

E-01345A-14-0113



0000153411

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMIS
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: Jenny Gomez

ORIGINAL

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2014 - 116201

Date: 5/15/2014

Complaint Description: 01H Billing - Smart Meter
N/A Not Applicable

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

MAY 16 2014

Complaint By: First: Patricia Last: Ferre

Account Name: Patricia Ferre

Work:

DOCKETED BY

Street:

City: Payson

State: AZ Zip: 85541

is: E-Mail

Utility Company: Arizona Public Service Company

Division: Electric

Contact Name: For assignment

Nature of Complaint:

*****DOCKET NO. E-01345A-14-0113*****

From: Util-PublicComment
Sent: Wednesday, May 14, 2014 8:41 AM
To: Util-PublicComment

Subject: Public Comment

Name: Patricia Ferre
Date: 5/13/2014

CityStateZip: Payson, AZ 85541
Cell: []
Docket: Formal Complaint
DocketNo: E-01345A-14-0113

Utility: Arizona Public Service Company

Position: Con

Comments: APS MYTH: "APS HAS REVIEWED EPA HEALTH AND SAFETY STANDARDS OF SMART METERS. AFTER REVIEW, NONE OF THE EPA STANDARDS SHOWED SMART METERS TO BE IN BREACH OF THEIR STANDARDS." APS Research Department I was seriously concerned about safety issues related to the APS proposed 'smart' meter system and what I would have to do to safeguard our health, after attending the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC) Friday, March 23, 2012 Workshop on Meter Guidelines, Docket No. E-00000C-11-0328. Particularly I could not understand how a 'smart' meter mesh network grid system could possibly be safe. I still don't. It isn't. As an electrically hypersensitive person (EHS) I contacted an

RECEIVED
2014 MAY 16 A 10: 09
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

