Harry Vere Lehmann
Principal Attorney

Law Offices of Harry V. Lehmann PC
4 Vineyard Court
Novato, California 94947

Area Code 415
Telephone: 897-2121
Facsimile: 898-6959

May 10, 2021

Senator Scott D. Wiener
State Capitol, Room 5100
Sacramento, CA 95814-4900

RE: (**I**) Fiscal risk inherent in SB 556 belies the rationale for direct transfer to the Senate Floor per Rule 28.8. (**II**) In addition to fiscal risk, the manner in which the Bill has been pushed through the Committee process even prior to the 28.8 tactic has violated statute and Constitution. (**III**) It is scientifically sustainable to vote against SB 556 on the basis of moral objection to radiation consequences.

Dear Senator Wiener -

This document is submitted to each California State Senator to assure that each of our Senators has received Actual Notice of the adverse fiscal and health consequences which clear and convincing evidence show would result from the SB 556. It is noted in passing that ***if*** SB 556 was intentionally named after the armor-piercing NATO bullet to illustrate how calculated abandonment of public access to Committee meetings can assure that the most powerful corporations can push your constituents around, as one constituent, I object.

Because lawyer letters are always manipulative, the only way to make a straight letter is to challenge readers to use their best analytical skills to evaluate what is said. I invite that approach towards this letter. This letter defends three core points with supporting annotation:

- SB 556 was through inadvertence transferred to the Floor of the Senate, without its planned Hearing on Monday, May 10th, by mistake stated as pursuant to Senate Rule 28.8 because of 'no fiscal impact.' SB 556 cannot lawfully have been so referred by Assembly Appropriations because evidence in the SB 556 preparation packets for each member of Appropriations show that SB 556 will predictably assume risks of fiscal consequences of potentially overwhelming weight. The State of California faces massive liability exposure from the implementation of Senate Bill 556. Senate Bill 649 presented the

same risks in 2017. Therefore SB 556 should be returned to Assembly Appropriations for a Hearing, with no prejudice to the Bill. Or, if the parliamentary and Constitutional factors are recognized as inherently 'fiscal' (including as to income) then the fiscal deadline has been missed this year. The industry's smartest lawyers and all of the re-insurers know that Telecom faces vast uninsurable liability exposure and legal defense fees costs due to multiple factors, including aesthetic health concerns. The 1996 Telecommunications Act nowhere uses the word 'health,' please see the holding of the California Supreme court in T-Mobile West LLC v. City and County of San Francisco 6 Cal. 5th 1107 (2019).

- There have been correctable procedural ambiguities in the manner in which SB 556 has proceeded through the Senate Committees: There are also oddities with companion legislation (such as last minute drafting of Senators supportive of the Bill as stand-in Committee members, without formality, when a quorum was otherwise absent). Other legal and Constitutional issues with SB 556 are stated in my respectful letter of April 14, 2021 to the Senate Standing Committee on Energy, Utilities, and Communication, which letter is respectfully incorporated herein by this reference as though more fully set forth herein. These procedural anomalies show that SB 556 must be returned to Assembly Appropriations for evaluation. The purpose of the annotated positions in the following work, not just these bullet points, is to assure that each of our Senators has Notice, and thereby ***actual knowledge***, of the ascertainable high risks inherent in SB 556.

- The letter of April 14th voiced the modernly unusual position at page 3 that any Senator or Assemblymember has the right to decline a vote for a particular Bill or to oppose that Bill in higher profile where the likely results a Bill would offend such Legislator's moral standards including non-relativistic moral standards derived from traditional schools of thought. Some may frown in the name of alleged scientific objectivity, but we've all seen scientists put different spins on the same data. This letter provides scientific sources showing that as the most ultimate question in science is disputed in the current 'crisis in Cosmology,' no Legislator need conclude that her or his moral judgments are inherently any less 'scientific,' than positions hawked most eloquently by those who have the most to gain. Remember Big Tobacco.

I. SENATE BILL 556 PRESENTS FORESEEABLE RISKS OF FINANCIAL HARM TO THE GOVERNMENTAL AND UTILITY LESSORS OF PROPERTIES USED FOR THE ANTENNAS.

