

Correspondence with Health Department

When it comes to Health issues with respect to radiofrequencies, the Victorian Chief Health Officer Dr Rosemary Lester advised me that:

- a. Radiofrequency matters are considered outside the scope of the Victorian Public Health and Wellbeing Act.
- b. The Department does not investigate issues of hypersensitivity by stating *“There would appear to be no requirement for any program to deal with alleged conditions of hypersensitivity.”*
- c. The health department considers public health issues involving radiofrequencies in the communications sector to be the responsibility of the Australian Communication and Media Authority (ACMA). One would assume that health is a primary responsibility of a health department. Apparently when it comes to RF it is not.

What I find quite disconcerting is the fact that the Victorian Chief Health Officer, despite saying RF related health issues are not within the health department’s scope and not having any qualifications in non-ionising radiation safety, has given her endorsement to say smart meter RF emissions are safe. Such a comment is deceitful as there have been no studies conducted to date that have a long term health focus in relation to smart meter emissions. Nobody has been able to provide proof of safety and there is plenty of evidence of people suffering disabling effects that have only occurred after a smart meter was installed.

Result: Handball to ACMA.

Correspondence with Energy Safe Victoria (ESV)

I sent an email to Energy Safe Victoria when they were seeking public comment on their draft Smart Meter Safety report by raising the issue of RF emissions in relation to health and safety. I received the following response from ESV.

“Energy Safe Victoria is the regulator for electrical safety, which includes electricity and infrastructure. We have no legislative role in relation to radio frequencies, which are administered by ACMA.

Our report was originally designed to review safety issues relating to smart meters affected by high-voltage injection. The report was never designed or intended to take a detailed look at RF as this does not fall within our regulatory framework.”

Result: Handball to ACMA.

Communication to the (former) Energy Minister Michael O'Brien

Mr O'Brien covered a number of topics in his response to my concerns which included health, privacy, security and alleged customer benefits.

a. With regards to my right to refuse the installation of a smart meter, Mr O'Brien failed to provide any references to Government legislation to support claims by power utilities that installation of a smart meter is required by law. Mr O'Brien also failed to provide any details of penalties for refusing installation (such a refusal action would be breaking the law if there was one). Instead, his response indicated that "*The distribution business own, operate and maintain the 'poles and wires' infrastructureAs such, the business is entitled to replace its own equipment....*". From this statement one can safely assume that there is NO LAW.

b. Advised me that the ACMA is responsible for mandating the standard for radio communications equipment.

c. indicated that "*The Victorian Health Department endorses ARPANSA's position and notes 'there is no substantive evidence to suggest that exposure to radiofrequency radiation such as from Smart Meters can increase the risk of chronic health effects, such as cancer'.*"

The above of course is at best nonsensical as there have been no studies on smart meter radiation emissions and long term health effects. The fact that the DPI, Health Department, ACMA or ARPANSA are all unwilling to investigate claims of ill health AFTER installation of a smart meter will allow them to continue making this ridiculous and erroneous statement.

Result: Handball to Power Companies, ACMA, Victorian Health Department and ARPANSA

Correspondence with Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA)

When I contacted the ACMA with regards to the Chief Health Officers claims I received the following response from the ACMA's Assistant Licensing Manager.

"The deployment of smart meters across Victoria is an initiative of the Government of Victoria.

The Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA) is not a provider or regulator of health services. As such, the ACMA cannot provide advice about the potential health impacts of radiocommunications devices."

Additionally, ACMA's CEO, Mr Chris Chapman, indicated that moral responsibility for protecting the health and safety of people from harmful effects of ionising and non-ionising radiation falls upon ARPANSA.

Result: Handball to the Victorian State Government (DPI) and to ARPANSA.

