

MA Clean Energy Future Tour - Danvers MA

On the proliferation of wireless technology including smart meters:

My name is Karen Spencer. I am from Gloucester. I like technology and I work in technology. For years, I have been an advocate for expanding broadband fiber network options to Cape Ann and the Gold Coast in order to spur economic development. I was drafted by Mayor Carolyn Kirk to chair a local Advisory Committee in Gloucester to that end - but city and state politics proved too much for my committee to achieve our vision.

I am also an active environmentalist. I installed Solar Panels on my home..... but I did not install them until after I did a lot of homework on inverters and confirmed I could go solar without a Smart Meter and without generating dirty electricity.

You see, like many in my family, I have allergies and some autoimmune issues. I also survived Lyme Disease and lived with 23 years of arthritis that was diagnosed as "chronic Lyme." That was a wrong diagnosis. I turned out to be hypersensitive to the fluoride added to city water. Since 2014, after 23 years, I no longer have arthritis. A slew of other symptoms also disappeared.

A symptom that was not eliminated by my change in water supply was my intermittent heart palpitations. I was also experiencing some sleep disturbances that didn't seem to be chemical or food related. So, about a year ago I hired a Building Biologist to check out my home. It turned out that the Smart Meter installed by the city water department on the side of my house was emitting over 20,000 RF radiation (as opposed to just 250 RF from my analog electric meter). When I had the Smart Meter removed, my heart palpitations stopped, my energy increased, and I started sleeping through the night.

In May 2017, I started not sleeping so well again. I noticed my respiration would sometimes become rapid for no reason. A week or so ago, I got a nose bleed. I thought 'well this is new and different' - wondering if the blood cancers that are killing off my cousins were coming for me. Then I went outside. Sure enough, the water department had re-installed the Smart Meter (in May). Since removing it, again, I have slept soundly every night, my energy level is up and - no more nose bleeds.

The most recent estimates are that about 1 in 5 Americans have become hyper-sensitized to environmental pollutants due to chronic exposure. We don't ask for this. We don't want these chronic health conditions. However, because of how embedded toxins have become in our modern lives, it is very difficult for us to avoid triggers. You see, pollutants may cause personal misery but they provide corporate profits.

Which brings me to my point.

1. Just because something is marketed as GREEN & CLEAN, it doesn't mean it is and
2. Just because something promises economic benefits due to new technology, it doesn't mean there aren't hidden costs.

At least 20% of the population is likely to suffer ill effects from constant 24/7 exposure to electrosmog - increasing health costs and decreasing quality of life. Women and children will be most impacted.

Senator Tarr, know this:

- ✓ Once the economy grows around expanded wireless technology, undoing the damage will have huge economic repercussions and therefore will be essentially impossible.

Senator, I understand the knee jerk opposition to the evidence of harm. When Dr. Ignaz Semmelweis first proposed that invisible bugs on the hands of physicians were the cause of high mortality among postpartum women, he was ridiculed. Worse, he was locked up for his outrageous hypothesis - even though his proposed solution, hand washing, was innocuous and simple.

Electrosmog is virtually invisible, too, and just as dangerous a pathogen as bacteria. If you don't wash your hands of this corporate marketing plan to extend wireless technology now, both the adverse health and adverse economic impacts will be staggering.

Karen Spencer
June 20, 2017

MA Clean Energy Future Tour - Danvers MA

On Fluoridation and Climate Change:

Extemporaneous remarks:

Since this meeting has such a strong climate change focus, I'd like to take it as an opportunity to make a few remarks on the policy of community water fluoridation.

The fluoridation chemicals we add to our drinking water originate in the smokestacks of industry, the captured air pollution.

An Andover toxicologist, Dr. Phyllis Mullenix, sampled Massachusetts fluoridation chemicals in 2014 and found them all heavily contaminated with many toxins that are not tested for under EPA regulations.... poisons like aluminum, arsenic, barium, cadmium, etc. However, these chemicals are legal to add to our drinking water supplies under the law per 1950 fluoridation policy.

