

July 8, 2024

TO: House Energy & Committee

FROM: Environmental Health Trust
Theodora Scarato
Theodora.Scarato@ehtrust.org

RE: Submission for the hearing to be held July 9:
“Fiscal Year 2025 Federal Communications Commission Budget.”

Submitted via email to clerk of the committee: Noah.Jackson@mail.house.gov

Dear Chairs McMorris Rogers and Latta, Ranking Members Pallone and Matsui, and Members of the Committee,

We write to you in advance of your hearing tomorrow, “Fiscal Year 2025 Federal Communications Commission Budget.”¹

We thank the Committee for considering our comments on FCC oversight. Environmental Health Trust (EHT) is a not-for-profit scientific think tank that promotes a healthier environment through research, education and policy. In 2021, the U.S. Court of Appeals issued a favorable ruling in our lawsuit against the FCC regarding its refusal to update its 1996 regulations for wireless radiofrequency (RF) radiation. The FCC has not responded to the court order mandating that the FCC provide a reasoned explanation as to how its RF regulations are sufficiently protective of children's vulnerability, long term exposures, wildlife and the environment.

We ask that Committee members consider asking FCC Chair Rosenworcel the following questions during the hearing:

1. What is the status of FCC complying with a court order issued by the US Court of Appeals DC Circuit in 2021² to provide a reasoned explanation for retaining its 1996 limits for human exposure to radiofrequency (cell tower radiation)?
 1. What steps has the FCC taken to comply with the court order? (See below for description of the court order, which found that the FCC had ignored record evidence and failed to comply with its statutory obligations issued by Congress)

1

<https://energycommerce.house.gov/events/communications-and-technology-subcommittee-hearing-the-fiscal-year-2025-federal-communications-commission-agency-budget>

2

[https://www.cadc.uscourts.gov/internet/opinions.nsf/FB976465BF00F8BD85258730004EFDF7/\\$file/20-1025-1910111.pdf](https://www.cadc.uscourts.gov/internet/opinions.nsf/FB976465BF00F8BD85258730004EFDF7/$file/20-1025-1910111.pdf)

2. What dollar amount in the FCC's budget request is allocated for complying with the DC Circuit order?
 3. When does the FCC expect to comply with and satisfy the requirements contained in the court's mandate?
 4. How can the FCC greenlight wireless proliferation without ensuring its exposure guidelines and regulations for wireless radiation are adequately protective?
2. Will the FCC begin a rulemaking based on [the latest science](#)³ to update its human radiofrequency exposure guidelines? Ensuring an up to date review and rulemaking would help reassure the public that the technology the FCC is rolling out (by expanding its power of preemption over local zoning authority) is safe for children, families, wildlife and the environment? Current wireless exposure guidelines are largely based on the results of a few studies performed over 40 years ago of just 11 monkeys and 12 rats, which were exposed for less than one hour⁴ GAO first recommended that the FCC revisit these limits back in 2012 and the FCC has not yet done so. (see [Attachments 1 and 2](#) below.)
3. Additional important questions to ask the FCC
1. Why is there no measuring and monitoring of ambient cell tower RF levels nationwide? Many other countries have [robust publicly posted cell tower radiation measurement](#) data⁵ but the US has no RF measurement program, nor any public information on ambient levels.⁶
 2. Given that the FCC does not have wildlife expertise in-house, will it request agencies with expertise such as the Environmental Protection Agency and Fish and Wildlife Service address the issue of wildlife exposure to RF, especially in light of published research indicating that insects, especially bees and other pollinators, are uniquely vulnerable to 5G's higher frequencies? If not, why not?
 3. As FCC RF limits were not designed to protect wildlife, how does it assure safety for animals in wilderness, forests, parks and ecologically sensitive areas?
 4. Telecommunications companies generally check for the RF compliance of their cellular towers/network antennas by measuring RF levels where people stand on the ground, but not up near the antennas where birds may perch or where tree limbs exist. Why isn't the FCC ensuring compliance for wildlife and wildlife habitat?
 5. Why is there no national database of all wireless facilities (including 4G and 5G "small cell" sites less than 200 feet in height) so that members of the public can be informed of the location of wireless antennas near their homes and their children's schools?

³ See FCC Docket 13-84 on human exposure to RF scientific submissions
[https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/search/search-filings/results?q=\(proceedings.name:\(%2213-84*%22\)\)](https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/search/search-filings/results?q=(proceedings.name:(%2213-84*%22)))

⁴ International Commission on the Biological Effects of Electromagnetic Fields (ICBE-EMF), (2022). [Scientific evidence invalidates health assumptions underlying the FCC and ICNIRP exposure limit determinations for radiofrequency radiation: implications for 5G](#). Environ Health. Oct 18;21(1):92.
<https://ehjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12940-022-00900-9>

⁵ Countries with RF limits more stringent than the USA and strict oversight programs
<https://ehtrust.org/u-s-government-regulations-on-cell-tower-radiation/>

⁶ Decades ago, the US EPA and FCC measured RF levels in various cities across the country. However the last report on such measurements was issued [by the EPA in 1986](#) in a report entitled "Radiofrequency Radiation Environment Environmental Exposure Levels And RF Radiation Emitting

Sources" <http://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPURL.cgi?Dockey=2000ECTO.txt>

Background on *Environmental Health Trust et al v. FCC (2021)*, U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals DC Circuit Judgment

In 2020, EHT and several other petitioners sued the FCC for its 2019 decision to retain its 1996 limits for human exposure to wireless radiation. The FCC's limits have remained almost entirely unchanged since 1996 and are designed only to protect against heating effects of short term exposures, not the biological impacts from long term exposure.⁷

In 2021, the U.S. Appeals Court, DC Circuit ruled in our case and found⁸ that the FCC had failed to take into account 11,000 pages of scientific evidence showing impacts of RF radiation on children, wildlife and the environment. In addition, the Court found that the FCC had not shown consideration of record evidence related to long-term impacts nor the ubiquity of wireless devices and other major technological changes since the 1996 guidelines (in use today) were first promulgated. In its 2021 order, the Court mandated the FCC explain how its limits were adequate in regards to the issues it had ignored stating the FCC must:

- “(i) provide a reasoned explanation for its decision to retain its testing procedures for determining whether cell phones and other portable electronic devices comply with its guidelines,
- (ii) address the impacts of RF radiation on children, the health implications of long-term exposure to RF radiation, the ubiquity of wireless devices, and other technological developments that have occurred since the Commission last updated its guidelines, and
- (iii) address the impacts of RF radiation on the environment.”

However, as of today, the FCC has not responded to the federal Court remand. Thus, the FCC's 1996 limits cannot be said to rest on an up to date scientific review.

⁷ Lin, J. C. (2023). Incongruities in recently revised radiofrequency exposure guidelines and standards. *Environmental Research*, 222, 115369; International Commission on the Biological Effects of Electromagnetic Fields (ICBE-EMF), (2022). Scientific evidence invalidates health assumptions underlying the FCC and ICNIRP exposure limit determinations for radiofrequency radiation: implications for 5G. *Environ Health*. Oct 18;21(1):92; Lopez I, Rivera M, Feliz N, Maestu C. (2022) It is mandatory to review environmental radiofrequency electromagnetic field measurement protocols and exposure regulations: An opinion article. *Front. Public Health*, 24 October; Davis, D., Birnbaum, L., Ben-Ishai, P., Taylor, H., Sears, M., Butler, T., & Scarato, T. (2023). Wireless technologies, non-ionizing electromagnetic fields and children: Identifying and reducing health risks. *Current Problems in Pediatric and Adolescent Health Care*, 53(2), 101374.

⁸ Final Court Decision EHT et. al v the FCC 8/13/2021

[https://www.cadc.uscourts.gov/internet/opinions.nsf/FB976465BF00F8BD85258730004EFDF7/\\$file/20-1025-1910111.pdf](https://www.cadc.uscourts.gov/internet/opinions.nsf/FB976465BF00F8BD85258730004EFDF7/$file/20-1025-1910111.pdf)

An ever growing body of scientific evidence documents adverse effects from RF radiation at exposure levels well below FCC limits⁹ with research findings that include [cancer](#), the induction of [oxidative stress](#), [epigenetic effects](#), impacts to [neurotransmitters](#), [memory](#), [brain development](#) and damage to the [immune](#), [endocrine](#), [hematological](#) and [reproductive system](#). Further, studies have found impacts to [tree canopy](#), [plant growth](#), [pollinator health](#) and the [orientation, migration and breeding of wildlife](#).¹⁰ The science clearly indicates that wireless networks create harmful interference in humans as well as flora and fauna.

Further, as documented in [Attachment 2 on Regulatory Gaps](#), there are no federal agencies with health and science expertise engaged in activities related to reviewing the science on health effects of rising environmental RF levels from network infrastructure. Other countries have long been objectively studying these health effects and some have accordingly reduced RF exposure limits, often by 90%, while also deploying telecommunications networks and devices.¹¹

Finally, with respect to the draft appropriations bill being considered at today's hearing,¹² we draw your attention to section 524, which would prohibit the FCC from using funds implementing its "net neutrality" rule. While we take no position on net neutrality *per se*, the FCC declared that it will use net neutrality, and its reclassification of wireless data service as a telecommunications service, to preempt local zoning authority over the deployment of wireless facilities. The FCC is expanding federal preemption to proliferate wireless facilities despite not having completed a rulemaking to update its human exposure guidelines for radiofrequency radiation — in other words, it has not ensured the safety of radiofrequency exposure that will result from these facilities. As a number of commenters during the rulemaking pointed out, the FCC could have written its net neutrality order to achieve its net neutrality policy goals while preserving local zoning authority over wireless facilities.¹³

⁹ Belpomme, D., Hardell, L., Belyaev, I., Burgio, E., & Carpenter, D. O. (2018). [Thermal and non-thermal health effects of low intensity non-ionizing radiation: An international perspective](#). *Environmental Pollution*, 242, 643–658; McCredden, J. E., Cook, N., Weller, S., & Leach, V. (2022). [Wireless technology is an environmental stressor requiring new understanding and approaches in health care](#). *Frontiers in Public Health*, 10; Miller, A. B., Morgan, L. L., Udasin, I., & Davis, D. L. (2018). [Cancer epidemiology update, following the 2011 IARC evaluation of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields \(Monograph 102\)](#). *Environmental Research*, 167, 673–683.

¹⁰ Levitt, B. B., Lai, H. C., & Manville, A. M. (2022b). [Effects of non-ionizing electromagnetic fields on flora and fauna. Part 2 impacts: How species interact with natural and man-made EMF](#). *Reviews on Environmental Health*, 37(3), 327–406; Thill A, Cammaerts MC, Balmori A. [Biological effects of electromagnetic fields on insects: a systematic review and meta-analysis](#). *Rev Environ Health*. 2023 Nov 23

¹¹ *Spectrum Management & Human RF Exposure – 2023 Recap*, National Spectrum Management Association(NSMA) 38th Annual Conference, National Press Club, Washington, DC, [NSMA Presentations 2023 - National Spectrum Management Association : National Spectrum Management Association](#)

¹²

<https://docs.house.gov/meetings/AP/AP23/20240605/117405/BILLS-118-SC-AP-FY2025-FServices-FY25FSGGSubcommitteeMark.pdf>

¹³ In its [final rule](#), the FCC readily acknowledged and defended expanded wireless preemption (for example see paragraphs 74, 76). NATOA [filed comments](#) supporting net neutrality but opposing local preemption over wireless facilities, and urging the FCC to avoid expanded preemption, writing: "NATOA urges the Commission to forbear the application of Sections 253 and 332(c)". National League of Cities [filed comments](#) opposing local preemption and urging forbearance. BB&K [filed comments](#) in the docket on behalf of a local governments coalition, opposing local preemption. (BB&K has acted as counsel over the years to a number of coalitions of local governments bringing judicial

How can the FCC allow such wireless proliferation without ensuring its exposure guidelines and regulations for radiofrequency radiation are adequately protective?

See attachments for details on each topic below.

[ATTACHMENT 1: EHT Recommendations on spectrum policy](#)

[ATTACHMENT 2: Today's Regulatory Gap Regarding Radiofrequency Bioeffects](#)

[ATTACHMENT 3: Radio-frequency Radiation Impacts on the Environment](#)

[ATTACHMENT 4: Radio-frequency Radiation Impacts on Human Health](#)

[ATTACHMENT 5: Legal and Liability Issues of Wireless](#)

[ATTACHMENT 6: Expert Recommendations on Technology Safety](#)

[ATTACHMENT 7: Factsheet on Environmental Impacts of Satellite Proliferation](#)

We are happy to provide the Committee with more information and resources.