Like SB 649 in 2017, the current Senate Bill 556, if implemented ***will result in transfer of the industry's massive uninsurable liability exposure to the government of California and to the other Lessors of poles and structures upon which antennas are built*** resulting the straight-forward non-novel application of well-established jurisprudential traditions statutes and case law grounded in **Contracts**, **Landlord-Tenant** (Doctrine of Fixtures), **Joint Venture**, **Agency**, and liability from the concurring results of independent tortfeasors (Summers v. Tice, et al). Boiled down, the companies and government entities which own poles and structures for the intended mass of antennas are ***Joint Venturers with Telecom***, ***In Contract*** **with Telecom to provide** ***the Dangerous Condition of Public Property*** **involved,** and ***the Landlord of Telecom.*** SB 556 would transfer their Telecom's uninsurable liabilities to the taxpayers based on those and other theories and combinations thereof. The industry can't get insurance for these exposures, so dumping the liability onto the taxpayer makes sense from their point of view. Every vote for SB 556 is a vote to risk the practical insolvency for the State of California, which risk should be fully evaluated.

The ***risks to the solvency*** of California should SB 556 be signed into law include the following listed points, the concerns which brought the sensible end to SB 649 in 2017:

1. The State can't be sued for 'negligence' or other basic common-law theories of relief, and Claimants can only sue as allowed in the Government Code.
2. The main CA Government Code section which is virtually always pled by all experienced public entity lawyers is Dangerous Condition of Public Property, Government Code 835.
3. If forcing of city and county and city properties into leasing contracts is allowed by SB 556, as would have been the case with SB 649 in 2017, what next follows when the cell tower is affixed to the utility pole or structure, due to the Doctrine of Fixtures and other legal reasons, is the merger of antenna and pole into that Public Property, creating a Dangerous Condition.
4. If SB 556 contains the 'Firefighters Exemption' as did SB 649 in 2017, which "Exemption" prohibits cellular broadcast antenna construction near where firefighters sleep, based on negative health grounds as pushed by their unions, ***the State is acknowledging that the radiation from these antenna are dangerous, as shown by***

many studies, including the $25 million study undertaken by the National Toxicology Program of our nation's NIH, which found that cellular radiation causes the formation of glioma cells, the most deadly of the brain cancer cells.

5. As a result of the above SB 556, like SB 649 before it, makes the resulting public property a Dangerous Condition of Public Property in the light of Government Code 835, which in turn makes lawsuits against the State much more formidable.
6. There is now overwhelming evidence of DNA and cellular damage from radio-frequency EMF as emitted by cellular phones and towers.
7. It is a matter of well-established public record that the international re-insurance industry has long refused to insure any aspect of the telecom industry for injuries caused by the radiation from cellular devices or installations.
8. ***The only avenue left to the cellular industry, other than just honestly facing up to this mess and helping us solve it, is to shift the legal responsibility to government.***
10. Seasoned and competent counsel, where injuries occur of a sort consistent with EMF injury to DNA, including glioblastoma as indicated by glioma findings from the NIH study, will file suit against responsible corporate entities, broadly, and also sue the State of California as above. In addition to the fact that the 1996 Act nowhere mentions 'health,' and that there is no protection for industry in the Act language for suits based on direct physical harm, ***the practical immunity offered to telecom under the act is conditional upon compliance with FCC standards, and there are material means available to show that currently marketed smart phones do not meet FCC standards when measured as actually used in the field, including up against the face.***
11. In the instance of unsuccessful bar to civil prosecution from said industry-inspired 1996 Act, and in a State where 'joint and several liability' means that a 5% liability contributor has 100% of financial responsibility from a loss, ***the result of the combination of the factors stated above is that in the instance of suit, including 'friendly,' all financial burdens from cellular injury are shifted to the State of California, under the results from SB 649 as here-projected, through exercise of the federal regulatory bar to such prosecution of cases against the telecom industry.***
12. During the 1990's ratepayer money was used to build the Internet Superhighway, at the least for more than thirteen billion dollars. The problem, from industry's standpoint, in the regulated context, was that the fiber optic systems comprising the actual massively constructed Internet Super Highway was just too damn good. Too efficient. Brilliant companies went bankrupt because the systems were so fast and so reliable and could carry such massive bandwidth, for cheap, that it was far more advantageous to the CTIA et al to move into far less regulated wireless, meaning, initially, cellular. The Superhighway still exists, now widely called dark fiber, linking all major cities and

most suburban areas surrounding cities. There are many examples, fiber optics use in South Korea is often cited, showing the incredibly better deal the consumer gets with fiber optic Internet. Plus, no wireless radiation. Many tens of thousands of good California jobs making local connections for higher speeds far greater reliability, much less cost, and no fire risks. Avoiding fire risks, particularly in rural and semi-rural areas, such as in El Dorado County, is a critical consideration when contemplating the advisability of stationing thousands of 'automatic-on' power systems and power backup systems in the most-fire-dangerous counties we have, given the fire risks from these diffuse, subject-to-wind damage and maintenance requiring SB 556 platforms.

