

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPLICANT WIZN'S SUPPLEMENTAL FINDINGS OF FACT

I.	History.....	1
A.	Background.....	1
B.	Permit #4C0901 RevocationPetition.....	2
C.	Permit #4C1004R.....	3
D.	Permit #4C1004R-EB.....	3
II.	Parties.....	3
III.	Scope of Appeal.....	4
IV.	Findings of Fact.....	5
A.	If Proposed Findings are Not Granted, They are Denied.....	5
B.	The Project.....	5
C.	WIZN's Experts on RF.....	6
D.	Background on RF.....	8
a.	Basic Explanation of EMF (RF).....	8
b.	Electromagnetic Energy (EME).....	8
c.	Electromagnetic waves.....	8
d.	The Electromagnetic Spectrum.....	9
e.	Ionizing and Non-Ionizing Radiation.....	10
f.	Radiofrequencies.....	10
g.	RF Radiation (RF).....	10
h.	Interaction of EM Waves With Humans.....	11
i.	The Difference Between The Effects Of RF And Ionizing Radiation.....	11
j.	Specific Absorption Rate (SAR).....	11
k.	"Maximum Permissible Exposure" (MPE).....	12
E.	Regulation of RF.....	12
a.	The Development of the FCC Standards Regarding Exposure to M/RF.....	12
b.	IEEE Standard C95.1-1991.....	14
c.	The Built-in Margin of Safety.....	17
d.	NCRP SC-53 Recommendations.....	17
e.	"Controlled" or "Uncontrolled" Exposure.....	18
F.	The FCC Guidelines Have Been Almost Universally Adopted.....	19
G.	The Standards Are Based Upon the Best Scientific and Health Research.....	19
a.	The FCC Consulted with The Appropriate Health Agencies.....	19
b.	The Research Upon Which The FCC Guidelines Is Based Is Constantly Updated.....	21
c.	The International Scientific Community Has Continuously Reviewed the Science and Found the FCC/ICNIRP Standard Appropriate to Protect Health and Safety.....	28

- d. The Vermont Department of Public Service Undertook An Independent Review of RF Standards And Concluded That The FCC Guidelines Were Appropriate..... 29
- H. In Adopting Its Standards, The FCC Did Examine The Possibility Of Non-Thermal Effects And Such Alleged Effects Have Been Extensively Addressed By The Many National And International Boards And Reviews Which Have Reviewed The Science..... 30
 - a. IEEE and FCC considered all potential health and safety effects of RF..... 30
 - b. Continuing Scientific Reviews Have Not Supported the Allegations of Adverse “Non-Thermal” Effects..... 30
 - c. Various International Studies Have Examined the Issue of Alleged Non-Thermal Effects and Have Rejected any Change in Standards Based Upon Such Speculative Claims..... 33
 - d. The issues Raised by Appellants Have Been Raised by Related Parties in FCC Proceedings and the Courts..... 36
- I. Appellants Presented No Credible Evidence that Exposure to Low Levels of RF Causes Adverse Health Effects..... 38
 - a. The Issues And Studies Cited By Appellants are Not New. They have Been Fully Reviewed and Rejected as the Basis for New Standards..... 38
 - b. Most of the Research Cited by Appellants Relates to Irrelevant Frequencies..... 40
 - c. Dr. Blank’s Contentions that National and International Scientific Boards and Regulatory Agencies are Biased and Lack Expertise are Not Credible..... 41
 - d. A Biological Response to Low Levels of RF Does Not Equate to Adverse Health Effects..... 42
 - e. Appellants Experts Admit Research on Stress Protein Response Does Not Demonstrate Adverse Health Effects..... 44
 - f. Mr. Kasevich’s Calculations Show that Biological Effects Are Only Triggered at Level in Excess of the FCC Guidelines..... 49
- J. The Project is in Compliance with the FCC Guidelines..... 50
 - a. WIZN’s Expert Donald L. Haes, Jr., Provided Credible Evidence of Compliance with FCC Standards..... 50
 - (i) Equipment and Methods Used by Mr. Haes in his RF Testing..... 50
 - (ii) The Project is in Compliance with the Guidelines in the Theoretical Modeling and the Actual Testing..... 52
 - (iii) Results of Mr. Hae’s RF Field Tests..... 53
 - b. The FCC Has Found WIZN’s RF To Be In Compliance With Its Guidelines..... 54
 - c. The Appellants’ Expert, Raymond Kasevich, was Not Credible, Especially in Regard to His Data From Contact or Near Contact Readings..... 55
 - (i) Mr. Kasevich’s RF Field Test Records are Incomplete and Suspect..... 56
 - (ii) Results of Mr. Kasevich’s RF Field Tests that were Disclosed..... 56
 - (iii) Mr. Kasevich Did Not Use His Equipment Properly..... 57
 - (iv) Mr. Kasevich Did Not Use Established Scientific Methodology in Testing..... 58
 - (v) Mr. Kasevich “Hot Spot” Readings Result from His Decision to Take Measurements Near or in Direct Contact with Metallic Objects ad Reflective Surfaces, in Direct Conflict with Industry Accepted Testing Practices..... 59

Deleted: EE

Deleted:

Deleted: ...

Deleted: ...

Deleted: ...

Deleted: ...

Deleted:

Deleted: ...

Deleted:

Deleted:

Deleted:

K.	The FCC Guidelines Are the Only Standards Supported by the Scientific Evidence.....	61	
a.	Dr. Blank's Threshold, at One-Billionth of the Universal Standard, is Unsupported and Unachievable.....	61	Deleted:
b.	Kasevich's Exclusion Zone is Unsupported and Unachievable.....	61	Deleted: ...
c.	The Bernstein Standard of 10% of the FCC Guidelines is Arbitrary and Unsupported.....	62	Deleted: ...
d.	The Exclusion Zone Inherent in the FCC Guidelines Suffices to Protect the Public.....	62	Deleted:
L.	Conclusions of Law.....	63	Deleted:
M.	Order.....	66	