

**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

Comment Filed by: (Kevin Mottus)
(11041 Santa Monica Blvd. #627
(Los Angeles, CA 90025)
(stopwirelessradiation@gmail.com)
(310-479-0299)

February 6, 2013

AFFIDAVIT OF Kevin Mottus

State of CA]

LA County]

I, Kevin Mottus, attest that my statements are true to the best of my knowledge.

Comment round for ET Docket No. 03-137 and WT Docket No. 12-357.

1. My name is Kevin Mottus. My address is 11041 Santa Monica Blvd. #627 Los Angeles, CA 90025.

2. I am a SOCIAL WORKER.

3. This Submission addresses the following: 4. Other Technical Issues 53. Part 27 contains several additional technical rules applicable to all Part 27 services, including Section 27.51 (Equipment authorization), Section 27.52 (RF safety),⁹⁵

FCC BEYOND A CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The FCC is unable to regulate the wireless industry because your commissioners and staff come from the wireless/telecom industry and return to the wireless/telecom industry. This is a massive conflict of interest, really to the degree that it is beyond a conflict of interest really. It is completely unethical. You should not be expected to regulate yourselves and you have failed to regulate RF radiation exposure emitted from wireless to the detriment of the health and well being of the public.

HAVING THE IEEE SET SAFETY STANDARDS IS REALLY A SAD AND INAPPROPRIATE JOKE AND THE PUBLIC'S HEALTH IS THE ONE TO SUFFER

Having a trade association from the industry being regulated set its own safety guidelines is really inappropriate given that they lack anyone with a biological background able to take into account the biological effects of RF radiation on humans and an obvious conflict of interest given that they are members of the industry who their regulations or limits will be effecting.

EPA SHOULD BE GIVEN MANDATE AND FUNDING TO REGULATE RF RADIATION USED BY WIRELESS

The FCC does not have the staff or medical expertise to set biologically based standards for the emissions of RF radiation as is necessary; therefore that duty should be given to

the EPA to regulate along with the funding to do so and carry out their own studies. Like with ionizing radiation where the Atomic Energy Commission was given the task of promoting the nuclear industry while also being asked to regulate it which clearly did not work, the dual relationship and mandate has not worked for the FCC either.

The tasks given to the Atomic Energy Commission were then split up with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission now regulating nuclear power and the Dept of Energy promoting nuclear energy use. The FCC needs a similar split to maintain a modicum of integrity and to effectively regulate the non-thermal biological effects of RF radiation emitted from wireless and to do so effectively with in house medically and scientifically trained staff. Funding needs to be allotted to enable the EPA to regulate RF radiation emissions.

The FCC has failed to protect the public from non-thermal biological effects from Radio Frequency radiation emitted from wireless. Now the FCC should be given the task of promoting the wireless/telecom industry while the EPA should be given the funding, mandate and power to regulate the RF radiation emissions used by the wireless industry to protect the health and well being of our population which is now almost completely exposed to this harmful agent due to the FCC efforts to expand its use.

When I asked others to write to you about their concerns about RF radiation exposure from wireless, most would not because they had given up believing that you could not do the right thing and act to protect the public. They believe that you are too intertwined with the industry you regulate to do what is right. I am writing to you today in hope that they are wrong although your past actions give me little reason to believe they are. The FCC needs to take drastic action to stem the tide and proliferation of wireless and thus public exposure to harmful RF radiation.

THE ASSERTION THAT THERE ARE NOT STUDIES PROVING NON-THERMAL EFFECTS FROM RF RADIATION IS SIMPLY NOT TRUE-THOUSANDS OF STUDIES ARE CITED.

FCC guidelines governing RF radiation exposure need to be lowered drastically to 1 million times lower to prevent the occurrence of non-thermal biological effects as supported by the BioInitiative Report and described in the studies carried out by the navy's in the report attached to an earlier submission by Zorach Glaser. In the report attached by Glaser he lists 90 pages of bibliographical citations of studies describing non-thermal biological effects due to exposure to RF radiation. The BioInitiative Report attached cites several thousand more. To believe the assertions of the wireless industry that there are not studies showing non-thermal effects simply is not true. I invite you to look at these citations and studies in the BioInitiative Report and Zorach Glaser's report and see for yourself the harm we are exposing our population to when we are exposing them to RF radiation in wireless.

