.

Page 132 & 133 #414 Response: Health Canada specific mandate is to maintain and improve their health, Safety Code 6 is a seriously flawed code missing critical science.

Page 133 #415 Response: While Safety Code 6 is outside the jurisdiction of the Commission, compliance with Safety Code 6 is required. The seriously flawed code is being revised to include causality, biological plausibility and reproducibility. In Volume 6, page 1156, line 20, Dr. Bailey acknowledges electrical information associated with the human organism isn't included in Safety Code 6.

You can't leave electrical information out of an electrical equation and expect accurate reporting.

Page 133 #416 Response: Where the Commission in past proceedings has considered Safety Code 6 and comparable standards, the mechanisms of action linking the frequencies to adverse health effects was missing. These proceedings for FBC incorporated the mechanisms. FBC's experts admitted under cross examination that the Exponent Report left substantial, critical information out of their reporting as well as Safety Code 6.

Page 133 #417 Response: In reviewing relevant scientific literature on an ongoing basis, Health Canada will be qualifying to several federal departments including the Royal Society of Canada how they dismissed electricity as peer reviewed science. That electrical mechanism was reported to Health Canada on September 14, 2010 and by witness at the request of Canadian Parliament's Standing Committee on Health in October 2010.

Furthering that will be what Health Canada did with the recommendations on the NDP in their supplementary report of the committee in December, 2010?

http://www.bcuc.com/Documents/Proceedings/2013/DOC_33322_C19-8_WKCC_Evidence.pdf

Volume 6, page 1121 transcripts show Dr. Shkolnikov's confirmation of electricity and electromagnetic induction being peer reviewed science.

Page 134 #418 Response: Same as #417 above regarding Health Canada's monitoring on an ongoing basis.

Page 134 #419 Response: Health Canada will be responding to several federal departments as to how they incorporated or dismissed peer reviewed science from 2010 in a 2011 review.

Page 134 #420 Response: Health Canada did not review and update their assessment, they dismissed electricity as peer reviewed science.

Page 134 #421 Response: Health Canada's review has been negligent and evident by their reference to thermal and non thermal effects. Those temperature terminologies are archaic science considering they left out critical electrical information and area coverage.

Page 135 #422 Response: The Exponent Report's references to non thermal are inaccurate and incomplete as admitted in cross examination above. What they refer to as non thermal effects can be seen quite easily with non invasive radiology lectured in medical education for education credits.

Page 135 #423 Response: CST's experts Maisch, Carpenter and Health Canada aren't discussing the same science. As a result they would never agree. As soon as you incorporate the reported mechanisms and bio electromagnetic information left out of the Exponent Report as well as Safety Code 6, it substantiates adverse health effects.

Volume 6, page 1157 & 1158, Dr. Bailey under cross examination admits nerve and muscle stimulation can influence hormonal and immune systems.

Page 135 #425 Response: The Exponent Report left out critical electrical information as well as the frequencies hitting people from head to toe. There is no acceptable power density of a vulnerable and intricate bio electromagnetic system. It means humans are under electrical load when they already have their own electricity.

Page 136 #426, 427 & 428 Response: The safety factors considered are no longer applicable with the mechanism linking the frequencies to adverse health effects. Referring to the SAR values are an admission the human body is being electromagnetically induced.

In Volume 6, page 1140, line 9 & 13, Dr. Shkolnikov answers "absolutely" that inducing currents and polarization billions of times per second could produce heat effect. Both of these actions have separate effects and inducing currents into the bio electromagnetic body changes electrical information in the body that was left out of the Exponent Report.

Page 137 #429 Response: The Chief Medical Officer is stating sufficient safety margins based on incomplete science as already reported here.

Page 137 #430 Response: Mr Warren is basing an unqualified opinion on flawed reporting.

Page 137 #431 Response: Mr. Warren confirms in Volume 6, page 1172, line 19 that FBC will radiate 17,000 sq. Kms. That included with missing electrical information shows causality, biological plausibility and reproducibility missing in Safety Code 6 linking the frequencies to adverse health effects.

