

Correspondence received by the Concord Select Board

Week Ending – June 17, 2024

1. Kristen Hagerty – 95 Revolutionary Road
2. Sorrel Sammons – 48 Academy Lane
3. Joe Laurin – 134 Southfield Road
4. Jerry Wedge – 109 Heaths Bridge Road
5. Mark and Tanya Gailus – 62 Prescott Road
6. Tanya Gailus – 62 Prescott Road
7. Alisha Boyajian – 77 Westford Road
8. Wendy Holt – 30 Dover Street
9. Joanne and Cyrus Gibson – 100 Newbury Court, Apartment 2217
10. Carolina Partridge – 41 Academy Lane
11. Sara Ballard – 34 Aurora Lane
12. The First Parish Diversity Committee – 20 Lexington Road
13. The Concord-Carlisle League of Women's Voters
14. Eric Van Loon – 95 Marthas Point Road
15. Meg Bruton – 286 Lexington Road
16. Meg Bruton – 286 Lexington Road
17. Ellen Quackenbush – 206 Prairie Street

From: [Kristen Hagerty](#)
To: [Shannon McAndrew](#)
Cc: [Joe Palumbo](#); [Andrea Foncerrada](#)
Subject: Public comment to the Select Board re: Flag raising
Date: Monday, June 10, 2024 12:01:35 PM

Hello Shannon,
Please distribute my comment to the Select Board in advance of their next meeting.
Thank you,
Kristen Hagerty, Concord resident

CC: DEI Commission co-chairs

Dear Select Board members,
Thank you for your service and for your candid and thoughtful deliberation of all matters before you. I realize that your service involves creating, amending, and abiding by policies for the Town and being responsive to your constituents. In fulfilling these challenging duties, I urge you to consider as well that your role is to actively promote the values of the Town. In doing so, you will need to make hard decisions to promote equity, while explaining to the public that equity is not the same as equality.

A concern that I heard in the discussion was about the precedent that would be set if the Town raised the Pride flag. This concern is the heart of the matter. The precedent set is that the Town has the right to send any message it wants when Town officials make that decision. You, our elected Select Board, should not feel that you need to make a decision to fly a flag that does not align with the values of the Town, regardless of what flags the Board has chosen to raise previously. Our policy states, "Flags may only be displayed by the Town as an expression of the Town's official sentiments by a vote of the Select Board as set forth above."

If you as our elected members of the Town chose to prominently display the Pride Flag to show support for the LGBTQIA+ community as part of our Town's desire to be more welcoming and inclusive, it is your prerogative. Similarly, if presented with a petition to raise a flag that does not align with the values of the Town, you must deny that request on the same basis.

Thank you for your continued deliberation on this matter and thank you for your dedicated service.

Kind regards,
Kristen Hagerty, Concord resident

95 Revolutionary Road

Reference

APP #16, <https://concordma.gov/DocumentCenter/View/43800/APP-16-Flag-Lowering-and-Raising-on-Town-Owned-Flag-Poles>

Section 3. Other Flags

Other Flags may be raised below the American Flag on Town owned flagpoles provided that

- (a) each such flag is no larger in any dimension than the American Flag flown above it, and
- (b) only when, if and for such period of time as the Town of Concord, acting through its Select

Board, expressly, on each occasion, and in its sole discretion, authorizes the raising of such flag.

The Town's flagpoles are not, and are not intended, to serve as a forum for free expression by the public. Flags may only be displayed by the Town as an expression of the Town's official sentiments by a vote of the Select Board as set forth above. It shall be a condition of the foregoing authorization that The Town shall acquire and retain ownership of all such flags at or before the time they are first raised, and they shall only be raised and lowered by the Fire Department in accordance with the Procedure set forth in Sec. 2 above.

From: [Mary Hartman](#)
To: [Megan Zammuto](#)
Cc: [Shannon McAndrew](#)
Subject: Fwd: Neighborhood Opposition to Wireless Facility at Umbrella!
Date: Monday, June 10, 2024 12:39:55 PM
Attachments: [SCI Assessment of Background Radiation Around Telecomm.pdf](#)
[SCI Balmori Cell Tower Radiation 2022 Review copy \(incl effects on nature\).pdf](#)
[favicon.ico](#)

From: Sorrel Sammons <sorrelsammons@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2024 12:16:41 PM
To: Mary Hartman <mhartman@concordma.gov>; Mark Howell <markhowell@concordma.gov>; Terri Ackerman <tackerman@concordma.gov>; Cameron McKennitt <cmckennitt@concordma.gov>; Wendy Rovelli <wrovelli@concordma.gov>; Megan Zammuto <mzammuto@concordma.gov>
Cc: eileen@theumbrellaarts.org <eileen@theumbrellaarts.org>
Subject: Neighborhood Opposition to Wireless Facility at Umbrella!

Some people who received this message don't often get email from sorrelsammons@hotmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This is an external email and has a suspicious subject or content. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments. When in doubt, contact the IT Department (support@concordma.gov).

Dear Select Board Members, Ms. Zammuto, and Ms. Williston:

I am writing - and forwarding several previously written emails over the years - to express my strong disagreement with the town issuing an RFP for a cell tower at the Emerson Umbrella building. I learned of this after reading the memo to the Select Board from Ms. Zammuto. I was SHOCKED to learn that the discussion around the Umbrella was taking place again, ignoring all of the previous discussion around the site which previously led to it being abandoned as an appropriate cell tower location. Why was it abandoned before and why should it be again?

Because:

- 1) It ignores Concord by-laws that were put in place to protect people. The by-laws say that no cell tower should be placed within 300 feet of a residence. The Umbrella has many houses and condos that fall well within the 300 feet restriction. Beyond that, 300 feet is an outdated distance that given current research should be extended to at least 1,000 feet (standards suggest the farther the better and the FCC was successfully sued for not updating their standards of RF safety from cell towers since early 2000s). How can we simply ignore by-laws that are in place, especially when the neighbors that are within the 300 feet have been clearly opposed to waiving these by-laws in order to place a cell tower at the Umbrella?

