This update in the rules for locating reception devices on private property is an unacceptable re- configuring of the meaning and intention of the original rule. This turns towns and rural areas into a disorganized and "free-for-all" regimen for locating intense radiation devices in densely inhabited areas. It allows competing wireless companies to redundantly locate radar-frequency emitters within 50 feet of each other in the middle of dense populations if desired, as long as private landowners are willing. Worse, it encourages financial returns to landowners who are or may be ignorant of adverse side effects. The FCC ruling does not provide clear guidelines for liability issues. For landowners renting properties it exposes renters to electromagnetic radiation not of their choosing. Though telecoms are immune to complaints about health effects (1996 Telco Act which the CT supreme court says indemnifies them), the private landowners are not so indemnified against lawsuits by renters, neighbors and public passers-by based on nuisance, disability, assault, and many other legal factors. This is “externalizes” liabilities created by 5G as they disseminate it without restraint. Ultimately, long term effects of radiation DO result in adverse health effects; this situation is no different from the smoking health effects where the penalties emerge over decades, and there is, of course, no way to turn back the clock. There now is overwhelming internationally verified evidence (which the FCC has refused to acknowledge since 1996), that the non-ionizing radiation of wifi frequencies have strong health effects. The property owners who cooperate with telcos in this assault on the public welfare can be legally challenged by appeals, and the irony is that citizens are potentially turned against other citizens who collecting lease money from the telcos while the latter are indemnified. Unnecessary community divisions result. I and my family and other informed citizens in Colorado State strongly oppose such a ruling against local sovereignty of regulating bodies as well as civic cohesion and health. The responsible act for Commissioners is to revoke this ruling and focus its money and efforts on updating the 1996 outdated standards that are well overdue. As well if the FCC is not looking at health effects, they need to require the agency responsible to look at the health effects of their products before they are deployed. You can’t just deploy something that isn’t tested. This basic standard needs to be an FCC requirement before any deployment. Oppose this ruling!