SAGE
Associates
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS

Assessment of Radiofrequency Microwave Radiation Emissions from Smart Meters

Sage Associates
Santa Barbara, CA
USA

January 1, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This Report has been prepared to document radiofrequency radiation (RF) levels associated with wireless smart meters in various scenarios depicting common ways in which they are installed and operated.

The Report includes computer modeling of the range of possible smart meter RF levels that are occurring in the typical installation and operation of a single smart meter, and also multiple meters in California. It includes analysis of both two-antenna smart meters (the typical installation) and of three-antenna meters (the collector meters that relay RF signals from another 500 to 5000 homes in the area).

RF levels from the various scenarios depicting normal installation and operation, and possible FCC violations have been determined based on both time-averaged and peak power limits (Tables 1 - 14).

Potential violations of current FCC public safety standards for smart meters and/or collector meters in the manner installed and operated in California are predicted in this Report, based on computer modeling (Tables 10 – 17).

Tables 1 – 17 show power density data and possible conditions of violation of the FCC public safety limits, and Tables 18 – 33 show comparisons to health studies reporting adverse health impacts.

FCC compliance violations are likely to occur under normal conditions of installation and operation of smart meters and collector meters in California. Violations of FCC safety limits for uncontrolled public access are identified at distances within 6” of the meter. Exposure to the face is possible at this

distance, in violation of the time-weighted average safety limits (Tables 10-11). FCC violations are predicted to occur at 60% reflection (OET Equation 10 and 100% reflection (OET Equation 6) factors*, both used in FCC OET 65 formulas for such calculations for time-weighted average limits. Peak power limits are not violated at the 6" distance (looking at the meter) but can be at 3" from the meter, if it is touched.

This report has also assessed the potential for FCC violations based on two examples of RF exposures in a typical residence. RF levels have been calculated at distances of 11" (to represent a nursery or bedroom with a crib or bed against a wall opposite one or more meters); and at 28" (to represent a kitchen work space with one or more meters installed on the kitchen wall).

FCC compliance violations are identified at 11" in a nursery or bedroom setting using Equation 10* of the FCC OET 65 regulations (Tables 12-13). These violations are predicted to occur where there are multiple smart meters, or one collector meter, or one collector meter mounted together with several smart meters.

FCC compliance violations are not predicted at 28" in the kitchen work space for 60% or for 100% reflection calculations. Violations of FCC public safety limits are predicted for higher reflection factors of 1000% and 2000%, which are not a part of FCC OET 65 formulas, but are included here to allow for situations where site-specific conditions (highly reflective environments, for example, galley-type kitchens with many highly reflective stainless steel or other metallic surfaces) may be warranted.*

*FCC OET 65 Equation 10 assumes 60% reflection and Equation 6 assumes 100% reflection. RF levels are also calculated in this report to account for some situations where interior environments have highly reflective surfaces as might be found in a small kitchen with stainless steel or other metal counters, appliances and furnishings. This report includes the FCC's reflection factors of 60% and 100%, and also reflection factors of1000% and 2000% that are more in line with those reported in Hondou, 2001; Hondou, 2006 and Vermeeren et al, 2010. The use of a 1000% reflection factor is still conservative in comparison to Hondou, 2006. A 1000% reflection factor is 12% (or 121 times as high) a factor for power density compared to Hondou et al, 2006 prediction of 1000 times higher power densities due to reflection. A 2000% reflection factor is only 22% (or 441 times) that of Hondou's finding that power density can be as high as 2000 times higher.

In addition to exceeding FCC public safety limits under some conditions of installation and operation, smart meters can produce excessively elevated RF exposures, depending on where they are installed. With respect to absolute RF exposure levels predicted for occupied space within dwellings, or outside areas like patios, gardens and walk-ways, RF levels are predicted to be substantially elevated within a few feet to within a few tens of feet from the meter(s).

For example, one smart meter at 11" from occupied space produces somewhere between 1.4 and 140 microwatts per centimeter squared (uW/cm2) depending on the duty cycle modeled (Table 12). Since FCC OET 65 specifies that continuous exposure be assumed where the public cannot be excluded (such as is applicable to one's home), this calculation produces an RF level of 140 uW/cm2 at 11" using the FCCs lowest reflection factor of 60%. Using the FCC's reflection factor of 100%, the figures rise to 2.2 uW/cm2 – 218 uW/cm2, where the continuous exposure calculation is 218 uW/cm2 (Table 12). These are very significantly elevated RF exposures in comparison to typical individual exposures in daily life. Multiple smart meters in the nursery/bedroom example at 11" are predicted to generate RF levels from about 5 to 481 uW/cm2 at the lowest (60%) reflection factor; and 7.5 to 751 uW/cm2 using the FCCs 100% reflection factor (Table 13). Such levels are far above typical public exposures.

RF levels at 28" in the kitchen work space are also predicted to be significantly elevated with one or more smart meters (or a collector meter alone or in combination with multiple smart meters). At 28" distance, RF levels are predicted in the kitchen example to be as high as 21 uW/cm2 from a single meter and as high as 54.5 uW/cm2 with multiple smart meters using

the lower of the FCCs reflection factor of 60% (Table 14). Using the FCCs higher reflection factor of 100%, the RF levels are predicted to be as high as 33.8 uW/cm2 for a single meter and as high as 85.8 uW/cm2 for multiple smart meters (Table 14). For a single collector meter, the range is 60.9 to 95.2 uW/cm2 (at 60% and 100% reflection factors, respectively) (from Table 15).

Table 16 illustrates predicted violations of peak power limit (4000 uW/cm2) at 3" from the surface of a meter. FCC violations of peak power limit are predicted to occur for a single collector meter at both 60% and 100% reflection factors. This situation might occur if someone touches a smart meter or stands directly in front.

Consumers may also have already increased their exposures to radiofrequency radiation in the home through the voluntary use of wireless devices (cell and cordless phones), PDAs like BlackBerry and iPhones, wireless routers for wireless internet access, wireless home security systems, wireless baby surveillance (baby monitors), and other emerging wireless applications.

Neither the FCC, the CPUC, the utility nor the consumer know what portion of the allowable public safety limit is already being used up or pre-empted by RF from other sources already present in the particular location a smart meter may be installed and operated.

Consumers, for whatever personal reason, choice or necessity who have already eliminated all possible wireless exposures from their property and lives, may now face excessively high RF exposures in their homes from

smart meters on a 24-hour basis. This may force limitations on use of their otherwise occupied space, depending on how the meter is located, building materials in the structure, and how it is furnished.

People who are afforded special protection under the federal Americans with Disabilities Act are not sufficiently acknowledged nor protected. People who have medical and/or metal implants or other conditions rendering them vulnerable to health risks at lower levels than FCC RF limits may be particularly at risk (Tables 30-31). This is also likely to hold true for other subgroups, like children and people who are ill or taking medications, or are elderly, for they have different reactions to pulsed RF. Childrens' tissues absorb RF differently and can absorb more RF than adults (Christ et al, 2010; Wiart et al, 2008). The elderly and those on some medications respond more acutely to some RF exposures.

Safety standards for peak exposure limits to radiofrequency have not been developed to take into account the particular sensitivity of the eyes, testes and other ball shaped organs. There are no peak power limits defined for the eyes and testes, and it is not unreasonable to imagine situations where either of these organs comes into close contact with smart meters and/or collector meters, particularly where they are installed in multiples (on walls of multi-family dwellings that are accessible as common areas).

In summary, no positive assertion of safety can be made by the FCC, nor relied upon by the CPUC, with respect to pulsed RF when exposures are chronic and occur in the general population. Indiscriminate exposure to environmentally ubiquitous pulsed RF from the rollout of millions of new RF sources (smart meters) will mean far greater general population exposures, and potential health consequences. Uncertainties about the

existing RF environment (how much RF exposure already exists), what kind of interior reflective environments exist (reflection factor), how interior space is utilized near walls), and other characteristics of residents (age, medical condition, medical implants, relative health, reliance on critical care equipment that may be subject to electronic interference, etc) and unrestrained access to areas of property where meter is located all argue for caution.

INTRODUCTION

How Smart Meters Work

This report is limited to a very simple overview of how smart meters work, and the other parts of the communication system that are required for them to transmit information on energy usage within a home or other building. The reader can find more detailed information on smart meter and smart grid technology from numerous sources available on the Internet.

Often called ‘advanced metering infrastructure or AMI’, smart meters are a part of an overall system that includes a) a mesh network or series of wireless antennas at the neighborhood level to collect and transmit wireless information from all the smart meters in that area back to a utility.

The mesh network (sometimes called a distributed antenna system) requires wireless antennas to be located throughout neighborhoods in close proximity to where smart meters will be placed. Often, a municipality will receive a hundred or more individual applications for new cellular antenna service, which is specifically to serve smart meter technology needs. The communication network needed to serve smart meters is typically separate from existing cellular and data transmission antennas (cell tower antennas). The mesh network (or DAS) antennas are often utility-pole mounted. This part of the system can spread hundreds of new wireless antennas throughout neighborhoods.

Smart meters are a new type electrical meter that will measure your energy usage, like the old ones do now. But, it will send the information back to the utility by wireless signal (radiofrequency/microwave radiation signal) instead of having a utility meter reader come to the property and manually

do the monthly electric service reading. So, smart meters are replacements for the older 'spinning dial' or analog electric meters. Smart meters are not optional, and utilities are installing them even where occupants do not want them.

In order for smart meters to monitor and control energy usage via this wireless communication system, the consumer must be willing to install power transmitters inside the home. This is the third part of the system and involves placing power transmitters (radiofrequency/microwave radiation emitting devices) within the home on each appliance. A power transmitter is required to measure the energy use of individual appliances (e.g., washing machines, clothes dryers, dishwashers, etc) and it will send information via wireless radiofrequency signal back to the smart meter. Each power transmitter handles a separate appliance. A typical kitchen and laundry may have a dozen power transmitters in total. If power transmitters are not installed by the homeowner, or otherwise mandated on consumers via federal legislation requiring all new appliances to have power transmitters built into them, then there may be little or no energy reporting nor energy savings.

Smart meters could also be installed that would operate by wired, rather than wireless means. Shielded cable, such as is available for cable modem (wired internet connection) could connect smart meters to utilities. However, it is not easy to see the solution to transmit signals from power transmitters (energy use for each appliance) back to the utility.

Collector meters are a special type of smart meter that can serve to collect the radiofrequency/microwave radiation signals from many surrounding

buildings and send them back to the utility. Collector meters are intended to collect and re-transmit radiofrequency information for somewhere between 500-5000 homes or buildings. They have three operating antennas compared to two antennas in regular smart meters. Their radiofrequency microwave emissions are higher and they send wireless signal much more frequently. Collector meters can be place on a home or other building like smart meters, and there is presently no way to know which a homeowner or property owner might receive.

Mandate

The California Public Utilities Commission has authorized California's investor-owned utilities (including Pacific Gas & Electric, Southern California Edison Company and San Diego Gas & Electric) to install more than 10 million new wireless* smart meters in California, replacing existing electric meters as part of the federal SmartGrid program.

The goal is to provide a new residential energy management tool. It is intended to reduce energy consumption by providing computerized information to customers about what their energy usage is and how they might reduce it by running appliances during 'off-time' or 'lower load' conditions. Presumably this will save utilities from having to build new facilities for peak load demand. Utilities will install a new smart meter on every building to which electrical service is provided now. In Southern California, that is about 5 million smart meters in three years for a cost of around $1.6 billion dollars. In northern California, Pacific Gas & Electric is slated to install millions of meters at a cost of more than $2.2 billion dollars. If consumers decide to join the program (so that appliances can report

energy usage to the utility), they can be informed about using energy during off-use or low-use periods, but only if consumers also agree to install additional wireless power transmitters on appliances inside the home. Each power transmitter is an additional source of pulsed RF that produces high exposures at close range in occupied space within the home.

> *"Proponents of smart meters say that when these meters are teamed up with an in-home display that shows current energy usage, as well as a communicating thermostat and software that harvest and analyze that information, consumers can see how much consumption drives cost -- and will consume less as a result. Utilities are spending billions of dollars outfitting homes and businesses with the devices, which wirelessly send information about electricity use to utility billing departments and could help consumers control energy use."*
>
> Wall Street Journal, April 29, 2009.

The smart meter program is also a tool for load-shedding during heavy electrical use periods by turning utility meters off remotely, and for reducing the need for utility employees to read meter data in the field.

Purpose of this Report

This Report has been prepared to document radiofrequency radiation (RF) levels associated with wireless smart meters in various scenarios depicting common ways in which they are installed and operated.

The Report includes computer modeling of the range of possible smart meter RF levels that are occurring in the typical installation and operation of a single smart meter, and also multiple meters in California. It includes analysis of both two-antenna smart meters (the typical installation) and of

three-antenna meters (the collector meters that relay RF signals from another 500 to 5000 homes in the area).

RF levels from the various scenarios depicting normal installation and operation, and possible FCC violations have been determined based on both time-averaged and peak power limits (Tables 1 - 14).

Potential violations of current FCC public safety standards for smart meters and/or collector meters in the manner installed and operated in California are illustrated in this Report, based on computer modeling (Tables 10 – 17).

Tables which present data, possible conditions of violation of the FCC public safety limits, and comparisons to health studies reporting adverse health impacts are summarized (Tables 18 – 33).

The next section describes methodology in detail, but generally this Report provides computer modeling results for RF power density levels for these scenarios, analysis of whether and under what conditions FCC public safety limit violations may occur, and comparison of RF levels produced under these scenarios to studies reporting adverse health impacts with chronic exposure to low-intensity radiofrequency radiation at or below levels produced by smart meters and collector meters in the manner installed and operated in California.

1) Single ‘typical’ meter - tables showing RF power density at increasing distances in 0.25’ (3”) intervals outward for single meter (two-antenna meter). Effects of variable duty cycles (from 1% to 90%) and various reflection factors (60%, 100%, 1000% and 2000%) have been calculated.
2) Multiple ‘typical’ meters - tables showing RF power density at increasing distances as above.

3) Collector meter - tables showing RF power density related to a specialized collector meter which has three internal antennas (one for every 500 or 5000 homes) as above.
4) Collector meter - a single collector meter installed with multiple 'typical' two-antenna meters as above.
5) Tables are given to illustrate the distance to possible FCC violations for time-weighted average and peak power limits (in inches).
6) Tables are given to document RF power density levels at various key distances (11" to a crib in a bedroom; 28" to a kitchen work area; and 6" for a person attempting to read the digital readout of a smart meter, or inadvertently working around a meter.
7) Tables are given to compare RF power density levels with studies reporting adverse health symptoms and effects (and those levels of RF associated with such health effects).
8) Tables are given to compare smart meter and collector meter RF to BioInitiative Report recommended limit (in feet).

Framing Questions

In view of the rapid deployment of smart meters around the country, and the relative lack of public information on their radiofrequency (RF) emission profiles and public exposures, there is a crucial need to provide independent technical information.

There is very little solid information on which decision-makers and the public can make informed decisions about whether they are an acceptable new RF exposure, in combination with pre-existing RF exposures.

On-going Assessment of Radiofrequency Radiation Health Risks

The US NIEHS National Toxicology Program nominated radiofrequency radiation for study as a carcinogen in 1999. Existing safety limits for pulsed RF were termed "not protective of public health" by the

Radiofrequency Interagency Working Group (a federal interagency working group including the FDA, FCC, OSHA, the EPA and others). Recently, the NTP issued a statement indicating it will complete its review by 2014 (National Toxicology Program, 2009). The NTP radiofrequency radiation study results have been delayed for more than a decade since 1999 and very little laboratory or epidemiological work has been completed. Thus, he explosion of wireless technologies is producing radiofrequency radiation exposures over massive populations before questions are answered by federal studies about the carcinogenicity or toxicity of low-intensity RF such as are produced by smart meters and other SmartGrid applications of wireless. The World Health Organization and the International Agency for Research on Cancer have not completed their studies of RF (the IARC WHO RF Health Monograph is not expected until at least 2011). In the United States, the National Toxicology Program listed RF as a potential carcinogen for study, and has not released any study results or findings a decade later. There are no current, relevant public safety standards for pulsed RF involving chronic exposure of the public, nor of sensitive populations, nor of people with metal and medical implants that can be affected both by localized heating and by electromagnetic interference (EMI) for medical wireless implanted devices.

Considering that millions of smart meters are slated to be installed on virtually every electrified building in America, the scope of the question is large and highly personal. Every family home in the country, and every school classroom – every building with an electric meter – is to have a new wireless meter – and thus subject to unpredictable levels of RF every day.

1) Have smart meters been tested and shown to comply with FCC

public safety limits (limits for uncontrolled public access)?

