

ATTACHMENT

For Item

#6

Wednesday,
August 7, 2019

PUBLIC COMMUNICATION RECEIVED BY THE
CLERK OF THE BOARD

DISTRIBUTED 08/06/19

From: Hans Norden <hansnorden@earthlink.net>
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2019 9:08 PM
To: FGG-DL, LSDOCS
Subject: 5G NO THANKS
Attachments: 5G.pdf

Hans Norden

Signature page for: **URGENT MESSAGE FROM YOUR CONSTITUENTS REGARDING
THE 5G WIRELESS ORDINANCE**

Name [Sign & Print]: MARIA C. SCHWARZ

Address: 1352 MULBERRY DRIVE SAN MARCOS CA 92069

Date: 08-05-19

Email Address
(optional): _____

Name of Your Supervisor (if you know):

Please: **1) print, 2) sign your name (& print) & address, 3) scan and 4) email** to the following:
lsdocs@sdcounty.ca.gov. Please send before noon on Monday, August 5.

Signature page for: **URGENT MESSAGE FROM YOUR CONSTITUENTS REGARDING
THE 5G WIRELESS ORDINANCE**

Name [Sign & Print]: HANS NORDEN

Address: 1352 MULBERRY DRIVE SAN MARCOS CA 92069

Date: 8-5-19

Email Address
(optional): _____

Name of Your Supervisor (if you know):

Please: **1) print, 2) sign your name (& print) & address, 3) scan and 4) email** to the following:
lsdocs@sdcounty.ca.gov. Please send before noon on Monday, August 5.

From: Jacob, Dianne
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2019 8:47 AM
To: FGG-DL, LSDOCS
Subject: FW: Concern about 5G Cell Tower Ordinance
Attachments: Concern about 5G - pg 1.jpg; Concern about 5G - pg 3.jpg; Concern about 5G - pg 2.jpg

From: Stephanie <stephanie@designfea.com>
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2019 11:46 PM
To: Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Jacob, Dianne <Dianne.Jacob@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Gaspar, Kristin <Kristin.Gaspar@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS) <Nathan.Fletcher@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Cox, Greg <Greg.Cox@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Subject: Concern about 5G Cell Tower Ordinance

Dear Board Members,

I would like to ask you to not pass the ordinance to allow 5G cell towers close to our homes and public places. The public should be informed prior to making a decision. I am concerned about property values (if a tower is installed near my home, it could reduce the value of my home). I also feel that safety extensive safety tests should be done prior to allowing towers to be placed close to homes and public places. The tests should be completed without industry influence. It is known that since 5G is a higher frequency, it has a shorter wavelength and greater energy. Because of this, more cell towers are needed. The combination of more cell towers, resulting in closer proximity to more people plus the greater energy could result in potential health risks. This also creates higher energy consumption and a greater carbon footprint. In the past, safety standards for emf were determined by the ability of a source (emf source) to increase the temperature of an object. Some research studies have shown that even 4G changes the electrical pathways of cells even without having enough energy to increase the thermal levels. However 5G has the ability to heat up objects and which violates the thermal safety regulations not to mention the potential health concerns about other cell damage.

I understand that 5G is the future. However, it is something that should be approached carefully, cautiously, and intentionally. It is not something that should be rushed into nor should it be influenced by industry lobbyists or influence. This is a decision where the people of San Diego should be included, where experts from both sides should be consulted, and the safest path forward should be determined for what is best for San Diegans health and productivity.

Please find attached my signed request.

Many thanks for your time and consideration!

Best,
Stephanie Pena
Encinitas

URGENT MESSAGE FROM YOUR CONSTITUENTS REGARDING THE 5G WIRELESS ORDINANCE

Dear San Diego County Board of Supervisors:

