

February 21, 2022

Re: Response to Feb 19th Opinion Piece in The Berkshire Eagle on Verizon Cell Tower

Dear Berkshire Eagle Editor,

I am writing as a former member of the New Hampshire Commission that was tasked with exploring the Environmental and Health Effects of Evolving Wireless and 5G Technology. As some of your readers may know, this Commission was formed through [bipartisan legislation](#) and was supported by the governor. The Commission was comprised of unpaid and unbiased experts in fields relating to health and radiation and were highly qualified to evaluate the issue in a fair and in-depth manner. The Commission submitted its [final report](#) in November 2020, with a key finding being that exposure to wireless communication radiation is harmful to the health of humans and the environment. It is because of the sharp contrast between the opinions expressed in your article and the factual conclusions reached by a panel of unbiased experts that I am writing you now.

I should note that I have weighed in on this issue several times before, including presentations to people in Pittsfield and a presentation to the Lenox, MA Board of Health; a video of that presentation can be seen on [here](#). The video provides an overview about the science behind wireless radiation, with that science coming from peer-reviewed journals and internationally recognized experts. The video also shows why statements about radiation from industry and some governmental agencies are not to be trusted. Please keep in mind that these are not the unfounded opinions of conspiracy theorists, but they are the well-documented conclusions of a formal state commission.

The Board of Health's decision to consider a cease-and-desist order is a brave one, and it puts its members in an uncomfortable position. They weighed the facts in this situation, not opinions, and came to the correct decision that the tower is harming nearby residents. I feel confident that if you were to review the proven science relating to wireless radiation, you would come to a conclusion similar to the one they reached.

Your Board of Health is doing its job by working to protect citizens against a known toxin. Sometimes doing the right thing can be an uphill battle because of the monied interests that are unwilling to pay the costs associated with mitigating a toxin. We have seen this situation play out many times before, and you are watching it play out now with wireless radiation. I implore The Berkshire Eagle to learn the facts about this issue so that it can support the efforts of the Board of Health.

Kent Chamberlin
Professor & Chair Emeritus
Dept. of Electrical & Computer Engineering
University of New Hampshire