

Dear Members of House Energy and Digital Infrastructure Committee:

Several months ago, I testified by email to this committee about the ridiculous FCC regulation prohibiting discussion of health effects of wireless radiation, a prohibition that would now be legally totally invalid due to the FCC ignoring a 2021 Federal Court order to review the 11,000 pages in their possession of peer-reviewed information on health effects. This prohibition is something that the Vermont Legislature in general and certain committees such as yours should acknowledge and explicitly override by inviting all the testimony and input you can get on how all emitters of wireless radiation DO affect the health of all living beings! I have not seen any such interest by your Committee or any other to be fully educated on this issue in order to make truly informed decisions on these matters.

Rather than addressing cell towers and Section 248a in this comment as I had in the last, I am delivering a very similar message to you regarding S213 that has to do with wireless smart meters and charges for opting out. If you are still considering the electric company's request to charge for opting out of these imposed "services", then you have not paid attention to the bottom line of concern, which is **harmful exposure to EMFs from ALL wireless devices**. Probably the only reason residents of Vermont or anywhere choose to opt out of smart meters from any utility is that they have done their homework and understand how demonstrably dangerous in several ways (fire risk, security, and health) these meters actually are. In fact, probably quite a few of them are already ill with EMR Sensitivity Syndrome from overexposure from many sources, and wouldn't be able to tolerate these wireless devices on their homes. I personally know several people whose lives have been permanently and significantly altered as a result of exposure specifically to Smart Meters! So, it is certainly not an equitable solution to say that anyone who wishes to opt out can do so but has to pay extra. In other words, if you're wealthy enough to afford this unfair extra cost on a "service" that you didn't even want in the first place, that's all good. But if you are living hand to mouth and any extra fee is a huge hardship, this is a patently unfair policy. **As is too often the case, electric and other companies get wealthier at the expense of people who have to pay for something they didn't want and shouldn't have to have in the first place, because it is HARMFUL to them!**

When I responded to the other issues I mentioned, I sent to you some information that perhaps you need to see again since, while I'm *sure* you read it thoroughly, you may have forgotten about it 3 months later. So, the rest of this testimony is a repeat of some of that information that is 100% relevant to this issue and bill as well.

I work with people who have been environmentally poisoned and are extremely sensitive not only to multiple chemical triggers, but also to electromagnetic radiation/frequencies (EMR, EMFs). People with these conditions are not able to be anywhere near such radiation without great suffering. These are real people with a **REAL, debilitating** condition. **Their numbers are growing by orders of magnitude**. There are literally almost NO places left on the planet where they can find any relief. And, most often, people with EMR illness and sensitivities have developed this syndrome from overexposure to EMFs, until their bodies reach a threshold beyond which symptoms appear and do not leave unless exposure is stopped. ***This can happen to anyone, including members of your committee and their families.***

In this country, in spite of thousands of peer-reviewed studies on EMR/EMF health effects (and common sense!), the government has NEVER conducted an in-depth investigation of either the FCC itself nor wireless radiation health and

environmental effects! And the FCC still goes by the very inadequate (even at the time) safety standard it composed back in 1996, allowing far more “allowable” radiation than any other country on the planet. That was before everyone had cell phones and 5G wasn’t even a thing. Harvard University published a report that concluded that the FCC was a totally compromised, corrupt, **captured agency**.*

So, I am asking you to please consider – as evidence in your decision-making – something that the FCC has bullied government decision-makers to believe isn’t supposed to be under consideration. ***Something that should be the first and foremost criterion to determine the “Public Good”***. Ignoring this is similar to closing one’s eyes and then saying something can’t be seen. Or sticking one’s head in the sand. Really. This never should have been acceptable, and certainly shouldn’t be now. Please exercise your responsibility for the REAL Public Good.

I am including several different links, lists of studies, other references, that are just a SMALL SAMPLE of what’s in the peer-reviewed literature **on health effects (on people, pollinators, plants, pets and other animals)**. If you follow the links I provide, you will be led to many, many more peer-reviewed studies as well as other, well-documented facts and information on the subject.

Thank you,

Deborah E Moore, MEd, MA, PhD

Rochester, VT