



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

From: [Sally Meadows](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: Fwd: Fire Concern regarding 5G Cell Towers
Date: Monday, June 13, 2022 10:47:02 PM

Begin forwarded message:

From: Los Altan <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Fire Concern regarding 5G Cell Towers
Date: June 13, 2022 at 5:49:31 AM PDT
To: aenander@losaltosca.gov, jweinberg@losaltosca.gov, lleeeng@losaltosca.gov,
nfligor@losaltosca.gov, smeadows@losaltosca.gov

Dear City Council Members,

As you may know, when I brought the 5G cell tower issue to the council back in 2019, many Los Altos residents provided me with their email addresses in order to keep them informed and up to date. While many residents have expressed their desire to protect our beautiful city, every time I update them on the details, many fervently forward information to all of you. Suffice it to say, many residents are extremely concerned with fire safety given how many fires have been started by utility lines in the past. I won't forward the email I sent to the residents since you now have multiple copies of them, but ensuring fire safety for all of us is critically important as our climate changes, our drought elongates only adding to increasing our fire risk.

Thanks,
Los Altan

From: [Sally Meadows](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: Fwd: Protect Los Altos citizens
Date: Monday, June 13, 2022 10:47:55 PM

Begin forwarded message:

From: Nancy Colace <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Protect Los Altos citizens
Date: June 11, 2022 at 7:24:25 PM PDT
To: aenander@losaltosca.gov, smeadows@losaltosca.gov, nfligor@losaltosca.gov,
lleeeng@losaltosca.gov, jweinberg@losaltosca.gov

Dear Los Altos City Council Members:

I am concerned about the potential for Fires in Los Altos that could cause property damage and injury and/or death. I ask all five City Council Members to adopt the fire and safety language for the Wireless Telecommunications Facilities Locational Standards and Design Guidelines proposed by City Council Member Lynette Lee Eng. It should be the top priority of the City Council to protect the lives and property of the citizens of Los Altos.

Nancy Colace

Citizen of Los Altos

Further Background information:

Three lives have been lost and well over \$6 Billion in property damage from four fires caused by Wireless Communication equipment in California. And there are forecasts for another terrible fire season this year. **It should be the top priority of the City Council to protect the lives and property of the citizens of Los Altos.**

We need Wireless Communications equipment deployed in Los Altos to have the same application content requirements that are used for all other residential and commercial projects that require a land use and/or building permit in Los Altos.

Specifically, we must have the APCO ANS 2.106.1 standard that is incorporated into the design requirements for Emergency Communications Networks in Los Altos ALSO be required for the Wireless Communication Equipment in Los Altos. This requires that any wireless communication components for Los Altos continue to be required to adhere to the standard fire/electrical/building code compliance, and the substantive structural safety design standards incorporated into APCO ANS 2.106.1. This will also help assure the availability of 911 under stress conditions.

Four Major fires caused by Wireless communication equipment in California:

- Guejito Fire (2007) in San Diego which became part of the Witch Creek Fire, the worst fire in San Diego history.
- Malibu Canyon Fire (2007); three utility poles overloaded with equipment from the following carriers snapped in the wind and ignited the grass below: Sprint (now T-Mobile), AT&T, Verizon, and NextG (now owned by Crown Castle). All four carriers as well as SCE were accused by the CPUC of attempting to mislead fire investigators.
- Woolsey Fire (2018); a telecommunications lashing wire came loose igniting at least one of the two ignition points for the fire that caused \$6 billion in property damage. California Edison was cited for 28 violations by the CPUC. One critical violation involves the failure by Edison to mark as a priority the repair a broken communication line and broken telecommunications lashing wire. The broken equipment was found during a May 2018 inspection. Without priority designation for repair, this known electrical hazard remained in disrepair. In November 2018 the broken Edison telecommunication equipment was involved as part of the ignition of the month-long fire. There were three deaths as a result of people being trapped in their cars.
- Silverado Fire in Irvine (2020) involved SCE and a T-Mobile lashing wire. Silverado merged with a second fire causing the evacuation of 130,000 people and significant property damage.

We cannot just continue to trust that the same telecom companies whose negligence caused these fires will adequately design and maintain their networks in Los Altos.

From: [Bill Hough](#)
To: [City Council](#); [Public Comment](#)
Cc: [Andrea Chelemengos](#)
Subject: public comment regarding item #11 on 6/14/2021 agenda
Date: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 8:53:16 AM

I am submitting this public comment in my capacity as a resident and taxpayer in Los Altos.

