



INTERNATIONAL
COMMITTEE *on*
ELECTROMAGNETIC
SAFETY

IEEE ICES Subcommittee 2

**Committee on Terminology, Units of Measurements, and Hazard
Communications**

Minutes of Committee Meeting, 20 June 2003, Maui, Hawaii

Meeting minutes recorded by Ken Gettman 20 June 2003

Edited by Ric Tell 22 October 2003

1. CTO by Chairman Ric Tell at 0830.
2. Introduction of those in attendance
3. Review of agenda for meeting. It was noted that the current draft of C95.7 would be the primary focus of the meeting.
4. Bush/D'Andrea moved (seconded) approval of the draft agenda – voting approved of the agenda.
5. Previous meeting minutes: minutes from the 12/13/02 Piscataway, New Jersey meeting had been previously electronically distributed. It was noted that there is a desire to change the title of the document and that there is a need to submit a revised PAR to support continued development of the draft Recommended Practice. Jules Cohen/Zisken moved (seconded) approval of the minutes – voting approved of the minutes.
6. New/Revised PAR:
 - There is a need to have the scope and purpose of the PAR and the document to be the same. It was agreed to wait until the document is “finished” before resubmitting the PAR.
 - There was a discussion concerning whether the document should be a Guide vs. Recommended Practice vs. Standard. The document provides options and recommendations. It does not contain requirements. It was noted that there may be other methods to achieve the same result. There was concern with how autocratic the approach is, with a suggestion that there will be more adoption of the documents principles if it is presented in a less authoritarian manner.
 - It was noted that the following descriptions may be useful for consideration: Standard – has very limited options for alternatives; Recommended Practice – contains the view that these are best methods and that regulators will allow alternative approaches based on good justification; Guide – this is just one of many alternatives and just offers one of the many methods.



INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE *on* ELECTROMAGNETIC SAFETY

7. Section 4.1.3 Documentation - Record Keeping

A question was raised on whether it is appropriate to assign personal responsibility to workers. The OSHA position was indicated to be that the employer is responsible for training and supervision to ensure compliance but it is still possible to have the personnel be responsible. There was concern for the effectiveness/consistency of personal RF monitors. The text was revised in the last sentence of the last paragraph of this section.

8. Section 4.1.4 Employee Involvement

There was concern that the text may encourage excessive employee involvement in measurement, with perhaps the point being reached that measurements are affected or obstructed. There was also concern that performing a survey might, by itself, raise concerns of workers. The intent is to obtain employee acceptance of the program. It was moved and seconded to accept the revised wording of the text – there was unanimous approval.

9. Section C.2 Calibration

A new sentence was added to indicate that it is suggested to compare readings between multiple instruments when that is possible. The clause also intends to provide guidance on the frequency of calibration. The NCSL (National Conference of Standards Laboratories) has issued a recommended practice to calibrate in accordance with the meter manufacturer's specifications but A2LA (American Association for Laboratory Accreditation) has suggested that there is an option to modify the calibration schedule based on calibration history. A concern was expressed with permission to use equipment past its manufacturer's recommended calibration due date in that it might create a potentially dangerous situation that may allow exposure of workers to excessive levels exceeding the MPE limits. It was suggested that even equipment within the calibration date needs verification for correct operation prior to use for measurement.

10. Section 3.33 Spatial Average (now 3.34)

It was suggested to make reference to C95.3.

11. Section 4.5.4 Medical Devices and Implants

There was concern that this clause addresses an area outside the scope of ICES. There is a desire indicated to reference the standards of ANSI C63.8. There was consensus that there is a need to explain why there is a concern for this area given the potential susceptibility of these products to RF fields. A suggestion was made that discussions with the medical practitioner also be conducted. An addition was made to indicate the possibility of obtaining information from the manufacturer of the emitter.

ACTION ITEM: Howard Bassen is to provide a list of references for this section.



INTERNATIONAL
COMMITTEE *on*
ELECTROMAGNETIC
SAFETY

ACTION ITEM: Howard Bassen is to work with Rick Tell to contact C63.8 for concurrence with the text provided.

Health assessment is implied to be done periodically since the medical situation of the worker may change in the course of their employment. There was some concern with implants not electronic, such as pins, because of the potential for localized SAR increase.

12. Single Tier vs. Two/Multiple Tier

There was consensus that having control over access to areas of elevated RF fields could result in allowing higher levels than those specified for uncontrolled areas to be acceptable since mitigating action can be implemented by those knowing what they may be subjected to.

13. It was noted that the document will be revised based on discussions and will be editorially reviewed. It was moved and seconded to send the document to SC2 for balloting. Approval was unanimous.

14. It was moved and seconded to keep this document as a Recommended Practice. The voting was 22 in favor and 4 against. The motion was indicated as passing.

15. The meeting ended at 11:56 AM.