

My Southborough Q&A with Mother of G*

Q: Some people will ask again if G's symptoms could be the result of "nocebo" effect (reverse of placebo). Can you share anything to explain how you are certain it isn't?**

A: As a parent whose child suffered disabling symptoms at the school, seeing is believing, so unfortunately we have no doubt that the chronic and intense exposure at Fay is a problem for our child. More telling however, our child has no idea there is such a syndrome and was experiencing symptoms at school long before a label was put on what he felt. Furthermore, our own physician analyzed dosimeter measurements of the actual peak Wi-Fi exposures our child was subject to at Fay on several school days. This data further correlates to the peak exposures and symptoms our child experienced at the school. When the Wi-Fi exposure was high in certain classes the child reported to the nurse with symptoms, however, the child had no way of knowing when the exposures peaked as the dosimeter does not indicate this without being expertly analyzed after data collection. It was after the data was gathered and analyzed from several school days that the startling connection was confirmed. Obviously, this causes us great concern about the intensity of exposures at Fay school. When we shared our results with the school to help achieve proper mitigation they banned us from using the medically indicated device, but offered no way to evaluate the exposures in any manner.

The sudden banning of the Dosimeter was puzzling for us as they allowed us to use it prior in their presence, although not when school was in session and under fully operational conditions, which is the most useful time to take measurements. Clearly, we have great concern over the number and intensity of industrial strength Wi-Fi access points our child was exposed to at Fay without our informed consent, and according to our doctor's opinions this has clearly impacted him. I think it is important to understand that all Wi-Fi is not the same in terms of intensity and duration of exposure and we have data that supports this. If you consider that most people have one router in their home but the schools have higher bandwidth needs so they use multiple Industrial /enterprise Wi-Fi which significantly outnumbers the access point infrastructure of most homes and coffee shops by a very high number. It is unfortunate that Fay's leadership is so resistant to examining this and making good faith accommodations in light of the data. Also, one final point confirming this is not the nocebo effect are the additional medical opinions (see exhibits attached to complaint as filed) that have concluded the same diagnosis.

Q: What do you say to people who accuse you of being lawsuit-happy?

A: Of course we can understand these thoughts, and there are many misconceptions regarding this. In fact, our lawsuit is a last resort, and it is only because we have exhausted all other avenues to address this serious health issue that we needed to proceed in this manner. We made every attempt to resolve this with the Fay school administration and its leadership, the Board of Trustees, prior to filing any lawsuit. Sadly, the school does not practice what they preach and the current course could have been avoided if they made a good faith attempt over 18 months ago when asked respectfully by us as parents and our medical professionals to find a reasonable accommodation for a child in need. In fact, Fay has refused to work with us in any meaningful way in the interest of our child's health and safety at their school. We are baffled that the school administration refused to meet with us as parents after several medical opinions pertaining to our child were submitted to the school.

The headmaster has continually blocked all communication with the teachers and the Board of Trustees which is contrary to the school's own governing by-laws. Mr. Gustavson and Mr. Clarence have insisted that we not speak to trustees when in fact the former headmaster, Steve White, has said speaking with trustees openly is the best way to resolve matters. One wonders why the current headmaster would blatantly disregard a child's health issue and prohibit parents from speaking with teachers and Trustees on behalf of their child's well-being.

Q: Can you explain in the damages you are asking for?

A: We are seeking monetary damages commensurate with the yearly tuition we have paid into the program in addition to the loss of the ability for our child to attend and finish the program to grade 9, as we had planned and invested in. We asked for a leave and tutorial support on Dec 1st. Regrettably, the school refused to allow the teachers to provide our privately hired tutor with information to facilitate obtaining course work and guidance for tutoring in order for our child to stay current with the Fay curriculum while on temporary leave. This made the leave unworkable and unfortunately, we were forced to find schooling elsewhere in the interim. Our child is temporarily in a school with significantly lower RF exposure and is doing well, but misses his Fay peers and beloved sports. Unfortunately, the school is about an hour away and the burden of travel is taking a toll. Of course, if we prevail at the trial on our injunction request that will mean the school will be ordered to have fixed the problem so that our child can return to Fay. If this happens our damages will be less because our child will return to finish the program we have paid dearly for over the last seven years.

Q: Given the controversial nature of disorder, can you share with readers the research you have come across on EHS?

A: I will send over in a separate email several peer reviewed papers that I feel will be helpful. The case studies are particularly relevant as what they detail is very similar in nature to the onset of symptoms in those who become sensitized to the Industrial strength/ Enterprise technology like Fay has put in. Fay installed this industrial technology without the consent of parents and have refused to share with the community the fact that radio-frequency/EMF radiation from Wi-Fi was classified as a 2B possible Human carcinogen by the WHO /IARC working group in 2011. Safety cannot be assured but the school continues to stand behind out of date and obsolete thermal compliance measurements, which it refuses to share in full even after multiple requests.

[Papers she provided:

- [The microwave syndrome or electro-hypersensitivity: historical background – Reviews on Environmental Health, 2014](#)
- [Wi-Fi in Schools: Are We Playing It Safe With Our Kids? – Santa Clara American Medical Association Bulletin, March/April 2015](#)
- [Electromagnetic hypersensitivity - an increasing challenge to the medical profession – Reviews on Environmental Health, 2015 \]](#)

Also the recent news reports I sent last week may help to illustrate the growing concern around this topic.

[Emailed links she is referring to:

- "The first is a recent news segment on Wi-Fi and wireless technology used at Maryland County Public Schools, where parents have recently expressed growing concern particularly as some

children are showing signs of sensitivity. [This brief story aired on FOX news Feb. 15, 2016](#)"

- "Also, [this piece recently aired on ABC in Australia](#) and is relevant because their standards are similar to US and only based on Thermal effects"
- "The final one is an [article in a Rhode Island newspaper](#) regarding a teacher's illness due to overexposure to EMF/wireless radiation in her school. Her advocacy for her own health apparently has been met with her subsequent termination, though the article states the school is considering her termination is based on continued insubordination"

Q: What justification did Fay School give you for not allowing G to be on campus for sports, etc.?

A: Sadly, the administration has given us no justification as to why our child cannot participate in the sports program during the leave, which was a reasonable accommodation. We are left to believe this is another attempt at retaliation by the administration. The school officials will be asked about this in pretrial questioning and at trial and we cannot imagine what answer they will give for not letting our child come to school for sports while he studied from home. We have endured outright threats of disenrollment for all our children and retaliation in several forms, including written letters from the administration, since we brought our documented medical concerns forward. Retaliation towards a child and family in need of accommodations is not something one would ever expect from an institution that purports to care for children. Its unfortunate but they clearly don't like the topic and in fact they have taken a similar approach with other parents who have expressed concern.

We hope the school will begin to be receptive to our pleas by doing something that really works – since we have agreed to pay for it. Our child formerly thrived in the program both academically and socially prior to being impacted by the schools high density technology infrastructure. We hope that they will properly address the exposures at the school. There are several reasonable steps that would mitigate exposure but still allow the full use of technology. We hope our child can finish the education he began at Fay from first grade and that the school will fully address the issues that have come to light before more children become sensitized and severely impacted. This technology is relatively new and we are just beginning to understand the many possible impacts both in-terms of the positive benefits of technology use and the very serious negative impacts overexposure can have.

**To make it easier for readers to follow, my original questions are edited and re-ordered. But all of Mother of G's responses are the original responses (reformatted).*

***Nocebo effect is the patients' response to perceived harmful stimuli (such as belief that they are being exposed to radiation when they aren't.)*