Document Download

LetterFCC1...

ID	1052883323587	**Proceeding**	OET 19-226
Name of Filer	Alex Aliferis		
Type of Filing	COMMENT	**Filing Status**	DISSEMINATED
Viewing Status	Unrestricted		
Total Pagecount	2		
Date Received	May 28, 2020	**Date Posted**	May 28, 2020
Address	505 E Locust St	**City**	Lodi
		State	CA
ZIP	95240		

Alex Aliferis

505 E Locust St

Lodi, CA 95240

5/28/2020

Dear FCC,

I am writing comments in regards to 19-226.

Issue #1: The FCC is planning to establish "safe" human exposure guidelines to ultra high frequencies, above 100 Gigahertz (GHz).

The FCC's repeated refusal to consider biological effects from exposure to all types of wireless radiation shows a clear and dangerous intention to disregard the emerging science which must inform its decisions regarding public health.

I feel the negative effects of high wireless to my body. When I carry my smartphone, or I have my laptop open, my skin burns.

Issue #2: The FCC is considering allowing manufacturers to average the radiation output of consumer devices over time.

Since the justification for this proposed rule change is that manufacturers want to be able to deliver more data to notebooks and tablets, it seems obvious that this change would result in higher exposures for users.

I object to the practice of allowing exposures to be averaged over time to comply with FCC exposure limits. There is no scientific basis to support the notion that short, periodic bursts of RF radiation are not biologically harmful, or that only cumulative effects over time may have an impact. The FCC should establish temporal limits for both Specific Absorption Rate (SAR) and power density.

Further, I agree with the American Academy of Pediatrics that the FCC's current method of testing wireless devices is not reflective of the way people actually use technology today. Given the increasing use of wireless devices by children and adolescents, we encourage the FCC to seek out and utilize testing protocols that reflect real-world situations.

Issue #3: How should the FCC regulate Wireless Power Transfer (WPT) technologies that can remotely charge devices while the user is in motion?

I recommend that before the agency considers even tentative approval of WPT devices operating at ranges in excess of 5o cm, it requires manufacturers to conduct pre-market testing to demonstrate the safety of such devices when used in all possible “worst case” scenarios,

including mitigation techniques to avoid inadvertent or collateral damage to the public. Such an analysis must include consideration of biological impacts.

The issues here are very significant. How will this impact an older person with an implanted cardiac pacemaker who uses a remote charger to charge his cell phone while he is moving around with the phone in his shirt pocket? Or consider the couple trying to get pregnant if the man's phone is frequently being charged wirelessly in the front pocket of his pants, with the beam irradiating his testicles?

What kind of human is the FCC considering protecting? What size, shape, age, and with what kind of underlying medical problem or weakness? I urge the agency to consider updating its standard anatomical models to reflect the wide variety of possible users.

I hope you consider my comments.

Thank you,

Alex Aliferis