



Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments

Bringing Science and Passion to the Environmental Health Movement

STEERING COMMITTEE

Laura Anderko, PhD, RN
Georgetown University

Adelita Cantu, PhD, RN
National Assoc of Hispanic Nurses

Lisa Campbell, DNP, RN, APHN-BC

Kathy Curtis, LPN
Clean & Healthy NY

Karen G. Duderstadt, PhD, RN
National Assoc of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners

Tom Engle, RN
Assoc of Public Health Nurses;
Public Health Nursing Section,
American Public Health Association

Robyn Gilden, PhD, RN
University of Maryland School of Nursing

Anne B. Hulick, JD, MSN, RN Coalition
for a Safe and Healthy Connecticut

Katie Huffling, RN, MS, CNM
American College of Nurse-Midwives

Beth Lamanna RN, WHNP, MPH

Jeanne Leffers, PhD, RN
University of Massachusetts

Ruth McDermott-Levy, PhD, RN
Villanova University

Lillian Mood, RN, MPH

Kathryn Murphy, MSN, RN
Naugatuck Valley Community College

Barbara Sattler, RN, DrPH, FAAN
University of San Francisco

Beth Schenk, PhD, MHI, RN
Providence Saint Patrick Hospital

Joyce Stein, RN
National Assoc of Neonatal Nurses

Mary Jane Williams, PhD, RN

Sandy Worthington, MSN, WHNP-BC,
CNM

Affiliations added for identification purposes only

April 18, 2021

The Honorable Mike McGuire
Chair, Governance and Finance Committee
State Capitol Building, Room 408
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: **OPPOSE SB 556** Street poles etc.

Cc: Committee Consultant
Mr. Anton Favorini-Csorba

Dear Chair McGuire and Members of the Senate Standing Committee on Governance and Finance:

Thank you for carefully considering the safety of Californians and California in your leadership on the Energy, Utilities, and Communications Committee.

The California Leadership Council of the Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments works at the local and state level to prevent illness and dangers found in our everyday environments. We care for patients who experience the health effects of climate and other environmental hazards presenting: respiratory illnesses, anxiety about wild fire danger and air pollution as well as electromagnetic sensitivity to name just a few.

We oppose SB 556 because it eliminates the authority of local governments to plan their communities considering the safety, energy efficiency and aesthetics in the placement of wireless facilities (attachments-antennas). Our surroundings, our parks and open spaces, our streetscapes affect our health as does our sense of safety. It should not be the purview of Wireless Carriers to determine, where and how many antennas belong on public poles in the “public right of way.” Residents in neighborhoods have access to their local MUNICIPAL elected officials and work together with them to ensure that neighborhoods are safe and retain their aesthetic character. Wireless antennas to not get removed, telecom carriers negotiate long term leases so decisions about where the antennas can be placed must be made carefully with local public input.

Many Californians are experiencing post-traumatic stress and “wild fire anxiety” because of the loss of life and property the last few years. This has been exacerbated by the announcement that this will be the most serious wild fire season in California’s history. Entire neighborhoods have been destroyed, lives lost, personal suffering and serious respiratory complications accompanied these wild fires. It is estimated that at least one wireless antenna catches fire in the US each month. Overloaded poles are not safe in wind storms, or fire storms. Wireless isn’t secure in firestorms. Wired internet in deep trenches to and into the buildings is safe in emergencies.

Many nurses have been involved at the local municipal level working with their elected officials to create safe rules for antennas (limiting the numbers,



Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments

Bringing Science and Passion to the Environmental Health Movement

keeping them away from schools, day care centers, parks, and long term care facilities.) Antenna citing is not a state issue it's a local issue.

Fifth Generation wireless aka 5G contributes to climate change which, second to COVID is the public health crisis of our lifetimes. 5G connectivity is easily interrupted by weather and foliage so 4G antennas are required as back up. 5G frequencies are shorter and 5G/4G antennas must be placed much closer together. This means increased density of 4 & 5G antennas (wireless telecom facilities). Each of these antennas requires and electricity source and uses much more electricity, contributing to our carbon foot print and climate change.

5G equipment on sidewalks will block **disability access** in our Public Rights of Way and in affected public buildings, which is unacceptable. Disability caused by hyper electromagnetic sensitivity (code: [ICD-10-CM W90 \(www.icd10data.com/\)](http://www.icd10data.com/)) has required longtime residents to move after antennas/towers were placed in front of their homes.

California needs to take effective steps to close the Digital Divide. SB-556, is not technology-neutral, it only serves to increase the profits of the Wireless carriers without closing the Digital Divide. The Digital Divide can be eliminated by regulating the internet as a public utility: **Wired** Broadband installed with deep underground conduit (prevents fires). Local government can distribute internet resources and can generate revenue. The California legislature should be assisting LOCAL Government in preparing applications for the Federal Stimulus funding for broadband which will include funding for WIRED fiber internet to and into the premises. Installation of wired broadband connections will be FASTER, with better video and audio, more private, more secure, more reliable, and safer than wireless. It will not be affected in weather, wind and firestorms.

Municipally administered and regulated internet as a utility is the only way to ensure closing the digital divide, protecting neighborhood aesthetics and safety, keeping our carbon footprint lower, and providing FASTER, more cyber secure service (on which Telemedicine relies).

Lastly, there are serious health questions that have not been taken into consideration because of language in the 1996 Telecommunications Act. Insurers will not include "pollution coverage" for Telecom because of the uncertainty of long term exposure to non-ionizing wireless radiation. Our own NIH/NTP research reported on in 2018 seriously questions the safety of 3G wireless radiation.

We urge the committee to vote NO on the elimination of local control over safety, aesthetics, and energy use.

Sincerely,
Barbara Sattler RN, DrPH
bsattler@usfca.edu