Sincerely,

Theodora Scarato
Environmental Health Trust
Theodora.Scarato@ehtrust.org

Rola Masri
Director of Government Outreach
Environmental Health Trust
RolaMasri@EHTrust.org

cc: Kent Chamberlin, President, EHT

challenges to FCC preemption.) Wired Broadband et al. [filed comments](#) and [reply comments](#), also urging the same forbearance.

ATTACHMENT 1: EHT Recommendations on Spectrum Policy

We urge Congress to alter its approach to spectrum management:

- to ensure long-term global leadership in multiple objectively measurable categories;
- to transform the wireless industry to compete on safety, much as the auto industry did starting in the 1970s;
- to oppose S.3909, S.4010, and HR 3565; and
- **not** to make more spectrum available for commercial use until it has addressed the issues that we raise in this letter.

Increased commercial utilization of spectrum would result in a massive proliferation of additional antennas across the country and increase the density of radiofrequency radiation in the environment without objectively understanding the costs. The types of layered, and/or shared spectrum use described at the March 21, 2024 Senate Commerce Committee hearing will result in increased radiofrequency densification. People and the environment would inevitably be exposed to much higher levels of radiation across the country. In addition, the antennas triggered by the availability of additional spectrum can be largely rolled out across the country while preempting local zoning authority, under what is known as “Section 6409” preemption.¹⁴ A number of municipal organizations have opposed preemption of local authority over the placement of wireless facilities.¹⁵

EHT shares the goal of ensuring that the future of technology in the US is as robust, efficient, and sustainable as possible. We submit that responsible spectrum management considers not only the impact of spectrum decisions on networks and devices but also on the environment and all life forms, including humans, animals, plants, and microbes.

With that in mind we have prepared the following recommendations on spectrum policy. In this document, “**spectrum utilization decisions**” refers to any action by Congress to allocate, reallocate, or alter the utilization of spectrum, whether for non-federal use, shared commercial/federal use, or federal use.

¹⁴ Previous C-band spectrum allocated to commercial use has triggered a wave of antenna deployments across the country. 47 USC §1455 is known as “Section 6409” of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012.

¹⁵ National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors (NATOA), together with the National League of Cities, National Association of Counties and US Conference of Mayors, recently wrote that “we oppose heavy-handed federal overreach into local land use, permitting, and franchise negotiation decisions.”

https://assets.noviams.com/novi-file-uploads/natoa/HR3557_Local_Government_Letter_20230928.pdf

Recommendation #1: Congress should not make any spectrum utilization decisions that increase RF exposure until the FCC complies with the U.S. Court of Appeals DC Circuit *remand* mandate issued in August 2021 in *EHT et al. v. FCC*, to address record evidence including long term health effects, children's vulnerability and environmental impacts of RF exposure.

Neither FCC, nor the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), have yet to address their responsibilities to ensure public health and environmental protection. The FCC has not responded to the August 13, 2021, U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit *ORDER* in [Environmental Health Trust et al. v. FCC, 2021](#) wherein the court ordered the FCC to “address the impacts of RF radiation on children, the health implications of long-term exposure to RF radiation, the ubiquity of wireless devices, and other technological developments that have occurred since the Commission last updated its guidelines, and...the impacts of RF radiation on the environment.” The Court also ordered the FCC to “provide a reasoned explanation for its decision to retain its testing procedures for determining whether cell phones and other portable electronic devices comply with its guidelines.”

No federal agency with health or science expertise has evaluated the comprehensive body of scientific research on the human health and environmental impacts of wireless radiation. As stated by the EPA, FDA, and Department of Interior, current FCC guidelines address heating effects of short term exposures only¹⁶ (see [Attachment 2](#) for more details). Current FCC human exposure guidelines are unchanged since 1996 and were based on now antiquated limits developed by [ANSI/IEEE C95.1-1992](#) and [NCRP's 1986 Report](#). These limits identified the level of adverse effects [based on studies](#) which exposed a few monkeys and rats to RF radiation for less than one hour, more than 40 years ago. They do not consider the biological effects of non-thermal or long-term low-level exposures of radiofrequency radiation documented in the scientific literature.¹⁷ Current guidelines also do not consider the documented effects of modulations and pulsation on living cells. As the DC Circuit recognized, these antiquated studies are a far cry from properly assessing the health and

¹⁶ Guidelines of the FCC, ICNIRP and IEEE are based on protection for short term heating, not for long term exposures. In 1999, the FDA stated in its [Nomination](#) to the National Toxicology Program to study wireless radiation that, “As noted above, the existing exposure guidelines are based entirely on protection from acute injury from thermal effects of RF exposure, and may not be protective against any non-thermal effects of chronic exposures.” FDA Nomination from FDA’s Center for Device and Radiological Health Radio Frequency Radiation Emissions of Wireless Communication Devices (CDRH) May 19, 1999

https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/sites/default/files/ntp/htdocs/chem_background/exsumpdf/wireless051999_508.pdf; EPA’s Norbert Hankin [clarified that the FCC’s 1996 RF limits do not protect against all effects](#) stating that, “federal health and safety agencies have not yet developed policies concerning possible risk from long-term, nonthermal exposures” in a 2002 letter <https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/4c0f61dc30c3d6bb27d90f53a57c616e.pdf> [George Brozowski Regional Health Physicist of the EPA’s 2014](#) letter stated, “The standards are intended to prevent adverse health effects that may be associated with tissue heating, but are not intended to address low intensity (nonthermal), longterm (chronic) exposures. Investigation as to whether there may be effects from exposures too low to cause heating is continuing.” The [US Department of the Interior](#) stated in a 2014 letter to the NTIA that, “the electromagnetic radiation standards used by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) continue to be based on thermal heating, a criterion now nearly 30 years out of date and inapplicable today.”

¹⁷ International Commission on the Biological Effects of Electromagnetic Fields (ICBE-EMF), (2022). [Scientific evidence invalidates health assumptions underlying the FCC and ICNIRP exposure limit determinations for radiofrequency radiation: implications for 5G](#). Environ Health. Oct 18;21(1):92.

environmental impacts of modern technology and ubiquitous wireless devices.

Recommendation #2: Congress should require prior to any spectrum utilization decisions that will transform the industry to compete on safety, and thus increase human and environmental RF exposure, including and not limited to: (i) best-practice premarket testing for long term safety, (ii) that devices and networks pass such safety testing, and (iii) quarterly post-market health and environmental surveillance along with monitoring and compliance oversight. Congress should require that federal agency spectrum utilization decisions be treated as a major federal action requiring an environmental impact statement under NEPA.

NEPA Section 106 states: “An agency shall issue an environmental impact statement with respect to a proposed agency action requiring an environmental document that has a reasonably foreseeable significant effect on the quality of the human environment.”¹⁸

The attachments below document the significant body of scientific evidence indicating adverse effects to humans and the environment from radiofrequency exposure resulting from spectrum allocation. As set out below, the FCC has consistently abrogated its responsibilities under NEPA.

Further, because of their unique effects, each frequency and modulation should be studied pre and post market for impacts on the environment and human health, before deployment. We recommend quantitative and qualitative risk assessments, including individual and cumulative effects, of spectrum utilization decisions. Such assessments should determine, not only the effects of the frequencies at different power levels but also the effects of the polarized wave forms when they are modulated, pulsed, and otherwise altered to fit the technological needs of non-federal entities.¹⁹ Premarket safety testing of long term exposure to altered frequencies on living things are essential to ensure technology is safe for people and the natural environment.

RF exposures should be monitored nationwide to understand current exposure levels as well as trends over time. A transparent, robust federal RF compliance program is needed to ensure that industry compliance testing is done correctly and that emissions are compliant. The public needs an oversight and enforcement program to investigate, and promptly address non-compliance with fines and mitigation.

¹⁸ 42 USC 4336

<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title42-section4336&num=0&edition=prelim>

¹⁹ Barnes, F., & Freeman, J. E. R. (2022). [Some thoughts on the possible health effects of electric and magnetic fields and exposure guidelines](#). *Frontiers in Public Health*, 10; Belyaev, I. (2010). [Dependence of non-thermal biological effects of microwaves on physical and biological variables: Implications for reproducibility and safety standards](#). *European Journal of Oncology Library*, 5, 187–218; Belyaev, I. Y., & Grigoriev, Y. G. (2007). [Problems in assessment of risks from exposures to microwaves of mobile communication](#). *Radiationnaia Biologiia, Radioecologia*, 47(6), 727–732; Panagopoulos, D. J., Johansson, O., & Carlo, G. L. (2015). [Real versus Simulated Mobile Phone Exposures in Experimental Studies](#). *BioMed Research International*, 2015, 607053; Panagopoulos, D. J., Johansson, O., & Carlo, G. L. (2015). [Polarization: A Key Difference between Man-made and Natural Electromagnetic Fields, in regard to Biological Activity](#). *Scientific Reports*, 5, 14914.; Lai, H., & Levitt, B. B. (2022). [The roles of intensity, exposure duration, and modulation on the biological effects of radiofrequency radiation and exposure guidelines](#). *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine*, 41(2), 230–255; Panagopoulos, D. J. (Ed.). (2022). [Electromagnetic Fields of Wireless Communications: Biological and Health Effects](#) (1st ed.). CRC Press.; Panagopoulos, D. J., Karabarbounis, A., Yakymenko, I., & Chrousos, G. P. (2021). [Human-made electromagnetic fields: Ion forced-oscillation and voltage-gated ion channel dysfunction, oxidative stress and DNA damage \(Review\)](#). *International Journal of Oncology*, 59(5), 92.

Current industry-generated or commissioned pre-construction reports and post-construction testing are largely inadequate, if not inaccurate, in large part because the modeling protocols and programs have not been validated for real world accuracy. There are no up-to-date, minimum standards for preparing RF compliance reports, studies and evaluations nor quality control.

As of March 2024, FCC has not issued updated guidance on how to comply with RF rules, which includes newly licensed frequencies and services, since 1997. The existing guidance, *Evaluating Compliance with FCC Guidelines for Human Exposure to Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields (FCC OET 65 (1997))*,²⁰ which provides assistance in determining whether proposed or existing transmitting facilities, operations or devices comply with limits for human exposure to radiofrequency (RF) under FCC rules, is outdated. Independent inspectors, informed by up-to-date guidance, should be required to carry out on-the-ground measurements post antenna deployments to verify compliance with human exposure limits.

Field compliance reports taking actual measurements can reach different conclusions depending on, for example, the number of measurements, location of measurements in relation to the antennas and the length of measurement in each location. Furthermore, reports are inconsistent regarding the inclusion of peak measurements versus averaged measurements, and the inclusion of actual values versus percentage of FCC limits.

Federal agencies with health and safety expertise should conduct ongoing research reviews, hazard evaluations, and quantitative risk assessments to ensure FCC limits are adequately protective. However, none of these needed regulatory safeguards are in place at this time.

Recommendation #3: United States Spectrum Policy should encourage wireless networks and devices to compete on safety, and thus ensure the public and environment is protected from harmful radio frequency interference. One example is the automobile industry which last century initially resisted competing on safety, and then embraced it and now regularly touts products that achieve high National Highway Traffic Safety Administration scores. See generally, [NHTSA | National Highway Traffic Safety Administration](#)

The Communications Act of 1934 created the FCC “for the purpose of promoting safety of life and property.”²¹

Similarly, NTIA shall, under its authorizing statute (47 USC 901(c)²²) seek policies:

- a) promoting the benefits of technological development for **all users** in the United States;
- b) fostering **national safety**;
- c) fostering the use of telecommunications resources in a manner that benefits **the public interest**;

²⁰ https://transition.fcc.gov/Bureaus/Engineering_Technology/Documents/bulletins/oet65/oet65.pdf

²¹ Section 1 (47 USC 151)

<https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/COMPS-936/pdf/COMPS-936.pdf>

²² 47 USC 901

<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?path=/prelim@title47/chapter8&edition=prelim>

Federal spectrum policy should seek to bolster coexistence not only among different spectrum users, devices, and networks, but also between technology on the one hand and all life forms on the other hand, including humans, plants, animals, and microbes. Spectrum research should include how different spectrum management techniques, and different wavelengths, (for example, pulsed, modulated, sawtooth, and other waveforms, as well as multiplexing technologies) differentially affect different lifeforms. And federal spectrum activities should include education for the public and state and local decision-makers on the impacts of RF exposure on humans, especially children, and ways to mitigate these impacts.²³ Electromagnetic related disability is recognized by the US government and multiple other entities.²⁴ In addition, certain segments of the population are more vulnerable to radiofrequency impacts, including children.²⁵

Many countries lack the environmental standards that we have in the United States, Europe, and other developed countries. It may be cheaper to operate a factory in a country where the factory can dump chemicals into a river without being subject to government limits. However, that is not the approach we have in the US. A recurring topic at the March 21 hearing focused on whether other countries are more aggressively making spectrum available for commercial use. However, because other countries are more aggressively irradiating their own population and environment, does not mean that the United States needs to follow suit. Neither Congress nor any government agency has considered or attempted to quantify the cost to the economy in terms of morbidity, mortality, and disability resulting from the range of health conditions linked to radiofrequency exposure. The United States is already having trouble meeting its recruiting targets for the armed services.²⁶ The national security impacts of spectrum policy should include assessing the impact of such decisions on force readiness and recruitment targets.

