

WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED

To: Suzanne Hartman, Project Planner

Re: Verizon Wireless Proposed Telecom. Facility

I received the tiny print post card a few days ago (close to Thanksgiving) Which is impossible to read or clearly understand. The diagram itself is even smaller than the mini-printing and insulting to ones intelligence.

Because Vintage Park residents, and all others who received these postcards, when so many were away for Thanksgiving or dealing with illness, we need two more weeks to respond with questions and concerns.

The postcard was hurried and without proofreading. For instance, I could not find any date for the meeting nor did it say what meeting, where and when, and can the public attend. Colgan area neighbors should be included and allowed to discuss questions and concerns. Also, be listened to without time constraints.

Another error is in the wheelchair section of the card. The very last line of that paragraph reads:

“Meeting information can also be accessed via
The internet at.”

That line ends with a period, not a website address. This alone shows the extreme hastiness (or intention) by the cards creator. More important, it's a crucial loss of information to the reader.

On the front of the card there's a map with Colgan Avenue. La Esplanada condos with some of their buildings are drawn on it. There's a black star marking Verizon's proposed location (244 Colgan Ave.)

Vintage Park Sr. Apts. lies directly across from that star. Yet no mention of us, or drawings of 120 units, exist. There are two residents in many of those units. There is no mention of us or them...on entire postcard.

My two biggest concerns are noise and health. Noise alone can, and does, worsen health. I discovered that CEQA (Ca. Environmental Quality Act) exists from 1970. So one question is:

Has an **environmental impact report** been done on Verizon's proposed project??? If so, does it address noise?

Will there be other potential negative effects on human health...like cancer risks from radiation. Will traffic be increased to the site (and pollution along with it)?

If Verizons proposed project is as sloppy, confusing, and unprofessional as the postcards, it's doomed from the get-go. The "get-go" just got up and went.

Annie Acker 

Vintage Park Sr. Apts.

135 Colgan, #2039, Santa Rosa.

My name is Judy Salerno and I live at 141 Colgan Avenue #1087, across the street from the Proposed Verizon Project.

Firstly, let me address the timing of your notice. You have not provided enough time to respond to your notice. Maybe picking a holiday weekend, small print unintentional, but from a resident's perspective, it appears intentional.

Frankly, I am astonished that the city would plunk down such a large project among a growing mixed-use community with retail and residential apartment buildings on an unpaved, extremely busy street that commuters use to reach Costco, surround retail outlets and access to Highway 101 in what has become an important vital and thriving community.

Santa Rosa Avenue's four way access at Colgan Avenue, with highway 101 access to the north, and access to highway 101 South, is a half city block away, is already difficult and dangerous to traverse. Many of our seniors living here do not have vehicles and must walk the unpaved conditions of Colgan Avenue, will make this long-term construction project a living hell. Can there be anything more unattractive than a chain-link fence?

I understand that these projects are necessary in growing cities, I hold no personal angst or animosity towards Verizon itself, I am addressing the idea of putting a project like this front and center of a vibrant and busy street. I have been a resident of Vintage Park Senior Apartments for 12 years. Before that, I was a resident of 626 Pine Street, where I worked hard to help designate Burbank Gardens a Historical neighborhood and worked with the City that paved our entire 60 acres with new streets. I know this area intimately. I met my husband at the El Rancho in 1977. I know Santa Rosa Avenue has always been considered a poor side of town, with strip clubs and trailer parks, etc. We are no longer that Avenue. You are aware, I'm sure, that currently, hundreds of apartments and homes to our left on Petaluma Blvd. are going up with more to follow.

I am asking for more appropriate notification for this community. I am asking for a representative to meet with our community personally. Not enough time has been allocated to notify this community. These notices are often mistakenly considered trash. The print is too small.

The city has always been receptive to the needs of the community. When the community finds out this economic development project is being proposed, not at our back door, but front and center in our face every day will not go unaddressed. Denial can be the only reasonable answer to Verizon's submission.

We are asking for a denial of this project. I am aware of contact from Ms. Laurinda Atwood. I am communicating with her on this dead in the water project, we are asking city planners if they would like this in their front yard.

We would appreciate project submittal documents to submit to our community.

I am stating for the record, that the Verizon Project Application at 244 Colgan Ave is DIRECTLY across the street from Vintage Park Senior Apartments at 147 Colgan and other building numbers (137, 139 et cetera).

I received the NOTICE OF APPLICATION in todays mail and request accommodation for the senior aged tenants that reside in close proximity to the proposed cell tower and other equipment. The residents age 63 and older, many with existing health issues, who would be at risk for scientifically documented adverse health affects of the EMF of the tower and other equipment. (UCBerkeley has a credentialed group that is solely dedicated to the data collection for this subject matter.)

