

[EXTERNAL] 2715 giffin avenue cell phone tower
Mon 3/25/2024 10:49 AM

I am opposed to yet another cell phone tower in Santa rosa. When will it stop? When is enough enough?

Who is the applicant? It does not say on your signage at the property.

Santa Rosa has over 40 cell phone towers and does not need another one. Every time that big Telecom applies for a permit, they do not prove a gap in coverage by drive by Tess and drop call data. They are only telling you there is a gap and coverage and the city buys it every time. if you look at Verizon's maps for Santa rosa, they indicate there is no Gap in coverage. In other words that Santa Rosa is fully covered. They only want more cell phone towers for streaming. This has nothing to do with emergency calls and texting.

There is a neighborhood adjacent to this site to the Northeast and another one to the east. These people are going to experience increased levels of radiation. This type of radiation has been classified as a possible carcinogen to humans by the international agency for research on cancer or IARC which is part of the WHO. The IARC listed it as a 2B carcinogen although many scientists on that panel wanted it to be listed as a proven carcinogen or 1A.

The city's own telecommunication ordinance says that you cannot locate a cell phone tower within 2 miles of another one. I'm sure there are plenty of other cell phone towers within 2 miles starting with the 5G by Verizon at the corner of Fresno and Occidental road.

Please deny the permit.

Sincerely
Jennifer LaPorta

[EXTERNAL] 2715 Giffen Av macrotower application PLEASE READ

Wed 3/27/2024 12:26 PM

Dear Santa Rosa Planning Commission,

I am opposed to yet another cell phone MACRO tower in our fine city. THis one is for AT&T and has 12 antennae. It is adjacent to a residential district (to the NE), with another residential district a short distance to the East. It's about 2 blocks from Kaiser Permanente on Mercury Way in Santa Rosa.

I know you're not allowed to reject it on the basis of "environmental or health" effects. Ever wonder why that is? Because there's a GAG order on the TRUTH about cell phone towers and their harmful effects.

This overreach of Big Telecom has created a **public health NUISANCE**, which will likely result in a **public health CRISIS**, as more people become sick from the cumulative effects of EMFs (electro magnetic fields). EMFs are like smoking was in the 50s and 60s, when people did not know they'd suffer and die from emphysema, lung and throat cancers decades later. Did you know we are now exposed to one quintillion times more EMFs than 20 years ago? That's a one with 18 zeros!

They say that it will operate under FCC guidelines. Look: The FCC is run by industry insiders and doesn't have a single scientist on board. Their 1996 emission guidelines were found to be outdated by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit on 8/13/21, yet the FCC has refused to update them. Their guidelines are not based on any biological effects; only thermal effects. The US has some of the highest emission guidelines in the world. The Precautionary Principle and common sense requires holding off on any new permits until the new guidelines are in effect. Guidelines are not the same as safety standards, which are based on evidence based scientific study.

It's apparent that the Planning Commission has no scientists onboard, judging by Suzanne Hartman's presentation last night at City Council, in response to an appeal for another macrotower at 244 Colgan Av. There was a lack of response to our specific objections. Sheer gaslighting. We at safetech4santarosa.org have physicists, environmental health scientists, physical therapists and others who have done a fairly deep dive into this subject matter. Several of us suffer from the effects of EMFs.

In 2011, the IARC (International Agency for Research on Cancer), part of the World Health Organization, classified EMFs as a Class 2B carcinogen, meaning possibly carcinogenic to humans. Many scientists on that panel wanted to name it a Class 1A carcinogen, meaning definitely carcinogenic.

CA firefighters are well aware of this, as SB 649 **exempted fire stations** from cell phone antennae in 2017. This was a result of firefighters' illnesses linked to these antennae on their stations. The firefighters suffered from headache, insomnia, brain fog, getting lost in the same town they grew up in, sometimes forgetting protocol in routine medical procedures, mood swings and infertility.

In 2004 a **SPECT brain imaging** pilot study was conducted on California firefighters who had lived in the shadow of a tower for over five years. The study, conducted by Gunnar Heuser, MD, PhD, found **brain abnormalities** in all six men, including delayed reaction time, lack of impulse control, and cognitive impairment.

If we care enough about firefighters' health, what about the rest of us?

