

From: Lindee Hoshikawa | Poncho Music [<mailto:mailponchomusic@gmail.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2017 10:17 AM

To: Smith, Randy L. (Commissioner) <R.Smith@chelanpud.org>; Arseneault, Garry <Garry.Arseneault@chelanpud.org>; Bolz, Dennis <Dennis.Bolz@chelanpud.org>; Congdon, Ann <ann.congdon@chelanpud.org>; McKenna, Steve <Steve.McKenna@chelanpud.org>; Hartman, Suzanne <Suzanne.Hartman@chelanpud.org>

Cc: Robyn Casal <grandmaskywalker@yahoo.com>

Subject: <External> Follow up on yesterday's meeting // AMI concerns

Chelan County PUD IT Warning:

Please use caution! This is an external email with links or attachments.

Commissioners,

I would like to offer my thanks to everyone for allowing a very informative meeting yesterday afternoon.

While many thoughts were expressed and discussed, I've woken this morning feeling like much was left to yet be said. I will try to be as concise as possible.

1) I wanted to expressly thank Commissioner Congdon for matching our courage to speak up by adding her own convictions to the discussion.

Following this, it should be clear to everyone that the current PUD media/press releases and communications located on the PUD website (<https://www.chelanpud.org/learning-center/advanced-meters/health-information>) **is now officially outdated and DOES NOT reflect a comprehensive Commissioner-body stance, nor us, members of the "enduringly concerned" constituency.**

The two groups- *Chelan County Smart Meter Awareness* and *Citizens Opposed to Smart Meter Technology in Chelan County*, also can provide much literature in this area, so please consider leveraging our knowledge.

2) I would strongly request that additional links be added to the current, biased information provided on the PUD website. We, the District, deserve a chance at better educating ourselves before AMI is implemented without our full (conscious) consent, and it is your responsibility to offer every piece of information available. I trust that much research has been done on your end so this should not be a difficult task. Frankly, the information that is currently being blasted by your media communications department is biased, one-sided half-truths that do not fully convey the honest entirety of the scientific and integrated-health industries knowledge base about EMF/RF radiation- and specifically 900Mhz. I detect many textbook examples of what's called '**Risk Perception Management**' in the current PUD rhetoric and I am speaking out about this now. We must do better than this.

3) Concerning the 16,000 one-way meters previously installed about 19 year ago- Since scientific research has caught up, we do have a moral and ethical responsibility to right this wrong. What are our options to correct this?

Commissioner Bolz stated in yesterday's meeting that he is convinced that the best way to resolve this is to migrate the entire County onto AMI. I would challenge this thinking and ask if this is, in fact, the best choice. With 49,500 customers, if all migrated to AMI, then we'd be exposing far greater numbers of people to increased levels of RF radiation. Shouldn't the issue of the 16,000 devices be dealt with as a compartmentalized occurrence and not treated as if blanketing the entire District will fix this issue?

Would it be possible for the existing 16,000 one-way devices be modified to enable fiber optic transmission of data, rather than using wireless transmission? If possible, wouldn't this fix be a viable solution for eliminating liability and ensuring the safety of affected households?

4) What percentage of the district is already connected or could easily be connected to the fiber optics infrastructure? Can we not simply offer digital meters but without wireless transmission?

5) **I wholeheartedly support an Opt-in approach to AMI.** Why not let the people choose?

6) In the next design phase, I would strongly ask the PUD to conduct its own research and have a 3rd party research and input on the devices (manufacture, make and model). Only then should statistics about devices be published as official media communication from the PUD.

Measurements such as peak values should be disclosed without averaging micro-watt exposure over 24hr periods or longer.

I will end my email here, knowing that there is still much to discuss.

Thank you for carefully reading and responding to these 6 points above,

Lindee Hoshikawa