1) The print size of of the mailing card is at an extremely small sized font of about 6 pt, which is not readable to most of the senior residents that reside here, and we ask that the information be presented in a fair and appropriate manner that the "PROJECT DESCRIPTION" and other information contained on the small card, be made accessible ie. is resent in a format that is READABLE in acceptable larger font size of 18 point, that I may distribute to the other residents in person. Many of the residents do not pick up their mail on a daily basis due to mobility problems, but instead once weekly.

The card received today says under PURPOSE OF ACTION. "Provide written or oral comment by November 27, 2023. This date is one week from today, when I received the card, which is not readable. Also, this is a holiday Thanksgiving week, which cuts into the days that residents will be available, many having opportunity to see family so will not be available. The time line of seven days may be reasonable for the billion dollar company that wants to rush the application through City of Santa Rosa,

Planning & Economic Development Department. The deep pockets of Verizon which would be the party benefiting from this project, and would save that company time, money and delays so strategically positioned to sneak, cheat, and otherwise circumvent challenges by neighbors, to achieve the intended goal of approval stage.

The time line of the corporate strategy is cost effective for VERIZON obviously, but does not accommodate, nor is it reasonable for the low income ELDERLY residents that struggle with daily tasks, have limited energy, and health issues such as pain and limitations that make every day activities more difficult and time consuming. A few of our younger an/ or healthier residents would like to organize an effort of outreach to educate and inform other tenants here, one week is clearly biased for Verizon and discriminatory to the elderly residents given the situation.

On the bottom of the card it states “ If the request is received at least 7 business days prior to the meeting the copy shall be provided no later than two (2) business days prior to the meeting. Again, the time constraint is discriminatory to the elderly population here, as there is no way that one or two residents can reach and educate the other 100 tenants in two days.

I am responding to the notice of application regarding the Verizon Wireless New Telecommunication Facility at 244 Colgan Ave., Santa Rosa, CA 95404. On November 14, the Santa Rosa City Council heard testimony from Sidnee Cox , Mary Dahl, and Kim Schroeder regarding strengthening the ordinance regarding cell tower placement given the health impacts they exact on residents living nearby. In 2021, Safe Tech for Santa Rosa, a community group, previously helped the council draft a protective small cell ordinance regarding small cell placement. These residents explained at length how devastating nearby Verizon towers have been to their neighbors, including children. Ms. Dahl, who lives 42 ft. away from a cell tower, described the health issues she's encountered from the radio frequency radiation. All speakers argued for stronger protection, especially in light of AB965, which allows telecom companies the ability to file hundreds of proposed sites at once, otherwise impeding local control over tower placement.

I am similarly concerned regarding wireless radiation that would otherwise affect me, my neighbors, and other residents living across the street from the proposed tower on Colgan. The close proximity of the proposed tower to the La Esplanada Condominiums, an adjacent

retirement condominium complex, and nearby houses raises the specter of harm. The proposed site is a shorter distance that encountered by Ms. Dahl in her neighborhood. In an attempt to mitigate such issues in advance here, I urge that the location be moved to a less densely housed area, closer to exclusively commercial areas (not mixed use). Is this the least intrusive means to provide wireless service? The currently proposed site, across the street from multiple residences, indicates otherwise. Thank you for your consideration.

We are vigorously opposed to the proposed Verizon cell tower adjacent to Costco and multifamily housing.

The City must deny this project based on the following:

1. Pursuant to FCC regulations Verizon must provide substantial evidence of a gap in service. This has not been done.
2. The application materials submitted by Verizon indicate that the maximum microwave exposure levels of the proposed cell tower will exceed even the very high NEIR levels established by the FCC.
3. There does not appear to be a sufficient documentation in the application materials to determine if the proposed cell tower complies with the National Electrical Code. Cell tower fires are commonly caused by electrical problems.

Santa Rosa needs an adequate Telecommunications Ordinance that ensures the community will not be impacted by the adverse health impacts of exposure 24/7 to high levels of microwave radiation.

Please enter this correspondence into the public record along with the following link from *Physicians for Safe Technology*.

<https://mdsafetech.org/cell-tower-health-effects/>

Greetings Suzanne, Thanks for your call today.

This is a very bad idea for the health of residents in the apartments and businesses and a park in this sensitive area.

The radiation will be constant 24-7 in all directions coming from over 20 antennas.

People and children are getting sick from

this intense RFR exposure which will double when other telecom companies can add their antennas to those already there. This is not safe exposure as we and our grandchildren visit the Colgan Creek Park very close by.

