PC 7-26-18

8 Pages

Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>

S17-0016 Cell Tower at Newtown Rd, Site 2

Bruce Person <bperson03@sbcglobal.net> Thu, Jun 21, 2018 at 1:02 PM
Reply-To: Bruce Person <bperson03@sbcglobal.net>
To: Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>

Dear Evan,
Please add these letters to the file, and hopefully we may have the consideration of the Planning Department and the Planning Commissioners at the meeting in July.

Bruce Person
4221 Clouds Rest Rd.
Placerville, Ca 95667

4 attachments

- **An Expensive New Scam.docx**
  12K
- **CELL FACTS.docx**
  16K
- **March 2018 NIEHS NIH National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences.docx**
  12K
- **Mission Statement.docx**
  14K

El Dorado County Planning Commision
Re: Conditional Use Permit S17-0016/AT&T CAF4, Site 2, Newtown

An Expensive New Scam

Recently I attended the AT&T public outreach meeting at the offices of El Dorado County to see if they had addressed the concerns of the public from the Planning Commission meeting where their project S17-0016 had been denied. Due to public outcry and the negligence on the part of AT&T to bring forward projects that had been adequately researched, the combined projects were denied by the Commission by a two to two vote. Now the projects will be voted on again by the Planning Commission sometime in July as individual projects instead of lumping them into a tidy package that would have only benefitted AT&T.

There were a few points of concern to the Commissioners at the first meeting which led to the denial of the project. The original denial was due to the fact that AT&T had not reached out to the neighboring landowners to present the project, and to show that they had even considered alternative locations. The aesthetic concerns of the public had not been addressed, and the potential for noise and the proximity to residential properties was seemingly of no concern to the AT&T representatives. There was very little effort put into determining if co-locations could achieve the same goal of coverage, and still these items are not adequately addressed. The Environmental Questionnaire had been filled out in a boiler plate manner for the seven different sites with glaring omissions and incorrect information leading to the thought that they had hardly even visited the sites. It was an appropriate action of the Commission to deny these projects!

At this time AT&T has lost much of its client base due to poor coverage in much of the County. Verizon has somehow created an infrastructure that meets the needs of most of those who cannot get coverage from AT&T. Now it appears that AT&T has gotten a sweetheart deal with the government to subsidize the building of new towers with public money - our money! Now you might think that using public money to build cell towers might mean we would get free service, or at least cheap service, but that is not the case. Our bills will not go down if we opt to use the publicly funded towers, and AT&T stands to gain even more when other carriers co-locate on their new towers which we are paying for! When coverage is already available, I am not sure why our tax dollars are being used to subsidize a privately owned enterprise! Co-locating on existing towers would mean AT&T would have to pay premiums to their competition - something they will not consider if our tax money can build towers for them!

If my money (our money) is being used to benefit AT&T, then I want accountability and consideration of my concerns before towers are placed in rural areas. If coverage is available without a new tower, then don't put a new tower in my backyard! CO-locate and get the coverage that exists with the competition! My service with Verizon is completely adequate, and a new AT&T tower at Clouds Rest and Snows Road is not necessary!

Bruce Person
4221 Clouds Rest Rd.
Placerville, Ca 95667

El Dorado County Planning Commision
Re: Conditional Use Permit S17-0016/AT&T CAF4, Site 2, Newtown

CELL FACTS

Industry representatives try to reassure communities that facilities are many orders of magnitude below what is allowed for exposure by standards-setting boards and studies bear that out (Cooper et al. 2006; Henderson and Bangay 2006; Bornkessel et al. 2007). These include standards by the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) used throughout Europe, Canada, and elsewhere (ICNIRP 1998). The standards currently adopted by the U.S. FCC, which uses a two-tiered system of recommendations put out by the National Council on Radiation Protection (NCRP) for civilian exposures (referred to as uncontrolled environments), and the International Electricians and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) for professional exposures (referred to as controlled environments) (U.S. FCC 1997). The U.S. may eventually adopt standards closer to ICNIRP. The current U.S. standards are more protective than ICNIRP's in some frequency ranges so any harmonization toward the ICNIRP standards will make the U.S. limits more lenient. **All of the standards currently in place are based on RFRs ability to heat tissue, called thermal effects. A longstanding criticism, going back to the 1950s (Levitt 1995), is that such acute heating effects do not take potentially more subtle non-thermal effects into consideration.** And based on the number of citizens who have tried to stop cell towers from being installed in their neighborhoods, laypeople in many countries do not find adherence to exisitng standards valid in addressing health concerns. Therefore, infrastructure siting does not have the confidence of the public (Levitt 1998)

Specific absorption rate (SAR)