- 1. We are asking for a moratorium because the citizens of San Diego County are unaware that the ordinance you are about to pass on August 7th will allow untested 5G cell towers in front of their homes as early as next week.** These 5G cell towers emit radiation that has never been tested for health or safety for plants, animals or humans. We need to wait for the 9th and 10th Circuit Court cases brought by other cities to be decided before cell towers are put in place. The courts could turn back the FCC directive that stripped local control from municipalities in the first place.
- 2. The FCC directive strips San Diego County of nearly all aspects of local control.** This is wrong and we believe San Diego County should fight in court to protect our local rights to decide crucial issues that impact our lives - especially the future well-being of our children.
- 3. Our homes comprise the greatest portion of our assets.** We know that before 5G there was a consensus among most realtors and appraisers that a cell tower in front of a home devalued the home by at least 20%. We are concerned that a 5G cell site in front of a home may render the home unmarketable. 5G is a different animal. In all previous generations of wireless – 2G, 3G, 4G – the telecom industry promised the technology would not cause cancer because it did not heat tissue. They are not saying that with 5G, because 5G *does* heat tissue. 5G will exceed the safety limits now in place by the FCC because it heats tissue, and thermal protection was the only protection offered by previous FCC “safety standards”. As soon as the public realizes this, no one will want to buy a house with a 5G tower in front of it.
- 4. The Board of Supervisors *must not fail* to protect San Diego County citizens.** Right now these 5G small cells can be installed with telecom submitting a ministerial permit (just a rubberstamp by the County on a piece of paper with no hearing and no appeal) with no consideration for our opinions, our safety, our health, our property values and our privacy. Our privacy is being lost to 5G with the collection of data at every level of our lives. There are no restrictions on who collects this data and who the second, third and fourth party buyers will be. **This mass data collection is a breach of privacy that should demand a moratorium instantly.**
- 5. We want 1000 foot setbacks for the following: schools, daycare centers, churches with daycare centers, all hospitals, “quiet zone” laboratories for RF testing of public safety equipment, and fire stations.** We want a minimum of 100 foot setbacks from our homes. We would prefer 500 feet as four other cities in California have done in their ordinances. We find zero setbacks from our homes suggested by County staff *completely unacceptable*. Our intention is not to defy the FCC directive which states an effective ban in residential areas is prohibited if setbacks create such an effect. However, we choose to protect our real estate values over the telecommunication industry’s convenience and profit, and demand setbacks

that protect our residences. We are willing to sit at the table and work with industry to come up with alternate locations for towers.

6. **We propose wireless free conservation areas/parks to be set aside by San Diego County to protect wildlife and to protect the migratory path of birds.** We are aware the FCC “safety standards” do not protect bees, birds, and animals. Because wildlife is unprotected, and because it is known through thousands of peer reviewed studies that EMFs (wireless radiation) jeopardize the ecosystem as a whole, we would like to create quiet zones without wireless so that animals do not lose their protected habitat. We need to protect certain airways for migratory birds and other wildlife just as the Board of Supervisors has voted to protect hundreds of thousands of acres of land in San Diego County.
7. **Require a certificate of completion from each telecommunications applicant.** Because the law allows for additional telecommunications equipment to be added to each pole, and because this equipment may be in the form of microphones, cameras, surveillance technology, Homeland Security and other carriers with their own small cells, a certificate of completion tells the County and tells us as homeowners when the job is completed and advises us if additional technology is being added subsequent to the initial installation. All additional equipment should require a separate permit.
8. **There has not been a single study done by the FCC, the EPA, or the FDA showing 5G is safe,** yet 5G cell antennas are going to spring up outside our children’s bedroom windows. We refuse to be part of a human experiment that benefits the needs of industry and fails to protect our basic human rights. Our profound concern is heightened for the following reasons: 1) We do not trust the federal government to look out for our health and public safety; 2) We do not trust the FCC “safety standards” to be protective because the World Health Organization’s cancer committee, IARC, classified everything on the RF – EMF spectrum a 2b “possible human” carcinogen at levels *below* the FCC “safety” standard, putting RF in the same category as DDT and diesel fumes; 3) The FCC has never looked at the non-thermal effects of RF radiation [cancer, Alzheimer’s, neurodegenerative diseases, ADHD, birth defects, infertility, disabling headaches, sleep disruption, vertigo]. The FCC only protects us from the effects of heat which includes shocks, burns, and heatstroke; 4) The chairman of the FCC, Ajit Pai, is the former lead attorney for Verizon and may have a conflict of interest. Therefore, **we are looking to our representatives in San Diego County to protect us.**
9. **Because there are no studies proving that 5G is safe, San Diego County should establish a hotline to take complaints from the more than 500,000 residents who live in the County and additional residents who work and come to the County for medical and recreational reasons.** This hotline should be staffed by an individual who has training in radiation sickness, known in Medicare and Medicaid billing as “Exposure to radiofrequency, Sequela”. These complaints should be tabulated and conveyed monthly to the California Department of Public Health, the EPA, the FDA, and the FCC.

