

janet drew
york
LD 878

I had written testimony in Support of LD 878 & I listened to the work session. I was surprised and disappointed that the Chair had invited ONLY an industry-paid Representative to present "expertise" and provide testimony at the work session.

I'd like to give you my response to some of what was said, and not said, during that testimony:

A. Not mentioned in the Energy Committee work session:

1. Federal / National Health info:

-ElectroMagnetic Radiation (EMR) is now the subject of an HHS-led investigation on what is causing the epidemic of chronic disease and Sensitivity is a coded diagnosis by Medicare.

-There are nationwide efforts against cell towers and smart meters; efforts FOR zoning ordinances and wired solutions, and stories of lives injured by EMR.

- Insurers have care outs for liability for EMR harms.

2. Federal / International Energy data:

- The Communications industry is expected by 2030 to consume ½ the nation's electricity and account for 20% of its carbon emissions, and industry's insistence on non-wired solutions is to blame.

According to the leading network engineering industry group, wireless can consume up to 1000x more energy than wired networks.

-Wireless does NOT save money in the long-run, from the shorter life span of antennas compared to fiber - and intrinsic wireless obsolescence forcing constant upgrading.

-Wireless' extra cost ensures politicians never will bridge the broadband digital divide with their bills, as wireless was blamed by GAO for this divide.

Local municipalities, rural coops & tribes can even build their own fiber networks.

B. re: Mr Thatcher in work session:

Mr. Thatcher spoke without citations, discounted the NH legislature- directed study & Chair, as biased! (Unprofessional and UNTRUE)

Mr Thatcher also said there is plenty of safety data since this technology has been around since radar.

But: In this country we allow highest international levels, and with dramatically fast pulsating frequencies and a much greater amount of exposure now, than since the time of radar cited by Mr. Thatcher.

1940's radar data is not equivalent to disparate & pervasive wireless 5G technology .

Mr. Thatcher also said that the proposed study wouldn't add that much, a thought echoed in the meeting.

Telecoms are very much averse to another study like NH's.

We might realize that

the telecoms are using the tobacco / asbestos/ PFAs playbooks: i.e. DENY DENY DENY *!

I again submit factual data

that the telecoms pay to discredit:

1. Report / testimony on cell tower fire risk and where cell tower equipment either caused or contributed to wildfires, including the worst in CA's history, the 2018 Woolsey fire (p.5)

2. Summary report on the biological effects of wireless radiation

3. New Hampshire Commission concluding that wireless radiation is harmful

<http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/statstudcomm/committees/1474/reports/5G%20final%20report.pdf>

(*Recent Email from NH chair is also below.)

4. Board of Health of Pittsfield, MA regarding their findings of harm from wireless radiation, and emergency cease & desist order on a cell tower
<https://ehtrust.org/cease-and-desist-order-against-verizon-cell-tower-by-board-of-health-pittsfield-ma/>

5. Tree workers are getting severe burn injuries from 5G “small cells” and are reporting incidents of being “shocked,” as in electric shock. This is happening to utility-line clearance workers. Here’s an article which reports that the FCC warns of potential shocks from radio waves.

<https://tcimag.tcia.org/safety/beware-the-dangers-from-am-radio-and-5g-transmission-sites/>

The article reports that “radio waves can burn you,” and further states that, according to the FCC,

“Biological effects can result from exposure to RF energy ... It has been known for many years that exposure to very high levels of RF radiation can be harmful due to the ability of RF energy to heat biological tissue rapidly. This is the principle by which microwave ovens cook food. Exposure to very high RF intensities can result in heating of biological tissue and an increase in body temperature. Tissue damage in humans could occur during exposure to high RF levels because of the body’s inability to cope with or dissipate the excessive heat that could be generated. Two areas of the body, the eyes and the testes, are particularly vulnerable to RF heating because of the relative lack of available blood flow to dissipate the excess heat load.”

