

**Missouri Corporation Commission
Office of Public Affairs & Consumer Protection**

James and Angela Dickson (Complainants)

VS.

KCP&L (Respondent)

File Number EC-2016-0230

This letter is response to the letter submitted by Attorney Hampton Williams of the Staff Counsel, Missouri Public Service Commission on May 13, 2016. James and Angela Dickson submitted a letter on April 25, 2016 and presented evidence on the health hazards of the smart meter that was placed on their home on January 20, 2016.

The evidence submitted by the Complainants James and Angela Dickson, proving the dangers and health hazards of smart meters meet the following criteria:

- 1) The evidence is backed by solid scientific evidence and was performed by scientists who are independent and unbiased in their findings.
- 2) The scientists did not receive any monetary compensation for their research and findings and did not have a vested interest in the results.
- 3) The scientific research has been shown to be ongoing since at least the 1960's and has been corroborated by numerous other independent and unbiased scientists since then. This evidence has only grown stronger as time has passed.
- 4) The evidence submitted by the complainants would be irrefutable in a court of law in that it breaks **MO Statutes Title XXV for regulations of certain utilities and carriers, section 393.130.1 stating that every gas corporation, every electrical corporation, every water corporation, and every sewer corporation shall furnish and provide such service instrumentalities and facilities as shall be safe and adequate and in all respects just and reasonable.**
- 5) The evidence submitted proves that the guidelines put in place by the FCC are indeed, unsafe, and cannot be used by KCP&L and/or Attorney Hampton Williams to prove grounds for the safety of the smart meter installed. In fact, staying within the guidelines of the FCC automatically puts them in the category of unsafe according to the evidence presented as the definition of safe is **Free from harm or risk: UNHURT; secure from threat of danger, harm or loss.** The fire hazards of smart meters in general show that they cannot possibly meet this definition. The guidelines of the FCC are irrelevant because their guidelines already break the definition of "Safe" as is required by MO Statute Title XXV, section 393.130.1.

****The FCC's guidelines can show a device to be unsafe, but cannot prove that a device is safe. Non-thermal levels of exposure are simply not regulated by the FCC. There are thousands of peer-reviewed studies showing potentially harmful biological effects of non-thermal levels of microwave radiation. Some of these studies were done with humans, and most were on mammals with nervous systems and biochemistry nearly identical to humans. The sheer volume of these studies is cause to strongly infer human risk until proven otherwise, especially since some of the studies done directly on humans do show harm. Furthermore, the World Health Organization has classified low level non-thermal microwave emissions, specifically including that emitted by (wireless) smart meters, as a possible human carcinogen.**

**** From the EPA:** "The FCC's current (radio frequency/microwave) exposure guidelines, as well as those of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) and the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection, are thermally based, and do not apply to chronic, non-thermal exposure situations.....the generalization by many that the guidelines protect human beings from harm by any or all mechanisms is not justified." Norbert Hankin of the EPA's Office of Air and Radiation, Center for Science and Risk Assessment, Radiation Protection Division, July 16, 2002.

Let's examine the evidence submitted by Staff Attorney Hampton Williams.

- 1) The evidence presented is a 2 page generic document outlining the safety of smart meters.
- 2) The evidence provided is contrived by PG&E. Need we say more??? PG&E is a utility company contriving evidence that their products are safe. PG&E has a vested interest to make sure that smart meters are seen as "safe".
- 3) Such evidence presented by Staff Attorney Hampton Williams would be thrown out in a court of law because it is biased, skewed evidence.

If this two page document submitted by Staff Attorney Hampton Williams is his idea of evidence then he has failed to convince us of the safety of smart meters. There is no mention of the evidence submitted by the complainants James and Angela Dickson and he did not refute any of the evidence we have presented. Simply ignoring the evidence presented by the Complainants James and Angela Dickson does not make it any less real or true.

Please do not let KCP&L and Attorney Hampton Williams' lack of integrity undermine the true purpose of the MO Public State Commission which is **to regulate the utility companies and uphold the rights of the people when deemed necessary**. Let the peoples' voice be heard and the Commission's purpose be upheld. Let the United States of America continue to be a place that will take a stand for justice when the lives of individuals and their families are being jeopardized by unethical decisions that are made by big entities such as KCP&L.

With all due respect, we ask that the Commission examine **ALL** of the evidence presented and make a fair and reasonable decision based on that evidence.

James and Angela Dickson