

Special Use Docket SU 22-11 (Calle Lobo Telecom)

Cochise County
Development Services
MAY 17 2022

____ YES, I SUPPORT THIS REQUEST
Please state your reasons:

X **NO**, I DO NOT SUPPORT THIS REQUEST:
Please state your reasons:

Headaches, Sleep disruption, ringing in Ears,
heart rhythm, dizziness, nausea, skin rashes,
loss of concentration, children exhibit learning
problems, etc.

1. Health Reasons : Concerns - (^{RF} studies out of Germany)
2. 70 foot tower in the line of sight of mountains
3. NOT needed, cell service is strong with the 168 towers nearby,
4. If approved I will be forced to sell the parcel of land that I intended to build on.
5. It will lower land values on nearby properties; by 18% to 20%.
6. Responsibility of Cellular Towers should be in less populated neighborhoods.

PRINT NAME(S): DEBI TEMMER

SIGNATURE(S): DEBI TEMMER

- 7 Once built they can raise the height by 20 feet without community consent
- 8 94% of buyers of property will not purchase land near a tower (the eight-digit identification number found on the tax

YOUR TAX PARCEL NUMBER: 1048201904
statement from the Assessor's Office)

Your comments will be made available to the Board of Adjustment. Submission of this form or any other correspondence becomes part of the public record and is available for review by the applicant or other members of the public. Written comments must be received no later than **5 PM on May 31, 2022** to be included in the staff report to the Board.

RETURN TO: Christine McLachlan
Cochise County Development Services
1415 Melody Lane, Building F
Bisbee, AZ 85603
(Or scan and email to: cmclachlan@cochise.az.gov)

CALLE LOBO HPAZ ANTENNA

Special Use Docket SU 22-11 (Calle Lobo telecom)

3 PAGES SUBMITTED BY PROPERTY OWNER IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO CALLE LOBO PROPOSED ANTENNA

MAKE AVAILABLE IN FULL TO THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT AND PUBLIC RECORD.

DATE 5/11/2022

1. PROPERTY VALUES DROP

Property Value drops by 18 - 20% and Buyers interested in property near a cell tower drop by 94%

POWER LINES AND CELL ANTENNAS LOWER PROPERTY VALUES

Wall Street Journal: The Electrifying Factor Affecting Your Property's Value "Vacant lots adjacent to power lines sell for significantly less than equivalent property further away as homeowners shy away from unattractive views...A recent study in the Journal of Real Estate Research by College of Charleston assistant professors Chris Mothorpe and David Wyman, finds that vacant lots adjacent to high-voltage transmission lines sell for 45% less than equivalent lots not located near transmission lines. Non-adjacent lots still located within 1,000 feet of transmission lines sell at a discount of 18%."

"Cellphone towers bring extra tax revenue and better reception to a section of the city, but many are skeptical because of the potential health risks and the impact on property values. Increasing numbers of people don't want to live near cell towers. In some areas with new towers, property values have decreased by up to 20%."

-National Business Post: Your new neighbor, a cell tower, may impact the value of your home 2022

Appraiser "Properties that are approximately close to the tower will suffer substantial degradation to their value based on the nature of the unusual feature in the residential neighborhood."

A recent survey by the National Institute for Science, Law & Public Policy (NISLAPP) found that 94 percent of homebuyers are "less interested and would pay less" for a property located near a cell tower or antenna.

Property Investor - Dealer "Forget buying these properties, people don't want to take them on rent even, particularly when they have a choice. If a person is going to invest, why would he buy a property with a tower?" asks Pal. According to LK Thakkar, a Defence Colony-based property dealer, while the cost of the building which has the tower is relatively less, other buildings in the vicinity also get affected. "No one wants to buy a house within 100 metres of the building which has the tower. The rates for such properties drop by 10-20%, and sometimes even more," said Thakkar, co-owner of A-One Associates. "Buyers are "less interested and would pay less" for a property located near a cell tower or antenna.

"Re a study on property in Kentucky- "The best estimate of the impact is that a property with a visible antenna located 1,000 feet away sells for 1.82% (\$3,342) less than a similar property located 4,500 feet away. The aggregate impact is \$10.0 million for properties located within 1,000 feet" In AZ that would be closer to 20%

drop in property value.