As an example, the United States required safety features in vehicles, such as seatbelts, headrests, anti-lock brakes, and airbags, years before other countries did so. Over time, automakers have come to compete on safety features. In transportation policy, we have long recognized that vehicles emit PM2.5 particulate matter. Transportation policymakers need to consider the impact of their decisions not only on travel times and road capacity, but also on the PM2.5 emissions (and the health and environmental impacts thereof) that result from different policy decisions.

²³ Davis, D., Birnbaum, L., Ben-Ishai, P., Taylor, H., Sears, M., Butler, T., & Scarato, T. (2023). [Wireless technologies, non-ionizing electromagnetic fields and children: Identifying and reducing health risks](#). *Current Problems in Pediatric and Adolescent Health Care*, 53(2), 101374; Clegg, F. M., Sears, M., Friesen, M., Scarato, T., Metzinger, R., Russell, C., Stadtner, A., & Miller, A. B. (2020). [Building science and radiofrequency radiation: What makes smart and healthy buildings](#). *Building and Environment*, 176, 106324.

²⁴ <https://ehtrust.org/resources-on-electromagnetic-sensitivity-and-accommodations/>

²⁵ Davis, D., Birnbaum, L., Ben-Ishai, P., Taylor, H., Sears, M., Butler, T., & Scarato, T. (2023). [Wireless technologies, non-ionizing electromagnetic fields and children: Identifying and reducing health risks](#). *Current Problems in Pediatric and Adolescent Health Care*, 53(2), 101374; Miller, A. B., Sears, M. E., Morgan, L. L., Davis, D. L., Hardell, L., Oremus, M., & Soskolne, C. L. (2019). [Risks to Health and Well-Being From Radio-Frequency Radiation Emitted by Cell Phones and Other Wireless Devices](#). *Frontiers in Public Health*, 7; Redmayne, M., & Johansson, O. (2015). [Radiofrequency exposure in young and old: Different sensitivities in light of age-relevant natural differences](#). *Reviews on Environmental Health*, 30(4), 323–335; Sage, C., & Burgio, E. (2018). [Electromagnetic Fields, Pulsed Radiofrequency Radiation, and Epigenetics: How Wireless Technologies May Affect Childhood Development](#). *Child Development*, 89(1), 129–136; McCredden, J. E., Cook, N., Weller, S., & Leach, V. (2022). [Wireless technology is an environmental stressor requiring new understanding and approaches in health care](#). *Frontiers in Public Health*, 10.

²⁶ “The all-volunteer force is dying. Here’s how to save it” By Mark Esper, former Secretary of Defense. Washington Post, 9/21/23.

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2023/09/21/military-all-volunteer-force-mark-esper/>

We ask Congress to consider how it can encourage the wireless industry to compete on safety. For example, Wi-Fi routers do not need to output the same amount of power while users are sleeping, as during heavy usage. Reducing such unnecessary emissions is good for public safety and energy conservation.

Recommendation #4: Spectrum should be allocated in accordance with the entire public interest, not just certain narrow corporate or agency priorities.

As spectrum is a finite resource with risks to health and the environment that carry significant negative externalities, it is essential to make spectrum recommendations in accordance with the public interest. Based on past history, for example with C-band deployment, when spectrum is reallocated from federal users to commercial users, the density of antennas and of aggregate radiofrequency emissions throughout the United States is dramatically increased.²⁷ At the same time, these reallocations may incur substantial cost to these federal users, and therefore ultimately to taxpayers and the public at large.

It may be that the optimal economic outcome for the United States is for federal users to retain spectrum, while commercial users increasingly rely on wired, fiber-optic broadband. For example, the Congressional Research Service reported earlier this year that for the Department of Defense to relinquish just 350 MHz of additional C-band would take 20 years and cost “hundreds of billions of dollars”²⁸ – which is approximately \$1 billion of cost to federal users to relinquish 1 MHz of spectrum. S.3909 proposes to reallocate 2500 MHz. Assuming a similar level of \$1 billion of cost to relinquish 1 MHz, reallocating that amount of spectrum could incur nearly \$2.5 trillion of taxpayer costs – without taking into account the negative externalities incurred by commercial users. Congress should consider whether this is an efficient allocation of resources in our economy. In addition, the BEAD deployment will be complete long before spectrum is reallocated from federal users. As a result, all or nearly all Americans by that point will have access to high-speed fiber connectivity at home, work, school, community centers, and other locations – which is and will be significantly faster than that which is provided over wireless

Fiber broadband surpasses wireless data in performance, speeds, reliability, latency, cybersecurity, privacy, scalability and has less impact on health and the environment. It would be a disservice to the American people for the government to continue to release frequencies to serve wireless broadband that is no longer viable for current and future needs.

The poor performance metrics of wireless broadband costs our states billions of dollars when residents and businesses are held up by unreliable service, low speeds, and issues with cybersecurity²⁹ and privacy. While wireless upload speeds unreliably peak at 50Mbps, fiber upload and download speeds start at 1000 Mbps and have the capacity to upgrade into Terabyte speeds. Wireless infrastructure fails during inclement weather or when the path of the signal is obstructed. Allowing more wireless broadband investments will perpetuate the

²⁷ Under “Section 6409” (47 USC 1455(a)), existing wireless facilities can be expanded with almost unlimited additional antennas. After C-band became available, a wave antenna deployments occurred under 6409, while claiming preemption over state and local government.

[https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=\(title:47%20section:1455%20edition:prelim\)](https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=(title:47%20section:1455%20edition:prelim))

²⁸ <https://sgp.fas.org/crs/misc/IF12351.pdf>

²⁹ <https://www.sdxcentral.com/articles/news/att-sounds-alarm-on-5g-security/2019/11/>

digital divide, as bandwidth and latency demands increase.³⁰

Wireless broadband presents a major cybersecurity risk. Individuals, institutions and businesses have suffered great losses as wireless signals are easily accessible to hackers. Fiber and current cable infrastructure can reliably offer superior service without these challenges.

Wireless broadband is also an energy guzzler. 5G base stations are expected to consume roughly 3 times the power of 4G base stations and more 5G base stations are required to cover the same area.³¹ Energy consumption is expected to increase by 61 times from 2020 to 2030 with 5G.³² One study done by the Federal Environment Ministry of Germany and the German Environment Agency found that video transmission through fiber optics is nearly 50 times more energy efficient than wireless.³³ Research on whole network level assessments of the operational energy use implications of 5G warns that “Energy-intensive user practices contribute to ever-growing levels of data traffic, and counteract³⁴ the energy-saving potential of 5G efficiency improvements.”³⁵

In addition, technologies that are fixed in place like smart meters need not communicate wirelessly when they can be better served with a wired connection. We urge Congress not to allow spectrum allocations for stationary technologies, including fixed wireless and satellite, that can be served with wired connections.

As BEAD funding grants accelerate the build out of fiber networks, wireless broadband will be less needed. We urge Congress to consider performance, speeds, reliability, latency, cybersecurity, privacy, scalability and impacts on health and the environment when making spectrum recommendations, especially when another technology is capable of better meeting the needs.

Recommendation #5: Broaden the range of stakeholders from whom it solicits input on spectrum policy to include public health, environmental health, and disability advocacy organizations, as well as the residential and commercial real estate industry, as RF Exposure measurements can impact real estate values and liabilities.³⁶

Broadening the definition of stakeholders to include a wider range of groups including public health, environmental health organizations such as Environmental Health Trust, disability advocacy, as well as community groups and organizations. More outreach needs to be done with the American public so they understand this issue and can participate in the process.

³⁰ 5G DEPLOYMENT: FCC Needs Comprehensive Strategic Planning to Guide Its Efforts, GAO, June 2020
<https://www.gao.gov/assets/gao-20-468.pdf>

³¹ <https://spectrum.ieee.org/5gs-waveform-is-a-battery-vampire>

³² https://www.datacenter-forum.com/datacenter-forum/5g-will-prompt-energy-consumption-to-grow-by-staggering-160-in-10-years?fbclid=IwAR0zO_dGvwT_phdacXuhOkllYOm_p0u95nJAac1toWs4zGUNJnotrvRki7l

³³ <https://www.umweltbundesamt.de/en/press/pressinformation/video-streaming-data-transmission-technology>

³⁴ https://www.etsi.org/images/files/ETSIWhitePapers/WP_47_GFDI.pdf

³⁵ Williams, Laurence and Sovacool, Benjamin K. and Foxon, Timothy J., The energy use implications of 5G: Reviewing whole network operational energy, embodied energy, and indirect effects (January 13, 2022). *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 157 (2022) 112033, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4008530>

³⁶ Affuso, E., Reid Cummings, J. & Le, H. Wireless Towers and Home Values: An Alternative Valuation Approach Using a Spatial Econometric Analysis. *J Real Estate Finan Econ* 56, 653–676 (2018).
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11146-017-9600-9>

ATTACHMENT 2: Today's Regulatory Gap Regarding Radiofrequency Bioeffects

Although the public and elected officials assume that federal agencies are engaged in radiofrequency oversight activities to ensure public health and environmental protection, this is inaccurate. FCC RF exposure limits are guidelines only, not federally developed safety standards.³⁷ Such standards are typically promulgated by agencies reviewing the totality of scientific evidence, performing risk analysis, and identifying the levels at which various adverse effects occur, as a basis for toxicant exposure limit that ensures adequate public protection. A review of federal agency involvement indicates scant research and oversight activities along with serious regulatory gaps including but not limited to:

Issues related to the FCC's 1996 human exposure guidelines :

- RF guidelines were designed for humans, not animals or plants, and only for effects of high intensity short term acute exposures. The limits were not designed to protect against effects of long term exposure.
- There is no periodic or ongoing, transparent evaluation of current scientific research to ensure FCC limits are adequate (no hazard evaluation, quantitative risk assessment of the totality of science, including impacts to brain development, reproduction or immune system) by any federal agency with health and safety expertise.

Issues related to agency authority.

- There is no agency with authority regarding impacts of ambient environmental exposures from the RF emissions of cell towers and base station antennas (including 4G, 5G) which is engaged in any scientific activities. In the case of cell phones, FDA has shared authority with FCC, although FDA has shown only limited activity.
- There is no agency with authority nor activities related to impacts of RF exposures to wildlife, animals and the natural environment (plants and trees.)

Issues related to bioeffects research and safety testing.

- There is no regulatory process for premarket safety testing (as currently done with drugs) to ensure new wireless communication frequencies, antenna systems and technologies are safe.
- There is no federal research program on biological impacts, except for a small animal study by the National Toxicology Program.³⁸

³⁷ The [FCC Website Policy on Human Exposure to Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields states](#), "At the present time there is no federally-mandated radio frequency (RF) exposure standard.<https://www.fcc.gov/general/fcc-policy-human-exposure>

³⁸ NTP announced in January 2024 that "No additional RFR studies are planned."

- There is no agency carrying out pre-or post-market research activities related to evaluating the health and environmental impacts of new technologies (i.e, new modulations such as 5G, or higher frequencies to be used in future technologies and/or antenna systems such as beamforming etc.).
- There is no agency carrying out activities related to evaluating the health and environmental impacts of 5G modulations nor for new technologies (i.e, that will use higher frequencies as well as new beamforming antenna systems, modulations and pulsation).
- There is no agency with activities related to impacts of RF exposures to wildlife, animals and the natural environment (plants and trees.)