We do not consent to be guinea pigs in this experiment on our health and lives!

See you on 3/28 for your public hearing!!!

Jennifer LaPorta, Santa Rosa 95407

BS Environmental Health

REHS Registered Environmental Health Specialist, ret.

[EXTERNAL] 2715 Giffen Av STUDIES

Wed 3/27/2024 3:42 PM

At the 1/11/24 Planning Commission meeting, Jeff Holton asked for reputable scientific studies to be sent. He cited the National Cancer Society as saying EMFs are no problem re cancer. However, the NCS is funded by Big Pharma. Not very reputable.

You need to check out Environmental Health Trust at ehtrust.org

They are independent environmental scientists. Check the science tab and the policy tab. I understand you don't set policy, but please take some time to educate yourselves. What will you do when a 4G or 5G antennae is placed on YOUR block???

It is a FALLACY that the federal Telecom Act (TCA) trumps what you can approve, as per what Mr. Peterson said on 1/11/24. You CAN legally deny a tower based on adequate proof of a gap in coverage (based on drive tests and dropped call DATA), and/or ugly esthetics, and/or the zoning code which says you cannot build macrotowers within 2 miles of each other, and/or undue environmental impacts, such as the bits of plastic that will degrade over time and fall off the tower, thus creating microplastics in the environment.

Jennifer LaPorta

please add this to my public comments

[EXTERNAL] future telecommunications proposals

Thu 4/4/2024 1:45 PM

5846 Leona Court

Windsor, CA 95492

April 4, 2024

City Planner- Suzanne Hartman: Hartman, Suzanne

Deputy Director, Jessica Jones

Planning Commission Members

Re: Future Telecommunications Proposals

Dear City Planner Hartman, Deput Director Jones, and Planning Commission Members Weeks, Duggan, Sanders, Peterson, Carter, and Cisco,

I would like to address some of the confusion you may be having with respect to proposals from the telecommunications industry giants for new macro towers in Santa Rosa. I have discussed some of these points in previous letters to the City Council and Planning Commission, but I will put all of my points together in this document. With the industry pushing the positive aspects of wireless radiofrequency radiation, RFR, and only a few people opposing it, such confusion is easy to understand. The opposition is based primarily on health concerns about such installations, although there are certainly other issues. But you will surely get more proposals in the future, so please allow me to comment on how you might approach them.

I'm well qualified to comment on the issues that arise in your considerations. I'm a retired physics professor, began my career as an experimental nuclear physicist, and ultimately evolved into astrophysics and astrobiology. I have written 250 scientific papers and written several books, one dealing with hazards and safe uses of RFR. I've given several public talks on RFR. And I have no axes to grind; I even own a cell phone.

One of the statements that telecom representatives make repeatedly is "**There is not a shred of evidence that RFR is harmful to human health.**" It would be overly generous to characterize this as a misrepresentation. There are thousands of research papers, reporting on work done in many countries, peer reviewed and published in respected journals. These deal with a litany of symptoms associated with excessive RFR exposure to humans: headaches, brain fog, nausea, heart symptoms, and more serious ones, including cancer. I have attached as the last pages of this letter the preface to the BioInitiative Report, a compilation of more than 1800 peer reviewed research papers assembled by 29 mostly M.D. and Ph.D. research professionals. Most of the papers report symptoms of RFR illness at exposure levels far below that that the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) calls its Maximum Permissible Exposure (MPE).

What about cancer? The International Agency for Research on Cancer, part of the World Health Organization, classifies RFR as a group 2B carcinogen for gliomas (brain cancers). That means that there are significant data supporting RFR as a possible cause of gliomas, but they say more research is needed. The American Cancer Society agrees with that assessment. Other types of cancers may be of even greater concern. Recent work (see Press Democrat, March 28 issue) indicates a shocking increase in colorectal cancers in young people, a cohort that has never had many CRCs until recent years. Doctors are struggling to identify causes but may soon study correlations between CRCs and cell phones. In which pocket did the patient keep his or her cell phone?

So, there are many well known responses to excessive RFR exposure, and more will undoubtedly develop in the near future.

Telecom must be aware of these problems. There are several lawsuits around the USA that have resulted from people having to leave their houses, due to a macro tower having been built close to it, to survive. Telecom, of course, denies the RFR is the cause.