Cell antennas and towers near homes affected property values, adding, "You can see a buyer's dismay over the sight of a cell tower near a home just by their expression, even if they don't say anything."

Articles "Cell Tower Antennas Problematic for Buyers" published in REALTOR® Magazine:

The Lo Down on Cell Towers, Neighborhood Values, and the Secretive Telecoms(link is external) (The Dissident Voice, Dec. 19, 2015)

Cell Towers: Not in My Back Yard (Tedium Blog, Aug. 5, 2015)

"Examining invisible urban pollution and its effect on real estate value in New York City" – by William Gati in New York Real Estate Journal September 2017

The Cost of Convenience: Estimating the Impact of Communication Antennas on Residential Property Values (Land Economics, Feb. 2016)

2. ONCE BUILT - CELL TOWERS CAN GO UP AN ADDITIONAL 20 FEET

Most people in the United States are unaware that once a tower is built, it can go up to 20 feet higher with no public process due to the passing of Section 6409(a) of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012. In other words, a 100 foot tower can be increased to 120 feet after it is constructed and the community will have no input. Communities are largely unaware of this law.

3. The US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) long considers cell towers as "Hazards and Nuisances."

See HUD webpage

4. HEALTH PROBLEMS

Some children get sick from being too close to cell phone antennas and towers on school grounds. At the beginning of the school year in 2003, an 11-year old girl suffered headaches and nausea on Wednesday afternoons when she attended Tarleton High School in Lancashire, England. After school on Wednesdays, she vomited at home. The symptoms went away until the following Wednesday. After many weeks, school administrators recognized that she had 3 Wednesday afternoon classes in the math building. There were cell phone antennas 8 feet directly above her classroom in the math building. Once her schedule changed, she no longer suffered from these symptoms. Other students got sick as well. It took 4 years, but the headmaster finally managed to get the antennas removed.

Additional Studies out of Germany address Cancer and even death.

REPORTED HEALTH PROBLEMS

Headaches

Sleep disruption

Ringing in Ears

Heart rhythms

Dizziness

nausea

Skin Rashes

Loss of Concentration

Learning Problems in Children

5. CELL TOWERS IN THE AREA

Cell service is sufficient to the Calle Lobo area and unnecessary.

31 TOWERS and 165 ANTENNAS WITHIN A 3.0 MILE RADIUS OF SIERRA VISTA AZ

Source antennasearch.com

go to this web site and you can see a map of all antennas. Unfortunately it seems Hereford is not mapped.

Thank You for your time considering this dire proposal.

Special Use Docket SU 22-11 (Calle Lobo Telecom)

Cochise
County
Development
Services
MAY 20 2022

____ YES, I SUPPORT THIS REQUEST
Please state your reasons:

X NO, I DO NOT SUPPORT THIS REQUEST:
Please state your reasons:

ABSOUTLY NOT. EYE SORE IN A RESIDENTIAL
NEIGHBORHOOD AREA. THERE ARE PLENTY OF AREAS
AROUND IN UNPOPULATED AREAS.

PRINT NAME(S):

EUGENE J. OPITZ

SIGNATURE(S):

Eugene Opitz

YOUR TAX PARCEL NUMBER: 10402042 B (the eight-digit identification number found on the tax statement from the Assessor's Office)

Your comments will be made available to the Board of Adjustment. Submission of this form or any other correspondence becomes part of the public record and is available for review by the applicant or other members of the public. Written comments must be received no later than **5 PM on May 31, 2022** to be included in the staff report to the Board.

