



## **PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE**

The following is public correspondence received by the City Clerk's Office after the posting of the original agenda. Individual contact information has been redacted for privacy. This may *not* be a comprehensive collection of the public correspondence, but staff makes its best effort to include all correspondence received to date.

To send correspondence to the City Council, on matters listed on the agenda please email [PublicComment@losaltosca.gov](mailto:PublicComment@losaltosca.gov)

**From:** [roger heyder](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#); [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** Los Altos Council meeting of 6/14, item 11 - public comment  
**Date:** Friday, June 10, 2022 8:18:32 AM

---

Hello,

This is public comment on item 11 - **Wireless Telecommunications Facilities**. Please read out, and include this public comment in the formal meeting minutes.

regards -- Roger Heyder  
resident of Los Altos

Los Altos City Council is stepping far over the line by putting resident health and safety at risk with their actions on adopting 5G against resident wishes. Ignoring city laws and spending recklessly are things which residents seem able to ignore, but doing things to harm residents is simply unacceptable and inexcusable.

The 5G emergency ordinance was enacted after several large public meetings, where many hundreds of residents supported the 5G ordinance, and only 1 or 2 residents opposed the ordinance. Nothing has changed, yet Council is considering altering the ordinance to the extent of basically eliminating it. **Misleadingly calling the initiative 'Wireless Telecommunications Facilities' rather than what it really is, 5G, is just typical - maybe residents won't notice.**

The residents of Los Altos have made their opinion very clear on the 5G issue. Council was elected to represent the residents, and implement their wishes. Sometimes that means fighting for what is right, something Council seems very incapable and unwilling to do.

It seems Council supports many outside special interests over the interest of residents. That is unacceptable. Council members that hold that posture should resign immediately, since you are failing in your responsibility to serve the residents of Los Altos.

Council must also inform residents how much money the city will make if the ordinance is lifted - right of way fees paid to the city by the 5G providers. That way residents can see how much it takes to sell us out.

**From:** [Leo Torreano](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#); [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Los Altos Council meeting of 6/14, item 11 - public comment  
**Date:** Friday, June 10, 2022 9:43:28 AM

---

This is public comment on item 11 - **Wireless Telecommunications Facilities**.  
Please read out, and include this public comment in the formal meeting minutes.

**Leo Torreano**  
**Los Altos resident**

When is the Los Altos City Council going to respect the overwhelming majority of its residents who reject the idea of having 5G antennas installed in our community and neighborhoods?

These antennas will reduce the aesthetics of our community, and thus lower the desirability of our town as a place to live.

There are so-called "unknown" health effects, but they are only unknown because our corrupt system of funding scientific research only incentivises research in areas that our governmental and corporate masters deem appropriate.

The **State of New Hampshire Commission on the Health and Environmental Impacts of 5G and Wireless Technology** was convened through bipartisan legislation and the commission findings are as follows:

- **Cellphone radiation, including 5G, poses a significant threat to human health and the environment**
- **This is not a scientific issue, it is a political issue**
- **The peer-reviewed science is quite clear about the risks about radiation exposure**
- **Technology can be used to significantly lower radiation exposure, but that would come at a cost to the industry**

Please join with other communities such as Portland, Oregon, Whitefish, Montana, and Mill Valley, California in stopping the roll-out of 5G service in our community.

The fact that this is still being pushed by the City council raises concerns with me about who the City Council is really trying to represent.

**From:** [Jane Osborn](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#); [City Council](#); [Gabriel Engeland](#)  
**Cc:** [Jonathan Shores](#); [Jane Osborn](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment, June 14, 2020, Agenda Item #11, Wireless Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, June 13, 2022 3:27:59 AM

---

Dear Honorable Mayor and City Council members,

At the May 10th, 2022 council meeting, I had the honor of being able to make a public comment. Below is a written transcript of my comments. In addition, I am making some further comments and providing a partial list of references.

**Written Transcript of public comment made to the City Council on May 10th, 2022, in regard to item #9, Wireless Ordinance:**

"Honorable Mayor and Council,

Since the FCC has never produced adequate scientific evidence that these newer wireless technologies are safe, I urge the council to err on the side of caution, since resident's health and well being may be negatively impacted.

In particular, I would like to ask the council not to allow these facilities to be placed as close together as one every 200 feet. Please stick to the original proposal for a 1000 foot distance between facilities, including facilities from multiple carriers. No one residential block or street or neighborhood should have to endure or be inflicted with this high of a density--basically one in front of every 3 houses.

My husband and I and many other residents feel that no residents should have to serve as lab rats, and be enrolled in an experiment involuntarily, without their consent--in order for the cell carriers to make even more billions in profits every year.

I agree with Dr. Cindy Russell's assertion that the carriers have created a "manufactured" sense of need for the newer 5G technology. As a psychologist, I have recognized some of their tactics, such as using fear-based emotional manipulation to get people to think they absolutely have to have this latest technology--or they will be left behind.

