



Council on Wireless Technology Impacts

Citizens and professionals concerned about responsible use of electromagnetic radiation

936-B Seventh Street, #206, Novato, California 94945

Phone: 650/738-9400

<http://www.energyfields.org>

Board of Directors

Frank Winston
President

Joan M. Ripple
Secretary/Treasurer

Libby Kelley

(July 31, 2007 testimony heard by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors regarding the proposed Google/ Earthlink WiFi Network)

Members of the Board of Supervisors, I am Libby Kelley, speaking as a Board member for the Council on Wireless Technology Impacts, a California nonprofit corporation. The question I raise is, why is an environmental assessment under CEQA needed prior to your decision whether to proceed with a city-wide WiFi network?

Here are three good reasons:

Advisors

Magda Havas, PhD
Henry Lai, PhD.
Bioelectromagnetics

Charles Keen
Stephen Scott
EMF Testing/Mitigation

1. You would learn why independent peer reviewed scientists like those who signed the Benevento Resolution in Italy last year believe WiFi systems pose a health risk. The resolution states “arguments that weak (low intensity) EMFs do not effect biological systems do not represent current scientific opinion.”
2. You would understand why the current FCC radiofrequency radiation exposure guidelines are criticized for not adequately protecting health. I was one of 54 citizen appellants who challenged the current FCC RFR exposure guidelines in Federal court in 1997. The U.S. Supreme Court did not accept our case on appeal, deferring to the U.S. Congress who could provide a legislative remedy. We remain concerned and continue to explain how these industry derived guidelines are irrelevant to the real world exposure conditions we now live in as they only serve to protect the public for only 30 minutes against tissue heating effects. The health concerns raised by knowledgeable scientists in key federal public health and safety agencies are being ignored. Our website, www.energyfields.org, provides scientific evidence showing RFR exposure has been linked to cellular and biochemical changes that can lead to cancer and neurological disease. We describe electrical hypersensitivity, a growing health condition worldwide, caused or triggered by EMF exposure. Since the wireless age began in the mid 1990s, more people, especially in high tech cities like San Francisco, are being involuntarily subjected to chronic exposure to antennas and towers and some are forced to seek medical care for symptoms such as depression and problems sleeping and concentrating.
3. You have been advised that safety is a null concept and negatives are not susceptible to proof. It is true that you cannot prove a null effect but if the research shows there are adverse effects then you know that the effect is NOT null. If studies consistently can NOT find any adverse effects after testing for cancers, miscarriages, neurological disorders etc . . . then you can say there is NO EVIDENCE of an adverse effect and there is SUPPORT for the NULL effect. This is NOT the case. Since 2003, a growing number of published studies now link adverse health effects to communities where there are cellular antennas, in Spain, England, Italy, the Netherlands, Austria, France, Australia, Israel, Greece, Turkey and Egypt, but not in the U.S.

San Francisco already has a significant electromagnetic environment due to Sutro Tower and existing antennas around the city. EMF exposure here is an air quality issue. CEQA rules and San Francisco's Precautionary Principle ordinance should be invoked to assess this proposal as it may pose a significant health risk to residents and workers. Give the public the right to know, what they are being exposed to, before increasing cumulative EMF exposure levels .

Isn't this right thing to do?