It is imperative that we must have the APCO ANS 2.106.1 standard that is incorporated into the design requirements for Emergency Communications Networks. The bottom line is that it should be the top priority of the City Council to protect the lives and property of the citizens of Los Altos by ensuring the same standards apply to wireless facilities.

Please ensure that any wireless communication components for Los Altos continue to be required to adhere to the standard fire/electrical/building code compliance, and the substantive structural safety design standards incorporated into APCO ANS 2.106.1. This will also help assure the availability of 911 under stress conditions.

From: [Deb Skelton](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: City Council meeting 6/14
Date: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 12:49:50 PM

Dear Council Members and City Staff,

This note is in regards to items on the agenda for the June 14 Los Altos City Council meeting. Please include this note in the packet.

First of all, many thanks to all of you for your dedication and for the work that you do.

Agenda item #5:

Santa Clara County Cities Association - I believe the current Mayor should have the opportunity to represent our City in this organization. I'm not sure why this transition has not occurred, it seems late in the game. Mayor Enander should be representing our City, if she so chooses, for the duration of her term. This should be passed on to Ms Meadows promptly, when she becomes our next Mayor.

Agenda item #11:

I believe Los Altos should have access to 5G without delay. It is important we keep current. Wireless communications are too important in today's society to fall behind. It is also very important that all safety standards are incorporated and that they be required for all wireless communication equipment.

Sincerely,
Debbie Skelton

From: [Sally Meadows](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: Fwd: Cell phone towers in Los Altos
Date: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 1:59:59 PM

Begin forwarded message:

From: Aram Darmanian [REDACTED]
Subject: Cell phone towers in Los Altos
Date: June 14, 2022 at 12:42:47 PM PDT
To: "aenander@losaltosca.gov" <aenander@losaltosca.gov>, "smeadows@losaltosca.gov" <smeadows@losaltosca.gov>, "nfligor@losaltosca.gov" <nfligor@losaltosca.gov>, "leeeng@losaltosca.gov" <leeeng@losaltosca.gov>, "jweinberg@losaltosca.gov" <jweinberg@losaltosca.gov>

Dear Los Altos City Council Members:

I am concerned about the potential for Fires in Los Altos that could cause property damage and injury and/or death. I ask all five City Council Members to adopt the fire and safety language for the Wireless Telecommunications Facilities Locational Standards and Design Guidelines proposed by City Council Member Lynette Lee Eng. It should be the top priority of the City Council to protect the lives and property of the citizens of Los Altos.

Aram Darmanian
Citizen of Los Altos

Further Background information:

Three lives have been lost and well over \$6 Billion in property damage from four fires caused by Wireless Communication equipment in California. And there are forecasts for another terrible fire season this year. **It should be the top priority of the City Council to protect the lives and property of the citizens of Los Altos.**

We need Wireless Communications equipment deployed in Los Altos to have the same application content requirements that are used for all other residential and commercial projects that require a land use and/or building permit in Los Altos.

Specifically, we must have the APCO ANS 2.106.1 standard that is incorporated into the design requirements for Emergency Communications Networks in Los Altos ALSO be required for the Wireless Communication Equipment in Los Altos. This requires that any wireless communication components for Los Altos continue to be

required to adhere to the standard fire/electrical/building code compliance, and the substantive structural safety design standards incorporated into APCO ANS 2.106.1. This will also help assure the availability of 911 under stress conditions.

Four Major fires caused by Wireless communication equipment in California:

- Guejito Fire (2007) in San Diego which became part of the Witch Creek Fire, the worst fire in San Diego history.
- Malibu Canyon Fire (2007); three utility poles overloaded with equipment from the following carriers snapped in the wind and ignited the grass below: Sprint (now T-Mobile), AT&T, Verizon, and NextG (now owned by Crown Castle). All four carriers as well as SCE were accused by the CPUC of attempting to mislead fire investigators.
- Woolsey Fire (2018); a telecommunications lashing wire came loose igniting at least one of the two ignition points for the fire that caused \$6 billion in property damage. California Edison was cited for 28 violations by the CPUC. One critical violation involves the failure by Edison to mark as a priority the repair a broken communication line and broken telecommunications lashing wire. The broken equipment was found during a May 2018 inspection. Without priority designation for repair, this known electrical hazard remained in disrepair. In November 2018 the broken Edison telecommunication equipment was involved as part of the ignition of the month-long fire. There were three deaths as a result of people being trapped in their cars.
- Silverado Fire in Irvine (2020) involved SCE and a T-Mobile lashing wire. Silverado merged with a second fire causing the evacuation of 130,000 people and significant property damage.

