ORIGINAL

OPEN MEETING AGENDA ITEM

2013 JUN 10 A 10: 15 Tucson AZ 85745 www.electromagneticsafety.org

CORP COMMISSION

520 743-0125

June 7, 2013

Arizona Corporation Commission Docket Control 1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, AZ, 85007-2996

Re: Docket No. E-00000C-11-0328. Smart Meters

Dear Arizona Corporation Commissioners, AZCC Staff, List of Interveners and others

This filing for the Smart Meters Docket #E-00000C-11-0328, contains an original filing and 13 copies and is filed on behalf for Arizonans for Safer Utility Infrastructure.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Kelley, MA Coordinator, Arizonans for Safer Utility Infrastructure Director, Electromagnetic Safety Alliance, Inc. www.electromagneticsafety.org

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED
JUN 1 0 2013
DOOKETED BY

 \mathcal{A}'



Dochercope

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

)

)

)

)

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMMISSION'S OWN GENERIC INVESTIGATION OF THE ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 1992

DOCKET NO. 00000C-11-0328

<u>AFFIDAVIT</u>

THE UNDERSIGNED hereby certifies that he is over eighteen years of age, competent to testify, and is not a party to this action.

Credentials and Experience:

My name is David O. Carpenter. I am a public health physician who currently holds the positions of Director, Institute for Health and the Environment at the University at Albany, Professor of Environmental Health Sciences in the School of Public Health at the University at Albany and Honorary Professor, Queensland Children's Medical Research Institute, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia. After graduating from Harvard College and Harvard Medical School I chose a career of research and public health, rather than the practice of patient medicine.

I spent seven years doing basic neuroscience research at the National Institute of Mental Health in Bethesda, MD, and then accepted a position that I held for eight years as a department head in the Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute (AFRRI), also in Bethesda. AFRRI is the primary Department of Defense research institute dealing with the health effects of both ionizing and non-ionizing radiation. The radiofrequency fields used by smart meters are one form of non-ionizing radiation.

Two of the major public health issues in New York in the late 1970s were Love Canal and Three Mile Island. Because of my experience with neurotoxicology (relevant to Love Canal) and radiation biology (relevant to Three Mile Island and electromagnetic fields), I was recruited to become the Director of the Wadsworth Center for Laboratories and Research of the New York State Department of Health in 1980. The Wadsworth Laboratories are the third largest public health laboratories in the United States, with about 1,000 employees at that time. Two weeks before I arrived in Albany there was a settlement between the New York Power Authority and the New York State Public Service Commission requiring that the New York State Department of Health

Page 1 of 9

#00000 C-11-0328

develop a research program to determine whether there were human health effects from exposure to electromagnetic fields coming from power lines, and I was given the responsibility of the administration of this program. With the five million dollars assessed from New York utilities we supported 16 research projects, issuing a final report in 1987. That report concluded that the magnetic fields associated with power lines were associated with an increase in the risk of childhood cancer, especially leukemia. After that time I became the spokesperson for the State of New York on issues related to electromagnetic fields until I left employment with the Department of Health in 1998. I have been involved in the issue of health hazards from exposure to electromagnetic fields of all frequencies since that time. I have edited a two volume book on the subject, published in 1994. I served as the co-editor of the Bioinitiative Report (www.bioinitiative.org), a comprehensive review of the literature on this subject, first published in 2007 and updated in 2012. The public health chapter from this report was subsequently published in a peer reviewed journal. I testified at hearings on electromagnetic fields before the US House of Representatives in the late 1990s and again in 2008, and at the President's Cancer Panel in 2009. I have also provided testimony on the human health effects of electromagnetic fields for the states of Connecticut, California, Maine and Vermont.