99% of these fluoridation chemicals go straight into our waste water. They accumulate in the environment, in the ocean and waterways where they persist for a million years. They are known to be toxic to many aquatic species, including micro-species at the bottom of the food chain.

We know that fluoridation chemicals also interfere with the migration and reproduction of some fish species. Consequently, fluoridation policy is having an adverse impact on the ecosystem.

These air pollution chemicals from smokestacks are building up in our oceans and waterways, where their environmental impact may be subtle, but is in fact worsening climate change.

References:

A new perspective on metals and other contaminants in fluoridation chemicals. Mullenix PJ. International Journal of Occupational and Environmental Health. 2014 Apr-Jun;20(2):157-66.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24999851>

Fluoride caused thyroid endocrine disruption in male zebrafish (Danio rerio). Jianjie C Wenjuan X, Jinling C, Jie S, Ruhui J, Meiyan L. Aquat Toxicol. 2016 Feb;171:48-58.
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26748264>

Letter to To: Senate Health and Human Services Re: SB 99 from Dr. Paul Engelking Professor of Chemistry University of Oregon. April 11, 2001. <http://www.nofluoride.com/presentations/Engelking.pdf>

Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment. 2002. Canadian water quality guidelines for the protection of aquatic life: Inorganic fluorides. In: Canadian environmental quality guidelines, 1999, Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, Winnipeg.
<http://ceqg-rcqe.ccme.ca/download/en/180>

Research Review: Impact of Artificial Fluoridation on Salmon Species in the Northwest USA and British Columbia, Canada. Richard G Foulkes and Anne C Anderson. Fluoride Vol.27 No.4 220-226 1994.
<http://sonic.net/kryptox/environ/salmon.htm>

Enviro Management Services Presentation: Human toxicity, environmental impact and legal implications of water fluoridation. Declan Waugh. February 2012. <https://www.slideshare.net/waughdeclan/human-toxicity-environmental-impact-and-legal-implications-of-water-fluoridation-february-2012-enviromanagement-services>

Green Facts: <http://www.greenfacts.org/en/fluoride/fluorides-3/07-risks.htm#0p0>

Letter to Governors from Erin Brockovich, Robert Bowcock & Michael Kohn. April 2016.
<http://fluoridealert.org/wp-content/uploads/brockovich-2016.pdf>

Karen Spencer
June 20, 2017

From: Seabreezes1 seabreezes1@iglide.net

Subject: Testimony from last night

Date: June 21, 2017 at 9:32 AM

To: Marc.Pacheco@masenate.gov, Tarr, Bruce E (SEN) Bruce.Tarr@masenate.gov

Cc: Paglia, Attilio (SEN) Attilio.Paglia@masenate.gov, Bruce.Tarr@state.ma.us

Bcc: Patricia Burke patricia999burke@gmail.com, Andrew Teichner andrew@ecovortx.com, Deb Moore secondlook1@earthlink.net



Good Morning, Senators -

Thank you for the opportunity last night to address the future of Massachusetts with my testimony. Attached is my prepared statement concerning the health and economic harm posed by the **proliferation of wireless technology**, including but not exclusive to smart meters. I have added my extemporaneous comments on the **contribution of fluoridation policy to climate change** with a few references on page 2.

Per Senator Tarr's comments after my testimony, I'd like to remind you again that "**opting out**" of Smart Meters offers no real protection to those of us with heightened sensitivities (approximately 20% of the population develops sensitivities due to chronic low dose exposures to environmental pollutants, those with autoimmune disease are most vulnerable and are the first to fall ill). Even if we manage to keep those meters off our own house, because the RF radiation is designed to cover distance, those meters on our neighbor's homes will have an adverse impact on our health. Also, walking down a street, going to the store, driving the car will bombard us with harmful radiation. Consider that the corporate benefit is maximized from achieving 100% coverage, as in the cell phone ad "*Can you hear me, now.*"

Moreover, any certification of safety is meaningless. Every drug recalled by the FDA was once labeled safe and even aggressively promoted as the standard of care, including widely prescribed statins and hormone replacement therapy drugs that resulted in many deaths. **It won't be as easy to undo the technology as it is to recall a drug.**

As I mentioned, I'm in favor of technology and would love to see fiber broadband expanded to Cape Ann and the Gold Coast. However, the wireless option (including 5G and cellular as well as smart meters) is highly toxic as **it is designed to send out powerful electrical signals which by nature will interfere with biological function, and the radiation is cumulative**. Opting out for our home is a red herring - it doesn't protect us when there are tens of thousands of these devices in our towns.

