

SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY AT <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/filings>

June 1, 2018

Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

RE: Accelerating Wireless Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers To
Infrastructure Investment--WT Docket No. 17-79--Request for Reconsideration
and Stay

Dear Sir/Madam:

I hereby request reconsideration and a stay of the Federal Communications Commission's March 30, 2018 decision in the above-referenced matter. The Order dispenses with pre-deployment environmental and historic preservation reviews of many next generation wireless facilities.

I would respectfully ask you to consider how 5G wireless will present barriers to health for many people.

These facilities will emit high frequency radiation directly into peoples' homes. Scientific studies indicate that the radiation from these facilities may cause cancer and have other harmful impacts, especially in infants and young children. Fiber optic systems would provide much safer – and faster, more secure internet access in homes, with use of wireless reserved for use when needed. Many of us who understand the risks are opting for ethernet connections rather than wireless.

The American Academy of Pediatrics, as well as individual pediatricians, pediatric neurologists and many others have recommended that children reduce their exposure to wireless radiation. Children, and the unborn, are much more at risk than adults. Hugh Taylor MD, the Chief of Obstetrics and Gynecology at Yale Medicine School has published a study on the effects of wireless radiation on the unborn animals. They developed memory, behavioral and attention problems as a result (Taylor, 2012; additional studies listed on EHTrust.org.) **Exponentially increasing children's exposure to wireless radiation is not consistent with the recommendations of the American Academy of Pediatrics recommendation to decrease children's exposure to wireless radiation.** Their exposure has already been increased by mandatory smart meters, especially children in high density, urban areas. I have seen baby strollers parked next to a set of 4 smart meters and 3 smart water meters. It is a significant amount of cumulative exposure when you consider the width of the house and the number of smart meters. Where will children play if this is broadcast into the children's yards? When the children grow up, will they be fertile enough to have children? This is another concern brought up by many researchers due to the damage to sperm and the testes (Levine, et al 2017, other studies on EHTrust.org). **Cell towers are already being erected over some playgrounds – demonstrating complete disregard for the American Academy of Pediatrician's & other expert's recommendations as well as a lack of government oversight.**

The neurological and cellular effects are important to consider, as the result will be daily, chronic and cumulative exposure. The wireless radiation passes through the walls of our homes, schools and offices, and penetrates our bodies. We do not even know all of the long term effects as this has not been studied. What will happen to people struggling with neurological problems such as multiple sclerosis, ALS, cognitive impairment/early Alzheimer's and other neurological conditions if they are exposed to this constant, continuous and cumulative radiation where they live and work? Where will people exercise? What will happen to people like myself, who have been told by their physicians (in my case, a specialist from a large teaching hospital and research center) to opt out of a smart meter, which has much less radiation than a 5G small cell tower? There is no research done on this level of radiation, there are not even studies on 5GHz safety. A recent review by Martin Pall, PhD notes the research at present focuses on 2.4 GHz or less (Pall, 2018).

Many physicians and researchers have signed letters urging for a moratorium on 5G Wireless. Cancer is a very serious concern. The non-thermal as well as thermal effects of wireless need to be considered, as well as the result of recent research findings of brain and heart tumors in some of the rodents exposed levels of wireless radiation that are much lower than will be emitted by small cell 5G wireless. The National Toxicology Program and Falacioni et al (2018) published recent research which included findings of heart and brain tumors in animals who received relatively low doses of radiation (0.9 GHz and 1.8 GHz). If these tumors occurred in the experimental groups at low levels of RFR, what would the results be if the upcoming 5G small cells (30 -80 GHz or more) were used in the experiment. Why is the health of the American public not being considered?

