

**THE BOROUGH COUNCIL IS EXPECTED TO VOTE ON TUESDAY,
SEPTEMBER 15
ON A PROPOSED SETTLEMENT TO PLACE NEW 5G TOWERS ON OUR
PAVILIONS**

A letter to my Spring Lake neighbors

2026

August 29,

Dear Neighbor,

My name is Kelley Badishkanian. My husband, our two boys and I live in Spring Lake full-time and love so much about our community. As part of that appreciation and concern for our town, two years ago I founded “Spring Lake Against 5G Towers”, a group of residents that has worked, like the Borough, to legally oppose Verizon’s proposal to install six forty-foot cell towers along Ocean Avenue.

On September 15, the Borough Council is expected to approve a settlement with Verizon that would place 5G equipment on each of our beachfront pavilions. I am writing because I am not sure most residents know this and because once the Council votes, the question is closed and future implications seem large.

TWO THINGS TO DO SOON

- 1. Email the Mayor and Council.** Contact details are at the end of this letter. A few sentences in your own words carries far more weight than a form letter. Tell them you want the beachfront protected, meaningful public review of any future installation preserved, and the long-term consequences considered before any settlement is approved.
- 2. Come to the meeting.** Borough Council, Tuesday, September 15 at currently scheduled for 7pm at Town Hall: Turnout is what registers. A full room tells the Council this matters to more than a handful of us — and you do not have to speak to make that point.

WHY WE ARE ASKING THE COUNCIL TO NOT TO SETTLE WITH VERIZON NOW

1. The settlement opens a door that does not close.

The proposed agreement would end the immediate legal dispute between Spring Lake and Verizon, but it puts no future limitations on installations by Verizon (or any other provider), anywhere in our town! Consider Asbury Park, where Verizon has installed nine 40-foot tall “ugly” black towers along a six-tenths-of-a-mile stretch of Ocean Avenue — roughly one every 450 feet. Spring Lake’s Ocean Avenue runs more than two miles!

2. It also takes the Planning Board out of the process.

Alongside the settlement, the Council is advancing a new ordinance that would allow it to approve future wireless installations without further review by its own Planning Board. This part deserves attention regardless of where you land on the towers themselves. The Planning Board exists so that decisions of this kind are examined in public, by people appointed to examine them. Removing that step is a permanent change to how Spring Lake governs itself — being adopted to resolve a single lawsuit.

3. No one has demonstrated that these installations are necessary.

Most of us have strong cell coverage throughout Spring Lake, including along the beachfront. Before public property is permanently altered, Verizon should have to show a specific service

problem it is solving, why any new locations are required, and what less intrusive alternatives were considered and rejected.

4. The beachfront plays a critical role in home values.

Our pavilions and boardwalk are part of the identity of this town. As you know, everyone who lives here and visits here admires the beauty of Spring Lake. Generations of residents and town councils have worked to keep Ocean Avenue uncluttered. All of this is reflected as part of our home values today. To agree to equipment concealed inside a cupola above our pavilions alters a historic building, and equally important is the lack of assurance that what follows will be as neatly concealed at all. That is not a right we can put back once it is gone.

5. And the health questions deserve a real hearing.

Scientists continue to debate the long-term biological effects of radiofrequency exposure, and whether current federal standards adequately account for cumulative exposure or for children and other vulnerable groups. Reasonable people can land in different places on this, and we are not asking anyone to accept a conclusion. But roughly over 150 homes sit within 1000 feet of the proposed locations, and these two locations are the places where a huge number of families spend their time on the beach and in the pools. That is reason enough to proceed carefully rather than quickly. A summary of the current health impact research accompanies this letter.

WHAT THIS COMES DOWN TO

This is not an argument about wireless technology. It is a question of whether a permanent decision about Spring Lake's beachfront and its resident's health gets made in public view, with the Borough's own review process intact, and with residents heard clearly and with enough time for proper consideration (we also wonder whether this topic is significant enough to require a resident vote).

The view of our group (SL Against 5G Towers) is that we all should continue to pursue the current legal path to block Verizon full stop. We would rather fight, and take the risk of losing, then acquiesce now and get no assurances in return from Verizon.

If we can engage now, email notes now and have as many of us in that room on September 15, the Council will take notice. If silent, that will be read as consent.

Kelley Badishkanian (feel free to read more at "SpringLakeAgainst5GTowers.com")

HOW TO REACH THE MAYOR AND BOROUGH COUNCIL

Mayor Jennifer Naughton — jnaughton@springlakeboro.org — (732) 449-0800

Borough Council

Brendan Judge, Council President

bjudge@springlakeboro.org

(908) 216-6623

Edwin Hale, Councilman

ehale@springlakeboro.org

(732) 814-9778

Matthew Sagui, Councilman

msagui@springlakeboro.org

(732) 449-1715

Joseph Erbe, Councilman

jerbe@springlakeboro.org

(732) 449-9511

Kathleen McDonough, Councilwoman

kmcdonough@springlakeboro.org

(732) 664-4999

Syd Whalley, Councilwoman

swhalley@springlakeboro.org

(310) 994-9602

APPENDIX: SELECTED HEALTH RESEARCH ON PROXIMITY TO WIRELESS BASE STATIONS

The studies below examine people living near cellular base stations, with distance or measured exposure as the variable of interest. They are listed so that residents can read the underlying material rather than take anyone's characterization of it. The evidence is genuinely mixed, and the final section reflects that. Our request to the Council does not depend on resolving this debate — it depends on the debate being unresolved.

