

## Oregon Health Authority Issues False and Misleading Report on Health Risks of Wireless Radiation Exposure to School Children

In June, 2019 the Oregon State Legislature passed [Senate Bill 283](#) which called upon the Oregon Health Authority (OHA) to “review peer-reviewed, independently funded scientific studies of the health effects of exposure to microwave radiation, particularly exposure that results from the use of wireless network technologies in schools...”

OHA’s final report was released to the Legislature on December 31, 2020.

Scientists, public health professionals and medical experts who study the biological effects and public health impacts from radiofrequency radiation (RFR) exposure are calling for the Legislature to retract OHA’s report and reject its determination that there is insufficient evidence to conclude that RFR exposure is harmful to children.

According to the experts, the study is fundamentally flawed due to its “industry-friendly” design. The authors of the report excluded published animal studies that show harmful impacts, failed to consider the unique vulnerability of children, had numerous errors and included studies funded by the wireless industry, a clear violation of the legislative mandate to only consider “independently-funded scientific studies.”

Also excluded from the OHA report are:

1. the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC)/WHO’s classification of wireless RFR exposure as a [possible human carcinogen](#), placing it in the same health risk category as lead, DDT and diesel exhaust,
2. conclusions from the 10 year, \$30 million major animal study conducted by the U.S National Toxicology Program (NTP) that determined [“clear evidence” of cancer](#) and DNA damage from RFR exposure, and
3. studies showing that RFR [penetrates deeper](#) into children’s brains, [damages the brain](#), and is associated with [breast cancer](#).

*“Overall, the National Toxicology Program findings demonstrate the potential for radiofrequency radiation to cause cancer in humans,”* states Linda Birnbaum, PhD recently retired as Director of the National Institutes of Environmental Health Sciences of the National Institutes of Health and Director of the National Toxicology Program (quoted from her comments in [the 2020 Amicus Brief filed in support of EHT v. FCC](#)).

Limiting the scope of this OHA report to include only human studies in this assessment and refusing to assess laboratory animal studies, as well as the many conclusive published cell data studies [showing biological harm from RFR](#) ensured from the start that the review would find no evidence of harm.

OHA’s omission of laboratory animal studies is contrary to the scientific consensus on methods to identify a hazard as followed by the world’s leading public health agencies:

- **The U.S. National Toxicology Program (NTP)**
- **Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)**
- **Food and Drug Administration (FDA)**

- International Agency for the Research on Cancer of the World Health Organization (WHO/IARC)
- Center for Disease Control (CDC)

*“The failure of Oregon Health Authority to consider the substantial body of evidence showing harm to animals is an outrageous betrayal of public health principles. The National Academy of Sciences, World Health Organization and U.S. public health agencies have a long tradition of relying on animal toxicology/carcinogenicity studies to identify hazardous agents and assess health risks in order to implement public health protective policies to prevent human harm. The Oregon Health Authority has utterly failed to protect public health.”* states [Devra Davis](#), PhD, President of Environmental Health Trust and founding director of the Board on Environmental Studies and Toxicology of the U.S. National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences.

Ronald Melnick, PhD who led the design of the \$30M U.S. NTP study during his 28 years as a National Institutes of Health toxicologist presented the study findings [concluding](#) that, *“Health and regulatory agencies need to promote precautionary measures especially for children and pregnant women. **In children the risk can be greater due to the increased penetration as well as the unique sensitivity of the developing brain.**”*

The OHA report’s flawed design shows clear scientific bias and fails to adhere to professional best practices as outlined by the [National Academy of Sciences](#); the report also included (and its conclusion relied upon) reviews of industry-funded scientific studies, a blatant violation of the legislative intent that only the findings from “independently-funded scientific studies” be included in the assessment.

Previously conducted OHA public health assessments **DID** rely upon data from animal studies, referenced U.S. National Toxicology Program studies as well as the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC)/WHO studies and documented children’s unique vulnerability - **all of which this OHA investigation on the health risks from children’s wireless exposure rejected.**

On behalf of the families of Oregon, the Oregon legislature must reject this report and direct OHA to undertake a more comprehensive scientific review that follows accepted professional best practices AND that only reviews studies that are independently-funded, thereby reducing the appearance of scientific bias or undue influence by wireless industry interests.

Contact: David Morrison - [wirelesswatch@yahoo.com](mailto:wirelesswatch@yahoo.com)