



Advancing Sound Public Health Policy  
on the Use of Electromagnetic Radiation (EMR)  
P. O. Box 117 Marshfield VT 05658  
Tel. and FAX : 802-426-3035 E-mail:  
info@emrpolicy.org

To: Maine State Legislature Joint Standing Committee on Energy, Utilities and Technology  
From: Janet Newton, President, The EMR Policy Institute  
Date: 25 April 2011  
RE: Comment on LD 1014 (HP 750) – “An Act To Create the Children's Wireless Protection Act”  
sponsored by Representative Andrea Boland  
Cc: Committee Clerk Kristen Gottlieb  
Representative Andrea Boland

Appended here:

1. California Public Utilities Commission’s Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) Comment on January 2011 preliminary version of the Smart Meter report issued by the California Council on Science and Technology (CCST)
2. March 2, 2010 Testimony of The EMR Policy Institute on HP 1207 LD 1706 “An Act to Create the Children’s Wireless Protection Act,” before the Maine Legislature Joint Standing Committee on Health and Human Services

Senator Thibodeau, Representative Fitts, and Honorable Members of the Joint Committee on Energy, Utilities and Technology:

Because of previously scheduled commitments, The EMR Policy Institute is unable to testify in person at the April 27, 2011 hearing before your committee on LD 1014 “An Act to Create the Children's Wireless Protection Act.” Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the hearing process for this important public health legislation.

The EMR Policy Institute (EMRPI) is a national advocacy organization established in 2003 whose goal is to create better cooperation between public health regulatory agencies and legislators in order to mitigate unnecessary hazardous electromagnetic radiation (EMR) exposures. EMRPI educates policy makers and the public on the need for sound, biologically-based human safety policy that protects public health regarding EMR exposures across the electromagnetic spectrum.

EMRPI continues to challenge the inadequacy of the US safety policy on electromagnetic and radiofrequency (RF) radiation exposures by submitting official comment to key federal agencies. EMRPI’s record of formal comment as individuals and through its organization dates back to 1997. It includes official comment to key federal agencies such as the NAS, FCC, FDA, GAO, NIOSH, NTIA and DOJ.

The directors of EMRPI have participated in taking three cases to the US Supreme Court challenging the FCC's RF safety policy as **inadequate to protect all members of the public in all exposure scenarios**. In each case the Court denied certiorari on procedural grounds.

This EMRPI Comment is based upon its 14-year record of scrutiny of the inadequacies in the current FCC RF radiation policy that was put in place in 1997. Since 1997 the FCC has resisted all calls to address these inadequacies, i.e., to develop biologically based safety limits for human exposure to RF radiation that protect all members of the public in the various exposure scenarios they encounter in daily life.

EMRPI gave oral and written testimony at the March 2, 2010 hearing on HP 1207 LD 1706 "An Act to Create the Children's Wireless Protection Act," before the Maine Legislature Joint Standing Committee on Health and Human Services. It is included herein as Appendix 2.

The FCC's focus on "safety" continues to protect devices rather than members of the public as found in its 2009 announcement of its International TV White Spaces Fellowship and Training Initiative:

*. . . by building on a proven concept: the safe deployment of new, intelligent devices in the unused spectrum that exists between television channels **without causing undue interference to adjacent users**.* (Emphasis added.)

"Adjacent users" refers to commercial communications devices rather than to humans with Implanted Medical Devices for one example.

The most recent state-level review of current US RF radiation policy is the report, "Health Impacts of Radio Frequency Exposure from Smart Meters," final version released in April 2011 by the California Council on Science and Technology (CCST). It came as a result of California utilities' initiative to deploy wireless smart meters statewide. It came at the request of California Assemblymen Jared Huffman and Bill Monning that CCST study the potential for health impacts from exposure to wireless Smart Meters. The CCST solicited input from scientific experts but did not include their conclusions in the preliminary version of its report issued in January 2011. See:

<http://www.ccst.us/publications/2011/2011smart-final.pdf>

It should be noted that while the CCST Report specifically addresses wireless Smart Meter exposures, the frequency range at which these devices operate is in the same range of frequencies at which today's cell phones and Smart phones also operate. The scientific literature in question applies to both of these exposure scenarios.

Comment on the preliminary version from the California Public Utilities Commission's Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) ([http://www.dra.ca.gov/DRA/hot/110203\\_smartmeters.htm](http://www.dra.ca.gov/DRA/hot/110203_smartmeters.htm)) found that the CCST Report (<http://www.ccst.us/news/2011/20110111smart.php>) does not fully explore **the basis for the Report's conclusion that, "there is no clear evidence that additional standards are needed to protect the public from smart meters or other common household electronic devices."** The full text of the DRA comment is included herein as Appendix 1.

At page 3 of its comment DRA recommends, "that CCST explore this issue in greater depth" with these statements:

**3. CCST should explain more clearly why it concluded that the available evidence does not indicate a need to limit non-thermal impacts of RF emissions.**

The report states that, "there is currently no conclusive scientific evidence pointing to a non-thermal cause and effect between human exposure to RF emissions and negative health impacts." While the report cites three studies that claim adverse impacts, it does not explain why these studies are not relevant to the current debate. The same can be said about the BioInitiative Report, a research survey often cited by parties concerned about RF emissions, which is merely listed in Appendix E as an "unsolicited document."

