Dear Mrs Benson

Unfortunately, Justin has left us, but I am more than happy to try and clear up the confusion.

The "Interim Guidelines on Limits of Exposure to 50/60Hz Electromagnetic Fields" that you mentioned, were endorsed by our Council and published on 1 November 1989. This publication was subsequently rescinded by Council on 14 March 2002, has not been replaced by NHMRC and is no longer available.

About ten years ago, ARPANSA took over all responsibility for radiation safety - responsibility for producing any guidelines or advice in this area now rests with them.

Please feel free to phone me if you need further clarification.

Regards

Anna Manzoney NHMRC Communications Manager

Ph: 02 6289 9137 Mobile: 0422 008 512 Website: www.nhmrc.gov.au

" geoff benson" <platypusses@bigpond.com> on 08/02/2003 01:08:27

To: Anna Manzoney/NHMRC/Health@Health\_gov\_au

cc:

Subject: Re: Response to questions

Attention: Anna Manzoney,

Dear Ms Manzoney

When my attempts to send the following email failed I phoned and was infomed Justin Kerr-Stevens was no longer there. I was further informed to forward correspondence to your email, I would appreciate your assistance to help me further understand the matter addressed below.

Thank you,

Margaret Benson.

---- Original Message ----

From: " geoff benson" <platypusses@bigpond.com>

To: <Justin.Kerr-Stevens@health.gov.au> Sent: Thursday, February 06, 2003 11:46 AM

```
> Dear Justin,
> I thank you for your earlier replies to my questions but I find
myself still confused as to the current situation. ARPANSA's
information is that the
> NHMRC has issued 'Interim guidelines on limits of exposure to 50/60Hz
> electric and magnetic fields'. The recomended magnetic field exposure
limit
> for members of the public (24 hour exposure) is 0.1 millitesla
(1,000mg-
> milligaus). It is my understanding that this comes from the National
> and Medical Research Council; Radiation Health Series No 30: Interim
> Guidelines on Limits of Exposure to 50/60 Hz Electric and Magnetic
Fields
> (1989).
   Do I understand from your response attached below that the above
quoted
> interim guidelines no longer apply and in fact haven't since 1998?
> Could you perhaps resolve my confusion and expand on the above so
that I
may
> completely understand the current situation in Australia in relation
> Australian Exposure Guidelines to these fields?.
> Pleases respond as soon as you can,
> thanking you for your assistance,
> yours sincerely,
> Margaret Benson.
> ---- Original Message ----
> From: <Justin.Kerr-Stevens@health.gov.au>
> To: <platypusses@bigpond.com>
> Sent: Thursday, September 05, 2002 3:12 PM
> Subject: Response to questions
> > Dear Ms. Benson,
> >
>> I apologise for the delay in responding to your questions.
>> Before I respond in detail, you should be aware that until 1998 the
NHMR
> was
>> responsible for developing guidelines and providing advice on
health
> issues
>> relating to radiation. This is why you still see a reference to
"NHMRC
> > Guidelines" on this subject on the ARPANSA web site.
> > However, in late 1998 the Australian Radiation Protection and
Nuclear
```

```
> Agency (ARPANSA), was set up as a Federal Government agency charged
with
> responsibility of protecting the health and safety of people and
the
> > environment, from the harmful effects of ionising and non-ionising
> radiation.
> > (In a similar manner that NHMRC is now no longer responsible for
food
> standards
> > - a separate agency has been set up for this as well).
> >
> > ARPANSA is developing a Radiation Protection Series of publications
> through a
> > review of the Radiation Health Series, formerly published by NHMRC
now
> the
>> responsibility of ARPANSA, and the Codes published under the
Environment
>> Protection (Nuclear Codes) Act 1978 ("the Nuclear Codes"), which
has now
> been
> > repealed. Information on the process for developing the Radiation
> Protection
>> Series review process can be found on the ARPANSA website
> (www.arpansa.gov.au).
> > Each publication also contains contact details for the
Commonwealth,
State
> and
> > Territory Radiation Protection Authorities that were correct at the
time
> of
> printing of the particular publication, but may have been amended
since.
> > With this as background, I can now respond to your questions:
> > 1. When were the ARPANSA guidelines adopted by NHMRC?
>> NHMRC does not adopt ARPANSA guidelines - ARPANSA are now
responsible
for
>> issuing their own guidelines under their own authority.
> >
>> 2. Were any other guidelines considered by the NHMRC?
> >
> > See preamble above. For the NHMRC Radiation Health Series
developed
> before
> ARPANSA came into being, NHMRC followed a detailed process of
negotiation
> and
```

>> study, such as the active engagement of specialist working parties,

public

> >

> > consultations and peer review.

```
> > 3. Have the guidelines accepted by NHMRC been updated since?
> > I would suggest approaching ARPANSA with this query as they are
now the
> > organisation responsible for Radiation safety.
> >
> > Kind Regards
> >
> >
> > Justin Kerr-Stevens
> > Public Affairs Officer
> > Communications Unit
> > NHMRC
> > (p) 02 6289 9176
> > (f) 02 6289 9197
> >
> >
```