2) It is not safe for the many residents in close distance to the cupola, as well as employees, campers, etc. Since the first time I heard of the discussion around cell towers being placed at schools, Emerson Park, and the Umbrella back in 2017, I have been following the science around cell tower safety. The evidence is only growing to support the harm that long-term exposure can have. Here are a few compelling things that I have found in my research.

- Why did the LA County School District ban cell towers from all school campus? <https://www.electrosmogprevention.org/public-health-alert/cell-phones-health-alerts/los-angeles-unified-school-district-resolutions/>
- What does recent research show with regard to the health effects of proximity to cell towers?
 - Read the literature review of just one article (attached - "Assessment of Background Radiation Around Telecommunication Mast of the MAjor Network Service Providers in Kaduna South, Kaduna State, Nigeria", *The European Journal of Theoretical and Applied Sciences*, 2023, Vol. 1 #5). “However, **recently released research has demonstrated that radiation from base stations and mobile phones poses a risk to both human health and the environment. For instance, the majority of laboratory investigations, according to Singh et al. (2018), have shown a direct link between exposure to RF radiation and adverse biological effects.** According to several in vitro studies, RF radiation causes DNA or chromosomal damage as well as a number of different cancers (Singh et al., 2018). By using a descriptive cross-sectional survey, Akintonwa et al. (2009) assessed the health risks of non-ionizing radiation from telecommunication masts on the exposed community and found that about 62% of the people were affected health-wise by exposure to mast radiation reducing these risks would significantly improve the health of the population. According to technical reports on toxicology and carcinogenesis studies in rats exposed to whole-body radiofrequency radiation at 900 MHz and in mice exposed to whole-body radiofrequency radiation at 1,900 MHz. it was revealed that there is strong evidence that RF radiation is a human carcinogen, causing glioma and vestibular schwannoma (acoustic neuroma), by Handell et al. 2019. Additionally, there is some evidence of an elevated risk of thyroid cancer and unmistakable proof that RF radiation is a multi- site carcinogen. After analyzing MPs usage and adolescent understanding of health risks, Handell et al. (2019) and Ferdous (2017) indicated that 70% of teenagers who use MPs in Sylhet City are dealing with various health issues....Evidence on the relationship between non-ionizing radiation and increasing the level of radiation exposure was studied by Santini et al., (2002). They found more significant symptoms of health effects within a radius of 300 m from the mobile phone base stations: irritability, depression, memory loss, dizziness, decreased libido, headache, sleep disorders, malaise (200m), and tiredness (300 m). Similarly, Oberfeld et al., (2010) found that persons living close to base stations reported more symptoms of irritability, fatigue, headache, nausea, memory loss, visual disturbances, dizziness, and cardiovascular problems, directly proportional to their exposure to microwaves.”

■

- Wifi boosting (Boston is doing this now!). At CCHS, the wifi signal has been boosted to extend well past the high school building - down to Memorial Stadium (where I just had CCHS GUEST wifi coverage throughout graduation day). If the town of Concord were to install boosters along Main Street, citizens and tourists alike would have good coverage (wifi, wifi calling) in town. Additionally, wifi signals do not extend very far so most residential areas would not be impacted. A quick search of how to do this provides many results, but see how Boston is doing something similar: <https://www.boston.gov/departments/innovation-and-technology/how-wicked-free-wi-fi-works#wi-fi-locations-map>
- Keyes Road - this article was pulled from the Town Meeting because Tricon was “a sure thing”. As a supporter of the article, I am shocked and feel betrayed that just two months after we were told Tricon was happening by an employee at the DPW meeting, it is suddenly no longer on the table. Now we have not had a public vote on Keyes Road to show town support. While there may be space issues around the DPW, the town is ultimately in control of how spaces are used. If the Keyes Road site needs to be used for a cell tower, then I bet the town would figure out an alternative, i.e. buy the old garage on Lowell Road, petition the state for land at MCI, etc.
 - Please note: as Alisha Boyajian showed in many presentations around town, the site line of the tower from Old North Bridge is NOT an issue. The photos taken from the balloon test were deemed to be satisfactory at the time they were taken, as well as by citizens who have seen the photo at presentations of that Keyes Road article.

I appreciate your time in reading my lengthy plea, which I will be forwarding to neighbors who have expressed concern over this issue in the past. I look forward to a response. Also, I have copied School Committee Chair, Ms. Marano, as I believe siting a cell tower at CCHS was also brought up at the Select Board meeting last week. Given the town consensus around the landfill RFP at town meeting, as well as approval of the article from all town agencies, I was surprised that a cell tower at the high school was even mentioned. That would be completely redundant to the landfill placement. All of the points made above are also relevant to the a tower at CCHS.

Best,

Sorrel Sammons
 48 Academy Lane
 617-413-8671

Begin forwarded message:

From: Sorrel Sammons <sorrelsammons@hotmail.com>
Subject: Re: Opposition to Wireless Facility at Umbrella and Emerson Park
Date: June 16, 2018 at 1:54:21 PM EDT
To: tmckean@concordma.gov, sng@concordma.gov, akaufman@concordma.gov, jhotchkiss@concordma.gov, mlawson@concordma.gov, amara@concordma.gov

Dear Select Board:

I am writing again prior to Monday's meeting to express my extreme disapproval of a cell tower placed in either Emerson Umbrella or Emerson park. Previously I sited my concerns with regard to: disregard for bylaws; worrisome scientific findings (albeit contradictory at times) with regard to residential proximity to a cell tower, particularly within 1000 feet; actual need of a new cell phone tower; and adverse affects on the housing market (especially as more and more studies come out to show negative health consequences).