DRA recommends that the CCST Report be expanded to provide a scientific critique of the BioInitiative Report, and other reports that assert a link between RF emissions and negative health impacts. CCST should explain why, in its opinion, these sources do not constitute evidence that indicates a need to establish limits for non-thermal impacts, if only as a precautionary measure, even if conclusive findings are not yet available.

Despite this critique from a California state regulatory agency the CCST's Key Report Findings as stated in the final version continue to assert at page 4 that:

3. To date, scientific studies have not identified or confirmed negative health effects from *potential non-thermal* impacts of RF emissions such as those produced by existing common household electronic devices and smart meters.
4. Not enough is currently known about potential non-thermal impacts of radio frequency emission to identify or recommend additional standards for such impacts.

It should be noted that:

- *The BioInitiative Report* reviews more than 2,000 peer-reviewed published scientific papers that demonstrate biological effects and negative health effects resulting from RF radiation exposures at "non-thermal," i.e., low-intensity, levels.
- Contributing authors of *The BioInitiative Report* David O. Carpenter MD MPH and Henry Lai PhD are scheduled to testify before your committee on April 27, 2011. Both of these experts have published numerous peer-reviewed papers and books in this area of science.

The Maine Center for Disease Control's 2010 report on smart meter RF emissions ([http://www.maine.gov/dhhs/boh/smart\\_meters.shtml](http://www.maine.gov/dhhs/boh/smart_meters.shtml)) issued conclusions that are similar to those of the CCST Report. The Maine CDC Report itself states that it is limited in scope.

EMRPI offers herein its Comment in the CCST proceeding as written testimony on LD 1014, “An Act to Create the Children’s Wireless Protection Act.” The emphasis of this testimony is to delineate the findings of the 2008 National Academy of Sciences Report, ***Identification of Research Needs Relating to Adverse Health Effects of Wireless Communication***. The stated task of this NAS project was to identify needs and gaps in the research record upon which US RF radiation safety policy is based. The Report did indeed find numerous inadequacies in that research record. Inadequate research results in safety policy that fails to address all exposures encountered by the public. As a result it cannot be asserted that US safety policy protects all members of the public from all mechanisms of harm in all exposure scenarios.

**The EMR Policy January 31, 2011 Comment submitted to The California Council on Science and Technology:**

1. The January 2011 CCST Report misses out on a key opportunity to address its own “Key Report Findings” and “Other Considerations” by failing to provide the public with a clear analysis of the scientific record upon which the current FCC RF radiation safety policy is based. On p. 8 The CCST Report specifically references the 2008 National Academies of Science Report: *Identification of Research Needs Relating to Adverse Health Effects of Wireless Communication* (NAS Report at: [www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=12036](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12036)) The National Academies of Science provides a service for the US federal government that parallels the role of CCST in the State of California, yet the CCST Report fails to include the specific details of the 2008 NAS Report findings.
2. Safety regulations are based on the published record of scientific studies in a given field. The NAS Report enumerates the holes in the RF research record upon which FCC RF safety policy is based. In failing to include the NAS Report findings, the CCST Report missed the mark for explaining its own Key Finding #3 – *To date, scientific findings have not identified nor confirmed negative health effects from potential non-thermal impacts of RF emissions such as those produced by existing common household electronic devices and smart meters. . .* and Other Considerations #3 – *Consumers should be provided with clearly understood information about the radiofrequency emissions of all devices that emit RF including smart meters.*
3. On p. 7 CCST Report states that: *Given current scientific knowledge, the FCC guideline provides a more than adequate margin of safety against the known thermal effects.* CCST fails, however, to specify the holes in the “current scientific knowledge” delineated in the NAS Report
4. On p. 8 CCST Report states that: ***At this time there is no clear evidence that additional standards are needed to protect the public from smart meters or other common household electronic devices.*** However, the 2008 NAS Report documents the need to characterize specific aspects of real-life public exposure to RF radiation that are not addressed in the scientific record

upon which the current FCC RF safety policy is based (see pp. 13-44):

- a. Exposure of juveniles, children, pregnant women, and fetuses both for personal wireless devices (e.g., cell phones, wireless personal computers [PCs] and for RF fields from base station antennas.
- b. Variability of exposures to the actual use of the device, the environment in which it is used, and exposures from other sources.
- c. Multilateral exposures.
- d. Multiple frequency exposures.
- e. Location of use (both geographic location and whether a device is primarily used indoors or outdoors).
- f. Models for men and women of various heights and for children of various ages.
- g. Exposure to rooftop maintenance workers and to members of the public that live in close proximity to multiple co-located base station antennas.
- h. Exposure to subpopulations among maintenance employees.
- i. Chronic exposures that are similar to those from existing TV and radio antennas.
- j. Multilateral exposure to the typical arrangement of four to six antennas with multiple frequencies, rather than a single antenna radiating at a single frequency from a single direction as used in laboratory studies.
- k. Exposure to others sources of RF radiation such as cordless phones, wireless computer communications, and other communications systems.
- l. Exposure to the hand or the human lap or parts of the body close to the device.
- m. RF exposure in close proximity to metallic adornments and implanted medical devices (IMDs) including metal rim glasses, earrings, and various prostheses (e.g., hearing aids, cochlear implants, cardiac pacemakers).
- n. Models for whole-body exposure due to base station antennas.
- o. Sufficiently long exposure and follow-up to allow for detection of effects that occur with a latency of several years.
- p. Lack of information concerning the health effects associated with living in close proximity to base stations.
- q. Research that includes children, the elderly, and people with underlying diseases.
- r. Research on possible adverse RF effects identified by changes in EEG (electroencephalogram) activity.
- s. Lack of information on possible neurophysiologic effects developing during long-term exposure to RF fields.
- t. Studies focusing on possible adverse RF effects identified by changes in cognitive performance functions.
- u. Effects of RF exposure to the sensitive biological targets of neural networks.
- v. Possible effects of RF exposure on fetal and neonatal development.
- w. Possible influences of exposure on the structure and function of the immune system,

