



NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR SCIENCE, LAW & PUBLIC POLICY

1601 18th Street, NW, Ste. 4, Washington, DC 20009
(202) 462-8800

September 24, 2017

Governor Jerry Brown
State Capitol, Suite 1173
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Governor Brown,

Please Veto SB.649.

I fled California several years ago after being injured by a neighbor's wireless router located on the other side of the wall from my pillow (i.e. brain). I became unfocused, severely fatigued, had heart irregularities, and occasionally collapsed to the floor, not able to hold my spine up. I was able to figure out the source of the biological disregulation, very fortunately, and left San Francisco as soon as I could. I went on an 8-year odyssey learning from international scientists about the biological and health effects from Radiofrequency radiation. I was stunned to learn how much science exists showing harm, and perplexed that, as a society, we were increasingly allowing wireless antennas and cell towers in our neighborhoods, homes, offices and schools.

As I suspect you know, scientists have known for decades that Radiofrequency radiation emitted by wireless technologies and antenna infrastructure is harmful. There has been much international research from dozens of countries, as well as research conducted by the U.S. Office of Naval Research, EPA, NASA, NIH, DOE and NIEHS/NTP. A telecom industry funded review of the science showing risks at non-thermal exposures, the *Ecolog Report*, spelled out many of these risks in 2000. In 2015, over 200 international scientists appealed to the UN about the biological and health risks—see International EMF Scientists' Appeal to the UN ([Video](#)). And the U.S. Department of Interior has [charged](#) that FCC standards for Radiofrequency radiation are outmoded and do not adequately protect migratory birds and other wildlife, as the exposure guidelines only consider potential heating effects.

Two letters sent to you recently by scientists clearly describe some of the known health and biological risks—one from Professor Beatrice Golomb, MD, PhD of UC San Diego, and the second from Professor Emeritus Martin Pall of Washington State University. I include these important letters here in case they have not made their way to your desk. As you will see, the letters include over 500 citations referencing *many thousands of studies* showing biological dysregulation and health risks caused by electromagnetic fields.

Governor Jerry Brown
September 24, 2017
Page 2

Governor Brown, I trust you will agree this evidence is alarming—and conclude, like I have, that further “densification” of antennas in our living environments is inappropriate, even immoral. The wireless industry’s ambitions for more and more antennas, and at higher and higher frequencies, overlooks known harm to humans, the ecosystem, DNA, and the increasingly evident extinction risk from fertility effects, described in Dr. Pall’s letter.

NISLAPP will publish a policy paper this Fall explaining why, on *technological grounds*, the intensely wireless approach to California communications envisioned in SB.649 is unjustified. Only a fiber-based broadband system can overcome the access inequality and second-rate connectivity that is currently impeding our nation in myriad ways. There are also sustainability impacts to consider from adding more and more wireless antennas. Wired transmissions are significantly more energy efficient compared to energy guzzling wireless antennas.

Risks from wireless communication—such as safety, security, privacy, public health, and environmental risks—can be eliminated if California would strategically invest for the long-term in wired communications, as is being done in other countries and in some communities in the U.S.

In addition, it is essential California understand the potential [liability shift from the industry to the State of California](#) by virtue of enacting this legislation, as was described in a letter to the Assembly Appropriations Committee by Harry Lehman, Esq. on July 19, 2017. Please understand the potential very serious financial consequences for California that could ensue.

Finally, the egregious usurping of local government rights in SB.649 erodes democracy and is in violation of the values on which this country was founded. On this issue alone, you should not be supporting this bill.

Personally, I substantially recovered my health by staying away from wireless technologies for several years. But still today, when traveling and near antennas or wireless devices, I sleep poorly, cannot concentrate, become fatigued, and my productivity declines. So, for me, “antenna densification” plans by the wireless industry could result in serious challenges. Imagine multiplying the difficulty someone like me might experience by the estimated 35% of people who are already somewhat electrically sensitive. Or, consider the effect of “antenna densification” on the estimated 3-8% of people very severely sensitive today, who, as Dr. Golumb explains in her letter, will certainly become far worse with this “antennas everywhere” approach, that SB.649 would facilitate.

If SB.649 is signed into law, an enormous human tragedy will unfold, Governor Brown, and this is why I am asking you to Veto this legislation. There will be more illnesses, and chronic illnesses, more cancers, neurological problems, cognition difficulties, more children struggling in schools, greater prescription drug use, more suicides, more unemployed, and unemployable, more people living as transients and greater homelessness—and a very great despair

Governor Jerry Brown
September 24, 2017
Page 3

throughout the State of California. This—all to support society’s addiction to constant access to the internet, which as I am sure you are aware, is cultivated intentionally by technology companies, and is also being enabled by inadequate, fraudulent FCC exposure guidelines.

The FCC exposure guidelines only consider biological risks from *heating* caused by the radiation. The guidelines do not take into account *non-thermal biological effects*, such as from the frequencies, pulsing, or other signal characteristics, nor *the additive effects* from multiple exposures, nor the *duration of exposures* (which can be 24/7 today), nor the *cumulative and long-term effects*. This corrupt regulator, the FCC, is turning a blind eye to the EMF science, choosing to support the wireless industry’s commercial interests over public health. And it is providing cover for manufacturers and service providers in the wireless industry with these inadequate guidelines. The FCC is ‘captured’ by industry, as described in “[Captured Agency: How the Federal Communications Commission is Dominated by the Industries It Presumably Regulates](#)”, published by the Edmund J. Safra Center for Ethics at Harvard University in 2015.

I urge you, Governor Brown, please don’t support these criminals in the wireless industry who deceive about risk. Veto SB.649. Do the right thing for human health, our common ecosystem and future generations.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Camilla Rees

Senior Policy Advisor, NISLAPP

Co-author, “*Public Health SOS: The Shadow Side of the Wireless Revolution*”

Author, “*The Wireless Elephant in the Room*”

Founder, ElectromagneticHealth.org

Founder, Campaign for Radiation Free Schools (Facebook)

Founder, [Manhattan Neighbors for Safer Telecommunications](#)

Advisory Board, Institute for Building Biology & Ecology

Voting Member, U.S. Health Freedom Congress

Affiliate, Social Venture Network

Board Member, Media in the Public Interest

CRGR@aol.com

SKYPE: 415-992-5093