After attending the meeting back in the winter at which point Verizon presented their proposal for the Umbrella, I walked away feeling extremely upset that we are placing the health of Verizon's wireless service business above our own health. I do appreciate that Verizon is trying to work with the town to 1) allow the town to benefit from the financial gain of putting up a tower and 2) allow the town to have some say in placement, rather than going to private property. However, I do not believe that these benefits are enough to issue an exemption from the bylaws that our town has set with regard to cell tower placement. I understand that it is written as such that exemptions can be issued, but why would we issue one now? Given the rigorous ZBA guidelines with regard to many of the bylaws, i.e. FAR (for which my recent request to add a mere 1.5-2 feet of height to a garage was rejected because it gave me more livable space EVEN when the footprint of the house stayed the same), it seems that the rigor should be applied with the greatest amount to a bylaw when it is in our town's best interest. The science is not conclusive that it is healthy to live near a cell tower (in fact, our state government is doing a thorough investigation in order to establish some guidelines that can protect us until the science is secure in its findings...can we wait for that to come out at least?) AND when the community is extremely upset at the two current proposed locations. Furthermore, it is even more upsetting when you consider that the simple appearance of a tower at a third location - off Keyes Road - caused that site to be rejected, but when faced with potential dangerous health side effects, the town is willing to consider it. It does seem that priorities have gone awry when you think of it that way. In addition, if the tower/pole is too ugly to go off of Keyes Road in a back area, how is it possibly attractive enough to make it into our premier town center park that hosts our residents, as well as visitors from all over, on a daily basis?

I plead with the Board to not allow the cell tower at Emerson Umbrella or the park. Not only is Emerson Umbrella within 1000 feet of our house, as well as many, many other homes, Emerson Park is right at the border of 1000 feet AND we are within 1000 feet of the tower at Concord Academy. As I mentioned below, there is a cumulative effect with regard to impact of the cell waves. I hope to attend the meeting Monday but with three children - ages 8, 12, and 14 - it is extremely hard to get to these meetings in the evening. I usually end up with a babysitter to cover one child while I drive the others around. Please know that there are many of us with concerns who simply may not be physically able to show up. I am writing in case I cannot.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please make placing any new cell towers as far as from residential areas your top priority, even if it means

sacrificing a small amount with regard to appearance.

Best,

Sorrel Sammons
48 Academy Lane

On Jan 22, 2018, at 3:08 PM, Sorrel Sammons
<sorrelsammons@hotmail.com> wrote:

Dear Select Board:

My name is Sorrel Sammons and I live at 48 Academy Lane, Concord. We have three children of elementary and middle school age that we are hoping to continue to raise here in downtown Concord. I am writing to oppose placement of a wireless facility at Emerson Umbrella. I oppose it for several reasons that I have spent the last month mulling over, discussing with neighbors, researching online (please excuse my lack of citation for things I have noted as with three children, I have very little time to reference specific articles I have read at this time):

- Placing a cell tower within 200ft. of housing - and on top of an educational facility - clearly goes against the intention of a town bylaw that the people of Concord approved in order to protect us in situations just as this. It seems unusual and wrong that a town ask to go around it's own bylaws in such a way. Why would such by-laws even be passed if the town can simply disregard them when it is convenient?

- The science on the safety of living in close proximity to a cell facility is too young to give definitive findings that it is safe. We do not want to be the guinea pigs on which the safety is put to the test, especially when you can find many studies that indicate a likely negative health affect from living close to cell facilities (as well as many communities and even counties who are taking steps to protect their citizens from the potential health affects of such exposure). In addition, I was surprised to see that there are already so many existing facilities in downtown Concord. Studies do show that the amount of radiation that you are exposed to is cumulative in these situations, i.e. the Umbrella site would give us a double dose as we are already receiving waves from the Concord Academy site. (Do the parents of students at Concord Academy know there is one on their campus?). It is hard enough to be concerned that the wifi from your own house and your neighbors will negative affect your health as some studies suggest, but to voluntarily add on layers of additional exposure seems completely insane.

- I haven't seen that the residents of Concord are expressing the need for an additional cell facility. Given the choice, the neighbors I have spoken with are fairly satisfied with service and certainly don't think it warrants a cell facility in-town. I've heard that it is partly to assist with the new parking meetings which is really unsettling as these are so controversial among town residents to begin with. I've also heard that it is to help with the financial situation of the town. If so, I do not believe our health is for sale.

- If there was a real need, other sites that do not impact residential and/or school areas need to be explored way more thoroughly before the residents of the town are asked to bear the burden. I've heard that Walden Woods shot down one for the area across route 2 that is clear of housing. If there truly is a need, it seems we should revisit this topic and weigh the opinions of town residents with outside groups appropriately.

- The impact of the cell facility on housing prices worries me a great deal. Current perception of the dangers of living near a cell facility - much less one highly publicized study on the negative impact of living near one - has the potential for permanent damage to the downtown Concord housing market. It could not only affect the residents that are currently here (of whom most of which strongly do not want a cell facility downtown), but also potentially affects the businesses that count on the residents of downtown to be actively shopping downtown.

I hope you will consider the voices of the residents that live in close proximity to this site and halt the process of considering a cell facility site at Emerson Umbrella.

Thanks so much for your time.