Members of SafeTech4SantaRosa have measured radiofrequency radiation levels near similar towers using well-calibrated RFR meters. Due to the lobe-shaped directional radiating energy from the towers, we have found that RFR levels can actually increase with distance. We have found RFR levels of more than 600,000 uW/m² (microwatts per meter squared) at 200 feet from a 12 antenna facility. Scientists have determined that levels over 1,000 uW/m² can cause biological harm for long term exposure. Source: SafeTech4SantaRosa.org

This is a very bad place to put this cell tower with so high RFR levels. This is especially true for the residents and children that cannot move out of the affected area, living and sleeping with constant emitting radiation day and night with no way to escape from these 4-5G high frequencies. This is an experiment risking the health and welfare of Santa Rosa residents in this area.

I worked for the City of Santa Rosa Park and Rec for 34 years, retiring in 2010. My family and I are against this placement of this cell tower in this sensitive area considering the health consequences to the adults and children residents living nearby and others working and shopping in this area. Verizon will not admit to any adverse effects to our health, even though these are verified results.

Wireless radiation is an undeniable risk to human health as evidenced by a voluminous body of sobering research. While I acknowledge that FCC rulings somewhat compromise your authority to apply that evidence to local telecommunication facility siting, you must use your position to deny Verizon's applications based on the authority you do have.

As City planners, you can and must demand that Verizon demonstrate a service coverage gap, as well as demonstrate that the proposed facility is the least intrusive means of addressing that gap. Further, if RF radiation exceeds the Maximum Permissible Exposure limit at any elevation, the proposed project must be denied.

Bottom line: 1) This facility will be too close to a location at which workers must put in daily hours, trapped near unsafe radiation. 2) Verizon's coverage in the area is very likely already adequate for mobile voice phone calls and text, *which is all FCC rulings require*. If it were not already adequate, Verizon would likely not be concealing their data (calling it "proprietary").

Thank you for your responsible attention to this matter of resident and worker safety.

I hereby object to the proposed LOCATION of the Verizon cell tower. I am in the process of preparing my objection to the location, and scanning the attachments. It will take me a couple of days to finish. I will forward to you upon completion.

Please do not let a cell tower be installed behind Costco in Santa Rosa. Wireless signal emits radio frequency RADIATION !!!!! We are already inundated with TOO MUCH RADIATION from all forms of wireless tech !!! There are many residential apartments in that area. Already people , animals, bees , trees are getting sick and dying from this RADIATION !!!!! The FCC has ignored 25 years of research that proves that wireless tech is UNHEALTHY for ALL LIFE.... . PLEASE do the right thing,... get educated , and use the precautionary principle = unless proven healthy , do not proceed and allow harm to occur....., sickness, bee colony collapse, failure to migrate for birds.... The FCC is a captured agency and does NOT protect us but only looks out for the greedy interests of the tech industry . PLEASE NO CELL TOWER !!!!! Theresa Melia Graton Ca. I shop SR regularly ., I get terrible headaches when exposed to Radio Frequency Radiation .

Families Advocating for Chemical and Toxics Safety (FACTS) respectfully asks you to deny Verizon's proposed cell tower at 244 Colgan Ave., **due to lack of FCC-required evidence of "Probable Dropped Call Log Data Set."**

Per the FCC, all carriers, including Verizon, are required to provide evidence that this Cell Tower is needed per dropped call logs in the form of a probable/queryable data set. Please ensure City of Santa Rosa includes with this important legal requirement by demanding Verizon provide the data set. Without this evidence of need, residents, businesses, and shoppers risk over-exposure to RF radiation. Please refer to the user manual for your cell phone to see the **warning about cell phone radiation**. Please see this Newsweek article that the proliferation of wireless radiation has not been adequately tested:

In addition, the FCC tests do not consider biological effects caused by anything other than the heat generated from radio-frequency energy, like altered protein expression or DNA damage. Experts and organizations like the Environmental Working Group have expressed concern over the testing rules for cell phones, citing studies that show links between cancers and cell phone radiation exposure. In 2011, a World Health Organization report classified radiation from cell phones as "possibly carcinogenic to humans," particularly as cell phone use relates to an increased risk for glioma, a malignant type of brain cancer.

Then there are the gaps in cell phone radiation testing. The American Academy of Pediatrics, for example, recently urged the FCC to begin taking child users of cellphones into account. "Children are not little adults and are disproportionately impacted by all environmental exposures, including cell phone radiation," their letter to the FCC reads.

<https://www.newsweek.com/iphone-6-bendgate-apple-says-your-iphone-shouldnt-go-your-pocket-avoid-273313>

FACTS is a project of the Center for Environmental Health, and we are an educational and advocacy non-profit organization that serves as a

clearinghouse for evidence-based information and expert resources in children's environmental health.

The Cell Tower is across from homes/residential apartments on Colgan Ave. These residents need to be protected for potentially excessive/redundant RF radiation.

Over-exposure to RF radiation is a real risk with negative health impacts.