Correspondence with DPI

The Victorian State Government Department of Primary Industries (*DPI*) is the administering department that has “*an enduring responsibility to take an active oversight role*” relating to the rollout of the *Advanced Metering Infrastructure* (AMI) which utilises smart meters. Deputy Secretary Sandra Denis, who never returned my phone calls, sent a letter with the following:

- a. Explained that any concerns regarding the standards and safe levels of radiofrequency emissions should be directed to ARPANSA.
- b. After I challenging the DPI with respect to the number of transmissions from a meshed networked wireless smart meter (Some utilities are falsely claiming that a smart meter transmits once every 4 hours or 6 times a day) indicated that any questions relating to the inbuilt radio transmitter operation should be directed to the power utility, which in my case is Powercor.
- c. Trivialised the Group 2B carcinogen rating by comparing it to coffee, joinery and pickled vegetables and disregarded the fact that DDT and lead are also in this category. Would you like to have either of these with your coffee Ms Denis?
- d. Referenced a previous letter from the former Victorian Energy Minister, Michael O’Brien, regarding EHS being defined by the WHO as not being a medical diagnosis. Unfortunately, neither Ms Denis nor Mr O’Brien acknowledged the rest of the WHO’s statement regarding EHS that it is potentially a disabling condition. They also disregarded the fact that I advised them that Sweden recognises EHS as a functional impairment and that the Austrian Medical Association has released comprehensive documentation on how to diagnose and treat EHS sufferers.

Result: Handball to ARPANSA and Powercor.

Correspondence with Powercor

Janet Hogarty, Team Leader – AMI Customer Management from Powercor responded to my letters to the CEO at the time, Mr Shane Breheny. As a representative of Powercor we can assume that Ms Hogarty’s response is therefore Powercor’s response on the issue and is as follows:

- a) Advised me that the Victorian Government passed a law in August 2006 to enable a state wide rollout of smart meters. When challenged to provide specific details of the “law” and penalties for breaching said law, Powercor’s representative Ms Hogarty provided in writing more specific details relating to the Order In Council along with the following statement “*We agree the Order requiring best endeavours to be used to install interval meters is only directed at distributors*”. It is important to note that they mention “*interval meters*” and not smart meters. I already have a digital interval meter (without wireless) so why do I need to have it replaced?
- b) Continued to claim that smart meters only transmit sms like messages every 4 hours despite the fact that I informed the Powercor CEO I have video evidence showing meters transmitting every minute or more.
- c) Refused to provide any written health assurances for smart meter RF emissions. The exact phrasing was “*We are not in a position to give you any guarantees or assurances about smart meters and your health concerns.*” They also said “*Powercor remains of the view that it is not aware of any proven health risks to customers from the installation or use of the smart meters*”.

d) Indicated that the smart meters operate at lower power levels than devices such as mobile phones and comply with ARPANSA Radiation Protection Standards. Of course I am sensitive to Bluetooth devices (2.5 milli Watts for a class 2 Bluetooth device compared to the 1Watt output from a smart meter) and have informed on many occasions that I am sensitive to a variety of RF emitting devices. ARPANSA RF standards are not fit for purpose for claiming proof of safety as I have clearly demonstrated in past "Taking a stand" blogs.

e) Tried to apportion blame to the Government as to why they have to install smart meters but failed to acknowledge that they were solely responsible for choosing wireless technology for data transmission, which is causing me and many others health issues.

f) Denied they were in breach of section 98(a) of the *Electricity Safety Act 1998* which requires power Utilities "to design, construct, operate and maintain their networks **to minimize as far as practicable hazards and risks to the safety of any person arising from the supply network.**" What is disturbing is that they continue to deny that harm is being caused despite the growing number of people whose health has been directly impacted by smart meter RF emissions especially when affected individuals have informed their power provider in writing or over the phone of their health issues that have arisen only after smart meter installation.

Result: Handball to the Victorian State Government (DPI) and ARPANSA.

Correspondence with Energy and Water Ombudsman (EMOV)

When contacting EMOV about the threatening and bullying behaviour of installers and/or health impacts by installed meters, EMOV responds that installing a smart meter is required by law. When asked to provide details of the legislation in question that compels a person to accept a smart meter they pull out the "installation of smart meters is outside of EMOV's jurisdiction" avoidance card as shown in the pro forma response below:

"Thank you for contacting the Energy and Water Ombudsman (Victoria) (EWOV)

Your complaint appears to be outside EWOVs Jurisdiction

As per EWOVs Charter, your complaint falls outside of EWOVs jurisdiction for the following reasons:

4.2 (e) required by legislation

The installation of advanced meters is outside of EWOV's jurisdiction as the matter is required by Victorian Government mandate.