Sincerely,

Sorrel Sammons

From: [joseph laurin](#)
To: [Mark Howell](#); [Wendy Rovelli](#); [Terri Ackerman](#); [Cameron McKennitt](#); [Mary Hartman](#); [Shannon McAndrew](#)
Subject: Question re the Senior Means-Tested Property Tax Exemption
Date: Monday, June 10, 2024 12:53:07 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from jlaurin978@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Select Board,

I would like to understand how the proposed (permanent) Senior Means-Tested Property Tax Exemption (STE) would be coordinated with the Residential Tax Exemption (RTE), specifically:

1. Could someone apply for, and qualify for, both the STE and the RTE?
2. How would someone's exemption for one program (say, the STE) be considered in the calculation of their exemption in the other program (say, the RTE)?
 - a. How would their exemptions be calculated for each program and in total?
 - b. Will the town know (or require people to disclose) the exemptions someone is receiving from one program while applying for the other?
3. The recent voter information mailer says one of the qualifications for the STE is that applicants' incomes "do not exceed certain income requirements tied to the State Income Tax Circuit Breaker".
 - a. What are those income requirements?
 - b. If they change based on a formula, what is the formula?
 - c. What is the expected income requirement for 2025?
4. More generally, do we need both the STE and the RTE?
 - a. Can't the RTE (the more broad-based program) be modified to incorporate considerations for senior residents, thus obviating the need for the STE and taking a step toward bureaucracy simplification?

Thank you in advance for your clarifications.

Joe Laurin
134 Southfield Road
978-866-9876

Date: June 10, 2024

To: Concord Select Board

Subject : Raising the Pride Flag

I am a member of the Concord Center Cultural District Task Force. At the June 6, 2024 meeting it came to our attention that the Select Board voted to delay until June 17th final consideration of the DEI Commission's request to fly the Pride Flag as part of this month's town-wide Pride celebration.

As a member of the Cultural Community of Concord, I strongly urge the Select Board to approve the DEI Commission's request. Flying the Pride Flag for even one day will make a positive difference for the LGBTQIA+ community and its allies, friends, and families, and will make Concord a more welcoming place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jerry Wedge
109 Heaths Bridge Road
Concord, MA 01742

From: [Mark Gailus](#)
To: [Mary Hartman](#); [Mark Howell](#); [Terri Ackerman](#); [Cameron McKennitt](#); [Wendy Rovelli](#); [Andrea Fountain](#); [Shannon McAndrew](#)
Subject: Pride Celebrations
Date: Monday, June 10, 2024 4:47:14 PM

Dear Members of the Select Board,

Regarding your June 3rd discussion about raising the Pride Flag on June 22 and 23:

Thank you for your thoughtful deliberation about a consistent flag raising policy.

We want to highlight that matters like Juneteenth or LGBTQ+ awareness are not separate group issues. Rather, they encompass all of humanity.

Re: How long a flag might be up for different occasions: This could also be decided on a case by case basis. For example, the solemnity of an historically significant day in our history would not be diminished if a mainly celebratory flag was raised throughout a celebration.

We hope you will grant the DEI Commission's request.

Best regards,

Mark Gailus and Tanya B. Gailus
62 Prescott Road

From: [tbartevyan](#)
To: [Mary Hartman](#); [Mark Howell](#); [Terri Ackerman](#); [Cameron McKennitt](#); [Wendy Rovelli](#); [Andrea Fountain](#); [Shannon McAndrew](#)
Subject: Regarding the CCCD Task Force recommendation
Date: Monday, June 10, 2024 5:26:58 PM

June 10, 2024

Dear Members of the Concord Select Board,

As you know, the Concord Center Cultural District (CCCD) Task Force, of which I am a member, finalized our recommendation to you on June 6th, with regards to an entity to administer future CCCD grants.

I would like to add some comments for the record, on my own behalf only.

I fully endorse our recommendation that the Local Cultural Council be charged with administering future CCCD grants. For me, it is of primary importance that the entity be a public body, as I have mentioned during our Task Force meetings.

I do not necessarily support the additional suggestion in the recommendation, i.e. that you consider giving the Local Cultural Council authority to oversee the West Concord Cultural District grants as well.

This sentence was added to the draft document at the last minute. It did not receive adequate deliberation during our meeting on June 6th. My attempts to achieve this failed.

As our letter admits, it is not in our purview. In my opinion the West Concord Cultural District Committee has been very functional.

I had to vote for the entire recommendation in the end, because it was the only means and opportunity for me to endorse our main recommendation re: CCCD grants being administered by the Local Cultural Council.

Clearly, if you move forward with our recommendation, there will need to be new directions to the Local Cultural Council regarding the two separate grants and their timelines.

Thank you for the opportunity to serve on the Task Force. I hope our work has made a positive difference for the arts, culture, community, and economy of our town. I am particularly happy that we were able to fund several artistic projects this year.

Sincerely,

Tanya Barteveyan
62 Prescott Road

p.s. I ask that you please post this letter as in a packet you deem appropriate.

From: [Mary Hartman](#)
To: [Shannon McAndrew](#)
Subject: Fwd: Comments on Cell Discussion
Date: Tuesday, June 11, 2024 1:43:34 PM
Attachments: [Seond Drive TestLavin 2023.pdf](#)

From: Alisha Boyajian <alishaboyajian3@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2024 12:05:43 PM
To: Mary Hartman <mhartman@concordma.gov>; Mark Howell <markhowell@concordma.gov>; Terri Ackerman <tackerman@concordma.gov>; Wendy Rovelli <wrovelli@concordma.gov>; Cameron McKennitt <cmckennitt@concordma.gov>
Cc: Kerry Lafleur <klafleur@concordma.gov>; Megan Zammuto <mzammuto@concordma.gov>
Subject: Comments on Cell Discussion

Some people who received this message don't often get email from alishaboyajian3@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Members of the Select Board,

Thank you for providing a cell tower update on 6/3. I felt it was important to clarify a few points:

1. A balloon test is typically done to assess visual impact, **however**, in addition, an antenna can in fact, be sent up on the balloon crane to broadcast signal and the strength of that signal can be measured in the desired coverage area to see if the potential site will perform as needed and expected. This was described by the RF engineer hired by the town in 2003 and the RF engineer our resident group spoke with. **Attached is an example of a report from such an RF study with measured signal.** The coverage maps we have to date are only informed guesses, not definitive, concrete data on how current facilities are performing, nor how future sites will perform. As pointed out in the meeting, the wireless providers will perform a more in-depth study if they feel it is necessary to clarify site suitability. I will add that it might be worth the town pursuing such analysis with an independent contractor if we wish to gain unbiased information about how a particular site might perform.
2. Town Meeting only demonstrated overwhelming support for the Landfill site, not any and all municipal land. Jumping to the Umbrella site or suggesting we circle back to the High School based on the Town Meeting vote for the Landfill comes across as a distortion of intent based on fallacious reasoning. Municipally-owned parcels *are* the best choices as they provide full control over lease terms and revenue, but the town still has a responsibility to assess impacts on the areas that immediately surround any new facility. Site choice should balance meeting community needs with the least amount of negative impact on surrounding areas.
4. While researching for the landfill warrant article, we came across a state law that

should be carefully considered. Mass. Gen. Laws, Chap. 71 lists the powers and duties of regional school districts. Sect. 16 (q) allows the leasing of district land only for "educational purposes." Therefore, leasing district land (the CCHS campus) to a private telecommunications company for a cell tower may violate state law. If the Town and School Committee decide to proceed with Verizon's proposal to lease the CCHS campus for a tower, it would be important to fully understand the implications of this law. We have been informed that the Dover-Sherborn Regional School Committee decided to not pursue a campus cell tower to avoid the risk of violating Mass. Gen. Laws Chap. 71, 16(q).

5. Yes it is true that the public desire for improved service has increased dramatically over the past 25 years. Yes it is true that many of the concerns over the Landfill and Keyes Rd sites, particularly distant viewsheds, would not be a barrier today. It is also true that the research around potential health impacts of spending too much time, too close to cell towers is stronger than ever. Objections to the Umbrella site are only 7 years in the past, not 25.

6. Yes it is true that wherever a facility gets placed, there will be some objections. The most logical step is to identify the town-owned sites that will have the least impact on the immediately surrounding areas and therefore the least objections. The warrant article for a tower sited in the Keyes Rd parking lot raised concerns **not only** from a standpoint of public works operations, but privately from some town-employee building occupants who understandably question the safety of spending several hours a day in close proximity to a tower. The Umbrella site raised similar concerns from the residents who live in the immediate vicinity, many of whom still reside there. Rather than declare an impossible situation and simply opting to go with Verizon's first choice, the town could consider reasonable accommodations to address town-employee concerns, such as finding alternative office space for individuals who feel strongly on the matter and problem-solving for operational concerns.

Lastly, holding onto the narrative that Concord's cell coverage issues are worse than other towns is only serving to create extreme community tension and polarization, which stalls progress. Cell coverage is challenging across the nation. [Please read this recent article from Time Magazine.](#) A quick spin through surrounding communities on the Nextdoor app with a "cell service" search phrase will pull up complaints of poor service, even in surrounding neighborhoods with plenty of multi-provider facilities. Wireless networks are simply overloaded. Verizon is struggling nationwide in particular, not just because they have been denied prime real estate in Concord but because their network configuration and their business choices to try and dominate the higher frequencies in a effort to be the 5G leader...except the 5G small cell build out needed to support using those higher frequencies is not able to happen as fast as they anticipated, particularly in more suburban and rural areas.

Please remember Verizon is a private for-profit corporation--not a public utility. We should be acting in the best interest of our community, not Verizon's.

New wireless facilities, placed in locations that offer appropriate buffers from schools and homes, like the Landfill and the DPW yard, will dramatically increase network capacity and improve user experience while minimizing negative community impacts

and objections. This is true even for Verizon, who is relying most heavily on the higher frequencies. Finding ways to move what activity we can off the wireless networks to hardwired connections will also reduce network congestion. Utilizing existing wifi networks inside our buildings is also smart, particularly in newly constructed, energy efficient buildings which are most difficult for usable cell signals to penetrate.

The follow-up conversation during the Select Board meeting on 6/3 suggested that the town is looking to head up the same, unproductive path of the past. The intention of Articles 38 and 39 was to support the town in moving forward with tower solutions that will improve cellular service while minimizing opposition and obstacles to actual build out.

Best,
Alisha Boyajian
77 Westford Rd
617.823.5156

From: [Wendy Holt](#)
To: [Shannon McAndrew](#)
Subject: Pride Flag
Date: Tuesday, June 11, 2024 11:37:20 PM

You don't often get email from wendyhlakem@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

I am shocked and saddened that the Select Board has decided against flying the Pride Flag. This is an important symbol of acceptance for a group that has never been fully accepted and is increasingly experiencing episodes of rejection and demonization.

Please support our fellow LGBTQ Concordians

Wendy Holt
30 Dover Street
Concord, MA 01742

June 12, 2024

Ms. Mary Hartman, Chair
Concord Select Board

Dear Ms. Hartman

The issue of which flags are allowed to fly on the Town Flag Pole is important, fraught and complex. As we watched the June 3, 2024 Select Board meeting it was clear that despite the pressure you were under you recognized the importance of getting the Town's Flag Policy correct.

We urge you to adopt a new and non ambiguous policy before you allow any more flags to be flown on the Town of Concord Flag Pole. The present APP16 on flag protocol is too open ended.

The Town of Carlisle Municipal Flag Policy serves as an excellent model. A synopsis of the relevant portions of the Carlisle January 23, 2024 Flag Policy follows:

3.2 Standard Flag Protocol

"Only the U.S., Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Town of Carlisle and official flags of the US Military and the POW/MIA flags may be flown on any Town-owned flag poles in the following order of precedence:.."