During my tenure as the Director of the Wadsworth Laboratories I promoted a collaborative relationship between the Department of Health and the University at Albany, resulting in the creation of the School of Public Health. In 1985 I was appointed as the first Dean of the School of Public Health, while remaining employed by the Department of Health. The School remains unique among schools of public health as being a full partnership between a university and a state health agency. I held the position of Dean until 1998, when I changed my state employment to the University and became the Director of the Institute for Health and the Environment, a position I hold today. I am a public health physician, whose research goals are to prevent human disease by preventing exposure to hazardous substances. I have published a total of over 350 papers in peer reviewed journals, have edited six books and have numerous other publications in books and reviews.

Health Effects of Radiofrequency Fields:

Until recently there has been relatively little attention to radiofrequency (RF) electromagnetic field exposures and human health. RF electromagnetic waves are those that are used for radio, television, radar, cell phones, smart meters, WiFi and all forms of wireless communication. Older studies have reported elevations in both leukemia and brain tumors among individuals with occupational exposures to RF (see www.bioinitiative.org for references), but the results were not very consistent across studies. Recent reports have found elevated rates of leukemia among children who live near AM radio transmitter sites (Michelozzi et al., 2002; Park et al., 2004; Ha et al.,

00000 C-11-1328

2007). This is the same cancer elevated with exposure to power-line frequency EMFs, suggesting that leukemia is the cancer most likely to show elevated risk with whole body exposure to EMFs of any frequency.

With the advent of enormous increases in the use of cell phones, we now have a situation in which a very large segment of society is regularly exposed to high levels of RF. In addition, the whole population has increased exposure through the placement of cell phone towers, wireless buildings and even wireless cities. Smart meters are one of the newest forms of RF radiation exposure.

The strongest evidence for hazards from exposure to RF radiation has come from Europe, especially Scandinavia, where cell phones were initially manufactured and have been in wide use for a longer period of time than in other parts of the world. Longterm use of a cell phone is associated with an elevated risk of brain tumors and acoustic neuromas, but only on the side of the head where the phone is regularly used. Acoustic neuromas are a benign tumor of the auditory nerve, but they, like other brain tumors, can be life-threatening because they are space occupying and grow within the bony skull. In a meta-analysis (a review and evaluation of multiple research studies), Hardell et al. (2008) reported an odds ratio (OR) of 2.0 (95% CI = 1.2-3.4) for glioma among adults who have used a cell phone for ten years or more, but only on the side of the head where the phone was used. (An odds ratio is the ratio of disease found in the exposed population as compared to those not exposed. Thus an OR of 2.0 means that the risk of developing a brain tumor was doubled in those who used a cell phone for 10 or more years as compared to those did not use a cell phone. CI stands for confidence interval, and if the lower number is greater than 1.0 epidemiologists consider that the relationship is statistically significant). There was also an OR of 2.4 (95% CI = 1.1-5.3) for acoustic neuroma among long-term users. Risks for meningioma, another type of brain cancer, were elevated, but not significantly so. Kundi (2009) has reported on 33 epidemiological studies, and finds that the combined ORs from these studies show an OR of 1.5 (95% CI = 1.2-1.8) for glioma. There was also a non-significant elevation in ORs for acoustic neuroma but no relationship with meningioma.

The INTERPHONE study was a 13-nation investigation coordinated by the World Health Organization (WHO), and the first results were published in 2010 by The Interphone Study Group. While no excess risk of brain cancer was reported when comparing individuals who had ever used a cell phone to those who had not, there was more than a doubling of risk of brain gliomas in individuals who had used a cell phone for 10 years or more, a 1.8-fold elevated risk if they had used a cell phone for 1,640 hours or more, and a 1.3-fold elevated risk if they had made more the 270 calls. The elevation in risk was only on the side of the head where the cell phone was regularly used. The Israeli component of this study found an elevated risk of ipsilateral parotid gland cancer with long-term cell phone use (Sadetzki et al., 2008). The parotid gland is one of the salivary glands, but is located in the cheek, near to where a cell phone would be used.