We cannot just continue to trust that the same telecom companies whose negligence caused these fires will adequately design and maintain their networks in Los Altos.

From: [Sally Meadows](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: Fwd: Cell phone towers in Los Altos
Date: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 2:00:36 PM

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Cell phone towers in Los Altos
Date: June 14, 2022 at 12:42:41 PM PDT
To: <aeander@losaltosca.gov>, <smeadows@losaltosca.gov>, <nfligor@losaltosca.gov>, <lleeeng@losaltosca.gov>, <jweinberg@losaltosca.gov>

Dear Los Altos City Council Members:

I am concerned about the potential for Fires in Los Altos that could cause property damage and injury and/or death. I ask all five City Council Members to adopt the fire and safety language for the Wireless Telecommunications Facilities Locational Standards and Design Guidelines proposed by City Council Member Lynette Lee Eng. It should be the top priority of the City Council to protect the lives and property of the citizens of Los Altos.

June Darmanian
Citizen of Los Altos

Further Background information:

Three lives have been lost and well over \$6 Billion in property damage from four fires caused by Wireless Communication equipment in California. And there are forecasts for another terrible fire season this year. **It should be the top priority of the City Council to protect the lives and property of the citizens of Los Altos.**

We need Wireless Communications equipment deployed in Los Altos to have the same application content requirements that are used for all other residential and commercial projects that require a land use and/or building permit in Los Altos.

Specifically, we must have the APCO ANS 2.106.1 standard that is incorporated into the design requirements for Emergency Communications Networks in Los Altos ALSO be required for the Wireless Communication Equipment in Los Altos. This requires that any wireless communication components for Los Altos continue to be required to adhere to the standard fire/electrical/building code compliance, and the substantive structural safety design standards incorporated into APCO ANS 2.106.1. This will also help assure the availability of 911 under stress conditions.

Four Major fires caused by Wireless communication equipment in California:

- Guejito Fire (2007) in San Diego which became part of the Witch Creek Fire, the worst fire in San Diego history.
- Malibu Canyon Fire (2007); three utility poles overloaded with equipment from the following carriers snapped in the wind and ignited the grass below: Sprint (now T-Mobile), AT&T, Verizon, and NextG (now owned by Crown Castle). All four carriers as well as SCE were accused by the CPUC of attempting to mislead fire investigators.
- Woolsey Fire (2018); a telecommunications lashing wire came loose igniting at least one of the two ignition points for the fire that caused \$6 billion in property damage. California Edison was cited for 28 violations by the CPUC. One critical violation involves the failure by Edison to mark as a priority the repair a broken communication line and broken telecommunications lashing wire. The broken equipment was found during a May 2018 inspection. Without priority designation for repair, this known electrical hazard remained in disrepair. In November 2018 the broken Edison telecommunication equipment was involved as part of the ignition of the month-long fire. There were three deaths as a result of people being trapped in their cars.
- Silverado Fire in Irvine (2020) involved SCE and a T-Mobile lashing wire. Silverado merged with a second fire causing the evacuation of 130,000 people and significant property damage.

We cannot just continue to trust that the same telecom companies whose negligence caused these fires will adequately design and maintain their networks in Los Altos.

From: [Willem De Lange](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: Virtual City Council Meeting; Tuesday, June 14, 2022; 7 PM; Wireless Ordinance--Agenda Item #11
Date: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 5:22:21 PM

Honorable Mayor, Council and City management,

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 wellbeing will 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.

In Particular corner lots, like the one we live on, off of Covington Road at 951 Castilleja Ct should be exempt from having to be out up with 5G amplifiers on the existing PG&E electricity pole. The pole I refer to is the one on Covington which faces our side yard where we spend the majority of our time when at home. It would be devastating to us to have to be under constant radiation and cooling fan noise from about 25 feet distance on that pole. I regard this as a cruel intrusion onto our precious enjoyment of outdoor living! (In our case we would prefer having it on the corner PG&E pole of Castilleja Ct and Covington Road where is has far less impact in people spending time outdoors.)

I am fearful that the utility companies are being given a blanket permission for placement optimal for penetrating their 5G waves into our neighborhood, regardless of our feedback and buy-in. We are part of an extensive community of Los Altos residents and have been communicating and meeting on the topic and feel very strongly about limiting the placement of 5G antennas, in particular close to residences and yards where people congregate regularly. What I am urgently asking is to please make an informed and health-conscious decision on this topic. There are a lot of publications available which I am endorsing to protect the health of our community, we dearly love and contribute to a lot!


I sent you an earlier letter and I have made comments during previous meetings on this topic.

