

2 May 2023

ASHLAND CITY COUNCIL:

As a Councillor of the City of Ashland, you have taken an oath of office that you will faithfully perform the duties of the City Councillor position.

Your position requires you to listen to proven facts and to make judgments that benefit the community, judgments that do no harm. Yet you are allowing a cell tower to go online within 100 meters of a public school when it has been shown again and again by hard science and by testimony in this public forum that cancer rates do not drop significantly until you have a distance of 500 meters from the cell tower.

Yesterday in Massachusetts state, residents of Sheffield and Great Barrington investigated industry disinformation (1)

Disinformation that says 5G is necessary and safe

Last night, the towns of Sheffield and Great Barrington passed protective warrant articles to pause any further applications for wireless infrastructure, including 5G, until the FCC does the August 2021 court ordered remand of the science showing standards that are protective of the elderly, the children, birds, bees, trees, the environment, and the people.

On May 4, Thursday, the Massachusetts Board of Public Health will be asked to recognize electro sensitivity as a disease dangerous to public health. Medicare and the Americans Disabilities Act along with other federal agencies have already recognized the reality of electro-sensitivity. And the numbers of the electro sensitive are growing.

Ashland is concerned for the the disabled and for the homeless, yet Ashland ignores electro sensitivity among its own residents, ignores the science and facts presented to them over five - now going on six years.

An increasing number of American cities and towns are taking responsibility for the protection of their residents against the dangers of electro magnetic frequencies caused by wifi and cell towers. Ashland City Council does not.

Miriam Reed, Ph.D.

(1) <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5ed0007ce169954eea17b10b/t/644d33b5762739110998c4ef/1682781109760/EMF+Points+of+Confusion+vs.+Fact.pdf>

From Ivy Ross ♡

Subject: Ashland's New Wireless Communication Facilities (WCF) Ordinance

Dear Mayor Graham, City Council Members, and City Staff,

As you study the issues at stake in resolving the content of the subject ordinance and who should prepare it, please consider a review of the Council study session on October 17, 2022 and the Council business meeting on October 18, 2022. The video recordings are available at the City Recorder's Web site. This is important background, especially for new Council members.

From all appearances in the October 18th business meeting, the City Council was rightfully directing City policy to City Staff to initiate dialogue with attorney Andrew Campanelli for the preparation of a new WCF ordinance for \$8500.00. In a parallel effort, Council members requested that the City attorney include specific provisions in a draft ordinance he was preparing based on a template from the League of Oregon Cities (LOC). As I understand it, the Council has the responsibility to establish City policy, and it seemed, at the time, a Council decision would then identify the best legal approach and authority to prepare the new WCF ordinance. The objective is not to prevent WCFs, but to give Ashland maximum regulatory authority to keep them at a safe distance from schools and the public.

It is now obvious that by the influence of some unknown authority, Ashland is no longer considering the services of Andrew Campanelli, the premiere legal advocate of municipal regulatory authority in WCF placement. **Did Council members make this decision?**

I have offered to share with all of you my objective information about man-made pulsed electromagnetic radiation (PEMR). No one has found it convenient to spend 60 minutes to learn about the solid science and its implications, which I've accumulated during the last five years in supporting Oregon for Safer Technology. The source material speaks for itself. The Council seems to have no interest in PEMR science or important provisions in a WCF ordinance from a knowledgeable City resident.

I make the following observation. When an industry recognizes that science identifies invisible harm to the consumer, public, or environment in its long-standing product or service, it often censors, challenges, and otherwise ignores the science and information to protect its profits. An example is the telecom industry's adoption of the "tobacco playbook" to deal with PEMR. In another situation, a different industry can recognize that the same invisible science presents high-risk for its future profits and liabilities, and it openly adopts policies to recognize the science and mitigate its business risks. An example is the liability-insurance industry. It respects the well-documented science that PEMR exposure is a **harmful environmental pollutant** that presents unacceptable financial and liability risks to its primary business. **It will not issue a policy that provides liability coverage for PEMR exposure among other high-risk pollutants.** All policies include a "pollutants exclusion clause."

So, the question for Council members to contemplate is how does Council policy treat the science? Does the Council ignore solid science that would call for specific provisions in a WCF ordinance? Or, does the Council's ordinance decision follow the lead of the insurance industry and allow the science to guide ordinance provisions that minimize potential City liabilities?