Respectfully & Gratefully, [See next page for signatures]

Signature page for: **URGENT MESSAGE FROM YOUR CONSTITUENTS REGARDING
THE 5G WIRELESS ORDINANCE**

Name [Sign & Print]: Stephanie Pena

Address: 475 Neptune Ave, Encinitas, CA 92024

Date: 8/5/19

Email Address
(optional): _____

Name of Your Supervisor (if you know):

Please send before noon on Tuesday August 6 to the following supervisors. You may select your own supervisor or send to all. Remember, Dianne Jacob is the Chairwoman.

Jim Desmond: jim.desmond@sdcountry.ca.gov

Dianne Jacob: dianne.jacob@sdcountry.ca.gov

Kristin Gaspar: kristin.gaspar@sdcountry.ca.gov

Nathan Fletcher: Nathan.Fletcher@sdcountry.ca.gov

Greg Cox: greg.cox@sdcountry.ca.gov

From: Jacob, Dianne
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2019 8:49 AM
To: FGG-DL, LSDOCS
Subject: FW: Comment on Agenda item 6 on upcoming 8/6/19 meeting

From: Alan Conrad <alan@edible-alchemy.net>
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2019 9:26 PM
To: Cox, Greg <Greg.Cox@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Jacob, Dianne <Dianne.Jacob@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Gaspar, Kristin <Kristin.Gaspar@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS) <Nathan.Fletcher@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Subject: Comment on Agenda item 6 on upcoming 8/6/19 meeting

Alan Conrad
1847 Klauber Ave.
San Diego, CA 92114
6192610582
bacteriafarmer@gmail.com

San Diego County Board of Supervisors
County Administration Center 1600 Pacific Hwy, Rm 335
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear County Supervisors,

I am writing to express my concern about the installment of 5G/small-cell antennas throughout San Diego County. The threats to public health, safety, privacy, security, property values, landscapes, and more must be addressed in the wireless ordinance. The citizens of San Diego County require your protection. I am grateful that The County is taking measures to incorporate such protections into an updated wireless ordinance, since the version approved in February makes no such provisions. Based on review of the latest ordinance draft, there are still a number of ways this ordinance could be improved to ensure the best for SD County citizens, which I trust is your primary goal. I ENCOURAGE YOU NOT TO VOTE IN FAVOR OF THE CURRENT DRAFT ORDINANCE UNTIL IT CONTAINS THE FOLLOWING:

- Restrict small cells in residential areas, and sensitive zones where children, elderly and those with special/medical needs will be. No small cell should be allowed within (a minimum) of 1000 feet from a residential property line, in any direction. Or within 1500 –3,000 ft of civic areas, including schools, hospitals, libraries, churches, daycares, community centers, senior facilities, police and fire stations, parks, and sports fields-to the property lines. Verizon has a commercial on YouTube where they measured the distance of a 5G signal (through hills and obstacles) at a distance of greater than 3,000 feet, so there should be zero issue with these setbacks, they are a necessity.
- Restrict proximity of small cells in business areas
- Stronger language. Use words which are definitive, instead of suggestions which can be ignored.