Issues related to cell tower oversight:

- Currently there is no federal registry for all wireless facility sites, cell towers, or small wireless facilities.
- The US has no measuring, monitoring or mapping of environmental RF levels.
- There is no federal oversight and enforcement program in place to ensure wireless facilities emissions are within FCC guidelines.
- There is no agency carrying out activities related to evaluating the health and environmental impacts of 5G modulations nor for new technologies (i.e, that will use higher frequencies as well as new beamforming antenna systems, modulations and pulsation).

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and RF Guideline Background

FCC RF exposure limits are guidelines only, as they are not federally developed safety standards³⁹ whereby agencies reviewed the totality of scientific evidence, performed risk analysis and identified a level of adverse effect to base a limit that would ensure adequate public protection. Such a process never happened.

The EPA was actively engaged in research to develop proper federal safety standards for RF that would protect humans from both thermal and non-thermal impacts, as it had been tasked to do by several federal agencies. However, just as the EPA was poised to release its RF limit recommendations in 1995⁴⁰ the EPA

<https://ehtrust.org/statement-by-devra-davis-phd-mph-on-the-u-s-government-national-toxicology-program-ceasing-research-on-cell-phone-radiation/>

³⁹ The [FCC Website Policy on Human Exposure to Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields](https://www.fcc.gov/general/fcc-policy-human-exposure) states, “At the present time there is no federally-mandated radio frequency (RF) exposure standard.” <https://www.fcc.gov/general/fcc-policy-human-exposure>

⁴⁰ In 1995 the EPA had briefed both the FCC and the National Telecommunications and Information Administration regarding its two Phases of activities related to the development of RF exposure safety standards. Phase 1 would address only short-term thermal impacts of RF radiation but “does not include modulation, chronic exposure or non thermal [heating] impacts.” Phase 2 would address modulated and nonthermal exposures and result in the final guidelines. See [Memorandum from Robert F. Cleveland, Office of Engineering and Technology to FCC Secretary, Ex Parte Presentation by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency \(March 22, 1995\)](#)

Three months later, EPA informed the FCC that its final RF guidelines “are essentially complete” and entering the review phase which would include a review by the Radiofrequency Interagency Work Group as well as stakeholders. [Letter from E. Ramona Trovata, EPA, Office of Radiation and Indoor Air, to Richard M. Smith, Chief, FCC, Office of Engineering and Technology \(June 19, 1995\)](#)

was defunded from all such activities. The FCC then promulgated limits based on recommendations developed by industry/military connected groups ([ANSI/IEEE C95.1-1992](#) and [NCRP's 1986 Report](#)). At that time, the EPA specifically recommended⁴¹ that an “updated, comprehensive review of the biological effects” be initiated as the IEEE and NCRP recommendations were based on pre-1986 studies.⁴²

Although the FCC’s [2013 inquiry stated](#), “Since the Commission is not a health and safety agency, we defer to other organizations and agencies with respect to interpreting the biological research necessary to determine what levels are safe,” there has been no updated federal review since 1996.

Yet, in 2019, when the Commission issued its decision not to update its exposure limits, it stated that it “took into account” views from other expert agencies and standard-setting organizations. The FCC interpreted the silence of federal agencies to mean agreement with the 1996 guidelines, stating in its [11/9/2020 brief](#) that, “no other agency advocated tightening the limits” and “the agency reasonably concluded that the weight of the scientific and health evidence, and particularly the judgment of federal agencies expert in health matters, demonstrated that no changes were warranted.” As mentioned earlier, the DC Circuit, in, *EHT et al. v. FCC*, rejected the FCC’s conclusion as “arbitrary and capricious” and in violation of the Administrative Procedures Act.

In July 8, 2020, Lee Ann B. Veal, Director of the EPA Radiation Protection Division Office of Radiation and Indoor Air wrote⁴³ Theodora Scarato, EHT Executive Director, that “EPA’s last review was in the 1984 document Biological Effects of Radiofrequency Radiation⁴⁴. The EPA does not currently have a funded mandate for radiofrequency matters.”

Federal agencies have not shown a review of the totality of the science (including impacts to the nervous, reproductive and immune systems of humans and animals) to issue such a “judgment.” The reality is that federal agencies are not engaged in researching and evaluating the numerous biological effects of RF to humans, flora and fauna. That is why federal agencies such as the EPA did not submit meaningful input to the FCC’s Inquiry. They have not been funded or directed to provide a determination or judgment.

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC)

The FCC has minimal to non-existent regulatory activities to ensure RF compliance for wireless networks. In several other countries, government agencies monitor RF levels regularly, review industry reports, measure a

⁴¹ [EPA Submission to ET Docket 93-62](#) "Guidelines for Evaluating the Environmental Effects of Radiofrequency Radiation state, “The FCC should consider requesting the NCRP to revise its 1986 report to provide an updated, comprehensive review of the biological effects on RF radiation and recommendations for exposure criteria.”

⁴² As the EPA stated to the FCC, “The 1992 ANSI/IEEE standard is based on literature published before 1986, except for a few papers on RF shock and burn. The cut-off date for the literature review supporting the NCRP recommendations is 1982.”

⁴³ Letter from Lee Ann B. Veal, Director of the Radiation Protection Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to Theodora Scarato, Executive Director, Environmental Health Trust, (July 8, 2020)<https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/EPA-Director-Letter-on-EMFs-to-Theodora-Scarato-July-8-2020.pdf>

⁴⁴ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1984 Report Biological Effects of Electromagnetic Radiation <https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPURL.cgi?Dockey=300065H1.TXT>

certain percentage of sites for compliance every year, penalize operators for non compliance, and transparently post RF levels for the public.⁴⁵ Not in the USA.

Environmental Health Trust gave a brief presentation on the policies of other countries at the [National Spectrum Managers Association 2023 Annual Spectrum Management Conference](#).⁴⁶

According to the FCC, “The FCC does not have a comprehensive, transmitter-specific database for all of the services it regulates. ... In some services, licenses are allowed to utilize additional transmitters or to increase power without notifying the FCC. Other services are licensed by geographic area, such that the FCC has no knowledge concerning the actual number or location of transmitters within that geographic area.”⁴⁷ With no comprehensive transmitter-specific database for all the services regulated by the FCC, and the ability for licenses to utilize additional transmitters and increase power without notifying the FCC, how are radiofrequency exposure levels monitored to remain within FCC guidelines?

Furthermore, according to the FCC, “The FCC does not have the resources or the personnel to routinely monitor the exposure levels at all of the thousands of transmitters that are subject to FCC jurisdiction. ... In addition, the FCC does not routinely perform RF exposure investigations unless there is a reasonable expectation that the FCC exposure limits may be exceeded.”⁴⁸ With no routine monitoring of RF exposure levels, people and the environment are at risk of exposures to RF levels that exceed current FCC guidelines.

The FCC is not ensuring that RF exposure levels are compliant as it has no monitoring or oversight program in place. The FCC has stated that, “There have been a few situations around the country where RF levels in publicly accessible areas have been found to be higher than those recommended in applicable safety standards.”⁴⁹ A 2014 investigation by the Wall Street Journal “[Cellphone Boom Spurs Antenna-Safety](#)

⁴⁵ Examples of governments with a national program to monitor environmental levels of radiofrequency and/or measure cell tower emissions for compliance with government exposure limits include: [France](#), [Australia](#), [Austria](#), [Brussels Belgium](#), [Switzerland](#), [India](#), [Israel](#), [United Kingdom](#), [Thailand](#), [Croatia](#), [Lithuania](#), [Spain](#), [Hungary](#), [Italy](#), [Netherlands](#), [Greece](#), [Turkey](#), [French Polynesia](#), [Senegal](#), [Monaco](#), [Bhutan](#), [Gibraltar](#), [Bulgaria](#), [Tunisia](#), [China](#), [Bahrain](#), [Norway](#), [Brazil](#), [Malta](#), [Ireland](#), [Romania](#) ([France even has 5G monitoring stations](#), Australia Telco posts RF info at [ACMA EME Checker](#) . Countries such France, Switzerland, Greece, and Belgium now have robust RF monitoring programs with RF measurements posted online in an easy to understand website that members of the general public can easily navigate, such as a map where you simply click on antenna/tower locations to see the latest measurements and how they compare to the country’s limits. Greece’s [National Observatory of Electromagnetic Fields](#) is operated by the Greek Atomic Energy Commission with 500 sensors since 2015. In India, telecommunications companies are to self-certify compliance at: 1. Launch, 2. With any modification/change and 3. On a biennial basis. In addition the country also states they audit 5% to 10% of sites annually on a random basis and all reports are posted on their EMF dedicated website.

<https://tarangsanchar.gov.in/EMFPortal/DoT> Penalties are Rs. 10 lakh per BTS per incidence. For the year 2022, they reported 320 of the 11,61,281 base stations they tested had emissions exceeding regulatory limits resulting in penalties for the telecom service providers. India’s RF public exposure limits are set at 10% of ICNIRP levels.

⁴⁶ See Conference site at <https://www.nsama.org/conferences/nsma-presentations-2023/> Video of Theodora Scarato at https://youtu.be/NNJUT-ZOcqE?si=GtL9k_IeEzuEmiUK&t=1597

⁴⁷ FCC RF Safety FAQ

<https://www.fcc.gov/engineering-technology/electromagnetic-compatibility-division/radio-frequency-safety/faq/rf-safety>

⁴⁸ FCC RF Safety FAQ

<https://www.fcc.gov/engineering-technology/electromagnetic-compatibility-division/radio-frequency-safety/faq/rf-safety>

⁴⁹ FCC RF Safety FAQ

[Worries⁵⁰](#) found “one in 10 sites violates the rules, according to six engineers who examined more than 5,000 sites during safety audits for carriers and local municipalities.” Since then, FCC rules that have mandated automatic approvals for adding antennas at existing cell sites and “streamlined” placement of new 5G/4G facilities by preempting state and local authority, have resulted in massive antenna proliferation nationwide.

Studies have found that environmental RF levels generated from RF emissions of cell towers, base station network antennas, and other wireless systems have significantly increased over the last few decades, with higher levels in urban areas and in areas of closer proximity to wireless network antennas, especially in locations within the main beams of the antennas.⁵¹ As an example, a 2018 multi-country study found ambient RF measurements in Los Angeles, California now 70 times higher than levels measured in the City in the late ‘70s, as part of a twelve-city study by the FCC and EPA.⁵²

The FCC has never done an environmental impact statement on the individual or cumulative impacts of its spectrum auctions, which have raised \$233 billion to date, nor on the allocation of these proceeds to various programs to deploy wireless networks. The FCC has not considered those funding decisions under NEPA, and so have not considered them to be major federal action. In 1986, the FCC categorically excluded most of its actions from NEPA review.⁵³

The FCC relies on licensees to measure exposure levels and prepare environmental assessments (EA) if needed and self-report any exceedances or potential exceedances.⁵⁴ It is indisputable that NEPA is a federal obligation yet the FCC has delegated to the licensees and the carriers the determination of whether a

<https://www.fcc.gov/engineering-technology/electromagnetic-compatibility-division/radio-frequency-safety/faq/rf-safety>

⁵⁰ “It’s like having a speed limit and no police,” said Marvin Wessel, an engineer who has audited more than 3,000 sites and found one in 10 out of compliance. Cellphone Boom Spurs Antenna-Safety Worries Many Sites Violate Rules Aimed at Protecting Workers From Excessive Radio-Frequency Radiation

https://www.wsj.com/articles/cellphone-boom-spurs-antenna-safety-worries-1412293055?mod=WSJ_hpp_MIDDLE_Video_second

⁵¹ Brown, R. (2022). [Assessment of radiofrequency radiation intensity on 35 Main Streets throughout Pennsylvania, USA during the fall of 2021](#). *American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Review*. 1(4). 8-20; Baltrėnas, P.,

Buckus, R., & Vasarevičius, S. (2012). [Research and evaluation of the intensity parameters of electromagnetic fields produced by mobile communication antennas](#). *Journal of Environmental Engineering and Landscape Management*, 20(4), 273–284; Bhatt, C. R., Redmayne, M., Billah, B., Abramson, M. J., & Benke, G. (2017).

