



July 23, 2013

City of Toronto
City of Toronto Water Department
Toronto, Ontario

Re: Meeting on RF EMFs & Wireless Water Meter Safety

Dear Sir/Madam:

Health Canada's Safety Code 6, the FCC and international governing bodies all use the same science standards for limits of human exposure to RF EMFs. Unfortunately, science standards and safety code admits to missing the link between the frequencies and adverse health effects.

If you go to page 9, second paragraph of Health Canada's Safety Code 6, you can read that causality, biological plausibility and reproducibility were missing. http://www.thermoguy.com/pdfs/Safety_Code_6.pdf

Causality, biological plausibility and reproducibility were reported to Health Canada and by expert witness through Canadian Parliament's Standing Committee on Health. Having a code on EMF exposure missing critical science has created a complexity of problems specific to the meeting today on wireless meters.

Health Canada, FCC and other international bodies adopted the Specific Absorption Rate(SAR) for the limits of human exposure. The SAR test is an admission that the RF EMFs are being absorbed, unfortunately it is a grossly flawed test. The SAR test only considered meters as the end use device and left out the coverage areas of the wireless infrastructure as well as the fact human biology is electrical as well as vulnerable.

In a utility application to the BCUC for wireless smart meters, the utility experts admitted under cross examination their intent to cover 17,000 sq. Kms with RF EMFs. The utility experts confirmed under cross examination their report on safety did not include the bio-electricity information of human biology. Their experts further confirmed the bio electrical information associated with humans was not in Safety Code 6. Their report on safety is scientifically baseless.

The utility experts used the SAR test only and were dismissive of adverse health effects because the science of the SAR didn't incorporate biology. It was alarming for our professionals to witness the 2 sides argue science that isn't even applicable. The SAR test is only related to water molecules heating yet the strength of Safety Code 6 is the stimulation of tissue is to be avoided as is the heat effect.

Following the reporting of the mechanisms linking the frequencies to adverse health effects, the dangers of wireless frequencies was lectured in medical education credits required for ongoing medical licensing. The medical education program was applicable to North America and literally changes the scope of medical diagnosis. Wireless environments have to be considered in medical diagnosis or there is a real risk of misdiagnosis.




This picture shows the Specific Absorption Rate used to determine exposure limits. The red arrow shows the position of the cell phone and the white arrow highlights the hole in the test model where liquid that simulates tissue is poured. The black wire inside the head is the temperature probe measuring for heat effect. This is the science used globally and because smart meters or wireless computers aren't held against the head like a cell phone, 24/7 exposure is considered safe for everyone including children and pregnant women.

The Specific Absorption Rate didn't incorporate the bio electricity of humans, their vulnerability and left out millions of frequencies in a frequency equation.

"Bringing the Invisible to Light Since 1979"

When you incorporate the errors or omissions in safety, you have causality, biological plausibility and reproducibility which links the frequencies to adverse health effects. Safety Code 6 has to be adapted and accommodate the missing science. Directly below is a utilities diagram of the wireless smart grid showing what they didn't incorporate into the Specific Absorption Rate or safety.



Pacemaker recipients are told to stay out of electromagnetic fields: however, the area coverage will take the EMFs right into their homes.

Utility companies are not incorporating health, building or infrastructure costs and haven't considered the agricultural, forestry, groundwater, fish spawning, economic or ecosystem damage. The frequencies are illegal as applied and the peer reviewed science substantiating that is electricity.

Health Canada is presently revising Safety Code 6 and has retained the Royal Society as an independent body. Safety Code 6 and exposure will change.

Residents have valid concerns for themselves and their building investment.

The complete science wasn't represented to municipalities or utilities. There are real reasons electrical professionals confine frequencies to an insulated wire. In a wireless application, EVERYTHING hit by the RF EMFs is effectively inside the wireless circuit. We aren't insulated for it and already have our own electricity.

Here is a letter from medical education administration and Toronto Health needs to contact them. It is now accepted and approved medical education. Safety Code 6 refers to nerve and muscle stimulation which also affects the hormonal and immune systems.

http://www.thermoguy.com/pdfs/Integrative_Health_Forum_on_Medical_Education_Including_Wireless_Exposure.pdf

Pollinators and migratory life use a magnetic field for navigation and Ontario's colony collapse of bees can't rule out RF EMFs.

The lost economy is the illusion that wireless saves money. If the Toronto Department of Water does need to install meters, they need to be wired without exception. The offset costs and liabilities will exceed benefits plus electromagnetically stimulating populations, buildings, infrastructure, etc is illegal.

Here is evidence submitted to the BCUC on the fact their smart meter program will not save or address energy concerns.

http://www.bcuc.com/Documents/Proceedings/2012/DOC_32604_C19-6_WKCC-Submission-RDCK-Nelson-Creston_Suspension.pdf

Please contact the writer with any questions and contact medical education administration for a medical program for education credits to be lectured in Toronto.

Sincerely,

Curtis Bennett
Chief Science Officer
Interprovincial Journeyman Electrician(Red Seal)
Building Construction Engineering Technologist
Adjunct Faculty for IHF & GEDI
33 Year Advanced Thermography Background
www.thermoguy.com/
curtis@thermoguy.com
Ph: 604-239-2694