Dr. Bailey's admission in #423 confirms the potential for adverse health effects.

Page 138 #431(b) Response: Mary McBride isn't qualified in her opinion and while meters may transmit intermittently, the smart grid radiating 17,000 sq. Km will be on 24/7. That subjects the coverage area to 24/7 exposure.

Page 138 #431(c & d) Response: It has already been established the Exponent Report left out critical electrical information that would change the report. Dr. Shkolnikov states in Volume 6, page 1112, line 24 that it would be his duty as a licensed engineer to revise any opinion if pertinent information was left out.

Page 138 #432 Response: Dr. Maisch & Dr. Maret's giving evidence that the exposure levels are below Safety Code 6 are based on the flawed reporting of Health Canada. There is no acceptable power density to electromagnetically induce bio electromagnetic human organisms.

Page 139 #433 Response: Compliance with Safety Code 6 is mandatory and a condition of license with Industry Canada. The wireless grid radiating 17,000 sq. Km does not comply with Safety Code 6 when incorporating the mechanisms and peer reviewed science called electricity.

Page 141 #438, 439 and 440(a & b) Response: Safety Code 6 is specific to protecting the public and these wireless frequencies as applied do not protect the public anymore with the missing science reported. These professionals were not told critical science and mechanisms were missing linking the frequencies to adverse health effects.

Page 142, 143, & 144 #441, 442 & 443 Response: Agencies reporting a "possible" link between the frequencies as a carcinogen was used to dismiss adverse health effects. The W.H.O. Reporting May 31, 2011 would have not used the word possible if Health Canada had reported to them the mechanisms linking the frequencies to adverse health effects was reported. http://www.bcuc.com/Documents/Proceedings/2013/DOC_33322_C19-8_WKCC_Evidence.pdf

Page 145, #444 Response: ICNIRP will have to revise their reporting to accommodate the missing mechanisms linking the frequencies to adverse health effects.

Page 145 #445 Response: The revision of the Exponent Report incorporating the missing mechanisms and electrical information will change their reporting on safety.

Page 146 #446 Response: The spokesman for the W.H.O. is referring to the meter as an end point device on the wireless circuit. The 17,000 sq. Kms radiated by FBC fir the smart meter program are the same frequencies as cell phones and the grid provides 24/7 exposure.

Page 147 -150, #447 to 456 Response: Science has changed on safety with the mechanisms reported and qualified linking the frequencies to adverse health effects.

Page 150 &151 #457 & 458 Response: References to exposure and duty cycle is limited information. The smart grid covering 17,000 sq. Km will be on 24/7 and exposure to the frequencies will be 24/7.

Page 151 #459 Response: Planetworks reporting was completed by an engineer not electrically or medically qualified in an opinion. Their reporting was based on Safety Code with missing data.

Page 151 #460 & 461 Response: References to distance from the meter making you safe is only referring to the meter as the end point device. If the smart grid is 17,000 sq. Kms, a short distance from the meter is irrelevant. Everything in the 17,000 sq. Kms is in the circuit and an admitted power density means electromagnetic induction of bio electromagnetic organisms is happening.

Page 151 & 152 #462, 463 & 464 Response: The reference here is specific to the meter as an end point device, the coverage area of 17,000 sq. Kms is hitting the buildings as well. Incorporating the Zigbee frequencies inside the home will electromagnetically radiate the occupants as well as the building.

Page 152 & 153 #465 & 466 Response: Reference to duty cycle is addressed above with the grid on 24/7. Admissions of lower power densities is an admission of electromagnetic induction and stimulating tissue, which is to be avoided.

Page 154 #467 Response: Refer to above with the Exponent Report author admitting science was missing.

Page 154, 155 & 156 #468, 469 & 470 Response: Low levels of power density are just an admission of electromagnetic induction by the frequencies. The meter can not just be discussed as an end point device, all wireless coverage where the EMF are interacting have to be considered. The missing bio electromagnetic information, orientation of the fields have to be incorporated.

Page 157 #471 Response: In past cases, the mechanisms linking the frequencies to adverse health effects wasn't known. If those transmission lines referred to in 471 were single lines, the mechanism linking them to adverse health effects could be shown today.

