

Dear International Commission,

Consultation on Guidelines for limiting exposure to EMF

My name is xxxx. I am a UK citizen. I am a Teaching Assistant and Governor in a primary school (children aged from 3 to 11 years old) in a rural area just outside London.

I recently became interested in non-ionising radiation protection because a company wishes to erect a telecommunications mast on a playing field, used by the school children, which is to be 200 metres away from the school.

The proposed location for the mast will also be 20 metres from a small housing estate which has families with young children living there.

There is already another mast located only about 200 metres away from the proposed location for the new mast.

I decided to read the Commission's consultation document, firstly because I am worried about the health risks of non-ionizing radiation on children living close by to a mast and children attending a school so close to the mast.

And secondly, these guidelines, produced and set by the International Commission, are used by governments globally as the measure for 'safe' limits of non-ionising radiation.

In the UK, for instance, and probably other countries, operators are able to self-certify that the cumulative exposure of EMF from their antennae, when operational, will not exceed the International Commission guidelines on non-ionising radiation protection.

Whilst I am not a scientist, and I do not pretend to fully understand EMF exposure, I am concerned about the cumulative effect on both children (especially) and adults in the future. I am, therefore, alarmed at the guidelines for the following reasons:

1. You, as the International Commission, cannot guarantee that there are no health risks associated with levels of non-ionizing radiation emanating from masts – the current guidelines restrict radiofrequency EMF to levels that *'do not cause any **known** health effect.'*

*Why can you not recommend limits that do not cause **any** health effect?*

2. You acknowledge that there has been little/limited research into the impact of non-ionising radiation on children.
Why then are children treated as 'the general public' when the research is limited.
3. There are no recommendations from the International Commission, as to a safe distance for 24 hour exposure to non-ionising radiation – for adults (general public) and especially children. So what will/would the impact / cumulative exposure effects be on, say, a pre-school child who lives in a house 20/ 50/ 100/ 200 metres away from telecoms antennae? What about over a 6 hour/12 hour/24 hour period? For 1 day/ 5 days/ 365 days a year?
4. There is no reference to the impact of a number of antennae emitting EMF in a particular area coming from different directions.
5. Finally there is no reference at all to the long term cumulative effects on adults and children. I suspect that the research is probably not there which means that the long term cumulative effects cannot yet be quantified.

I am concerned because the International Commission has to bear the brunt of responsibility of the cumulative exposure of EMF on children when the effects are not yet known. A parallel can be drawn with the impact of diesel cars – once encouraged over petrol engines – now having a major impact on children and the environment.

I would therefore, humbly, urge the International Commission to:

- *include minimum safe exposure levels including restricting time and distance – especially areas where children frequent and*
- *initiate further comprehensive studies of the impact of low levels of non-ionising radiation on children.*

I apologise for not being a technical person. Thank you for reading this.

XXXX