More importantly are the real life people are becoming electrosensitive and are getting cancer due to heavy long term use of wireless devices emitting RF radiation. Business people, lawyers, salespeople having heavy amounts of RF radiation exposure via wireless

devices are getting cancer. We are literally crippling and often murdering our work force by exposing them to RF radiation, a cancer causing agent.

JUST ASK STEVE JOBS, JOHNNIE COCHRAN, SENATOR EDWARD KENNEDY, GARY CARTER, STEVE SABOL AND NOW LEBRON JAMES AND SHERYL CROW IF WIRELESS IS SAFE?

You say I cannot prove that their cancer was caused by RF radiation well you certainly cannot prove that it was not especially knowing what we know about the harmful and carcinogenic nature of RF radiation. Ask LeBron James who developed a tumor on his face where he holds his cell phone in his salivary gland if wireless is safe. European studies have shown an increase in the occurrence of cancer in the brain, salivary gland and acoustic nerve for those using cell phones who are more highly exposed to RF radiation. If LeBron James one of our most fit and able bodied citizens can get a tumor from cell phone use what does that mean for our small children now exposing themselves heavily to RF radiation through heavy cell phone use?

AS A GOVERNMENT BODY THE FCC HAS THE REQUIREMENT TO ACT PROTECTIVELY WHEN THERE IS SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE NOT ABSOLUTE PROOF AS IN A COURT OF LAW.

There is no absolute proof in science but that is what the FCC is waiting for to take protective action. The actual mechanism of cancer production is not known so The FCC is waiting to take action. We do not know the exact mechanism of action for any cancer but that does not keep us from taking protective action due to an association. We limit lead because it is seen to be harmful not because we have absolute proof. We limit exposure to asbestos not because we know the exact mechanism of cancerous action but because there is an association. The FCC has confused the legal requirement for action which is absolute proof with their governmental requirement which is that there be sufficient evidence for protective action. In the case of RF radiation exposure there is sufficient evidence it is harmful and cancerous to take protective action and set preventative exposure limits and certainly not to actively and aggressively promote the exposure of RF radiation as the FCC has done instead.

THERE IS SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE AVAILABLE FOR THE FCC TO SIGNIFICANTLY LIMIT RF RADIATION EXPOSURE RATHER THAN PROMOTE IT WITH RECKLESS ABANDON

The FCC has taken a very unwise course of expanding wireless and RF radiation exposure over the past 6 years. There is sufficient evidence to take precautionary action to protect the public from harm but instead the FCC has ignored the evidence and promoted this technology aggressively. We are all paying the price with decreased health and that cost will be increasing dramatically in the future. The FCC has allowed the wireless industry to play a dangerous game of hide the symptoms by allowing them to fund their own research. Their studies have been shown to be biased and of poor quality. Averaging has been used to hide the effects of RF radiation. Very light users of cell phones have been grouped with heavy users to hide the effect. Short term users have been mixed with long term users to hide the effect. Individuals dying from the cancer in question have been eliminated even though these individuals should be the most focused

on when looking for dangerous health effects. The FCC has done little to ensure the integrity of these studies or to fund independent research to ensure the safety of RF radiation exposure at current levels.

EPA SHOULD REGULATE RF RADIATION EMISSIONS DUE TO CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND LACK OF APPROPRIATE STAFF AT FCC

The FCC should not be allowed to regulate the RF radiation exposure used by wireless due to massive conflicts of interest. It is really more than a conflict of interest it is asking people from the industry itself to limit the industry they come from. It has not worked. I ask that the EPA be given funding and charge to regulate the RF radiation exposures from wireless devices and transmitters.

RF RADIATION EXPOSURE LIMITS SHOULD BE LOWERED TO .0001Uw/CM2 AS RECOMMENDED AND SUPPORTED BY THE BIOINITIATIVE REPORT TO PREVENT UNNECESSARY HARMFUL NON-THERMAL BIOLOGICAL EFFECTS

Respectfully submitted by:

(Kevin Mottus)
(11041 Santa Monica Blvd. #627)
(Los Angeles, CA 90025)
(stopwirelessradiation@gmail.com)
(310-479-0299)

February 6 , 2013