Page 157 #472 Response: FBC is required to comply with Safety Code 6 and the frequencies as applied do not. Furthering that are a complexity of considerations as well as liabilities with FBC electromagnetically radiating 17,000 sq. Kms and everything in the coverage areas.

The mechanisms are known and the Exponent Report admits missing critical science. The Interveners have shown causation, biological plausibility and reproducibility which links the frequencies to adverse health effects.

Page 157 #473 Response: FBC is required to comply with Safety Code 6 and protect the public, not radiate 17,000 sq. Kms to communicate with wireless meters. The liability across the coverage area will far exceed any benefit.

Page 158 #475 Response: FBC reference to what they refer to as my self appointed title should be given no weight at all. In my opening statements, I referred to being an unbiased professional looking forward to providing evidence as well as being cross examined.
http://www.bcuc.com/Documents/Proceedings/2013/DOC_33849_C19-17_WKCC-WRITTEN-OPENING-STATEMENT.pdf

FBC did not exercise the right to cross examine me and told Mr. Fulton they did not want to cross examine me. Had FBC done so, I would have qualified the title as well as other facts related to credentials.

I am the Chief Science Officer for very particular reasons. The entire academic world is literally blind to temperature. As electrical and engineering professionals, temperature is an important consideration but only considered in calculators.

My background as an infrared consultant started in 1979 during the pioneering of portable infrared. What I did differently was complete a double science background in electrical and building engineering specifically to compliment my extensive background in infrared applications.

Our work and through my direction has allowed us to consult on complex issues the world's professionals are blind to. Industrial shut downs by oil, gas, refinery, utilities, lumber, mines, governments, etc have been scheduled based on our reporting.

Working for fire departments at an operation's level was to provide their professional's sight through smoke. During the 2003 interface fires in Kelowna, the Province of BC and municipalities fought forest fires blind when they could have tracked the direction of the fires through the smoke. We were the only ones that watched the interface fire hit Kelowna and I initiated the evacuation of Kettle Valley August 21, 2003.

DFO has used our work as their standard in RFP in the aerial detection of ground water. That required consulting for forestry, biologists, hydrologists, agriculture, etc related to the application.

Medicine is blind to inflammation, disease progression, non thermal effects, cancer detection, physiological changes with effective treatment and after years of challenges by medicine, I lead a team and have lectured medical education for education credits required for ongoing medical licensing for 6 years.

I have been retained to lecture in 7 counties to date and our work will change academia of the world after evolving temperature out of the calculator. I am published and adjunct faculty for 2 international medical education groups.

Buildings and their energy consumption are designed with temperatures provided by Environment Canada through building codes. Municipalities across the country sign buildings off as compliant because they can't see building function.

Los Angeles alone spends over 100 million dollars a year responding to urban heat islands, our work included showing solar EMFs interacting with absorbent exteriors cause urban heat islands. http://www.bcuc.com/Documents/Proceedings/2012/DOC_32604_C19-6_WKCC-Submission-RDCK-Nelson-Creston_Suspension.pdf

Water behind walls can be seen as can mold.

I was cleared by Canada's Defence Minister to consult on a vulnerability issue after 9/11 that the military couldn't see and the list goes on. Offered services on the Gulf Oil Spill as chemicals in water can be seen.

Here are the questions by FBC for IR #1. You will read I do not have medical credentials but lecture medical education including doctors, nurses, dentists, etc for CE credits they require for licensing. I am not a physician but consult them in clinical environments. I am not a professional engineer but they do retain us to consult for them.

http://www.bcuc.com/Documents/Proceedings/2013/DOC_33705_C19-13_WKCC_Resps-FBC_IR-1_Intvr-Evidence.pdf

Dr. Shkolnikov referred to me as an engineer once and an electrical engineer at another time during cross examination. It has been typical with double science credentials for people or professionals to refer to me in different capacities.