For each and all of the above reasons, SB 556 presents a high level of potential fiscal risk for California such that prudence requires more study of these fiscal and societal impacts prior to the Bill reaching either Floor, much less the Office of the Governor. In addition to the liability of our State, due to the business exclusions from coverage in HO-3 policies, if the pending legislation is amended late in course to allow these radiation broadcasting antennas on private property, homeowners who are sued will not even have coverage for legal defense, whether the case against that landowner is for easement violations or aesthetic concerns about health under the decision of the California Supreme Court in T-Mobile West LLC v. City and County of San Francisco 6 Cal. 5th 1107 (2019), or under Contracts, Negligence, Joint Venture, Agency.

II. SEPARATE FROM THE FISCAL MERITS OF SB 556, THE BILL HAS PROCEEDED THROUGH THE COMMITTEE PROCESS IN VIOLATION OF STATUTE AND DUE PROCESS OF LAW.

The protection of the governmental workplace has faced huge challenges. Those of us who live or have business and family in Sacramento will understand what happened at Capitol Mall better than the national nightly news has time to report. Legislators and staff face legitimate need to get the work of government done in the midst of an unprecedented state of fear from Covid 19. The professionals engaged in the work of government have had to improvise in contexts in which for most was very new territory.

The Legislature's long term adaptive reflex has been to unnecessarily sweep power away from constituents and concentrate it in the professional echelons. As it is in other vast productive realms, advancement in approval within the governing Party is now the most conducive element to one's being allowed vocalization of positions and concerns on legislation. For example, up until Appropriations made the erroneous 'no fiscal impact'

inadvertence of referral to the Floor of the Senate, I was one of the two people 'approved,' to speak for two minutes against SB 556 at Appropriations. Then it was referred out under 28.8.

There is no rational excuse consistent with California law and the rule of democracy in California for anything near this level of unnecessary and utterly constrictive violations of the fundamental rights of the public to engage interactively with Committee Hearings, which if by Zoom, for example are still subject to necessary limitations on time each allowed.

Everybody in the private sector from businesses to vast corporations to religious institutions has been using Zoom or other video interactive software suites for interactive group meetings. No Covid risk. Few if any security risks, and subject to webmaster control.

Since 1850 California's constituents have had the ability and under the law now clearly the right to attend and offer viewpoint at legislative Committee meetings. While it is understandable due to the Covid pandemic that in-person attendance could be suspended, but instead of implementing readily available constituent engagement technologies in wide use elsewhere, ***those in political control in California have implemented a comprehensive shut down of constituent commentary***.

Under the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, and in company with 170 years of California history, constituents are entitled to attend and voice their views at these Committee meetings, which are supposed to be "Open." Now, instead, persons must apply, as I did to become an 'approved opponent,' at any hearing on a pending Bill, in which case two such 'approved' personalities, ***having been approved in advance by the same Committee which will hear their testimony***, will be given two minutes each.

Those wishing to otherwise communicate are encouraged to go to the Legislatures web portal. At the web portal the constituent finds the opportunity to 'check the box,' as to whether favoring or opposing the Bill, and then there's a text box **which has a hundred character limit** for the constituent to fill in her reasons. Just voicing support or opposition to a Bill is not the binary reason for witness testimony, most people want to say 'why' they favor or oppose a Bill. That part has been effectively cut out. For those who have taken the hours necessary to prepare a formal letter, there is an attachment opportunity, which apparently sometimes works, although one advocate got back a 'limited to 100 characters' note when the attachment of a letter was repeatedly attempted. The Senate has made no attempt to comply with the law, specifically the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, which could have been accommodated, like everybody else, with Zoom, but instead a Star Chamber approach has so far been found indelibly convenient.

Our First Amendment rights, bought at ultimate expense, are now trampled here by the operational reality that citizen input to the legislative process has been curtailed to such massive extent that the Committees which are structurally in place to weigh the value of Bills

before them are now deciding which two 'approved opponents,' are allowed to have two minutes, supposedly on behalf of the many.