including prenatal, neonatal, and juvenile exposures.

- x. Possible influences of RF exposures on the structure and function of the central nervous system, including prenatal, neonatal, and juvenile exposures.

5. At p. 8 CCST Report states that: *No clear causal relationship between RF emissions and non-thermal human health impacts has been scientifically established, nor have the mechanisms that might lead to such biological impacts been clearly identified.* In this statement CCST Report leaves the inaccurate impression that science has established the “mechanism” or cause of development of other diseases such as cancer, Alzheimers’ Disease or ALS, which is not the case. Lack of a single mechanism for causation of adverse health effects arising from exposure to low-intensity levels of RF emissions is not a valid rationale to negate the scientific evidence demonstrating these “non-thermal” effects.

6. Illustrating inadequate protection under the current FCC RF safety policy is the experience of geophysics professor Gary Olhoeft PhD with the critical EMI (electromagnetic interference) problems he encounters daily with his Medtronic Deep Brain Stimulator (DBS). Prof. Olhoeft’s comment was read into the record at the first Public Comment period at the July 26-27, 2010 FCC-FDA combined public meeting on, “Enabling the Convergence of Communications and Medical Systems.” Despite Dr. Olhoeft’s insightful analysis and account of this one example of EMI between wireless systems and his DBS, neither the FCC moderator nor the FDA moderator of the following day’s panel on Electromagnetic Compatibility (EMC) raised one question on this EMI topic so critical to the life, health and well being of millions of Americans. Even the last panel discussion, Electromagnetic Compatibility – How to Promote EMC, made no mention of compatibility with implanted electronic medical devices such as Deep Brain Stimulators that treat Parkinson’s patients, or insulin pumps for diabetics, for example.

Professor Olhoeft submitted his written Comment in the current US Department of Justice Advanced Notice of Proposed Rule Making proceeding. See also the video of his presentation at the 2009 EMRPI scientific conference, “Electromagnetic Radiation Impacts on Human Health,” at:

[www.youtube.com/watch?v=jo-B6LWfVzw&feature=related](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jo-B6LWfVzw&feature=related)

- 7. No federal agency is keeping track of cumulative wireless power density, nor identifying critical levels and locations where individuals who require IMDs may be at risk.
- 8. The FCC continues to issue compliance statements for new wireless devices and systems without regard for existing RF levels.
- 9. In stark contrast to the lack of public health concern in key US federal and state agencies are these precautionary provisions called for in The European Parliament April 2009 Resolution approved by a


vote of 559-22: [www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P6-TA-2009-0216+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P6-TA-2009-0216+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN)

- **Particular consideration of biological effects**, especially given that **some studies have found the most harmful effects at lowest levels**;
- **Evaluation of potential long-term adverse effects of mobile telephony radio frequencies**;
- Increased investigation of **harmful effects of multiple exposures to different EMF sources, particularly for children**;
- Member States to follow the example of Sweden and to recognize persons that suffer from electrohypersensitivity as being disabled so as to grant them adequate protection as well as equal opportunities;

10. EMRPI strongly urges the State of California to broaden #4 of CCST Other Considerations to require Smart Grid / Smart Meter options that employ fiber optic and hard-wired data transmission rather than wireless transmitting Smart Meters.

Given these numerous and serious “holes” in the research record that is the basis of current US RF radiation safety policy, EMRPI strongly urges the Joint Standing Committee on Energy, Utilities and Technology to support enactment of LD1012 in order to protect the health and well being of the children and citizens of Maine.

Respectfully submitted by  
The EMR Policy Institute



Janet Newton, President  
P.O. Box 117  
Marshfield VT 05658  
JNewton@emrpolicy.org  
Telephone: (802) 426-3035  
[www.emrpolicy.org](http://www.emrpolicy.org)



Appendix 1

## DRA

Division of Ratepayer Advocates  
California Public Utilities Commission

**JOSEPH P. COMO**  
Acting Director

505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, California 94102  
Tel: 415-703-2381  
Fax: (415) 703-2057

<http://dra.ca.gov>

**To: California Council on Science and Technology (CCST) Smart Meter Project**  
**From: David Ashuckian, Deputy Director**  
**Date: January 31, 2011**

**RE: Report on "Health Impacts of Radio Frequencies for Smart Meters"**

The Division Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) submits these comments on the CCST's Report on "Health Impacts of Radio Frequencies for Smart Meters" issued on January 11, 2011 ("the Report").