It has been recognized by thousands of studies of the biological effects of RF radiation even below thermal levels. See the biological summary provided by Odette. It should be noted that 5G antennas with the potential to generate very high levels of RF radiation being placed outside children’s bedrooms and classrooms and in parks where children play, is the very focus of President Trump’s Executive Order establishing the MAHA Commission which states that its “mission” is to study RF radiation as a contributing cause to childhood chronic disease. Therefore, the bills that we discussed as problematic during our meeting seem to contradict the very mission of the MAHA Commission.

<https://www.fcc.gov/engineering-technology/electromagnetic-compatibility-division/radio-frequency-safety/faq/ef-safety>

<https://tcimag.tcia.org/safety/beware-the-dangers-from-am-radio-and-5g-transmission-sites/>

Tree workers, especially those involved in utility-line clearance, can be exposed to radiofrequency (RF) radiation from cell antennae, which can lead to thermal burns and other tissue damage due to the heat generated by the radiation.

Regarding the LD 878 ONTP vote out of committee:

If the study design was really inadequate, I'd have expected some work to improve it, and I would expect your information to come from more than one industry-paid expert.

But the fact is, the study, with its literature review is not the problem. The moneyed telecom lies and lobbying, and your tendency to trust them most, seem to be problems. I ask that the Committee and Legislature seriously consider supporting and funding this study so that Mainers can be truly informed about safe use of his convenient but risky technology, & I share a recent email from the NH study Chair.

I hope you will decide to support this study, to help gain information for Maine families. Because I know that the committee didn't get a balanced view in this work session, and neither did I & my neighbors.

Janet Drew, RN, ret.
York, ME

April 2025 email from NH study Chair Kent Chamberlin PhD
Good morning All,

I just want to comment that if you had brought in paid representatives from the tobacco industry years ago, they would have downplayed any harm from smoking. The same is true for the asbestos industry, where it took around 100 years to ban the product after it had been proven to cause mesothelioma, a deadly form of lung cancer. It is also happening with glyphosate today, where you can purchase this known carcinogen at most hardware stores. This process of downplaying harms is referred to as predatory delay, and that is all about convincing people that the science showing harm is “conflicted” or “inconclusive”. The endgame for predatory delay is to enable industry to continue doing business as usual so that they can continue making profits despite the harm that their products may cause. When it comes to wireless radiation, the science showing harm is crystal clear.

When questions about the harmfulness of products arise, who should you believe? Paid industry representatives with little or no relevant background in science or health, or a commission of unbiased content experts with no ties to industry such as those who served on the New Hampshire Commission; the findings of the New Hampshire Commission are not unique as there are many, many other organizations that have come to the same conclusion. The obvious answer should be to trust the independent scientists who have no vested interest in the outcome rather than the vested industry interests who have a lot to gain from deploying their infrastructure.

In my experience dealing with the harms of wireless radiation, the only people I’ve heard claim that wireless radiation is harmless are those affiliated with industry. The reason you are not hearing about the harms in the media, which you would expect to be front-page news, is that some of the major advertisers in media outlets are from telecom related industries; further, some of the companies that own media outlets also own telecom. And the reason that our government regulators are not carrying out their mission to protect us is that they are captured; this statement is not from some extremist website, but from a Harvard University Center for Ethics report.

If you are interested, I can show you the scientific findings that the New Hampshire Commission used to draw its conclusions. As you’ll see, the science is clear. Wireless radiation is harmful, and it’s not only about cancer.

In closing, I note that only about one in six lifetime smokers contract lung cancer. Does that mean that it hasn’t been proven that smoking causes cancer? What does it take to prove harm, six out of six? As long as you can convince people that the science is to be doubted, it’s unlikely that meaningful regulations will be put in place. I hope that we can learn from past mistakes and act on the wireless radiation issue sooner rather than later.

That’s my input. Please let me know if you would like to learn more about this important issue.

-Kent