RETURN TO: Christine McLachlan
Cochise County Development Services
1415 Melody Lane, Building F
Bisbee, AZ 85603
(Or scan and email to: cmclachlan@cochise.az.gov)

Cochise
County
MAY 17 2022
Development
Services

Special Use Docket SU 22-11 (Calle Lobo Telecom)

YES, I SUPPORT THIS REQUEST
Please state your reasons:

NO, I DO NOT SUPPORT THIS REQUEST:
Please state your reasons:

PRINT NAME(S):

THOMAS P MARTIN

SIGNATURE(S):

Thomas P Martin

YOUR TAX PARCEL NUMBER:

104020479

(the eight-digit identification number found on the tax statement from the Assessor's Office)

Your comments will be made available to the Board of Adjustment. Submission of this form or any other correspondence becomes part of the public record and is available for review by the applicant or other members of the public. Written comments must be received no later than **5 PM on May 31, 2022** to be included in the staff report to the Board.

RETURN TO:

Christine McLachlan
Cochise County Development Services
1415 Melody Lane, Building F
Bisbee, AZ 85603
(Or scan and email to: cmclachlan@cochise.az.gov)

Special Use Docket SU 22-11 (Calle Lobo Telecom)

YES, I SUPPORT THIS REQUEST

Please state your reasons:

NO, I DO NOT SUPPORT THIS REQUEST:

Please state your reasons:

- #1 The most important of ALL! This will create loss of property value.
- #2 This is a residential neighborhood. The size of this obstruction is not conducive to a residential neighborhood. If this company wants to add a new tower, state land is 1/2 mile away with more than adequate open acreage!

over →
for
more

PRINT NAME(S):

DONALD S. Dohmen Amy K. Dohmen

SIGNATURE(S):

[Signature]
Amy K. Dohmen

YOUR TAX PARCEL NUMBER:

104-82-019E9

(the eight-digit identification number found on the tax statement from the Assessor's Office)

Your comments will be made available to the Board of Adjustment. Submission of this form or any other correspondence becomes part of the public record and is available for review by the applicant or other members of the public. Written comments must be received no later than **5 PM on May 31, 2022** to be included in the staff report to the Board.

RETURN TO:

Christine McLachlan
Cochise County Development Services
1415 Melody Lane, Building F
Bisbee, AZ 85603
(Or scan and email to: cmclachlan@cochise.az.gov)

#3 Health Concerns There is adequate documentation on this. This concern is of value to be noted.

#4 Nesting Birds - They always find a way. Issue that none of us want to have to deal with.

#1 The most important of all? This will create loss of property value.
#2 This is a residential neighborhood. The size of this obstruction is not conducive to residential neighborhood. If this company wants to add new towers, state land is a way with more than adequate open access!

Donato S. Dorman, Andy K. Dorman
Group Chairman
10/20/2011

Your comments will be made available to the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors will be made available to the public. The Board of Directors will be made available to the public. The Board of Directors will be made available to the public.

Special Use Docket SU 22-11 (Calle Lobo Telecom)

YES, I SUPPORT THIS REQUEST
Please state your reasons:

NO, I DO NOT SUPPORT THIS REQUEST:
Please state your reasons:

NUMBER ONE CONCERN: Living under a communication tower.
We are attaching documents concerning a lawsuit and the effects of wireless radio frequency radiation.



NUMBER TWO CONCERN: The aesthetics.
Will not fit in this lovely rural landscape. It will be 30 feet taller than the tallest tree.

NUMBER THREE CONCERN: Property devaluation.

PRINT NAME(S):

DJEMAI' BLOT & SEANNINE FANTA BLOT

SIGNATURE(S):

YOUR TAX PARCEL NUMBER: 104-82-019 J 1 (the eight-digit identification number found on the tax statement from the Assessor's Office)

Your comments will be made available to the Board of Adjustment. Submission of this form or any other correspondence becomes part of the public record and is available for review by the applicant or other members of the public. Written comments must be received no later than **5 PM on May 31, 2022** to be included in the staff report to the Board.

