Document Download

FCC%20rules%20comment%...
s%2520comment%25205.14.2020.pdf)

Pall20205GRiskSciBook.pdf (h...
742696%2FPall20205GRiskSciBook.pdf)

ID	10514149742696	**Proceeding**	OET 19-226
Name of Filer	Joan Dahlquist		
Type of Filing	COMMENT	**Filing Status**	DISSEMINATED
Viewing Status	Unrestricted		
Total Pagecount	129		
Date Received	May 14, 2020	**Date Posted**	May 15, 2020
Address	2208 North Cleveland Avenue	**City**	Chicago
		State	IL
ZIP	60614		

May 14, 2020

RE - FCC on Proposed New Wireless Radiation Rules, Docket 19-226

To the FCC – I oppose the proposed rules

From a concerned mother, who has son is being over exposed to radiation from the 5G antenna 50' from our home since April 2020.

The proposed rules are horrible, with no regard to human health and non-thermal effects, and even allow localized thermal tissue heating in small (1cm2) areas of any part of the body (including brain, skin, eyes) (paragraphs 127-128) to assist industry.

I strongly disagree with new rules that continue to deny non-thermal effects, average power measurements instead of limiting peak power which cause effects. The FCC has continues to erroneously focus on power and heating versus pulsation and modulation which are the determining factors of biological effects.

I am requesting the FCC request the FDA to establish biologically-based population-protective limits for all electronic product radiation, as they are statutorily required to do (http://www.electricalpollution.com/documents/PressReleaseFDANegligence12Feb2020.pdf). The FCC has readily acknowledged that they lack the expertise to set safety limits themselves so they should be asking the FDA to do so. Specifically, any limits should be readily measurable on location, necessitating the use of maximum permissible exposure (MPE) field strength and power density. Although, thermal effects must be a backstop (just like immediate toxicity for chemicals) and NO MPE should be allowed whose corresponding SAR would result in thermal harm, long-term biological effects of chronic exposure should guide the formation of population-protective RF/MW safety limits. This is what the BioInitiative Recommendations are based on. The FCC and FDA should adopt the latest BioInitiative recommendations in the interim as they begin to set up their own continuous review program to revise those recommendations as additional studies show that reductions and refinements are needed. Limits for higher frequencies should be established using available literature and FDA should commission additional studies to further determine safety limits that prevent adverse biological effects using techniques like the one recommended by Dr. Martin Pall to test for inappropriate voltage-gated ion channel activation https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25879308. Addressing paragraph 120, peak exposure levels should used to determine compliance, not averages, because peak measurements are more predictive of adverse biological effects.

We are being driven from home due to the saturation of 5G in our neighborhood and our suffering daily from interrupted sleep, fatigue, brain fog and body aches. We are concerned the long term effect maybe cancer and death. It is time the telecomm companies stop acting like big tobacco and quit denying their products are safe and it is long past due that the FCC begin to act like a regulator and not tool for Telecomm companies. And finally it is wrong of the FCC to limit comment on these proposed rules while the country is fighting a pandemic, peoples ability to comment on the rules is severely limited due to pandemic constraints.