Further context: Santa Rosa does not engage in ongoing cell tower monitoring of the RF radiation! So, once a tower goes up, it can be collocated, meaning other carriers can add their antennas onto the tower (and in this case, the fake pine tree). This will double the already intense RF radiation levels.

FACTS calls your attention to SafeTech4SantaRosa's measurement of radiofrequency radiation levels near similar towers using well-calibrated RF radiation meters. Due to the lobe-shaped directional radiating energy from the towers, we have found that RF radiation levels can actually increase with distance. We have found RFR levels of more than 600,000 uW/m² (microwatts per meter squared) at 200 feet from a 12 antenna facility. Scientists have determined that levels over 1,000 uW/m² can cause biological harm for long term exposure.

Thank you for your service in protecting our City.

I hereby object to the proposed LOCATION of the Verizon cell tower. I am in the process of preparing my objection to the location, and scanning the attachments. It will take me a couple of days to finish. I will forward to you upon completion.

Thank you.

Hello, I want to voice my concern for cell towers which emit high radio frequencies. Our bodies are vibrational. Every organ has a different frequency at which it functions optimally. When we are exposed to these radio or other frequencies, there is biological harm done to them. Over time dysfunction and illness occur, including cancer, brain disorders, etc.

Please look at the research-there is plenty of it- and make your decisions with the full facts. Don't allow big money to skew your decisions.

I appreciate all you do!

As an 80 year old resident of Vintage Park, I am attending the Dec 14 meeting. I am very concerned that this proposed Verizon tower is literally across the street. Such close proximity is clearly prohibited; extensive scientific research indicates it will negatively affect the health of our senior community.

It will surely also affect the Costco customers and staff on the other side.

And, finally, my Verizon phone works at peak performance, though such towers are only to be considered as correction to poor cell performance.

Please stop this plan with more time for exploration.

Please 🙏 do not allow Verizon to put another dangerous 5G tower behind Costco in Santa Rosa! It will endanger the health of many residents nearby, and shoppers in the area. The radiation levels exceed safety and will multiply with each carrier that tags on. Verizon has plenty of coverage in Santa Rosa, so there is no need and it can be refused.

No no no!

This tower will expose vulnerable residents, shoppers, businesses and employees to high levels of radiofrequency radiation.

This is an absolute fact.

We are told that this radiation is “within FCC limits for 30 minute exposure.” Thousands of peer reviewed scientific studies prove biological harm at a fraction of FCC limits. *People are getting sick from this radiation.*

Why aren't we told this? Because the FCC is controlled by the very powerful telecommunications industry.

The City's HANDS ARE NOT TIED! Verizon must prove a gap in service coverage and prove their proposed tower is the least intrusive means of remedying that gap. They must also prove sufficient fall zones as well as electrical and fire safety.

A big problem: Santa Rosa does not engage in ongoing cell tower monitoring of the RF radiation!

And worst of all- once a tower goes up, it can be collocated, meaning other carriers can add their antennas onto the tower (and in this case, the fake pine tree). *This will double the already intense RFR levels.*

Members of [SafeTech4SantaRosa](#) have measured radiofrequency radiation levels near similar towers using well-calibrated RFR meters. Due to the lobe-shaped directional radiating energy from the towers, we have found that RFR levels can actually increase with distance. We have found RFR levels of more than 600,000 uW/m² (microwatts per meter squared) at 200 feet from a 12 antenna facility.

Scientists have determined that levels over 1,000 uW/m² can cause biological harm for long term exposure. Source: [SafeTech4SantaRosa.org](#)

This proposed 5G Verizon tower will have more than 20 antennas.

WE MUST STOP THIS PROPOSED FACILITY. PLEASE HELP!

I have not seen the agenda posted for the Planning Commission meeting on Dec. 14th. There is a telecommunication project proposed for 244 Colgan Ave. that will be heard at that meeting. Could you provide some more detailed information regarding this application? I would appreciate a link so I can view the entire application.

The public notice that appeared in the PD on Sunday, Dec. 3rd contained very little information, and the drawing of the faux tree cell tower with a number of antennas was quite blurry and not readable. We also don't know the name of the telecommunication company that will be housed on this tower, the

number and specs of the antennas, the engineering report, the RFR (radiofrequency radiation) compliance report, and other important info contained in the application.

Several days ago I visited the location and did not see the required sign posted informing neighbors and local businesses of this proposed installation. I will return later today to see if it is still missing.

December 12, 2023

Dear Santa Rosa Planning Commission Members,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposal by Verizon to locate a transmission tower at XXXXXXXXX. I have several reasons for my concern about this tower.

First, describing its location as 'light industrial' surely only refers to where the tower is to be located. However, unlike buildings, for which the zoning designations were clearly defined, that designation fails to acknowledge the more than one hundred apartments on the other side of Colgan Rd., and they will be affected by the radiation produced by the Verizon tower.