### Introduction and Summary

DRA is an independent division of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) whose mission is to obtain the lowest possible rates for service consistent with reliable and safe service levels. (Cal. Public Utilities Code § 309.5(a).) DRA has represented the interests of residential and small business customers in CPUC proceedings involving deployment of advanced metering infrastructure (AMI) systems, also known as smart meters. DRA has not taken a position on whether the meters pose health risks, but it has called on the CPUC to review reliable information on this subject and to address customers' concerns in a public proceeding. DRA welcomes the CCST's contribution to public understanding of the health impacts of RF emissions from smart meters.

In these comments, DRA identifies several questions that warrant additional explanation or analysis. We address three topics, in the following order:

- There are additional factors that can impact RF exposure from SmartMeters that are not addressed in the Report, and should be considered.
- Exposure from multiple co-located meters should be examined more closely.
- CCST should more clearly explain the basis for its conclusion that: "At this time there is no clear evidence that additional standards are needed to protect the public from smart meters or other common household electronic devices." (Report, p. 8.)

### Comments

1. **CCST should consider additional factors that can impact RF exposure from smart meters.**

The Report concludes that it is unlikely that California's smart meter population will result in human exposure that exceeds FCC guidelines (which, as explained in the report, address only thermal impacts). While there appears to be consensus that exposure from smart meters in a wide range of installation scenarios will be significantly lower than FCC guideline limits, a new report from Sage Associates (Sage

Report) indicates exposure may exceed FCC guideline levels under certain circumstances.<sup>1</sup> For example, this report calculates that the exposure in a highly reflective environment (“1000% reflection” per the report) adjacent to a bank of 8 meters exceeds FCC guideline levels.<sup>2</sup> DRA questions whether the exposure levels calculated by Sage in this situation would be achieved in real buildings, but believes that Sage raises issues that merit further consideration.<sup>3</sup> A December 2010 EPRI report also discusses physical factors that are not explicitly addressed in the CCST Report.<sup>4</sup>

The Report identifies six “key factors to consider, when evaluating exposure to RF from smart meters,” (Report, p. 25). DRA finds this list of factors a useful tool for policymakers. However, the December 2010 EPRI Report and the January 2011 Sage Report indicate that there may be additional factors that should not be overlooked. DRA has prepared a list of such factors, which is attached to these comments. DRA recommends that CCST consider the degree to which the factors listed in this Attachment (particularly environmental conditions such as building materials and exterior conditions) apply to smart meter RF exposure, and augment the table and supporting discussions as appropriate.<sup>5</sup>

## **2. The exposure from multiple co-located meters should be examined more thoroughly.**

The CCST Report addresses the issue of exposure in a multiple- meter setting by citing the EPRI report’s field measurements (8% exposure level with 10 meters operating). But other information provided by EPRI indicates that it may be imprudent to draw broad conclusions from these measurements, for at least two reasons.

First, this measurement applies only to Itron meters, which have a nominal power output approximately four times lower than the electric meters used by PG&E. Second, according to a November 2010 summary of the EPRI Report, power density did not diminish as rapidly with distance with multiple meters for a single meter.<sup>6</sup> These factors suggest that actual statewide RF exposure levels may be higher than the EPRI measurement cited in the CCST Report.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> “Assessment of Radio Frequency Microwave Radiation Emissions from Smart Meters”, January 1, 2011. Available at <http://sagereports.com/smart-meter-rf/>.

<sup>2</sup> Sage Report, Table A7. FCC guidelines exceeded at 9” from source with a 1% duty cycle, and at 2.5’ with a 10% duty cycle.

<sup>3</sup> Sage bases the existence of a “1000% reflection” scenario on studies by Hondou and others, in which the RF source was operating within a reflective chamber, such as when a cell phone is used in an elevator. In contrast, smart meters will generally be located outside of occupied building spaces, and outside of any reflective surfaces inside the building. Because of this difference, RF emissions by the smart meter would be reflected away from the occupied space, and any RF transmitted into that space would be greatly attenuated. The Hondou studies may be relevant to the propagation of RF signals from Smart appliances.

<sup>4</sup> “An Investigation of Radio frequency Fields Associated with the Itron Smart Meter,” EPRI report number 1021126.

<sup>5</sup> The December EPRI report provides discussion and data on many of these additional issues. It should be noted, however, that the specific measurements and resulting data only apply to one type of meter deployed by SDG&E and SCE, and to walls of metal lathe construction.

<sup>6</sup> “Radio-Frequency Exposure Levels from Smart Meters,” EPRI report # 1022270, p. 5 and Figure 4.

<sup>7</sup> In addition, EPRI concludes that “beyond three of four meters the aggregate field does not materially increase with additional meters. (EPRI Report, p. 9-7.) However, data in Figure 9-5 and Table 9-2 indicates that this conclusion may not be generally applicable due to the fact that the second meter added, “Meter B”, generated the strongest RF field, and may have diminished the impact of the additional meters added.

On the other hand, the EPRI measurements could overestimate actual emission levels, for the following reason. The EPRI report notes that the meters were specially programmed for the tests to emit a constant RF level, although in normal use each meter emits an RF signal intermittently and randomly. Even when two or more meters emit at the same time, their levels will only sum directly if they are perfectly in phase.