For the benefit of members of the public who may be new to this issue, I would like to read a statement made by:

**Joel Moskowitz, PhD, Director, Center for Family and Community Health, at the UC Berkeley, School of Public Health.**

**Dr. Moskowitz stated:**

**" We are guinea pigs in a massive technological experiment that threatens our health. Our government needs to determine what constitutes a safe level of long term exposure to wireless radiation and strengthen the FCC's radio frequency exposure guidelines. In the meantime, the government should impose a moratorium on technologies that increase our exposure to wireless radiation, especially new forms of wireless radiation like 5G cellphone radiation."**

**These were Dr. Moskowitz' concluding remarks to a presentation during which he discussed the apparent negative biological and health effects of wireless radiation.**

Thank you."

.....  
**If there had been more time, I would have added this comment on May 10th:**

I urge you to please take all the time you need to make these decisions. Once these facilities are placed, residents will have to suffer the negative consequences for several years, including possible negative effects on their health and well being.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

**There are indications that the FCC has not done their "due diligence," and has been negligent or derelict in their duty to protect the public health, possibly for decades.**

• There appears to be a widely held belief that even back in 1996, the FCC did not provide adequate scientific evidence at the time to demonstrate that even the earlier technologies were safe, when they developed their standards for wireless technology. It has been reported that the FCC only considered thermal effects of wireless radiation, and only for short periods of time that did not duplicate "real life" conditions. Among other things, apparently, they did not consider the effects of non-thermal, non-ionizing radiation on the environment, including on the human environment, when they developed their standards for wireless technology in 1996. Furthermore, they did not consider the "real life" effects of "pulsing and modulation of the carrier signal."

Also, it has been reported that the FCC "cherry picked" their evidence; ignored or did not consider significant amounts of available scientific evidence, including evidence based on research done in other countries; and may have "suppressed" evidence. Apparently, they relied on experiments that did not even begin to duplicate "real world" or "real life" conditions. For example, in one of the worst examples, it has been reported that they relied on the results of a study in which a plastic manikin's head was filled with salt water, and then a cell phone was held up to the plastic head for some period of time (which was not long or sustained) to see if this caused a raise in the temperature of the water inside the plastic head. Would you want to rely on a study with such crude methodology to determine that a technology is safe "in real life," or to determine safety standards?

- It appears the FCC also has ignored requests from government agencies, as well as from members of Congress and the Senate, to reassess their procedures and standards, or to provide evidence that wireless technologies are safe.

For example, in 2012, the Government Accounting Office (GAO) recommended that the FCC reassess their standards and procedures to reflect "real world" use of cell phones, and to be based on the latest scientific evidence. In 2013, the FCC then started an official inquiry into whether or not their wireless standards should be updated. Apparently, they opened a public comment period, during which it is reported that they immediately received thousands of pages of scientific evidence and received comments from at least 80 distinguished scientists from around the world expressing concerns. It is reported that shortly thereafter, the FCC then closed the comment period and terminated any further effort to re-assess or update their standards.

In December 2018, Congresswoman Anna Eshoo, Chair of the House Subcommittee on Health, and Senator Richard Blumenthal, wrote a formal letter requesting that the FCC provide scientific evidence that 5 G wireless technology is safe. Apparently, their request was ignored, and they never received the requested response.

- **A lawsuit against the FCC-- Environmental Health Trust, et. al. versus the FCC and USA (No 20-1025)--was argued on 1/25/21 and decided on 8/13/21, in a US Court of Appeals, DC Circuit. The court found that the "...FCC had failed to provide a reasoned explanation for its determination that its existing radio frequency (RF) exposure regulations were adequate to ensure public safety in light of evidence presented to the FCC regarding health impacts posed by various technology developments since 1996, including the ubiquity of wireless devices and WiFi, and the emergence of 5G technology."**

[https://www.cadc.uscourts.gov/internet/opinions.nsf/FB976465BF00F8BD85258730004EFDF7/\\$file/20-1025-1910111.pdf](https://www.cadc.uscourts.gov/internet/opinions.nsf/FB976465BF00F8BD85258730004EFDF7/$file/20-1025-1910111.pdf)

One implication of this decision is that presumably the FCC will be required to re-assess and update their wireless standards, based on scientific evidence.

A further implication of this court decision is that the FCC had not done its due diligence, and appears to have been remiss or negligent in regard to their obligation to determine appropriate safety standards based on scientific evidence, and to protect the safety of the public.

**There currently is legislation pending that would return more local control to cities and states over wireless facilities:**

- On January 14, 2019, HR530, was introduced by Congresswoman Anna Eshoo in the House of Representatives, which garnered 52 co-sponsors, including Jackie Speier, who was the first representative to sign on as a co-sponsor. This bill seeks to preserve or restore local rights of state and city governments.

- On June 27, 2019, a similar bill, S.2012, was introduced in the Senate by Senator Diane Feinstein. This bill seeks to repeal the regulations adopted by the FCC that preempt local control related to installation of small wireless facilities. This bill is supported by the National League of Cities and the League of California Cities.

#### REFERENCES (Partial List):

- THE LARGEST UNETHICAL MEDICAL EXPERIMENT IN HUMAN HISTORY, Ronald N. Kostoff, Ph.D., Research Affiliate, School of Public Policy, Georgia Institute of Technology, copyright 2020.