2) Are these FCC public safety limits sufficiently protective of public health and safety? This question is posed in light of the last thirty years of international scientific investigation and public health assessments documenting the existence of bioeffects and adverse health effects at RF levels far below current FCC standards. The FCC's standards have not been updated since 1992, and did not anticipate nor protect against chronic exposures (as opposed to acute exposures) from low-intensity or non-thermal RF exposures, particularly pulsed RF exposures.

3) What demonstration is there that wireless smart meters will comply with existing FCC limits, as opposed to under strictly controlled conditions within government testing laboratories?

4) Has the FCC been able to certify that compliance is achievable under real-life use conditions including, but not limited to:

- In the case where there are both gas and electric meters on the home located closely together.

- In the case where there is a "bank" of electric and gas meters, on a multi-family residential building such as on a condominium or apartment building wall. There are instances of up to 20 or more meters located in close proximity to occupied living space in the home,in the classroom or other occupied public space.

• In the case where there is a collector meter on a home that serves the home plus another 500 to 5000 other residential units in the area, vastly increasing the frequency of RF bursts.

• In the case where there is one smart meter on the home but it acts as a relay for other local neighborhood meters. What about 'piggybacking' of other neighbors' meters through yours? How can piggybacking be reasonably estimated and added onto the above estimates?

• What about the RF emissions from the power transmitters? Power transmitters installed on appliances (perhaps 10-15 of them per home) and each one is a radiofrequency radiation transmitter.

• How can the FCC certify a system that has an unknown number of such transmitters per home, with no information on where they are placed?

• Where people with medical/metal implants are present? (Americans with Disabilities Act protects rights)

5) What assessment has been done to determine what pre-existing conditions of RF exposure are already present. On what basis can compliance for the family inside the residence be assured, when there is no verification of what other RF sources exist on private property? How is the problem of cumulative RF exposure properly assessed (wireless routers, wireless laptops, cell phones, PDAs, DECT or other active-base cordless phone systems, home security systems,

baby monitors, contribution of AM, FM, television, nearby cell towers, etc).

6) What is the cumulative RF emissions worst-case profile? Is this estimate in compliance?

7) What study has been done for people with metal implants* who require protection under Americans with Disabilities Act? What is known about how metal implants can intensity RF, heat tissue and result in adverse effects below RF levels allowed for the general public. What is known about electromagnetic interference (EMI) from spurious RF sources in the environment (RFID scanners, cell towers, security gates, wireless security systems, wireless communication devices and routers, wireless smart meters, etc)

*Note: There are more than 20 million people in the US who need special protection against such exposures that may endanger them. High peak power bursts of RF may disable electronics in some critical care and medical implants. We already have reports of wireless devices disabling deep brain stimulators in Parkinson's patients and there is published literature on malfunctions with critical care equipment.

PUBLIC SAFETY LIMITS FOR RADIOFREQUENCY RADIATION

The FCC adopted limits for Maximum Permissible Exposure (MPE) are generally based on recommended exposure guidelines published by the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP) in "Biological Effects and Exposure Criteria for Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields," (NCRP, 1986).

In the United States, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) enforces limits for both occupational exposures (in the workplace) and for public exposures. The allowable limits are variable, according to the frequency transmitted. Only public safety limits for uncontrolled public access are assessed in this report.

Maximum permissible exposures (MPE) to radiofrequency electromagnetic fields are usually expressed in terms of the plane wave equivalent power density expressed in units of milliwatts per square centimeter (mW/cm2) or alternatively, absorption of RF energy is a function of frequency (as well as body size and other factors). The limits vary with frequency. Standards are more restrictive for frequencies at and below 300 MHz. Higher intensity RF exposures are allowed for frequencies between 300 MHz and 6000 MHz than for those below 300 MHz.

In the frequency range from 100 MHz to 1500 MHz, exposure limits for field strength and power density are also generally based on the MPE limits found in Section 4.1 of "*IEEE Standard for Safety Levels with Respect to Human Exposure to Radio Frequency Electromagnetic Fields, 3 kHz to 300 GHz*," ANSI/IEEE C95.1-1992 (IEEE, 1992, and approved for use as an American National Standard by the American National Standards Institute

(ANSI).

US Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Exposure Standards

Table 1, Appendix A FCC LIMITS FOR MAXIMUM PERMISSIBLE EXPOSURE (MPE)

(A) Limits for Occupational/Controlled Exposure

Frequency Range (MHz)	Electric Field Strength (E) (V/m)	Magnetic Field Strength (H) (A/m)	Power Density (S) (mW/cm2)	Averaging Time $[E]^2$ $[H]^2$ or S (minutes)
0.3-3.0	614	1.63	(100)*	6
3.0-30	1842/f	4.89/f	$(900/f_2)$*	6
30-300	61.4	0.163	1.0	6
300-1500			f/300	6
1500-100,000			5	6

B) FCC Limits for General Population/Uncontrolled Exposure

Frequency Range (MHz)	Electric Field Strength (E) (V/m)	Magnetic Field Strength (H) (A/m)	Power Density (S) (mW/cm2)	Averaging Time $[E]^2$ $[H]^2$ or S (minutes)
0.3-3.0	614	1.63	(100)*	30
3.0-30	824/f	2.19/f	$(180/f_2)$*	30
30-300	27.5	0.073	0.2	30
300-1500	--	--	f/1500	30
1500-100,000	--	--	1.0	30

f = frequency in MHz *Plane-wave equivalent power density

NOTE 1: ***Occupational/controlled*** limits apply in situations in which persons are exposed as a consequence of their employment provided those persons are fully aware of the potential for exposure and can exercise control over their exposure. Limits for occupational/controlled exposure also apply in situations when an individual is transient through a location where occupational/controlled limits apply provided he or she is made aware of the potential for exposure.

NOTE 2: ***General population/uncontrolled*** exposures apply in situations in which the general public may be exposed, or in which persons that are exposed as a consequence of their employment may not be fully aware of the potential for exposure or can not exercise control over their exposure. Source: FCC Bulletin OET 65 Guidelines, page 67 OET, 1997.

In this report, the public safety limit for a smart meter is a combination of the individual antenna frequency limits and how much power output they create. A smart meter contains two antennas. One transmits at 915 MHz and the other at 2405 MHz. They can transmit at the same time, and so their effective radiated power is summed in the calculations of RF power density. Their combined limit is 655 uW/cm2. This limit is calculated by formulas from Table 1, Part B and is proportionate to the power output and specific safety limit (in MHz) of each antenna.

For the collector meter, with it's three internal antennas, the combined public safety limit for time-averaged exposure is 571 MHz (a more restrictive level since it includes an additional 824 MHz antenna that has a lower limit than either the 915 MHz or the 2405 MHz antennas). In a collector meter, only two of the three antennas can transmit simultaneously (the 915 MHz LAN and the GSM 850 MHz (from the FCC Certification Exhibit titled RF Exposure Report for FCC ID: SK9AMI-2A). The proportionate power output of each antenna plus the safety limit for each antenna frequency combines to give a safety limit for the collector meter of 571 uW/cm2. Where one collector meter is combined with multiple smart meters, the combined limit is weighted upward by the additional smart meters' contribution, and is 624 uW/cm2.

Continuous Exposure

FCC Bulletin OET 65 guidelines require the assumption of continuous exposure in calculations. Duty cycles offered by the utilities are a fraction of continuous use, and significantly diminish predictions of RF exposure.

At present, there is no evidence to prove that smart meters are functionally unable to operate at higher duty cycles that some utilities have estimated (estimates vary from 1% to 12.5% duty cycle, and as high as 30%). Confirming this is the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) in its "Perspective on Radio-Frequency Exposure Associated with Residential Automatic Meter Reading Technology (EPRI, 2010) According to EPRI:

> *"The technology not only provides a highly efficient method for obtaining usage data from customers, but it also can provide up-to-the-minute information on consumption patterns since the meter reading devices can be programmed to provide data as often as needed."* Emphasis added

The FCC Bulletin OET 65 guidelines specify that continuous exposure (defined by the FCC OET 65 as 100% duty cycle) is required in calculations where it is not possible to control exposures to the general public.

> *"It is important to note that for general population/uncontrolled exposures it is often not possible to control exposures to the extent that averaging times can be applied. In those situations, it is often necessary to assume continuous exposure."* (emphasis added)
>
> FCC Bulletin OET 65, p, 10

> ***"Duty factor**. The ratio of pulse duration to the pulse period of a periodic pulse train. Also, may be a measure of the temporal transmission characteristic of an intermittently transmitting RF source such as a paging antenna by dividing average transmission duration by the average period for transmissions. A duty factor of 1.0 corresponds to continuous operation."*
>
> (emphasis added)
>
> FCC Bulletin OET 65, p, 2

This provision then specifies duty cycles to be increased to 100%.

The FCC Guidelines (OET 65) further address cautions that should be observed for uncontrolled public access to areas that may cause exposure to high levels of RF.

Re-radiation

The foregoing also applies to high RF levels created in whole or in part by re-eradiation. A convenient rule to apply to all situations involving RF radiation is the following:

(1) Do not create high RF levels where people are or could reasonably be expected to be present, and (2) [p]revent people from entering areas in which high RF levels are necessarily present.

(2) Fencing and warning signs may be sufficient in many cases to protect the general public. Unusual circumstances, the presence of multiple sources of radiation, and operational needs will require more elaborate measures.

(3) Intermittent reductions in power, increased antenna heights, modified antenna radiation patterns, site changes, or some combination of these may be necessary, depending on the particular situation.

FCC OET 65, Appendix B, p. 79

Fencing, distancing, protective RF shielded clothing and signage warning occupants not to use portions of their homes or properties are not feasible nor desirable in public places the general public will spend time (schools, libraries, cafes, medical offices and clinics, etc) These mitigation strategies may be workable for RF workers, but are unsuited and intolerable for the public.

Reflections

A major, uncontrolled variable in predicting RF exposures is the degree to

which a particular location (kitchen, bedroom, etc) will reflect RF energy created by installation of one or more smart meters, or a collector meter and multiple smart meters. The reflectivity of a surface is a measure of the amount of reflected radiation. It can be defined as the ratio of the intensities of the reflected and incident radiation. The reflectivity depends on the angle of incidence, the polarization of the radiation, and the electromagnetic properties of the materials forming the boundary surface. These properties usually change with the wavelength of the radiation. The reflectivity of polished metal surfaces is usually quite high (such as stainless steel and polished metal surfaces typical in kitchens, for example).

Reflections can significantly increase localized RF levels. High uncertainty exists about how extensive a problem this may create in routine installations of smart meters, where the utility and installers have no idea what kind of reflectivity is present within the interior of buildings.

Reflections in Equation 6 and 10 of the FCC OET Bulletin 65 include rather minimal reflection factors of 100% and 60%, respectively. This report includes higher reflection factors in line with published studies by Hondou et al, 2006, Hondou, 2002 and Vermeeren et al, 2010. Reflection factors are modeled at 1000% and 2000% as well as at 60% and 100%, based on published scientific evidence for highly reflective environments. Hondou (2002) establishes that power density can be higher than conventional formulas predict using standard 60% and 100% reflection factors.

> *"We show that this level can reach the reference level (ICNIRP Guideline) in daily life. This is caused by the fundamental properties of electromagnetic field, namely, reflection and additivity. The level of exposure is found to be much higher than estimated by conventional framework of analysis that assumes that the level*

rapidly decreases with the inverse square distance between the source and the affected person."

"Since the increase of electromagnetic field by reflective boundaries and the additivity of sources has not been recognized yet, further detailed studies on various situations and the development of appropriate regulations are required."

Hondou et al (2006) establishes that power densities 1000 times to 2000 times higher than the power density predictions from computer modeling (that does not account properly for reflections) can be found in daily living situations. Power density may not fall off with distance as predicted by formulas using limited reflection factors. The RF hot spots created by reflection can significantly increase RF exposures to the public, even above current public safety limits.

"We confirm the significance of microwave reflection reported in our previous Letter by experimental and numerical studies. Furthermore, we show that 'hot spots' often emerge in reflective areas, where the local exposure level is much higher than average."

"Our results indicate the risk of 'passive exposure' to microwaves."

"The experimental values of intensity are consistently higher than predicted values. Intensity does not even decrease with distance from the source."

"We further confirm the existence of microwave 'hotspots', in which he microwaves are 'localized'. The intensity measured at one hot spot 4.6 m from the transmitter is the same as that at 0.1 m from the transmitter in the case with out reflection (free boundary condition). Namely, the intensity at the hot spot is increased by ***approximately 2000 times*** *by reflection."* Emphasis added

"To confirm our experimental findings of the greater-than-predicted intensity due to reflection, as well as the hot spots, we performed two numerical simulations...". " intensity does not monotonically decrease from the transmitter, which is in clear contrast to the case without reflection."

"The intensity at the hot spot (X, Y, Z) = 1.46, -0.78, 105) around 1.8 m from the transmitter in the reflective boundary condition is ***approximately 1000 times higher*** *than that at the same position in the free boundary condition. The result of the simulation is thus consistent with our experiments, although the values differ owing to the different conditions imposed by computational limits."*

Emphasis added

"(t)he result of the experiment is also reproduced: a greater than predicted intensity due to reflection, as well as the existence of hot spots."

"In comparison with the control simulation using the free boundary condition, we find that the power density at the hot spot is increased ***by approximately a thousand times*** *by reflection."*

Emphasis added

Further, the author comments that:

"we may be passively exposed beyond the levels reported for electro-medical interference and health risks."

"Because the peak exposure level is crucial in considering electro-medical interference, interference (in) airplanes, and biological effects on human beings, we also need to consider the possible peak exposure level, or 'hot spots', for the worst-case estimation."

Reflections and re-radiation from common building material (tile, concrete, stainless steel, glass, ceramics) and highly reflective appliances and furnishings are common in kitchens, for example. Using only low reflectivity FCC equations 6 and 10 may not be informative. Published studies underscore how use of even the highest reflection coefficient in FCC OET Bulletin 65 Equations 6 and 10 likely underestimate the potential for reflection and hot spots in some situations in real-life situations.

This report includes the FCC's reflection factors of 60% and 100%, and also

reflection factors of 1000% and 2000% that are more in line with those reported in Hondou, 2001; Hondou, 2006 and Vermeeren et al, 2010. The use of a 1000% reflection factor in this report is still conservative in comparison to Hondou, 2006. A 1000% reflection factor is 12% of Hondou's larger power density prediction (or 121 times, rather than 1000 times)/ The 2000% reflection factor is 22% of Hondou's figure (or 441 times in comparison to 2000 times higher power density in Hondou, 2006).

Peak Power Limits

In addition to time-averaged public safety limits that require RF exposures to be time-averaged over a 30 minute time period, the FCC also addresses peak power exposures. The FCC refers back to the ANSI/IEEE C95.1-1992 standard to define what peak power limits are.

The ANSI/IEEE C95.1-1999 standard defines peak power density as "*the maximum instantaneous power density occurring when power is transmitted*." (p. 4) Thus, there is a second method to test FCC compliance that is not being assessed in any FCC Grants of Authorization.

> "*Note that although the FCC did not explicitly adopt limits for peak power density, guidance on these types of exposures can be found in Section 4.4 of the ANSI/IEEE C95.1-1992 standard."*
>
> *Page 10, OET 65*

The ANSI/IEEE limit for peak power to which the FCC refers is:

> *"For exposures in uncontrolled environments, the peak value of the mean squared field strengths should not exceed 20 times the square of the allowed spatially averaged values (Table 2) at frequencies below 300 MHz, or <u>the equivalent power density of 4 mW/cm2 for f between 300 MHz and 6 GHz</u>".*

The peak power exposure limit is 4000 uW/cm2 for all smart meter frequencies (all transmitting antennas) for any instantaneous RF exposure of 4 milliwatts/cm2 (4 mW/cm2) or higher which equals 4000 microwatts/cm2 (uW/cm2).

This peak power limit applies to all smart meter frequencies for both the smart meter (two-antenna configuration) and the collector meter (three-antenna configuration). All these antennas are within the 300 MHz to 6 GHz frequency range where the 4000 uW/cm2 peak power limit applies (Table 3, ANSI/IEEE C95.1-1999, page 15).

Smart meters emit frequencies within the 800 MHz to 2400 MHz range.

Exclusions

This peak power limit applies to all parts of the body with the important exception of the eyes and testes.

The ANSI/IEEE C95.1-1999 standard specifically excludes exposure of the eyes and testes from the peak power limit of 4000 uW/cm2*. However, nowhere in the ANSI/IEEE nor the FCC OET 65 documents is there a lower, more protective peak power limit given for the eyes and testes (see also Appendix C).