The EPRI report highlights a fundamental problem in characterizing RF exposure from smart meters which must be considered by policy makers: the impact of two RF fields only add arithmetically in the limited situation where they are 100% in phase with each other. Outside of this limited condition, additional RF fields will add to a lesser degree, or reduce the combined level due to “destructive interference.” This concept applies both to fields from multiple RF radios and reflected fields.

From a policy perspective, at least three methods can be considered for treatment of multiple meters:

1. The combined exposure estimate could be based on a simple addition of multiple fields *if* clear disclosure is provided indicating that this method provides a worst-case scenario which would rarely occur, according to information provided by PG&E and EPRI.
2. Actual network operating data could be obtained and used to guide a statistically based estimate of how often meters are operating, and how their fields combine when multiple meters are co-located. This could result in a methodology to estimate “nominal” exposure levels.
3. One could assume the meters never transmit in phase, and account for the multiple meters by increasing the effective duty cycle.

Each of these methods has pro and cons which should be discussed among RF experts in a public venue, as recommended by many parties to the CPUC proceedings. Such a discussion should consider whether the communication network operating algorithms could include constraints to prevent co-located meters from transmitting at the same time.

DRA recommends that the CCST explore this issue in greater depth.

3. **CCSF should explain more clearly why it concluded that the available evidence does not indicate a need to limit non-thermal impacts of RF emissions.**

The report states that “there is currently no conclusive scientific evidence pointing to a non-thermal cause and effect between human exposure to RF emissions and negative health impacts.”<sup>8</sup> While the report cites three studies that claim adverse impacts, it does not explain why these studies are not relevant to the current debate. The same can be said about the Bioinitiative Report, a research survey often cited by parties concerned about RF emissions, which is merely listed in Appendix E as an “unsolicited document.”

DRA recommends that the CCST Report be expanded to provide a scientific critique of the Bioinitiative report, and other reports that assert a link between RF emissions and negative health impacts. CCST should explain why, in its opinion, these sources do not constitute evidence that indicates a need to establish limits for non-thermal impacts, if only as a precautionary measure, even if conclusive findings are not yet available.

## **Conclusion**

The CCST’s contribution to the public discussion about RF exposure from Smart Meters can be made more valuable by addressing the questions identified in these comments.

---

<sup>8</sup> CCST Report, p.15.

## **Attachment: RF Issues That Warrant Additional Consideration**

### **Smart Meter RF Emission Sources**

- Does the power and directivity of smart meters vary over time, across all the installed meter “forms,” or in “hard to reach” locations?
- How do the horizontal and vertical radiation patterns for each smart meter component impact RF exposure inside and outside of buildings?
- How should the exposure from multiple co-located meters be established, and should it impact the combined power density or duty cycle? (Can published smart meter vendor data help address these questions?)
- Do meter warranty terms establish maximum permissible duty cycles?
- Can the smart meter network systems be programmed to limit/reduce duty cycle and RF exposure?

### **Environmental Considerations/Boundary Conditions**

- How do reflections from the meter mounting surface, ground, and adjacent structures impact RF exposure for those outside of the building?
- What are the reflection, absorption, and transmission characteristics of common building and ground cover materials?
- What type of real-world smart meter installations result in RF propagation which deviates from free-field predictions?

### **RF Receivers**

- What time and spatial averaging methods are required to accurately characterize thermal impacts from RF exposure? Non-thermal impacts?
- Are FCC guidelines designed to protect all persons exposed by smart meters, including children, the elderly, and those with health issues or medical implants?
- Does reduced mobility of the person receiving the RF exposure increase the level of exposure?

### **Other**

- How will full deployment of home area networks impact RF exposure?
- How will full deployment of the smart grid or other uses of smart meter networks impact duty cycles, and therefore RF exposure?
- Are there administrative measures which could be ordered by the CPUC to limit RF exposure where excessive levels are found to exist?

#### Board of Directors

Janet Newton  
President  
Marshfield VT

Deb Carney  
Vice President  
Golden CO

Diana Warren  
Secretary  
Wayland MA

Debra Lynne  
Treasurer  
New Milford CT

#### Science Advisory Group

Magda Havas, Ph.D.  
Trent University  
Peterborough, Ontario  
Canada

Gerard J. Hyland, Ph.D.  
University of Warwick  
Coventry, Great Britain

Raymond Kasevich, M.S.E.E.  
RF Consultant  
Great Barrington MA

Henry C.Lai, Ph.D.  
University of Washington  
Seattle WA

Roger D. Mattson, Ph.D.  
Health/Safety Consultant  
Golden CO

Jerry L. Phillips, Ph.D.  
University of Colorado  
Colorado Springs CO

Stuart Selikowitz, M.D.  
Dartmouth Medical School  
Hanover NH

The EMR Policy Institute is a  
501 (c)(3) non-profit  
organization as defined by  
the U.S. Internal Revenue  
Service.

## Testimony on HP 1207 LD 1706 An Act to Create the Children's Wireless Protection Act presented by Janet Newton, President The EMR Policy Institute

[www.emrpolicy.org](http://www.emrpolicy.org)

March 2, 2010

### US Regulation of Exposure to Radiofrequency Radiation for Cell Phone Emissions

Senator Branagan, Representative Perry and Honorable Members of the Health and Human Services Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I am Janet Newton, President of The EMR Policy Institute. We continue to challenge the inadequacy of the US public health policy on cell phone safety by submitting official comment to key federal agencies as listed on the PowerPoint slide. No US agency policy protects children from cell phone radiation exposure. The federal record demonstrates this fact to be true.