Absorption of RFR depends on many factors including the transmission frequency and the power density, one's distance from the radiating source, and one's orientation toward the radiation of the system. Other factors include the size, shape, mineral and water content of an organism. **Children absorb energy differently than adults because of differences in their anatomies and tissue composition. Children are not just "little adults". For this reason, and because their bodies are still developing, children may be more susceptible to damage from cell phone radiation.** For instance, radiation from a cell phone penetrates deeper into the head of children (Gandhi et al. 1996; Wiart et al. 2008) and certain tissues of a child's head, e.g., the bone marrow and the eye, absorb significantly more energy than those in an adult head (Christ et al. 2010). The same can be presumed for proximity to towers, even though exposure will be lower from towers under most circumstances than from cell phones. This is because of the distance from the source. The transmitter is placed directly against the head during cell phone use whereas proximity to a cell tower will be an ambient exposure at a distance.

The intensity of RFR decreases rapidly with the distance from the emitting source; therefore, exposure to RFR from transmission towers is often of low intensity depending on one's proximity. But intensity is not the only factor. **Living near a facility will involve long-duration exposures, sometimes for years, at**

many hours per day. People working at home or the infirm can experience low-level 24 h exposures. Nighttimes alone will create 8 h continuous exposures. The current standards for both ICNIRP, IEEE and the NCRP (adopted by the U.S. FCC) are for whole-body exposures averaged over a short duration (minutes) and are based on results from short-term exposure studies, not for long-term, low-level exposures such as those experienced by people living or working near transmitting facilities. For such populations, these can be involuntary exposures, unlike cell phones where user choice is involved.

Biological effects at low intensities

Many biological effects have been documented at very low intensities comparable to what the population experiences within 200 to 500 ft (*60–150 m) of a cell tower, including effects that occurred in studies of cell cultures and animals after exposures to low-intensity RFR. Effects reported include: genetic, growth, and reproductive; increases in permeability of the blood–brain barrier; behavioral; molecular, cellular, and metabolic; and increases in cancer risk. Out of the 56 papers in the list, 37 provided the SAR of exposure. The average SAR of these studies at which biological effects occurred is 0.022 W/kg — a finding below the current standards. **Ten years ago, there were only about a dozen studies reporting such low-intensity effects; currently, there are more than 60. This body of work cannot be ignored. These are important findings with implications for anyone living or working near a transmitting facility.** However, again, most of the studies in the list are on short-term (minutes to hours) exposure to low-intensity RFR. Long-term exposure studies are sparse. In addition, we do not know if all of these reported effects occur in humans exposed to low-intensity RFR, or whether the reported effects are health hazards. Biological effects do not automatically mean adverse health effects, plus many biological effects are reversible. **However, it is clear that low-intensity RFR is not biologically inert. Clearly, more needs to be learned before a presumption of safety can continue to be made regarding placement of antenna arrays near the population, as is the case today.**

Long-term exposures and cumulative effects

There are many important gaps in the RFR research. The majority of the studies on RFR have been conducted with short-term exposures, i.e., a few minutes to several hours. Little is known about the effects of long-term exposure such as would be experienced by people living near telecommunications installations, especially with exposures spanning months or years. The important questions then are: What are the effects of long-term exposure? Does longterm exposure produce different effects from short-term exposure? Do effects accumulate over time? These questions are completely ignored by the proponents of these projects that will affect me and my family for the remainder of our lives! This is a complete travesty of justice!

The most recent studies by the NIH (National Institute of Health) paints a new and dire picture of the cancer causing effects of cell phones and cell towers!

March 2018 NIEHS NIH National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences

A panel of external scientific experts met March 26-28 at NIEHS and recommended that some National Toxicology Program (NTP) conclusions be changed to indicate stronger levels of evidence that cell phone radiofrequency radiation (RFR) caused tumors in rats. The panel reviewed the conclusions of two draft technical reports, one in rats and one in mice, based on 10 years and $25 million of research. The Panel was divided into two groups. Panel 1 provided consultation on the reverberation chamber technology and Panel 2 provided recommendations on the study findings and NTP's draft conclusions. **The experts recommended that tumors in tissues surrounding nerves in the hearts of male rats, called malignant schwannomas, be reclassified from some evidence to clear evidence of carcinogenic activity.** The panel recommended that findings for a type of brain tumor, called malignant glioma, and a tumor in the adrenal gland, called pheochromocytoma, be reclassified as some evidence of carcinogenic activity in male rats.

Working from NTP's scale of clear evidence, some evidence, equivocal evidence, and no evidence, Panel 2 made the following recommendations:

https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/ntp/about_ntp/trpanel/2018/march/actions20180328_508.pdf.

In the findings from the study, the panels determined that there was clear, some, and equivocal evidence of increased carcinogenic activity in almost all the studies!

