EXHIBIT 2

MG

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUL 16 2002

OFFICE OF
AIR AND RADIATION

Ms. Janet Newton
President
The EMR Network
P.O. Box 221
Marshfield, VT 05658

Dear Ms.Newton:

This is in reply to your letter of January 31, 2002, to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator Whitman, in which you express your concerns about the adequacy of the Federal Communications Commission's (FCC) radiofrequency (RF) radiation exposure guidelines and nonthermal effects of radiofrequency radiation. Another issue that you raise in your letter is the FCC's claim that EPA shares responsibility for recommending RF radiation protection guidelines to the FCC. I hope that my reply will clarify EPA's position with regard to these concerns. I believe that it is correct to say that there is uncertainty about whether or not current guidelines adequately treat nonthermal, prolonged exposures (exposures that may continue on an intermittent basis for many years). The explanation that follows is basically a summary of statements that have been made in other EPA documents and correspondence.

The guidelines currently used by the FCC were adopted by the FCC in 1996. The guidelines were recommended by EPA, with certain reservations, in a letter to Thomas P. Stanley, Chief Engineer, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, November 9, 1993, in response to the FCC's request for comments on their Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM), Guidelines for Evaluating the Environmental Effects of Radiofrequency Radiation (enclosed).

The FCC's current exposure guidelines, as well as those of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) and the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection, are thermally based, and do not apply to chronic, nonthermal exposure situations. They are believed to protect against injury that may be caused by acute exposures that result in tissue heating or electric shock and burn. The hazard level (for frequencies generally at or greater than 3 MHz) is based on a specific absorption dose-rate, SAR, associated with an effect

that results from an increase in body temperature. The FCC's exposure guideline is considered protective of effects arising from a thermal mechanism but not from all possible mechanisms. Therefore, the generalization by many that the guidelines protect human beings from harm by any or all mechanisms is not justified.

These guidelines are based on findings of an adverse effect level of 4 watts per kilogram (W/kg) body weight. This SAR was observed in laboratory research involving acute exposures that elevated the body temperature of animals, including nonhuman primates. The exposure guidelines did not consider information that addresses nonthermal, prolonged exposures, i.e., from research showing effects with implications for possible adversity in situations involving chronic/prolonged, low-level (nonthermal) exposures. Relatively few chronic, low-level exposure studies of laboratory animals and epidemiological studies of human populations have been reported and the majority of these studies do not show obvious adverse health effects. However, there are reports that suggest that potentially adverse health effects, such as cancer, may occur. Since EPA's comments were submitted to the FCC in 1993, the number of studies reporting effects associated with both acute and chronic low-level exposure to RF radiation has increased.

While there is general, although not unanimous, agreement that the database on low-level, long-term exposures is not sufficient to provide a basis for standards development, some contemporary guidelines state explicitly that their adverse-effect level is based on an increase in body temperature and do not claim that the exposure limits protect against both thermal and nonthermal effects. The FCC does not claim that their exposure guidelines provide protection for exposures to which the 4 W/kg SAR basis does not apply, i.e., exposures below the 4 W/kg threshold level that are chronic/prolonged and nonthermal. However, exposures that comply with the FCC's guidelines generally have been represented as "safe" by many of the RF system operators and service providers who must comply with them, even though there is uncertainty about possible risk from nonthermal, intermittent exposures that may continue for years.

The 4 W/kg SAR, a whole-body average, time-average dose-rate, is used to derive dose-rate and exposure limits for situations involving RF radiation exposure of a person's entire body from a relatively remote radiating source. Most people's greatest exposures result from the use of personal communications devices that expose the head. In summary, the current exposure guidelines used by the FCC are based on the effects resulting from whole-body heating, not exposure of and effect on critical organs including the brain and the eyes. In addition, the maximum permitted local SAR limit of 1.6 W/kg for critical organs of the body is related directly to the permitted whole body average SAR (0.08 W/kg), with no explanation given other than to limit heating.

I also have enclosed a letter written in June of 1999 to Mr. Richard Tell, Chair, IEEE SCC28 (SC4) Risk Assessment Work Group, in which the members of the Radiofrequency Interagency Work Group (RFIAWG) identified certain issues that they had determined needed to be addressed in order to provide a strong and credible rationale to support RF exposure guidelines.

Federal health and safety agencies have not yet developed policies concerning possible risk from long-term, nonthermal exposures. When developing exposure standards for other physical agents such as toxic substances, health risk uncertainties, with emphasis given to sensitive populations, are often considered. Incorporating information on exposure scenarios involving repeated short duration/nonthermal exposures that may continue over very long periods of time (years), with an exposed population that includes children, the elderly, and people with various debilitating physical and medical conditions, could be beneficial in delineating appropriate protective exposure guidelines.

I appreciate the opportunity to be of service and trust that the information provided is helpful. If you have further questions, my phone number is (202) 564-9235 and e-mail address is hankin.norbert@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

Norbert Hankin
Center for Science and Risk Assessment
Radiation Protection Division

Enclosures:

1) letter to Thomas P. Stanley, Chief Engineer, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, November 9, 1993, in response to the FCC's request for comments on their Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM), Guidelines for Evaluating the Environmental Effects of Radiofrequency Radiation
2) June 1999 letter to Mr. Richard Tell, Chair, IEEE SCC28 (SC4) Risk Assessment Work Group from the Radiofrequency Radiation Interagency Work Group