

**From:** Kallie Caples <mitkofmonsterschildcare@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Monday, July 6, 2026 10:24 AM

**To:** Assembly <assembly@petersburgak.gov>

**Subject:** July 6th Meeting

Dear Honorable Assembly Members,

My name is Kallie Caples, and I am the owner/director of Mitkof Monsters ChildCare, a State of Alaska licensed childcare facility (License #2147429) serving children ages infant through pre-K at 11 North 12th Street. I'm writing to formally oppose the proposed siting of a second telecommunications tower within 1,000 feet of our facility, and to ask the Assembly to require a greater setback — at minimum 1,000 feet, and preferably 1,500 feet — or an alternative location before any permit is issued.

I'd ask the Assembly to weigh this request in light of the full context of who you're hearing from. During the pandemic, when childcare facilities across Alaska were closing their doors, this facility was the only licensed childcare facility in the state to stay open — and it didn't just stay open; it expanded services to care for the children of essential workers when no one else would. The owner at the time made that commitment to this community because the community needed them to. I'm asking this Assembly to honor that relationship now, when it's our turn to need something from you.

I want to be direct about the scope of what I'm asking you to consider. I understand that under Section 332(c)(7)(B)(iv) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, this Assembly's hands are tied on the question that matters most to me as a childcare provider: the health and developmental effects of sustained, close-proximity RF/EMF exposure on infants and young children. Federal law preempts local governments from denying or conditioning tower siting on the basis of RF emissions, provided the facility complies with FCC exposure limits. I am not asking you to violate that preemption, and I recognize you are not in a position to weigh that evidence even though I believe it is real and growing. So I am bringing you the case you *are* permitted to weigh: the direct, foreseeable economic harm this tower will do to a licensed small business that this community relied on when it mattered most, and to the families who depend on it.

1. This is a predictable, quantifiable business loss — not a hypothetical one.

Parents make enrollment decisions based on their own perceptions of risk, regardless of whether federal regulations allow this Assembly to consider them. When a parent learns that a second tower will sit within 1,000 feet (or closer) of where their child naps, eats, and plays for eight-plus hours a day, the realistic outcome is not "they read the FCC compliance report and stayed believing that was safe." The realistic outcome is that they withdraw their child and enroll somewhere else, find a home daycare provider, or stay home themselves — a risk made sharper by the fact that Mitkof Monsters has no real alternative in this community for many of the essential-worker families who depend on us.

A licensed childcare facility runs on thin margins and a waitlist-dependent enrollment model. Even a small number of withdrawals represents a meaningful share of our operating revenue. That is not a speculative harm. It is a direct, foreseeable consequence of this tower-siting decision, and it is squarely within this Assembly's authority to weigh business and economic impact in land use decisions.

2. A second tower compounds the risk that the Assembly can act on independently of RF emissions.

Setting aside emissions entirely, a second structure at this location raises ordinary, generally applicable land use and safety questions this Assembly has always had authority over:

- Fall zone and structural failure radius — does the proposed setback meet or exceed the tower's engineered fall zone, accounting for ice shedding and structural failure, given that a childcare playground and parking/pickup area sit within that radius?
- Cumulative visual and character impact — a second tower at this site changes the character of a corridor that includes a childcare center, [assisted living facility/hospital under construction, if applicable], and residential housing.
- Alternative site and co-location analysis — has the applicant demonstrated that co-location on the existing tower, or sitting at an alternative location, was genuinely infeasible? "We found a property owner willing to lease" is not the same as "no alternative existed."
- Precedent — approving a second tower at reduced setback here sets the standard that this Assembly will be asked to apply to the next childcare center, school, or care facility that comes before you.

3. The market itself already reflects what the science suggests.

I'm aware this Assembly cannot legally act on RF health evidence. But I'd ask you to notice what the market is already telling you without anyone needing to litigate the science: parents are price-sensitive to perceived risk near their children, property near towers is documented to carry a value discount, and businesses serving children are the first to feel that discount in the form of empty enrollment slots. You don't have to resolve the underlying health question to recognize that the economic behavior it produces is real, immediate, and falls hardest on a small business with no ability to absorb the loss.

My request to the Assembly:

I understand this letter is timely to your consideration of Ordinance #2026-14, which amends Title 19 to regulate wireless communication facilities and towers. I'd ask that the standards adopted in that ordinance — and any decision on this specific tower — reflect the following:

1. Require a setback of greater than 1,000 feet — preferably 1,500 feet — from any licensed childcare facility, consistent with the standard now under consideration in Ordinance #2026-14.
2. Require the applicant to document a genuine co-location and alternative-site analysis before approval.
3. At a minimum, table this decision until the economic impact on adjacent licensed care facilities has been studied.

I am happy to provide enrollment data, parent correspondence, or further documentation to support this request. Thank you for your time and for taking seriously the responsibility you carry for the children and small businesses in this borough.

Respectfully,

Kallie Caples

--

Owner/Director  
Mitkof Monsters Childcare  
P.O.Box 1426 Petersburg, AK, 99833  
PHONE # 907-772-2500