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is a licensing and engineering agency that relies on other agencies and organizations to recommend and set safety standards for communications technology. It is not a health agency itself.

The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulates electronic devices that come in contact with the human body through its Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH). This includes cell phones as they are held up to the side of the head in normal use.

The FCC has traditionally adopted safety recommendations from the American National Standards Institute (ANSI). ANSI is an industry-based organization comprised of numerous committees representing diverse business interests, such as automobile manufacturers, chemical/pharmaceutical companies, the electrical industries, and many others. To create standards for radiofrequency/microwave radiation (RF/MW) used in telecommunications and other RF/MW-related activities, ANSI looks to a subcommittee of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) called C95.1 that is responsible for making recommendations for RF/MW exposures. The standards are referred to as ANSI-IEEE C95.1-1992; the date refers to the last year in which revisions were made to the original standard, which was put out in 1966.

The model used for both the IEEE and the NCRP standards is an adult male of average height and weight. Though safety margins are factored in, the standards do not take women, pregnant women, or children into consideration – all of whom absorb radiation differently than this “average” model. Nor does it consider the elderly or the infirm who are more susceptible to adverse exposures.

The model, and all of the research it is drawn from, is based solely on the thermal effects these frequencies can create. It has been known for decades that microwaves, at sufficient power output, can create heating. That is what occurs in a microwave oven. The current FCC model presumes that nothing adverse other than heating occurs. Therefore, if heating does not occur, no other adverse biological effect does either. But a range of adverse non-thermal effects have been noted or decades as well – at levels significantly lower than the current FCC standard. This has been at the heart of the debate since the 1950's.

### **Timeline of U.S. Federal Activities Addressing Exposure to Mobile Phone Radiation**

**1996** - With passage of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 the FCC began to regulate the RF emissions of mobile phones. Prior to 1996 mobile phones were exempt from US federal RF regulation.

**1999** – Federal Radiofrequency Interagency Work Group (RFAIWG) issued its June 17, 1999 letter to the radiofrequency (RF) standards setting subcommittee of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE SCC28) that identified issues, “that we believe need to be addressed to provide a strong and credible rationale to support RF exposure guidelines.” The letter was issued “in response to previous requests for greater participation on our part in the SCC28 deliberations on RF guidelines.” See: [www.emrpolicy.org/litigation/case\\_law/docs/exhibit\\_a.pdf](http://www.emrpolicy.org/litigation/case_law/docs/exhibit_a.pdf)

RFAIWG is comprised of experts in exposure to radiofrequency radiation (RF) from the Environmental Protection Agency, Federal Communications Commission, Food and Drug Administration, National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, and the National Telecommunications Information Administration.

What happened – The IEEE committee has not responded.

To date the RFAIWG-identified issues have not been incorporated into any revision of IEEE Radiofrequency Exposure Standards. The current FCC human RF exposure guidelines are based on the IEEE RF exposure standards and the NCRP (National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurement) RF exposure guidelines. Going forward, the NCRP no longer works on RF exposure standards development. It reviews the RF standards development work of other bodies.

#### **RFAIWG RF Guideline Issues Related to Mobile Phone Use**

- **Biological basis for local SAR limit -**

*... an effort should be made to base local SAR limits on the differential sensitivity of tissues to electric fields and temperature increases. For example, it seems intuitive that the local limits for the brain and bone marrow should be lower than those for muscle, fat and fascia; this is not the case with the current limits which implicitly assume that all tissues are equally sensitive (except for eye and testicle).*

- **Selection of an adverse effect level -**

*Since the adverse effect level for the 1991 guidelines was based on acute exposures, does the same approach apply for effects caused by chronic exposure to RF radiation, including exposures having a range of carrier frequencies, modulation characteristics, peak intensities, exposure duration, etc., that does not elevate tissue temperature on a macroscopic scale?*

- **Acute and chronic exposures -**

*. . . a clear rationale needs to be developed to support the exposure guideline for chronic as well as acute exposure.*

- **Time averaging –**

*If prolonged and chronic exposures are considered to be important, then there should be a reconsideration of the time-averaging practices that are incorporated into existing exposure guidelines.*

- **Replication / Validation -**

*Published peer-reviewed studies that have been independently replicated/validated should be used to establish the adverse effects level from which exposure guidelines are derived. The definition of "replicated/validated" should not be so restrictive to disallow the use of a set of reports that are scientifically valid but are not an exact replication/validation of specific experimental procedures and results.*

*Peer-reviewed, published studies that may not be considered to be replicated/validated, but are well done and show potentially important health impacts provide important information regarding uncertainties in the data base used to set the adverse effect level (e.g., incomplete data base).*

- **Important Health Effects Literature Areas –**

*Documentation should be provided that the literature review process included a comprehensive review of the following three areas:*

- 1) long-term, low-level exposure studies (because of their importance to environmental and chronic occupational RFR exposure);*
- 2) neurological/behavioral effects (because of their importance in defining the adverse effect level in existing RFR guidelines); and*
- 3) micronucleus assay studies (because of their relevance to carcinogenesis).*

**1999 -** FDA nominated RF radiation emissions of wireless communication devices to the National Toxicology Program (NTP) for Toxicological Studies for research because of “widespread consumer and worker exposure” and because “the available data is inadequate to properly assess safety.”

