

**DOCKETED**

<b>Docket Number:</b>	20-BUSMTG-02
<b>Project Title:</b>	Public Comment on California Energy Commission Business Meetings
<b>TN #:</b>	235294
<b>Document Title:</b>	Claire A. Warshaw Comments - Oct 14th, 2020 letter re-submitted to 20-BUS-MTG CEC Docket Sun, Oct 18, 2020 First page was truncated Adde
<b>Description:</b>	N/A
<b>Filer:</b>	System
<b>Organization:</b>	Claire A. Warshaw
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Public
<b>Submission Date:</b>	10/18/2020 9:10:07 PM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	10/19/2020

*Comment Received From: Claire A. Warshaw*  
*Submitted On: 10/18/2020*  
*Docket Number: 20-BUSMTG-02*

**Oct 14th, 2020 letter re-submitted to 20-BUS-MTG CEC Docket Sun,  
Oct 18, 2020 First page was truncated Adde**

Wednesday, October 14th, 2020 [Same letter re-submitted to 20-BUS-MTG CEC Docket Sunday, October 18, 2020, since first submittal first page was truncated. Added business meeting agenda item referrals]

Dear California Energy Commission (CEC) and Stakeholders:

It has taken a long time to learn that the CEC monthly business meetings seem to have a different style than some typical board meetings. Granted researchers are ultimately responsible for their products, more so than the CEC, or the public audience who might witness research and business suggested. That is what I surmise. If I am wrong about that, then please let the monthly business meeting, witnessing audience know.

Feeling like I ought to be a responsible audience member, I am writing because I learned a few things, hindsight, which I hope those pursuing new research business paths summarized in CEC monthly business meetings are well aware of. This is not a threat. I am writing to share. Also, I am not an expert on what I am sharing. I read or heard this information and it may not be entirely true. While working full time at SMUD, January 2005-April 2015, I was not exposed to much education on wireless technology, nor did I have much time to learn about wireless.

I noticed in September's business meeting that there was an item concerning a connection between two distant and separate Kaiser locations [SEPT 2020 CEC BUS. MTG ITEM 6]. I hope there is not biological tissue ever at risk in that path, even if the connection is pulsed. I imagine distant pulses might be powerful. Maybe the researchers can check this possibility. Maybe this is not a concern. Maybe I am not remembering the research correctly or reviewed it too quickly. I am not looking back at it to write this. Please excuse this paragraph if I did not interpret it correctly.

I noticed in today's, October business meeting, there were fantastic CALSEED grants including one with infrared devices [OCT 2020 CEC BUS MTG. ITEM 5, especially ITEM 5H].

I have been told for years that infrared heats biological tissue. Though device technical specifications might make certain fields seem harmless, repetitive exposure, electrical surges, hacked circumstances, cumulative and long term epidemiological studies, might have been sparsely examined during device creations. Business sometimes trumps public health and environmental concerns.

I ask that researchers who use laser, infrared and radar, please check to see if exposed

Wednesday, October 14th, 2020 **[Same letter re-submitted to 20-BUS-MTG CEC Docket Sunday, October 18, 2020, since first submittal first page was truncated. Added business meeting agenda item referrals]**

Dear California Energy Commission (CEC) and Stakeholders:

It has taken a long time to learn that the CEC monthly business meetings seem to have a different style than some typical board meetings. Granted researchers are ultimately responsible for their products, more so than the CEC, or the public audience who might witness research and business suggested. That is what I surmise. If I am wrong about that, then please let the monthly business meeting, witnessing audience know.

Feeling like I ought to be a responsible audience member, I am writing because I learned a few things, hindsight, which I hope those pursuing new research business paths summarized in CEC monthly business meetings are well aware of. This is not a threat. I am writing to share. Also, I am not an expert on what I am sharing. I read or heard this information and it may not be entirely true. While working full time at SMUD, January 2005-April 2015, I was not exposed to much education on wireless technology, nor did I have much time to learn about wireless.

I noticed in September's business meeting that there was an item concerning a connection between two distant and separate Kaiser locations [SEPT 2020 CEC BUS. MTG ITEM 6]. I hope there is not biological tissue ever at risk in that path, even if the connection is pulsed. I imagine distant pulses might be powerful. Maybe the researchers can check this possibility. Maybe this is not a concern. Maybe I am not remembering the research correctly or reviewed it too quickly. I am not looking back at it to write this. Please excuse this paragraph if I did not interpret it correctly.

I noticed in today's, October business meeting, there were fantastic CALSEED grants including one with infrared devices **[OCT 2020 CEC BUS MTG. ITEM 5, especially ITEM 5H]**.

I have been told for years that infrared heats biological tissue. Though device technical specifications might make certain fields seem harmless, repetitive exposure, electrical surges, hacked circumstances, cumulative and long term epidemiological studies, might have been sparsely examined during device creations. Business sometimes trumps public health and environmental concerns.

I ask that researchers who use laser, infrared and radar, please check to see if exposed biology is being heated and/or damaged **[OCT 2020 CEC BUS MTG. ITEM 5]**. This is a concern if possibly devices dry out an area - causing more drought, or overly heat photosynthetic biology, which in turn might not create oxygen or fix carbon dioxide.

