

WHAT REALLY IS THE TRUTH REGARDING THE CELL PHONE ANTENNAS ON THE BAYVILLE WATER TOWER?

Question: Aren't the RF (radio frequency) emissions from the cell phone tower within federal allowable limits?

Answer: The FCC is required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to evaluate the effect of emissions from FCC-regulated transmitters on the quality of the human environment, but for some reason the FCC has NOT established an allowable limit. **“At the present time there is NO federally-mandated radio frequency (RF) exposure standard.”** Please remember **NO** studies by the FCC prove that extended RF emission exposure to children are safe..

Question: Why would our government allow cell phone towers if they are dangerous?

Answer: Our government does not always know what is safe at the time they are allowing it. From 1946-1962, the U.S. military ordered more than 200,000 active-duty GIs to observe one or more nuclear bomb tests either in the Pacific or at the Nevada Test Site. It was believed at the time that the amount of radiation they were exposed to was safe. Sadly it was later determined to be just the opposite. I don't think I need to explain the story of asbestos and lead use in this country.

Question: If cell phone towers are so dangerous why isn't a warning sign posted?

Answer: According to the FCC and Bayville's own Local Law 2002-8, a warning sign **IS** required. A warning sign was posted at one time but subsequently taken down after a resident raised questions concerning the warnings stated.

Question: Isn't the water tower the best location for the antennas?

Answer: It is the best location as far as the cell phone companies are concerned because it saves them a lot of money as opposed to having to disperse them or build their own tower.

Question: I thought the Telecommunications Act of 1996 states that, "No State or local government or instrumentality thereof may regulate the placement, construction, and modification of personal wireless service facilities on the basis of the environmental effects of radio frequency emissions to the extent that such facilities comply with the Commission's regulations concerning such emissions."

Answer: Although the residents of Bayville are concerned about health and safety, the residents have other legal grounds to move the antennas. Permission to use the water tower property violates a covenant in the deed, disallowing commercial use. Refer to B.R.A.C.T website to read the deed for yourself.

Question: Won't our taxes go up if we lose the revenue from renting the space on the water tower?

Answer: No, not at all. We are not advocating the elimination of cell phone towers from Bayville, just from any location near our schools. And, for informational purposes, the amount of tax increase, if any, would be nominal when dispersed amongst all of the Bayville taxpayers.

Question: I thought Mayor Siegel knew the uncertainty of cell phone tower safety and was against them. How did they get placed up there?

Answer: The first antennas were allowed to be placed by Mayor Siegel's predecessor. During a speech to the Locust Valley Rotary Club in April 1998 Mayor Siegel agreed that **“...we are in violation of our deed”**. The Mayor was referring to the fact that the water tower property deeded to the village is not allowed to be used for commercial purposes. As the Mayor also stated in her speech, it was actually the deed she used to keep the cell phone companies “at bay” for a long period of time.

PLEASE DONATE TO B.R.A.C.T AND HELP US MOVE THE ANTENNAS AWAY FROM OUR SCHOOL

Bayville Residents Against Cell Towers (B.R.A.C.T)
(516) 628-3997

www.bayvilleresidentsact.com
bayvilleresidentsact@yahoo.com