From the Executive Summary of the FDA’s Nomination:

*Over 80 million Americans currently use wireless communications devices (e.g., cellular phones) with about 25 thousand news users daily. This translates into a potentially significant public health problem should the use of these devices even slightly increase the risk of adverse health effects. Currently cellular phones and other wireless communication devices are required to meet the radiofrequency radiation (RFR) exposure guidelines of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), which were most recently revised in August 1996. The existing exposure guidelines are based on protection from acute injury from thermal effects of RFR exposure, and may not be protective against any non-thermal effects of chronic exposure. Animal exposure research reported in the literature suggests that low level exposures may increase the risk of cancer by mechanisms yet to be elucidated, but the data is conflicting and most of this research was not conducted with actual cellular phone radiation . . . There is currently insufficient scientific basis for concluding either that wireless communication technologies are safe or that they pose a risk to millions of users. A significant research effort, involving large well-planned animal experiments is needed to provide the basis to assess the risk to human health of wireless communications devices.*

*. . . A large number of biological effects have been reported in cell cultures and in animals, often in response to exposure to relatively low-level fields, which are not well established but which may have health implications and are, hence, the subject of on-going research. It is not*

scientifically possible to guarantee those non-thermal levels of microwave radiation, which do not cause deleterious effects for relatively short exposure, will not cause long-term adverse health effects.

**2000** - Senator Joe Lieberman and Congressman Ed Markey request GAO (Government Accounting Office) to investigate US research on and regulation of mobile phone health issues.

**2001** – GAO issued Report 01-545 Research and Regulatory Efforts on Mobile Phone Health Issues. See: [www.gao.gov/new.items/d01545.pdf](http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d01545.pdf)

One section of the GAO Report addresses “shortcomings” of the FDA and FCC. In particular it underscored a brochure produced by FCC’s Consumer Information Bureau that “puts the statement ‘Cell Phones Cause Medical Problems’ into the category of ‘fiction,’ noting that ‘there is no scientific evidence that proves wireless phone usage can cause cancer, increased blood pressure, memory loss, or other health problems,’ though research is continuing.” Officials in the FCC’s Office of Engineering and Technology were asked to comment on that statement. They concurred with the GAO that “this characterization could be misleading, because it implies that the health issue is settled.”

**GAO Report Conclusions –**

*Scientific research to date does not demonstrate that the radiofrequency energy emitted from mobile phones has adverse health effects, but the findings of some studies have raised questions indicating the need for further investigations . . . Given the long-term nature of much of the research being conducted – particularly the epidemiological and animal studies – it will likely be many more years before a definitive conclusion can be reached on whether mobile phone emissions pose any risk to humans health . . .*

*Given the prominence of the mobile phone health issue, FDA and FCC need to provide the public with clear, accurate, and timely information so that they can make informed decisions.*

**2003** - RFIAWG sent another letter to Chou at IEEE with three more RF concerns:

- **Exclusion of pinna** [ear lobe]. IEEE proposed to reclassify the earlobe as an “extremity” as if it is not part of the head.

*If the pinna is to be considered an extremity and subjected to exposure limit of 20 W/Kg over 10 g of tissue, then a clear rationale for treating the pinna as an extremity should be presented. This rationale should include biological properties of the pinna that qualifies it for this exclusion. If thermal effects would be the basis for the ICES standard, then the thermophysiology of the pinna and the skin, bone and other head tissues adjacent to the pinna should be discussed.*

- **Rationale for relaxation of current limits**

*Federal agencies, as well as the general public and the public health community, are very concerned about a relaxation of exposure guidelines that may result in increased exposure in the future. A rationale should be presented for relaxation of standards. The rationale should include a clear explanation of the impact of the exposures that may result, i.e., the description of the exposures and the effects on critical tissues and organs. An explanation should be given as to why the current standard should be relaxed. The issue of safety factors should be also be addressed as part of the rationale for relaxation of current limits.*

- **Sensitivity of different tissues**

*A clear explanation on how the revision has taken into account sensitivity of different tissues to temperature. Effects of acute and chronic exposure to elevated temperature should be revised standard a description of the risk analysis that was done.*

What happened? The IEEE committee has not responded.

Frequently noted in the 2001 GAO Report is the CRADA (Cooperative Research and Development Agreement) between FDA and CTIA (Cellular Telecommunications and Internet Association). Outcomes of that CRADA at NTP and The National Academies of Science are:

**2005** – NTP issues a Fact Sheet describing the FDA-nominated RF radiation study entitled: “Studies on Radiofrequency Radiation Emitted by Cellular Phones - Year 2005.” It makes the following statements about the research upon which the current FCC Radiofrequency Radiation exposure guidelines are based:

*. . . The existing exposure guidelines are based on protection from acute injury from thermal effects of RFR exposure. Current data are insufficient to draw definitive conclusions concerning the adequacy of these guidelines to be protective against any non-thermal effects of chronic exposures.*