RETURN TO: Christine McLachlan
Cochise County Development Services
1415 Melody Lane, Building F
Bisbee, AZ 85603
(Or scan and email to: cmclachlan@cochise.az.gov)

10 February 2021

Town of Ashfield
Planning Board
Town Hall
412 Main Street
Ashfield, MA 01330-0560

Dear Sirs/Madams:

I am a public health physician who has been involved in issues related to electromagnetic fields (EMFs) for several decades. I served as the Executive Secretary for the New York Powerline Project in the 1980s, a program of research that showed that children living in homes with elevated magnetic fields coming from powerlines suffered from an elevated risk of developing leukemia. After that project was completed I served as the spokesperson for New York State on issues related to both power line and radiofrequency EMFs. I have served as Director of the Wadsworth Laboratory of the New York State Department of Health, as well as Dean of the School of Public Health at the University at Albany/SUNY. I have edited two books on effects of EMFs, ranging from low frequency fields to radiofrequency/ microwave radiation, or the kind emitted by WiFi routers, cell phones, neighborhood antennas or cell towers and wireless computer equipment. I served as the co-editor of the BioInitiative Report 2012 (www.bioinitiative.org), a comprehensive review of the literature showing biological effects at non-thermal levels of exposure, much of which has since been published in the peer-reviewed journals. Also, I testified before the President's Cancer Panel that examined radiation exposures as they relate to cancer risk in 2009. Thus, this is a subject which I know well, and one on which I take a public health approach rooted in the fundamental principle of the need to protect against risk of disease, even when one may not have all the information that would be desirable.

I have been asked to comment on the application for construction of a 120 foot cell tower on farm land that will be located only 1500 feet from homes with children. I also am aware that AT&T has dismissed concerns of resulting health effects from the operation of this cell tower based on their conclusion that the radiofrequency emission will be much lower than the current standards of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). Those standards, which not been reviewed for many years, are grossly inadequate for protection of human health. That is one reason why I am currently a plaintiff on one of the two cases pending in federal courts suing the FCC for failure to protect public health. The FCC admits that it has no health expertise, and it has been described by Harvard scientists as "a captured agency" because its member all come from the telecommunication industry. As our legal case progresses I have every expectation that these standards will be soon dramatically changed.

There is clear and strong evidence that intensive use of cell phones increases the risk of brain cancer, tumors of the auditory nerve and cancer of the parotid gland, the salivary gland in the cheek by the ear. The WHO's International Agency for Research on Cancer has classified the radiation from both cell phones and cell towers as a Class 2B "Possible Carcinogen" in 2011. Cell towers use similar radio-frequency radiation as cell phones (in the 1.8 to 5.0 GHz range). The difference between a cell phone and a cell tower environment, however, is that while the cell phone is used only intermittently, and at higher power, a cell tower environment is continuous, serving many people at the same time. Cell

towers direct their beam in all directions, such that anyone nearby is continuously exposed to radiofrequency radiation. While the intensity is much less than one would receive holding a cell phone to your head, the emissions from a cell tower are continuous. Thus the aggregate exposure over time coming from being close to a cell tower can be very significant. A child living nearby or in a school with a nearby cell tower will be exposed every moment he or she is at home or in school.


The latency for development of cancer after exposure to radiofrequency radiation is long, often up to 20 years for brain cancer. Thus the cancer effects of exposing children will not be seen immediately but they will be elevated risk of cancer for many years to come. Studies done in several countries around the world have reported elevated rates of cancer, especially leukemia, in residents living near to cell towers.

Unfortunately cancer is not the only disease of concern. Radiofrequency electromagnetic fields are well documented to reduce male fertility. The last thing one wants for boys to grow up and not be able to reproduce. Other studies have found that individuals living near to cell towers have abnormal levels of several different hormones, and suffer from reduced cognitive ability. Furthermore there is increasing recognition of the fact that some people, including children, are exceptionally sensitive to electromagnetic fields, and show the syndrome of electro-hypersensitivity. This is characterized by headache, 'brain fog' and reduced ability to learn, often accompanied by nausea and gastrointestinal and cardiovascular symptoms. This is certainly not something that one wants to have occur, even if only in some children.

Placement of cell towers should be as far as possible from any place where humans are present. Certainly having a cell tower near to a home where anyone lives, but especially children, is dangerous to health.

Thank you for your consideration. I urge that approval not be given for construction and operation of this cell tower.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "David O. Carpenter". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

David O. Carpenter, M.D.
Director, Institute for Health and the Environment
University at Albany

LAWSUITS ON 5G, WI-FI , WIRELESS RADIATION AND HEALTH EFFECTS

Mar 4, 2021

LAWSUITS ON 5G AND WIRELESS RADIATION

This is a short sampling of lawsuits on wireless and health. There are many more than we present on this page but they provide examples of the worldwide legal action moving forward.