You have previously been referred to your local Member of Parliament and the Department of Primary Industries.

EWOV's role

EWOV is an independent body which receives and investigates enquiries and complaints from electricity, gas and water consumers. Our role is to help consumers resolve problems with their provider if they have not been able to do so directly with the provider. EWOV is able to resolve a complaint in a number of different ways so that you and the company are satisfied. "

Result: Handball to the Victorian State Government (DPI) and local Member of Parliament

Correspondence with ARPANSA

When I contacted ARPANSA regarding my sensitivity to smart meter RF emissions I received the following advice and commentary from ARPANSA's CEO

- a. ARPANSA does not regulate smart meters and cannot comment on the policies of other government departments - state, territory or Commonwealth.
- b. Advise me to talk to the DPI with regards to smart meter issues as smart meters are a Victorian Government initiative.
- c. Denies that individuals such as myself are unprotected and suggests I talk to a GP about my health issues.
- d. Falsely claims that Australia's RF Standards provide protection against RF emissions below the thermal threshold for life time exposures. I say this is false because the 1998 ICNIRP Guidelines on which our standards are based clearly say "*Induction of cancer from long-term EMF exposure was not considered to be established, and so these guidelines are based on short-term, immediate health effects such as stimulation of peripheral nerves and muscles, shocks and burns caused by touching conducting objects, and elevated tissue temperatures resulting from absorption of energy during exposure to EMF*"
- e. Provided a typical boiler plate response saying that "The weight of national and international scientific opinion is that there is no substantiated evidence that exposure to low level RF EME causes adverse health effects." Of course with no one actually conducting research on smart meter RF and potential health implications this statement is meaningless. I also have to wonder how long ARPANSA will keep recycling the above statement as it appears repeatedly in ARPANSA literature over the last 10 years and is beginning to wear thin. Every week, new scientific studies are released on <http://www.emf-portal.de> showing possible biological effects caused by RF that can lead to harm. More recently I have been monitoring the above website and have found far more papers showing biological effects than those that don't.
- f. Indicated that ARPANSA does not investigate individual cases.
- g. Dr Stephen Solomon also responded to me by indicating that less than 20 people have actually registered health issues and sensitivity to smart meters with ARPANSA. He ignored my question as to whether ARPANSA would investigate the more than 140 people that have registered their health issues with SSMA.

Result: Handball back to ACMA, the Victorian State Government (DPI) and suggested I see a doctor.

Interactions with General Practitioners

Depending on the GP, either they are not aware of what EHS is (majority) or have heard about it but don't have the tools or the methodology to diagnose and treat it. They suggest I take medication such as ibuprofen for my headache which does nothing to stop the symptoms that only occurred in earnest when wireless enabled smart meters were rolled out in our streets. They are unable to make any further suggestions. I have been sent to a neurologist who has not been able to identify the cause of my headaches and other sensory issues that I have been experiencing. It is my opinion that the medical profession as a whole is not adequately trained to deal with this issue nor is there any interest, at this stage, by the Health Department or Medical bodies in rectifying this deficiency.

SSMA has documented evidence of situations where GP's have written letters and medical certificates indicating that their patient should not have a smart meter installed on their home, or, should have one that is installed removed due to their patients state of health and vulnerability to RF exposure (i.e. implants that can be subject to EMR interference). Such requests, which are based on professional medical advice and

directives, have been completely disregarded by both the power companies and the Victorian government. This in itself is of great concern, as without due respect for medical certificates, doctors will simply no longer be able to provide health care to their patients and the community at large.

Communication with the Victorian Radiation Health and Safety Advisory Council

The Victorian Radiation Health and Safety Advisory Council put someone onto the case who is not a non-ionising radiation expert and recommended I talk to people who had previously worked in the Telecoms industry whose opinions are publically available and believe that EHS is not a valid condition. Yet a ruling at the administrative appeals tribunal (Melbourne) seems to recognise sensitivity to EMR as a valid health concern by ruling in favour of Dr Alexander McDonald on February 28th 2013.