> *"The following relaxation of power density limits is allowed for exposure of all parts of the body <u>except the eyes and testes</u>." (p.15)*
>
> *"Since most exposures are not to uniform fields, a method has been derived, based on the demonstrated peak to whole-body averaged SAR ratio of 20, for equating nonuniform field exposure and partial body exposure to an equivalent uniform field exposure. This is used in this standard to allow relaxation of power density limits for partial body exposure<u>, except in the case of the eyes and the testes</u>." (p.20)*

"In the case of the eyes and testes, direct relaxation of power density limits is not permitted."(p. 30)

*Note: This leaves unanswered what instantaneous peak power is permissible from smart meters. The level must be below 4000 uW/cm2. This report shows clearly that smart meters can create instantaneous peak power exposures where the face (eyes) and body (testes) are going to be in close proximity to smart meter RF pulses. RF levels at and above 4000 uW/cm2 are likely to occur if a person puts their face close to the smart meter to read data in real time. The digital readout of the smart meter requires close inspection, particularly where there is glare or bright sunlight, or low lighting conditions. Further, some smart meters are installed inside buildings within inches of occupied space, virtually guaranteeing exposures that may violate peak power limits. Violations of peak power limits are likely in these circumstances where there is proximity within about 6" and highly reflective surfaces or metallic objects. The eyes and testes are not adequately protected by the 4000 uW/cm2 peak power limit, and in the cases described above, may be more vulnerable to damage (Appendix C for further discussion).

METHODOLOGY

Radiofrequency fields associated with SMART Meters were calculated following the methodology described here. Prediction methods specified in Federal Communications Commission, Office of Engineering and Technology Bulletin 65 Edition 97-01, August 1997 were used in the calculations.[1]

Section 2 of FCC OET 65 provides methods to determine whether a given facility would be in compliance with guidelines for human exposure to RF radiation. We used equation (3)

$$S = \frac{P \times G \times \partial}{4 \times \pi \times R^2} = \frac{EIRP \times \partial}{4 \times \pi \times R^2} = \frac{1.64 \times ERP \times \partial}{4 \times \pi \times R^2}$$

where:

S = power density (in $\mu W/cm^2$)
P = power input to the antenna (in W)
G = power gain of the antenna in the direction of interest relative to an isotropic radiator
∂ = duty cycle of the transmitter (percentage of time that the transmitter actually transmits over time)
R = distance to the center of radiation of the antenna
EIRP = PG
ERP = 1.64 EIRP

where:

EIRP = is equivalent (or effective) isotropically radiated power referenced to an isotropic radiator
ERP = is equivalent (or effective) radiated power referenced to a half-wave dipole radiator

Analysis input assumptions

1. SMART Meters [SK9AMI-4] have two RF transmitters (antennas) and are the type of smart meters typically installed on most buildings. They contain two antennas that transmit RF signals (916 MHz LAN and 2405 MHz Zigbee). The antennas CAN transmit simultaneously, and thus the maximum RF exposure is determined by the summation of power densities (from the FCC Certification Exhibit titled RF Exposure Report for FCC ID: SK9AMI-4).

   Model SK9AMI-4 transmits on 915 MHz is designated as LAN Antenna Gain for each model.

   a. Transmitter Power Output (TPO) used is as shown on the grant issued by the Telecommunications Certification Body (TCB).

   b. Antenna gain in dBi (decibels compared to an isotropic radiator) used comes from the ACS Certification Exhibit.

2. Collector Meters [SK9AMI-2A] have three RF transmitters (antennas) and are installed where the utility needs them to relay RF signals from surrounding smart meters in a neighborhood. Collector meters contain a third antenna (GSM 850 MHz, 915 MHz LAN and 2405 MHz Zigbee). Collector meters can be placed on any building where a collector meter is needed to relay signals from the surrounding area. Estimates of the number of collector meters varies between one per 500 to one per 5000 smart meters. Collector meters will thus 'piggyback' the RF signals of hundreds or thousands of smart meters through the one collector meter. In a collector meter, only two of the three antennas can transmit simultaneously (the 915 MHz LAN and the GSM 850 MHz (from the FCC Certification Exhibit titled RF Exposure Report for FCC ID: SK9AMI-2A).

3. The Cell Relay transmitting at 2480 MHz is <u>not</u> on most meters and <u>not</u> considered in this analysis.

    a. Transmitter Power Output (TPO) used is as shown on the grant issued by the Telecommunications Certification Body (TCB).

    b. Antenna gain in dBi (decibels compared to an isotropic radiator) used comes from the ACS Certification Exhibit.

ERP (Effective Radiated Power) used in the computer modeling here is calculated using the TPO and antenna gain established for each model

Red figures used to Calculate ERP		**ACS and TCB Certification data sheet**							
		SK9AMI-2A				**SK9AMI-4**			
		ACS			TCB	**ACS**			TCB
Radio	Frequency	dBm	Watts	dBi	Watts	dBm	Watts	dBi	Watts
GSM	850	31.8	1.5136	-1.0					
LAN	915	21.92	0.1556	3.0		24.27	0.2673	**2.2**	**0.267**
LAN	916								0.257
GSM	1900	28.7	0.7413	1.0					
Register	2405	18.71	0.0743	**1.0**	**0.074**	19.17	0.0826	4.4	
Cell Relay	2480	-14.00	0.00004	4.00					

Assumptions: TPO per TCB , Antenna Gain per ACS Certification

ERP Calculation: **Bold** figures are used for single meter ERP in modeling

Type	TPO	dBi	dB	Mult	ERP	Freq	
1900 GSM	0.741	1.0	-1.15	0.77	0.5689	1900	
850 GSM	1.514	-1.0	-3.15	0.48	0.7328	850	Model
RFLAN	0.267	2.2	0.05	1.01	**0.2704**	915	SK9AMI-4
ZIG BEE	0.074	1.0	-1.15	0.77	**0.0570**	2405	SK9AMI-2A

Reflection Factor

This equation is modified with the inclusion of a ground reflection factor as recommended by the FCC. The ground reflection factor accounts for possible ground reflections that could enhance the resultant power density. A 60% (0.6) enhancement would result in a 1.6 (1 + 0.6) increase of the field strength or a 2.56 = $(1.6)^2$ increase in the power density. Similar increases for larger enhancements of the field strength are calculated by the square of the original field plus the enhancement percentage. [2.3.4]

<u>Reflection Factors:</u>

$60\% = (1 + 0.6)^2 = 2.56$ times
$100\% = (1 + 1)^2 = 4$ times
$1000\% = (1 + 10)^2 = 121$ times
$2000\% = (1 + 20)^2 = 441$ times

Duty Cycle

How frequently SMART Meters can and will emit RF signals from each of the antennas within the meters is uncertain, and subject to wide variations in estimation. For this reason, and because FCC OET 65 mandates a 100% duty cycle (continuous exposure where the public cannot be excluded) the report gives RF predictions for all cases from 1% to 100% duty cycle at 10% intervals. The reader can see the variation in RF emissions predicted at various distances from the meter (or bank of meters) using this report at all duty cycles. Thus, for purposes of this report, duty cycles have been estimated from infrequent to continuous. Duty cycles for SMART Meters were calculated at:

Duty cycle ∂:

1%	50%
5%	60%
10%	70%
20%	80%
30%	90%
40%	100%

Continuous Exposure

FCC Bulletin OET 65 and the ANSI/IEEE C95.1-1992, 1999 requires that continuous exposure be calculated for situations where there is uncontrolled public access. Continuous exposure in this case means reading the tables at 100% duty cycle.

> *"Another feature of the exposure guidelines is that exposures, in terms of power density, E2 or H2, may be averaged over certain periods of time with the average not to exceed the limit for continuous exposure.*[11]

"As shown in Table 1 of Appendix A, the averaging time for occupational/controlled exposures is 6 minutes, while the averaging time for general population/uncontrolled exposures is 30 minutes. It is important to note that for general population/uncontrolled exposures it is often not possible to control exposures to the extent that averaging times can be applied. In those situations, it is often necessary to assume continuous exposure." (FCC OET 65, Page 15)

Calculation Distances in Tables (3-inch increments)

Calculations were performed in 3-inch (.25 foot) increments from the antenna center of radiation. Calculations have been taken out to a distance of 96 feet from the antenna center for radiation for each of the conditions above. The antenna used for the various links in a SMART Meter is assumed to be at the center of the SMART Meter from front to back – approximately 3 inches from the outer surface of the meter.

Calculations have also been made for a typical nursery and kitchen. In the nursery it has been assumed that the baby in his or her crib that is located next to the wall where the electric SMART Meters are mounted. The closest part of the baby's body can be as close as 11 inches* from the meter antenna. In the kitchen it has been assumed that a person is standing at the counter along the wall where the electric SMART Meters are mounted. In that case the closest part of the adult's body can be located as close to the meter antenna as 28 inches.

The exposure limits are variable according to the frequency (in megahertz). Table 1, Appendix A show exposure limits for occupational (Part A) and uncontrolled public (Part B) access to radiofrequency radiation such as is emitted from AM, FM, television and wireless sources.

* Flush-mounted main electric panels that house smart meters are commonly installed; placing smart meters 5” 6” closer to occupied space than box-mounted main electric panels that sit outward on exterior building walls. Assumptions on spacing are made for flush-mounted panels.

Conditions Influencing Radiofrequency Radiation Level Safety

The location of the meter in relation to occupied space, or outside areas of private property such as driveways, walk-ways, gardens, patios, outdoor play areas for children, pet shelters and runs, and many typical configurations can place people in very close proximity to smart meter wireless emissions. In many instances, smart meters may be within inches or a few feet of occupied space or space that is used by occupants for daily activities.

Factors that influence how high RF exposures may be include, but are not limited to where the meter is installed in relation to occupied space, how often the meters are emitting RF pulses (duty cycle), and what reflective surfaces may be present that can greatly intensify RF levels or create 'RF hot spots' within rooms, and so on. In addition, there may be multiple wireless meters installed on some multi-family residential buildings, so that a single unit could have 20 or more electric meters in close proximity to each other, and to occupants inside that unit. Finally, some meters will have higher RF emissions, because – as collector units – their purpose is to collect and resend the RF signals from many other meters to the utility. A collector meter is estimated to be required for every 500 to 5000 buildings. Each collector meter contains three, rather than two transmitting antennas. This means higher RF levels will occur on and inside buildings with a collector meter, and significantly more frequent RF transmissions can be expected. At present, there is no way to predict whose property will be used for installation of collector meters.

People who are visually reading the wireless meters 'by sight' or are visually inspecting and/or reading the digital information on the faceplate may have

their eyes and faces only inches from the antennas.

Current standards for peak power limit do not have limits to protect the eyes and testes from instantaneous peak power from smart meter exposures, yet relevant documents identify how much more vulnerable these organs are, and the need for such safety limits to protect the eyes and testes.

No Baseline RF Assessment

Smart meter and collector meter installation are taking place in an information vacuum. FCC compliance testing takes place in an environment free of other sources of RF, quite unlike typical urban and some rural environments. There is no assessment of baseline RF conditions already present (from AM, FM, television and wireless communication facilities (cell towers), emergency and dispatch wireless, ham radio and other involuntary RF sources. Countless properties already have elevated RF exposures from sources outside their own control.

Consumers may also have already increased their exposures to radiofrequency radiation in the home through the voluntary use of wireless devices (cell and cordless phones), PDAs like BlackBerry and iPhones, wireless routers for wireless internet access, wireless home security systems, wireless baby surveillance (baby monitors), and other emerging wireless applications.

Neither the FCC, the CPUC, the utility nor the consumer know what portion of the allowable public safety limit is already being used up or pre-empted by RF from other sources already present in the particular location a smart meter may be installed and operated.

Consumers, for whatever personal reason, choice or necessity who have already eliminated all possible wireless exposures from their property and lives, may now face excessively high RF exposures in their homes from smart meters. This may force limitations on use of their otherwise occupied space, depending on how the meter is located, building materials in the structure, and how it is furnished.

RESULTS, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The installation of wireless ‘smart meters’ in California can produce significantly high levels of radiofrequency radiation (RF) depending on many factors (location of meter(s) in relation to occupied or usable space, duty cycle or frequency of RF transmissions, reflection and re-radiation of RF, multiple meters at one location, collector meters, etc).

Power transmitters that will relay information from appliances inside buildings with wireless smart meters produce high, localized RF pulses. Any appliance that contains a power transmitter (for example, dishwashers, washers, dryers, ranges and ovens, convection ovens, microwave ovens, flash water heaters, refrigerators, etc) will create another ‘layer of RF signals’ that may cumulatively increase RF exposures from the smart meter(s).

It should be emphasized that no single assertion of compliance can adequately cover the vast number of site-specific conditions in which smart meters are installed. These site-specific conditions determine public exposures and thus whether they meet FCC compliance criteria.

Tables in this report show either distance to an FCC safety limit (in inches) or they show the predicted (calculated) RF level at various distances in microwatts per centimeter squared (uW/cm2).

Both depictions are useful to document and understand RF levels produced by smart meters (or multiple smart meters) and by collector meters (or collections of one collector and multiple smart meters).

Large differences in the results of computer modeling occur in this report by

bracketing the uncertainties (running a sufficient number of computer scenarios) to account for variability introduced by possible duty cycles and possible reflection factors.

FCC equations from FCC OET 65 provide for calculations that incorporate 60% or 100% reflection factors. Studies cited in this report document higher possible reflections (in highly reflective environments) and support the inclusion of higher reflection factors of 1000% and 2000% based on Vermeeren et al, 2010, Hondou et al, 2006 and Hondou, 2002. Tables in the report provide the range of results predicted by computer modeling for duty cycles from 1% to 100%, and reflection factors of 60%, 100%, 1000%, and 2000% for comparison purposes. FCC violations of time-weighted average calculations and peak power limit calculations come directly from FCC OET 65 and from ANSI/IEEE c95.1-1992, 1999. Duty cycle (or how frequently the meters will produce RF transmissions leading to elevated RF exposures) is uncertain, so the full range of possible duty cycles are included, based on best available information at this date.

- Tables 1-2 show radiofrequency radiation (RF) levels at 6" (to represent a possible face exposure). These are data tables.
- Tables 3-4 show RF levels at 11" (to represent a possible nursery/bedroom exposure). These are data tables.
- Tables 5-6 show RF levels at 28" to represent a possible kitchen work space exposure. These are data tables.
- Tables 7-9 show the distance to the FCC violation level for time-weighted average limits and for peak power limits (in inches). These are data tables.
- Tables 10-15 show where FCC violations may occur at the face, in the nursery or in the kitchen scenarios. These are colored tables

highlighting where FCC violations may occur under all scenarios.

- Tables 16-29 show comparisons of smart meter RF levels with studies that report adverse health impacts from low-intensity, chronic exposure to similar RF exposures. These are colored tables highlighting where smart meter RF levels exceed levels associated with adverse health impacts in published scientific studies.
- Tables 30-31 show RF levels in comparison to Medtronics advisory limit for MRI exposures to radiofrequency radiation at 0.1 W/Kg or about 250 uW/cm2. These are colored tables highlighting where smart meter RF levels may exceed those recommended for RF exposure.
- Tables 32-33 show RF levels from smart meters in comparison to the BioInitiative Report recommendation of 0.1 uW/cm2 for chronic exposure to pulsed radiofrequency radiation.

Findings

RF levels from the various scenarios depicting normal installation and operation, and possible FCC violations have been determined based on both time-averaged and peak power limits (Tables 1 - 14).

Potential violations of current FCC public safety standards for smart meters and/or collector meters in the manner installed and operated in California are illustrated in this Report, based on computer modeling (Tables 10 – 17).

Tables that present data, possible conditions of violation of the FCC public safety limits, and comparisons to health studies reporting adverse health impacts are summarized (Tables 18 – 33).

Where do predicted FCC violations occur for the 655 uW/cm2 time-averaged public safety limit at the face at 6" distance from the meter?

Table 10 shows that for one smart meter, no violations are predicted to occur at 60% or 100% reflection factor at any duty cycle, but violations are predicted to occur with nearly all scenarios using either 1000% or 2000% reflection factors.

Table 10 also shows that for multiple smart meters, FCC violations are predicted to occur at 60% reflection factor @ 50% to 100% duty cycles; and also at 100% reflection factor @ 30% to 100% duty cycle. All scenarios using either 1000% or 2000% reflection factors indicate FCC violations can occur (or conservatively at 12% to 22% of those in Hondou et al, 2006).

Table 11 shows that for one collector meter, one violation occurs at 60% @ 100% duty cycle; and at 100% reflection factor for duty cycles between 60% and 100%. Violations are predicted to occur at all scenarios using either 1000% or 2000% reflection factors.

Table 11 also shows that for one collector meter plus multiple smart meters, FCC violations can occur at 60%reflection factor @ 40% to 100% duty cycles; and also at 100% reflection factor @ 30% to 100% duty cycle. All scenarios using either 1000% or 2000% reflection factors indicate FCC violations can occur.

Where do predicted FCC violations occur for the 655 uW/cm2 time-averaged public safety limit in the nursery crib at 11" distance?