Page 3 of 9

000000 - 11-0328

There is reason for particular concern about risks to children exposed to RF. Hardell et al. (2004) studied relative risk based on the age when a person began to use a cell phone. For use of either analog or cordless phones when assessed at >1 or >5 year latency, he found that individuals whose use began while they were in their 20s has higher ORs for brain cancer than those whose use began at an older age. Later Hardell and Carlberg (2009) reported that children who began use of a cell phone prior to the age of 20 had an OR of developing glioma of 5.2 (95% CI = 2.2-12) after only one+ year of cell phone use, while for all ages the OR was 1.4 (95% CI = 1.1-1.7). The same relative relationship was seen with use of a cordless phone, where use before the age of 20 years gave an OR of 4.4 (95% CI = 1.9-10), whereas for all ages the OR was 1.4 (95% CI = 1.1-1.8). These studies support the conclusion that use of cordless phones also increases risk, and that children are more vulnerable to risk of brain cancer than adults. The elevated risk to children poses a major concern given the current extensive use of cell phones, even by young children. It is important to note that it was also children who showed the elevations in risk of developing leukemia among those living near to high powered radio transmission towers. These two kinds of studies show clearly that children are more at risk of developing cancer than adults when exposed to radiofrequency radiation.

The Specific Issue of Smart Meters:

There is clear and strong evidence that intensive use of cell phones increases the risk of brain cancer, tumors of the auditory nerve and cancer of the parotid gland. Wireless smart meters, such as those proposed for use in Arizona, use similar radiofrequency radiation, although the intensity of exposure in the immediate environment is under most circumstances lower than what one gets from holding a cell phone close to your head. The difference between a cell phone and a smart meter environment is that while the cell phone is used only intermittently, a smart meter will generate RF continuously with intermittent pulses. There is also strong evidence that leukemia rates are increased among people living near to powerful AM radio transmission towers. Because WiFi, radio transmission towers and smart meters all generate similar RF radiation, my conclusion is that if the whole body is exposed, leukemia is the major cancer of concern, while if only the head is exposed as in using a cell phone, one sees increased risk of local cancers, such as brain cancer.

There have been no studies of the health effects of smart meters to my knowledge, since they are recent devices. The International Agency for Research on Cancer of the World Health Organization this past summer declared radiofrequency radiation to be a possible human carcinogen (IARC, 2013). While it is true that the nature of exposure to RF from smart meters is not significantly different from that coming from other wireless

Page 4 of 9

000000 -11-0328

devices, what is important is cumulative, aggregate exposure. In my judgment we should practice "prudent avoidance", which is to say reduce unnecessary exposure to the degree possible until the magnitude of risk is fully understood.

*

My specific concerns about smart meters are as follows:

- The benefit of the smart meters is entirely to the utilities, and is economic in nature. If they install smart meters they can fire those individuals who at present are employed to go around reading meters. Thus, this is a job-killing proposal, and will increase unemployment in a state that already has too much.
- 2. Wireless smart meters typically produce atypical, relatively potent and very short pulsed radiofrequency microwaves whose biological effects have never been fully tested. They emit these millisecond-long bursts on average 9,600 times a day with a maximum of 190,000 daily transmissions and a peak level emission two and a half times higher than the stated safety signal, as acknowledged by the Pacific Gas & Electric Company before the California Public Utilities Commission. I assume the specifics of the smart meters being installed in Arizona will be similar to those in California. Wireless smart meters usually transmit information to the utility for only brief periods of time, but the device continuously generates radiation even though it is not used. This will expose anyone nearby 24/7.
- 3. The intensity of microwaves will fall off with distance from the smart meter, but when an individual is nearby the whole body will be exposed, not just a head as when using a cell phone.
- 4. When a smart meter is installed residents have no choice in the matter or ability to avoid exposure. But every individual has the option to use or not use other personal wireless devices. There is a major difference between an exposure which an individual chooses to accept and one that is forced on individuals who can do nothing about it. While in my judgment it is unwise for the industry and the government to push wireless smart meters on the public, at the very least individuals who are concerned about their health and the health of their families should have the opportunity to "opt-out" of having a smart meter placed in their home or workplace.
- 5. The evidence for adverse effects of radiofrequency radiation is currently strong and grows stronger with each new study. The same benefit to the utility could be achieved by use of a "wired" smart meter that did not use radiofrequency radiation to communicate from the home to the utility. Wired meters with shielded cables do not increase exposure. However the cost of installation of a wired smart meter needs to be balanced against the cost to the health of the public of installation of wireless smart meters.

