

Public Correspondence received as of March 27, 2024.

---

**[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](http://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](http://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

---