*Studies in laboratory animals are considered crucial for understanding whether exposure to RFR is adverse to human health because meaningful data from epidemiological studies (human population studies) of cellular phone use will not be available for many years. This is due to the long latency period between exposure to a carcinogenic agent and the diagnosis of a tumor. Most scientific organizations that have reviewed the results from laboratory studies conducted to-date, however, have concluded that they are not sufficient to estimate potential human health cancer risks from low-level RFR exposures and long-term, multi-dose, animals studies are needed.*

***What is the NTP Doing?***

*The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) nominated RFR emissions of wireless communication devices to the [NTP] for toxicology and carcinogenicity testing. The NTP has carefully evaluated the efforts underway and concluded that while they have an excellent probability of producing high quality results, additional studies may be warranted to more clearly define any potential hazards to the U.S. population.*

**2007** – As negotiated in the FDA / CTIA CRADA, the National Academies of Science (NAS) convened a Workshop on Identification of Research Needs Relating to Potential Biological or Adverse Health Effects of Wireless Communication Devices. The NAS performs an unparalleled public service by bringing together committees of experts in all areas of scientific and technological endeavor. These experts serve pro bono to address critical national issues and give advice to the federal government and the public. Since its creation in 1863, the nation's leaders have often turned to the NAS for advice on the scientific and technological issues that frequently pervade policy decisions. See:

[www.nationalacademies.org/about/history.html](http://www.nationalacademies.org/about/history.html)

**2008** - NAS issued its Report entitled: *Identification of Research Needs Relating to Potential Biological or Adverse Health Effects of Wireless Communication Devices*, which states that the FCC's RF Safety Guidelines do not take into account a number of factors needed to protect public health. See: [www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=12036](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12036)

The committee judged that important research needs included, in order of appearance in the text, the following:

- Characterization of exposure to juveniles, children, pregnant women, and fetuses from personal wireless devices and RF fields from base station antennas.
- Characterization of radiated electromagnetic fields for typical multiple-element base station antennas and exposures to affected individuals.
- Characterization of the dosimetry of evolving antenna configurations for cell phones and text messaging devices.
- Prospective epidemiologic cohort studies of children and pregnant women.
- Epidemiologic case-control studies of childhood cancers, including brain cancer.
- Prospective epidemiologic cohort studies of adults in a general population and retrospective cohorts with medium to high occupational exposures.
- Human laboratory studies that focus on possible adverse effects on electroencephalography activity and that include a sufficient number of subjects.
- Investigation of the effect of RF electromagnetic fields on neural networks.
- Evaluation of doses occurring on the microscopic level.
- Additional experimental research focused on the identification of potential biophysical and biochemical/molecular mechanisms of RF action.

( p. 2)(Emphasis added.)

\* \* \*

#### Children

1. Prospective Cohort Studies of Pregnancy and Childhood. Children are potentially exposed from conception through maternal wireless device use and then postnatally when they themselves become users of mobile phones.
2. Case-control Study of Children Mobile Phone Users and Brain Cancer. Owing to widespread use of mobile phones among children and adolescents and the possibility of relatively high exposures to the brain, investigation of the potential effects of RF fields in the development of childhood brain tumors is warranted.

(p.2)(Emphasis added.)

\* \* \*

***The body of the full NAS Report identifies the following issues as not being covered by existing research and therefore are not addressed in current RF safety policy:*** (Emphasis added.)

- Are there differences in health effects of short-term vs. long-term exposure?
- Are there differences between local vs. whole-body exposures?
- Can the knowledge of biological effects from current signal types and exposure patterns be extrapolated to emerging exposure scenarios?
- Are there any biological effects that are not caused by an increase in tissue temperature (nonthermal effects)?
- Does RF exposure alter (synergize, antagonize, or potentiate) the biological effects of other chemical or physical agents?
- Are there differences in risk to children?
- Are there differences in risk to other subpopulations such as the elderly and individuals with underlying disease states?

( pp. 11-12.)(Emphasis added.)

\* \* \*

Laboratory Exposure Systems

*Most of the present-day exposure systems used in laboratory studies focus on the exposure of the head. Though exposures to the head are relevant for most cell phone exposures, whole-body exposures due to base stations are a research need. The laboratory exposure systems also need to include ELF and pertinent modulation protocols.*

( p. 17.) (Emphasis added.)


**2009** – FDA’s Center for Devices and Radiological Health asked for a private briefing on *The BioInitiative Report* in April of 2009. It was provided by *The Report’s* co-editors David O. Carpenter MD, MPH, and Cindy Sage, MA. See: [www.bioinitiative.org](http://www.bioinitiative.org)

What happened? The FDA has taken no action to protect children since the NAS Report was issued.

It is clear from the statements of the NAS Report as well as from the statements of federal experts in the RFIAWG and from the statements of the FDA and the NTP, all cited herein, that to date the question of adverse health effects from long-term exposure to cell phones to all subgroups of the American public has not been answered in the research record. Our US RF safety guidelines are based on this incomplete research record. Precaution for reducing the exposure of our most vulnerable citizens, i.e., children, pregnant women and the unborn, is warranted.

Children have no voice about their cell phone exposure. Adults in their lives along with policy makers make those decisions for them. I’m very unhappy that my three young grandchildren have no choice about what phone they are given to use. We need warning labels on cell phones so that parents make responsible, informed decisions about their children’s future health.

Respectfully submitted by



Janet Newton, President  
The EMR Policy Institute