[Radiofrequency-electromagnetic field exposures in kindergarten children](#). *Journal of Exposure Science & Environmental Epidemiology*, 27(5), 497–504; Bousad Y, Chen XL, Legout A, Chaintreau A, Dabbous W. (2022) [Longitudinal study of exposure to radio frequencies at population scale](#). *Environ Int*. Apr;162:107144 ; Mazloum, T., Aerts, S., Joseph, W., & Wiart, J. (2019). [RF-EMF exposure induced by mobile phones operating in LTE small cells in two different urban cities](#). *Annals of Telecommunications*, 74(1), 35–42.; Urbinello, D., Joseph, W., Verloock, L., Martens, L., & Rössli, M. (2014). [Temporal trends of radio-frequency electromagnetic field \(RF-EMF\) exposure in everyday environments across European cities](#). *Environmental Research*, 134, 134–142.

⁵² Sagar, S. et al. (2018). [Comparison of radiofrequency electromagnetic field exposure levels in different everyday microenvironments in an international context](#). *Environment International*, Volume 114, 297-306.

⁵³ Federal Register at page 14999

<https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-1986-04-22/pdf/FR-1986-04-22.pdf>

47 CFR 1.1306

<https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-47/section-1.1306>

⁵⁴ FCC Public Notice – April 27, 2000, YEAR 2000 DEADLINE FOR COMPLIANCE WITH COMMISSION’S REGULATIONS REGARDING HUMAN EXPOSURE TO RADIOFREQUENCY EMISSIONS

<https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2000/05/05/00-11237/year-2000-deadline-for-compliance-with-commission-s-regulations-regarding-human-exposure-to>

Categorical Exclusion applies. Carriers have a due diligence checklist with different requirements to check off yet this document is never submitted to the FCC if the applicant determines that the facility is categorically excluded; the FCC has no records of carriers doing their due diligence unless the review finds a potentially significant environmental effect that triggers an EA, which they submit. If nothing is triggered on the checklist, then the applicant starts building without the public having access to the checklist and measurements, and no ability to refute or comment on the project.

The Food and Drug Administration (FDA)

The FDA does not regulate, have activities related to, nor have authority regarding the RF emissions of cell towers, cell tower antennas, network infrastructure, or 5G facilities. Further, in regards to cell phones the FDA has not shown an evaluation of the totality of the science. Non cancer issues, such as headaches, oxidative stress, brain development, impacts to wildlife, and any studies on vulnerable populations such as pregnant people, children or the medically vulnerable have not been evaluated by the FDA in any report or evaluation shared with the public.

The FDA's very **limited activities** related to cell phones and cancer include a now outdated literature review (with science ending in 2018) focused solely only on cell phones and cancer.⁵⁵ This literature review, done by anonymous individuals (rather than transparently presented experts) is focused only on cancer and omits all non cancer studies such as research on brain development, reproduction, or synergistic effects. The review focused only on cell phones and omitted research on Wi-Fi, 5G, 4G or other RF sources. The review is a literature review and not a systematic review nor is it a hazard or risk analysis nor is it an evaluation of FCC cell tower radiation limits, despite being presented in this way. Several experts sent letters to the FDA⁵⁶ criticizing the literature review for numerous reasons including the fact that it does not follow any scientifically accepted protocols for risk or hazard assessment.

The [FDA's 2021](#) and [2022](#) Annual reports of the Center for Devices and Radiological Health have zero mention of the issue of cell phones or cell towers or wireless electromagnetic radiation. The [2022 to 2025](#)

⁵⁵ FDA, [Review of Published Literature between 2008 and 2018 of Relevance to Radiofrequency Radiation and Cancer](#)

⁵⁶ 2019/2020 Letters to the FDA Regarding Inaccurate Information on the NTP and FDA Website

[Letter calling for a retraction of FDA signed by several scientists](#) including Ronald Melnick PhD, former National Institutes of Health Scientist, Samuel Milham MD, former Head of the Chronic Disease Epidemiology Section, Washington State Department of Health; David Carpenter MD, Director of the Institute for Health and Environment at University of Albany's School of Public Health, former director of the Wadsworth Laboratory of the New York State Department of Health, Lennart Hardell MD, PhD, Professor Department of Oncology, Faculty of Medicine and Health Dr. Anthony Miller, Professor Emeritus of University of Toronto and World Health Organization Senior Advisor [Ronald Melnick PhD's individual letter to the FDA on the National Toxicology Program study](#) [Albert Manville PhD, retired Senior Wildlife Biologist, Division of Migratory Bird Management, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Wash. DC HO Office \(17 years\); Senior Lecturer, Johns Hopkins University](#) [Prof. Tom Butler of the University College in Cork, Ireland's letter to the FDA](#) [Igor Belyaev, PhD, Dr. Sc. Head, Department of Radiobiology of the Cancer Research Institute, Biomedical Research Center of the Slovak Academy of Science letter to the FDA](#) [Paul Heroux PhD, McGill University](#) [Alfonso Balmori, BSc statement to the FDA](#)

[Report on Strategic Priorities](#) has nothing on the issue of RF radiation.⁵⁷ The FDA has not shown any evidence of monitoring RF bioeffects research via new agency reports, meetings or budget allocations on the issue.

The Government Accountability Report on 5G ([GAO 2020](#)) clarified that the FDA and other organizations “only reviewed a subset of the relevant research” and stated in regards to the FDA Literature Review that “The assessment focused on cancer-related animal and human studies of frequencies below 6 GHz.”

FDA Statements

“The FDA does not regulate cell towers or cell tower radiation. Therefore, the FDA has no studies or information on cell towers to provide in response to your questions.”

[Ellen Flannery, Director, FDA Policy Center for Devices and Radiological Health to a California mother with a cell tower on her street who asked the FDA about safety, July 11, 2022](#)

“Under the law, FDA does not review the safety of radiation-emitting consumer products such as cell phones and similar wireless devices before they can be sold, as it does with new drugs or medical devices.”

[FDA Website until 2019 -](#)

“We don’t have jurisdiction over cellphone towers since those are environmental emitters.”

[Email From FDA’s David Kassiday](#) in 2016

The Environmental Health Trust issued a [“Report on FDA Activities on Cell Phones and Radiofrequency”](#)⁵⁸ which documents the lack of adequate research review and misleading information put forward by the FDA. While the FDA webpages and cell phone cancer literature review seem to assert that safety is assured, the FDA has not adequately evaluated the totality of the science to reach any such safety or risk conclusion.

National Toxicology Program (NTP)

In 1999, the FDA requested the NTP perform large scale animal studies on cell phone radiation [stating](#),⁵⁹ “A significant research effort, including well-planned animal experiments, is needed to provide the basis to assess the risk to human health of wireless communications devices.”

The findings of the NTP’s \$30 million animal study were released in a 2018 final report which found that long term exposure to RF was associated with two types of cancer in male rats, schwannoma of the heart and

⁵⁷ <https://www.fda.gov/media/155888/download>

⁵⁸

https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/EHT-Report_-_Report-on-FDA-Activities-Related-to-Cell-Phones-and-Radiofrequency-Radiation-2.pdf

⁵⁹ [FDA CDRH nomination of NTP to Study RFR. Nomination Background: Wireless Communication Devices](#)

glioma of the brain,⁶⁰ with the NTP's highest level of evidence.⁶¹ Further, the NTP notably found significant increases in DNA damage ([Smith-Roe et al., 2020](#)), as well as the induction of cardiomyopathy of the right ventricle in male and female rats. The later Ramazzini Institute studies found elevated incidence of the same tumors the NTP found - heart schwannomas in male rats - despite the Ramazzini Institute use of much lower RF radiation exposures than the NTP which were intended to mimic cell tower base station environmental exposures ([Falcioni et al., 2018](#); [Vornoli et al., 2019](#)).

Analysis of the NTP data according to current risk assessment guidelines concluded that U.S. government FCC limits should be lower by 200 to 400 times to protect children ([Uche & Naidenko, 2021](#)). Several published reviews conclude that the current body of evidence indicates RF radiation is a proven Group 1 human carcinogen ([Miller et al 2018](#), [Peleg et al 2018](#), [Carlberg and Hardell 2017](#), [Belpomme et al 2018](#)).

However, the FDA stated that they “disagreed” with the NTP findings⁶². The DC Circuit rejected FDA’s statement, saying “we find them to be of the conclusory variety that we have previously rejected as insufficient.”⁶³

National Cancer Institute (NCI)

Although the NCI has a lengthy web page on cell phones, the NCI has not performed any type of safety evaluation, nor any formal research review. The NCI has repeatedly stated that “Neither the literature reviews, nor the fact sheets, make safety determinations.” ([Letter from NCI to Scarato](#)).

When directly asked about cell phone safety issues by the New Hampshire Commission on 5G⁶⁴, the National Cancer Institute [responded](#), “As a Federal research agency, the NCI is not involved in the regulation of radiofrequency telecommunications infrastructure and devices, nor do we make recommendations for policies related to this technology...Our sister agencies, the FDA as well as the FCC, retain responsibility for reviewing guidance on safety concerns and informing the public if those circumstances change.”

The NCI signed onto a [one paragraph letter](#) in response to the [FCC Inquiry on RF Human Exposure Rules in 2013](#) simply thanking the FCC for “FCC’s interest in continuing to work closely with NIH and other federal agencies with expertise in public health for guidance and expertise on this matter.” However, NCI never submitted a substantive, meaningful comment regarding the adequacy of FCC guidelines, nor a systematic

⁶⁰M. Wyde et al., 2018; M. E. Wyde et al., 2018 <https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/whatwestudy/topics/cellphones>

⁶¹ <https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/whatwestudy/testpgm/cartox/criteria>

⁶² FDA Press [Release, Statement from Jeffrey Shuren, M.D., J.D., Director of the FDA’s Center for Devices and Radiological Health on the National Toxicology Program’s report on radiofrequency energy exposure](#), November 1, 2018

⁶³ EHT et al.v FCC, supra

⁶⁴ New Hampshire Commissioner Denise Ricciardi asked the NCI, “What is the NCI opinion on the safety of cell phones? If you have one, please share your scientific documentation. The NCI responded, “The FDA and FCC are the responsible federal agencies with authority to issue opinions on the safety of these exposures. As a Federal research agency, the NCI is not involved in the regulation of radiofrequency telecommunications infrastructure and devices, nor do we make recommendations for policies related to this technology.” page 31 of the New Hampshire Commission Report on 5G <https://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/statstudcomm/committees/1474/reports/5G%20final%20report.pdf>

research review or evaluation regarding carcinogenicity or any other health issue as the NCI has not engaged in such activities.

Centers for Disease Control (CDC)

The CDC has no research activities related to EMF bioeffects. There has been no research review or evaluation by CDC experts regarding carcinogenicity or any other health issue. While the CDC does have webpages on cell phone radiation and wireless wearables, FOIAs show several were drafted with the help of an [industry consultant](#).

National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH)

NIOSH has no current activities related to non ionizing EMFs. Although U.S. NIOSH scientists long have recommended precautionary measures to minimize risk from occupational RF exposure⁶⁵ and developed recommendations to reduce extremely low frequency EMF,⁶⁶ protective policies were never further developed or implemented.

Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA)

OSHA currently is not engaged in bioeffect activities.

On July 1, 2015 [OSHA wrote the FCC](#) that, “RF emissions are not on OSHA's active regulatory agenda, so we have not conducted a comprehensive literature review or risk assessment on RF hazards” and “OSHA does not appear to have a particularized program in place to ensure worker safety with regard to RF exposure from the wide variety of RF transmitters regulated by the Commission. . . . we are not aware that OSHA has adequate resources to ensure compliance with our limits for occupational/controlled exposure among our licensees and grantees.”

⁶⁵ December 1979 [Radiofrequency \(RF\) Sealers and Heaters \(80-107\) | NIOSH | CDC](#)

“Absorption of RF energy may also result in “nonthermal” effects on cells or tissue, which may occur without a measurable increase in tissue or body temperature. “Nonthermal” effects have been reported to occur at exposure levels lower than those that cause thermal effects. While scientists are not in complete agreement regarding the significance of reports of “nonthermal” effects observed in laboratory animals, NIOSH believes there is sufficient evidence of such effects to cause concern about human exposures. NIOSH and OSHA recommend that precautionary measures be instituted to minimize the risk to workers from unwarranted exposure to RF energy.”

⁶⁶ See “Precautionary Strategies to Reduce Worker Exposures to Extremely Low Frequency (ELF) Magnetic Fields, a Possible Carcinogen” by Joseph D. Bowman, PhD, of the Engineering and Physical Hazards Branch at the National Institute for Occupational Safety (NIOSH) Slide presentation to the [Collaborative on Health and the Environment \(Bowman 2016\)](#). Listen to the presentation at https://www.healthandenvironment.org/partnership_calls/18482

OSHA was actively engaged in RF bioeffect activities in previous decades. The agency had developed elements for a [Comprehensive RF Protection Program](#) in the mid 90s⁶⁷ that was never implemented. An OSHA representative also participated in the now defunct RF Interagency workgroup.

