

To the Nevada City Planning Commission

You now have a decision that may be a matter of life and death over some citizens of your city.

There is ample evidence that Cell towers cause cancer yet the Federal government has told you that you cannot be concerned about the health of the people, that Business is more important than the welfare of the people.

You have listened to a Representative of Verison. His job is to get those cell phone towers up by any means necessary. And he will say whatever is necessary to accomplish his task. He has the federal government on his side.

Now, you can say there is nothing I can do. I will have to live with those who get sick and witness those who die but it is not my fault. I am just following the orders of the federal government to give the Cell Phone industry what they want.

The other possibility is to order Verison to chose another site away from where people work and live. Buy doing so you are not denying the installation of a cell tower just ordering that it be located far enough from the people to not be a hazard. This is a perfectly reasonable request of Verison.

There is no urgent or necessary reason to have any Cell Phone Tower within the Nevada City limits.

I am suggesting a compromise. Tell Verison you will consider a tower but in a more suitable location. Don't let Verison browbeat you into submission.

If You allow this installation on the proposed building site, I have no doubt there will be negative consequences and those consequences. will result in the City being sued and the County being sued. And when the people see what is going on, they will no longer want to hang out downtown. They will not want to work downtown. They will not want to rent downtown. They will no longer want to buy property downtown. Property values will fall.

And because the county will be locked into a tight unbreakable contract for probably 30 years. There will be no recourse to undo the damage.

Bottom line, It will be BAD FOR BUSINESS!

over

So the reason to deny this application is that is bad for business.
You don't have to mention health issues, Just say it will be bad for business.

On the other hand if you let it go through you will be facing suits from the people whose lives will be harmed when they do begin getting Cancers.

In 2011 the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) designated exposure to wi-fi radiation to be a possible human carcinogen.

Lloyd's of London now includes Exclusion 32 in it's policy's:

"The Electromagnetic Fields Exclusion (Exclusion 32) is a general Insurance Exclusion and is applied across the market standard. The Purpose of the exclusion is to exclude cover for illnesses caused by continuous long-term non-ionizing radiation exposure i.e. through mobil phone usage."

This would include the microwave radiation emitted from commercial wi-fi transmitters and wireless devices.

Other insurance companies will very likely follow Lloyd's lead.

It is obvious that Microwave technology when used UNwisely can cause damage to our health. Lloyd's of London knows this and now so do you.

Ultimately you might be sued by Verison for considering the health of your constituents or you could face being sued by your constituents for defending Verison.

So, are you going to be hero's and defend your constituents or are you going to side with the corporation.

I think you should propose a compromise. Get the tower moved out of town.

Do what is best for the people of the city and what is best for the business of the City.

Thank you for your time.

Marston Schultz
Grass Valley

Substitute City Officials for School officials in the following article.

<https://thebridgenewsservice.com/2015/02/26/school-boards-left-on-the-hook-for-wi-fi-injuries/>

The Bridge News Service

Non Corporate Media from Canada

School Boards Left On The Hook For Wi-Fi Injuries.

By Janis Hoffman

Posted on February 26, 2015

School officials could be personally liable for exposing children and staff to microwave radiation in our schools.

School districts, school boards and school medical health officers have been notified that Lloyd's of London has now excluded any liability coverage for injuries, "*directly or indirectly arising out of, resulting from or contributed to by electromagnetic fields, electromagnetic radiation, electromagnetism, radio waves or noise.*" This would include the microwave radiation emitting from the commercial wi-fi transmitters and wireless devices in our schools.

In response to a request for clarification, this response was received on Feb. 18, 2015 from CFC Underwriting LTD, London, UK agent for Lloyd's:

"The Electromagnetic Fields Exclusion (Exclusion 32) is a General Insurance Exclusion and is applied across the market as standard. The purpose of the exclusion is to exclude cover for illnesses caused by continuous long-term non-ionizing radiation exposure i.e. through mobile phone usage."

Lloyd's of London, one of the world's largest insurance companies often leads the way in protection by taking on risks that no one else will. At the end of this article there is a copy of a recent renewal policy which, as of Feb. 7, 2015, excludes any coverage associated with exposure to non-ionizing radiation.

In 2011 the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) dropped a bombshell

on the wireless industry. They designated exposure to wi-fi radiation to be a possible human carcinogen. As well in the 1990s illnesses resulting from asbestos exposure, covered by Lloyd's at the time, almost destroyed the insurance company. Due to these issues, it appears Lloyd's is acting fast to avoid another such financial fiasco by not covering illnesses that result from exposure to wireless radiation.

With the Lloyd's of London announcement, parents and teachers are left with this question: exactly who is liable if their child is harmed by wi-fi in their school? Concomitantly, are the individuals who approved the installation of wireless internet networks in our schools to be held personally liable for negligence?

School officials and administrators appear to be in a bind as they have refused to acknowledge the 1000s of peer-reviewed, non-industry funded studies by scientists and medical experts that show that wi-fi radiation is harmful, especially to children. Moreover, their dogged allegiance to Health Canada's now invalidated safety guidelines have left parents with nowhere else to turn other than the courts. It appears that school boards' intransigent position on the issue may have left board members themselves vulnerable to being personally sued.