The Cost of Doing Nothing:

At present we do not know precisely to what degree the risk of cancer is increased by Page 5 of 9

* 000000-11-0328

exposure to RF fields from cell phones, smart meters and other wireless devices. Human studies are difficult under any circumstances, but those difficulties are even greater when studying the effects of radiofrequency radiation. Levels of exposure for each of us to RF fields vary over the course of every day as we move through our environment, use cell phones, sit or stand near to smart meters and other wireless devices for varying periods of time. There is a whole body exposure from cell phone towers, radio and television transmission towers and WiFi. Most studies to date have relied on place of residence in relation to radiofrequency towers or self-reports of how frequently individuals used their cell phone ten years ago, and this is difficult to remember with any certainty. This makes exposure assessment extremely poor. Given the long latency for development of cancer, one would expect that the actual risk of radiofrequency-induced cancer is significantly greater than that indicated by studies with inadequate exposure assessment. Unfortunately almost every study done to date has inadequate exposure assessment.

There is considerable evidence that children are more vulnerable to many environmental insults than are adults (Ginsberg, 2003). The reality is that children are using cell phones at increasing rates and for long durations. Therefore, if the risks are real, and especially if children are more susceptible, we may be facing an epidemic of brain and other cancers. The concern is increased because to date there has been little warning advising restrictions on use of cell phones, especially by children. While questions regarding mechanisms are not all answered, the evidence for a relationship between cell phone exposure and cancer is sufficiently strong so as to demand action. The alternative may be significant increases in certain cancers, especially leukemia and brain cancer. It is not clear whether there is increased risk of other kinds of cancer following exposure because there has not been a study of, for example, the health hazard of wearing a cell phone on your belt and pelvic cancers.

In late 2012, a revised Bioinitiative Report was released that reports that, since the initial 2007 report, new studies have been reported that demonstrate links to sperm DNA damage, infertility, and hyperactivity, learning and behavioral problems in young children.

A newly published review of neurological disorders and deaths in the Western countries (Pritchard et al., 2013) found between 1997 and 2010 there was a sharp rise of dementia and other neurological deaths in people under 74 with earlier onset affecting people under 55 years of age. Of the 10 biggest Western countries, the USA had the worst increase in all neurological deaths, men up 66% and women 92%. The authors speculate that these changes could be attributable to the many environmental and social changes over the past 30 years: "the explosion in electronic devices, rises in background non-ionizing radiation- PC's, micro waves, TV's, mobile phones; road and air transport up four-fold increasing background petro-chemical pollution; chemical additives to food etc. There is no one factor rather the likely interaction between all

Page 6 of 9

000000 - 11-0328

these environmental triggers."

Recently the Board of the American Academy of Environmental Medicine, in opposition to installation of wireless smart meters, stated "Chronic exposure to wireless radiofrequency radiation is a preventable environmental hazard that is sufficiently well documented to warrant immediate preventative public health action", and called for "An immediate moratorium on 'smart meter' installation until these serious public health issues are resolved. Continuing with their installation would be extremely irresponsible."

The State of Arizona would be wise to follow this advice from the physician organization most responsible for dealing with human disease as a result of environmental exposures. There is now much more evidence of risk to health, affecting billions of people world-wide. The status quo is not acceptable in light of the evidence for harm. Many scientists and medical experts urgently recommend that measures following the Precautionary Principle be applied immediately — such as using wired meters — to reduce biologically inappropriate microwave exposure. We are not advocating the abolishment of RF technologies, only the use of common sense and the development and implementation of best practices in using these technologies in order to reduce exposure and risk of health hazards.