Table 12 shows that for one smart meter, no violations are predicted to occur at 60% or 100% reflection factor at any duty cycle, but violations would be predicted with nearly all scenarios using either 1000% or 2000% reflection factors.

Table 12 also shows that for multiple smart meters, no FCC violations are predicted to occur at 60% reflection factor at any duty cycle; and also at 100% reflection factor @ 90% and 100% duty cycle. All scenarios using either 1000% or 2000% reflection factors indicate FCC violations can occur.

Table 13 shows that for one collector meter, one violation occurs at 100% reflection @100% duty cycle. No violations at 60% reflection are predicted. Violations are predicted to occur at all scenarios using 1000% reflection except @ 1% duty cycle. All 2000% reflection scenarios indicate FCC violations can occur.

Table 13 shows that for one collector meter plus multiple smart meters, FCC violations are not predicted to occur at 60% reflection factor. At 100% reflection factor, violations are predicted at 60% to100% duty cycles. FCC violations are predicted for all1000% and 2000% reflection factors with the exception of 1000% reflection at 1% duty cycle.

Where do predicted FCC violations occur for the 655 uW/cm2 time-averaged public safety limit in the kitchen work space at 28" distance?

Table 14 shows that for one smart meter, no violations are predicted to occur at 60% or 100% reflection factor at any duty cycle. Violations would be predicted with scenarios of 1000% reflection @ 70% to 100% duty cycles and at 2000% reflection factor @ 20% to 100% duty cycles.

Table 14 also shows that for multiple smart meters, no FCC violations are predicted to occur at 60% or at the 100% reflection factors at any duty cycle. Violations are predicted at 1000% reflection factor @ 70% to 100% duty cycles and at 2000% reflection factor @20% to 100% duty cycles.

Table 15 shows that for one collector meter, one violation occurs at 100% reflection @100% duty cycle. No violations at 60% reflection are predicted. Violations are predicted to occur at all scenarios using 1000% reflection except @ 1% duty cycle. All 2000% reflection scenarios indicate FCC violations can occur.

Table 15 shows that for one collector meter plus multiple smart meters, FCC violations are not predicted to occur at 60% or at 100% reflection factors at any duty cycle. At 1000% reflection factor, violations are predicted at 30% to 100% duty cycles. FCC violations are also predicted at 2000% reflection factor @10 to 100% duty cycles.

Where can peak power limits be violated? The peak power limit of 4000 uW/cm2 instantaneous public safety limit at 3" distance? This limit may be exceeded wherever smart meters and collector meters (face plate or any portion within 3" of the internal antennas can be accessed directly by the public.

Table 16 shows that for one smart meter, no violations are predicted to occur at 60% or 100% reflection factor at any duty cycle. Peak power limit violations would be predicted with scenarios of 1000% reflection @ 10% to

100% duty cycles and at 2000% reflection factor @ 10% to 100% duty cycles.

Table 16 also shows that for multiple smart meters, peak power limit violations are predicted to occur at 60% reflection @ 60% to 100% duty cycle and for 100% reflection @ 40% to 100% duty cycles. Violations are predicted at 1000% reflection factor @ 10% to 100% duty cycles and at 2000% reflection factor @1% to 100% duty cycles.

Table 17 shows that for one collector meter, peak power limit violations are predicted to occur at 60% reflection @80% to 100% duty cycles and at 100% reflection @ 50% to 100% duty cycles. Violations of peak power limit are predicted to occur at all scenarios using 1000% reflection except @ 1%; and for 2000% reflection violations of peak power limit are predicted at all duty cycles.

Table 17 shows that for one collector meter plus multiple smart meters, peak power limit violations are predicted to occur at 60% @ 40% to 100% and 100% reflection @ 30% to 100% duty cycles. At 1000% and 2000% reflection factors, peak power limit violations are predicted at all duty cycles.

Where are RF levels associated with inhibition of DNA repair in human stem cells at 92.5 uW/cm2 exceeded the in the nursery crib at 11" distance?

Table 18 shows that for one smart meter, RF exposures associated with inhibition of DNA repair in human stem cells are predicted to occur at 60% reflection factor@ 70% to 100% duty cycles, and at 100% reflection factor @ 50% to 100% duty cycles. All scenarios using either 1000% or 2000% reflection factors exceed these RF exposures except 1000% at 1% duty cycle.

Table 18 also shows that for multiple smart meters, RF exposures associated with inhibition of DNA repair in human stem cells are predicted to occur at 60% reflection factor@ 20% to 100% duty cycles, and at 100% reflection factor @ 20% to 100% duty cycles. All scenarios using either 1000% or 2000% reflection factors exceed these RF exposure levels except 1000% at 1% duty cycle.

Table 19 shows that for one collector meter, RF exposures associated with inhibition of DNA repair in human stem cells are predicted to occur at 60% reflection factor@ 30% to 100% duty cycles, and at 100% reflection factor @ 20% to 100% duty cycles. All scenarios using either 1000% or 2000% reflection factors exceed these RF exposure levels.

Table 19 shows that for one collector meter plus multiple smart meters, RF exposures associated with inhibition of DNA repair in human stem cells are predicted to occur at 60% reflection factor@ 20% to 100% duty cycles, and at 100% reflection factor @ 10% to 100% duty cycles. All scenarios using either 1000% or 2000% reflection factors exceed these RF exposure levels. *Where are RF levels associated with pathological leakage of the blood-brain barrier at 0.4 – 8 uW/cm2 exceeded the in the nursery crib at 11" distance?*

Table 20 shows that for one smart meter, RF exposures associated with pathological leakage of the blood-brain barrier at 8 uW/cm2 are predicted to occur at 60% reflection factor@ 10% to 100% duty cycles, and at 100% reflection factor @ 5% to 100% duty cycles. RF levels at 0.4 uW/cm2 (the lower end of the range) are exceeded at all duty cycles and at all reflection factors in the nursery in the crib.

Table 20 also shows that for multiple smart meters, RF exposures associated with pathological leakage of the blood-brain barrier at 8 uW/cm2 are predicted to occur at 60% reflection factor@ 5% to 100% duty cycles, and at 100% reflection factor @ 5% to 100% duty cycles. RF levels at 0.4 uW/cm2 (the lower end of the range) are exceeded at all duty cycles and at all reflection factors in the nursery in the crib.

Table 21 shows that for one collector meter, RF exposures associated with pathological leakage of the blood-brain barrier at 8 uW/cm2 are predicted to occur at 60% reflection factor@ 5% to 100% duty cycles, and at 100% reflection factor @ 5% to 100% duty cycles. RF levels at 0.4 uW/cm2 (the lower end of the range) are exceeded at all duty cycles and at all reflection factors in the nursery in the crib.

Table 21 shows that for one collector meter plus multiple smart meters, .RF exposures associated with pathological leakage of the blood-brain barrier at 8 uW/cm2 are predicted to occur at 60% reflection factor@ 5% to 100% duty cycles, and at 100% reflection factor @ 1% to 100% duty cycles. RF levels at 0.4 uW/cm2 (the lower end of the range) are exceeded at all duty cycles and at all reflection factors in the nursery in the crib.

Where are RF levels associated with adverse neurological symptoms, cardiac problems and increased cancer risk exceeded in the nursery crib at 11" distance?

Table 22 shows that for one smart meter, RF exposures associated with adverse neurological symptoms above 0.1 uW/cm2 are exceeded at all duty cycles and at all reflection factors in the nursery in the crib.

Table 22 shows that for multiple smart meters, RF exposures associated with adverse neurological symptoms above 0.1 uW/cm2 are exceeded at all duty cycles and at all reflection factors in the nursery in the crib.

Table 23 shows that for one collector meter, RF exposures associated with adverse neurological symptoms above 0.1 uW/cm2 are exceeded at all duty cycles and at all reflection factors in the nursery in the crib.

Table 23 shows that for one collector meter plus multiple smart meterss, RF exposures associated with adverse neurological symptoms above 0.1 uW/cm2 are exceeded at all duty cycles and at all reflection factors in the nursery in the crib.

Where are RF levels associated with inhibition of DNA repair in human stem cells at 92.5 uW/cm2 exceeded the in the kitchen work space at 28" distance?

Table 24 shows that for one smart meter, RF levels do not exceed those associated with inhibition of DNA repair at 60% or 100% reflection factor at any duty cycle. RF levels are exceeded at 1000% @ 10% to 100% duty cycles; and at 2000% reflection factor @ 5% to 100% duty cycles.

Table 24 also shows that for multiple smart meters, RF levels do not exceed those associated with inhibition of DNA repair at 60% or 100% reflection factor at any duty cycle. RF levels are exceeded at 1000% @ 5% to 100% duty cycles; and at 2000% reflection factor @ 1% to 100% duty cycles.

Table 25 shows that for one collector meter, RF levels do not exceed those associated with inhibition of DNA repair at 60% at any duty cycle; at 100% reflection factor they are exceeded at 70% to 100% duty cycles.. RF levels are exceeded at 1000% @ 5% to 100% duty cycles; and at 2000% reflection factor @ 1% to 100% duty cycles.

Table 25 shows that for one collector meter plus multiple smart meters, RF levels exceed those associated with inhibition of DNA repair at 60% reflection@100% duty cycle; at 100% reflection factor they are exceeded at 70% to 100% duty cycles.. RF levels are exceeded at 1000% @ 5% to 100% duty cycles; and at 2000% reflection factor @ 1% to 100% duty cycles.

Where are RF levels associated with pathological leakage of the blood-brain barrier and neuron death at 0.4 – 8 uW/cm2 risk in the kitchen work space at 28" distance?

Table 26 shows that for one smart meter, RF exposures associated with pathological leakage of the blood-brain barrier at 8 uW/cm2 are predicted to occur at 60% reflection factor@ 40% to 100% duty cycles, and at 100% reflection factor @ 30% to 100% duty cycles, and at all 1000% and 2000% reflections. RF levels at 0.4 uW/cm2 (the lower end of the range) are exceeded at all duty cycles and at all reflection factors in the kitchen work space except at 1% duty cycle for 60% and 100% reflections.

Table 26 also shows that for multiple smart meters, RF exposures associated with pathological leakage of the blood-brain barrier at 8 uW/cm2 are predicted to occur at 60% reflection factor@ 30% to 100% duty cycles, and at 100% reflection factor @ 20% to 100% duty cycles, and at all 1000% and 2000% reflections. RF levels at 0.4 uW/cm2 (the lower end of the range) are exceeded at all duty cycles and at all reflection factors in the kitchen.

Table 27 shows that for one collector meter, RF exposures associated with pathological leakage of the blood-brain barrier at 8 uW/cm2 are predicted to occur at 60% reflection factor@ 20% to 100% duty cycles, and at 100% reflection factor @ 10% to 100% duty cycles. RF levels at 0.4 uW/cm2 (the lower end of the range) are exceeded at all duty cycles and at all reflection factors in the kitchen work space.

Table 27 shows that for one collector meter plus multiple smart meters, .RF exposures associated with pathological leakage of the blood-brain barrier at 8 uW/cm2 are predicted to occur at 60% reflection factor@ 20% to 100% duty cycles, and at 100% reflection factor @ 20% to 100% duty cycles. RF levels at 0.4 uW/cm2 (the lower end of the range) are exceeded at all duty cycles and at all reflection factors in the kitchen work space.

Where are RF levels associated with adverse neurological symptoms, cardiac problems and increased cancer risk in the kitchen work space at 28" distance?

Table 28 shows that for one smart meter, RF exposures associated with adverse neurological symptoms above 0.1 uW/cm2 are exceeded at all duty cycles and at all reflection factors in the kitchen work space.

Table 28 shows that for multiple smart meters, RF exposures associated with adverse neurological symptoms above 0.1 uW/cm2 are exceeded at all duty cycles and at all reflection factors in the kitchen work space.

Table 29 shows that for one collector meter, RF exposures associated with adverse neurological symptoms above 0.1 uW/cm2 are exceeded at all duty cycles and at all reflection factors in the kitchen work space.

Table 29 shows that for one collector meter plus multiple smart meterss, RF exposures associated with adverse neurological symptoms above 0.1 uW/cm2 are exceeded at all duty cycles and at all reflection factors in the kitchen work space.

Where do RF levels exceed the Medtronics Safety Advisory?

Table 30: At no duty cycles for either 60% or 100% reflection factors; between 10% and 100% duty factors for 1000% and between 5% and 100% duty factors for 2000% reflection (for one smart meter).

Table 30: At 60% reflection @ 60% to 100% duty cycle; and at 100% reflection @ 40% to 100% duty cycle; at 1000% reflection @ 5% to 100% duty cycle and for all duty cycles at 2000% reflection (for multiple smart meters).

Table 31: At 60% reflection @ 70% to 100% duty cycle; at 100% reflection at 50% to 100% duty cycles; at 1000% reflection @ 5% to 100% and at all duty cycles for 2000% reflection (for one collector meter).

Table 31: At 60% reflection @ 40% to 100% duty cycle; at 100% reflection at 30% to 100% duty cycles; and at all duty cycles for both 1000% reflection and for 2000% reflection (for one collector meter plus three smart meters).

Where are RF levels associated with smart meters in all their configurations (one meter, multiple smart meters, one collector meter, one collector plus multiple smart meters) above those recommended in the BioInitiative Report (2007)?

Tables 32 and 33 depict the distance from the center of radiation for the smart meter(s) and collector meter scenarios in feet. The distances (in feet) at which RF levels exceed the BioInitiative Report recommended limit of 0.1 uW/cm2 is as small as 3.4' (one smart meter at 60% reflection and 1% duty cycle). At 60% reflection and 100% duty cycle, the distance to the BioInitiative recommended limit increases to 34 feet for one smart meter.

When multiples of smart meters are considered, the shortest distance to where the BioInitiative Report recommended limit is exceeded is 9.7 feet (for 60% reflection @ 1% duty cycle). It increases to 97' @100% duty cycle for multiple smart meters.

For a single collector meter, the shortest distance to a BioInitiative Report exceedence is 5.9 feet (60% reflection @ 1% duty cycle). At 60% reflection and 100% duty cycle, it increases to 59 feet.

For a collector and multiple smart meters, the shortest distance is 10.9 feet at 60% reflection @ 1% duty cycle, and increases to108 feet at 100% duty cycle.

Conclusions

FCC compliance violations are likely to occur under widespread conditions of installation and operation of smart meters and collector meters in California. Violations of FCC safety limits for uncontrolled public access are identified at distances within 6" of the meter. Exposure to the face is possible at this distance, in violation of the time-weighted average safety limits (Tables 10-11). FCC violations are predicted to occur at 60% reflection and 100% reflection factors*, both used in FCC OET 65 formulas for such calculations for time-weighted average limits. Peak power limits are not violated at the 6" distance (looking at the meter) but can be at 3"

from the meter, if it is touched.

This report has also assessed the potential for FCC violations based on two examples of RF exposures in a typical residence. RF levels have been calculated at distances of 11" (to represent a nursery or bedroom with a crib or bed against a wall opposite one or more meters); and at 28" (to represent a kitchen work space with one or more meters installed on the kitchen wall).

FCC compliance violations are identified at 11" in a nursery or bedroom setting using Equation 10* of the FCC OET 65 regulations (Tables 12-13). These violations are predicted to occur where there are multiple smart meters, or one collector meter, or one collector meter mounted together with several smart meters.

FCC compliance violations are not predicted at 28" in the kitchen work space for 60% or for 100% reflection calculations. Violations of FCC public safety limits are predicted for higher reflection factors of 1000% and 2000%, which are not a part of FCC OET 65 formulas, but are included here to allow for situations where site-specific conditions (highly reflective environments, for example, galley-type kitchens with many highly reflective stainless steel or other metallic surfaces) may be warranted (see Methodology Section).

In addition to exceeding FCC public safety limits under some conditions of installation and operation, smart meters can produce excessively elevated RF exposures, depending on where they are installed. With respect to absolute RF exposure levels predicted for occupied space within dwellings, or outside areas like patios, gardens and walk-ways, RF levels are predicted to be substantially elevated within a few feet to within a few tens of feet from the

meter(s).

For example, one smart meter at 11” from occupied space produces somewhere between 1.4 and 140 microwatts per centimeter squared (uW/cm2) depending on the duty cycle modeled (Table 12). Since FCC OET 65 specifies that continuous exposure be assumed where the public cannot be excluded (such as is applicable to one’s home), this calculation produces an RF level of 140 uW/cm2 at 11” using the FCCs lowest reflection factor of 60%. Using the FCC’s reflection factor of 100%, the figures rise to 2.2 uW/cm2 – 218 uW/cm2, where the continuous exposure calculation is 218 uW/cm2 (Table 12). These are very significantly elevated RF exposures in comparison to typical individual exposures in daily life. Multiple smart meters in the nursery/bedroom example at 11” are predicted to generate RF levels from about 5 to 481 uW/cm2 at the lowest (60%) reflection factor; and 7.5 to 751 uW/cm2 using the FCCs 100% reflection factor (Table 13). Such levels are far above typical public exposures.