Inaccurate Statements by Elected Officials

There is a lack of appropriate oversight in Congress due to the FDA and FCC's lack of full transparency regarding RF safety and their regulatory activities. Agencies should transparently state that they have not reviewed the research on health issues such as impacts to memory, epigenetic impacts and impacts to the environment (including pollinators). Agencies should also clearly state that the regulations do not address long term effects. The FDA should clarify that it has no authority nor judgment regarding health impacts from environmental levels of RF exposure from network antennas (including 5G, 4G, small cells, macro cell towers, or unlicensed antennas). The Congressional Committees tasked to provide oversight are not even aware this issue is in need of accountability.

Inaccurate statements by elected officials regarding the involvement of federal agencies on 5G and RF bioeffects.

U.S Senator Schumer's [February 6, 2023 Letter](#) states "*Rest assured that as additional studies on microwave radiation and RF exposure are published by scientists and reviewed by government agencies... "Many other federal agencies, such as the EPA, FDA, NIOSH, OSHA have been actively involved in monitoring and investigating issues related to RF exposure."* However, EPA, NIOSH, and OSHA are not actively involved.

[U.S. Representative Scott Fitzgerald](#)'s November 5, 2021 letter states that, "In addition to the FCC, Federal health and safety agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) have been actively involved in monitoring and investigating issues related to radio frequency (RF) exposure." However, EPA, NIOSH, and OSHA are not actively involved.

Representative Doris Matsui stated in a [December 20, 2023 letter](#)⁶⁸ that "*the monitoring and investigation of RF exposure on public health is a collaborative effort between several federal agencies. Since 1996, the FCC has required all wireless communications devices sold in the United States to meet minimum guidelines for safe human exposure to RF energy. RF exposure standards are developed by subject matter experts such as the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) and the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP) and are used by federal, state and local governments to regulate the teleservice industry and protect public health. These regulators and experts have not found conclusive,*

⁶⁷ Presentation on April 12, 1995 by Robert A. Curtis, Director US DOL/OSHA Health Response Team to the National Association of Broadcasters at the Broadcast Engineering Conference Las Vegas, NV
<https://www.osha.gov/radiofrequency-and-microwave-radiation/role-of-rf-measurements>

⁶⁸ <https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/Representative-Doris-Matsui-Letter-on-5G-December-20-2023.pdf>

significant or causal evidence to suggest that 5G is harmful to humans.” However, there is no collaborative effort in regards to bioeffects.

Senator Diane Feinstein, [September 6, 2021](#), stated, without evidence, “Since 1996, it has been the FCC’s policy to cooperate with industry, expert agencies, and health and safety organizations to ensure that guidelines continue to be appropriate and scientifically valid.” However, expert agencies such as *EPA*, *NIOSH*, and *OSHA* with health and science expertise are not working with FCC on this topic.

ATTACHMENT 3: Radiofrequency Radiation Impacts on the Environment

No U.S. agency or international authority has ever acted to review research on wireless radiation effects on the environment nor set exposure limits to ensure protections for birds, bees, trees and wildlife.^{69,70} It is a critical regulatory gap.

In 2014, the U.S. Department of Interior wrote a letter to the NTIA detailing several published studies showing impacts of wireless radiofrequency radiation (RFR) to birds stating that, “There is a growing level of anecdotal evidence linking effects of non-thermal, non-ionizing electromagnetic radiation from communication towers on nesting and roosting wild birds and other wildlife.” It further stated, “However, the electromagnetic radiation standards used by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) continue to be based on thermal heating, a criterion now nearly 30 years out of date and inapplicable today.”⁷¹

Significant research has accumulated indicating serious environmental effects of RF, yet with no review by federal agencies. On August 13, 2021, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit ruled in our case against the FCC (*EHT et al. v FCC*),⁷² stating “we find the Commission’s order arbitrary and capricious in its complete failure to respond to comments concerning environmental harm caused by RF radiation.” The Commission also “completely failed even to acknowledge, let alone respond to, comments concerning the impact of RF radiation on the environment. That utter lack of a response does not meet the Commission’s obligation to provide a reasoned explanation for terminating the notice of inquiry.”⁷³ Despite the 2021 court order, the FCC has remained silent. It has taken no action to justify its refusal to update its 1996 wireless radiation exposure guidelines .

In 2021 and 2022 a three-part landmark research review by U.S experts of over 1,200 studies on the effects of non-ionizing radiation to wildlife entitled “Effects of non-ionizing electromagnetic fields on flora and fauna” found adverse effects in all species studied at even very low intensities. Findings included impacts

⁶⁹ Levitt, B. B., Lai, H. C., & Manville, A. M. (2021). [Effects of non-ionizing electromagnetic fields on flora and fauna. Part 3. Exposure standards, public policy, laws, and future directions. Reviews on Environmental Health.](#)

⁷⁰ Levitt BB, Lai HC and Manville AM II (2022) [Low-level EMF effects on wildlife and plants: What research tells us about an ecosystem approach.](#) Front. Public Health 10:1000840. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2022.1000840

⁷¹ https://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/us_doi_comments.pdf

⁷² [Final Court Decision EHT et. al v. the FCC](#) 8/13/2021

[https://www.cadc.uscourts.gov/internet/opinions.nsf/FB976465BF00F8BD85258730004EEDE7/\\$file/20-1025-1910111.pdf](https://www.cadc.uscourts.gov/internet/opinions.nsf/FB976465BF00F8BD85258730004EEDE7/$file/20-1025-1910111.pdf)

²³[https://www.cadc.uscourts.gov/internet/opinions.nsf/FB976465BF00F8BD85258730004EEDE7/\\$file/20-1025-1910111.pdf](https://www.cadc.uscourts.gov/internet/opinions.nsf/FB976465BF00F8BD85258730004EEDE7/$file/20-1025-1910111.pdf)

to orientation, migration, reproduction, mating, nest, den building and survivorship.^{74 75 76}

In a review published in *Environment International* on the ecological effects of RF-EMF, 70% of the studies reviewed found RF had a significant effect on birds, insects, other vertebrates, organisms, and plants, with development and reproduction in birds and insects being the most strongly affected.⁷⁷ Biologists caution that non ionizing electromagnetic radiation is a critical factor in the decline of pollinator and insect populations.⁷⁸

A 2023 [systematic review and meta-analysis of studies](#) on the biological effects on insects of non-ionizing electromagnetic fields, including cell tower and Wi-Fi radiation, was published in the journal *Reviews on Environmental Health*, finding the “vast majority of studies found effects, generally harmful ones” with toxic effects such as impacts to reproduction and immune health occurring at legally allowed exposure levels.⁷⁹

Pollinators at Risk: Higher Exposures to Insects From 5G and Higher Frequencies

- The study “[Exposure of Insects to Radio-Frequency Electromagnetic Fields from 2 to 120 GHz](#)” by Thielens et al 2018 published in *Scientific Reports* found that for the 4 insects studied (western honeybee, australian stingless bee, beetle, locust), exposure at and above 6 GHz could lead to an increase in absorbed power between 3–370% (a factor if over 3 times.) The researchers concluded that “this could lead to changes in insect behavior, physiology, and morphology over time...”
- A follow up study on the honeybee entitled “[Radio-Frequency Electromagnetic Field Exposure of Western Honey Bees](#)” published in *Scientific Reports* by Thielens et al (2020) modeled exposure in various life cycle stages (worker, drone, larva, and queen) and combined the data with in-situ measurements of environmental RF-EMF exposure near beehives in Belgium in order to estimate realistic exposure and absorbed power values. Again, they found even a relatively small shift of 10% of environmental incident power density from frequencies below 3 GHz to higher frequencies will lead to a relative increase in absorbed power of a factor higher than 3.

⁷⁴ Levitt, B. B., Lai, H. C., & Manville, A. M. (2021). [Effects of non-ionizing electromagnetic fields on flora and fauna, Part 3. Exposure standards, public policy, laws, and future directions.](#) *Reviews on Environmental Health*.

⁷⁵ Levitt, B. B., Lai, H. C., & Manville, A. M. (2021). [Effects of non-ionizing electromagnetic fields on flora and fauna, part 1. Rising ambient EMF levels in the environment.](#) *Reviews on Environmental Health*, 37(1), 81–122.

⁷⁶ Levitt, B. B., Lai, H. C., & Manville, A. M. (2021). [Effects of non-ionizing electromagnetic fields on flora and fauna, Part 2 impacts: How species interact with natural and man-made EMF.](#) *Reviews on Environmental Health*, 37(3), 327–406.

⁷⁷ Cucurachi, S., Tamis, W. L. M., Vijver, M. G., Peijnenburg, W. J. G. M., Bolte, J. F. B., & de Snoo, G. R. (2013). [A review of the ecological effects of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields \(RF-EMF\).](#) *Environment International*, 51, 116–140.

⁷⁸ Balmori A. (2021) [Electromagnetic radiation as an emerging driver factor for the decline of insects.](#) *Science of the Total Environment*. 767: 144913

⁷⁹ Thill A, Cammaerts MC, Balmori A. [Biological effects of electromagnetic fields on insects: a systematic review and meta-analysis.](#) *Rev Environ Health*. 2023 Nov 23

- In a subsequent study, researchers modeled the exposures of 2.5 to 100 GHz into the honeybee brain and vital organs in [Estimation of the Specific Absorption Rate for a Honey bee Exposed to Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields from 2.5 to 100 GHz](#)," by Jeladze et al (2023) and found relatively higher SAR values are observed at 12, 25, and 40 [GHz] frequencies in the 4.8 - 8 W/Kg range, especially for the brain tissue. The SAR values varied depending on exposure parameters such as the direction of the incident plane wave, polarization, frequency, and body peculiarities. The authors conclude that, *"based on the obtained results, we can conclude that the exposure to high-frequency RF-EMFs on honey bees might have an undesired impact, which can cause an attenuation of the vital functions of this important insect."*
- ["Radio-frequency exposure of the yellow fever mosquito \(A. aegypti\) from 2 to 240 GHz,"](#) published in PLOS Computational Biology, which found that for the given incident RF power, the absorption increases with increasing frequency between 2 and 90 GHz with a maximum between 90 and 240 GHz. Even at the same incident field strength, the power absorption by the mosquito is 16 times higher at 60 GHz than at 6 GHz. For 120 GHz, this increase is even larger compared to 6 GHz, with a factor 21.8. The absorption was highest in the region where the wavelength matches the size of the mosquito. The authors conclude that, *"In the future, the carrier frequency of telecommunication systems will also be higher than 6 GHz. This will be paired with higher absorption of EMF by yellow fever mosquitoes, which can cause dielectric heating and have an impact on behavior, development and possibly spread of the insect."*

Impacts on Plants

A 2017 review ["Weak radiofrequency radiation exposure from mobile phone radiation on plants"](#) found physiological and/or morphological effects in 89.9% of studies reviewed.⁸⁰

"Additionally, our analysis of the results from these reported studies demonstrates that the maize, roselle, pea, fenugreek, duckweeds, tomato, onions and mungbean plants seem to be very sensitive to RF-EMFs. Our findings also suggest that plants seem to be more responsive to certain frequencies, especially the frequencies between (i) 800 and 1500 MHz (p < 0.0001), (ii) 1500 and 2400 MHz (p < 0.0001) and (iii) 3500 and 8000 MHz (p = 0.0161)."

Trees are also at risk from wireless. A field monitoring study spanning nine years involving over 100 trees found damage on the side of the trees facing transmitting cell antennas.⁸¹ Researchers have released subsequent reports documenting continued impacts to tree canopy from cell tower antennas.^{82,83} Other RF effects include impacts to leaf, shoot, seedlings of Aspen trees.⁸⁴

⁸⁰ Halgamuge, M. N. (2017). [Review: Weak radiofrequency radiation exposure from mobile phone radiation on plants](#). *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine*, 36(2), 213–235

⁸¹ Waldmann-Selsam, C., Balmori-de la Puente, A., Breunig, H., & Balmori, A. (2016). [Radiofrequency radiation injures trees around mobile phone base stations](#). *Science of The Total Environment*, 572, 554–569.

⁸² Breunig, Helmut. ["Tree Damage Caused By Mobile Phone Base Stations An Observation Guide."](#) (2017).