Respectfully, this 'approved opponent,' and 'approved proponent' approach is clearly un-Constitutional because among other reasons ***there are no standards*** for assessing how to make such 'approval.' ***Also, who has the right to make such decisions approving whom will speak, for example, if a majority of the involved Committee already likes the involved Bill***?

SB 556 was left idle without action for most of a month. Then, as advocates were informed, ***due to the pending deadline for matters having fiscal consequence*** the Bill was suddenly on the calendar. Now it has been taken off-hearing through 28.8 by Assembly Appropriation as having no fiscal consequence. This has the utter and complete effect of cutting off constituent input. This was dragged to the deadline on the basis that it was a fiscal Bill, and then it was sent out to the Floor on the basis that it was not a fiscal Bill..

Why were there only three days between the two Committee hearings in 2021? The effect of this was to cut off any practical any of realistic chance for public participation.

Even though SB.556 was able to be heard as early as March 20, it sat idle for nearly a month and was not scheduled at the Senate Standing Committee on Energy Utilities and Communications until Apr 19 -- nearly 30 days later. Then, when challenged on why the Bill was assigned to the Apr 22 SFG hearing and not on the other available date of May 6. the reason given was that it was a Fiscal Bill and had to be heard by Apr 30.

This also demonstrates that SB 556 being taken off the May 10, 2021 Senate Appropriations Committee agenda -- citing 28.8 as SB 556 having no fiscal consequence -- was not justified. This completely cut off constituent input. This Bill was dragged to the deadline on the basis that it was a fiscal Bill, and then it was sent directly to the Senate floor on the basis that it was not a fiscal Bill. SB.556 has significant fiscal impact and needs to be added to the May 17, 2021 Senate Appropriations Committee agenda. Aside from the merits of this Bill, in the way SB 556 has so far been handled shows that the process needs work.

Unlike the accommodation which was made for electro-magnetic sensitive Californians wishing to offer SB 649 testimony in 2017, which accommodations were accomplished for SB 649 in the following Committees: Assembly Local Government, Assembly Communications and Conveyance, Assembly Appropriations. With SB 556 there has been no legally required dialogue from the Legislature despite ADA application.

SB 556 is vague due to the lack of an agreed definition for what constitutes a so-called 'small wireless facility.' Since the dawn of California by Statehood on September 9, 1850 constituents have had the ability to meet with their legislators and senior staff, and in particular to attend and present viewpoint at meetings of legislative Committees.

There has not been any electronic replication of the telephone access to staff which has been normally available to constituents for decades. Often, constituents seeking to reach

specific staffers are met with non-specific voice mails about how tough it is to make things work properly. Contrary to this failure to apply readily available technology, if staffers are working from home, then the phones used to reach those staffers for legislative business should be government issued phone systems which work reliably, consistently and in a pattern, no more, no less, replicating what was in place pre-pandemic. Instead, callers are routinely told that a sought staffer cannot be reached because that staffer's 'personal phone' is used for business, and 'we can't give out personal phone numbers.' Staff should have been provided with governmentally sponsored working phones with working voice mail. Instead, there has been at best piecemeal cell phone management. This could have been handled by VOIP into everybody's home. There is no technical or medical reason for this shut down of the ability of the governed to reach those who govern because this problem set has all along been readily capable of technical solution. There are now nonsensical rules subject to unpredictable enforcement, such about personal computers at Hearings.

While the Senate prohibits bringing computers into the Chamber, even prohibits tablet computers, the Assembly, as has always been the case, has allowed laptops and still does. In the Assembly, also, witnesses are able to work as citizen journalists, but on the Senate side there is no such access. Even a portfolio as used for a legal pad is not allowed in the Senate, only the bare legal pad and a pen. This is arbitrary and capricious because at one instance the same citizen was allowed in with his portfolio notebook, and the next time it was not allowed. We know that Zoom could be used, because one member of most committees, typically just one, will appear at a hearing via Zoom.

In many of the above individual instances Constitutional entitlements, including as protected by California statute, have been abrogated in violation of the Due Process rights, including deprivation of constituent rights to Free Speech and Assembly. As these State Actions are in the instances of individual violation are, the greater indelible picture is a confusing montage of uncoordinated failures to use modern technologies and a decision to deploy harsh top-down constraints instead, which process should be stopped and updated, and in particular, aside from the merits, SB 556 should fail for its many Due Process violations.

