

Harry Vere Lehmann
Principal Attorney

Law Offices of Harry V. Lehmann PC

PO BOX 1846
Novato, CA 94948

Via hand delivery to office on May 12, 2017 with a copy for senior staff

Senator Ricardo Lara, Chair
Senate Appropriations Committee
State Capitol Room 5050
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Respectful Legal Notice of Cancer Risks inherent in Senate Bill 649

Dear Senator Lara-

The health issues inherent the decision on SB 649 are at the greatest importance that you will face in your career. It is relevant for you to know that I know that I have been in litigation practice for four decades and specialized in engineering and scientific proof matters since 1983, and I write this to you out of measured science-compliant concern. It is from that reliance on the study of empirical data that I have devoted the majority of my working time to this issue for the last six years. The stakes here are life, death & disease.

On May 27, 2016 the U. S. Government's National Institutes of Health (NIH) announced the results of a \$25 Million study which proved that cellular radiation causes cancer.* This is consistent with many hundreds of other studies, including classification by the World Health Organization of EMF radiation as a carcinogen.* The danger presented is difficult to psychologically accept, despite compelling science, since that comprehension involves recognizing that a dominant tech trend of our times is imbued with profound health consequences that require Senatorial responsibility and courage, which, when up against the short term interests of massive industry, is a huge ask. But this is what it is all about, that part of you at your very core which wants to do real humanitarian good while in office.

A listing of studies on the health effects of pulsed radiofrequency radiation has been established for your convenience at www.senatebill649data.com. This Notice respectfully advises you of the well-documented risks from cellular antenna EMF exposure, which risks will be vastly increased for the entire California citizenry if SB 649 is signed into law. Those who study the data will see that this is the time for Senators to pull the sword from the stone.

SB 649 allows placement of *data intense* antennas everywhere - conceivably on every residential block in California. Since NIH and many other studies have shown that cellular radiation causes physical harm, placement of radiation sources next to where Californians sleep is not appropriate. This radiation will be more harmful to kids, their skulls are less developed.* After losing four friends and colleagues to brain cancer I have studied in this area for about ten years and most recently worked on this issue through a small company

called Green Swan, Inc., (www.greenswan.org). Although our Green Swan focus is about headset risk prevention and not cellular towers, science-based education is core to our mission and when I learned about SB 649 I felt morally compelled to write.

With a feeling of great humility, I join with many to respectfully urge that SB 649 not be forwarded to the Senate Floor pending the Senate's further study of the scientific evidence as to whether deployment will expose millions of California residents to increased cancer risk.

It is noted as a matter of demographic interest that if some segments of our residents were early adopters of a 'cell phone only' approach such persons may be at greater risk due to longevity of exposure and cumulative effect. The NIH study shows that the glioma - the cancer cell, which causes brain (glioblastoma) can be caused by cell phone radiation. Other health impediments from radiofrequency radiation are well documented. This Notice refers to a tiny fraction of sources demonstrating that cellular EMF (SB 649) is harmful, please see www.senatebill649data.com. There has been no actual study undermining the NIH findings and in comment on the study, a representative of the American Cancer society stated that the Toxicology Division of NIH is the 'international gold standard,' for such analysis.

We have all witnessed situations where vast governmental structures have waded into disastrous outcomes due to mistaken policy, sometimes this is seen through a partisan lens, sometimes it is clear to all. It is a very long list. Often in such situations, if the legislative arm of government had been given more complete data, prior to starting huge endeavors, massive grief and expense could have been avoided. While the Senate is now being asked by industry to 'rush to judgment' on this Bill, in closing I respectfully join with others who say that there was not adequate Notice before the last hearings on this Bill, before the Senate Governance and Finance Committee. As to the Notice for that hearing, the Bill was abruptly taken off calendar, and the restored three days later, upon which day two different State-sponsored web sites presented directly contradictory data, on the last possible day for such Notice, one saying the hearing was restored, the other State site retaining the position that it was still pulled. For Due Process of Law, the quality of any Notice to the public is lost by conflict when the alleged Internet official record is corrected to announce the restoration of the Bill to calendar, on the very same day on which another and widely-relied-upon State website retained the prior 'removed from calendar' status until late correction on a Friday afternoon, which is what happened.

Very truly yours,



Harry V. Lehmann

*other data links:

<https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/results/areas/cellphones/>

<https://ehtrust.org>

<http://www.motherjones.com/environment/2016/05/federal-study-links-cell-phone-radiation-cancer>