- Permit approvals must be made to be discretionary rather than ministerial,with the entire shot clock used, so the public can provide input that can be acted on, with a new streamlined system to accommodate objections and ADA Accommodations Requests.
- ADA language and provisions. The ordinance lacks language that protects Americans with disabilities, and their use of these rights-of-way and travel paths,where the small cells structures will be deployed. Small cells may make it impossible to occupy one's home or yard, as well, if sensitive to rf radiation.
- Require a Master Plan. The master plan needs to be coordinated across all carriers, and provide information for each antenna project like RF exposure levels, power levels, frequencies, and location address. The master plan should also be published online with ample notice, such that citizens can provide input BEFORE the antenna is installed. REQUIRE that these companies have a plan and strategy for where they place the antennas, and enforce their compliance. This will minimize excessive, haphazard installments.If there is no plan, require it as part of permit application.
- No Colocation! Co-location means multiple antennas to a single pole. And despite the thinking, it does not reduce clutter. Actually, it produces a huge eyesore of a pole will multiple projections hanging off of it. It DRAWS more attention because of the extra hardware. Colocation allows poles to become scarily top-heavy, and also exposes citizens to higher doses of radiation since multiple antennas will emit from a single location.One antenna per pole, and no antennas within 1000 feet of ANY other antenna, even from other providers.
- No cutting or disturbance of trees and landscaping –at all. This must be forbidden! There are other towns and cities with gorgeous, old trees being chopped down or excessively trimmed to allow for small cell deployment. Not going to happen in San Diego!
- Provide clear-easy-to-reach County support for citizens.We need to have a dedicated hotline/service to contact The County when issues with the small cells arise, such as noise, safety, health problems, or other complaints need to be reported. This service can be funded by the wireless providers as a part of their application/bond/yearly renewal fees.
- Insurance for rf radiation and other injuries,and Bonds. Require proof that the companies, annually, have adequate insurance (\$2 million dollars each small cell) and bonds of \$500,000 per small cell to protect against malfunction, accidents, damages, and injuries, including from exposure to nonionizing radiation. These provide protection for the County too.
- Random third-party testing. Random, independent third party inspections, by companies contracting with the County, must be required at least 3-4 times annually, at the expense of the telecom company owning the small cells, to ensure compliance with FCC guidelines for each pole (in total) and for each small cell on the pole.
- Require notice for any residence within a mileof a proposed small cell site, to provide ample time for residents to come forward and provide input, particularly those with medical reasons to avoid rf radiation.During noticing, large signage noticing must also be placed on prospective poles with full details of application plans in large print, including frequencies and power, size of small cell.•Approvals for permits may only be

reissued yearly with new re-application, with proof of having met all criteria including noticing, liability insurance as above, and bonds. Small cells may not be upgraded without a full new application process.

- Require safety signage on all poles. All poles must have necessary warning signs and RF safety information as well as company and County contact names and phone numbers. Include total rf emission levels near bottom ten feet of poles or general area if more than one pole.

- Keep small cells away from parks and ball fields –at least 3000 ft away. The County Parks Dept. income desires do not come ahead of public safety and aesthetics. Cell towers and small cells are a safety hazard and produce clutter in our parks and ballfields.

Thank you for taking the time to consider and apply these suggestions. I look forward to seeing these changes in the ordinance draft before it is voted on.

Finally, I'd like to remind all of you of the Nuremberg Code, which prohibits mass experiments on the population. If 5G isn't this, I don't know what is. I will be holding you all PERSONALLY RESPONSIBLE should you fail to do your sworn duty to protect myself and the rest of San Diego Country residents.

Sincerely,
Alan Conrad

From: Cox, Greg
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2019 8:50 AM
To: FGG-DL, LSDOCS
Subject: FW: Undeniable Harm, Wireless Ordinance POD 17-004 5G and Small Cell Antennas

From: Richard Van Every [mailto:richvanevery@me.com]
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2019 3:35 PM
To: docs@sdcounty.ca.gov
Cc: Cox, Greg; Jacob, Dianne; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS); Desmond, Jim; Gaspar, Kristin
Subject: Undeniable Harm, Wireless Ordinance POD 17-004 5G and Small Cell Antennas

August 5th, 2019

Richard M Van Every Jr
P.O. Box 937
Cardiff, CA 92007

Dear San Diego County Planning Commissioners,

I'm a 40 year resident of Encinitas, CA. The wave of 5G is deceptive, unjust and untested. It's clearly a crime against all life forms.

I urge you to stand up to serving your districts and protecting the people.

Don't believe the propaganda - the FCC is one of the most captured agencies in Washington.

5G is not safe. What legacy do you want to leave? This is your chance to stand up and do what's right over taking orders from the corporate elite telecom companies that does not have the people's health and wellbeing in mind.

I'm writing this letter to the County Supervisors because I believe that Encinitas and other cities within San Diego will be adopting the SD County Ordinance.

The 5G antennas will cause physical harm and financial hardship. The evidence is conclusive that microwaves at levels less than the FCC limits cause physical harm. The financial harm is the devaluation of real property because other people have the perception of harm also and won't want to live in my home with an antenna there.

