Document Download

5g%20lette...

ID	10514338502761	**Proceeding**	OET 19-226
Name of Filer	Candice Schempp		
Type of Filing	COMMENT	**Filing Status**	DISSEMINATED
Viewing Status	Unrestricted		
Total Pagecount	3		
Date Received	May 13, 2020	**Date Posted**	May 14, 2020
Address	3184 S. Fox Leash Ave.	**City**	Eagle
		State	ID
ZIP	83616		

To whom it may concern,

I have a daughter with a severe seizure disorder. I want to believe that her life is just as valuable as the life of each one of your constituents (or, the people who elect you, as well as their loved ones). I am going to assume that you as an entity of elected officials do actually care about the well being of the people who elected you, and also assume that you love your own families, children, and grandchildren, all of whom will be affected negatively by this bill, should it pass. I am, therefore going to assume that you, as an entity, would require stringent and pertinent safety studies of the technology that is quickly outpacing said safety studies, before you allow it to roll forth unchecked. I am also going to assume that you are open and even grateful for further information and comments regarding this matter.

Please consider the following comments, even though they are not my own words, they strongly reflect my own concerns, and we will all benefit (with the exemption of the conglomerate giants who will be making an enormous profit from the passing of this bill, and possibly of those of you who will be getting some of that profit, if you choose to trade the health and well-being of your loved ones in exchange for such) from the stalling of this bill, as it is currently written:

The FCC's repeated refusal to consider biological effects from exposure to all types of wireless radiation shows a clear and dangerous intention to disregard the emerging science which must inform its decisions regarding public health.

The agency's reliance on organizations of physicists and engineers for advice on human exposures has resulted in a sole focus on "thermal" effects, despite thousands of published, peer-reviewed studies showing biological harm, even at non-thermal levels, for various frequency ranges.

The FCC's own admission that it is unaware of any other types of effects demonstrates a failure to actively investigate the issue by proactively engaging with the scientific community studying the short and long-term biological impacts of exposure to humans and possible interference with systems of the natural world. Failure to seek out and consider the latest science makes decisions of the FCC suspect.

Moreover, the complex comment process used by the FCC virtually ensures

that most commenters will be those who follow the activities of the agency closely and have a financial interest in the agency's decisions.

I do not support the proposed change to allow manufacturers to produce wireless devices that govern their own radiation power output, especially for notebooks and tablets frequently used by children who, according to the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), are more vulnerable to RF radiation than adults.

Since the justification for this proposed rule change is that manufacturers want to be able to deliver more data to notebooks and tablets, it seems obvious that this change would result in higher exposures for users.

I object to the practice of allowing exposures to be averaged over time to comply with FCC exposure limits. There is no scientific basis to support the notion that short, periodic bursts of RF radiation are not biologically harmful, or that only cumulative effects over time may have an impact. The FCC should establish temporal limits for both Specific Absorption Rate (SAR) and power density.

Further, I agree with the American Academy of Pediatrics that the FCC's current method of testing wireless devices is not reflective of the way people actually use technology today. Given the increasing use of wireless devices by children and adolescents, we encourage the FCC to seek out and utilize testing protocols that reflect real-world situations.

I recommend that before the agency considers even tentative approval of WPT devices operating at ranges in excess of 5o cm, it requires manufacturers to conduct pre-market testing to demonstrate the safety of such devices when used in all possible “worst case” scenarios, including mitigation techniques to avoid inadvertent or collateral damage to the public. Such an analysis must include consideration of biological impacts.

The issues here are very significant. How will this impact an older person with an implanted cardiac pacemaker who uses a remote charger to charge his cell phone while he is moving around with the phone in his shirt pocket? Or consider the couple trying to get pregnant if the man's phone is frequently

being charged wirelessly in the front pocket of his pants, with the beam irradiating his testicles?

What kind of human is the FCC considering protecting? What size, shape, age, and with what kind of underlying medical problem or weakness? I urge the agency to consider updating its standard anatomical models to reflect the wide variety of possible users.

Thus ends the comments that are not my wording. I implore the readers to consider the enormous responsibilities of our collective safety, which you currently hold within your grasp.

Sincerely,

Candice Schempp