RF levels at 28” in the kitchen work space are also predicted to be significantly elevated with one or more smart meters (or a collector meter alone or in combination with multiple smart meters). At 28” distance, RF levels are predicted in the kitchen example to be as high as 21 uW/cm2 from a single meter and as high as 54.5 uW/cm2 with multiple smart meters using the lower of the FCCs reflection factor of 60% (Table 14).

Using the FCCs higher reflection factor of 100%, the RF levels are predicted to be as high as 33.8 uW/cm2 for a single meter and as high as 85.8 uW/cm2 for multiple smart meters (Table 14). For a single collector meter, the range is 60.9 to 95.2 uW/cm2 (at 60% and 100% reflection factors, respectively)

(from Table 15).

Table 16 illustrates predicted violations of peak power limit (4000 uW/cm2) at 3” from the surface of a meter. FCC violations of peak power limit are predicted to occur for a single collector meter at both 60% and 100% reflection factors. This situation might occur if someone touches a smart meter or stands directly in front.

Uncertainty About Actual RF Levels

Consumers may also have already increased their exposures to radiofrequency radiation in the home through the voluntary use of wireless devices (cell and cordless phones), PDAs like BlackBerry and iPhones, wireless routers for wireless internet access, wireless home security systems, wireless baby surveillance (baby monitors), and other emerging wireless applications.

Neither the FCC, the CPUC, the utility nor the consumer know what portion of the allowable public safety limit is already being used up or pre-empted by RF from other sources already present in the particular location a smart meter may be installed and operated.

Consumers, for whatever personal reason, choice or necessity who have already eliminated all possible wireless exposures from their property and lives, may now face excessively high RF exposures in their homes from smart meters. This may force limitations on use of their otherwise occupied

space, depending on how the meter is located, building materials in the

structure, and how it is furnished.

People who are afforded special protection under the federal Americans with Disabilities Act are not sufficiently acknowledged nor protected. People who have medical and/or metal implants or other conditions rendering them vulnerable to health risks at lower levels than FCC RF limits may be particularly at risk (Tables 30-31). This is also likely to hold true for other subgroups, like children and people who are ill or taking medications, or are elderly, for they have different reactions to pulsed RF. Childrens' tissues absorb RF differently and can absorb more RF than adults (Christ et al, 2010; Wiart et al, 2008). The elderly and those on some medications respond more acutely to some RF exposures.

Eyes and Testes - Safety standards for peak exposure limits to radiofrequency have not been developed to take into account the particular sensitivity of the eyes, testes and other ball shaped organs. There are no peak power limits defined for the eyes and testes, and it is not unreasonable to imagine situations where either of these organs comes into close contact with smart meters and/or collector meters, particularly where they are installed in multiples (on walls of multi-family dwellings that are accessible as common areas).

What can be determined from the relevant standards (FCC and ANSI/IEEE and certain IEEE committee documents is that the eye and testes are potentially much more vulnerable to damage, but that there is no scientific basis on which to develop a new, more protective safety limit. What is certain is that the peak power limit of 4000 uW/cm2 exceeds what is safe (Appendix C).

In summary, no positive assertion of safety can be made by the FCC, nor relied upon by the CPUC, with respect to pulsed RF when exposures are chronic and occur in the general population. Indiscriminate exposure to environmentally ubiquitous pulsed RF from the rollout of millions of new RF sources (smart meters) will mean far greater general population exposures, and potential health consequences. Uncertainties about the existing RF environment (how much RF exposure already exists), what kind of interior reflective environments exist (reflection factor), how interior space is utilized near walls), and other characteristics of residents (age, medical condition, medical implants, relative health, reliance on critical care equipment that may be subject to electronic interference, etc) and unrestrained access to areas of property where meter is located all argue for caution.

Electronic Interference

Consumers may experience electronic interference (electromagnetic interference or EMI) from smart meter wireless signals. The FCC also is charged with investigating consumer complaints about electronic interference.

> *"The FCC requires that unlicensed low-power RF devices must not create interference and users of such equipment must resolve any interference problems or cease operation. According to the FCC (47CFR Part 15): "The operator of a radio frequency device shall be required to cease operating the device upon notification by a Commission representative that the device is causing harmful interference. Operation shall not resume until the condition causing the harmful interference has been corrected."*
>
> (EPRI, 2010)

Medical and other critical care equipment in the home environment may not work, or work properly due to electronic interference from smart meters.

Security systems, surveillance monitors and wireless intercoms may be rendered inoperable or unreliable. Some cordless telephones do not work reliably, or have substantial interference from smart meter RF emissions.

Electronic equipment and electrical appliances may be damaged or have to be replaced with other, newer equipment in order not to be subject to electromagnetic interference from smart meter RF bursts.

Americans With Disabilities Act

People who have medical implants, particularly metal implants, may be more sensitive to spurious RF exposures for two reasons. Electromagnetic interference (EMI) with critical care medical equipment and medical implants is a potentially serious threat. Patients with deep-brain stimulators (Parkinson's disease patients) have reported adverse health effects due to RF from various environmental sources like security gates and RFID scanners. Patients with deep brain stimulators have reported the devices to be reprogramming or electrodes shut-down as a result of encounters with wireless RFID scanners. One manufacturer, Medtronics, has issued a warning for DBS implant patients to limit RF exposure to less than 0.1 W/Kg SAR (or sixteen times lower than for the general public) for MRI exposures.

The IEEE SC4 committee (2001) considered changes to existing ANSI/IEEE standards adopted in 1992 (C95.1-1992). They discussed vulnerable organs

(eyes, testes) and metallic implants that can intensify localized RF exposures within the body and its tissues.

> *"Question 20: Are there specific tissues or points within the body that have particularly high susceptibilities to local heating due to thermal properties in the immediate vicinity of the tissue?"*

Committee minutes include the following discussion on metallic implants.

> "*Metallic implants are an interesting example of this question. There can be very localized high field concentrations around the tips of long metal structures, in the gaps of wire loops. Of course, these metal devices don't create energy, but can only redistribute it, so the effect is limited to some extent. Also the high thermal conductivity and specific heat capacity make them good thermal sinks for any localized heat sources generated around them."*

Since deep brain stimulators in Parkinson's patients involve metal implants that are essentially long metal structures with tips that interface with brain tissue and nerves within the brain and body, exposing such patients with implants to high levels of pulsed RF that can produce localized, high RF within the body is certainly inadvisable. It is clear the IEEE SC4 committee recognized the potential risk by to calling such implanted metallic devices good 'thermal sinks' for localized heating dissipation.

The FCC's Grants of Authorization and other certification procedures do not ensure adequate safety to safeguard people under Department of Justice protection under the Americans with Disabilities Act.

References

ANSI/IEEE standards adopted in 1992 (C95.1-1992) and 1999 revisions June 2001 SC-4 Committee Minutes

Christ A Gosselin MC Christopoulou M Kühn S Kuster N. Age dependent tissue-specific exposure of cell phone users. Physics in Medicine and Biology, Volume 55, Issue 7, pp. 1767–1783, 7 April 2010, online March 5

EPRI, 2010. A Perspective on Radio-Frequency Exposure Associated With Residential Automatic Meter Reading Technology, Electric Power Research Institute, Palo Alto, CA.

Federal Communications Commission, 1997. FCC Bulletin OET 65 97-01 Guidelines Evaluating Compliance with FCC Guidelines for Human Exposure to Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields.

Hondou T Ueda T Sakat Y Tanigwa N Suzuki T Kobayashi T Ikeda K. Passive Exposure to Mobile Phones: Enhancement of Intensity by Reflection, Journal of the Physical Society of Japan Vol. 75, No. 8, August, 2006, 084801 (2006) The Physical Society of Japan

Hondou T, Rising Level of Public Exposure to Mobile Phones:Accumulation through Additivity and Reflectivity. Journal of the Physical Society of Japan, Vol. 71, No. 2, February, 2002, pp. 432–435 (2002) The Physical Society of Japan.

The Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers, Inc. 1999. IEEE Standards Coordinating Committee 28, IEEE Standard for Safety Levels with Respect to Human Exposure to Radio Frequency Electromagnetic Fields 3 kHz to 300 GHz. December, 1998.

Khurana VG Hardell L Everaert J Bortkiewicz A Carlberg M Ahonen M, 2010. Epidemiological Evidence for a Health Risk from Mobile Phone Base Stations. Int Journal of Occupational Environmental Health 2010;16:263–267

Kundi M Hutter HP Mobile phone base stations—Effects on wellbeing and health. Pathophysiology 16 (2009) 123–135

Markova E Malmgren LOG Belyaev IY. Microwaves from mobile phones

inhibit 53PB1 focus formation in human stem cells stronger than in differentiated cells: Possible mechanistic link to cancer risk. Environmental Health Perspectives On-line 22 October 2009 doi:10.1289/ehp.0900781

National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP) in "Biological Effects and Exposure Criteria for Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields," NCRP Report No. 86, Sections 17.4.1, 17.4.1.1, 17.4.2 and 17.4.3. Copyright NCRP, 1986, Bethesda, Maryland 20814

National Toxicology Program Fact Sheet, (2009). *Cell Phone Radiofrequency Radiation Studies*, (September 2009).

Vermeeren G Gosselin MC Gosselin Kuhn S Kellerman V Hadmen A Gati A Joseph W Wiart J Meyer F Kuster N Martens L. The influence of the reflective environment on the absorption of a human male exposed to representative base station antennas from 300 MHz to 5 GHz, Phys. Med. Biol. 55 (2010) 5541–5555 doi:10.1088/0031-9155/55/18/018

Wiart, J., Hadjem, A., Wong, M.F., & Bloch, I. (2008). Analysis of RF exposure in the head tissues of children and adults. *Physical Medicine & Biology*, 53, 3681-3695.

Appendix A Tables A1- A 48

RADIOFREQUENCY RADIATION VERSUS DISTANCE

One Smart Meter

Table A1	60% Reflection	(1%-100% duty cycles in each table)
Table A2	100% Reflection	(1%-100% duty cycles in each table)
Table A3	1000% Reflection*	(1%-100% duty cycles in each table)
Table A4	2000% Reflection*	(1%-100% duty cycles in each table)

Multiple Smart Meters (Four)**

Table A5	60% Reflection	(1%-100% duty cycles in each table)
Table A6	100% Reflection	(1%-100% duty cycles in each table)
Table A7	1000% Reflection	(1%-100% duty cycles in each table)
Table A8	2000% Reflection	(1%-100% duty cycles in each table)

One Collector Meter

Table AA9	60% Reflection	(1%-100% duty cycles in each table)
Table A10	100% Reflection	(1%-100% duty cycles in each table)
Table A11	1000% Reflection	(1%-100% duty cycles in each table)
Table A12	2000% Reflection	(1%-100% duty cycles in each table)

One Collector Meter + 3 SM**

Table A13	60% Reflection	(1%-100% duty cycles in each table)
Table A14	100% Reflection	(1%-100% duty cycles in each table)
Table A15	1000% Reflection	(1%-100% duty cycles in each table)
Table A16	2000% Reflection	(1%-100% duty cycles in each table)

TABLES OF CRITICAL DISTANCES IN NURSERY (CRIB AT 11") AND KITCHEN SINK (AT 28") FROM SMART METER (A17-A48)

Table A17 Nursery Set –
Table A18 One Smart Meter – Critical Distance 11" to baby in crib
Table A19 60%, 100%, 1000%, 2000% duty cycle
Table A20 1% thru 90% duty cycle

Table A21 Nursery Set –
Table A22 Eight Smart Meters – Critical Distance 11" to baby in crib

Table A23 60%, 100%, 1000%, 2000% reflection
Table A24 1% thru 100% duty cycle

Table A25 Nursery Set –
Table A26 One Collector– Critical Distance 11" to baby in crib
Table A27 60%, 100%, 1000%, 2000% reflection
Table A28 1% thru 100% duty cycle

Table A29 Nursery Set –
Table A30 One Collector Meter + 7 SM– Critical Distance 11" to baby crib
Table A31 60%, 100%, 1000%, 2000% reflection
Table A32 1% thru 100% duty cycle

Table A33 Kitchen Set –
Table A34 One Smart Meter – Critical Distance 28" to kitchen sink person
Table A35 60%, 100%, 1000%, 2000% reflection
Table A36 1% thru 100% duty cycle

Table A37 Kitchen Set -
Table A38 Eight Smart Meters – Critical Distance 28" to kitchen sink person
Table A39 60%, 100%, 1000%, 2000% reflection
Table A40 1% thru 100% duty cycle

Table A41 Kitchen Set –
Table A42 One Collector – Critical Distance 28" to kitchen sink person
Table A43 60%, 100%, 1000%, 2000% reflection

Appendix B Tables 1 – 33 of Report

Data Tables, FCC Violation Tables, Health Comparisions

Appendix C

Other Sources of Information on sensitivity of the eyes and testes

In the most recent proposed revisions of RF safety standards, the IEEE SC4 committee (2001) deliberated at length over the problem of peak power limits and non-uniform RF exposure with respect to the eye and testes. The quotes below come from committee drafts submitted in response to questions from the committee moderator.

ANSI/IEEE standards adopted in 1992 (C95.1-1992) and 1999 revisions
June 2001 SC-4 Committee Minutes

These committee discussions are informative on the issue of particular organ sensitivity to RF, and unanswered questions and differences of opinion on the subject among members. They discussed vulnerable organs (eyes, testes) and metallic implants that can intensify localized RF exposures within the body and its tissues (see also discussion on metallic implants).

Question 20: Are there specific tissues or points within the body that have particularly high susceptibilities to local heating due to thermal properties in the immediate vicinity of the tissue?

Committee minutes include the following discussion on the particular sensitivities of 'ball shaped' organs including the eyes and testes.

"*Eye balls are commonly regarded as the critical organ*"

"In the range of a few GHz (gigahertz*), reasonances may occur in ball shaped eyes and testes. They are also electrically and thermally partly insulated from other tissues. Additionally these organs or some of their parts (lens) are thermally a little bit more vulnerable than other tissues."*

"(m)odeling has noted that rapid changes in dialectrics such as cerebral spinal fluid in the ventricles of the brain and surrounding brain tissue lead to high calculated SARs. Secondly, exposure of the eye to microwave

radiation can lead to increased temperature that is sufficient to damage tissues. The temperature rise will, of course, depend on the intensity of the irradiation, how well the energy is coupled into tissues, and how well the deposited energy is removed by normal mechanisms such as conduction and blood flow. Microwaves at the lower frequencies will be deposited deeper in the eye, while at higher frequencies they will be absorbed near the front surface of the eye. The eye does not efficiently remove heat deposited internally by microwave exposure. The main avenue of heat removal is conduction and blood flow through the retina and choroid. The lens has been thought to be the most vulnerable tissue since it has no blood flow. Other than conduction through the sclera and convection from the surface of the cornea, heat removal is poor compared to other body tissues. Because the lens is avasular it has been thought to be particularly sensitive to thermal effects of microwave exposure. These facts have led many investigators to postulate that the poor heat dissipation from within the eye of humans and other animals may lead to heat buildup and subsequent thermal damage."

"Eyes do not have good blood circulation and testes have lower than body temperature."

"These organs are not well-perfused, hence have been singled out for the exclusion."

"Are the above numbers valid for all parts of the body in all exposure conditions over the time averaging period of the exposure? They (the basic limits) were derived in the manner you describe in body reasonance conditions i.e. coherent exposure over the whole body length of a human. Could the limit values of SAR be increased for partial body exposure? Yes, but we do not have the data to make this decision. In the near field of a source, clearly the limit value will depend on frequency (depth of penetration), organ blood supply and tolerance of that organism to sustain a certain rate of temperature increase during the time averaging period and the environmental conditions. If you have to deal with possible pathologies of organs then matters become even more complicated, because you are dealing not only with heat physiology, but also with general pathology, whose books are much thicker than those on physiology.

Table 1
Radiofrequency Radiation Level at 6" at the Face in uW/cm2
(One Smart Meter, Four Meters)

One Meter	**Table A1**	**Table A2**	**Table A3**	**Table A4**
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection*	2000% Reflection*
1%	2.1 uW/cm2	3.3	99	361
10%	21	33	989	3606
20%	42	65	1979	7212
30%	63	98	2968	10818
40%	83	131	3958	14424
50%	105	164	4947	18030
60%	105	196	5936	21636
70%	147	229	6926	25241
80%	168	262	7915	28847
90%	188	294	8904	32453
100%***	209	327	9894	36059

Four Meters**	**Table A5**	**Table A6**	**Table A7**	**Table A8**
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection*	2000% Reflection*
	15 uW/cm^2	24	712	2596
10%	151	236	7124	25963
20%	301	471	14247	51925
30%	452	707	21371	77888
40%	603	942	28494	103850
50%	754	1177	35618	129813
60%	904	1413	42741	155775
70%	1055	1648	49865	181738
80%	1206	1884	56988	207701
90%	1356	2119	64112	233663
100%***	1507	2355	71235	259626

This table shows RF power density for face reading a meter at 6" distance.

