

California Alliance for Safer Technology
Keep Cell Towers Away from Our Homes and Schools!

8 REASONS TO VOTE NO ON SB 649

1. Over 270 of the cities and 45 of the 52 counties in California representing over 2/3 the State's population oppose SB 649– and the opposition is growing.

“The League of California Cities is strongly opposed to SB 649, which would represent a major shift in telecommunications policy and law by requiring local governments to lease out the public's property, cap how much cities can lease this space out for, eliminate the ability for cities to negotiate public benefits, the public's input and full discretionary review,... for the installation of 'small cell' wireless equipment.” League of California Cities

2. Major newspapers and organizations have taken a stand against SB 649:

Los Angeles Times calls SB 649 [“An audacious 5G power \(pole\) grab.”](#)

The Sacramento Bee explains: [“Imagine if a private company decided to place a bunch of equipment on your house and offered you pennies on the dollar to “rent” your roof space. Now imagine that you didn't have the right to say “no.”](#)

[AARP opposes SB 649:](#) “AARP opposes SB 649 because it undermines the authority of local governments and thereby deprives local citizens the right to have a say about where small-cell towers are located in their communities.” (7/19/17 letter to Assembly Appropriations Committee)

3. Firefighters received an exemption in SB 649 based upon [health grounds](#).

Through an exemption in the bill, California legislators accept the need to protect the health of firefighters, some of whom have measurable brain abnormalities following years of exposure to cell towers near their stations. SB 649 is in effect admitting that the devices that will be located in close proximity to homes and schools are likely dangerous. What about everyone else? **Don't we deserve the same protection?**

4. Has liability fallen through the cracks and into the lap of the State?

Because SB 649 takes authority away from local government, the State could be assuming financial liability risk for future injury, fire, loss of health and property devaluation due to the close proximity of cell antennas to homes, workplaces and schools. Multiple underwriters, including Lloyd's of London, refuse to cover injury or damage from electromagnetic radiation (EMF).

[“The Electromagnetic Fields Exclusion ... is applied across the market as standard.”](#) The exclusion includes: *“Bodily injury, property damage, or personal and advertising injury.....provided that such injury or damage results from or is contributed to by the pathological properties of electromagnetic radiation.”* CFC Underwriting, UK agent for Lloyd's of London

5. Contrary to assurances by the telecom industry, the “safety” of wireless exposure has never been established.

In May 2011 the World Health Organization’s preeminent cancer research agency, IARC, classified everything on the RF – EMF spectrum [*as a possible human carcinogen*](#), putting it in the same category as DDT. This includes radiation from cell towers.

A major [**\\$25 million study recently released by the U.S. National Toxicology Program**](#) of the National Institutes of Health **found increased incidences of brain cancer, malignant tumors of the heart and DNA damage in laboratory animals from exposure levels the FCC considers "safe"!**

The [American Cancer Society’s statement](#) on the significance of this new study: “*The NTP report linking radiofrequency radiation (RFR) to two types of cancer marks a paradigm shift in our understanding of radiation and cancer risk. The findings are unexpected; we wouldn’t reasonably expect non-ionizing radiation to cause these tumors.*”

6. Wireless Exposure Standards do not adequately protect public health:

The FCC, EPA and WHO have failed to adequately keep up with this technology and defend the public over the interests of large telecom corporations. In 2015, 225 leading scientists and researchers in the area of EMF and wireless radiation from 41 nations appealed to the United Nations to urge the World Health Organization to exert strong leadership in fostering the development of more protective EMF guidelines, encourage precautionary measures and educate the public about health risks, **particularly risk to children and fetal development.** [International EMF Scientist Appeal](#)

7. SB 649 ushers in widespread exposure to 5G – a new generation of wireless radiation (RF) which has NEVER been tested for its impact on public health.

Ron Melnick, PhD, the National Institutes of Health scientist who led the design of the U.S. National Toxicology Program study that found cancer and DNA damage in laboratory animals from cell phone radiation cautioned: “[There is an urgent need to evaluate 5G health effects now before millions are exposed.](#)”

8. Contrary to promises made to disadvantaged communities...SB 649 includes nothing in the text of the bill to remedy the *Digital Divide*.

“...communications providers have repeatedly demonstrated that they will not make advanced services available to low-income or rural areas unless **they are required to do so**. SB 649 contains no such requirement, instead allowing providers to pick and choose where to build their networks without any community input.” The Greenlining Institute’s Letter sent June 27th in opposition to SB 649

Please vote **NO** on SB 649!