Also, I wrote a letter, with similar concerns, to the California Senate Committee on Energy, Utilities and Telecommunications, this past Monday. In order to send the letter to these California Senators, through their online portal system, I selected Senate Bill 497 to support. I did not realize prior to working on the letter, that this bill existed. Since SB-497, directly affects the CEC, I am sharing my letter here. Please see the attached.

Thanks for sharing.

Sincerely,

Claire Warshaw

Also,

1. it seems logical that California would ask aviation, rail, shipping, defense, and space industries to participate in goalling zero emission transportation and machinery. I understand that light duty and other automotive vehicles contribute heavily to greenhouse gas emissions. However, by the looks of rocket launches, it seems our nation supports industries which could cast many atmospheric difficulties, including massive amounts of greenhouse gases, and possibly upper ozone layer holes. While popular news shares successful rocket launches, the pollution, carbon activity, ozone possible damage, and heat from these launches seemingly not being mentioned. California played a large role in [aviation,] space and defense many years ago. Our retirees might be able to make a difference bringing these industries to the zero emission table **[ITEM 1 2020-2023 Investment Plan Update for Clean Transportation Program]**.

2. Please help the hydrogen industry work out well designed first responder plans **[ITEM 1, 5C, 11]**. Thanks.

Monday, October 12, 2020

Dear California Senate Committee Senators on Energy, Utilities and Telecommunications:

I support Senate Bill 497, for the following reasons and more. The Chair of the California Energy Commission is and has been exposed to what seems relevant energy stakeholder information. I believe the chair can educate legislators, removing a business "spin," on information which has been heard in commission meetings, present and past. The Chair also has extensive academic and work history.

I am disturbed that California allowed 5G telecommunications installations without testing the technology more thoroughly. From reading, I understand Federal Communications Commission public safety electromagnetic field limits were determined in the 90s and thus, are considered outdated. I understand also that other nations have greater restrictions than the United States. I cannot imagine how bad this new 5G installation might be on top of other wireless fields.

I do not know how it is possible for contractors to eliminate some of the wireless infrastructure while installing new, though recently I received encouraging news from AT&T. In my neighborhood, and others in Sacramento, when I log on wirelessly to one of my laptops, I easily see over 10 other wifi connections.

Furthermore, wireless fields, including satellite and wifi fields, might play a role in exacerbating California wildfires. Wireless technology, especially excessive wireless technology, seems potentially dangerous, similarly to wired technology, but more so because it is un-grounded. I was taught at SMUD to verify a building's main meter switch in construction plans. We were told that fire fighters wanted to be able to turn off a building's electricity in the presence of fire.

Also, I wondered if recent California lightning was caused by satellites not being regulated properly. I wonder if it is possible that this committee can explore this topic with other United State leaders, specifically asking if satellites are able and/or trying to control California's weather system. In the past "cloud seeding" played a role in rain patterns. I fear bad satellite operators might be purposely trying to hurt certain properties or people in California. I received an unverifiable Twitter post that satellites can be hacked too, which would probably be disturbing to many if true. I hope legislators have the ability to ask tough questions on satellite technologies.

Since leaving SMUD, 2015, I began to follow energy news from other entities, such as the California Energy Commission. I felt that it would be a natural progression to a new job, to work for such an organization. During this time, approximately 2016 to present, I learned and absorbed information I never expected to encounter, such as carbon dioxide's (CO<sub>2</sub>'s) role in greenhouse gas emissions. I hope none of these acronyms are symbolic. [I fear "dry-labbed" - fake - data with acronyms which might also stand for other news or created to make hate.] I graduated from the University of California at Davis (UCD) with a Bachelor of Science in Botany, March 1986. Though I did not become a professional Botanist, I understood a basic concept that the photosynthesis process has the ability to fix CO<sub>2</sub> and generate O<sub>2</sub>. I believe that photosynthetic processes might be easily damaged and generate only CO<sub>2</sub>. Can this please be verified by suitable professional biologists/botanists, not associated with business pursuits?

It seems relevant to consider overhead repetitive scanning of plants, and blue-green algae/bacteria, when thinking about CO<sub>2</sub> generation. Repetitive scanning with infrared and radar for example, might heat or damage locations, humans and other biology in ways that were not easily predicted by people who did not study much photosynthesis. Radiation is said to be cumulative. I do not understand ignoring cumulative injuries.

I might guess that climate change is not only caused by greenhouse gas emissions from combustion engines, leaking natural gas systems, and other types of more visible heating technologies, but also has some compounding contributors which have not yet been additionally studied and checked. Humans seem to love the cell phone, fantastic satellite imagery/data, space, defense, security, convenience and spontaneous gratifications, which wireless has granted. I do too, although afford to not want use hazardous items. I hope legislation does not hesitate to explore these possibilities, especially in light of recent horrid fire disasters.

Thanks for trying to understand and explore these concerns.

Sincerely,

Claire Warshaw