*Note: 1000-2000% reflection based on Vermeeren et al, 2010; Christ et al, 2010; Hondou, 2002.
**More than 4 meters placed together do not appreciably increase the exposure to one reference point, such as a crib or bed. However, multiple meters can increase the square footage of space similarly affected.
***Continuous exposure is required in calculations of time-weighted average radiofrequency exposure for uncontrolled public access by FCC OET 65 (p. 15).

Table 2
Radiofrequency Radiation Level at 6" at the Face in uW/cm2
(One Collector, 1 Collector + 3 Smart Meters)

One Collector	**Table A9**	**Table A10**	**Table A11**	**Table A12**
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection*	2000% Reflection*
1%	6 uW/cm2	10	296	1078
10%	63	98	958	10780
20%	125	196	5916	21561
30%	188	293	8874	32341
40%	250	391	11832	43121
50%	313	489	14789	53902
60%	376	587	17747	64682
70%	438	685	20705	75462
80%	501	782	23663	86243
90%	563	880	26621	97023
100%***	626	978	29579	107803

One **C + 3 SM**	**Table A13**	**Table A14**	**Table A15**	**Table A16**
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflectio	1000% Reflection*	2000% Reflection*
1%	19	29	890	3242
10%	188	294	8895	32420
20%	376	588	17990	64839
30%	565	882	26686	97259
40%	753	1176	35581	129678
50%	941	1470	43700	162098
60%	1129	1764	53371	194517
70%	1317	2058	62266	226937
80%	1506	2352	71161	259356
90%	1694	2647	80056	291776
100%***	1882	2941	88952	324195

This table shows RF power density for face reading a meter at 6" distance.

*Note: 1000-2000% reflection based on Vermeeren et al, 2010; Christ et al, 2010; Hondou, 2002.
**More than 4 meters placed together do not appreciably increase the exposure to one reference point, such as a crib or bed. However, multiple meters can increase the square footage of space similarly affected.
***Continuous exposure is required in calculations of time-weighted average radiofrequency exposure for uncontrolled public access by FCC OET 65 (p. 15).

Table 3
Radiofrequency Radiation Level at 11" in the Nursery in uW/cm2
(One Smart Meter, Four Meters)

One Meter	Table A17	Table A18	Table A19	Table A20
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection*	2000% Reflection*
1%	1.4	2.2	66	241
5%	7	11	331	1227
10%	14	21.9	662	2414
20%	28	43.8	1324	4828
30%	42	65.7	1986	7242
40%	56.1	87.6	2649	9655
50%	70.1	109	3312	12069
60%	84.1	131	3974	14483
70%	98.1	153	4636	16897
80%	112	175	5299	19311
90%	126	197	5961	21175
100%***	140	218	6623	24139

Four** Meters	Table A21	Table A22	Table A23	Table A24
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection*	2000% Reflection*
1%	4.9	7.5	227	828
5%	24	38	1137	4142
10%	48	75	2273	8284
20%	96	150	4546	16569
30%	144	225	6819	24853
40%	192	301	9092	33137
50%	240	376	11365	41421
60%	289	451	13638	49705
70%	337	526	15911	57990
80%	385	601	18184	66274
90%	433	676	20457	74558
100%***	481	751	22730	82843

This table shows RF power density for readings at 11" in the crib.

*Note: 1000-2000% reflection based on Vermeeren et al, 2010; Christ et al, 2010; Hondou, 2002.
**More than 4 meters placed together do not appreciably increase the exposure to one reference point, such as a crib or bed. However, multiple meters can increase the square footage of space similarly affected.
***Continuous exposure is required in calculations of time-weighted average radiofrequency exposure for uncontrolled public access by FCC OET 65 (p. 15).

Table 4
Radiofrequency Radiation Level at 11" in the Nursery in uW/cm2
(One Collector/1C + 3 Smart Meters)

One Collector Duty Cycle	**Table A25** 60% Reflection	**Table A26** 100% Reflection	**Table A27** 1000% Reflection*	**Table A28** 2000% Reflection*
1%	4.0 uW/cm^2	6.2	187	680
5%	19.7	30.8	933	3399
10%	39.5	61.7	1865	6798
20%	78.9	123	3730	13596
30%	118	185	5596	20394
40%	158	247	7461	27192
50%	197	308	9326	33990
60%	237	370	11191	40788
70%	276	432	13056	47586
80%	316	493	14922	54384
90%	355	555	16787	61182
100%***	395	617	18652	67980

One Collector + 3 Meters** Duty Cycle	**Table A29** 60% Reflection	**Table A30** 100% Reflection	**Table A31** 1000% Reflection*	**Table A32** 2000% Reflection*
1%	7.4 uW/cm^2	11.5	348	1267
5%	36.8	57.5	1738	6334
10%	73.5	115	3476	12668
20%	147	230	6952	25337
30%	221	345	10428	38005
40%	294	460	13904	50674
50%	368	575	17380	63342
60%	441	689	20855	76010
70%	515	804	24331	88679
80%	588	919	27807	101347
90%	662	1034	31283	114015
100%***	735	1149	34759	126684

This table shows RF power density for readings at 11" in the crib.

*Note: 1000-2000% reflection based on Vermeeren et al, 2010; Christ et al, 2010; Hondou, 2002.

**More than 4 meters placed together do not appreciably increase the exposure to one reference point, such as a crib or bed. However, multiple meters can increase the square footage of space similarly affected.

***Continuous exposure is required in calculations of time-weighted average radiofrequency exposure for uncontrolled public access by FCC OET 65 (p. 15).

Table 5
Radiofrequency Radiation Level at 28" in the Kitchen in uW/cm2
(One Smart Meter, Four Meters)

One Meter Duty Cycle	**Table A33** 60% Reflection	**Table A34** 100% Reflection	**Table A35** 1000% Reflection*	**Table A36** 2000% Reflection*
1%	0.2	0.3	10.2	37.3
5%	1.1	1.7	51.1	186
10%	2.2	3.4	102	373
20%	4.3	6.8	204	745
30%	6.5	10.1	307	1118
40%	8.7	13.5	409	1490
50%	10.8	16.9	511	1863
60%	13	20.3	613	2235
70%	15.1	23.7	716	2608
80%	17.3	27	818	2980
90%	19.5	30.4	920	3353
100%***	21.6	33.8	1022	3726

Four Meters** Duty Cycle	**Table A37** 60% Reflection	**Table A38** 100% Reflection	**Table A39** 1000% Reflection*	**Table A40** 2000% Reflection*
1%	0.6	0.9	26	94.6
5%	2.8	4.3	129	473
10%	5.5	8.6	260	946
20%	11	17.2	519	1892
30%	16.5	25.7	779	2837
40%	22	34.3	1038	3783
50%	27.5	42.9	1298	4729
60%	32.9	51.5	1557	5675
70%	38.4	60.1	1817	6621
80%	43.9	68.6	2076	7566
90%	49.4	77.2	2336	8512
100%***	54.9	85.8	2595	9458

This table shows RF power density for readings at 28" in the kitchen work space.

*Note: 1000-2000% reflection based on Vermeeren et al, 2010; Christ et al, 2010; Hondou, 2002.
**More than 4 meters placed together do not appreciably increase the exposure to one reference point, such as a crib or bed. However, multiple meters can increase the square footage of space similarly affected.
***Continuous exposure is required in calculations of time-weighted average radiofrequency exposure for uncontrolled public access by FCC OET 65 (p. 15).

Table 6
Radiofrequency Radiation Level at 28" in the Kitchen in uW/cm2
(One Collector/1C + 3 Smart Meters)

One Collector Duty Cycle	**Table A41** 60% Reflection	**Table A42** 100% Reflection	**Table A43** 1000% Reflection*	**Table A44** 2000% Reflection*
1%	0.6 uW/cm^2	1	28.8	105
5%	3.1	4.8	144	525
10%	6.1	9.5	288	1049
20%	12.2	19	576	2098
30%	18.3	28.6	864	3148
40%	24.4	38.1	1152	4197
50%	30.5	47.6	1439	5246
60%	36.5	57.1	1727	6295
70%	42.6	66.6	2015	7344
80%	48.7	75.1	2303	8393
90%	54.8	85.7	2591	9243
100%***	60.9	95.2	2879	10492

One Collector + 3 Meters** Duty Cycle	**Table A45** 60% Reflection	**Table A46** 100% Reflection	**Table A47** 1000% Reflection*	**Table A48** 2000% Reflection*
1%	0.9 uW/cm^2	1.5	45	162
5%	4.7	7.4	223	811
10%	9.4	14.7	445	1622
20%	18.8	29.4	890	3245
30%	28.3	44.2	1336	4867
40%	37.7	58.9	1781	6490
50%	47.1	73.6	2226	8112
60%	56.5	88.3	2671	9734
70%	65.9	103	3116	11357
80%	75.4	118	3561	12979
90%	84.8	132	4006	14602
100%***	94.2	147	4452	16224

This table shows RF power density for readings at 28" in the kitchen work space.

*Note: 1000-2000% reflection based on Vermeeren et al, 2010; Christ et al, 2010; Hondou, 2002.

**More than 4 meters placed together do not appreciably increase the exposure to one reference point, such as a crib or bed. However, multiple meters can increase the square footage of space similarly affected.

***Continuous exposure is required in calculations of time-weighted average radiofrequency exposure for uncontrolled public access by FCC OET 65 (p. 15).

TABLE 7

DISTANCE AT WHICH FCC TWA SAFETY LIMIT IS EXCEEDED (in inches) (FCC limit is 655 uW/cm^2 in smart meters)

One Smart Meter	**Table A1**	**Table A2**	**Table A3**	**Table A4**
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection*	2000% Reflection*
1%	0.5”	0.6”	3.5”	6.68”
10%	1.6”	2.0”	11.1 ”	21.1”
20%	2.3”	2.8”	15.6”	29.9”
30%	2.8”	3.5”	19.2”	36.6”
40%	3.2”	4.0”	22.1”	42.2”
50 %	3.6”	4.5”	24.7”	47.3”
60%	3.9”	4.9”	27.1”	51.7”
70%	4.3”	5.3”	29.3”	55.9”
80%	4.6”	5.7”	31.3”	59.8”
90%	4.8”	6.0”	33.2”	63.4”
100%***	5.1”	6.4”	35.0”	66.8”

Four Meters**	**Table A5**	**Table A6**	**Table A7**	**Table A8**
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection*	2000% Reflection*
1%	1.44”	1.8”	9.4”	18.7”
10%	3.42”	4.8’	31.2”	59.7”
20%	5.70”	7.47”	44.2”	84.0”
30%	7.29”	9.39”	54.1”	103.4”
40%	8.6”	11.0”	62.5”	119.5”
50 %	9.73”	12.4”	70”	133.6”
60%	10.7”	13.6”	76.6”	146.3”
70%	11.7”	14.8”	82.2”	158.0”
80%	12”	15.8”	88.4”	169.0”
90%	13”	16.8”	93.8”	179.3”
100%***	14”	17.7”	98.9”	188.9”

*Note: 1000-2000% reflection based on Vermeeren et al, 2010; Christ et al, 2010; Hondou, 2002.
**More than 4 meters placed together do not appreciably increase the exposure to one reference point, such as a crib or bed. However, multiple meters can increase the square footage of space similarly affected.
***Continuous exposure is required in calculations of time-weighted average radiofrequency exposure for uncontrolled public access by FCC OET 65 (p. 15).

TABLE 8

DISTANCE AT WHICH FCC TWA SAFETY LIMIT IS EXCEEDED FOR COLLECTOR METER (in inches)
(FCC limit is 571 uW/cm^2 or 624 uW/cm^2 for collector+ 3 SM)

FCC Limit=571 uW/cm^2 for collector meter

One Meter (1 collector)	**Table A9**	**Table A10**	**Table A11**	**Table A12**
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection*	2000% Reflection*
1%	0.9”	1.2”	6.5”	12.3”
10%	3.0”	3.7”	20.4”	39.0”
20%	4.2”	5.2”	28.9”	55.1”
30%	5.1”	6.4”	35.3”	67.5”
40%	5.9”	7.4”	40.8”	77.9”
50 %	6.6”	8.3”	45.6”	87.1”
60%	7.3”	9.1”	50.0”	95.4”
70%	7.9”	9.8”	54.0”	103”
80%	8.4”	10.5”	57.7”	110”
90%	8.9”	11.1”	61.2”	116”
100%***	9.4”	11.7”	64.5”	123”

FCC Limit = 624 uW/cm^2 for collector meter plus 3 smart meters

One Collector + 3 Smart Meters**	**Table A13**	**Table A14**	**Table A15**	**Table A16**
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection*	2000% Reflection*
1%	1.6”	2.1”	10.9”	21.3
10%	4.2”	5.6”	35.6”	68.1”
20%	6.7”	8.7”	50.4”	96.3”
30%	8.5”	10.8”	61.7”	118”
40%	9.9”	12.6”	71.3”	136”
50 %	11.2”	14.2”	79.7”	152”
60%	12.4”	15.6”	87.4”	167”
70%	13.4”	16.9”	94.4”	180”
80%	14.4”	18.1”	101”	193”
90%	15.3”	19.2”	107”	204”
100%***	16.1”	20.3”	113”	215”

*Note: 1000-2000% reflection based on Vermeeren et al, 2010; Christ et al, 2010; Hondou, 2002.
**More than 4 meters placed together do not appreciably increase the exposure to one reference point, such as a crib or bed. However, multiple meters can increase the square footage of space similarly affected.

***Continuous exposure is required in calculations of time-weighted average radiofrequency exposure for uncontrolled public access by FCC OET 65 (p. 15)

TABLE 9

PEAK POWER LIMIT
(Distance at which 4000 uW/cm2*** FCC peak limit is exceeded in inches)

	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection*	2000% Reflection*
One Smart Meter	2”	2.6”	14.2”	27”
Four Smart Meters	4.1”	5.2”	28.3”	54”
One Collector Meter	4”	4.5”	24”	46.7”
One Collector + 3 SM	5.0”	6.3”	34.6”	66.1”

*Note: 1000-2000% reflection based on Vermeeren et al, 2010; Christ et al, 2010; Hondou, 2002.

**More than 4 meters placed together do not appreciably increase the exposure to one reference point, such as a crib or bed. However, multiple meters can increase the square footage of space similarly affected.

*** FCC OET 65 and ANSI/IEEE C95.1-1992, 1999 specify that 4000 uW/cm2 public safety limit be applied for frequencies between 300 MHz and 6 GHz (6000 MHz) for peak power exposure.

Table 10
Potential FCC Violations of TWA 655 uW/cm2 - Face at 6"
(One Smart Meter, Four Meters)

One Meter	Table A1	Table A2	Table A3	Table A4
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	2.1 uW/cm2	3.3	99	361
10%	21	33	989	3606
20%	42	65	1979	7212
30%	63	98	2968	10818
40%	83	131	3958	14424
50%	105	164	4947	18030
60%	105	196	5936	21636
70%	147	229	6926	25241
80%	168	262	7915	28847
90%	188	294	8904	32453
100%	209	327	9894	36059

Four Meters	Table A5	Table A6	Table A7	Table A8
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
	15 uW/cm^2	24	712	2596
10%	151	236	7124	25963
20%	301	471	14247	51925
30%	452	707	21371	77888
40%	603	942	28494	103850
50%	754	1177	35618	129813
60%	904	1413	42741	155775
70%	1055	1648	49865	181738
80%	1206	1884	56988	207701
90%	1356	2119	64112	233663
100%	1507	2355	71235	259626

This table shows RF power density for face reading a meter at 6" distance.

Exceeds 655 uW/cm2 at 6" at the face

Table 11
Potential FCC Violations of TWA 571/624 uW/cm2- Face at 6"
(One Collector, 1 Collector + 3 Smart Meters)

One Collector	Table A9	Table A10	Table A11	Table A12
Duty Cycle	60%	100%	1000%	2000%
571 limit	Reflection	Reflection	Reflection	Reflection
1%	6 uW/cm2	9	279	1015
10%	59	92	2786	10152
20%	118	184	5571	20305
30%	177	276	8357	30457
40%	236	368	11142	40610
50%	295	460	13928	50762
60%	354	553	16713	60914
70%	413	645	19449	71067
80%	471	737	22285	81219
90%	530	829	25070	91372
100%	589	921	27856	101524

One C + 3 SM	Table A13	Table A14	Table A15	Table A16
Duty Cycle	60%	100%	1000%	2000%
	Reflection	Reflectio	Reflection	Reflection
624 limit				
1%	18	29	874	3185
10%	185	289	8740	31854
20%	370	578	17480	63709
30%	555	867	26220	95563
40%	740	1156	34960	127418
50%	925	1445	43700	159272
60%	1109	1734	52441	191126
70%	1294	2023	61181	222981
80%	1479	2311	69921	254835
90%	1664	2600	78661	286690
100%	1849	2889	87401	318544

This table shows RF power density for face reading a meter at 6" distance.