During my cross examination, I was very aware of Dr. Shkolnikov's reference to me being an electrical engineer. I dismissed it because I have never represented that nor would I. Furthering that, FBC "expert" panel spent the bulk of their time attempting to walk around the science and sell their self interests in the Exponent Report. I didn't want to waste my cross examination time correcting your experts when they had access to all evidence including credentials.

In regards to being an "expert witness" at the level you refer to? Experts don't talk around science to substantiate self interests, especially with a report as scientifically incomplete as the Exponent Report.

Page 159 #476 Response: Don't dismiss what you refer to as an electrician's knowledge of electrical systems. Electricians are trained, educated and employed to install as well as troubleshoot electrical systems designed by electrical engineers. We are the practical compliment to their objectives and engineers are not qualified to do work as an electrician. Working the tool end of electrical and harnessing the electron is one of the most dangerous job in the world.

As an engineering technologist specific to buildings and the electrical credentials, I am very qualified in what I referred to as molecular earthquakes. While FBC lawyers assume it is phenomena, I assure you the engineering community does not. Dr. Shkolnikov's confirming electromagnetic induction as science substantiates my cross examination and dismisses your comment on phenomena.

Page 159 #477 Response: Dr. Bailey and Dr. Shkolnikov did not thoroughly and conclusively address the issues in cross examination. They admitted errors and substantiated the Exponent Report as a scientifically baseless document not even discussing or addressing the issues of bio electromagnetic.

Page 159 #477(a) Response: This is another attempt to substantiate a flawed report. Refer to page 136 above and Dr. Shkolnikov refers to inducing currents creating heat as another mechanisms. There is no reference to the multitude of frequency interactions, the resultant frequencies, voltage changes and more calculations depending on the person or orientation to the EMF. Then you have to do more calculations every time the person moves within the EMF. This is part of that bio electromagnetic information Dr. Bailey says wasn't included in the Exponent Report.

Dr. Bailey admitting to the stimulation of nervous systems also affecting hormonal and immune systems should set off alarm bells for what that means. It substantiates all the biological reporting of the CST witnesses including the Bioinitiative Report.

Dr. Bailey confirming Safety Code 6 doesn't contain bio electromagnetic information further substantiates a flawed Exponent Report and substantiates Safety Code 6 missing critical science on exposure.

Page 159 #477(b) Response: This paragraph is electrically incomplete without all the information Dr. Bailey left out of the Exponent Report, the calculations of electrical changes by Dr. Shkolnikov and science professionals don't use terms you refer to as "likely" transparent. We know or we don't. These EMFs covering 17,000 sq. Kms will interact with anything they hit and that is why it requires the incorporation of all the sciences of everything in the coverage area. Referring to a heat effect as the only adverse health effect exists because mechanisms have been missing or not included.

Page 159 #477(c) Response: As soon as you add Mr. Warren admitting the frequencies are going to cover 17,000 sq. Kms, you have causality. It shows how the frequencies hit people from head to toe. Include the missing electrical and bio electromagnetic information with the frequency interactions shows biological plausibility as well as reproducibility. Now Dr. Bailey and the Exponent Report can use that in their revision of their reporting.

Page 160 #477(d) Response: An admitted power density being absorbed inside the body is an electrical load and not in a localized area. The fact the body has its own electricity further complicates the bio electromagnetic information and results.

These frequencies go through walls and buildings, Dr. Shkolnikov referred to 1 meter ground penetration. They go through your body, they do not just cause excitation on the surface of the skin. Blanket coverage of the grid substantiates being hit by the frequencies from head to toe.

Page 160 #477(e) Response: Dr. Shkolnikov stated in cross it was possible but not probable, you have no science, tests, reporting or evidence to substantiate this paragraph.

Page 160 #477(f) Response: Safety Code 6 did negate to consider conductivity and bio electromagnetic. If they didn't you would be referring to the body as vulnerable, intricate electrochemical system. Instead you are back to the heat effect only. 100% of the required electrical calculations are missing. Safety Code 6 and SAR tests is an admission of electromagnetic induction which is harm, not just heat.

