

LATE CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED AS OF APRIL 11, 2024

[EXTERNAL] Att tower on Giffen ave.

Received: Monday, April 8, 2024, 9:37AM

I would like to state:

I am very much against the AT&T tower proposal for 2715 Giffen.

I do not see how an AT&T tower in this area is required for Public Safety. These towers lower property values and I do not want to be affected by an unnecessary project. Not to mention RFR exposure and plastic pollution.

Please don't approve this proposal.

Thanks,
Anita Miller

[EXTERNAL] Fwd: April 11 - Planning Committee meeting - public comment

Received April 10, 2024, 5:49PM

To: Suzanne Hartman, City Planner

Chairman Weeks and Members of the Planning Commission

Re: 10:1 Conditional Use Permit for a new telecommunication tower at 2715 Giffen Ave

My concerns and questions relate to the proximity of the proposed 85 foot high tower location to

densely populated subdivisions and schools within a 500 - 1500 ft distance.

- As a homeowner living in the adjacent neighborhood for 33 years I'm troubled that additional public input was not encouraged beyond the 600 ft postcard mailing distance and the PD notification. Per FCC Rules the Waterford RF emissions compliance report for AT&T Mobility defines permissible exposure for the general population this way: 'uncontrolled exposure limits apply to those situations in which persons may not be aware of the presence of electromagnetic energy, where exposure is not employment related or where persons cannot exercise control over their exposure'. It will be too late to voice concern after the monopole is erected. Has the School Board or Sutter Medical or any residents outside of the 600 ft boundary (who don't receive the PD) been

notified?

- The seven alternative sites considered (all within the same business park) did not address the distance from residential homes and schools. Why is distance from residential homes and schools not a criteria to be necessarily considered for a suitable alternate location? There is open space surrounding the business park on the south and west side. Is there an environmental restriction or is it not cost effective to explore alternative locations further away from residential and schools?
- RF sensitivity (500-1640 ft) is being researched ongoing internationally by the WHO indicating increased long-term cumulative impact risks for brain tumors (glio) and negative effects on male fertility, the eyes, breasts, fetuses, nervous system, sleep, headaches (see: evidence for clearly elevated health risk by RF from cell phone network antenna on humans - from radiofrequency sickness to cancer). Why does the Waterford RF compliance report not address the proximity to the (residential) general public? It says there is 'no hazardous exposure to the general public at ground level' and that exposure is dependent on the directional layout of the antennae. The antennae are directed N-N/E toward the schools and neighborhood from heights of 78, 76, 74 ft.
- 2 schools - R.L. Stevens elementary and Caesar Chavez Language Academy are within 1000 ft of the proposed tower. The American Academy of Pediatrics reports that children are more vulnerable to RF radiation and the cumulative damage. The California communities of Palo Alto, Los Altos, Walnut Creek, San Diego, Encinitas all have policies, ordinances or zoning that ensures cellular antennas are restricted to a specific minimum distance from schools (1000-1500 ft). Why can't Santa Rosa have the same high standards? City of Santa Rosa (attachment 16: Presentation - pg 17) " the City has no discretion to deny a Telecommunication Facility due to concerns about exposure".
- The proposed monopole consists of 12 antennas, 18 radios, 2 microwave dishes. There will be vertical space available for future co-location of antennas by other wireless carriers. What will the future carriers load at 'full build-out' add to the maximum permissible exposure (MPE) limits? Within the US there are many cities that have initiated ordinances with exemplary radiofrequency radiation testing requirements; ie. routine, annual radiofrequency radiation emission assessments (balloon tests?) to ensure continued compliance with FCC emissions limits. Within California - Davis,

Fairfax, Suisun City require testing by a licensed professional engineer post-installation and every year thereafter, at maximum power, including cumulative impacts from nearby facilities , to verify compliance. Why can't Santa Rosa have the same high standards to test for variable exposure over time?

- Finally I'd like to know if the City has sufficiently addressed the impact and potential danger to the residential/school area of a major Earthquake or Fire. ? Homeowners in proximity are complying with Cal OES seismic retrofits due to the heavy clay soil content in the area. Can this monopole pass seismic safety standards?

Thank you for considering these concerns. I continue to trust in the neutrality and intelligent due

diligence of our City Planners to have the best interest of all Santa Rosa citizens . This is the

first time since moving to Santa Rosa in 1986 that I have been moved to advance my concerns.

Marsha Greenfield