Exceeds 571 or 624 uW/cm2 at 6" at the face.

Table 12
Potential FCC Violations of 655 uW/cm2 TWA Safety Limit
Nursery at 11"
(One Smart Meter, Four Meters)

One Meter Duty Cycle	Table A17 60% Reflection	Table A18 100% Reflection	Table A19 1000% Reflection	Table A20 2000% Reflection
1%	1.4	2.2	66.2	241
5%	7	11	331	1227
10%	14	21.9	662	2414
20%	28	43.8	1324	4828
30%	42	65.7	1986	7242
40%	56.1	87.6	2649	9655
50%	70.1	109	3312	12069
60%	84.1	131	3974	14483
70%	98.1	153	4636	16897
80%	112	175	5299	19311
90%	126	197	5961	21175
100%	140	218	6623	24139

Four Meters Duty Cycle	Table A21 60% Reflection	Table A22 100% Reflection	Table A23 1000% Reflection	Tab;e A24 2000% Reflection
1%	4.9	7.5	227	828
5%	24	37.6	1137	4142
10%	48.1	75.1	2273	8284
20%	96.2	150	4546	16569
30%	144	225	6819	24853
40%	192	301	9092	33137
50%	240	376	11365	41421
60%	289	451	13638	49705
70%	337	526	15911	57990
80%	385	601	18184	66274
90%	433	676	20457	74558
100%	481	751	22730	82843

This table shows RF power density FCC violations at 11".

Exceeds 655 uW/cm2 FCC TWA Safety Limit

Table 13

Potential FCC Violations of the 571/624 uW/cm2

TWA Safety Limit at 11" in the Nursery

(One Collector/1C + 3 Smart Meters)

One Collector Duty Cycle 571 limit	**Table A25** 60% Reflection	**TableA26** 100% Reflection	**Table A27** 1000% Reflection	**Table A28** 2000% Reflection
1%	4.0 uW/cm^2	6.2	187	680
5%	19.7	30.8	933	3399
10%	39.5	61.7	1865	6798
20%	78.9	123	3730	13596
30%	118	185	5596	20394
40%	158	247	7461	27192
50%	197	308	9326	33990
60%	237	370	11191	40788
70%	276	432	13056	47586
80%	316	493	14922	54384
90%	355	555	16787	61182
100%	395	617	18652	67980

One Collector + 3 Meters** Duty Cycle 624 limit	**Table A29** 60% Reflection	**Table A30** 100% Reflection	**Table A31** 1000% Reflection	**Table A32** 2000% Reflection
1%	7.4 uW/cm^2	11.5	348	1267
5%	36.8	57.5	1738	6334
10%	73.5	115	3476	12668
20%	147	230	6952	25337
30%	221	345	10428	38005
40%	294	460	13904	50674
50%	368	575	17380	63342
60%	441	689	20855	76010
70%	515	804	24331	88679
80%	588	919	27807	101347
90%	662	1034	31283	114015
100%	735	1149	34759	126684

This table shows RF power density FCC violations at 11"

Exceeds either 571 or 624 uW/cm2 FCC Limit

Table 14
Potential FCC Violations of the 655 uW/cm2 Safety Limit at 28" in the Kitchen
(One Smart Meter, Four Meters)

One Meter	Table A33	Table A34	TableA35	Table A36
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	0.2	0.3	10.2	37.3
5%	1.1	1.7	51.1	186
10%	2.2	3.4	102	373
20%	4.3	6.8	204	745
30%	6.5	10.1	307	1118
40%	8.7	13.5	409	1490
50%	10.8	16.9	511	1863
60%	13	20.3	613	2235
70%	15.1	23.7	716	2608
80%	17.3	27	818	2980
90%	19.5	30.4	920	3353
100%	21.6	33.8	1022	3726

Four Meters	Table A37	Table A38	Table A39	Table A40
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	0.6	0.9	26	94.6
5%	2.8	4.3	129	473
10%	5.5	8.6	260	946
20%	11	17.2	519	1892
30%	16.5	25.7	779	2837
40%	22	34.3	1038	3783
50%	27.5	42.9	1298	4729
60%	32.9	51.5	1557	5675
70%	38.4	60.1	1817	6621
80%	43.9	68.6	2076	7566
90%	49.4	77.2	2336	8512
100%	54.9	85.8	2595	9458

This table shows RF power density readings at 28" in the kitchen work space.

Exceeds 655 uW/cm2 FCC Limit

Table 15
Potential FCC Violations of 571/624 uW/cm2 FCC Limit at 28" in the Kitchen
(One Collector/1C + 3 Smart Meters)

One Collector Duty Cycle 571 limit	**Table A41** 60% Reflection	**Table A42** 100% Reflection	**Table A43** 1000% Reflection	**Table A44** 2000% Reflection
1%	0.6 uW/cm^2	1	28.8	105
5%	3.1	4.8	144	525
10%	6.1	9.5	288	1049
20%	12.2	19	576	2098
30%	18.3	28.6	864	3148
40%	24.4	38.1	1152	4197
50%	30.5	47.6	1439	5246
60%	36.5	57.1	1727	6295
70%	42.6	66.6	2015	7344
80%	48.7	75.1	2303	8393
90%	54.8	85.7	2591	9243
100%	60.9	95.2	2879	10492

One Collector + 3 Meters** Duty Cycle 624 limit	**Table A45** 60% Reflection	**Table A46** 100% Reflection	**Table A47** 1000% Reflection	**Table A48** 2000% Reflection
1%	0.9 uW/cm^2	1.5	45	162
5%	4.7	7.4	223	811
10%	9.4	14.7	445	1622
20%	18.8	29.4	890	3245
30%	28.3	44.2	1336	4867
40%	37.7	58.9	1781	6490
50%	47.1	73.6	2226	8112
60%	56.5	88.3	2671	9734
70%	65.9	103	3116	11357
80%	75.4	118	3561	12979
90%	84.8	132	4006	14602
100%	94.2	147	4452	16224

This table shows RF power density readings at 28" in the kitchen work space.

Exceeds 571/624 uW/cm2 FCC Limit

Table 16
Potential FCC Violations of Peak Power Limit 4000 uW/cm2 at 3"
(One Smart Meter, Four Meters)

One Meter	Table A1	Table A2	Table A3	Table A4
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	19	29	890	3245
10%	188	294	8904	32453
20%	377	589	17809	64906
30%	565	883	26713	97360
40%	754	1177	35618	129813
50%	942	1472	44522	162266
60%	1130	1766	53426	194719
70%	1319	2061	62331	227172
80%	1507	2355	71235	259626
90%	1696	2649	80140	292079
100%	1884	2944	89044	324532

Four Meters	Table A5	Table A6	Table A7	Table A8
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	75	118	3562	12981
10%	754	1177	35618	129813
20%	1507	2355	71235	259626
30%	2261	3532	106853	389438
40%	3014	4710	142470	519251
50%	3768	5887	178088	649064
60%	4521	7065	213705	778877
70%	5275	8242	249323	908690
80%	6029	9420	284941	1038503
90%	6782	10597	320558	1168315
100%	7536	11774	356176	1298128

This table shows RF power density at 3" distance at surface of meter

Exceeds 4000 uW/cm2 at 3" from antenna radiation center at face of meter.

Table 17
Potential FCC Violations of Peak Power Limit 4000 uW/cm2 at 3"
(One Collector, 1 Collector + 3 Smart Meters)

One Collector	**Table A9**	**Table A10**	**Table A11**	**Table A12**
Duty Cycle	60%	100%	1000%	2000%
571 limit	Reflection	Reflection	Reflection	Reflection
1%	53	83	2507	9137
10%	530	829	25070	91372
20%	1061	1658	50140	182743
30%	1591	2486	75211	274115
40%	2122	3315	100281	365486
50%	2652	4144	125351	456858
60%	3182	4973	150421	548229
70%	3713	5801	175491	639601
80%	4243	6630	200562	730972
90%	4774	7459	225632	822344
100%	5304	8288	250702	913715

One C + 3 SM	**Table A13**	**Table A14**	**Table A15**	**Table A16**
Duty Cycle	60%	100%	1000%	2000%
	Reflection	Reflectio	Reflection	Reflection
624 limit				
1%	92	144	4370	15927
10%	925	1445	43700	159272
20%	1849	2889	87401	318544
30%	2774	4334	131101	477816
40%	3698	5779	174802	637088
50%	4623	7223	218502	796360
60%	5547	8668	262203	955632
70%	6472	10113	305903	1114904
80%	7397	11557	349604	1274176
90%	8321	13002	393304	1433448
100%	9246	14446	437005	1592720

This table shows RF power density at 3" distance at surface of meter.

Exceeds 4000 uW/cm2 at 3" from antenna radiation center at face of meter.

Table 18

Radiofrequency Radiation Levels Associated with Inhibition of DNA Repair in Human Stem Cells at 11" in the Nursery

(One Smart Meter, Four Meters)

One Meter	Table A17	Table A18	Table A19	Table A20
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	1.4	2.2	66.2	241
5%	7	11	331	1227
10%	14	21.9	662	2414
20%	28	43.8	1324	4828
30%	42	65.7	1986	7242
40%	56.1	87.6	2649	9655
50%	70.1	109	3312	12069
60%	84.1	131	3974	14483
70%	98.1	153	4636	16897
80%	112	175	5299	19311
90%	126	197	5961	21175
100%	140	218	6623	24139

Four Meters	Table A21	Table A22	Table A23	Table A24
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	4.9	7.5	227	828
5%	24	37.6	1137	4142
10%	48.1	75.1	2273	8284
20%	96.2	150	4546	16569
30%	144	225	6819	24853
40%	192	301	9092	33137
50%	240	376	11365	41421
60%	289	451	13638	49705
70%	337	526	15911	57990
80%	385	601	18184	66274
90%	433	676	20457	74558
100%	481	751	22730	82843

Exceeds 0.037 W/Kg or ~92 uW/cm2

Table 19

Radiofrequency Radiation Level Associated with Inhibition of DNA Repair in Human Stem Cells at 11" in the Nursery

(One Collector / 1C + 3 Smart Meters)

One Collector	Table A25	Table A26	Table A27	Table A28
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	4.0 uW/cm^2	6.2	187	680
5%	19.7	30.8	933	3399
10%	39.5	61.7	1865	6798
20%	78.9	123	3730	13596
30%	118	185	5596	20394
40%	158	247	7461	27192
50%	197	308	9326	33990
60%	237	370	11191	40788
70%	276	432	13056	47586
80%	316	493	14922	54384
90%	355	555	16787	61182
100%	395	617	18652	67980

One C+ 3 SM	Table A29	Table A30	Table A31	Table A32
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	7.4 uW/cm^2	11.5	348	1267
5%	36.8	57.5	1738	6334
10%	73.5	115	3476	12668
20%	147	230	6952	25337
30%	221	345	10428	38005
40%	294	460	13904	50674
50%	368	575	17380	63342
60%	441	689	20855	76010
70%	515	804	24331	88679
80%	588	919	27807	101347
90%	662	1034	31283	114015
100%	735	1149	34759	126684

Exceeds 0.037 W/Kg or ~92 uW/cm2

Table 20

Radiofrequency Radiation Level Associated with Pathological Leakage of the Blood-brain Barrier at 0.4-8 uW/cm2 at 11" in the Nursery

(One Smart Meter, Four Meters)

One Meter	Table A17	Table A18	Table A19	Table A20
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	1.4	2.2	66.2	241
5%	7	11	331	1227
10%	14	21.9	662	2414
20%	28	43.8	1324	4828
30%	42	65.7	1986	7242
40%	56.1	87.6	2649	9655
50%	70.1	109	3312	12069
60%	84.1	131	3974	14483
70%	98.1	153	4636	16897
80%	112	175	5299	19311
90%	126	197	5961	21175
100%	140	218	6623	24139
Four Meters	**Table A21**	**Table A22**	**Table A23**	**Table A24**
	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
	4.9	7.5	227	828
	24	37.6	1137	4142
	48.1	75.1	2273	8284
	96.2	150	4546	16569
	144	225	6819	24853
	192	301	9092	33137
	240	376	11365	41421
	289	451	13638	49705
	337	526	15911	57990
	385	601	18184	66274
	433	676	20457	74558
	481	751	22730	82843

Exceeds between 0.4-8 | Exceeds 8 uW/cm2

Table 21

Radiofrequency Radiation Level Associated with Pathological Leakage of the Blood-brain Barrier at 0.4 - 8 uW/cm2

(One Collector/1C + 3 Smart Meters)

One Collector Duty Cycle	**Table 25** 60% Reflection	**Table A26** 100% Reflection	**Table A27** 1000% Reflection	**Table A28** 2000% Reflection
1%	4.0 uW/cm^2	6.2	187	680
5%	19.7	30.8	933	3399
10%	39.5	61.7	1865	6798
20%	78.9	123	3730	13596
30%	118	185	5596	20394
40%	158	247	7461	27192
50%	197	308	9326	33990
60%	237	370	11191	40788
70%	276	432	13056	47586
80%	316	493	14922	54384
90%	355	555	16787	61182
100%	395	617	18652	67980

One Collector + 3 Meters** Duty Cycle	**Table A29** 60% Reflection	**Table A30** 100% Reflection	**Table A31** 1000% Reflection	**Table A32** 2000% Reflection
1%	7.4 uW/cm^2	11.5	348	1267
5%	36.8	57.5	1738	6334
10%	73.5	115	3476	12668
20%	147	230	6952	25337
30%	221	345	10428	38005
40%	294	460	13904	50674
50%	368	575	17380	63342
60%	441	689	20855	76010
70%	515	804	24331	88679
80%	588	919	27807	101347
90%	662	1034	31283	114015
100%	735	1149	34759	126684

Exceeds between 0.4-8 Exceeds 8 uW/cm2

Table 22 Radiofrequency Radiation Levels Associated with Adverse Neurological Symptoms, Cardiac Problems and Increased Cancer Risk (chronic exposure above 0.05- 0.1 uW/cm2) Nursery at 11" One Meter and Four Meters

As reported in Khurana et al, 2010 in the International Journal of Environmental Occupational Health 16:263-267; Kundi and Hutter, 2009, Pathophysiology 16: 123-135 and the BioInitiative Report, 2007, Chapters 1 and 17.

One Meter Duty Cycle	**Table A17** 60% Reflection	**Table A18** 100% Reflection	**Table A19** 1000% Reflection	**Table A20** 2000% Reflection
1%	1.4	2.2	66.2	241
5%	7	11	331	1227
10%	14	21.9	662	2414
20%	28	43.8	1324	4828
30%	42	65.7	1986	7242
40%	56.1	87.6	2649	9655
50%	70.1	109	3312	12069
60%	84.1	131	3974	14483
70%	98.1	153	4636	16897
80%	112	175	5299	19311
90%	126	197	5961	21175
100%	140	218	6623	24139

Four Meters Duty Cycle	**Table A21** 60% Reflection	**Table A22** 100% Reflection	**Table A23** 1000% Reflection	**Table A24** 2000% Reflection
1%	4.9	7.5	227	828
5%	24	37.6	1137	4142
10%	48.1	75.1	2273	8284
20%	96.2	150	4546	16569
30%	144	225	6819	24853
40%	192	301	9092	33137
50%	240	376	11365	41421
60%	289	451	13638	49705
70%	337	526	15911	57990
80%	385	601	18184	66274
90%	433	676	20457	74558
100%	481	751	22730	82843

Exceeds 0.1 uW/cm2

All exposure levels exceed those identified in Khurana et al, 2010; Kundi and Hutter, 2009 and the BioInitiative Report (2007) to be associated with increased risk of adverse neurological symptoms (headache, sleep disruption, restlessness, tremor, cognitive impairment tinnitus), increased cancer risk or heart problems, arrythmias, altered heart rhythm, palpitations. These effects are reported in studies of populations living at distances < 500 meters from base stations, and at levels at or over 0.05-0.1 uW/cm2, but not at RF levels below chronic RF exposure levels of 0.05 - 0.1 uW/cm2 in healthy populations.

Table 23 Radiofrequency Radiation Levels Associated with Adverse Neurological Symptoms, Cardiac Problems and Increased Cancer Risk (chronic exposure above 0.05- 0.1 uW/cm2) Nursery at 11" One Meter and Four Meters

As reported in Khurana et al, 2010 in the International Journal of Environmental Occupational Health 16:263-267; Kundi and Hutter, 2009, Pathophysiology 16: 123-135 and the BioInitiative Report, 2007, Chapters 1 and 17.