Feel free to reach out if you'd like clarification on any of my comments.



2016.06.20_Gre
enClea...ony.pdf

Regards,

Karen Spencer
Gloucester, MA
978.283.4606

Sign the Petition: <http://petitions.moveon.org/sign/dietary-fluoride-and.fb48>

More power to you if fluoridation doesn't bother you, but not the power to assume it's safe for your neighbor with kidney disease, his pregnant wife or their diabetic daughter!

About Karen: Currently a consultant working with software development teams, Karen Spencer is a former analyst and project leader. She is adept at conducting research and analyzing trends. Her special interests include critical thinking, data-driven decision making, and organizational theory. She and others in her family are among the 15% of Americans with chemical sensitivities triggered by exposure to fluoridated food and drink.

From: Seabreezes1 seabreezes1@iglide.net 
Subject: S.1864 An Act relative to utilities, smart meters, and ratepayers' rights
Date: June 21, 2017 at 5:32 PM



To: Mike.Barrett@masenate.gov, Michael.Brady@masenate.gov, Thomas.Golden@mahouse.gov, Tackey.Chan@mahouse.gov, Anne.Gobi@masenate.gov, **Tarr, Bruce E (SEN)** Bruce.Tarr@masenate.gov, Joan.Lovely@masenate.gov, Marc.Pacheco@masenate.gov, Adrian.Madaro@mahouse.gov, Carolyn.Dykema@mahouse.gov, Daniel.Cahill@mahouse.gov, James.Cantwell@mahouse.gov, Joan.Meschino@mahouse.gov, Josh.Cutler@mahouse.gov, Leonard.Mirra@mahouse.gov, Nick.Collins@mahouse.gov, Randy.Hunt@mahouse.gov, Michael.Moore@masenate.gov, Jennifer.Flanagan@masenate.gov, Kathleen.OConnorlves@masenate.gov, David.Linsky@mahouse.gov, Diana.DiZoglio@mahouse.gov, Jack.Lewis@mahouse.gov, Kate.Hogan@mahouse.gov, Linda.Campbell@mahouse.gov, Marjorie.Decker@mahouse.gov, Solomon.Goldstein-Rose@mahouse.gov, Rebecca.Ashby@masenate.gov, Caleb.Oakes@mahouse.gov, Robert.Knorr@state.ma.us, Monica.Bharel@state.ma.us, Erin.Collins@state.ma.us

Bcc: Cecelia Doucette c2douce@gmail.com, Patricia Burke patricia999burke@gmail.com

Dear Committee Members:

Although I appreciate the intent of S.1864, as someone who has experienced ill effects from exposure to Smart Meters, I must take this opportunity to respectfully say that S.1864 is a sham meant to placate opposition without offering any real relief to citizens. Opting out of smart meters on my home does not protect me from the emissions from the meters on my neighbors' homes. It doesn't protect me when I walk down the street or go about my business in Massachusetts communities. It won't protect me if I need to move into an apartment building or stay in a hotel, and even go to dinner in a restaurant from experiencing heart palpitations, fatigue and mental confusion from the cumulative effect of invisible emissions from these devices in any public location.

Additionally, S. 1864 certainly won't protect the voiceless infants, young children, and even those in the womb who share my genetic sensitivity to electrosmog.