If you have legal action for us to share, please email info@ehtrust.org with the press release and details.

United States

Environmental Health Trust et al., versus the Federal Communications Commission

[EHT et al., v the FCC](#) is a historic case regarding the FCC's 25-year-old exposure guidelines for radio-frequency radiation (RFR) from cell phones, cell towers, Wi-Fi, 5G and other wireless communication devices. The 14 petitioners in the case claim the FCC violated several federal laws when the FCC decided (in 2019) not to update their 1996 wireless radiation limits after a 7 year inquiry and thousands of pages of research on the FCC record showing harmful effects from wireless radiofrequency radiation.

EVIDENCE OF WIRELESS RADIATION INJURIES IGNORED BY THE FCC

Oct 25, 2021



After reviewing more than 14,000 pages of petitioners' evidence, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit ruled that the FCC's 2019 decision not to update 1996 safety limits for wireless radiation was "arbitrary and capricious."

Where can I see court filings and FCC documents?

- [Final Court Decision 8/13/2021](#)

- [Link to 11,000 Pages of Evidence](#) – 447 exhibits in 27 Volumes-
- [EHT Factsheet on EHT et al. v FCC](#)

Support EHT by joining us on Patreon and sign up for our newsletter.

What evidence of people injured by wireless radiation was ignored by the FCC?

The Court **found** that the FCC did not adequately review record evidence of people harmed by wireless radiation. More than 180 people submitted evidence to the FCC of illness from wireless radiation as detailed in our opening brief. Examples include [Wood](#), [Hertz](#), [Sheehan](#), [Burke](#), [Seward](#), [Finley](#) and the numerous personal declarations in one of the [EMF Safety Network Submissions](#). Medical experts also submitted testimony with case histories such as [Dr. Jetler's testimony with case histories of children](#), [Susan Foster's documentation of injuries to firefighters](#) and the [American Academy of Environmental Medicine Recommendations Regarding Electromagnetic and Radiofrequency Exposure](#). The FCC also ignored the scientific documentation on electromagnetic sensitivity submitted to the record such as [Belyaev 2015.pdf](#), [McCarty 2011](#), [Isaac Jamieson's Presentation](#) and the [Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity Summary by Dr Erica Mallery-Blythe](#).

The Court found the FCC ignored the scientific evidence indicating harmful biological impacts. The record contained hundreds of science-based submissions documenting genetic damage, brain damage, headaches, sleep impacts, reproductive effects and more. These are referenced in our [opening brief](#) and all of these documents are downloadable in [27 Appendices](#).

The FCC was sent extensive research compilations by the [BioInitiative](#), [Dr. Moskowitz](#), [Powerwatch](#), [EHT](#), [Environmental Working Group](#), [Dr. Henry Lai](#), [EMR Policy Institute](#) and numerous other scientific experts. The [BioInitiative Charts](#) documenting effects at intensities from cell tower, Wi-Fi, wireless laptop and 'smart' meters were [submitted](#) in numerous filings.

Several U.S. government/military reports documenting biological effects from decades ago—when the U.S. had robust funded research—were also included such as [EPA’s 1984 Report on Biological Effects](#), a [Navy 1969 Report Reviewing Soviet and Eastern European Research](#) and a [Navy 1971 Report on Biological Effects](#). A 2012 review on biological effects by a National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences scientist cautioned that studies showing harm at low levels should not be ignored until there was “sufficient proof that the effects of microwaves on the brain and central nervous system are not detrimental to the health and well-being of our people.”

[A 1965 Report by Ford Motor Company on the record](#) details numerous effects on the central nervous system as well as changes to blood sugar and sleep “which by no means can be attributed to the effect of heat.”