It is also important to note that there is only one non-ionising expert on the Victorian Radiation Health and Safety Advisory Council and that is Dr Ken Joyner. Dr. Ken Joyner was formerly Motorola's Director of "Global EME Strategy and Regulatory Affairs" and has also represented the Australian Mobile Telecommunications Association, an industry group, on the telecommunications standards committee as well as representing the Mobile Manufacturers Forum.

What was surprising is that despite the clear conflicts of interests, Dr Ken Joyner being the only non-ionising expert on the advisory council was not given responsibility to responding to my queries regarding RF safety and health issues. Instead I was directed to an ionising radiation expert, which is completely left field and not appropriate for investigating non-ionising radiation concerns.

Conclusion:

It is amazing how many authoritative people I have been in contact with over this issue who think they are qualified to produce "factual" statements. So many "righteous" people who are supposed to serve the public but are not prepared to listen and help people who are suffering. Many of the responses from the various departments above are based on template answers that are void of intellectual and moral decency.

Many Government departments and Industry bodies suggest that a weight of evidence has not linked radiofrequencies below the thermal threshold with any health issues. We need a paradigm shift in scientific thinking that moves away from the current "weight of evidence" model used by a lot of international RF standards bodies and health departments because it relegates all evidence that is of a lesser weight to being unimportant and inconsequential. Scientist should be testing each and every research article (positive and negative) for quality, accuracy and repeatability especially if a study is showing possible harm. Not one study showing possible effects should be ignored unless they can be unequivocally proven to be flawed. Even if there is only one study that shows an effect that is potentially harmful and meets stringent scientific acceptance criteria it must be taken seriously.

Everybody should have the right to live in an environment free from unnecessary pain and mental anguish that is being inflicted on us by these unnatural RF emissions that are delivered by smart meters and other wireless devices/transmitters. In this regard the Victorian Government has been delinquent and wilfully negligent in its handling of the smart meter rollout by not conducting any post rollout surveillance studies to confirm that wireless smart meters are safe and not causing health issues. Power Utilities have also shown a wanton and callous disregard to those who are suffering by continuing to rollout smart meters on and around the affected individual's property. They assume that because RF emissions are purportedly lower than other wireless devices that smart meters must be safe. The government and the power utilities continue to make fallacious and unfounded statements knowing full well that there are people suffering and that ALL radiofrequencies have been classified by the IARC as a possible carcinogen. None of the departments contacted have yet to provide any proof of safety. If any one of them actually took the time to investigate the mounting scientific evidence of harm they would recognise that wireless RF exposure can result in increased

risks and has been linked to leukaemia, reproductive issues, behavioural issues, autism, neurological effects, DNA changes, certain types of cancer, and changes in the blood-brain barrier. It is time that responsible and considered action be taken by all of the offending parties mentioned in this blog to avoid a future public health catastrophe. A post rollout surveillance study investigating those who are claiming to be affected by smart meter emissions would be a good start as well as adopting the precautionary principle espoused in ACMA's Industry Code which is not currently being followed.

References:

Sood, R. & Price, D. 2012, *Smart Metering? Dumb Solution*, Frontier Economics, Client Briefing. Available: <http://stopsmartmetersau.files.wordpress.com/2012/12/smart-metering-dumb-solution-frontier-australia.pdf>

Victorian Auditor-General 2009, *Towards a 'smart grid' – the roll-out of Advanced Metering Infrastructure*, Audit Summary. Available: http://download.audit.vic.gov.au/files/111109_AMI_Audit_Summary.pdf

Don Maisch Phd. September 2010, A Machiavellian Spin Political and corporate involvement with cell phone research in Australia, http://www.emfacts.com/download/A_Machiavellian_Spin_Sept_2010.pdf

Evaluation of Specific Absorption Rate as a Dosimetric Quantity for Electromagnetic Fields Bioeffects, Dimitris J. Panagopoulos, Olle Johansson, George L. Carlo 2013
<http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0062663>

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/152957266/Scientists-Collaborate-to-Tell-the-World-Why-Microwave-Guidelines-Are-Inappropriate>