

**Lint, Elizabeth**

---

**From:** K. Oh <koh2010@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 21, 2019 10:07 PM  
**To:** License Commission  
**Subject:** Written comments on the draft policy on small cell facilities

Thank you very much for emailing me the draft of the policy.

I would like to submit my written comment here, calling for provisions addressing the potential health risks associated with an extended and chronic exposure to radio-frequency waves generated by small cell facilities. (Please see the notes at the end of this email regarding such health risks.)

What is unclear to me is the frequencies and magnitudes of radio-frequency waves to be generated by small cell facilities in general, and the facility to be installed across the street from my home in particular. What would be the electromagnetic field strength and power density of the radiation, say, 10, 20, 30, 50 feet away from the facility at the same altitude as the facility, as well as at the ground level? How do these levels of exposure compare to, say, the level associated with regular cellphone use? (Is there any way I could get an answer to this question regarding the facility proposed to be installed on 1972 Mass. Ave.? Also, is the facility going to beam the radiation to particular direction?)

Once a small cell facility is installed, will additional permits be required for changes and upgrades to be made on it?

I'm also hoping to find out federal and State laws and guidelines relevant to installing small cell facilities in City of Cambridge, and am wondering if I could get help/information/pointers from your office.

Thank you,  
Kyung-ju Oh

**<Some facts relevant to the health risks posed by small cell facilities>**

There is no consensus among the scientists about the safety of radio-frequency waves in relation to human and animal health. Study results have been inconsistent on this subject. (See <https://emfacademy.com/5g-radiation/#dangerous>, and <https://www.who.int/peh-emf/publications/facts/fs304/en/> for the detail.)

In 2017 a number of scientists and medical doctors have issued letters requesting EU a moratorium on the increase of cell antennas until further investigation on the potential health risk. As of April 30 2019, 233 scientists and doctors have signed the appeal. (<http://www.5gappeal.eu/about/http://www.5gappeal.eu/about/>)

In 2001 the World Health Organization categorizes radio-frequency waves as a possible carcinogen. (<https://emfacademy.com/5g-radiation/#dangerous>)

A few municipalities, and at least one country, even opted out of 5G due to health concerns for their residents. (For the record, I'm not arguing for opting out at all.) (See <https://techcrunch.com/2018/09/10/bay-area-city-blocks-5g-deployments-over-cancer-concerns/> and [https://elpais.com/elpais/2017/09/05/inenglish/1504595848\\_113103.html](https://elpais.com/elpais/2017/09/05/inenglish/1504595848_113103.html).)

**Clarke, Dana**

---

**From:** K. Oh <koh2010@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 30, 2019 6:16 PM  
**To:** Clarke, Dana  
**Subject:** Re: Comments of ExteNet Systems, Inc. - Cambridge Draft Policy on Small Cell Attachments in the Public Way

Thank you for your communication.

I would like to add a brief comment on the comment by ExteNet Systems, Inc.

ExteNet says they cannot provide the call capacity information for the following reasons:

"Call Capacity of equipment is dependent on many factors. Wireless Service Providers consider the factors they use to estimate such to be highly confidential and proprietary. In addition, call capacity is not necessarily consistently measurable, as such is variable based on environmental factors and the type of usage the small cell is incurring from time to time (i.e., voice or data). " p.19-20

I would like to comment that the company can and should make their best efforts to present information the city needs.

My concern in particular is information regarding health risks a small cell facility may pose those who live and work in vicinity. Certain information regarding the power of the radiation the radio emits should be collected to ensure that the people chronically exposed to the radiation are not at risk. Doesn't a corporation installing such a facility have a legal and/or social responsibility to do their best to deliver such information? If the data is something that changes depending on circumstances, certain representations--a range and the average, for example--can still be made for the specific location where the facility is proposed to be installed.

Thank you,

-Kyung-ju Oh

Here is the content of my written comment submitted on 5/21:

Thank you very much for emailing me the draft of the policy.

I would like to submit my written comment here, calling for provisions addressing the potential health risks associated with an extended and chronic exposure to radio-frequency waves generated by small cell facilities. (Please see the notes at the end of this email regarding such health risks.)

What is unclear to me is the frequencies and magnitudes of radio-frequency waves to be generated by small cell facilities in general, and the facility to be installed across the street from my home in particular. What would be the electromagnetic field strength and power density of the radiation, say, 10, 20, 30, 50 feet away from the facility at the same altitude as the facility, as well as at the ground level? How do these levels of exposure compare to, say, the level associated with regular cellphone use? (Is there any way I could get an answer to this question regarding the facility proposed to be installed on 1972 Mass. Ave.? Also, is the facility going to beam the radiation to particular direction?)

Once a small cell facility is installed, will additional permits be required for changes and upgrades to be made on it?

I'm also hoping to find out federal and State laws and guidelines relevant to installing small cell facilities in City of Cambridge, and am wondering if I could get help/information/pointers from your office.

Thank you,  
Kyung-ju Oh

**<Some facts relevant to the health risks posed by small cell facilities>**

There is no consensus among the scientists about the safety of radio-frequency waves in relation to human and animal health. Study results have been inconsistent on this subject. (See <https://emfacademy.com/5g-radiation/#dangerous>, and <https://www.who.int/peh-emf/publications/facts/fs304/en/> for the detail.)

In 2017 a number of scientists and medical doctors have issued letters requesting EU a moratorium on the increase of cell antennas until further investigation on the potential health risk. As of April 30 2019, 233 scientists and doctors have signed the appeal. (<http://www.5gappeal.eu/about/http://www.5gappeal.eu/about/>)

In 2001 the World Health Organization categorizes radio-frequency waves as a possible carcinogen. (<https://emfacademy.com/5g-radiation/#dangerous>)

A few municipalities, and at least one country, even opted out of 5G due to health concerns for their residents. (For the record, I'm not arguing for opting out at all.) (See <https://techcrunch.com/2018/09/10/bay-area-city-blocks-5g-deployments-over-cancer-concerns/> and [https://elpais.com/elpais/2017/09/05/inenglish/1504595848\\_113103.html](https://elpais.com/elpais/2017/09/05/inenglish/1504595848_113103.html).)

On Thu, May 30, 2019 at 11:07 AM Clarke, Dana <[dclarke@cambridgema.gov](mailto:dclarke@cambridgema.gov)> wrote:

Thank you for providing your comments regarding the Cambridge Draft Policy on Small Cell Attachments in the Public Way. If anyone else has any feedback or comments, please feel free to email them to me.

*Dana Clarke*

*Administrative Assistant*

*Cambridge License Commission*

*831 Massachusetts Avenue*

*Cambridge, MA 02139*

*Phone: 617-349-6141*

*Fax: 617-349-6148*

*[License@cambridgema.gov](mailto:License@cambridgema.gov)*