Male Hsd:Sprague Dawley SD rats, exposed to GSM-modulated cell phone RFR at 900 MHz •

Panel 2 voted to recommend (8 yes, 3 no, 0 abstentions) the conclusion, **clear evidence** of carcinogenic activity of male Hsd:Sprague Dawley SD rats based on incidences of malignant schwannoma in the heart.

Clear evidence of carcinogenic activity from normal doses of Electromagnetic radiation in rats and mice equates to clear evidence of carcinogenic activity in humans too! As more studies are completed, the evidence will mount and our concept of cell phones may soon change to something similar to asbestos and cigarettes as cancer causing! Should we be proactive or suffer the consequences of ignorance and corporate greed?

Bruce Person
4221 Clouds Rest Rd.
Placerville, Ca 95667

March 2018 NIEHS NIH National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences

A panel of external scientific experts met March 26-28 at NIEHS and recommended that some National Toxicology Program (NTP) conclusions be changed to indicate stronger levels of evidence that cell phone radiofrequency radiation (RFR) caused tumors in rats. The panel reviewed the conclusions of two draft technical reports, one in rats and one in mice, based on 10 years and $25 million of research. The Panel was divided into two groups. Panel 1 provided consultation on the reverberation chamber technology and Panel 2 provided recommendations on the study findings and NTP's draft conclusions. The experts recommended that tumors in tissues surrounding nerves in the hearts of male rats, called malignant schwannomas, be reclassified from some evidence to clear evidence of carcinogenic activity. The panel recommended that findings for a type of brain tumor, called malignant glioma, and a tumor in the adrenal gland, called pheochromocytoma, be reclassified as some evidence of carcinogenic activity in male rats.

Working from NTP's scale of clear evidence, some evidence, equivocal evidence, and no evidence, Panel 2 made the following recommendations:

https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/ntp/about_ntp/trpanel/2018/march/actions20180328_508.pdf.

In the findings from the study, the panels determined that there was clear, some, and equivocal evidence of increased carcinogenic activity in almost all the studies!

Male Hsd:Sprague Dawley SD rats, exposed to GSM-modulated cell phone RFR at 900 MHz •

Panel 2 voted to recommend (8 yes, 3 no, 0 abstentions) the conclusion, clear evidence of carcinogenic activity of male Hsd:Sprague Dawley SD rats based on incidences of malignant schwannoma in the heart.

El Dorado County Planning Commision
Re: Conditional Use Permit S17-0016/AT&T CAF4, Site 2, Newtown

After reading the Mission Statement of the Planning Department, I find it difficult to believe that the Planners have actually taken the statement to heart. My research and understanding of the Cell Tower issues must be much different than those of the Planning department... and it makes me wonder if they have actually read the information submitted by many of the residents who oppose the towers for many reasons!

Mission Statement

The mission of the Planning Department is to: Guide land use and development consistent with the General Plan, Building Codes and related regulations, by providing accurate, timely and courteous professional and technical services to our customers, **to maintain the County's unique quality of life, protect public safety and the environment** and to promote economic vitality for current and future generations.

REQUIRED FINDINGS In accordance with Section 130.52.020 and 130.52.021 of the Zoning Ordinance, the following findings must be made by the Zoning Administrator or Planning Commission before the Minor/conditional use permit can be approved:

1. The issuance of the permit is consistent with the General Plan;

2. The proposed use would not be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare, or injurious to the neighborhood; and

3. The proposed use is specifically permitted by minor/conditional use permit pursuant to this Title.

In the most recent study done by the NIH (National Institute of Health), increased risks of cancer are documented after a 10 year, $25,000,000.00 dollar study of RFR (Radio Frequency Radiation) and EMR (Electromagnetic Radiation) on mice and rats exposing them to the allowed limits now in effect. How is this in line with the required findings of the zoning ordinance? See the results here - https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/ntp/about_ntp/trpanel/2018/march/actions20180328_508.pdf.

Why are the lease areas not required to be as large as the equipment to be located within the lease? If the tower is 150 feet tall, why is the lease area only 35' x 40'? If the tower fails, it should be contained within the leased area and not allowed to affect neighboring properties not being compensated by the lease!

Some of the most common areas and elements of failure which result in the collapse of Cell Towers are baseplates, flanges, joints, bolts and guy wires.

In some cases, Cell Towers have caught fire. With a simple visit to Youtube, you can watch multiple videos of a Cell Tower burning as it collapsed to the ground. Even their foundations have the capacity to fail.
For these reasons, it is imperative that local zoning authorities adopt and require strict compliance with setback requirements necessary to protect both local citizens and the public from the danger of collapse that Cell Towers present. Many other Counties enforce more stringent setback and lease area requirements that better protect the public, and neighboring parcels!

Bruce Person
4221 Clouds Rest Rd.
Placerville, Ca 95667