⁸³ 2021 Report ["Tree damage caused by mobile phone base stations"](#)

⁸⁴ Haggerty, K. (2010). [Adverse Influence of Radio Frequency Background on Trembling Aspen Seedlings: Preliminary](#)

Environmental Health Trust has developed a website focused on the science of wildlife and wireless at wildlifeandwireless.org.

ATTACHMENT 4: Radiofrequency Radiation Impacts on Human Health

Extensive published scientific evidence indicates that wireless radiofrequency (RF) radiation at levels far below FCC limits can cause cancer,⁸⁵ increased oxidative stress,⁸⁶ genetic damage,⁸⁷ structural and functional changes of the reproductive system,⁸⁸ memory deficit,⁸⁹ behavioral problems⁹⁰, and neurological impacts.⁹¹

*EHT et al. v. FCC the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit 2021*¹⁷ also ruled the FCC ignored scientific evidence on negative health effects from long term wireless radiation exposure at current allowable levels, especially in regards to children, whom the American Academy of Pediatrics states⁹² are more vulnerable to wireless radiation. The court ordered the FCC to examine the record evidence regarding long term exposure to children, health effects unrelated to cancer and environmental impacts. To date, the FCC has not responded. This landmark ruling highlights how no federal health agency has reviewed the full body of current research to ensure current safety standards are protective.

Observations. *International Journal of Forestry Research*, 2010, 836278.

⁸⁵ Miller, A. B., Morgan, L. L., Udasin, I., & Davis, D. L. (2018). Cancer epidemiology update, following the 2011 IARC evaluation of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (Monograph 102). *Environmental Research*, 167, 673–683. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.06.043>

⁸⁶ Yakymenko, I., Sidorik, E., Kyrylenko, S., & Chekhun, V. (2011). Long-term exposure to microwave radiation provokes cancer growth: Evidence from radars and mobile communication systems. *Experimental Oncology*, 33(2), 62–70. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21716201/>.

⁸⁷ Falcioni, L., Bua, L., Tibaldi, E., Lauriola, M., De Angelis, L., Gnudi, F., Mandrioli, D., Manservigi, M., Manservigi, F., Manzoli, I., Menghetti, I., Montella, R., Panzacchi, S., Sgargi, D., Stollo, V., Vornoli, A., & Belpoggi, F. (2018). Report of final results regarding brain and heart tumors in Sprague-Dawley rats exposed from prenatal life until natural death to mobile phone radiofrequency field representative of a 1.8 GHz GSM base station environmental emission. *Environmental Research*, 165, 496–503. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.01.037>

⁸⁸ Kim S, Han D, Ryu J, Kim K, Kim YH. Effects of mobile phone usage on sperm quality - No time-dependent relationship on usage: A systematic review and updated meta-analysis. *Environ Res*. 2021 Nov;202:111784. doi: 10.1016/j.envres.2021.111784. Epub 2021 Jul 30. PMID: 34333014

⁸⁹ Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute. "Mobile phone radiation may affect memory performance in adolescents, study finds." *ScienceDaily*. *ScienceDaily*, 19 July 2018. www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/07/180719121803.htm.

⁹⁰ Divan HA, Kheifets L, Obel C, Olsen J. Cell phone use and behavioral problems in young children. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2012 Jun;66(6):524-9. doi: 10.1136/jech.2010.115402. Epub 2010 Dec 7. PMID: 21138897.

⁹¹ Hiie Hinrikus, Jaanus Lass & Maie Bachmann (2021) Threshold of radiofrequency electromagnetic field effect on human brain, *International Journal of Radiation Biology*, 97:11, 1505-1515, DOI: [10.1080/09553002.2021.1969055](https://doi.org/10.1080/09553002.2021.1969055)

⁹² AAP Letter to the FCC Chairman calling for the FCC to open up a review of RF guidelines (7/12/2012), AAP Letter to US Representative Dennis Kucinich in Support of the Cell Phone Right to Know Act 12/12/2012, AAP to FCC Commissioner Mignon Clyburn and FDA Commissioner Margaret Hamburg calling for a review of RF guidelines 8/29/2013

The state of New Hampshire commissioned a study on the Environmental and Health Effects of Evolving 5G Technology and issued a final report⁹³ in 2020 with 15 recommendations including: requiring setbacks of all wireless transmitters from residences, businesses and schools, adopting a statewide position to encourage fiber optics to the premise, acknowledging the need for further studies to outline clinical symptoms related to RF exposure, developing RF safety limits to protect the environment, among other recommendations.

In 2022, the Pittsfield, Massachusetts Board of Health sent a cease-and-desist order to shut down a Verizon cell tower. The order⁹⁴ issued to Verizon states “Whereas, soon after the facility was activated and began transmitting, the City started to receive reports of illness and negative health symptoms from residents living nearby the facility....The negative health symptoms the affected residents have reported include complaints of headaches, sleep problems, heart palpitations, tinnitus (ringing in the ears), dizziness, nausea, skin rashes, and memory and cognitive problems, among other medical complaints. ... Whereas, as further documented below, the neurological and dermatological symptoms experienced by the residents are consistent with those described in the peer-reviewed scientific and medical literature as being associated with exposure to pulsed and modulated Radio Frequency (“RF”) radiation, including RF from cell towers.”

A major 2022 review of the existing scientific literature on cell tower radiation and health found associations with radiofrequency sickness, cancer and changes in biochemical parameters.⁹⁵ For example, a study published in *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine* on people living near cell antennas found significant biochemical changes in the blood. This study evaluated effects in the human blood of individuals living near mobile phone base stations compared with healthy controls living more than 300 meters from a base station. The group living closer to the antennas had statistically significant higher frequency of micronuclei and a rise in lipid peroxidation in their blood; these changes are considered biomarkers predictive of cancer.⁹⁶

According to Dr. Linda Birnbaum, Scientist Emeritus and Former Director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences and National Toxicology Program of the National Institutes of Health, “Aware that the FCC’s 1996 limits lacked the underpinning of solid scientific data regarding long term health effects, the FDA requested large-scale studies by the National Toxicology Program (NTP) and in 2018 the NTP studies found clear evidence of an association with cancer in male rats.⁹⁷ Additionally, the NTP found heart damage and DNA damage, despite the fact that the animals were carefully exposed to non-heating RFR levels long assumed to be safe. The Ramazzini Institute animal studies⁹⁸ used even lower

⁹³ <https://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/statstudcomm/committees/1474/reports/5G%20final%20report.pdf>

⁹⁴ <https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/Pittsfield-Health-Board-Cell-Tower-Order-to-Verizon-April-11-2022-FINAL-REDACTED.pdf>

⁹⁵ A. Balmori (2022). Evidence for a health risk by RF on humans living around mobile phone base stations: From radiofrequency sickness to cancer. *Environ. Res.*, 214 (2022), Article 113851
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2022.113851>

⁹⁶ Zothansiam, Zosangzuali, M., Lalramdinpui, M., & Jagetia, G. C. (2017). Impact of radiofrequency radiation on DNA damage and antioxidants in peripheral blood lymphocytes of humans residing in the vicinity of mobile phone base stations. *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine*, 36(3), 295–305.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15368378.2017.1350584>.

⁹⁷ National Toxicology Program Radiofrequency Radiation
<https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/whatwestudy/topics/cellphones/index.html>

⁹⁸ Falcioni et al., Report of final results regarding brain and heart tumors in Sprague-Dawley rats exposed from prenatal life until natural death to mobile phone radiofrequency field representative of a 1.8 GHz GSM base station

RFR lower exposures to approximate cell tower emissions and also found increases of the same tumor type. The NTP studies were carefully controlled to ensure exposures did not significantly heat the animals. The animal study findings in combination with human studies indicate adverse effects from non heating levels of radiofrequency.

A review paper on corporate risk entitled “Limiting Liability with Positioning to Minimize Negative Health Effects of Cellular Phone Towers” reviewed the “large and growing body of evidence that human exposure to RFR from cellular phone base stations causes negative health effects.” The authors recommend restricting antennas near homes and within 500 meters of schools and hospitals to protect companies from future liability.⁹⁹

ATTACHMENT 5: Legal and Liability Issues of Wireless

U.S. mobile operators have been [unable to get insurance](#) to cover liabilities related to damages from long term exposure to radiofrequency emissions for well over a decade.¹⁰⁰

It is notable that in 2000, the Ecolog Institute Report on radiofrequency health effects, commissioned by T-Mobile and DeTeMobil Deutsche Telekom MobilNet, recommended an RF exposure limit 1000x lower than the FCC’s current power density limit after reviewing the research on biological effects, including impacts to the immune system, central nervous system, hormones, cancer, neurotransmitters and fertility.¹⁰¹ Insurers [rank](#) 5G and electromagnetic radiation as a “high” risk,¹⁰² [comparing the issue](#) to lead and asbestos.¹⁰³ A 2019 Report¹⁰⁴ by [Swiss Re Institute](#), a world leading provider of insurance, classifies 5G mobile networks as a “high”, “off-the-leash” risk stating, “Existing concerns regarding potential negative health effects from electromagnetic fields (EMF) are only likely to increase. An uptick in liability claims could be a potential

environmental emission, Environmental Research, Volume 165, 2018,
Pages 496-503 DOI: 10.1016/j.envres.2018.01.037

⁹⁹ Pearce, J. M. (2020). Limiting liability with positioning to minimize negative health effects of cellular phone towers. *Environmental Research*, 181, 108845. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2019.108845>.

¹⁰⁰ Roseanne White Geisel, (2007) [Insurers exclude risks associated with electromagnetic radiation](#), Business Insurance

¹⁰¹ [Review of the Current Scientific Research in view of Precautionary Health Protection](#), Commissioned by T-Mobile DeTeMobil Deutsche Telekom MobilNet GmbH. (2000) Translated into English
<https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/T-mobile-RF-Radiation-Ecolog-2000-Report-pdf>

¹⁰² <https://ehtrust.org/key-issues/reports-white-papers-insurance-industry/>

¹⁰³ Lloyd’s of London Report on Electromagnetic Fields “Electromagnetic fields from mobile phones: recent developments.” Lloyd’s Emerging Risks Team Report, November 2010; 2016 Austrian Accident Insurance Institute (AUVA) ATHEM Report “Investigation of athermal effects of electromagnetic fields in mobile communications.” ; Business Insurance (2011) [White paper explores risks that could become 'the next asbestos'](#)

See also Factsheets on Legal Liability of Cell Towers at
<https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/Legal-Liability-Cell-Tower-Radiation-Health-Effects-3.pdf>

¹⁰⁴ Swiss Re 5G Report “Off the leash – 5G mobile networks”
<https://www.swissre.com/institute/research/sonar/sonar2019/SONAR2019-off-the-leash.html> PDF
<https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/Swiss-Re-SONAR-Publication-2019-excerpt-1.pdf>

long-term consequence” and “as the biological effects of EMF in general and 5G in particular are still being debated, potential claims for health impairments may come with a long latency.”

Due to their understanding of the magnitude of this future financial risk [most insurance plans](#) have “electromagnetic field exclusions” applied as the [market standard](#).¹⁰⁵ As an example, [Portland Oregon Public School Insurance](#) states,¹⁰⁶ “Exclusions: This insurance does not apply to: Bodily injury, personal injury, advertising injury, or property damage arising directly or indirectly out of, resulting from, caused or contributed to by electromagnetic radiation, provided that such loss, cost or expense results from or is contributed to by the hazardous properties of electromagnetic radiation.”

Wireless and non-ionizing electromagnetic radiation are defined as a type of “pollution” by wireless companies themselves. According to [pg. 10 of the Verizon Total Mobile Protection Plan](#), “Pollution” is defined as “The discharge, dispersal, seepage, migration or escape of pollutants. Pollutants means any solid, liquid, gaseous, or thermal irritant or contaminant including smoke, vapor, soot, fumes, acid, alkalis, chemicals, artificially produced electric fields, magnetic field, electromagnetic field, sound waves, microwaves, and all artificially produced ionizing or nonionizing radiation and/or waste.” Similar definitions for pollution are in the product protection plans for [AT&T](#), [Sprint](#), [Verizon](#), and [T-Mobile](#).

Wireless companies inform shareholders of RF risk¹⁰⁷ but not the communities impacted by the infrastructure.¹⁰⁸ Companies clearly inform shareholders that companies may incur significant financial losses related to non-ionizing electromagnetic fields. Corporate investor [warnings](#) by companies such as [T-Mobile](#), [AT&T](#), [Verizon](#), [Vodafone](#) and [Crown Castle](#) are contained in their Annual Reports, and Form 10-K (or Form 20-F or 40-F for foreign companies) with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). For example, Crown Castle states in their [10-K tax filing](#) that:

If radio frequency emissions from wireless handsets or equipment on our communications infrastructure are demonstrated to cause negative health effects, potential future claims could adversely affect our operations, costs or revenues.

