

From: Hard L <weino7@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 7, 2020 8:29 PM
To: Council Coments <CouncilComments@jonesboro.org>
Subject: 5G Observations re: DJDC final version 8.17

(While I plan to attend a council meeting in the near future, I am out-of-town for this one. When I saw the DJDC on the agenda for a third reading, I felt compelled to submit these comments. I request they be read aloud by the city clerk or attorney):

The overarching comment concerning resources already committed to this DJDC effort, (the sunk cost), is "if you vote to build it, who will come" - once "woke" to the dangers of 5G millimeter wave wireless radiation?

We now live in the midst of a world-wide crisis of health from COVID-19(+++?). As such, a thorough review of 5G in Jonesboro is timely (as well as Arkansas, if local state representatives take it on). We do not need to compound one ongoing health crisis with the very real risks of another, wireless radiation. Many countries, states, and local jurisdictions have halted 5G - this city government's hands are not tied. As such, the goal is that the city:

- 1) conduct a public information session on the entire plan for 5G installation, then activation;
- 2) conduct a review of the city's telecom-related ordinance(s) & the 5G ordinance passed pre-COVID-19 and update ordinances to greatly restrict/stop 5G, to include random RF engineering inspections of radiation, especially in all residential areas;
- 3) place the monitoring of issues related to 5G under a city council committee to ensure public visibility, and;
- 4) stop issuing permits to telecoms & 5G site developers until the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) addresses concerns outlined in the lawsuit brought by the Environmental Health Trust (just updated on July 30, 2020). <https://ehtrust.org/eh-takes-the-fcc-to-court>"

Reference the "DJDC", the following is highlighted in the annotated copy attached:

Page 1:
Paragraph 1.0. Purpose and Intent:

-b) include telecom overlays for the districts, highlighting those outside of CW&L's right of ways;

Page 2:

2.0, Administration & Phasing:

-2.1 Applicability:

--b) include telecom "authorities" similar to CW&L's on Applicability Matrices, etc. throughout DJDC, for public review;

Page 6:

-4) "Need to preserve existing trees..." As greenspace interrupts the 5G wireless signal from antenna-to-antenna, 5G is in contravention with this laudable requirement;

-Sidewalk & Streetscape Standards, same for "existing vegetation";

Page 7: Modifications,

-c)ii,5., "considerations of health and welfare of general public foremost;

-c)iv,3., "...provides public benefits....";

Para 2.8, Encourage CW&L to analyze telecoms more restrictively, as each telecom has different standards, uses different site-developers that operate differently, and none have a 100-year vested interest in the city. CW&L will bear the brunt of customer service complaints when 5G wireless radiation from its' infrastructure intrudes into homes and other buildings, as well as greenspace;

Para 3.1a) "...or designee...." repeated? Does this indicate two-levels below principal?

Page 9: Commercial uses, "Food services...." includes alcohol sales outside establishments? (Note: in dry county?)

Page 10: includes "pets", "schools", other environmental concerns from 5G;

Page 11: "Manufacturing...."

-consider 5G as "hazardous waste"?

-telecoms as "utilities & utility services...."

Table 3-2: Criteria,

-includes "Brewery, distillery..." (Note: in dry county?)

-utility & utility services factors "greenery, etc." & is anti-"considerations of health and welfare of general public foremost";

Page 13: "Temp Use Parking....", how does 30' distance affect proximity to 5G antennas?

Page 14: iii, "...General Frontages...." in context of 5G antenna distances, heights, strength of RF radiation emissions;

Page 17:

-paras 8 & 9, in context of 5G;

-d)iv), distances, heights, etc. for all 5G;

Page 18: Require setbacks for telecoms that are much stricter than CW&L's;

Page 23: telecom overlays for 5G will inform public of pluses, minuses, and risks of location;

Page 36, et al, note proximity of light poles, etc. to buildings; many photos include what appear to be 5G capable light poles in close proximity, anti-"considerations of health and welfare of general public foremost";

Para 6.0, Street Design Standards, anti-"considerations of health and welfare of general public foremost";

Para 8.0, Street Trees and Streetscape, anti-"considerations of health and welfare of general public foremost";

Para 8.4 Street Lighting, et al, all less than x' from buildings, anti-"considerations of health and welfare of general public foremost";

The rest of the document, to include all Definitions, "Scapes", "Public/Play Areas", etc., are likely reasons to stop 5G.

Thanks for consideration of these comments. As a resident, I can provide as much information as reasonably requested from a reasonable resident - this is not difficult, as much of the work has been implemented elsewhere. Professional RF engineering inspections written into ordinances, with penalties; independent legal advice to tighten ordinances on the city's, not

the wireless industry's (the AML is not independent); and other actions taken by jurisdictions throughout the USA to prioritize the public's health, safety & welfare above all else is the "transparency" and the "investment" residents expect from elected officials and city staff.

Again, thanks.

Howard L. "Hard L" Weinstock
Wilkins Avenue, 72401

Ward 4
District 5