3.3 Other Flags

"The Town of Carlisle flag pole is not intended to serve as a forum for public free expression. All other flags are prohibited from being flown on Town of Carlisle flag poles."

A similar policy for Concord would prevent endless hours of needless wrangling. There are many worthy and controversial causes that may have flags to promote them. To wade into those waters can also be costly, as proved by the Supreme Court Case *Shurtleff v City of Boston*. The case cost the City \$ 2.1 million in legal fees.

Please step forward and create a policy which will serve the Town now and in the future. This will allow you to focus on the complex business of keeping the Town of Concord running.

Sincerely,

Joanne and Cyrus Gibson

100 Newbury Court , Apt. 2217
Concord, MA. 01742

From: [Mary Hartman](#)
To: [Shannon McAndrew](#)
Subject: Fwd: Voicing my great concern about a cell tower at Emerson Umbrella
Date: Wednesday, June 12, 2024 5:28:31 PM

From: CPart <ccpartridge01@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2024 5:11:59 PM
To: Mark Howell <markhowell@concordma.gov>; Mary Hartman <mhartman@concordma.gov>; Terri Ackerman <tackerman@concordma.gov>; Cameron McKennitt <cmckennitt@concordma.gov>; Wendy Rovelli <wrovelli@concordma.gov>
Cc: Mike <partridge8@gmail.com>
Subject: Voicing my great concern about a cell tower at Emerson Umbrella

Some people who received this message don't often get email from ccpartridge01@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Board Members,
I live on Academy Lane, just across the street from Emerson Umbrella, and I was alarmed to learn the town will be submitting another RFP for a cell tower to be placed in the Umbrella cupola.

I am sure you are all well aware of the volume of data available regarding the deleterious health effects of chronic exposure to RF-radiation and the need to locate cell towers responsibly, as far away from homes and schools as possible. I also understand the need to build a tower that will provide service to Concord Center and the high School. However, placing a tower in the center of a high density residential community that contains hundreds of homes and a recreation center that houses after school programs and summer camps, is not appropriate. This proposal affects thousands of residents and taxpayers, and deserves your immediate reconsideration.

Respectfully,

Caroline Partridge
41 Academy Lane
617-359-3875

From: [Sara Ballard](#)
To: [Shannon McAndrew](#)
Subject: Please raise a Pride Flag June 22
Date: Wednesday, June 12, 2024 9:28:16 PM

[You don't often get email from sara@sb.org. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Dear Select Board,

As a Concord resident, I'm writing to urge you to please allow the raising of a Pride Flag on the morning of June 22. This would send a strong message that the Town of Concord values and respects all of its citizens. This show of support would mean so much to LGBTQ residents, their families, and allies.

I am very pleased to learn the a flag will be raised in honor of Juneteenth. I hope you will give Concord's Pride Day the same consideration.

Thank You,

Sara Ballard
34 Aurora Lane

From: [Suzie Weaver](#)
To: [Shannon McAndrew](#)
Subject: Please Raise the Pride Flag for Concord Pride!
Date: Wednesday, June 12, 2024 9:48:23 PM

You don't often get email from skatesuzie@aol.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

To the Concord Select Board:

As members of the First Parish in Concord Diversity Committee, which promotes education and awareness about LGBTQ+ issues, we write to urge that you find a way to permit the raising of the Pride flag on Concord's flag pole in Monument Square on the occasion of Concord's Pride celebrations.

While choosing not to fly a flag may seem to be a measure of neutrality, it can also act as assent to a status quo that continues to tolerate discriminatory treatment of minority groups. Flying this flag, on the other hand, would be an affirmative statement in support of equal rights and fair treatment for LGBTQ+-identifying people in our community. We would hope that this stance is wholly compatible with what Concord stands for.

Sincerely,
The First Parish in Concord Diversity Committee
20 Lexington Road
Suzie Weaver, Chair
Concord, MA

League of Women Voters Concord–Carlisle

PO Box 34, Concord, MA 01742

12 June 2024

To the Select Board of the Town of Concord:

We commend you for the progress you have made helping Concord become a more welcoming community, and we have much more work ahead of us. As you are aware, we have tried to honor our League policy of inclusion by quarterly holding a Social Justice Roundtable in partnership with Concord's Diversity Equity & Inclusion Commission. These meetings have all been in person and have grown in participation.

The Board of the League of Women Voters of Concord-Carlisle supports the Concord DEI Commission's plans for raising awareness through the flying of flags representing those who have been historically underserved or marginalized. Our support includes raising a flag for Pride Month as well as for Juneteenth.

Raising a flag in town even for 24 hours is a strong symbol of intentions and aspirations for a more inclusive community. The flags show our commitment to inclusivity not only to our own community but also to our visitors as well as to our employees. Please consider these flag-raising a sign of our commitment.

As you know, we would be with other towns that are leading the way:

Newburyport

<https://www.newburyportpride.com/events/event-three-haxds>

Beverly

<https://patch.com/massachusetts/beverly/beverly-host-pride-month-flag-raising-event>

Dedham

<https://www.dedham-ma.gov/Home/Components/Calendar/Event/9650/17?npage=163&toggle=next7days>

Framingham

<https://www.framinghamma.gov/pride>

Woburn

<https://woburnma.gov/events/event/pride-flag-raising/>

Gloucester

<https://www.gloucester-ma.gov/Calendar.aspx?EID=7779>

Melrose

<https://www.cityofmelrose.org/events/pride2024>

Lowell

<https://www.lowellma.gov/1410/Flag-Raising>

Marblehead

<https://www.marblehead.org/home/events/123101>

Wakefield

<https://www.wakefield.ma.us/home/news/progress-pride-flag-raising-on-june-3>

Danvers

<https://patch.com/massachusetts/danvers/danvers-glbtc-pride-community-celebrations-set-june>