I request the following:

1. Please protect us from the placement of antennas near our residences. Require a minimum of 100' setback from 5G and small cell antennas to residential property lines (as was ordered by the planning commissioners).
2. Make the construction of 5G and small cell antennas as rigorous as other telecom antennas, require compliance testing to FCC OET 65 and require the following:
 - i) Administrative or higher level permit
 - ii) Noticing of all the occupants within 500 feet

- iii) Supporting structure must meet ANSI TIA 222 class III pole requirements certified by an independent third-party
 - iv) Prohibit new supporting structures in residential areas unless all other remedies have been exhausted
 - v) Application processing fees including consultants are to be borne by the applicants
3. Give the county the power to disapprove an application for any of the reasons stated here:
- i) Conflict with safety and safety-related codes and requirements;
 - ii) The facility would not conform to the County's policy of concealment;
 - iii) Conflict with the character of a neighborhood or district;
 - iv) The use or construction of facilities is contrary to an already stated purpose of a specific zoning or land use designation;
 - v) The placement and location of facilities would create an unacceptable safety or financial risk to residents or the safety of the general public, employees and agents of the City or employees of the service provider or other service providers, or the reasonable probability of such;
 - vi) The placement and location of a facility would result in a conflict with, compromise in or change in the nature or character of the adjacent surrounding area.
4. Make the San Diego County wireless ordinance tough for our protection. Use the example of the city of Hercules that was written by a telecom company found at this link (update for small cell pending): <https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Hercules/#!/Hercules10/Hercules1016.html#10-16>

Please consider that the purpose of this ordinance is to protect citizens San Diego County. It is not to provide convenience to telecommunication companies or license to put antennas anywhere they want.

Thank you,

Rich Van Every

www.richvanevery.com

"What we do for ourselves will die with us, what we do for others is immortal."

- Winston Churchill

From: Cox, Greg
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2019 8:51 AM
To: FGG-DL, LSDOCS
Subject: FW:

From: Donna Napier [mailto:djnalp@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2019 3:50 PM
To: diane.jacobs@sdcounty.ca.gov; Cox, Greg
Subject:

San Diego County Board of Supervisors

County Administration Center

1600 Pacific Hwy, Rm 335

San Diego, CA 92101

greg.cox@sdcounty.ca.gov, dianne.jacob@sdcounty.ca.gov, kristin.gaspar@sdcounty.ca.gov,

nathan.fletcher@sdcounty.ca.gov, jim.desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov

Dear County Supervisors,

I am writing to express my concern about the installment of 5G/small-cell antennas throughout San Diego County. The threats to public health, safety, privacy, security, property values, landscapes, and more must be addressed in the wireless ordinance. The citizens of San Diego County require your protection. I am grateful that The County is taking measures to incorporate such protections into an updated wireless ordinance, since the version approved in February makes no such provisions.

Based on review of the latest ordinance draft, there are still a number of ways this ordinance could be improved to ensure the best for SD County citizens, which I trust is your primary goal.

I ENCOURAGE YOU NOT TO VOTE IN FAVOR OF THE CURRENT DRAFT ORDINANCE UNTIL IT CONTAINS THE FOLLOWING:

- **Restrict small cells in residential areas, and sensitive zones where children, elderly and those with special/medical needs will be.** No small cell should be allowed within (a minimum) of 1000 feet from a residential property line, in any direction. Or within 1500 – 3,000 ft of civic areas, including schools, hospitals, libraries, churches, daycares, community centers, senior facilities, police and fire stations, parks, and sports fields - to the property lines. Verizon has a commercial on YouTube where they measured the distance of a 5G signal (through hills and obstacles) at a distance of greater than 3,000 feet, so there should be zero issue with these setbacks, they are a necessity.
- **Restrict proximity of small cells in business areas**
- **Stronger language.** Use words which are definitive, instead of suggestions which can be ignored.
- **Permit approvals must be made to be discretionary rather than ministerial,** with the entire shot clock used, so the public can provide input *that can be acted on*, with a new streamlined system to accommodate objections and ADA Accommodations Requests.
- **ADA language and provisions.** The ordinance lacks language that protects Americans with disabilities, and their use of these rights-of-way and travel paths, where the small cells structures will be deployed. Small cells may make it impossible to occupy one's home or yard, as well, if sensitive to rf radiation. ADA protection must not be discriminatory toward those who have physical mobility disabilities only. What about citizens with EHS, pacemakers, ADD/ADHD, autoimmune, etc? Also, provide a set of directions for these requests with a timeline for granting them and incorporate into the shot clocks and beyond (which can then hold up the shot clock). These rights-of-way and public streets belong to us too, and this liability belongs to San Diego County.
- **Require a Master Plan.** The master plan needs to be coordinated across all carriers, and provide information for each antenna project like RF exposure levels, power levels, frequencies, and location address. The master plan should also be published online with ample notice, such that citizens can provide input BEFORE the antenna is installed. REQUIRE that these companies have a plan and strategy for where they place the antennas, and enforce their compliance. This will minimize excessive, haphazard installments. If there is no plan, require it as part of permit application.
- **No Colocation!** Co-location means multiple antennas to a single pole. And despite the thinking, it does not reduce clutter. Actually, it produces a huge eyesore of a pole with multiple projections hanging off of it. It DRAWS more attention because of the extra hardware. Colocation allows poles to become scarily top-heavy, and also exposes citizens to higher doses of radiation since multiple antennas will emit from a single location. One antenna per pole, and no antennas within 1000 feet of ANY other antenna, even from other providers.
- **No cutting or disturbance of trees and landscaping – at all.** This must be forbidden! There are other towns and cities with gorgeous, old trees being chopped down or excessively trimmed to allow for small cell deployment. Not going to happen in San Diego!
- **Provide clear-easy-to-reach County support for citizens.** We need to have a dedicated hotline/service to contact The County when issues with the small cells arise, such as noise, safety, health problems, or other complaints need to be reported. This service can be funded by the wireless providers as a part of their application/bond/yearly renewal fees.
- **Insurance for rf radiation and other injuries, and Bonds.** Require proof that the companies, annually, have adequate insurance (\$2 million dollars each small cell) and bonds of \$500,000 per small cell to protect against malfunction, accidents, damages, and injuries, including from exposure to nonionizing radiation. These provide protection for the County too.
- **Random third-party testing.** Random, independent third party inspections, by companies contracting with the County, must be required at least 3-4 times annually, at the expense of the telecom company owning the small cells, to ensure compliance with FCC guidelines for each pole (in total) and for each small cell on the pole.
- **Require notice for any residence within a mile** of a proposed small cell site, to provide ample time for residents to come forward and provide input, particularly those with medical reasons to avoid rf radiation. During noticing, large signage noticing must also be placed on prospective poles with full details of application plans in large print, including frequencies and power, size of small cell.
- **Approvals for permits may only be reissued yearly with new re-application,** with proof of having met all criteria including noticing, liability insurance as above, and bonds. *Small cells may not be upgraded without a full new application process.*
- **Require safety signage on all poles.** All poles must have necessary warning signs and RF safety information as well as company and County contact names and phone numbers. *Include total rf emission levels near bottom ten feet of poles or general area if more than one pole.*
- **Keep small cells away from parks and ball fields – at least 3000 ft away.** The County Parks Dept. income desires do not come ahead of public safety and aesthetics. Cell towers and small cells are a safety hazard and produce clutter in our parks and ballfields.

Thank you for taking the time to consider and apply these suggestions. I look forward to seeing these changes in the ordinance draft before it is voted on.

Sincerely,

Signature

Printed name

From: Cox, Greg
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2019 8:52 AM
To: FGG-DL, LSDOCS
Subject: FW: 5G Wireless Ordinance
Attachments: 400172.pdf

Importance: High

From: Turpin, Melissa Avitia [mailto:Melissa.Turpin@procopio.com]
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2019 4:30 PM
To: Desmond, Jim; Jacob, Dianne; Gaspar, Kristin; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS); Cox, Greg
Cc: Neal, S. Todd
Subject: 5G Wireless Ordinance
Importance: High

The attached is being sent at the request of S. Todd Neal, who resides at 6162 Mimulus, Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067. Thank you.

MELISSA AVITIA TURPIN
LEGAL SECRETARY

P. 619.525.3883 | melissa.turpin@procopio.com
525 B STREET, SUITE 2200, SAN DIEGO, CA 92101
[LinkedIn](#) | procopio.com



mailgw01.procopio.com made the following annotations

Mon Aug 05 2019 16:30:11

This is an email from Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves & Savitch LLP, Attorneys at Law. This email and any attachments hereto may contain information that is confidential and/or protected by the attorney-client privilege and attorney work product doctrine. This email is not intended for transmission to, or receipt by, any unauthorized persons. Inadvertent disclosure of the contents of this email or its attachments to unintended recipients is not intended to and does not constitute a waiver of attorney-client privilege or attorney work product protections. If you have received this email in error, immediately notify the sender of the erroneous receipt and destroy this email, any attachments, and all copies of same, either electronic or printed. Any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents or information received in error is strictly prohibited.