The potential connection between radio frequency emissions and certain negative health effects, including some forms of cancer, has been the subject of substantial study by the scientific community in recent years. We cannot guarantee that claims relating to radio frequency emissions will not arise in the future or that the results of such studies will not be adverse to us.

Public perception of possible health risks associated with cellular or other wireless connectivity services and wireless technologies (such as 5G) may slow or diminish the growth of wireless companies and deployment of new wireless technologies, which may in turn slow or diminish our growth. In particular, negative public perception of, and regulations regarding, these perceived health

¹⁰⁵ [Electromagnetic Field Insurance Policy Exclusions Cell Phone Radiation and EMFs - Environmental Health Trust](#)

¹⁰⁶ page 30 <https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/Portland-Public-School-2017-18-Excess-Liability0D0A-policy-1.pdf>

¹⁰⁷ [Corporate Company Investor Warnings in Annual Reports 10k Filings Cell Phone Radiation Risks - Environmental Health Trust](#)

¹⁰⁸ <https://ehtrust.org/key-issues/corporate-company-investor-warnings-annual-reports-10k-filings-cell-phone-radiation-risks/>

risks may slow or diminish the market acceptance of wireless services and technologies. If a connection between radio frequency emissions and possible negative health effects were established, our operations, costs, or revenues may be materially and adversely affected. We currently do not maintain any significant insurance with respect to these matters.”

[Verizon stated in its 10-K for 2022](#) under the section “Legal and Regulatory Risks” that:

“We are subject to a substantial amount of litigation, which could require us to pay significant damages or settlements. We are subject to a substantial amount of litigation and claims in arbitration, including, but not limited to, shareholder derivative suits, patent infringement lawsuits, wage and hour class actions, contract and commercial claims, personal injury claims, property claims, environmental claims, and lawsuits relating to our advertising, sales, billing and collection practices. In addition, our wireless business also faces personal injury and wrongful death lawsuits relating to alleged health effects of wireless phones. or radio frequency transmitters. We may incur significant expenses in defending these lawsuits. In addition, we may be required to pay significant awards or settlements.”

ATTACHMENT 6: Expert Recommendations on Technology Safety

This section includes recommendations from the following groups:

1. GAO
2. American Academy of Pediatrics
3. California Department of Health
4. Connecticut Department of Public Health
5. North Carolina Public Health Department
6. Maryland State Children’s Environmental Health and Protection Advisory Council
7. Santa Clara Medical Association
8. California Medical Association
9. Scientists With Expertise in Biological Effects of Electromagnetic Radiation
10. New Hampshire State Commission on 5G Health and Environment

United States Government Accountability Office

A 2012 Government Accountability Office (GAO) Report titled “Telecommunications: Exposure and Testing Requirements for Mobile Phones Should Be Reassessed”¹⁰⁹ stated that “By not formally reassessing its

¹⁰⁹ [Exposure and Testing Requirements for Mobile Phones Should Be Reassessed Report to Congressional Requesters.](#) United States Government Accountability Office, 2012.

current limit, FCC cannot ensure it is using a limit that reflects the latest research on RF energy exposure...” and that “Some consumers may use mobile phones against the body, which FCC does not currently test, and could result in RF energy exposure higher than the FCC limit.” This report resulted in two GAO recommendations for the FCC:

Recommendation 1: “The Chairman of the FCC should formally reassess the current RF energy exposure limit, including its effects on human health, the costs and benefits associated with keeping the current limit, and the opinions of relevant health and safety agencies, and change the limit if determined appropriate.”

Recommendation 2: “The Chairman of the FCC should reassess whether mobile phone testing requirements result in the identification of maximum RF energy exposure in likely usage configurations, particularly when mobile phones are held against the body, and update testing requirements as appropriate.”

According to the GAO report “Despite many years of consideration, FCC still has no specific plans to take any actions that would satisfy our recommendations. Accordingly, we are closing the recommendations as not implemented.”

The American Academy of Pediatrics

The American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) has written [several letters to the FCC](#) calling on them to update wireless safety limits to protect children ¹¹⁰stating that, “Current FCC standards do not account for the unique vulnerability and use patterns specific to pregnant women and children. It is essential that any new standard for cell phones or other wireless devices be based on protecting the youngest and most vulnerable populations to ensure they are safeguarded throughout their lifetimes.”

In response to the U.S. National Toxicology Program [animal study findings of cancer and DNA damage](#)¹¹¹ from cell phone radiation, the AAP also issued the cell phone safety tips specifically for families¹¹² to reduce exposure to wireless radiation including, “If you plan to watch a movie on your device, download it first, then switch to airplane mode while you watch in order to avoid unnecessary radiation exposure.”

The American Academy of Pediatrics [states regarding cell towers](#)¹¹³ that, “An Egyptian study confirmed concerns that living nearby mobile phone base stations increased the risk for developing: Headaches, Memory problems, Dizziness, Depression, Sleep problems.”

¹¹⁰ [The American Academy of Pediatrics Letters to the FCC](https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/American-Academy-of-Pediatrics-Letters-to-FCC-and-Congress-.pdf)
<https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/American-Academy-of-Pediatrics-Letters-to-FCC-and-Congress-.pdf>
[AAP Letter to the FCC Chairman calling for the FCC to open up a review of RF guidelines \(7/12/2012\)](#)
[AAP Letter to US Representative Dennis Kucinich in Support of the Cell Phone Right to Know Act 12/12/2012](#)
[AAP to FCC Commissioner Mignon Clyburn and FDA Commissioner Margaret Hamburg calling for a review of RF guidelines 8/29/2013](#)

¹¹¹ [Cell Phone Radio Frequency Radiation](#)

¹¹² [Cell Phone Radiation & Children’s Health: What Parents Need to Know - HealthyChildren.org](#)

¹¹³ [Electromagnetic Fields: A Hazard to Your Health? - HealthyChildren.org](#)

California Department of Health

The California Department of Health released [an advisory on how to reduce cell phone radiation](#)¹¹⁴ stating children may be more at risk and “Although the science is still evolving, some laboratory experiments and human health studies have suggested the possibility that long-term, high use of cell phones may be linked to certain types of cancer and other health effects.” Recommendations include, “Parents should consider reducing the time their children use cell phones and encourage them to turn the devices off at night.”

Connecticut Department of Public Health

The Connecticut Department of Public Health states in its FAQs on Cell Phones that it is “wise” to reduce cell phone radio frequency to one’s brain.¹¹⁵

North Carolina Public Health Department

[The North Carolina Public Health Department](#) lists the full cancer findings of the NTP study¹¹⁶, the FDA stance, and also the American Academy of Pediatrics recommendations to reduce cell phone radiation stating “there is some concern that exposure to non-ionizing radiation, also called radio frequency radiation, that is emitted by cell phones may result in an increased risk of cancer or other health effects”

Maryland State Children’s Environmental Health And Protection Advisory Council

The [Maryland State Children’s Environmental Health And Protection Advisory Council](#), whose 19 member Commission includes experts in public health, pediatricians, state health and environment agencies and legislators issued a report recommending reducing wireless exposure to children in schools and homes.¹¹⁷

Santa Clara Medical Association

The [Santa Clara Medical Association](#) Best Practices for Technology in schools¹¹⁸ recommends reducing Wi-Fi exposure and restricting cell towers near schools.

California Medical Association

In 2014, the California Medical Association passed two resolutions regarding wireless standards: 1. To “support efforts to reevaluate microwave safety exposure levels associated with wireless communication devices, including consideration of adverse non-thermal biologic and health effects from non-ionizing electromagnetic radiation used in wireless communications”; and 2. To “support efforts to implement new

¹¹⁴ California Department of Public Health, [Cell phone advisory](#) (2017)

¹¹⁵ [Connecticut Department of Public Health, Cell Phone Factsheet 2015](#)

¹¹⁶ [North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services, Cell Phones 2020](#) .

¹¹⁷ The Maryland State Children’s Environmental Health and Protection Advisory Council [Wi-Fi in School Report](#), [Letter to the Federal Communications Commission](#) May 1, 2019 and [“Guidelines to Reduce Electromagnetic Field Radiation”](#)

¹¹⁸ [Santa Clara County Medical Association Best Practices for Safe Technology in Schools](#)

safety exposure limits for wireless devices to levels that do not cause human or environmental harm based on scientific research.”

Scientists With Expertise in Electromagnetic Radiation

Numerous medical groups have called for policies to reduce children’s exposure¹¹⁹. For example, the [EMF Scientists](#) are over 259 scientists from 41 countries who have peer-reviewed publications on electromagnetic fields who made a 2015 appeal to the United Nations¹²⁰ and all member States in the world to encourage the World Health Organization “to exert strong leadership in fostering the development of more protective EMF guidelines, encouraging precautionary measures, and educating the public about health risks, particularly risk to children and fetal development.” A recent paper published in *Environment Magazine*¹²¹ argues that government regulation and protection from the increased levels of RF is well past due.

New Hampshire State Commission on 5G Health and Environment

In 2019 the New Hampshire government passed House Bill 522 “An act establishing a commission to study the environmental and health effects of evolving 5G technology.”¹²² The Commission released its [Final Report on Commission to Study the Environmental and Health Effects of Evolving 5G Technology](#)¹²³ in 2020 with findings that safety assurance for wireless technology “come into question because of the thousands of peer-reviewed studies documenting deleterious health effects associated with cellphone radiation exposure.” In its report the Commission issued 15 recommendations:

1. Support statewide deployment of fiber optic cable connectivity with wired connections inside homes.
2. New Hampshire schools and libraries should replace Wi-Fi with hardwired connections.
3. Require setbacks for new wireless antennas from residences, businesses, and schools.
4. New Hampshire health agencies should educate the public on minimizing radiofrequency radiation (RFR) exposure with public service announcements on radio, television, and print. “Warnings concerning the newborn and young as well as pregnant women”
5. Establish RFR free zones in commercial and public buildings
6. New measurement protocols needed to evaluate high data rate, signal characteristics associated with biological effects and cumulative effects of multiple radiation sources.
7. RFR signal strength measurements for cell sites should be done by independent contractors.
8. NH professional licensure to offer education so home inspectors can include RFR intensity

¹¹⁹ [Reykjavik Iceland Appeal on Wireless in School](#); [Scientist 5G Appeal to the EU](#)(2017) [Nicosia Declaration](#) (2017); [the International Society of Doctors for Environment 5G Appeal](#) (2018); [2020 Consensus Statement of UK and International Medical and Scientific Experts and Practitioners on Health Effects of Non-Ionising Radiation](#).

¹²⁰https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/European_Journal_on_Oncology_December_2015.International_EMF_Scientist_Appeal-2.pdf and [EMF Scientist](#)

¹²¹ Ben-Ishai, P. (2024). [Applying the Precautionary Principal To Wireless Technology: Policy Dilemmas and Systemic Risks](#) *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, Volume 66, 2024, P: 5-18.

¹²² https://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/bill_status/legacy/bs2016/

¹²³ <https://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/statstudcomm/committees/1474/reports/5G%20final%20report.pdf>

measurements.

9. Warning signs to be posted in commercial and public buildings.
10. State should measure RFR and post maps with measurements for the public.
11. Require 5G structures to be labeled for RFR at eye level and readable from nine feet away.
12. Engage agencies with ecological knowledge to develop RFR safety limits that will protect the trees, plants, birds, insects, and pollinators.
13. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, FCC should do an environmental impact statement as to the effect on New Hampshire and the country as a whole from 5G and the expansion of RF wireless technologies.
14. Cell phones and wireless devices should be equipped with updated software that stops cell phones from radiating when positioned against the body.
15. A resolution to US Congress to require the FCC to commission an independent health study and review of safety limits.

ATTACHMENT 7: Fact Sheet on Environmental Impacts of Satellite Proliferation

S.4010 is a Senate companion bill¹²⁴ to HR 1338,¹²⁵ the impact of which is described in the attached factsheet on environmental and other impacts of satellite proliferation.¹²⁶

¹²⁴ <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/senate-bill/4010>

¹²⁵ <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/1338>

¹²⁶ Fact sheet also available at

<https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/Satellite-federal-bills-EHT-factsheet-11-1-23.pdf>