[https://smartech.gatech.edu/bitstream/handle/1853/62452/LARGEST\\_UNETHICAL\\_MEDICAL\\_EXPERIMENT\\_FINAL.pdf](https://smartech.gatech.edu/bitstream/handle/1853/62452/LARGEST_UNETHICAL_MEDICAL_EXPERIMENT_FINAL.pdf)

I stumbled on this massive, comprehensive review three days after I made my comments to the council on May 10th, 2022. It is very apropos with regard to my concern that we are lab rats in an experiment to which we never gave informed consent. Among other things, this article provides a very comprehensive look at staggering amounts of research that show negative biological and health effects from wireless radiation. The author provides hundreds of pages of research titles, organized into themes, as well as hundreds of pages of references.

- CELLPHONES, CELL TOWERS, AND WIRELESS SAFETY; Joel Moskowitz, PhD, Director, Center for Family and

Community Health, School of Public Health, U. C. Berkeley; Presentation given on February 27, 2019.

<https://uhs.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/cellphonescelltowerswirelessafety.pdf>

- 5G AND THE FCC: 10 REASONS WHY YOU SHOULD CARE, Sharon Buccino. Attorney and Senior Director for Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), Feb. 13, 2019.

<https://protectnepa.org/5g-fcc-wireless/>

- 5G COMING TO YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD, Sharon Buccino, NRDC, June 10, 2020.

<https://www.nrdc.org/experts/sharon-buccino/5g-coming-your-neighborhood>

- <https://www.actu-environnement.com/media/pdf/news-29640-appel-scientifiques-5g.pdf>

- [https://www.cadc.uscourts.gov/internet/opinions\\_nsf/FB976465BF00F8BD85258730004EFDF7/\\$file/20-1025-1910111.pdf](https://www.cadc.uscourts.gov/internet/opinions_nsf/FB976465BF00F8BD85258730004EFDF7/$file/20-1025-1910111.pdf)

- CONGRESSWOMEN ESHOO AND SPEIER INTRODUCE HR 539 TO BLOCK FCC CELL TOWER PREEMPTION: Physicians for Safe Technology, January 22, 2019.

<https://mdsafetech.org/2019/01/22/congresswomen-eshoo-and-speier-introduce-hr-530-to-block-fcc-cell-tower-preemption/>

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Respectfully,  
Jane Osborn  
Resident of Los Altos

E. Jane Osborn, Ph.D. Nationally Certified School Psychologist, NCSP 24709. Licensed Educational Psychologist, LEP 1610. Cognitive and Developmental Psychology. [REDACTED]

From: [Kathleen Richards](#)  
To: [Public Comment - City Council](#)  
Subject: Los Altos Council meeting of 6/14 Item 11 - public comment  
Date: Monday, June 13, 2022 10:38:01 AM

---

Please include in the public comment - telecommunication 5G

The FCC 5G safety guidelines were overturned by a DC District Court in August 2021. The court ruled that the FCC's decision in 2019, that its 1996 radio frequency emission guidelines adequately protect the public was capricious, arbitrary and not evidence based, in violation of the Administrative Procedures Act. The court also found that the analysis provided by the U.S. Federal Drug Administration, on which the FCC relied for its decision, was also not evidence based. ([https://url.avanan.click/v2/\\_\\_\\_https://childrenshealthdefense.org/wp-content/uploads/chd-v-fcc-we-won-decision.pdf\\_\\_\\_YXAZomxvc2FsdG9y2E6YtpvOmJjNzcnWjgwY2Q1YzU2Yj1jMTk4MzgyZnZkMzdmZmZjY6ZmY1MT04OTJiYzd1NmU0NjU1NDE4MTU5OTI2MmQ5NGY5MmVhZDZjMjFhZjNiN2FhYjQxN2E5MzdlYjQ3MGYxMmUwYz1iOnQ6VA](https://url.avanan.click/v2/___https://childrenshealthdefense.org/wp-content/uploads/chd-v-fcc-we-won-decision.pdf___YXAZomxvc2FsdG9y2E6YtpvOmJjNzcnWjgwY2Q1YzU2Yj1jMTk4MzgyZnZkMzdmZmZjY6ZmY1MT04OTJiYzd1NmU0NjU1NDE4MTU5OTI2MmQ5NGY5MmVhZDZjMjFhZjNiN2FhYjQxN2E5MzdlYjQ3MGYxMmUwYz1iOnQ6VA)).

Since the FCC has NOT demonstrated that 5G is safe, this clearly eliminates any FCC argument that health concerns cannot be considered in determining 5G implementation. A large majority of the residents of Los Altos oppose 5G implementation due to health and environmental concerns, so their position is valid and should be respected by retaining the 5G ban.

I can understand why the carrier lawyers did not raise this relevant and important court decision, as it is not in their favor. I would like to know why Los Altos legal representation was not aware of this important ruling, or did not make residents aware of this ruling. This is not working in the best interest of their clients, the residents of Los Altos. Competent legal representation should be found that can resolve this important issue in alignment with the wishes of the residents of Los Altos.

thanks - Kathleen Richards