Although the proposal cannot be rejected based on health effects, those will be enormous for the people living in the apartments, even though the tower will come close to falling under the FCC guidelines. But allow me to elaborate on what those radiofrequency radiation (RFR) levels will do to those living there, essentially 24/7. The FCC limit was based on an RFR level that would cause a 1.8 degree F temperature rise in living tissue in 30 minutes. But that will produce another 1.8 F rise in the next half hour. In 8 hours the 16 half hour segments will produce a temperature rise of 28.8 F.

From the distribution maps Verizon provided in its proposal, the apartments are all included in the region in which the RFR level is between 100 and 5 percent of the FCC limit. Giving Verizon the benefit of the doubt, I'll assume it's 10 percent, which would mean that the temperature rise would be 8.6 F each 24 hour period.

Of course, there are caveats. Verizon's proposal states that their levels exceed the FCC limits in some places, but that this would be corrected by a 3 db (actually, a factor of about 2) reduction. Who will check to see that this has been done? This must be specified.

Furthermore, the heating would not be uniform throughout a body as large as that of a person. If they rotated, as if on a barbeque spit, it would take longer to achieve the calculated effect. But the body's primary cooling mechanism, sweating, would have been used up far too soon to prevent disaster.

The conclusion from this: the FCC's limit might be appropriate for someone remaining in a high RFR environment for short periods of time, but they are disastrous for someone living in a place subjected to RFR at their limit. Furthermore, the above argument is based only on temperature effects, which the FCC has claimed are the only effects of RFR. This is clearly wrong, as evidenced by more than one thousand published research paper claiming effects such as cancer and others. Note that these were probably not funded by telecommunications companies, unlike many of the papers telecom claims give the opposite result.

So in the summary letter, the conclusion that there are no safety concerns raised by the tower is certainly incorrect.

My second point is with regard to the monopine tower. The plastic on them degrades over time and needs to be replaced every few years. The plastic will fall into Colgan Creek, where it will

enrich whatever body of water it flows into with the plastic. And this is an environmental hazard that must be addressed by Verizon. So they can ditch the monopine, but then they run into a problem with aesthetics. Legal challenges to monopines have established that the proposal can be rejected on this basis.

Finally, it is always desirable, and sometimes required, that a proposal for a new tower be accompanied by evidence that it is required to alleviate a gap in service. The Verizon proposal claims that their study of the service in this area is proprietary, so they apparently know if a gap in service exists at the proposed location. But if they won't provide it, then one can certainly ask if they've investigated other sites, perhaps to find one that won't have such a terrible impact on the people living in the apartments.

Yours sincerely,

Richard N. Boyd, Ph.D. (in physics)

Professor Emeritus, Ohio State University

Susan Dolan
137 Colgan Avenue, Apt. 2049
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Cell: (707) 971-3187

Via E-mail

Suzanne Hartman, City Planner
And respected City Planning Commissioners
City of Santa Rosa
100 Santa Rosa Avenue
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

To be considered at the meeting of the Planning Commission on December 14, 2023, and at the hearing on December 18, 2023.

I strongly object to the proposed LOCATION for the placement of the Verizon cell tower at 244 Colgan Avenue, Santa Rosa, California.

Verizon is planning on placing the proposed tower in a dense area of the population and right across the street (about 50 feet) from my apartment complex.

My apartment complex is directly across the street from the proposed Verizon cell tower. I live in Vintage Park Senior Apartments. Our complex is less than 50 feet from the proposed tower! There are many seniors here already in poor health. The radiation waves travel 983.6 feet!

The proposed site located at 244 Colgan Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA has many nearby apartment buildings (including ours directly across the street), residences, businesses, stores, as well as an entire shopping center just a few feet on the other side of the proposed tower which includes a Costco, Target, Trader Joe's, and several other popular stores. This means thousands and thousands of people will be affected by the additional electromagnetic field (EMF) radiation from the proposed Verizon cell tower. There are already adverse health effects from the radiation. In addition, the radiation increases by 200% after 5 years. Not only that, the towers are going to increase exponentially unless we stop this runaway train!

I assume they are installing a 5G cell tower? If so, 5G needs more gigahertz and therefore, is much, much stronger as well as having more complex EMF and RF radiation which can be much more harmful in dense urban areas. It is not possible to accurately measure 5G emissions, "[T]he 5G radio emission fields are quite different to those of previous generations because of their complex beamformed transmissions in both directions – from base station to handset and for the return. Although fields are highly focused by beams, they vary rapidly with time and movement and so are unpredictable, as the signal levels and patterns interact as a closed loop system. [Health - Action Against 5g](#) In fact, Dr. Martin Pall has much more to say about the damage caused to our bodies from EMF radiation. Please look at his article.