One Collector				
	Table A33	**Table A34**	**Table A35**	**Table A36**
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	4	6.2	187	680
5%	20	30.8	933	3399
10%	40	61.7	1865	6798
20%	79	123	3730	13596
30%	118	185	5596	20394
40%	158	247	7461	27192
50%	197	308	9326	33990
60%	237	370	11191	40788
70%	276	432	13056	47586
80%	316	493	14922	54384
90%	355	555	16787	61182
100%	395	617	18652	67980
1C + 3 SM	**Table A37**	**Table A38**	**Table A39**	**Table A40**
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	100% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	7.4	11.5	348	1267
5%	36.8	57.5	1738	6334
10%	73.5	115	3476	12668
20%	147	230	6952	25337
30%	221	345	10428	38005
40%	294	460	13904	50674
50%	368	575	17380	63342
60%	441	689	20855	76010
70%	515	804	24331	88679
80%	588	919	27807	101347
90%	662	1034	31283	114015
100%	735	1149	34759	126684

Exceeds 0.1 uW/cm2

All exposure levels exceed those identified in Khurana et al, 2010; Kundi and Hutter, 2009 and the BioInitiative Report (2007) to be associated with increased risk of adverse neurological symptoms (headache, sleep disruption, restlessness, tremor, cognitive impairment tinnitus), increased cancer risk or heart problems, arrythmias, altered heart rhythm, palpitations. These effects are reported in studies of populations living at distances < 500 meters from base stations, and at levels at or over 0.05-0.1 uW/cm2, but not at RF levels below chronic RF exposure levels of 0.05 - 0.1 uW/cm2 in healthy populations.

Table 24
Radiofrequency Radiation Levels Associated with Inhibition of DNA Repair in Human Stem Cells at 28" Kitchen Example
(One Smart Meter, Four Meters)

One Meter	Table A33	Table A34	Table A35	Table A36
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	0.2	0.3	10.2	37.3
5%	1.1	1.7	51.1	186
10%	2.2	3.4	102	373
20%	4.3	6.8	204	745
30%	6.5	10.1	307	1118
40%	8.7	13.5	409	1490
50%	10.8	16.9	511	1863
60%	13	20.3	613	2235
70%	15.1	23.7	716	2608
80%	17.3	27	818	2980
90%	19.5	30.4	920	3353
100%	21.6	33.8	1022	3726

Four Meters	Table A37	Table A38	Table A39	Table A40
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	0.6	0.9	26	94.6
5%	2.8	4.3	129	473
10%	5.5	8.6	260	946
20%	11	17.2	519	1892
30%	16.5	25.7	779	2837
40%	22	34.3	1038	3783
50%	27.5	42.9	1298	4729
60%	32.9	51.5	1557	5675
70%	38.4	60.1	1817	6621
80%	43.9	68.6	2076	7566
90%	49.4	77.2	2336	8512
100%	54.9	85.8	2595	9458

Exceeds 0.037 W/Kg or ~92 uW/cm2

Table 25

Radiofrequency Radiation Levels Associated with Inhibition of DNA Repair in Human Stem Cells at 28" in Kitchen

(One Collector / 1C + 3 Smart Meters)

One Collector	**Table A41**	**Table A42**	**Table A43**	**Table A44**
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	0.6 uW/cm^2	1	28.8	105
5%	3.1	4.8	144	525
10%	6.1	9.5	288	1049
20%	12.2	19	576	2098
30%	18.3	28.6	864	3148
40%	24.4	38.1	1152	4197
50%	30.5	47.6	1439	5246
60%	36.5	57.1	1727	6295
70%	42.6	66.6	2015	7344
80%	48.7	75.1	2303	8393
90%	54.8	85.7	2591	9243
100%	60.9	95.2	2879	10492

One Collector + 3 SM	**Table A45**	**Table A46**	**Table A47**	**Table A48**
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	0.9 uW/cm^2	1.5	45	162
5%	4.7	7.4	223	811
10%	9.4	14.7	445	1622
20%	18.8	29.4	890	3245
30%	28.3	44.2	1336	4867
40%	37.7	58.9	1781	6490
50%	47.1	73.6	2226	8112
60%	56.5	88.3	2671	9734
70%	65.9	103	3116	11357
80%	75.4	118	3561	12979
90%	84.8	132	4006	14602
100%	94.2	147	4452	16224

Exceeds 0.037 W/Kg or ~92 uW/cm2

Table 26

Radiofrequency Radiation Levels Associated with Pathological Leakage of the Blood-brain Barrier at 0.4 - 8 uW/cm2 at 28" in Kitchen

(One Smart Meter, Four Meters)

One Meter	Table A33	Table A34	Table A35	Table A36
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	0.2	0.3	10.2	37.3
5%	1.1	1.7	51.1	186
10%	2.2	3.4	102	373
20%	4.3	6.8	204	745
30%	6.5	10.1	307	1118
40%	8.7	13.5	409	1490
50%	10.8	16.9	511	1863
60%	13	20.3	613	2235
70%	15.1	23.7	716	2608
80%	17.3	27	818	2980
90%	19.5	30.4	920	3353
100%	21.6	33.8	1022	3726

Four Meters	Table A37	Table A38	Table A39	Table A40
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	0.6	0.9	26	94.6
5%	2.8	4.3	129	473
10%	5.5	8.6	260	946
20%	11	17.2	519	1892
30%	16.5	25.7	779	2837
40%	22	34.3	1038	3783
50%	27.5	42.9	1298	4729
60%	32.9	51.5	1557	5675
70%	38.4	60.1	1817	6621
80%	43.9	68.6	2076	7566
90%	49.4	77.2	2336	8512
100%	54.9	85.8	2595	9458

Exceeds 8 uW/cm2

Exceeds between 0.4 and 8 uW/cm2

Table 27

Radiofrequency Radiation Levels Associated with Pathological Leakage of the Blood-brain Barrier at 0.4 - 8 uW/cm2 at 28" in Kitchen

One Collector/1C + 3 Smart Meters

One Collector	Table A41	Table A42	Table A43	Table A44
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	0.6 uW/cm^2	1	28.8	105
5%	3.1	4.8	144	525
10%	6.1	9.5	288	1049
20%	12.2	19	576	2098
30%	18.3	28.6	864	3148
40%	24.4	38.1	1152	4197
50%	30.5	47.6	1439	5246
60%	36.5	57.1	1727	6295
70%	42.6	66.6	2015	7344
80%	48.7	75.1	2303	8393
90%	54.8	85.7	2591	9243
100%	60.9	95.2	2879	10492
One Collector + 3 SM	**Table A45**	**Table A46**	**Table A47**	**Table A48**
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	0.9 uW/cm^2	1.5	45	162
5%	4.7	7.4	223	811
10%	9.4	14.7	445	1622
20%	18.8	29.4	890	3245
30%	28.3	44.2	1336	4867
40%	37.7	58.9	1781	6490
50%	47.1	73.6	2226	8112
60%	56.5	88.3	2671	9734
70%	65.9	103	3116	11357
80%	75.4	118	3561	12979
90%	84.8	132	4006	14602
100%	94.2	147	4452	16224

Exceeds 8 uW/cm2 | Exceeds between 0.4 and 8 uW/cm2

Table 28 Radiofrequency Radiation Levels Associated with Adverse Neurological Symptoms, Cardiac Problems and Increased Cancer Risk (chronic exposure above 0.05- 0.1 uW/cm2) Kitchen at 28" One Meter and Four Meters

As reported in Khurana et al, 2010 in the International Journal of Environmental Occupational Health 16:263-267; Kundi and Hutter, 2009, Pathophysiology 16: 123-135 and the BioInitiative Report, 2007, Chapters 1 and 17.

One Meter	**Table A33**	**Table A34**	**Table A35**	**Table A36**
Duty Cycle	60% Reflectio	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	0.2	0.3	10.2	37.3
5%	1.1	1.7	51.1	186
10%	2.2	3.4	102	373
20%	4.3	6.8	204	745
30%	6.5	10.1	307	1118
40%	8.7	13.5	409	1490
50%	10.8	16.9	511	1863
60%	13	20.3	613	2235
70%	15.1	23.7	716	2608
80%	17.3	27	818	2980
90%	19.5	30.4	920	3353
100%	21.6	33.8	1022	3726

Four Meters	**Table A37**	**Table A38**	**Table A39**	**Table A40**
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	100% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	0.6	0.9	26	94.6
5%	2.8	4.3	129	473
10%	5.5	8.6	260	946
20%	11	17.2	519	1892
30%	16.5	25.7	779	2837
40%	22	34.3	1038	3783
50%	27.5	42.9	1298	4729
60%	32.9	51.5	1557	5675
70%	38.4	60.1	1817	6621
80%	43.9	68.6	2076	7566
90%	49.4	77.2	2336	8512
100%	54.9	85.8	2595	9458

Exceeds 0.1 uW/cm2

All exposure levels exceed those identified in Khurana et al, 2010; Kundi and Hutter, 2009 and the BioInitiative Report (2007) to be associated with increased risk of adverse neurological symptoms (headache, sleep disruption, restlessness, tremor, cognitive impairment tinnitus), increased cancer risk or heart problems, arrythmias, altered heart rhythm, palpitations. These effects are reported in studies of populations living at distances < 500 meters from base stations, and at levels at or over 0.05-0.1 uW/cm2, but not at RF levels below chronic RF exposure levels of 0.05 - 0.1 uW/cm2 in healthy populations.

Table 29 Radiofrequency Radiation Levels Associated with Adverse Neurological Symptoms, Cardiac Problems and Increased Cancer Risk (chronic exposure above 0.05- 0.1 uW/cm2) Kitchen at 28" One Collector, 1C + 3 Smart Meters

As reported in Khurana et al, 2010 in the International Journal of Environmental Occupational Health 16:263-267; Kundi and Hutter, 2009, Pathophysiology 16: 123-135 and the BioInitiative Report, 2007, Chapters 1 and 17.

One Collector	**Table A41**	**Table A42**	**Table A43**	**Table A44**
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	0.6	1	28.8	105
5%	3.1	4.8	144	525
10%	6.1	9.5	288	1049
20%	12.2	19	576	2098
30%	18.3	28.6	864	3148
40%	24.4	38.1	1152	4197
50%	30.5	47.6	1439	5246
60%	36.5	57.1	1727	6295
70%	42.6	66.6	2015	7344
80%	48.7	75.1	2303	8393
90%	54.8	85.7	2591	9243
100%	60.9	95.2	2879	10492

1C, 1C+3 SM	**Table A45**	**Table A46**	**Table A47**	**Table A48**
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	0.9	1.5	45	162
5%	4.7	7.4	223	811
10%	9.4	14.7	445	1622
20%	18.8	29.4	890	3245
30%	28.3	44.2	1336	4867
40%	37.7	58.9	1781	6490
50%	47.1	73.6	2226	8112
60%	56.5	88.3	2671	9734
70%	65.9	103	3116	11357
80%	75.4	118	3561	12979
90%	84.8	132	4006	14602
100%	94.2	147	4452	16224

Exceeds 0.1 uW/cm2

All exposure levels exceed those identified in Khurana et al, 2010; Kundi and Hutter, 2009 and the BioInitiative Report (2007) to be associated with increased risk of adverse neurological symptoms (headache, sleep disruption, restlessness, tremor, cognitive impairment tinnitus), increased cancer risk or heart problems, arrythmias, altered heart rhythm, palpitations. These effects are reported in studies of populations living at distances < 500 meters from base stations, and at levels at or over 0.05-0.1 uW/cm2, but not at RF levels below chronic RF exposure levels of 0.05 - 0.1 uW/cm2 in healthy populations.

Table 30
Exceeds Medtronics Advisory Limit at 11"
(One Smart Meter, Four Meters)

One Meter	Table A17	Table A18	Table A19	Table A20
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	1.4	2.2	66.2	241
5%	7	11	331	1227
10%	14	21.9	662	2414
20%	28	43.8	1324	4828
30%	42	65.7	1986	7242
40%	56.1	87.6	2649	9655
50%	70.1	109	3312	12069
60%	84.1	131	3974	14483
70%	98.1	153	4636	16897
80%	112	175	5299	19311
90%	126	197	5961	21175
100%	140	218	6623	24139

Four Meters	Table A21	Table A22	Table A23	Tab;e A24
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	4.9	7.5	227	828
5%	24	37.6	1137	4142
10%	48.1	75.1	2273	8284
20%	96.2	150	4546	16569
30%	144	225	6819	24853
40%	192	301	9092	33137
50%	240	376	11365	41421
60%	289	451	13638	49705
70%	337	526	15911	57990
80%	385	601	18184	66274
90%	433	676	20457	74558
100%	481	751	22730	82843

Exceeds Medtronics SAR Advisory Limit

Table 31
Exceeds Medtronics Advisory Limit at 11"
(One Collector, 1C + 3 SM)

One Collector	Table A25	TableA26	Table A27	Table A28
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	4.0 uW/cm^2	6.2	187	680
5%	19.7	30.8	933	3399
10%	39.5	61.7	1865	6798
20%	78.9	123	3730	13596
30%	118	185	5596	20394
40%	158	247	7461	27192
50%	197	308	9326	33990
60%	237	370	11191	40788
70%	276	432	13056	47586
80%	316	493	14922	54384
90%	355	555	16787	61182
100%	395	617	18652	67980

One Collector + 3 Meters**	Table A29	Table A30	Table A31	Table A32
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	7.4 uW/cm^2	11.5	348	1267
5%	36.8	57.5	1738	6334
10%	73.5	115	3476	12668
20%	147	230	6952	25337
30%	221	345	10428	38005
40%	294	460	13904	50674
50%	368	575	17380	63342
60%	441	689	20855	76010
70%	515	804	24331	88679
80%	588	919	27807	101347
90%	662	1034	31283	114015
100%	735	1149	34759	126684

Exceeds Medtronics SAR Advisory Limit

Table 32
Distance to the BioInitiative Report Recommendation 0f 0.1 uW/cm2 (in feet)

(One Smart Meter, Four Meters)

One Meter	Table A1	Table A2	Table A3	Table A4
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	3.4’	28.0’	23.6’	45’
10%	10.9’	13.6’	74.5’	143'
20%	15.3’	19.2’	105’	201'
30%	18.8’	23.5’	129’	247'
40%	21.7’	27.1’	149’	285'
50%	24.3’	30.4’	167’	318'
60%	26.6’	33.2’	348’	348
70%	28.7’	35.8’	197’	376'
80%	30.7’	38.3’	211’	403'
90%	32.6’	40.6’	224’	428'
100%	34.3’	42.8’	256’	450'

Four Meters	Table A5	Table A6	Table A7	Table A8
Duty Cycle	60% Reflectio	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	9.7	12'	67'	128'
10%	30.7’	38.4’	211’	402'
20%	43.5’	54.2’	298’	570'
30%	53.2’	66.3’	365’	698'
40%	61.3’	76.8’	422’	805'
50%	68.5’	85.8’	471’	900'
60%	75.0’	94.0’	517’	985'
70%	81’	102’	558’	1065'
80%	87’	109’	598’	1140'
90%	92’	115’	632’	1210'
100%	97’	122’	667’	1275'

Exceeds the BioInitiative Recommendation of 0.1 uW/cm2 at this distance (in feet)

Table 33
Distance to the BioInitiative Report Recommendation 0f 0.1 uW/cm2 (in feet)
(One Collector, 1C + 3 Smart Meters)

One Collector	**Table A9**	**Table A10**	**Table A11**	**Table A12**
Duty Cycle	60% Reflection	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	5.9’	7.25’	41'	78’
10%	18.6’	23.0’	129’	246’
20%	26.5’	32.5	182’	348’
30%	32.5’	39.8’	223’	426’
40%	37.5’	46.0’	258’	493’
50%	42.0’	51.3’	288’	550’
60%	46.0’	56.3’	603’	603'
70%	49.6’	60.8’	342’	650'
80%	53.0’	64.8’	365’	695'
90%	56.3’	68.8’	387’	739'
100%	59.2’	74.0’	407’	778'

1C + 3 Smart Meters	**Table A13**	**Table A14**	**Table A15**	**Table A16**
Duty Cycle	60% Reflectio	100% Reflection	1000% Reflection	2000% Reflection
1%	10.9’	13.6’	74.7’	142’
10%	34.3’	42.8’	236’	450’
20%	48.5’	60.5’	333’	673'
30%	58.5	74.3’	408’	780’
40%	68.5	85.6’	471’	900'
50%	76.5’	96.0’	526’	1005’
60%	84.0’	105’	577'	1100'
70%	90.7’	114’	625’	1190'
80%	97.0’	121’	666'	1160'
90%	103’	129’	707’	1275’
100%	108’	136’	745'	1420’

Exceeds the BioInitiative Recommendation of 0.1 uW/cm2 at this distance (in feet)