I have many questions that I hope you will consider. Will people who are unfortunate enough to be very sensitive to radio frequency radiation be doomed to a life indoors (if they are fortunate enough to find a method to shield their homes from these high levels of radiation, and afford it)? I think that is a very fair question to ask, as I have a woman who calls me to ask for advice about how to manage her very severe electro sensitivity. She cannot go anywhere. She does not know where she will live, as smart meters are now mandatory. She is increasingly disabled. Is it fair to leave no space safe for those who suffer? She has seen every doctor she can, however, she has had no relief. This appears to be an access issue under the ADA which should be considered early on, prior to any deployment of 5G. Also, the issue of cost of remediating a home that needs to be shielded from this type of radiation for health reasons. Also, on a practical note, given the NTP and Falcioni studies, will the heart and brain surgeons be given special protection in case they are needed on a larger scale, given the cancer risks? The oncologists? Who will fund any increase in illnesses? Additional need for special education services? Will there be enough people who are healthy to work and pay for the illnesses, given the fertility and health risks?

All research considered should take into account the funding source of the research. The Environmental Health Trust and others have pointed out that that has a significant relationship to the outcomes. I was disheartened to learn that roughly 70% of industry funded studies are supportive of safety, whereas only about 30% of the independent studies supported the safety of radio frequency radiation.

Notwithstanding this research, the Commission refused in its Order to evaluate health impacts of the emissions but relied on outdated regulations from 1996. As a pediatric physical therapist, mother of 5 children (4 of whom were chronically ill but recovered using diet and lifestyle strategies, eating organic foods, being careful about exposures to toxins, etc), and an adult who has been chronically ill for much of my adult life I find this appalling. I work hard to try to adhere to the healthy lifestyle my physicians have recommended. I have a diet so strict it is difficult or impossible to eat out, and I have made many other difficult lifestyle adjustments. I cannot express to you what it feels like to realize that some of my hard-earned progress is already slipping simply with increasing exposure to the current increase in cell towers, especially one about a mile from my home. How many of us will suffer? I am working hard to do whatever I can to keep or improve the level of health and function I have. It seems very unfair that our government plans force me to live with exponentially more wireless radiation than I already am exposed to and is already making me sick.

The General Accountability Office issued a report in July 2012 recommending that the FCC update its radiofrequency exposure limits. To date, the Commission has not acted on GAO's recommendation and yet the FCC is moving forward without regard to the public welfare. This is unacceptable. Our health matters, and it is unjust to put people at risk, exposing them to radiation levels that so many scientists and physicians are saying is unsafe. How is America free if we cannot be assured of safety and the right to consent to our exposures on our own property?

The next generation facilities also threaten the integrity of residential communities in other ways. For example, these next generation facilities may include towers up to 50 feet or taller high with any number of antennas and associated equipment attached to the towers and on the adjacent ground. These facilities will have a direct impact on the aesthetics and property values of affected neighborhoods. Yet the Order does not consider these negative impacts.

Please reconsider the Order and issue a stay until the Commission completes its review of this and other requests for reconsideration. I also incorporate the reference the Request for Reconsideration and Stay submitted in this proceeding by Edward B. Myers on May 29, 2018. Also, please consider that the public was not made aware of this. I was not aware of the need to comment until now, and wish I had time to prepare a better written comment. Matters that affect our property and especially public health deserve careful consideration and review as well as fair and effective public notice.

For the convenience of the Commission, I have submitted a copy of Mr. Myers' Request for Reconsideration and Stay with this filing.

Respectfully,

Donna DeSanto Ott PT, DPT, MS, FMCHC

Donna DeSanto Ott, PT, DPT, MS, FMCHC

References

- Falcioni L, Bua L, Tibaldi E, et al. Report of final results regarding brain and heart tumors in rats exposed from prenatal life until natural death to mobile phone frequency radiofrequency field representative of a 1.8 GHz GSM base station environmental emission. Environmental Research, (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.01.037>
- Pall, M. Wi-Fi is an important threat to human health. Environmental Research, 2018; 164, 405-416.doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.01.035
- Wyde M, et al. Report of partial findings from the National Toxicology Program Carcinogenesis Studies of cell phone radiofrequency radiation in Hsd: Sprague rats (whole body exposure) . <http://biorxiv.org/content/early/2016/05/26/055699>)
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.01.037>
- www.ehtrust.org
-