There is very little research on anything, including the environment and birds, bees and trees, yet companies are pushing ahead with 5G. Apparently, China is finding that there is quite a negative affect [sic] on the delicate ecosystems in China with the use of 5G.

Also, pursuant to the "Oncology Letters," (here is the link to this article: [Health risks from radiofrequency radiation, including 5G, should be assessed by experts with no conflicts of interest - PMC \(nih.gov\)](#)), many of the reports on radiation health risks show no risk to health. This is because they were written either by or at the direction of a person with a vested interest in the project (i.e., a **conflict of interest**), i.e., Verizon. A conflict of interest will obviously result in a biased report.

Several scientists and doctors in the European Union called for a moratorium on the deployment of 5G because of the possible harm to human cells. A copy of that article written by Lennart Hardell and Michael Carlberg of The Environment and Cancer Research Foundation, is in the "Oncology Letters" mentioned above.

Many insurance companies will not cover injuries from EMF or radio frequency (RF) radiation. They list those types of injuries as exclusions. Why do you think that is? RISK to health. They know there is a huge risk because it is not being researched first. Shoot and ask questions later, right? See report by Dr. Elizabeth Lee Vliet [Health Ranger Report: Dr. Elizabeth Lee Vliet warns about the dangers of 5G and EMF radiation | ripehealth - latest medical, fitness, healthcare and more](#). This article is current as of November 21, 2023. They know it causes damage to your health.

The Santa Rosa City Municipal Code, with regard to installation of cell towers, at section 13-06.070 states:

"Findings—Decisions—Consultants.

(A) Findings Required for Approval.

(1) Except for eligible facilities requests, the Director of Transportation and Public Works or the City Manager or designee, as the case may be, shall approve an application if, on the basis of the application and other materials or evidence provided in review thereof, it finds the following:

(a) The facility is not detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare;

...."

You will note (a) above. We believe this facility WILL BE DETRIMENTAL to public health, safety, and welfare.

Theodora Scarato, MSW indicates that companies that install, sell, and use EMF radiation have advised their shareholders about the risk for lawsuit due to the effect of the radiation on our health. What happens when everyone is sued as a class action? Are we going to have to get all these cell companies out of bankruptcy like with PG & E? This cost would be enormous. Not only that, but the report states in pertinent part: "The proposed ordinance will focus on the placement, . . . in a manner that considers the . . . public health and safety" [EPA Letter Confirms Lack of Wireless and 5G Safety Regulations for Birds, Bees and Trees - Environmental Health Trust \(ehtrust.org\)](#)

In addition, Ms. Scarato received a letter from the Environmental Protection Agency Lee Ann B. Veal, Director, Radiation Protection Division, Office of Radiation and Indoor Air, (in the link in the previous paragraph) which confirms they have never reviewed the impact to birds, bees, and trees either. In fact, no agency has set limits for birds, bees, or trees. Studies on bees however, revealed that their behavioral effects disrupted navigation and their egg laying rate decreased. "Research has found a high level of damage to trees from antennae radiation" showing they sustained more damage on the side of the tree facing the antennae.

I recently saw a television series based on the gas leak from December of 1984 in Bhopal, India. They did not believe that anyone would possibly put a Union Carbide plant with a lethal chemical right in the middle of a large city in India. Union Carbide knew it was lethal because they ran tests 15 years prior which conclusively showed the MIC was fatal. But Union Carbide kept that information from the public and the nearby railroad. Then the accident occurred, a leak of the lethal chemical, and 15,000 people were killed. Not only that, but Union Carbide also kept secret that there was an antidote, but they did not allow the antidote to come into the city because it made them look guilty. I feel like that is what could happen here. And this is only the beginning. I believe we are being misled about the effects of cell towers, streaming, wi fi and cell phones because there is too much money in it. They will not abandon or change it because money is more important than people, just like in India.

What about the disaster in Chernobyl? Let us keep our citizens safe, please.

The Physicians for Safe Technology are a very good resource with regard to harm caused by cell towers and radiation as a result of wireless devices. Their link is as follows: [Physicians for Safe Technology | Wireless Technology and Public Health \(mdsafetech.org\)](#).

I know we cannot stop progress, and I know I want to continue to use a cell phone myself, but I would like to keep as safe as I possibly can until all of the risks are

Suzanne Hartman, City Planner
And Respected City Planning Commissioners
December 13, 2023
Page 4

known. We need to wait until more research has been done, especially for 5G. I do not keep my cell phone in the bedroom at night because I do not want it near me. I keep it in the living room. **Some say EMF and RF radiation is the tobacco of our generation.** See: [Physicians for Safe Technology | Wireless Technology and Public Health \(mdsafetech.org\)](https://www.mdsafetech.org).

