

**Lisa M. Cagno**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 20, 2021 7:59 AM  
**To:** Amanda Linehan; Lisa M. Cagno  
**Subject:** April 20, 2020 Verizon Public Hearing

[REDACTED]

To whom it may concern,

Please take this public comment in opposition to file 142-21, a petitioner's request from Westborough to add small cell antennas and supporting infrastructure to Maiden. I live on Pierce Street, and a device is being proposed for Pierce St, but in all honesty, I do not know the service radius of each device and therefore I do not know which devices will directly impact my home. Nor do I know which routes that I walk would be affected. Walking routes are important as well because in the past, I used to go for walks to get fresh air, and to get away from the work I do on my computer. The 100% connectivity model of internet providers has robbed the public of being able to un-plug. With that being the case, the benefits of cutting back on screen time are quite lacklustre. But to the point of not knowing, I had reached out to the chainwoman almost a month ago with simple technical questions to inform my comments, and I am left empty-handed. The public hearing notice that I received in the mail said that information would be available. The chainwoman informed me that one hundred pages was dropped off at her house on Friday. The city is not open for business on Friday. I only learned about those documents on Monday (yesterday), I promptly issued requests for that information on Monday, and now the petition is today and no information has been made available. As a matter of transparency and accountability, I request that the city acknowledge that at the current point in time, there are neither, and I would request that both be restored prior to a decision being made surrounding the petitioner's request.

However, just because no information was provided, that does not mean information is not available. The World Health Organization acknowledges that electro-magnetic hypersensitivity exists, and that it can affect people at exposure levels significantly lower than what the current US standards allow. (1) Furthermore,

"On November 1, 2020, the New Hampshire Commission to Study the Environmental and Health Effects of Evolving 5G Technology has released its final report to New Hampshire Governor Christopher T. Sununu, Speaker of the House Stephen J. Shurtleff, President of the Senate Donna Soucy summarizing its findings that safety assurances for 5G have "come into question because of the thousands of peer-reviewed studies documenting deleterious health effects associated with cellphone radiation exposure." (2)

"The majority of the New Hampshire Commission voted to support 15 recommendations to the New Hampshire Governor. Recommendations include: support an independent study of 5G health effects; reduce public exposure to cell phones, wireless devices and replace Wi-Fi with wired-non wireless networks- in schools and libraries; ensure cell network infrastructure antenna setbacks from schools and homes; measure levels of cell network radiation; establish wireless radiation limits to protect trees and insects; establish more sophisticated measurement protocols to include high data rates; require software changes to reduce radiation exposure into the body; establish wireless radiation-free zones; and call on the US Federal Communications Commission to do an environmental assessment on the impact of 5G and wireless infrastructure expansion." (2) This "Commission to study the environmental and health effects of evolving 5G technology." was established by House Bill 522 (3). "The Commission that was convened as a result of this legislation was comprised of thirteen members with backgrounds that include physics, engineering electromagnetics, epidemiology, biostatistics, occupational health, toxicology, medicine, public health policy, business, and law. The Commission also has representation from the telecommunications industry." (3)

"The Commission recognizes that cellular and wireless communications is very important to the citizens of New Hampshire. The rollout of wireless services and new products in the industry can be key to enhancing public safety, economic opportunity, and healthcare. Regardless of the evidence presented and the risks associated with RF electromagnetic field effects, business and residents alike want 100% coverage and seamless connectivity. The majority of the Commission believes that some balance can be struck to achieve the benefits of technology without jeopardizing the health of our citizens." (3)

To become acquainted with the issues relevant to 5G radiation exposure and health, the Commission heard from ten recognized experts in the fields of physics, epidemiology, toxicology, and public policy. **All but the presenter representing the Telecommunications Industry (the transcript of that presentation can be found in the Commission's minutes of Nov 21st) acknowledged the large body of peer reviewed research that shows that the type of RF-radiation generated by wireless devices can have a deleterious effect on humans, especially children, as well as animals, insects, and vegetation (see Appendix D)." (3)**

These people on the New Hampshire commission are not your average Joe's or conspiracy theorists. They are experts in their respective fields, and they largely disagreed with the current approach of the petitioner, who may or may not try to convince the city tonight, based on industry talking points, that the proposed small cell antennas are somehow necessary and or/safe. Neither one of those appear to be true.

As someone who works in a health-related field, I purchased a device to measure EMF at appointment locations for clients who are sensitive to EMF. Over the past year, the background exposure levels in my home have increased significantly. When the pandemic first hit and a family member started working from home, I helped her plug in a printer for work and it detected 7 nearby wifi hosts. Today, roughly one year later, now there are over 20. As a small business owner who is self-employed, I need to be responsible for my health so that I can continue to work. Additionally, as my clients tend to be those with health ailments, including EMF sensitivity, it both downgrades the quality of service that I can offer and constitutes tangible financial loss if a client with EMF sensitivity calls and I am unable to find a suitable location to schedule an appointment. One client specifically chose me over other professionals because seeking help in a commercial location was simply not an option due to the building having wifi that was too strong. Even though I am versatile and travel, it's getting increasingly difficult to find locations that can accommodate these people in need.

The apparent harm from wireless signals affect the body on all levels of health, both physical and emotional. If the city wants to fight obesity and promote an active lifestyle, reducing wireless exposure is part of the solution. If the city wants to combat depression and suicide, then reducing

wireless exposure is part of the solution. If the city wants to fight opioid addiction, again, reducing exposure to something that could promote chronic pain might be part of the solution.

Malden is already home to environmental justice communities. Malden is already tackling historic pollutants like lead and urban fill. Let's do the right thing for the residents and have an honest discussion based on the current information. Let's do the right thing and have difficult discussions because the city already put a walking path under a high tension powerline corridor and lined it with new apartments, the city already promoted a bike share program where people were practically sitting on gps devices, 5g has already been introduced to residential areas, and children were already given wireless technology and hot spots to learn from home during the pandemic. How can children learn if their growth and development has been altered? I guess we'll see. At the very least, please inform the public what devices they can purchase to measure the output of this technology. It might be good to have on record down the road if people ever want to file a class action suit. Also, if people weren't aware, the FCC is currently being sued. Maybe we should wait and see how that pans out.

I've tried my best to look to reliable sources and avoid the mess of questionable information that can be found online. As the city makes its decision tonight, please again consider the findings of the New Hampshire Commission:

**All but the presenter representing the Telecommunications Industry (the transcript of that presentation can be found in the Commission's minutes of Nov 21st) acknowledged the large body of peer reviewed research that shows that the type of RF-radiation generated by wireless devices can have a deleterious effect on humans, especially children, as well as animals, insects, and vegetation (see Appendix D)." (3)**

Sincerely,

John Saia  
39 Pierce Street  
Malden, MA

Sources

- (1) Electromagnetic hypersensitivity : proceedings (who.int)
- (2) New Hampshire State Report on Health and Environmental Effects of 5G and Wireless Radiation - Environmental Health Trust (ehtrust.org)
- (3) [5G final report.pdf \(state.nh.us\)](#)