Another issue that must be addressed is the FCC MPE. Telecom's standard claim here is "**This tower is safe because it satisfies the FCC MPE everywhere.**" The MPE has been the FCC's limit on RFR exposure since experiments were done in the 1990s under the auspices of the *International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection*, ICNRP, on a handful of rats and monkeys that were exposed to RFR for several tens of minutes. Some burns were observed on the animals. But the ICNRP concluded that the **Exposure** represented by an **Exposure Rate** of 1 milliwatt per square centimeter for a **Time** of 30 minutes was acceptable. The FCC adopted the ICNRP **Exposure** as their MPE. Note that **Exposure** is the **Exposure Rate** multiplied by **Time**.

Exposure = (Exposure Rate) x Time

The FCC also concluded that workers could sustain an **Occupational Exposure Rate** that is a factor of 5 larger for one-fifth the **Time**. This would produce the same MPE.

However, what matters is the **Exposure**. What if you're working an 8 hour shift in an environment that is at the **Exposure Rate** the FCC found acceptable for 30 minutes? There are 16 half hour segments in 8 hours, which means you'll get a factor of 16 times the FCC's MPE. The FCC provided no guidance for such situations. Similarly, if your home is in such an environment, but now you get exposed 24/7. As you know, legislation has been passed that prevents you from rejecting a telecom proposal on the basis of health effects. However, that does not apply to situations in which the 30 minute FCC MPE is exceeded. And it will be in many situations involving longer **Times** than 30 minutes. Telecom needs to consider what happens in the work or living conditions I mentioned. They've apparently assumed that after 30 minutes you'll leave the high RFR environment, even if you work or live there!

For an excellent recent article that deals with the ICNRP and FCC RFR limits, see https://icbe-emf.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/ICBE-EMF-paper-12940_2022_900_OnlinePDF_Patched-1.pdf.

There are a few additional facts that need to be considered with regard to MPEs. The telecom proposals calculate a calculated maximum MPE (for a 30 minute exposure) at ground level. However, human feet are relatively insensitive to radiation. It would be much more appropriate to quote the value at five to six feet above the ground, since that's where brains live, and research has established that brains are much more sensitive to RFR than feet. Of course, the RFR levels increase with height above ground level, so that would increase the calculated maximum of the MPE that the proposal would determine.

The area at which the proposals want to locate their towers are nearly always subject to the ubiquitous RFR from nearby towers, and this is apparently not generally included in telecom's calculated maximum MPEs. That would not be difficult to include in the calculations.

A more difficult feature would be the effect to the calculated MPE from scattering of RFR. The probabilities for this are well known from physics experiments, although it might be difficult to include this effect in the calculations, since it depends not only on the variation of RFR with altitude but also on the placement and size and composition of nearby buildings. Scattering will tend to homogenize the RFR, selectively scattering it from places where the predicted values are high to where they are low. Thus it will surely also increase the calculated maximum MPE. An approximation to determine the magnitude of this effect could be made, for example, by considering the scattering from a single wall of a nearby building, from which there would be both scattering and absorption. This would not be difficult. But regardless, scattering will also surely increase the calculated MPE at a height above ground of 5 to 6 feet. All of these effects would raise the maximum estimated MPE value determined from the simple calculations of just the emissions from the antennas of a single tower. The effect could be appreciable,

In order for all of you to serve the people you represent, it's essential that you understand to what levels the citizens of Santa Rosa are being exposed. This is especially crucial when the FCC MPE appears to apply, but assumes that you'll only get exposed for 30 minutes, and when some potentially important effects have been ignored altogether. The health of the community depends critically on your decisions, and your understanding of the limitations of telecom's claims when they state that they are in concordance with the FCC limit.

I wish to mention one last thing that probably reflects more on the chicanery of telecom than anything else. In the recent Verizon proposal and in the ATT proposal an effort is made to show how little the proposed tower will affect the aesthetics of the environment. Both proposals show pictures with trees,

telephone poles, etc. in the foreground, so they look huge, and the simulated tower far enough away so that it can barely be seen. For example, if the recent Verizon proposal had shown the view from the front windows of the people in the apartments on the opposite side of Colgan Ave. from the tower, the tower would have appeared as a huge blot dominating the landscape. You can insist on realistic views of proposed towers from the vantage point of the citizens who will be most affected.

