

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)
)
Notice of Proposed Rulemaking)
18 FCC Rcd 13187, 13188 ¶1 (2003)) ET Docket No. 03-137
)
And)
)
Service Rules for the Advanced Wireless Services) WT Docket No. 12-357
)
H Block---Implementing Section 6401 of the)
Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of)
2012 Related to the 1915-1920 MHz and)
1995-2000 MHz Bands ¶53 footnote 95)

To: Office of the Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554

Reply Filed by: Catherine Kleiber
N9387 Riverview Dr.
Waterloo, WI 53594
kleiber@gdinet.com
(920) 478-9696

March 6 , 2013

1. The FCC is in violation of the responsibilities to protect the public health and safety (H.R. Report No. 104-204, p. 94) and under the ADA, particularly the 2009 Amendments, by not having biologically-based radiofrequency radiation safety limits.
2. Increasing numbers of medical groups (Exhibits safeschools2012.pdf and aap_support_letter_cell_phone_right_to_know_act.pdf) and researchers [The 2012 BioInitiative Report is incorporated by reference herein in its entirety (<http://www.bioinitiative.org/>)] are calling for minimizing exposure to radiofrequency radiation for vulnerable populations e.g. children and pregnant women, elderly, those with medical implants, and those with radiofrequency induced functional impairments.
3. Does the FCC think it knows better than medical doctors and biological researchers or will it adopt biologically-based radiofrequency radiation safety limits?
4. The FCC has acknowledged in phone conversations with me and others that it does not have the biological expertise to set biologically-based radiofrequency radiation safety limits. In light of H.R. Report No. 104-204, p. 94 charging the FCC with protecting the public health and safety, why has the FCC not requested in a loud and persistent manner that the EPA, which has the expertise, be empowered and funded to set biologically-based radiofrequency radiation safety limits?
5. In light of H.R. Report No. 104-204, p. 94 charging the FCC with protecting the public health and safety, how does the FCC justify continuing to roll out new spectrum for use and/or re-allocating old spectrum for more intensive use when this results in an overall increase in radiofrequency radiation for the entire population, including vulnerable populations, at levels far beyond those found to cause biological effects?
6. In light of H.R. Report No. 104-204, p. 94 charging the FCC with protecting the public health and safety, how does the FCC justify having radiofrequency radiation limits which only apply to each transmitter individually, not the aggregate radiation levels, given that biological effect occur based on the aggregate, not just the contribution of each transmitter independently?
7. In light of H.R. Report No. 104-204, p. 94 charging the FCC with protecting the public health and safety, how does the FCC justify involuntarily exposing the entire population to a class 2B carcinogen when faster, more secure, more energy efficient methods are available to deliver the service in most situations.
8. In situations where no alternative exists, the service delivered is usually a non-essential service e.g. video, text, or voice access while walking down a street or sitting in a cornfield. In light of H.R. Report No. 104-204, p. 94 charging the FCC with protecting the public health and safety, how does the FCC justify raising the health risks for the whole population so people can access non-essential information and make non-essential communications?

9. In light of H.R. Report No. 104-204, p. 94 charging the FCC with protecting the public health and safety and the evidence of numerous detrimental health effects of exposure to radiofrequency radiation (www.bioinitiative.org), why has the FCC not endorsed pricing of wireless communication that would relegate it to use only for essential communications in order to protect the public health?
10. Why has the FCC not prioritized using taxpayer funded broadband grants for wired internet connections, including fiber optic which has been shown to cause the desired economic development due to being the fastest, most secure, most energy efficient, and safest method of providing broadband.
11. With healthcare costs rising quickly and budgetary deficits and in light of H.R. Report No. 104-204, p. 94 charging the FCC with protecting the public health and safety, why would the FCC waste any taxpayer money on a technology now classified as a class 2B possible human carcinogen that is likely to be re-classified soon as a probable human carcinogen since evidence already exists to support such a classification (<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6017161984>, http://www.law.harvard.edu/news/2011/11/18_safracenter-cellphone-radiation-corruption.html)?
12. The FCC is supposed to comply with the ADA, so how does it justify approving devices and use of spectrum that make a percentage, 3-5% or more, of the population unable to access public places, due to the environmentally-induced functional impairment caused by wireless technology?
13. Our family has experienced this first-hand. We can no longer be in cities, restaurants, libraries, schools, government buildings, and other public places where radiofrequency radiation levels are high. Levels over about 5 microwatts/meter squared make our children feel unwell and suffer detrimental cognitive effects. Our children are missing out on many potentially beneficial experiences because wireless technology has turned those experiences into potentially life-threatening experiences due to the dangerous cardiac reactions wireless technology produces in them. They are not alone in this. Many others report experiencing it. I do myself under high exposure situations, like close proximity to a WiFiing computer, cellphone, or other strong transmitter. Further, it is mentioned in Dodge (attached as Dodge_1969.pdf) as one of the serious effects of radiofrequency exposure. (Please see my previous Reply for additional details about the problems the FCC's abdication of its duty to protect the public health and safety have caused for me and my family - confirmation number 2013218204120)
14. In light of the ADA and H.R. Report No. 104-204, p. 94 charging the FCC with protecting the public health and safety and evidence showing potentially very serious effects on children, pregnant women and other vulnerable persons (www.bioinitiative.org), why has the

FCC not formulated rules prohibiting placement of antennas on roofs of or in proximity to hospitals, schools, and homes?

15. We are experiencing trouble accessing medical care due to the presence of transmitters of various descriptions near the hospital, on the hospital roof , and in hospital equipment. Again, due to the very serious nature of our reactions, accessing medical care under these circumstances could be life-threatening and by allowing this situation to arise the FCC is in violation of the ADA. In light of H.R. Report No. 104-204, p. 94 charging the FCC with protecting the public health and safety and the 2009 Amendments to the ADA, what is the FCC proposing to do to once again allow access to medical facilities by the whole population, including those adversely affected by radiofrequency radiation?
16. Please send me considered and complete answers to my questions in a timely fashion.
17. I hope that the FCC will immediately begin taking steps to protect the public health and safety as required by H.R. Report No. 104-204, p. 94 charging the FCC with protecting the public health and safety. I hope it will stop clinging to its outdated physics-based radiofrequency radiation limits, since they are irrelevant to protecting the public health and safety, as charged in H.R. Report No. 104-204, p. 94, and place a moratorium on any increases in radiofrequency radiation exposure until meaningful modern biologically-based radiofrequency radiation safety limits can be put in place.