Each entry gives the study and where to read it on the left, and what it reported on the right. Stated limitations appear in grey.

A. Studies reporting symptoms by distance or measured exposure

Santini et al. (2002) <i>Pathologie Biologie — France</i> Read the study › emf-portal.org	530 residents surveyed. Headache, sleep disturbance, fatigue and irritability were reported more frequently by those living within 300 metres of a base station. <i>Limitation:</i> Self-reported symptoms; participants aware of tower location.
Navarro et al. (2003) <i>Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine — La Ñora, Spain</i> Read the study › cdnsciencepub.com	Symptom severity tracked measured power density in the home, not distance alone — an exposure–response relationship rather than a proximity association.
Hutter et al. (2006) <i>Occupational and Environmental Medicine — Austria</i> Read the study › pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov	365 residents, with radiofrequency levels measured in bedrooms rather than estimated. Found significant associations with headache and difficulty concentrating. Methodologically the strongest study in this group.
Abdel-Rassoul et al. (2007) <i>NeuroToxicology — Egypt</i> Read the study › pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov	Used objective neurobehavioral performance testing in addition to questionnaires, and found measurable differences in residents near a base station.
Zothansيام et al. (2025) <i>Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine — Mizoram, India</i> Read the study › tandfonline.com	183 highly exposed residents compared with 126 demographically matched controls. Higher symptom prevalence among those within 50 metres of a base station and at power densities of 5–8 mW/m ² . The most recent study directly addressing proximity.

B. Studies reporting cancer incidence near base stations

Eger et al. (2004) <i>Umwelt·Medizin·Gesellschaft — Naila, Germany</i> Read the study › emf-portal.org	Ten years of patient records. Newly diagnosed cancers were significantly more frequent among residents within 400 metres, with onset on average eight years earlier. <i>Limitation:</i> Small population; no exposure measurement; no control for confounders.
Wolf & Wolf (2004) <i>International Journal of Cancer Prevention — Netanya, Israel</i> Read the study › researchgate.net	Elevated cancer incidence among residents within 350 metres of a transmitter, compared with a nearby control area. <i>Limitation:</i> Same design weaknesses as above.

Dode et al. (2011) <i>Science of the Total Environment — Belo Horizonte, Brazil</i> Read the study › sciencedirect.com	7,191 cancer deaths mapped against 856 base stations across a full municipality. Elevated mortality within 500 metres. The largest population studied to date on this question.
--	---

C. Reviews synthesizing the proximity literature

Levitt & Lai (2010) <i>Environmental Reviews</i> Read the study › cdnsiencepub.com	Open-access review; the origin of the frequently cited finding that eight of ten epidemiological studies reported effects in populations within 500 metres, at exposures below international guideline limits.
Balmori (2022) <i>Environmental Research</i> Read the study › sciencedirect.com	Recent review arguing the symptom pattern around base stations is consistent enough to constitute a recognizable syndrome.
Kundi & Hutter (2009) <i>Pathophysiology</i> Read the study › pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov	A review sympathetic to the underlying concern that nonetheless concludes the cancer-cluster studies are too methodologically limited to support firm conclusions. Included here because it is the fairest critique of Section B.

D. Evidence pointing the other way

World Health Organization commissioned review (2024) <i>Environment International</i> Read the study › sciencedirect.com	Systematic review of 74 studies and databases. Found moderate-certainty evidence of no effect, or only a small effect, for the most-studied cancers, and specifically no increased risk of childhood leukaemia near transmitters and base stations.
ICBE-EMF response (2025) <i>Reviews on Environmental Health</i> Read the study › pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov	A formal scientific challenge to the methodology of the WHO review, arguing it does not establish safety. The existence of this dispute among specialists is itself relevant to the Council's decision.

WHAT THIS RESEARCH DOES AND DOES NOT SHOW

Most of the symptom studies rely on residents reporting how they feel while knowing where the tower is, and experiments in which subjects are not told whether a transmitter is switched on have generally not reproduced the effects. This body of work does not fully establish that base stations cause illness, and this appendix does not claim that it does.

What it does establish is that qualified researchers continue to disagree, that the disagreement is active in the current literature rather than settled decades ago, and that the studies reporting effects did so at exposure levels already below the federal limits Verizon would be required to meet. That is the basis for asking the Council to take more time — not a conclusion about the technology.