I propose that Verizon change the location of this cell tower away from the heart of residences and shopping centers to a more rural location. The radiation is also harming birds bees and trees though. If they are unable to relocate it, then I propose they try to work out a deal to share one of the other five (5), yes five, cell towers within a 1-mile radius instead of adding more cell towers. The effect of the EMF radiation decreases the further away the tower is.

The digital age is becoming a runaway train. We are not waiting to see the damage this radiation causes. See attached article, "EMF Caution." Will we care once it is known? What if your child or parent is damaged as a result? Will you care then? We need to think about our future, and especially the future of our children and grandchildren. What kind of world do we want to leave them with?

It is the job of the City of Santa Rosa to protect its residents.

Please move the proposed Verizon cell tower to a location that is less populated and away from senior citizens and protective of nature.

We need to find another way. I can be reached at (707) 971-3187.

Thank you for your consideration of my objection.

Sincerely,



Susan Dolan

Juzanne Hartman, Project Planner Sautz Rosa City

reder

<https://childrenshealthdefense.org/defender/henry-hank-allen-chd-verizon-lawsuit-radiofrequency-radiation-cell-towers/>

12/12/23

•

[Big Tech](#)


› [News](#)

CHD Funds Lawsuit on Behalf of Man Who Says Verizon Cell Tower Triggered Life-Threatening Cardiac Events

The lawsuit, filed today, could set an important legal precedent that would help people like Henry “Hank” Allen, who have electromagnetic sensitivity, fight back against cell towers being placed near their homes.

By

[Suzanne Burdick, Ph.D. Brenda Baletti, Ph.D.](#)



Miss a day, miss a lot. Subscribe to The Defender's Top News of the Day. It's free.

An Idaho man alleging the radiofrequency radiation emitted by a cell tower installed next to his home triggered more than 15 episodes of atrial fibrillation today sued Verizon and other companies involved in the operation of the tower.

Henry "Hank" Allen, age 53, said his electromagnetic sensitivity (EMS) makes him vulnerable to life-threatening cardiac episodes, which began in April 2021, when Verizon activated the tower.

The lawsuit, funded by Children's Health Defense (CHD) and filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Idaho Southern Division, could set an important legal precedent that would help others with EMS who want to fight back against having a cell tower placed near where they live.

W. Scott McCollough, lead litigator for CHD's Electromagnetic Radiation (EMR) and Wireless cases, told The Defender:

"It's becoming really clear that this massive deployment of wireless technology everywhere is functionally prohibiting a large number of people from being able to participate in society or even live safely in their own homes.

In addition to protecting disabled people individually, she said, the cases are testing whether the ADA can be used “as an effective means to push back against the uncontrolled rollout of wireless infrastructure.”

“We are very excited to launch this new strategic line of cases, which we hope will shift the paradigm for people severely harmed and disabled by RF radiation,” she said.

McCullough said these cases are significant because the number of people affected by EHS is substantial. “We’re talking millions of people, and hundreds of thousands for whom it just ruins their lives completely.”

“The numbers are such that, frankly, we expect to find that it overwhelms the people who are already disabled by other causes,” he added, and people disabled by EHS must also be accommodated under the ADA.

Man moves to rural Idaho to escape RF radiation

Allen was diagnosed with EMS in 2014 while working as a licensed general contractor in California on job sites with high RF radiation.

After realizing how exposure to RF radiation was exacerbating his EMS symptoms, he and his family decided to relocate to a small farm in Idaho roughly two miles away from a cell tower.

Allen also changed careers to minimize his exposure to RF radiation by getting licensed as a real estate broker and working from his home, which he hardwired for internet access.

With these changes, Allen was able “to successfully live and work normally from home despite his disability” — until April 2021, when Verizon built a cell tower next to his property.

Shortly after Verizon turned on the tower, Allen’s health “took a dramatic downturn” as he suffered atrial fibrillation and was rushed to the emergency room “unsure whether he would live,” the complaint said.

A doctor did an echocardiogram, ran a full blood panel, did a cardioversion to restore a regular heartbeat and gave Allen IV drugs to slow his heart rate.

Two days later, it happened again.

In March 2022, Allen had invasive heart surgery — cardiac ablation — to treat the recurrent heart rhythm problems.

However, Verizon, AT&T and Dish in 2022 added additional antennas to the tower.

“This equipment ... also triggers Mr. Allen’s severe and in some instances life-threatening symptoms associated with his recurring and ongoing disability,” stated Allen’s lawyers in an

“This case is designed to recognize the fact that wireless technology does indeed make a lot of people sick, and also to give them some much needed relief.”