III A SCIENTIFIC APPROACH SHOWS THAT EACH LEGISLATOR RETAINS THE REASONABLE RIGHT TO VOTE ON THE BASIS OF CONSCIENCE, INCLUDING MORALITY AS PERCEIVED FROM TRADITIONAL SOURCES.

This section defends the unusual position at page 3 of the referenced April 14 letter, that: "***It is respectfully noted that any Senator or member of the Assembly has the unencumbered and free speech right to decline to support any bill because of that Legislator's moral concerns, with no lawful obligation to thereafter explain***."

If a Senator or Assemblymember has determined that it is morally inappropriate to allow the widespread densified deployment of industrial machinery for the purpose of distributing known carcinogenic microwave radiation – it is entirely the right of such Legislator to reject this vast dense microwave deployment. There is no serious scientific question as to whether the cellular radiation is carcinogenic, the $25 million NTP study at NIH has settled that question with a 'yes,'(NTP report as initially announced on 5/27/16, as endorsed by the NTP panel after almost two years of peer review at the Research Triangle peer review conference on 3/28/18, with addition of the 'clear evidence,' language, and as shown in the final NTP report of on or about 11/03/18. See www.mdsafetech.org , and www.ehtrust.org . These references imbue each reader with actual knowledge of these hazards to each reader's constituency.

That Senators have a duty to take actual science into account is by itself a prime reason for this letter. Yet reliance solely upon one person's favorite conclusion based on the massively over-broad term 'science' as to the root nature of existence is inconsistent with the documented massive voids in the so-far-failed attempts of our finest Cosmology scientists to objectively demonstrate, for pertinent example the mechanism of The Big Bang. This chasm between Cosmologists is due to the extreme dispute in Cosmology as to the reliability of what is called Inflation in Big Bang Theory. The 'no absolute rules' outlook sometimes found in the modern intelligencia, is in the Cosmology of modern physics is utterly dependent on a scientific idea called ***Inflation***, with a capital "I."

Inflation is currently widely accepted in Cosmology as essential to the mathematical survival of Big Bang Theory. Inflation has remained the cornerstone for the survival of scientifically sustainable Big Bang theory since its announcement by "the father of Inflation," physicist Alan Guth in 1981.

Paul J. Steinhardt, Albert Einstein Chair in Physics at Princeton remained a strong advocate of Inflation for more than two decades. When Dr. Steinhardt was a winner of the Direc Prize in 2003, he is one of the world's top experts on Inflation in Cosmology. A few years later in a cover article in Scientific American, with calculations demonstrated, Dr. Steinhardt offered proof for his position that Inflation is not mathematically possible.

Below see a link to a recent Scientific American article concerning what New York Times science journalist Dennis Overbye calls '**a crisis in Cosmology**." **The core point is not who is right or wrong in the Inflation argument, but that the argument exists at all**:

https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/observations/cosmology-has-some-big-problems

None of us should be bullied every time somebody starts pontificating on what some supposed unitary version of 'science,' says. It is okay to recognize that science itself by its nature is the study of its own imperfections. Despite what may be read in the press Big Bang, one stilt upon which moral relativity resides, is at least as to the 'how,' also currently a faith-based belief (for another example the absence of empirical proof for the ever popular String Theory - see ***Not Even Wrong*** by Dr. Greene's Columbia colleague in Physics, Peter Woit). With human life and health at stake for millions of people, it is not 'unscientific,' to rely upon moral guidance viewpoints as factors in decision making about whether to vote for a major Bill. The polarized dispute in Big Bang theory due to Inflation is provided merely to illustrates that there are multiple competing faith-based views, including widely publically perceived 'science,' on one hand, and, an alternative ways of living which study science issues vry seriously yet still retain the influence of older teachings.

Many legitimate tributaries of scientific thought lead us to recognize an underlying tendency towards system, Lorenz, Mandelbrot, Bohm, so that evolution over vast time to complex and ultimately conscious system assembly be likely. Always with thanks to James Gleick for ***Chaos, The Birth of a New Science***. Also on moral relativity see ***Modern Times***, by the late Paul Johnson. Also arguably relevant here, Seth Lloyd's ***Programming the Universe: A Quantum Computer Scientist Takes on the Cosmos.***

A thought experiment is suggested: If it is assumed, as is so widely searched-for, that there exists an ultimately indivisible constituent to the universe, usually spoken of as a particle, and there exists in the universe, even locally, an underlying and now-well-documented tendencies towards system, not entropy, as seen through Chaos Theory, such combination could, over billions of years, tend towards organized structure. With a given tendency to system, indivisible ultimate sub-atomic particles could predictably over billions of years evolve into massive computational consciousness.