I hope this discussion has been helpful to you and that it explains why those of us who have given public comments at your meetings are so passionate about what we view to be willful dishonesty of telecom.

Yours sincerely,

Richard N. Boyd, Ph.D. (physics)
Professor Emeritus



BioInitiative 2012

A Rationale for Biologically-based Exposure Standards
for Low-Intensity Electromagnetic Radiation



You are here: [Home](#)/[Preface](#)

Search for:

Today, the BioInitiative 2012 Report updates five years of science, public health, public policy and global response to the growing health issue of chronic exposure to electromagnetic fields and radiofrequency radiation in the daily life of billions of people around the world.

The BioInitiative 2012 Report has been prepared by 29 authors from ten countries*, ten holding medical degrees (MDs), 21 PhDs, and three MsC, MA or MPHs. Among the authors are three former presidents of the Bioelectromagnetics Society, and five full members of BEMS. One distinguished author is the

Chair of the Russian National Committee on Non-Ionizing Radiation. Another is a Senior Advisor to the European Environmental Agency. As in 2007, each author is responsible for their own chapter.

The great strength of the BioInitiative Report (www.bioinitiative.org) is that it has been done independent of governments, existing bodies and industry professional societies that have clung to old standards. Precisely because of this, the BioInitiative Report presents a solid scientific and public health policy assessment that is evidence-based.

The BioInitiative Report was first posted in August 2007. It still has a significant international viewing audience. Each year, about 100,000 people visit the site. In the five years since its publication, the BioInitiative website has been accessed over 10.5 million times, or four times every minute. Every five minutes on the average, a person somewhere in the world has logged on. More than 5.2 million files and 1 million pages of information has been downloaded. That is equivalent to more than 93,000 full copies of the 650+ page report (288.5 million kbytes).

The global conversation on why public safety limits for electromagnetic and radiofrequency fields remain thousands of times higher than exposure levels that health studies consistently show to be associated with serious health impacts has intensified since 2007. Roughly, 1800 new studies have been published in the last five years reporting effects at exposure levels ten to hundreds or thousands of times lower than allowed under safety limits in most countries of the world. Yet, no government has instituted comprehensive reforms. Some actions have been taken that highlight partial solutions. The Global Actions chapter presents milestone events that characterize the international 'sea change' of opinion that has taken place, and reports on precautionary advice and actions from around the world.

The world's populations – from children to the general public to scientists and physicians – are increasingly faced with great pressures from advertising urging the incorporation of the latest wireless device into their everyday lives. This is occurring even while an elementary understanding of the possible health consequences is beyond the ability of most people to grasp. The exposures are invisible, the testing meters are expensive and technically difficult to operate, the industry promotes new gadgets and generates massive advertising and lobbying campaigns that silence debate, and the reliable, non-wireless alternatives (like wired telephones and utility meters) are being discontinued against public will. There is little labeling, and little or no informed choice. In fact there is often not even the choice to stay with safer, wired solutions, as in the case of the 'smart grid' and smart wireless utility metering, an extreme example of a failed corporate-governmental partnership strategy, ostensibly for energy conservation.

A collision of the wireless technology rollout and the costs of choosing unwisely is beginning and will grow. The groundwork for this collision is being laid as a result of increased exposure, especially to radiofrequency fields, in education, in housing, in commerce, in communications and entertainment, in medical technologies and imaging, and in public and private transportation by air, bus, train and motor vehicles. Special concerns are the care of the fetus and newborn, the care for children with learning disabilities, and consideration of people under protections of the Americans With Disabilities Act, which includes people who have become sensitized and physiologically intolerant of chronic exposures. The 2012 Report now addresses these issues as well as presenting an update of issues previously discussed.

* Sweden (6), USA (10), India (2), Italy (2), Greece (2), Canada (2), Denmark (1), Austria (2), Slovak Republic (1), Russia (1)

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "David Carpenter", written over a horizontal line.

David Carpenter, M
Co-Editor
BioInitiative Report

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Cindy Sage", written over a horizontal line.

Cindy Sage, MA
Co-Editor
BioInitiative Report

© Copyright 2006 - 2024 BioInitiative Report, All Rights Reserved. Site by Daveworks Inc.

[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

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