## Brooklyn Community Board 9 890 Nostrand Ave Brooklyn, New York 11225 Environmental Protection Committee Meeting

## **AMENDED**

May 4, 2023 Meeting ID: 861 8203 1710

**Attendance (Board Members):** Debbie Timothy, Committee Chair; Theresa Westerdahl, Sylveta Hamiton-Gonzales

Attendance (Community Resident Members): N/A

Absent (Board Members): N/A

Absent (Community Resident Members): Kristine Azzoli

Guests: Alicia Boyd, Felice Robertson CB9, Fred Baptiste CB9, Jay Sorid CB9, Jill McManus, Khryie Alleyne CB9, Lashuan Ellis, Martina Victoria, Nichola Cox CB9, Odette Wilkens, Sue Peters, Theodora Scarato

Agency Representatives: Khalid Jemmott, Community Associate

- I. Call to order:
  - a. Meeting called to order at 7:10 pm by Chair Debbie Timothy
- II. Words of Encouragement: Bishop Hamilton-Gonzales, CB9 Member
- **III.** Committee Business:
  - a. N/A
- IV. Introductions/Roll Call
  - a. Committee members and guests
- V. Old Business
  - a. Meeting Attendance
  - b. Clean-up/Walk-Through Project
    - i. EP Committee will continue advocating for the project
  - c. EP Committee members are to continue taking pictures of problematic areas in the community. All information will be reported to the CB9 staff by phone or email for follow-up and feedback
- VI. New Business
  - a. Link NYC 5G Network continued discussion/updates
    - i. Community raises concerns with the Link 5G Towers
- VII. Brooklyn Community Board 9 Environmental Committee Proposed Resolution

**WHEREAS;** New York City, through its Office of Technology and Innovation (OTI), has contracted with CityBridge to install and operate a citywide wireless communications network; and,

WHEREAS; CityBridge installed its LinkNYC network as the initial deployment of the citywide wireless

communications network intended to replace outdated public pay phones; and

**WHEREAS;** LinkNYC provided free 4G wireless cellular connectivity using towers placed on sidewalks throughout NYC, many of which include electronic display screens; and

WHEREAS; Community Board 9 in Brooklyn and other communities through out the NYC and constituents of

their districts have reported adverse impacts resulting from existing LinkNYC infrastructure, including visual

impacts, inappropriate usage, impacts on sidewalk clearances, and rat infestation; and

WHEREAS; CityBridge is now in the process of upgrading its LinkNYC network to Link5G to accommodate

technological upgrades that have recently become commonplace in cellular communications; and

WHEREAS; Link5G infrastructure is a 32' tall tower that is installed on sidewalks in the public right-of-way;

and

WHEREAS; Link5G towers in commercial districts include electronic screens similar to those found on LinkNYC kiosks that display advertising and public information; and

WHEREAS; the design of the Link5G towers has been approved by the Public Design Commission; and

**WHEREAS;** Link5G must adhere to siting requirements determined by NYC Department of City Planning, and

must obtain Landmarks Preservation Commission approval if sited in historic districts; and

WHEREAS; CityBridge and OTI installed 5G towers without notification and input from the residents and Community

Board 9 in Brooklyn; and

WHEREAS; CityBridge and OTI have proposed unknown number of sites across Community District 9; and

WHEREAS; CityBridge and OTI have stated that the siting of proposed Link5G towers in Community District

9 are based on gaps in coverage and locations where excess demand for the network exists as determined by

commercial cellular carriers; and

**WHEREAS;** where the currently proposed locations for 5G towers are not disclosed to residents and Community Board 9

WHEREAS; residents of Community District 9 have strongly objected to the design and the visual impacts that

Link5G towers would have on streetscapes, both with and without screens; and

WHEREAS; there are widespread concerns that 5G towers will be constructed at distances considered too close

to adjacent buildings, as has already occurred on Bedford; and

WHEREAS; 10' of distance from a tower to a residence that is permitted is extremely insufficient and should be

revisited as a policy; and

WHEREAS; there are no reported issues by residents of Community District 9 of cellular gaps and frequent

dropped calls that would justify Link5G being installed in the proposed locations; and

WHEREAS; the proposed sites for Link5G don't include any locations in areas known to be potential digital deserts within Community District 9; and

**WHEREAS**; OTI and CityBridge have not provided detailed plans regarding the full build-out of Link5G, both

within Community District 9 and other parts of the Borough; and

WHEREAS; there is a desire for any telecommunications infrastructure to be buried underground both for

reliability purposes and to minimize visual impacts; and

WHEREAS; there have been questions raised by some residents as to whether sufficient research has been

performed to fully assuage concerns that the radiation emitted by 5G infrastructure won't have any long-term

impacts on public health or the environment, including young children, seniors, people with medical implant

devices, pets, plants, and parks; and

WHEREAS: there has the 5G towers pose safety risk including combustion, accidents related to the falling over

of the 5G towers; and

WHEREAS; the community-at-large has expressed their views that Link5G is unnecessary and unwanted in

Community District 9 in Brooklyn at present and until many of the issues identified have been resolved;

WHEREAS; New York City is in control of this process through its contract with the provider;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,** that Community Board 9 Brooklyn disapproves the proposal as presented

to install Link 5G towers in Community District 9; and

## **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,** that a moratorium be placed on construction and planning of Link5G poles and

devices in Community District 9 Brooklyn.

## **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,** that the existing 5G are not activated and are removed

VIII. Committee Vote

i. Voted unanimously

IX. Adjournment

i. Meeting adjourned at 9:33 PM