My spouse 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 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.

Willem and Margriet De Lange
951 Castilleja Ct
Los Altos, CA 94024
Email: [REDACTED]
Cell: [REDACTED]

From: [Jane Osborn](#)
To: [Public Comment](#); [City Council](#); [Gabriel Engeland](#)
Cc: [Jonathan Shores](#); [Jane Osborn](#)
Subject: Followup/Update. Public Comment, June 14, 2020, Agenda Item #11, Wireless Ordinance
Date: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 6:45:09 PM

Dear Honorable Mayor and City Council Members,

This is a follow up to the public comments I submitted on May 13, 2022 (below). I would like to add to my previous comments, and also provide some additional reference:

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- **You may be wondering why the FCC has been able to get away with being so negligent and not doing their "due diligence" with regard to setting their standards in 1996 and in regard to not reassessing and updating these outdated standards.**

It is a widely held belief that the FCC is a "Captured Agency," that has a long history of conflicts of interest. Captured agencies have been defined as being "...essentially controlled by the industries they are supposed to regulate."

It has been noted that "...the entire system is greased by the free flow of executive leadership between the FCC and the industries it presumably oversees." (Alster, Chapter 1) There are at least two recent examples of this. More recently, the FCC was headed by Ajit Pai, from January 2017 to January 2021. **Mr. Pai previously was an attorney for Verizon.** Apparently he was well known for being fiercely anti-regulatory, despite the fact that he was heading a supposedly regulatory agency. His predecessor was Tom Wheeler, who was appointed to head the FCC in 2013. **Mr. Wheeler previously had headed two very powerful telecommunications industry lobbyist groups, the CTIA and the NCAA.** Apparently the FCC long has had an open door policy for lobbyist, as opposed to scientists and other non-lobbyists (who typically would have to wait a couple of months to get an appointment). It is reported that industry lobbyists are "...at the FCC's door day and night." (Alster, Chapter 1) Apparently the industry boasts about the fact that it typically has about 500 meetings with the FCC per year. (Alster, Chapter 4)

- **The telecommunication industry does not have a good track record for being concerned about public health and safety.**

I gave one example of this in my public comments at the PC meeting held on March 17, 2022. Earlier this year, the FAA requested that the wireless carriers postpone their roll out of 5G, at least in areas near airports, due to concerns on the part of pilots and the FAA that the 5G transmissions might interfere with the safe operation of the altimeters on planes. Initially, Verizon and AT&T both refused this request. Eventually, they backed down and came to an agreement with the FAA.

The most sinister and consequential example of a lack of concern for public health and safety is the apparent, reported active suppression, discrediting or down-playing of legitimate scientific findings, and attempts to bully scientists. (Alster, Chapter 4) It has been reported that "...'war gaming' researchers who come up with unfavorable results have been persistent themes with this industry." (Alster, Chapter 4)

Also, it is well known that this industry uses "intimidation tactics," lawsuits and "bullying tactics," against cities and scientists (for example). It is reported that "This is a very rich industry that does not hesitate to outspend and out bully challengers into submission." (Alster, Chapter 4)

- In a previous comment, I made reference to the fact that a plastic mannequin's head has been used as a tool for testing safety of wireless devices (i.e. cell phones). I would like to provide some additional information. **The plastic mannequin head is referred to as SAM--i.e. Specific Anthropomorphic Mannequin.**

Apparently this device still is in use but has been highly criticized by many scientists due to the fact that it does not duplicate real world conditions of the head and brain. It is filled with a fluid that is supposed to duplicate average electrical properties of the head, and measure specific absorption rate of non-ionizing radiation. Scientists have pointed out that this process "... cannot indicate differential absorption of specific brain tissue, nor absorption in small children and smaller adults." (Gandhi, 2012). One criticism is that it does not duplicate tissue and organs of the head and brain, and does not represent the range of head and brain sizes that exists in the human population. The plastic head (SAM) is a "one size fits all" that was based on the size of a 220 pound man (which represents about 3% of the population)--since originally it was developed decades ago for use by the military with regard to military personnel using radar.

Scientists feel that this process vastly underestimates the real world Specific Absorption Rate (of non-ionizing radiation or SAR) in children and small women. It has been noted that "As head size decreases, the percentage of energy absorbed in the brain increases, so higher SAR in children's brains can be expected. (Gandhi, et. al. 2012). For example, research done in 1996 with MRI scans in 5 and 8 year old children indicated that the specific absorption rate of non-ionizing radiation is 2 times higher in children compared to adults. (Gandhi, et. al., 2012).

