

1 other and that's really what the literature shows when you look at this is that  
2 there are some studies that show a weak positive effect and we need you to  
3 think maybe there's something here but there's no consistency in the number of  
4 the studies from around the world which again either means we do more studies  
5 or we are not yet don't have the techniques to really find what's going on and it's  
6 very frustrating to leave us in that situation. In this situation scientists  
7 themselves are likely to be divided about the significance of the data and you've  
8 heard that. You've heard scientists on both sides and as one politician said, I  
9 wish I could find a scientist that had only one hand because I would say on the  
10 other hand this and on this hand this and that's what you're hearing in all of  
11 these testimonies is that we are looking at the same evidence and coming up  
12 with some different conclusions. However for the reasons explained above,  
13 most scientists and commissions agree and they say most, not all, that any  
14 health effects of low level electromagnetic fields if they exist at all are likely to be  
15 very small compared to other health risks that people face in every day life.  
16 That's the conclusion that I came to when I reviewed these studies. That's the  
17 conclusion I've come to as I've looked at all of these studies and that's the  
18 conclusion I sent to you. However, I did end my letter which in fact that I think it  
19 would be prudent to use the ALARA principle which has been spelled out to you.  
20 As I look at the ALARA principle and again there have been some changes in  
21 the testimony and the evidence that has come out, I think it would not be  
22 prudent to do anything that would increase the exposure to radiation on Lookout  
23 Mountain and I think you need to take that into consideration. I also think

1 although it is a very difficult thing and sometimes goes against common sense  
2 particularly depending on where you live, I think it also would be prudent to have  
3 radiation exposure to as small a population as you possibly can. That may  
4 mean that you need to look at other sites. That's something that you need to  
5 look at but I think again that given the information we have, it would be prudent  
6 to do both of those things and I would be happy to answer any questions you  
7 may have.

8 LAWRENCE: Questions. Rick?

9 SHEEHAN: Yeah. Dr. Johnson, you, you're, a number of  
10 individuals that testified here tonight and also last hearing that they were  
11 correlating this to the tobacco industry not having the knowledge you know then  
12 that they do now kind of a thing and that this thermal radiation concept is so that  
13 we are going to learn more about as time goes on through further research and  
14 those kinds of things. Matter of fact in the tobacco analogy you have seen such  
15 correlation that you have approached this Board to look at and seriously  
16 consider a resolution, an ordinance of some kind that would limit public smoking  
17 in public places and I'm working diligently on that very aspect. I'm guessing  
18 based upon that effort that this does not suggest an effort to you to do the same  
19 kind of thing in tobacco at this point. That you do not see based upon your  
20 testimony a risk enough to take some assertive action, I guess maybe, let me  
21 ask the question another way. If at some point you saw a direct correlation to  
22 this, wouldn't it be the role of the health department to step up immediately and  
23 take action? There's been some testimony here today of concern that once this