Bringing this closer to home, it's important for Ashland to realize that the City does not have liability insurance coverage for adverse health effects from PEMR exposure. The industry, even Lloyds of London, does not offer it. Telecom only offers to "self-insure" or provide promised third-party coverage. Respected Napa-Valley attorney Mark Pollock, when he was alive, warned cities that they may go bankrupt if their WCF ordinance does not require telecom liability insurance without a "pollutants exclusions clause" and a copy of the policy. That this insurance requirement may not be readily offered is a "red flag."

We don't want Ashland to experience the relevant health tragedies and adverse publicity caused by PEMR in **Pittsfield, MA**. Sickness from a cell tower among 16 families was sufficiently serious for the Pittsfield Board of Health to issue a cease and desist order to Verizon for removal of the tower. Significant legal action has followed, including a lawsuit against the mayor and other City officials.

Also, in California, for undisclosed reasons, the legislature has exempted fire stations as sites for cell towers and WCFs. The truth is, fire fighters and paramedics previously lost significant cognitive function from this WCF exposure. It completely incapacitated them in emergencies. Their disease was confirmed in brain scans.

Does the Council have sufficient objective information from science and legal counsel to make an informed WCF-ordinance decision without further investigation? Would you consider a video conference session with Andrew Campanelli to understand how he can benefit Ashland?

One last important comment: the new ordinance does not belong as much in the right-of-

way chapter as it does in ordinance Chapter 18.4.10 Wireless Facility Ordinance with some possible content in Chapter 18.5.4 Conditional Use Permits. These Chapters guide current City approvals for WCF permit applications.

Thank you for reading this far in my long email.

Respectfully,

Alan Rathsam, BSME, MSME, PE (retired)



For Immediate release

May 1, 2023

Sheffield and Great Barrington voters approve hold on 5G applications

Berkshire County, MA – At the Sheffield and Great Barrington annual town meetings May 1st, 2023 residents voted in favor of the citizen’s petition Article 32 which requires the town to hold applications for 5G installations until the “FCC completes the DC Circuit court-mandated Environmental Review of the entire 800,000 to 1 million wireless telecommunication facilities roll out to the conditions as stated in the NEPA Policy Act 1969 including studies from scientists independent from industry, who have fully investigated millimeter wave 5G small cell technology safety; and that the FCC regulations have been updated to include measures that comply with the results of this review.”

Citing scientific evidence of biological harm from wireless radiation, an eleven-thousand page document was submitted as part of a legal case filed against the FCC by the Environmental Health Trust, the environmental health organization led by Dr. Devra Davis, a member of the team awarded the Nobel Peace Prize as a lead author for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change scientists. The Court found that the FCC did not adequately review recorded evidence of people harmed by wireless radiation and found the FCC ignored the scientific evidence indicating harmful biological impacts. Based on this and the fact that the FCC has not updated the safety limits to include 5G small cell millimeter frequencies, petitioners want to put a hold on 5G small cell millimeter wave installations until they are proven safe.

Specific concerns from the residents target the studies revealing millimeter wave frequency harm to pollinators. As agricultural communities, voters want to be convinced that their crops will not suffer if the myriad of 5G transmitters negatively affect the bees. Their warrant asks for input from scientists who are independent from the telecom industry who can give an unbiased report. The petitioners related telecom’s rollout of 5G without sufficient research as similar to big tobacco’s promotion of cigarettes. It was years later and many cancer deaths before regulations were enacted limiting smoking in public places and adding warning labels to packaging. Voters spoke out that we want to know for sure a similar fate will not bestow residents where electro-hypersensitivity syndrome becomes the norm with no recourse to remove the transmitters causing the problem.

Sheffield and Great Barrington joined several other communities in Massachusetts that are focused on regulating 5G small cell installations. In response to limited phone service in some areas, the petitioners cited that the 5G small cells are not about making a phone call. They are short range and were designed to make streaming faster. But, testing has subsequently proven its hardly faster than 4G from cell towers, and the small

cell frequencies are disrupted by rain and trees so are unreliable. The Scientific Alliance for Education (S.A.F.E.) in Sheffield has provided seminars in both Sheffield and Great Barrington recently so residents could avail themselves of the non-industry research they have compiled. It seems to have paid off in both towns as the petitioners turned out and even applauded when statements for the Article was read. Nina Anderson, President of S.A.F.E. says,"this is the first step in trying to protect our towns from intrusion by industry who has not complied with the court order and not proven this technology is safe." Details on this and other wireless concerns can be found on their website www.SafeHelpsYou.org.

-end-