ACC customer service lady in a state of panic about the upcoming APS changes. She could not explain a safe 'smart' grid to me and referred me to APS customer service person, Elizabeth McFall. Thus began series of cordial, polite conversations between us relating to my questions and Elizabeth's answers about APS' idea of safety and what seemed to me to be an appalling inhumane APS policy. I asked questions and Elizabeth explained APS safety policy which came to sound more and more to me as being like a modern electronic concentration camp where there was no freedom from ubiquitous radiation permeating everything, everywhere. I did not seem to find APS website information on Smart Meters a source of inspiration in resolving my concerns, including the Myth vs Fact. Found it difficult to trust the website information, felt I was being manipulated, told half-truths and presented with distorted information. I had also listened to a talk by Dr. George Carlo on the history of the Mobile Phone Industry. I selectively transcribed portions which I posted on Docket E-00000C-11-0328 on April 9, 2012. It is listed at the end of this document as reference material. I did not trust APS' reliance on FCC guidelines, because I already knew the FCC has no authority to set human safety standards, and that 1.6 watts per kilogram is NOT really a safety standard. I asked Elizabeth about an EPA environmental impact study relating to 'smart' meters - showing 'smart' meter technology to be environmentally safe for humans and our environment. Elizabeth told me she didn't know the answer about that and would have to contact the APS Research Department and get back to me. Elizabeth phoned me back on Tuesday May 24, 2012, with the APS Research Department answer to my EPA question. She carefully read the APS Research Department statement and repeated it for me so I could write it down exactly right, word for word. Elizabeth was very careful to get the words exactly right herself and I followed suit. Elizabeth then confirmed the accuracy of the APS statement for me when I read it back: "APS has reviewed EPA health and safety standards of 'smart' meters. After review, none of the EPA standards showed 'smart' meters to be in breach of their standards." I then asked Elizabeth, what did APS review? What were the EPA safety standards? What EPA documents can I see that APS reviewed? I wanted to see copies of the EPA documents APS reviewed that proved 'smart' meters are safe! FACT: Elizabeth finally broke with the APS Research Department protocol statement and said: "THERE ARE NO EPA SAFETY STANDARD DOCUMENTS REFERRING TO 'SMART' METERS, SO OF COURSE 'SMART' METERS ARE NOT IN BREACH OF NO STANDARDS." FACTS: CURRENTLY ACC STAFF AND APS STAFF ARE VOTING WITH THEIR ACTIONS AND ARE USING WEAPONIZED 'SMART' MICROWAVE TECHNOLOGY ON THEMSELVES AND EVERYONE ELSE. THE GENERAL PUBLIC IS MOSTLY UNINFORMED AND IGNORANT OF THE CONSEQUENCES. POWERFUL INFLUENCES OBVIOUSLY CHOSE TO CIRCUMVENT THE STRINGENT EPA NEPA REGULATIONS THAT WOULD HELP KEEP ALL OF US SAFE FROM A WEAPONIZED 'SMART' MICROWAVE TECHNOLOGY. WE THE PEOPLE NEED TO MAKE THINGS RIGHT FOR OUR OWN HEALTH; FOR THE HEALTHY LIFE OF ARIZONA; FOR THE HEALTH OF FUTURE GENERATIONS OF LIFE ON OUR PLANET. THIS AFFECTS ALL OF US AND ALL LIFE FORMS. It is interesting to note that 'smart' AMI actually fits the definition of a WMD. Yes, the definition of a weapon of mass destruction. The definition of WMD in Wikipedia under Military: "For the general purposes of national defense, the U.S. Code defines a weapon of mass destruction as: any weapon or device that is intended, or has the capability, to cause death or serious bodily injury to a significant number of people through the release, dissemination, or impact of: toxic or poisonous chemicals or their precursors, a disease organism, radiation or radioactivity[28] "US CODE: 50, ch. 40, § 2302. Definitions". .law.cornell.edu. 23 March 2010. Retrieved 5 August 2010. The Wikipedia WMD definition does not mention a specific time frame. It seems the present plan to implement AMI is global. AMI may also be efficiently linked up to Geo-engineering, Weather Modification Warfare, GMOs and other creative forms of warfare against healthy life on earth, since it is rumored that a depopulation agenda is being implemented. I wish all of us will at least live in a world safe from toxic microwave radiation! Respectfully submitted, Patricia Ferre Additional Notes
<http://images.edocket.azcc.gov/docketpdf/0000135739.pdf> Please scroll down past the 51 pages of SAGE Associates Environmental Consultants Assessment of Radiofrequency Microwave Radiation Emissions from Smart Meters, Sage Associates, Santa Barbara, CA. Dr. George Carlo Tells the History of Mobile Phone Industry Part 8 of 12 www.youtube.com/watch?v=iJr8DdFozs FDA, FCC & EPA are the US agencies that might apply to cell phone regulations brief notes, page 1 of 2 FCC Political pressure: 1.6 watts per kilogram standard adopted as a guideline by FCC before the 1.6 watts per kilogram guideline was adopted for analog signals There was almost no science to support that 1.6 watts per kilogram (marker 0.38) FCC auctions bandwidths for billions and FCC became the mortgage holder for 90% of the sale price for the bandwidths, requiring only 10% down FCC, as mortgagor has CONFLICT OF INTEREST: makes billions from the cell phone industry. FCC does not have the authority to set safety standards. Industry points to 1.6 watts per kilogram as a

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

safety standard but it is NOT a safety standard. FCC is a commission based agency, it is not a safety agency. (marker 3:20) Industry says it meets "all of the applicable safety standards" forgetting to tell the public that there are no applicable safety standards! (marker 3:66) EPA Most aggressive government agency in terms of controlling radio frequency radiation emissions. The cell phone industry would never be able to follow the standards. If EPA were involved we would have to follow a very stringent standard called National Environmental Policy Act Standard (NEPA). The cell phone industry would never be able to follow the standard. BUDGET OF THE EPA WAS DRASTICALLY CUT SO THAT IN 2006 THERE WAS ONLY 1 PERSON AT THE EPA ADDRESSING RADIO FREQUENCY RADIATION & HE WAS NOT ALLOWED TO SPEAK PUBLICLY ABOUT THE ISSUE.

End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

Noted and filed for the record in Docket No. E-01345A-14-0113

End of Comments

Date Completed: 5/15/2014

Opinion No. 2014 - 116201