None of this is sought to be stated from any religious perspective, the matters stated here are supportive of an Agnostic viewpoint. Yet, for all of the many faults in religious institutions , the traditions of seeking goodness and fair treatment permeate the attempts of all developed cultures to deal with what has been historically perceived as a powerful force.

IV CONCLUSION

SB 556 presents severe hazard of negative fiscal consequence to governmental and utility entities which are compelled into contract by government, as the Landlords of Telecom. When the antennas are affixed to the poles or structures, 'merger' takes place under the Doctrine of Fixtures, and the resulting Dangerous Condition of Public Property is co-owned by the entity involved.

We all seek legislators who will take engineering into account and fairly balance the often-competitive testimonies from scientists, since we so infrequently encounter exact scientific agreement when vast sums are at stake. Voters are not trying to elect a Spock or a Kirk, ***but reasonable human beings who will also take being human into account***. Being human includes awareness of moral principles; it is the absence of those moral limits which clinicians properly label as psychotic. Voters want honorable people. So say we all.

Objective legal risks with fiscal hazard, illustrated by the firefighter exemption, justify opposition to SB 556 because thereby the known effects on DNA are taken into account, see, again, www.mdsafetech.org . Yet, lives of children and adults are at stake when we continue to treat our population as experimental guinea pigs by constant multi-axial microwave radiation. This should not be allowed, either the physical risk, or the negative health concerns under T-Mobile West LLC v. City and County of San Francisco, supra. When making the scientifically correct choice about the known effects of microwave radiation, and for evaluation of fiscal risk by referral to Assembly Appropriations, ***it is also scientifically permissible to resort to thoughtfully rely on traditional moral outlook to oppose this Bill***.

In the 1930's the great barrister Clarence Darrow, an Agnostic, was once asked to become the leading spokesperson for a prominent national Atheist organization. Darrow responded, 'I don't know if there is a life after this, and you don't know if there is, but you pretend you do, and you've created a religion all its own out of it, and I want nothing to do with it.' The bottom line is that we mortal humans 'don't know,' the full history of this universe, we grasp with reasoning minds. Let us together assume that Mr. Darrow has a point: that the possibility of some form of supervening consciousness is not typically knowable to we who labor here in our transitory mortal forms. Even that dispassionate Agnostic approach does not support the outright rejection of the standards about right and wrong which result from the thousands of years through which our species articulated standards based on the belief that ultimate responsibility resides with the individual choosing to do the right thing.

Satyagraha,

Harry V. Lehmann

HP Color LaserJet MFP M283fdw

Fax Confirmation

May-17-2021 4:52PM

Job	Date	Time	Type	Identification	Duration	Pages	Result
332	5/17/2021	4:42:56PM	Send	19166428979	9:23	12	OK

Harry Vere Lehmann
Principal Attorney

Law Offices of Harry V. Lehmann PC
4 Vineyard Court
Novato, California 94947

Area Code 415
Telephone: 897-2121
Facsimile: 898-6959

May 17, 2021

The Hon. Erika Contreras
Secretary of the California State Senate
State Capitol, Room 3044
Sacramento, CA 95814
Via 12 page fax: 916-642-8979

Re: Please, kindly forward attached May 10, 2021 letter to Senator Weiner, who lacks a fax machine.

Dear Secretary Contreras -

The attached May 10th letter to Senator Scott Weiner has been dispatched by US Mail to his snail mail address.

Please accept my respectful request that you kindly provide this fax, which contains my letter of May 10th, to Senator Weiner's office via such staff and means most convenient to you.. Senator Weiner is the only Senator for whom we could not locate a fax number. The provided May 10th letter was received by each other Senator no later than May 11, 2021.

Thirty-none of our Senators therefore received the factual, scientific, Constitutional, and legal points in the attached letter ***prior*** to the recent Floor vote on SB 556.

Therefore from a viewpoint in opposition to SB 556, an essential deadline was met, so that each Senator (except as it turned out for Senator Weiner) can be shown by fax record to have had ***actual knowledge*** of the fiscal and scientific consequences from SB 556 prior to their Floor vote. The fact that Senator Weiner didn't have a fax and resulting delay, after rest, allowed use some of the post-deadline time, after rest, to fix typos. Therefore the attached is same May 10 letter sent to all Senators with some typos cleaned up.

Thank you,

Harry V. Lehmann