In addition to Verizon, defendants in the suit include Horizon Tower LLC, which owns and operates the tower, and telecommunication providers AT&T and Dish Wireless, which also own and operate equipment at the tower site.

According to the lawsuit, Allen said the high levels of radiofrequency (RF) radiation emitted by the tower also exacerbated other EMS symptoms, including tinnitus, extreme fatigue, impaired memory and vision, sleep disruption, and flu-like symp

EMS, sometimes called electromagnetic hypersensitivity (EHS) or microwave syndrome, is the “medical term” for a federally recognized condition — protected under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) — in which individuals suffer adverse health effects due to electromagnetic field (EMF) exposure.

Up to 30% of the U.S. population experiences mild EHS, 1.5-5% have moderate cases of the condition, approximately 1.5% suffer severe cases like Allen’s, and approximately 0.65% cannot work at all because of their disability.

The complaint said Allen “lives and works in constant fear for his health and his very life” because of the constant RF exposure he is subjected to and the defendants “refuse to recognize the federal disability laws that would solve the conflict.”

McCullough said in a press release the lawsuit is a civil rights case that offers “a new legal theory” under the ADA:

“Federal courts must apply federal disability laws to protect people disabled by RF radiation coming from cell towers.

“If Hank’s case is successful, the court will either remove the tower, or otherwise order the telecom defendants to modify their operations in order to not so intensively beam RF radiation through Hank’s home so he can live in peace.”

More lawsuits like this are coming

Allen’s case is the first in a series of strategic cases that CHD will fund later this year and in 2024 on behalf of individuals with EMS, according to Miriam Eckenfels-Garcia, director of CHD’s EMR program.

“In these lawsuits, we are leveraging federal disability laws to petition for reasonable accommodation for clients that have been disabled by RF radiation coming from a cell tower near them,” Eckenfels-Garcia told The Defender.

August 2023 letter to Verizon, AT&T and Dish in which they asked the companies to provide disability accommodations/modifications.

Allen has “exhausted all available self-help options,” according to the complaint, including painting his house with RF-blocking paint, tinting the windows with RF-blocking tint, utilizing wire screens and wearing special clothing that blocks RF.

The RF emitted by the transmitting equipment threatens the plaintiff’s life. “His condition is such that he may die as a result of the next cardiac event caused from RF exposure,” the complaint alleges.

The wireless companies responded to Allen’s request for a reasonable accommodation/modification by claiming that the federal disability laws do not apply to their tower operations because they do not meet the criteria for a “place of public accommodation.”

The “Courts of Appeals” are split, according to the complaint, on whether a “place” refers to an actual physical structure or whether it also applies to goods, services and privileges that are also offered “virtually.”

The complaint argues that the space on the tower leased to the telecommunications companies and associated infrastructure that are necessary to access the internet constitute a physical “place” subject to compliance with the ADA. It adds that given that access to the virtual realm is essential to modern life, it should also be considered a “place,” under the ADA.

Although Allen subscribes to wireless services, he cannot use them without accommodation because they severely exacerbate his disability.

Local residents didn’t want tower

A planning commission in Ada County, Idaho, granted Horizon a conditional use permit to construct the tower in 2018, the complaint says.

However, after local residents told their representatives that extra communications infrastructure was not necessary, elected Ada County representatives voted to overrule the commission and deny Horizon’s permit application.

The tower was very unpopular in the Eagle, Idaho, community, according to the complaint, which already had extensive broadband coverage that the city had paid to install and was not dependent on the tower or antennas.

Instead, the tower and antennas were useful and lucrative to wireless companies to expand private mobile data service.

Horizon appealed and Ada County settled the dispute by reinstating the conditional use permit. The tower and its first antennas were built in 2020 and 2021 and RF began transmitting from the tower in March 2021.

The plaintiff's symptoms began soon thereafter.

Here's what Allen wants from the lawsuit

Allen hopes the court will rule on at least three things.

First, he is asking the court to rule that provisions in the ADA apply to cell towers when they transmit RF radiation through the homes and bodies of EMS-disabled individuals.

In turn, Allen hopes the court will conclude that Horizon, Verizon, AT&T and Dish violated the ADA by refusing to engage in a good faith process to accommodate his disability and that he is entitled to a remedy that will allow him to access services without being substantially injured by them.

Second, he asked the court to end the defendants' discrimination against him by mandating the tower be moved "to a new location that is reasonably calculated to avoid injuring the disabled population," meaning that it wouldn't be installed right next to other citizens with EMS.

Alternatively, he is asking the companies to be compelled to utilize their existing technological capabilities to adequately reduce the amount of RF energy directed at his home and body.

Third, he is asking the court to compel the companies to stop discriminating against him and instead make reasonable accommodations so he can access their services.

Allen is requesting a jury trial, where a jury can provide him with the requested relief, as well as attorney fees and costs.