In addition, the full text of numerous individual scientific papers were placed on the record. For example, [Belpomme 2018](#) documents the science on cognitive and neurobehavioral problems in children, microwave illness, impacts of combined exposures, oxidative stress and genetic and epigenetic mechanisms. [Nittby 2009](#) documents blood-brain barrier impacts. [Yakymenko 2015](#) finds more than 90% of studies show oxidative impacts. [Pall 2015](#) reviews neuropsychiatric effects. Dr. Lai [summarized research](#) on neurological effects published from 2007 to 2017 and [DNA breaks](#).

What scientific research on impacts to reproduction was ignored by the FCC?

The court specifically noted the FCC did not explain why it ignored the issue of impacts to reproduction. Numerous FCC submissions documented effects to sperm, testes and the ovaries. Submissions include a comprehensive [research list on reproductive effects](#) by the Bioinitiative for the European Union as part of [Cindy Sage’s submission](#), studies compiled for [Canadian Parliament](#), research compilations by [Pong](#), [Dr. Dart](#), individual studies such as found in a [compilation](#)

of research on Wi-Fi and review papers on reproductive impacts such as Yahyazadeh 2018, Atasoy 2012, Adams 2014 and Asghari 2016.. Altun 2018 co-authored by EHT's Dr. Davis reviews mechanistic pathways of the effects on fertilization, oogenesis and spermatogenesis and evaluates metabolomic effects on the male and female reproductive systems in recent human and animal studies.

Science showing harm from long term exposures to low levels such as cell tower radiation.

The FCC noted that the FCC ignored science on long term exposures which would include the research on people living near cell towers. Submissions include [Shahbazi-Gahrouei 2013](#)(headache, dizziness, depression, sleep disturbance, memory loss), [Zothansiama 2017](#) (DNA changes in blood), [Thamilselvan, Meo 2015](#) (diabetes) and [numerous compilations](#) of dozens of studies on cell tower radiation. The FCC was sent a study on how cell towers near schools is a human rights issue ([Roda and Perry 2013](#)), and [Dr. Paul Dart's PPT presentation](#) and [scientific research compilation](#). Dr. Henry Lai and Blake Levitt submitted a written letter with [research compilations](#) of studies showing harmful effects from wireless levels far far lower than FCC limits as well as the full text of their [publication on chronic exposure to cell towers](#) and low intensity wireless radiation.

Numerous submissions document how FCC limits were not developed to protect from biological impacts nor effects from long term low level exposures. The paper "[Origins of US Safety Limits for Microwave Radiation](#)" details the post cold war research and development of limits to protect against over heating, but not biological effects. A [1993 EPA Letter from the EPA to the FCC](#) on the record states that "it is clear" that the limit is based on short term exposures and not on research considering chronic long term exposures.

The FCC record also has the unfortunate history of how the EPA was defunded from researching the issue. Submissions include a 1984 letter by the [U.S. Science Advisory Board](#) that recommends that the EPA develop radiation protection guidance to protect the public. [EHT's submission \(page 173\)](#) shares the presentations the EPA made about they would develop safety limits to protect against biological effects. However in 1996, the EPA was fully defunded from the issue of non ionizing electromagnetic radiation and the US adopted limits by groups dominated by industry military and scientists with longstanding industry ties. Lloyd Morgan's "[US Exposures Limits:A History of Their Creation](#)" documents how these standards setting groups were aware of biological effects decades ago.

EHT submitted hundreds of pages of science to the FCC record and continues to submit evidence to 13-84 and 19-226 in anticipation of a new record review ([See EHT submissions](#)).

What expert recommendations were ignored by the FCC?

Numerous groups of scientists and medical experts directly wrote the FCC. The American Academy of Pediatrics [called on the FCC](#) to strengthen limits to protect children. Public health organizations such as Black Women for Wellness, Breast Cancer Fund, Center for Environmental Health, Center for Health, Environment & Justice, Consumer Federation of California, Environmental Working Group, the Empire State Consumers Project, Healthy Child Healthy World, Product Policy Institute, Science and Environmental Health Network and Teens Turning Green signed [a letter](#) urging the FCC to strengthen limits- especially for children.