In summary, there is at present extensive evidence that exposure to excessive levels of radiofrequency fields as a result of long-term and heavy use of cell phones poses a risk of cancer, and this evidence is rapidly growing. The risk is greater for children, who are the most vulnerable members of our society and those on whom our future is most dependent. Smart meters cause exposure to similar radiofrequency fields, but the duration of exposure may be much longer and aggregate exposure may be greater. It is unwise to install smart meters throughout the population. It is unethical to place smart meters on homes of individuals who are concerned about their health and the health of their families. At a minimum there must be an "opt-out" option for individuals who are concerned. Enforcement of placement of smart meters will certainly open both industry and governments to litigation if they ignore the evidence for hazard. We are not going to go back to a pre-wireless age, but we need rather to find ways in which to use contemporary technology safely and learn to balance risks against benefits.

\$ 00000 B-11-0328

I DO SOLEMNLY DECLARE AND AFFIRM under the penalties of perjury that the matters and facts set forth herein are true to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

dourd Over yant-

David O. Carpenter, M.D.

Institute for Health and the Environment. 5 University Place Rensselaer, NY 12144 Phone 518-525-2660 • • • •

References:

- Ginsberg GL. Assessing cancer risks from short-term exposures in children. Risk Anal. 2003 Feb;23(1):19-34.
- Ha M, Im H, Lee M, Kim HJ, Kim BC, Gimm YM, Pack JK. Radio-frequency radiation exposure from AM radio transmitters and childhood leukemia and brain cancer. Am J Epidemiol. 2007 Aug 1;166(3):270-9.
- Hardell L, Carlberg M. Mobile phones, cordless phones and the risk for brain tumours. Int J Oncol. 2009 Jul;35(1):5-17.
- Hardell L, Carlberg M, Söderqvist F, Hansson Mild K. Meta-analysis of long-term mobile phone use and the association with brain tumours. Int J Oncol. 2008 May;32(5):1097-103.
- Hardell L, Mild KH, Carlberg M, Hallquist A. Cellular and cordless telephone use and the association with brain tumors in different age groups. Arch Environ Health. 2004 Mar;59(3):132-7.
- IARC (International Agency for Research on Cancer) (2013) Non-Ionizing Radiation, Part
 2: Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields. IARC Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans. World Health Organization.461 pp.
- INTERPHONE Study Group. Brain tumour risk in relation to mobile telephone use: results of the INTERPHONE international case-control study. Int J Epidemiol. 2010 Jun;39(3):675-94.
- Kundi M. The controversy about a possible relationship between mobile phone use and cancer. Environ Health Perspect. 2009 Mar;117(3):316-24.
- Michelozzi P, Capon A, Kirchmayer U, Forastiere F, Biggeri A, Barca A, Perucci CA. Adult and childhood leukemia near a high-power radio station in Rome, Italy. Am J Epidemiol. 2002 Jun 15;155(12):1096-103.
- Park SK, Ha M, Im HJ. Ecological study on residences in the vicinity of AM radio

Page 8 of 9

000000-11-0328

broadcasting towers and cancer death: preliminary observations in Korea. Int Arch Occup Environ Health. 2004 Aug;77(6):387-94.

Pritchard C, Mayers A, Baldwin D. Changing patterns of neurological mortality in the 10 major developed countries - 1979-2010. Public Health. 2013 Apr;127(4):357-68. Sadetzki S, Chetrit A, Jarus-Hakak A, Cardis E, Deutch Y, Duvdevani S, Zultan A, Novikov

I, Freedman L, Wolf M. Cellular phone use and risk of benign and malignant parotid gland tumors--a nationwide case-control study. Am J Epidemiol. 2008 Feb 15;167(4):457-67.