Page 160 #477(g) Response: If this statement were true, you would have the SAR test as it relates to every piece of the wireless circuit, the cumulative effect of all of them, the incorporation of the Zigbee frequencies interactions and the cumulative effect. You only address the meter and do not report the cumulative power densities inside the body as well as include changes with every movement within the EMF. Safety Code 6 only considered the meter and exposure for 24/7 because the meter isn't held against the head.

Safety Code 6 only refers to the end point device and they can't include the routers, antennas because stimulation of tissue is to be avoided. Jerry Flynn specifically asked about the cumulative effect of all the frequencies, I didn't see you verify that in discussion or calculations.

Page 161 #477(h) Response: You always refer to intermittent transmissions by the meter and now you are admitting 24/7 exposure to cell phone frequencies with frequencies hitting people from head to toe. This acceptance is based on Health Canada saying the meter isn't held against the head but they did leave out the routers, relays and antennas as well as bio electricity.

Page 161 #477(i) Response: This paragraph is electrical and engineering nonsense to substantiate the application. I would warn and advise FBC that civil engineers have not dismissed the frequency interaction as it relates to their responsibility. What kind of air pressure in a normal conversation penetrates the ground 1 meter? I didn't see the evidence of the compressive strength tests from engineers.

Page 161 #477(j) Response: This is another paragraph of engineering and science nonsense. You refer to zero or static field frequencies or a few Hz above that and then blanket 17,000 sq. Kms with 900 million cycles per second just to communicate with meters? What applicable professional or department did you get this from, please produce the tests and reporting. There is substantial reporting of harm to pollinators, birds of all kind, animals, etc.

Page 161 #478 Response: FBC will not address climate change, the 17,000 sq. Km coverage area with an admitted power density will create a 17,000 sq. Km heat sink that will contribute to climate change. FBC will not reduce emissions except in the reported meter reader being eliminated from driving. With regard to building energy use, power consumption and emissions, you are not reducing the emissions. You are billing people for the energy waste. All of these building inspections were completed in FBC coverage area.

http://www.bcuc.com/Documents/Proceedings/2012/DOC_32604_C19-6_WKCC-Submission-RDCK-Nelson-Creston_Suspension.pdf

I would have looked forward to providing any evidence in the best interest of the application, that is one of the reasons for looking forward to cross examination.

Jerry Flynn's cross examination was informative and provided a more in depth view of the wireless grid to be deployed. His questions about the cumulative effect were to the point but not qualified.

While Jerry's cross qualified mechanisms linking the frequencies to adverse health effects, the mechanisms reported substantiated Jerry's concerns on adverse health effects. Having a retired military officer represent concern should set off alarms regardless if he is referring to the internet.

The mechanisms reported and electrical information missed substantiate the CST witnesses reporting adverse health effects. FBC referring to heat effect with others referring to biological effects isn't even discussing the same science. Safety Code 6 is a seriously flawed code missing critical science and the science has changed.

In closing the FortisBC application for the deployment of wireless smart meters should be denied. The application of invasive frequencies of these kind isn't definable as sustainable when you consider the applicant will radiate everything in the coverage area with unrealized liability as a result.

Radiating infrastructure will accelerate corrosion and adversely affect municipalities, industries, crops, timber, spawning, health as well as building compliance with building code.

I look forward to see the revised Exponent Report after Dr. Shkolnikov completed the changes with all electrical information incorporated and considered. The revision of Safety Code 6 is due from the Royal Society late 2013.

The dangers of the frequencies as applied is now lectured in medical education for CE credits and approved in North America. It is no longer opinion, it is recognized medical education. The dangers of radiating 17,000 sq. Kms is it shows how frequencies hit people from head to toe and effectively changes medical diagnosis.

http://www.bcuc.com/Documents/Proceedings/2013/DOC_33322_C19-8_WKCC_Evidence.pdf

Sincerely,

Curtis Bennett
Chief Science Officer
Interprovincial Journeyman Electrician(Red Seal)
Building Construction Engineering Technologist
Adjunct Faculty for IHF & GEDI
33 Year Advanced Thermography Background
www.thermoguy.com
curtis@thermoguy.com
Ph: 604-239-2694