The Honorable Senator Benjamin Allen State Capitol, Room 5072, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

### Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor is regulation of <u>operations</u> preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Joel Anderson State Capitol, Room 5052, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

# Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Toni G. Atkins State Capitol, Room 4072, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

## Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Patricia C. Bates State Capitol, Room 305, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

# Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Jim Beall State Capitol, Room 2082, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

# Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Tom Berryhill State Capitol, Room 3067, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

## Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Steven Bradford State Capitol, Room 2062, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

### Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Anthony Cannella State Capitol, Room 5082, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

# Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Kevin de León State Capitol, Room 205, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

# Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Bill Dodd State Capitol, Room 5064, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

# Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Jean Fuller State Capitol, Room 4048, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

# Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Ted Gaines State Capitol, Room 3076, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

### Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Cathleen Galgiani State Capitol, Room 5097, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

### Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Steven M. Glazer State Capitol, Room 5108, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

# Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Ed Hernandez State Capitol, Room 2080, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

# Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Robert M. Hertzberg State Capitol, Room 4038, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

# Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Jerry Hill State Capitol, Room 5035, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

### Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Ben Hueso State Capitol, Room 4035, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

### Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator HannahBeth Jackson, State Capitol, Room 2032, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

## Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Ricardo Lara 5050 State Capitol, Room, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

# Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Connie M. Leyva State Capitol, Room 4061, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

# Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Mike McGuire State Capitol, Room 5061, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

### Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Tony Mendoza State Capitol, Room 5100, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

## Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Holly J. Mitchell State Capitol, Room 5080, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

## Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Bill Monning State Capitol, Room 313, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

# Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator John M. W. Moorlach State Capitol, Room 2048, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

# Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Mike Morrell State Capitol, Room 3056, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

# Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Josh Newman State Capitol, Room 4082, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

## Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Janet Nguyen State Capitol, Room 3048, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

## Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Jim Nielsen State Capitol, Room 2068, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

# Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Richard Pan State Capitol, Room 5114, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

## Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Anthony J. Portantino State Capitol, Room 3086, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

## Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Richard D. Roth State Capitol, Room 4034, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

## Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Nancy Skinner State Capitol, Room 2059, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

## Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Henry I. Stern State Capitol, Room 3070, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

## Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Jeff Stone State Capitol, Room 4062, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

### Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Andy Vidak State Capitol, Room 3082, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

# Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Bob Wieckowski State Capitol, Room 4085, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

# Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Scott D. Wiener State Capitol, Room 4066, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

# Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.

The Honorable Senator Scott Wilk State Capitol, Room 4090, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator: May 30, 2017

It is essential that you vote NO on SB649, a bill called "Wireless Telecommunication Facilities".

SB649 is an unnecessary gift to the telecommunications industry, a taking of public funds and property values, harming public health and safety and human and agricultural productivity. The State has a strong interest in protecting its economic base and freedom from physical injury and impairment. The bill would result in scientifically established hazardous radiation exposure to all living beings in California.

SB649 would allow telecommunications companies to install powerful microwave radiation antennas, misleadingly called "small cells" to conceal their radiation power and concentration, on light poles and utility poles in the public right of way for 4G/5G. Poles may be only 15 feet from homes and offices. Tens thousands of these antennas and associated equipment would be placed on residential blocks and farms in California, deploying radio frequency / microwave (RF/MW) radiation into homes 24/7.

Pulse-modulated RF/MW radiation, particularly this close to homes, offices and farm animals, is a "hazard", as acknowledged by IEEE and FCC in 1991 in the guideline-setting process.

Although SB649 proponents claim a huge financial bonanza from 4G/5G deployment, there is no evidence to support it. In fact, the Russians refused 5G as badly engineered (as also U.S. engineers have admitted) and instead provided fiber-optics, which works much better, to all homes and apartments. Furthermore, cell phones are a mature industry: nearly everyone already has one.

There are three main reasons for opposing SB649:

- health and agricultural science, with human and animal physical injuries and impairments,
- violation of federal and state laws, and
- violation of the powers of local government

# Health and agricultural science, and physical injury/impairments to human, animals, insects:

SB649 proponents misrepresent the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) as preempting all state and local regulation of wireless facilities. State and local governances are preempted only from regulating the "placement, construction, and modification" of wireless facilities based on their "environmental effects", but not based on health effects or health science. Nor Nor is regulation of operations preempted on any basis. State and local governments remain authorized and obligated to regulate every activity not preempted by TCA, and on every basis not preempted.

The Chair of the original FCC guideline Committee himself (John Osepchuk) acknowledges >20,000 scientific studies, with immediate, short-term and/or long-term adverse effects from RF/MW radiation.