- **IN SUMMARY, in view of the FCC's apparent failure to protect public safety adequately, it seems ironical that according to the city's wireless team consultant, cities supposedly are not allowed to make a finding of negative declaration of environmental impact, including on the human environment, because the FCC has deemed that there is no environmental impact.**

Apparently cities are required to defer to an agency that has been found by a court to have failed to show evidence that the devices they regulate are safe. Cities are required to defer to an agency that appears to have been negligent, or possibly even has been guilty of malfeasance, at times. At the same time, cities are obligated ethically and by the State of California to determine that an ordinance will not harm the environment, including humans. Cities appear to have been placed in a no-win, "catch 22" situation. In spite of this, there are cities all over the country who have made a valiant, courageous effort to protect their residents and other inhabitants, which is their ethical duty, by writing ordinances that suggest they are not blindly accepting the FCC standards or totally caving in and deferring to the demands of the wireless carriers.

I would like to repeat my request that the city increase the distance between small wireless facilities. Even a 500 foot distance between devices would be safer and less deleterious than a 200 foot distance, and would appear to be more typical of what is seen in the ordinances of other cities that my husband and I have looked at.

Also, I would like to request that these facilities not be placed as close as 10 or 25 feet from a residential dwelling unit, due to the apparent hazards related to risk of fires, potential (probable) harm from wireless radiation, and deleterious effects on health and cognitive functioning from noise emissions that will be posed by having these devices so close to dwellings where people, including vulnerable children and seniors, are living and sleeping.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES (Partial):

- CAPTURED AGENCY: HOW THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATION COMMISSION IS DOMINATED BY THE INDUSTRIES IT PRESUMABLY REGULATES; Norm Alsters, Published by Edmund J. Safra Center for Ethics, Harvard University. (Note. I did not find the date of publication, but the author cites references as recent as 2015.)

https://ethics.harvard.edu/files/center-for-ethics/files/capturedagency_alster.pdf

- VERIZON AND AT&T DECLINE REGULATORS' REQUEST TO DELAY NEW 5G SERVICES; New York Times, January 2022

[Verizon and AT&T Decline Regulators' Request to Delay New 5G Services](#)

- AIRLINE INDUSTRY PANIC PROMPTS AT&T AND VERIZON TO BACK DOWN ON 5G, CRITICIZES FAA OVERSIGHT, Fortune Magazine

[Airline industry panic prompts AT&T and Verizon to back down on 5G, criticize FAA oversight](#)

- EXPOSURE LIMITS: THE UNDERESTIMATION OF ABSORBED CELL PHONE RADIATION, ESPECIALLY IN CHILDREN, Om P. Gandhi et. al., Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine, 31(1): 34-51, 2012

<https://ehtrust.org/fcc-and-icnirp-limits-do-not-protect-people-of-the-environment-from-cell-phone-radiation-health-effects/>

- [FCC and ICNIRP Limits Do Not Protect People of the Environment From Cell Phone Radiation Health Effects - Environmental Health Trust](#)

Thank you very much for your time and 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]

On Monday, June 13, 2022, 3:27:35 AM PDT, Jane Osborn [REDACTED] > wrote:

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 it's determination that it's 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 it's 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

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. **Cell: 650-346-6390. Land Line: 650-967-5167 (Preferred Option)**

From: [Jane Osborn](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Cc: [Jane Osborn](#)
Subject: Public Comment, June 14, 2022, Wireless Ordinance
Date: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 7:00:26 PM

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

I have been very concerned about the potential fire danger posed by the small wireless facilities. I became even more alarmed about this hazard when I learned in the latest iteration of the proposed wireless ordinance that some residents may be forced to have a potentially dangerous SWF on their property, due to a public utility easement having been given decades ago when telephone utility poles primarily delivered land line services, which are innocuous, in comparison to the current wireless devices!

In my neighborhood, and in most neighborhoods in Los Altos, our properties are heavily wooded with trees and shrubs. The danger of fire is increased further by the drought. If a fire were to start on or near our property, it could cause loss of lives, especially if a fire were to occur at night when we are sleeping. We could be trapped inside our houses and burned alive or die from smoke inhalation.

I read the recommendations that were suggested by fire safety expert, Susan Foster, in the letter she sent to the council in April 2022. They seem as if they would provide an extra measure of safety in order to protect the public from the devastating consequences of fires, especially fires that could cause loss of life and property.

I was wondering if the city's current guidelines and standards include any or all of her suggestions. If not, is it possible for the city to consider implementing/including some or all of these suggestions?

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,
Jane Osborn

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