The FCC record contained the hundreds of scientists and doctors who have signed onto the [EMF Scientists Appeal](#) and the [European Union 5G Appeal](#). The FCC record contained the resolution of the [California Medical Association](#), the recommendations of the [Vienna Medical Association](#), the [Porto Alegre 2009 resolution](#) and the 1997 [Boston Physicians petition](#) calling to halt a new wireless network in Boston due to "voluminous medical studies". A list of [governments](#)

and policy actions worldwide had medical/scientific appeals going back decades.

What evidence of harmful effects to wildlife and the environment from wireless radiation was ignored by the FCC?

When the FCC adopted safety guidelines in 1996, they were only designed for humans, not wildlife or trees and plants. When the FCC opened its inquiry in 2013, it specifically asked for information on **the adequacy of the limits to protect human health and the environment**. In turn numerous studies finding harmful environmental effects were submitted to the FCC record, yet the FCC fully ignored all of them when they decided to affirm the 1996 limits in 2019. Examples of research sent to the FCC include [Balmori 2015](#) (RF threat to wildlife), [Haggerty 2010](#) (harms Aspen), [Halgamuge 2016](#) (review on plants), and [Waldmann-Selsam 2016](#) (field study on trees). [Cucurachi 2012](#) reviewed 113 studies and found 65% showed ecological effects with high as well as at low dosages.

The Court ruling highlighted the 2014 letter by the [Department of Interior](#) which stated that,

“There is a growing level of anecdotal evidence linking effects of non-thermal, non-ionizing electromagnetic radiation from communication towers on nesting and roosting wild birds and other wildlife....” “However, the electromagnetic radiation standards used by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) continue to be based on **thermal heating, a criterion now nearly 30 years out of date and inapplicable today.**” and “third-party peer-reviewed studies need to be conducted in the U.S. to begin examining the effects from radiation on migratory birds and other trust species.”

EHT submitted a [compilation of research](#) on impacts to insects and wildlife which found the induction of piping signal (a stress response), decline in colony strength and impacts to navigation. [Thielens 2018](#) documents how bees and

insects can intensely absorb the higher frequencies of 5G leading to behavior changes.

The record contained images of trees harmed by cell antennas such as “Trees in radiation field of 65 mobile phone base stations” and the review article “Impacts of radio-frequency electromagnetic field (RF-EMF) from cell phone towers and wireless devices on biosystem and ecosystem.

Reports on environmental effects were on the FCC record such as India’s interministerial report on wildlife impacts, a compilation of impacts to birds, and Bees Birds and Mankind: Destroying Nature by ‘Electrosmog by Ulrich Warnke.

The scientific documentation and testimony on impacts to birds and wildlife by former US Fish and Wildlife Service biologist Albert Manville was on the FCC record as well as Dr. Cindy Russell’s [Wireless Silent Spring](#) published in the Santa Clara County Medical Association Bulletin.

A submission by Ed Friedman of a letter from the Global Union Against Radiation Deployment from Space stated the potential environmental and human health hazards from 5G necessitates a comprehensive NEPA review... specifically, a formal Environmental Impact Statement which should include a full review of environmental effects, as well as human health and safety.

EHT continues to strongly advocate for a full environmental review of 5G before continued deployment.

EHT scientists and international experts have written several letters to the FDA in regards to their dismissal of the NTP study as well as their inaccurate webpage information. [Read these letters here.](#)

Important Video Resources

- Video of Oral Arguments
- Transcript of Oral Argument
- EHT Video Analysis Oral Arguments With Clips
- EHT Press Conference after Historic Court Ruling



TEN YEAR REPORT



Stay Up to Date With EHT

* Email

First Name

Postal Code

By submitting this form, you are consenting to receive marketing emails from: EHT, PO Box 58, Teton Village, WY, 83025, US. You can revoke your consent to receive emails at any time by using the [SafeUnsubscribe®](#) link, found at the bottom of every email. [Emails are serviced by Constant Contact.](#)

Sign Up!



Environmental Health Trust

info@ehtrust.org

P.O. Box 58

Teton Village WY 83025

Express mail:

7100 N Rachel Way Unit 6

Eagles Rest

Teton Village WY 83025

EIN: 20-7498107

NEWSLETTER

To receive email updates, environmental tips, promotions to support our work and more from EHT, please sign up.