School boards may be covered by directors' insurance which applies to people who are performing their duties "in good faith." The question is: are they still protected when it could be shown that they were being "willfully blind?"

Definitions:

"In good faith:" in contract law, the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing is a general presumption that the parties to a contract will deal with each other honestly, fairly, and in good faith, so as to not destroy the right of the other party or parties to receive the benefits of the contract.

"Wilful blindness:" (sometimes called ***ignorance of law, wilful ignorance or contrived ignorance or Nelsonian knowledge***) is a term used in law to describe a situation in which an individual seeks to avoid civil or criminal liability for a wrongful act by intentionally putting him or herself in a position where he or she will be unaware of facts that would render him or her liable.

11 thoughts on “School Boards Left On The Hook For Wi-Fi Injuries. By Janis Hoffman”

1. Pingback: [School boards left on the hook for Wi-Fi injuries « In These New Times](#)
2. [maty185](#) on March 19, 2015 at 5:01 am said:

Reblogged this on [Grossesse Québec](#) and commented:

Les directions d'écoles pourraient être tenues personnellement responsables d'exposer les enfants et les membres du personnel aux radiations micro-ondes dans les écoles.

Like

[Reply](#) ↓

3. Pingback: [Good news for electro-sensitives – well, French ones anyway...](#)
4. Pingback: [Letter to The Editor: “Smart” meter risks too great for liability insurance | Sedona.Biz - The Internet Voice of Sedona and The Verde Valley](#)
5. Karl Muller on March 25, 2015 at 7:53 am said:

This is a very important article. I have been researching the issue of health insurance and mobile phone masts for a decade now, and this story represents a turning point. You cannot overestimate the importance of liability cover for this industry. Just two or three cancer cases arising near a mast, especially one sited in a school, and telecoms operators are looking at massive legal and liability bills. Without cover, they are in real trouble. And out of 23 peer-reviewed studies on masts and health that I have seen, 21 show a clear pattern of problems, including significantly raised cancer rates. The one study that did not find an elevated cancer risk (Elliott, in the UK) is a very dubious exercise, rated as basically worthless by Prof Michael Kundi, the world expert on this subject. There is plenty of evidence of hazard. These are studies from Germany, Austria, Poland, Israel, Brazil, Egypt, Spain, France, Cyprus, and even Iraq, all finding a similar syndrome of illnesses near masts. There is no choice about exposure to a mast, as there is about handset exposure.

The British lawyer Alan Meyer says that there is a likelihood of liability devolving on landowners who allow masts on their properties. They sign mutual indemnity agreements with the telecoms operators (indemnifying the operator from liability in case of health claims). These have NEVER been

DON'T LET THIS HAPPEN!

The Union

September 16th 2022

Staff reporter

Cancer Cluster discovered In Downtown Nevada City

A higher than normal amount of Cancer cases have been reported by our local hospital in Grass Valley. It seems that a number of cases have been showing up in Nevada City. This jewel of the Gold Country has had over 100 cases of brain tumors in the last year. All of these cases were with people that lived or worked in the center of downtown Nevada City. It can take 5 to 6 years for Cancer to show up in its victims. Coincidentally Microwave towers were installed in Nevada City just 6 years ago.

Reinette Senum former city council member, said she was not surprised. Senum, owned a business almost across the street from Friar Tucks where cell phone towers were installed. "I was not going to gamble with the my life and the life of my employees, so I moved my Cafe" said Senum. Now she is glad she did. "I'm sad to see many of my friends getting Cancer. "We tried to stop the installation of these microwave towers but they wouldn't listen."

Senum along with a group of concerned citizens opposed the installation of several microwave towers on the roof of the Friar Tuck building. To no avail the County, was determined to get that yearly \$30,000 paycheck from Verison, no matter what the health risk to its citizens. Joe Smith, Supervisor at the time of the installation said, "Verison assured us there were no health risks". Ironically, some of the County and City employees are among the Cancer victims.

Medical insurance companies in the United States, following the lead of Lloyd's of London are refusing to pay for any illness caused by microwave exposure.

The medical bills could add up to several million dollars. Normally in a case like this Verison would be sued for damages but the federal government passed a law that shields Verison from any liability.

Now Nevada City and Nevada County are faced with class action suits. Current County supervisors said they were not at fault , since they were not on the board at the time.

Lawyers for the Cancer victims argued that the City and County should have applied the precautionary principle and not allowed the cell phone towers to be installed so close to where the people lived. Now that the damage has been done, the County cannot get out of their contract with Verison.

Besides having to deal with the law suit, the supervisors are concerned about how this will effect tourism. And landlords are worried about keeping tenants. Relators are concerned they won't be able to sell anything downtown, News spreads rapidly in a small town. Who want's to risk getting Cancer?

Locals tend to stay out of the "Cancer Zone" and business is slow in downtown Nevada City.

If property values drop this will lower tax revenues and the County may have a net loss in income as a result of installing the microwave towers.

Verison denied any responsibility.