Belchertown

<https://www.wwlp.com/news/local-news/hampden-county/belchertown-honors-pride-month-with-flag-raising-ceremony/>

Pittsfield

<https://www.wamc.org/news/2024-05-31/pittsfield-to-kick-off-this-years-pride-celebration-with-flag-raising-at-city-hall>

Hamilton

<https://www.hamiltonma.gov/events/event/pride-flag-raising-patton-park/>

Holyoke

<https://www.westernmassnews.com/2024/06/03/pride-flag-raising-holyoke-city-hall/?outputType=amp>

Amherst

*BE IT FURTHER PROCLAIMED, this proclamation will be recognized by raising the **Progress Pride flag from June 1 to June 30, 2024 with a formal flag raising celebration and proclamation reading on June 13th at 3:00 pm to coincide with the Amherst Celebration of Queer Identity and Progress.***

<https://amherstma.gov/DocumentCenter/View/72760/6b-Pride-Month-Proclamation-2024?bidId=>

Worcester

<https://www.facebook.com/events/1106321187140846/>

Boston

<https://www.necn.com/news/local/boston-kicks-off-pride-month/3249529/>

Somerville

<https://www.somervillema.gov/events/2024/06/04/pride-flag-raising>

Chelsea

<https://www.nbcboston.com/news/local/chelsea-other-mass-towns-celebrate-start-of-pride-month/3386637/>

Respectfully submitted on behalf of
League of Women Voters Concord-Carlisle

Emily Wheeler, Clerk

From: [Mary Hartman](#)
To: [Shannon McAndrew](#)
Subject: Fwd: EEA No. 16654 - Hanscom Field North Airfield Development, Bedford
Date: Thursday, June 13, 2024 2:02:59 PM

From: Eric Van Loon <vanloon.eric@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2024 11:47:25 AM
To: alexander.strysky@mass.gov <alexander.strysky@mass.gov>
Cc: Mike Barrett <Mike.Barrett@MaSenate.gov>; Simon Cataldo <simon.cataldo@gmail.com>; Mark Howell <markhowell@concordma.gov>; Terri Ackerman <tackerman@concordma.gov>; Mary Hartman <mhartman@concordma.gov>; Wendy Rovelli <wrovelli@concordma.gov>; Cameron McKennitt <cmckennitt@concordma.gov>; Eric Simms <esimms@concordma.gov>
Subject: EEA No. 16654 - Hanscom Field North Airfield Development, Bedford

Some people who received this message don't often get email from vanloon.eric@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This is an external email and has a suspicious subject or content. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments. When in doubt, contact the IT Department (support@concordma.gov).

Dear Secretary Tepper,
North Airfield Dvpmt, Bedford

RE: EEA No. 16654 - Hanscom Field

I served as Assistant Secretary of Environmental Affairs in Gov. Dukakis' first Administration, taught Environmental Law at Boston University Law School, and was Executive Director of the Union of Concerned Scientists 1979-84. I also served four years as Gov. Dukakis' Undersecretary of Economic Affairs in his second administration, am a 45-year resident of Concord, and was elected to six terms as Concord Town Moderator.

Having served as a senior state policy maker in both Environmental and Economic Affairs, I appreciate the sometimes challenging balancing that must be weighed between the economic value of a proposed project and its environmental impact. However I believe it is impossible for any objective review of the Hanscom DEIR to conclude anything other than that its huge negative environmental impact far exceeds its economic value, its DEIR is deeply flawed and must be redone, and allowing it to proceed would make impossible the achievement of the Healey-Driscoll Administration's 2050 Net Zero GHG emissions goal.

1. The environmental impact of the project would be hugely negative, and the DEIR claim to the contrary is demonstrably false. Its Net Zero claim is, bluntly, insulting to one's intelligence due to its counting building emissions only while ignoring aircraft emissions. Its Sustainable Aviation Fuels (SAF) claim is inaccurate because much biofuel production generates as much CO2 as conventional fossil fuel production and, in any event, SAF cannot be produced at scale anytime soon. Importantly, its claim that thousands of ferry flights will be eliminated is based on a flawed methodology, while the recent independent analysis indicates as many as 5000 additional flights may ensue. Most fundamentally, the GHG emissions would cancel out decades of neighboring towns carbon reduction efforts, much of

greater Boston's, and nearly 70% of climate gains from all solar PV ever installed statewide in Massachusetts.

2. The DEIR is fundamentally flawed because it fails to include and address much key information. Its omissions include: GHG emission data for actual flights rather than takeoffs and landings only, USAF/EPA PFAS contamination location and remediation efforts, and air quality deterioration evaluation.

Although MEPA itself lacks legal authority to deny this project outright, the Healey-Driscoll Administration is not without influence on MASSPORT. Stopping this development does not close Hanscom or ban private jets, but rather limits expansion of the most carbon-intense form of per passenger travel. The project would add fuel to our climate emergency fire for the benefit of a very small number of voters. No other single project likely to come before you during your term in office is likely to compare. Please do the intelligent thing.

Thank you for considering these thoughts.

Eric E Van Loon

95 Marthas Point Road

Concord MA 01742

vanloonerie@gmail.com

As a veteran kindergarten teacher of 25 years, I always appreciate learning new things in life. I hope I never stop having that excitement with learning. I also know the power of reflection and pause after a decision has been made. And, change. When students watch us, as community members, teachers, and as parents as we give space for reflection, listening and change, we send a powerful message. When we model what further discourse looks like, as a community, it is dynamic. Further discourse is not just tolerating another's idea. It isn't just allowing someone else to speak with headphones on. Listening is an active activity.

