EXHIBIT A

Supplement I The Connecticut Clean Atmosphere Act
Federal Law Citations

(2) RadioFrequency / Microwave (RF/MW) radiation, including maser, of signal strength metered at and near the reported, publicly-accessible location in excess of -85 dBm (decibel-milliwatt) for any frequency or channel band specified by a transmitting entity's FCC transmission license, which entity must comply with all of the following:

(a) the Federal 1934 Communications Act (CA) requirement at 47 U.S.C. §324 ch.652, Title III, 48 Stat.109 of "minimal amount of power necessary to carry out the communication";

(b) the primary purpose of CA at 47 U.S.C. §151, as reaffirmed in the 1996 Telecommunications Act (TCA) purpose at U.S.C. §332 (a)(1) Mobile Services: to "promote the safety of life and property";

(c) TCA requirements, including the circumscribed preemptions at 47 U.S.C. §332 (c)(7)(A) and (c)(7)(B)(iv) omitting the "health effects" and "operations" of wireless facilities, so as to avert any preemption thereof, and preserving state and local officials' authorities to promote health, safety, life and property; while acknowledging the actuality of "the environmental effects" of the radiation; stating positively, "Except as provided in this paragraph, nothing in this chapter shall limit or affect the authority of a State or local government or instrumentality thereof over decisions regarding the placement, construction, and modification of personal wireless service facilities";

(d) TCA's preemption bounds, which apply solely to mobile phone calls made outdoors and not to internet data or any other wireless communication, rendering all other communications outside the bounds of said preemption; and rendering the states as holding full regulatory authority by way of zero extant preemption for all wireless transmissions that are not "personal wireless service facilities" as defined under TCA;

(e) The confirmation by the U.S. District Court, Eastern District of New York (E.D.N.Y.) that the TCA does not "protect" "improved capacity and speed", but rather provides for telecommunications carriers only in the case of a "significant gap in coverage," defined therein as less than "–85 dbm".

(f) TCA's Conference Report at H. R. Rep. No. 104-204, pt. 1, p. 94 (1995), leaving regulation of the operations of wireless facilities within state and local authorities and specifically citing "safety" as regulatory criterion, while warning that any further attempted preemptions "should be terminated";

(g) The consistent decisions of the federal D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals in 2019 and 2021 declaring the FCC's rulemaking "arbitrary and capricious" and without "reasoned explanation" in connection with its further deregulated deployments of wireless facilities, and particularly to its exposure guideline as non-protective of health and environment, with no guideline now extant for ongoing and new transmission frequencies >6 GHz; or

(h) Further confirmation by the U.S. District Court, E.D.N.Y., that "if the Court find that even one reason given for the denial [of an applied-for wireless facility] is supported by substantial evidence, the decision of the local zoning body cannot be disturbed." (T-Mobile Ne LLC v. Town of Islip, 893 F. Supp. 2d 338, 355 E.D.N.Y 2012); and that an applicant-corporation must 'first obtain. . . permission to use the streets," meaning local control must likewise be supported by the State;

(i) The U.S. Treasury's 2021 recommendation of internet dataspeed of 100 Mbps, both

upload and download, as standard, so that people can efficiently work and study at home; which dataspeed is not achievable through wireless facilities without exceeding the CA's requirement of minimum power to carry out the communication, but which speed is easily achievable through fiber-optics to the premises (FTTP); andThe federal Public Health Service Act Amendment of 1968 states at §354: "The Congress hereby declares that the public health and safety must be protected from the dangers of electronic product radiation;" thus, the federal stance is clear, with health effects recognized and state authorities established and ongoing;

(i) Given the CT Siting Council's original and fundamental lack of authority to regulate electronic operations, and its functioning as consistently contrary to the above federal laws and precedents, the Siting Council is hereby removed at once through this act from participation in wireless facilities' siting regulatory processes; and

(j) Given CT Public Utilities Regulatory Authority's (PURA's) lack of regulatory capacity over wireless facilities' operations and their specifications, and its functioning as contrary to the above federal laws and precedents, any perceived authority in its participation in wireless facility placement is hereby removed.