I appreciate the convenience and economic opportunities that this shiny new technology offers. I thought they sounded great, too, when I first heard about Smart Meters. However, I've become increasingly aware that all wireless communication (cellular, 4G, 5G, and smart meters) has a cumulative impact on biological systems. I ask you to appreciate the reality that human beings have an electrical as well as a biochemical nature and that wireless technology is a new type of pollution for which we have sufficient evidence of adverse health effects.

The proliferation of wireless technology is already stressing the health of those of us with autoimmune diseases, and we number in the millions. Toxicant Induced Loss of Tolerance (TILT) is estimated to affect 20% or more of the American population. One third of school children suffer from chronic health problems, aggravated by exposures to environmental pollution. Electrosmog generated by wireless technology in general and smart meters in particular are pollution.

Please do not be deceived by corporate marketing plans and big labels that claim something is "green and clean." The only way to protect the vulnerable among us to outlaw smart meters in Massachusetts, and consider ways to minimize exposure to wireless technology in public venues. I suggest the only way to serve the best interests of the million or so Massachusetts residents who will likely have their health worsened by smart meters (and likely have no idea that the invisible radiation from those devices is the cause of their ill health) is to consider the actions of our legislators who banned public smoking in order to protect the health of the most vulnerable among us.

Please reconsider what is really necessary to minimize pollution and protect health. Attached please find my oral testimony from June 20th in Danvers, specific to wireless technology, albeit not specific to S.1864.



2016.06.20_Gre
enClea...ony.pdf

Respectfully,

Karen Spencer
67 Langford Street
Gloucester, MA 01930
978.283.4606
Email: Seabreezes1@iglide.net

From: Seabreezes1 seabreezes1@iglide.net
Subject: S.108 An Act relative to the safe use of handheld devices by children
Date: June 22, 2017 at 7:45 AM



To: Italien@masenate.gov, James.Timilty@masenate.gov, Jennifer.Flanagan@masenate.gov, Michael.Brady@masenate.gov, Ryan.Fattman@masenate.gov, Sal.DiDomenico@masenate.gov, Daniel.Hunt@mahouse.gov, James.Arciero@mahouse.gov, Jay.Livingstone@mahouse.gov, Jennifer.Benson@mahouse.gov, Jon.Zlotnik@mahouse.gov, Jose.Tosado@mahouse.gov, Joseph.Mckenna@mahouse.gov, Juana.Matias@mahouse.gov, Ruth.Balser@mahouse.gov, Steven.Howitt@mahouse.gov, Rep.Smitt@mahouse.gov, Sarah.Peake@mahouse.gov, Timothy.Whelan@mahouse.gov, julian.cyr@masenate.gov, Robert.Knorr@state.ma.us, Monica.Bharel@state.ma.us, Erin.Collins@state.ma.us

Bcc: Cecelia Doucette c2douce@gmail.com, Patricia Burke patricia999burke@gmail.com

Dear Committee Members,

Although I am currently a consultant working in the capacity of analyst and project leader in high tech venues, I began my career as an early childhood teacher. I am also a mother, and hopefully one day will be a grandmother. Additionally, I am someone with allergies and autoimmune issues who has to take care to protect my body from environmental pollutants, a trait that runs in my family.

I can't tell you how alarmed I am at the realization that wireless devices from cell phones to smart meters have been proven by science and by my experience to have an adverse impact on human health. They are enticing toys and great tools, but so are guns, cars and fireworks. But they cause physical harm to many of us.

Additionally, as we all know, e-devices are addictive. Sadly, parents are not up to the challenge to protect their children either physically or psychologically from the dangers of e-devices. They are equally as hooked; in other words, e-devices have the potential for causing psychological harm to citizenry of all ages. It falls to the government to use restrictions as a method of educating parents and children about the addictive and damaging effects of these devices.

I support all efforts to restrict access to electronic devices for children, especially under age 12 when their minds should be engaged with learning effective social interactions and real world activities in order for them to achieve their potential as physically & psychologically healthy, fully functioning human beings.

Respectfully,

Karen Spencer
67 Langsford Street
Gloucester, MA 01930
978.283.4606
Email: Seabreezes1@iglide.net