Children know. Thankfully, they are learning about history and who wrote it and reading the more honest stories that are on our bookshelves today. And, the stories are still coming. And, hopefully some of our children will write them. And, even here in Concord, where **one** of the histories of a nation was born, it is always being retold as we dig deeper into it. New, more honest and layered narratives, are breathing new life into what our Concord history is, our state, nation and the world. That's exciting. Pulitzers are awarded for it! History is yesterday but it is being made today.

If all of the currently named school personalities came together today, say at a long table at the library – in the Goodwin room - the conversation would indeed be a rich one - with experience, history, views and lenses. It would be amazing to be a fly on the wall. And, I would opine that each of them would offer a seat to us. I think they would look down at the School Committee and really scratch their heads in sad dismay.

It becomes more and more apparent that the School Committee feels undermined , frustrated, annoyed and shut off from listening. I watched those Zoom School Committee meetings. More importantly, it is becoming clear that only a *few* are holding fast and hard to the concept that it's their business, not ours. I can't buy that they really believe they allowed the process to proceed in a more thoughtful, tactical way for such a decision that affects the town's most important constituents – it's children. Are they so rankled that the DEI and towns folk checked them about the process? How can they justify this stance? "We get to do it so back off town?" If the argument is that they followed procedure and it's their call, I would respectfully argue that they did not leave enough process time. And the process was deeply flawed. Upholding the tenets of democracy allows for our elected officials to be questioned about policy and process. They are being insincere. It is easy now to call what proponents have asked for – a process that is fair and connected to the community - as bullying or woke culture. Those arguments are being heard throughout the country, and it is sad and far from educational. And, it is dangerous and frankly un-democratic at its core. It's clear the Committee fast tracked this naming. And, the eyes of children and history are watching.

The School Committee and the town are writing tomorrow's history for our children. That, in 2024, the School Committee said no to Ellen Garrison. They said yes to naming a building yet need to hold fast to Concord Middle School as a name. I am embarrassed. And, we are now a story for all to consume. Because, history doesn't stay static. It's out there.

Saying no to Ellen Garrison sends a distinctively powerful message. Kids will walk away knowing adults said no to this amazing black woman – a daughter of our town. Because, let's be honest here – that's how children will see it. The implicit message on this decision by adults is heartbreaking.

Meg Bruton
286 Lexington Road

It saddened me to read in the Concord Bridge that the Select Board **tabled** the raising of the Pride flag. Proclamations are heartening and wonderful. Yet, visibility is so important. Not only for Concord's LGBTQ citizens, but their allies and their family members and for the many local and international tourists that visit our town steeped in democracy and history. We are a destination and a beacon. I remember when Deval Patrick's wife, Diane, marched in the Boston Pride parade years ago. She referenced their daughter Katharine who had just bravely come out publicly as a lesbian. She said, in effect, we don't just *accept* her – she *enriches* our whole family.

I had the good fortune to be in downtown Boston this week to support the Horizons for Homeless Children agency at its booth for the International Day of Play. I am among many local volunteers who engage with the youngest and most vulnerable children in the shelter during a weekly play shift. I am so proud that Concord has supported this agency and these newly arrived people in the shelter. The climate is not as welcoming elsewhere. I walked past the state house. Three flags blew in the wind. The U.S., POW/MIA and the Pride flag.

How can we as a town "*formally*" observe Pride month, yet take pause at raising a flag in celebration and unity? Isn't the town proudly a part of these events? It seems so. It made me so proud to see all of the events posted at the main library. It's amazing to see the many events and secular agencies supporting it – the Beede, the Concord Museum, the town library. That's the importance of visibility on a bulletin board.

Yet, a flag is a special design or is used as signaling. Isn't Concord *signaling* support of the rights for its LGBTQ citizens *and their families* to live safely, strongly and freely here in Concord? LGBTQ rights have not always been a given and there is still much work to be done, here and abroad to reach those goals. These rights have been hard fought. The flag is about that, too. Not just identity. The Pride flag and its history are not a "bulletin board" novelty, so it saddened me to hear it referenced as such. (I doubt the intention of the statement was to cause hurt.) Rather, it is a symbol of, well, pride and acceptance, and toil, and overcoming violence, isolation and hate. It is also part of the arc that bends towards justice, humanity and hope. And, dignity.

As a town, we are recognizing Pride with town events. To say that the Select Board is now worried at "*where do we draw the line*" with regard to the flag pole is confusing. Is it something else? I remember arguments like that during the marriage equality debates. They were shocking. So, yes, raising the flag is making a statement. Not raising it is also making a clear statement. Proclamations aren't up for all to see. The Select Board approved the rally and the march – for the first time – *they* wrote the proclamation. That is a statement.

Let's raise the flag in the words of the proclamation, "with joy and excitement" and with the "intention of lifting up the LGBTQIA community". Let's put debates aside about special interests wanting access to the flag pole. Concord, let's put those words into action and "lift up" the flag.

To the Concord Select Board,

I am writing to add my voice to those Concordians requesting that the Pride Flag be flown from the town flagpole on Saturday, June 22nd.

Such a decision is inline with town goals and ethics:

- Such a public display of tolerance of diversity would reinforce Concord Town Meeting's vote to be a "Welcoming Community."
- Displaying the Pride Flag would demonstrate that Concord strides to recognize and honor all people who live in, visit, or shop in our town.

I have heard the objection that flying the Pride Flag would allow all groups to display their flag/banners on Monument Square. Again, as stated by the DEI Commission, this request comes from a town committee, created by the Select Board expressly to support the inclusion of diversity in all its variations in our town. Certainly, this would not provide a precedent for any group.

As the parent of two gay children, who were welcomed by friends, neighbors and classmates, I think such a display simply recognizes the ethic of tolerance that has begun to take hold in this town. Please nurture this welcoming spirit and let our Pride Flag fly overhead on June 22nd.

Sincerely,

Ellen Quackenbush
206 Prairie St