URGENT MESSAGE FROM YOUR CONSTITUENTS REGARDING THE 5G WIRELESS ORDINANCE

Dear San Diego County Board of Supervisors:

1. **We are asking for a moratorium because the citizens of San Diego County are unaware that the ordinance you are about to pass on August 7th will allow untested 5G cell towers in front of their homes as early as next week.** These 5G cell towers emit radiation that has never been tested for health or safety for plants, animals or humans. We need to wait for the 9th and 10th Circuit Court cases brought by other cities to be decided before cell towers are put in place. The courts could turn back the FCC directive that stripped local control from municipalities in the first place.
2. **The FCC directive strips San Diego County of nearly all aspects of local control.** This is wrong and we believe San Diego County should fight in court to protect our local rights to decide crucial issues that impact our lives - especially the future well-being of our children.
3. **Our homes comprise the greatest portion of our assets.** We know that before 5G there was a consensus among most realtors and appraisers that a cell tower in front of a home devalued the home by at least 20%. We are concerned that a 5G cell site in front of a home may render the home unmarketable. 5G is a different animal. In all previous generations of wireless – 2G, 3G, 4G – the telecom industry promised the technology would not cause cancer because it did not heat tissue. They are not saying that with 5G, because 5G *does* heat tissue. 5G will exceed the safety limits now in place by the FCC because it heats tissue, and thermal protection was the only protection offered by previous FCC “safety standards”. As soon as the public realizes this, no one will want to buy a house with a 5G tower in front of it.
4. **The Board of Supervisors *must not fail to protect San Diego County citizens.*** Right now these 5G small cells can be installed with telecom submitting a ministerial permit (just a rubberstamp by the County on a piece of paper with no hearing and no appeal) with no consideration for our opinions, our safety, our health, our property values and our privacy. Our privacy is being lost to 5G with the collection of data at every level of our lives. There are no restrictions on who collects this data and who the second, third and fourth party buyers will be. **This mass data collection is a breach of privacy that should demand a moratorium instantly.**
5. **We want 1000 foot setbacks for the following: schools, daycare centers, churches with daycare centers, all hospitals, “quiet zone” laboratories for RF testing of public safety equipment, and fire stations.** We want a minimum of 100 foot setbacks from our homes. We would prefer 500 feet as four other cities in California have done in their ordinances. We find zero setbacks from our homes suggested by County staff *completely unacceptable*. Our intention is not to defy the FCC directive which states an effective ban in residential areas is prohibited if setbacks create such an effect. However, we choose to protect our real estate values over the telecommunication industry’s convenience and profit, and demand setbacks

that protect our residences. We are willing to sit at the table and work with industry to come up with alternate locations for towers.

6. **We propose wireless free conservation areas/parks to be set aside by San Diego County to protect wildlife and to protect the migratory path of birds.** We are aware the FCC “safety standards” do not protect bees, birds, and animals. Because wildlife is unprotected, and because it is known through thousands of peer reviewed studies that EMFs (wireless radiation) jeopardize the ecosystem as a whole, we would like to create quiet zones without wireless so that animals do not lose their protected habitat. We need to protect certain airways for migratory birds and other wildlife just as the Board of Supervisors has voted to protect hundreds of thousands of acres of land in San Diego County.
7. **Require a certificate of completion from each telecommunications applicant.** Because the law allows for additional telecommunications equipment to be added to each pole, and because this equipment may be in the form of microphones, cameras, surveillance technology, Homeland Security and other carriers with their own small cells, a certificate of completion tells the County and tells us as homeowners when the job is completed and advises us if additional technology is being added subsequent to the initial installation. All additional equipment should require a separate permit.
8. **There has not been a single study done by the FCC, the EPA, or the FDA showing 5G is safe,** yet 5G cell antennas are going to spring up outside our children’s bedroom windows. We refuse to be part of a human experiment that benefits the needs of industry and fails to protect our basic human rights. Our profound concern is heightened for the following reasons: 1) We do not trust the federal government to look out for our health and public safety; 2) We do not trust the FCC “safety standards” to be protective because the World Health Organization’s cancer committee, IARC, classified everything on the RF – EMF spectrum a 2b “possible human” carcinogen at levels *below* the FCC “safety” standard, putting RF in the same category as DDT and diesel fumes; 3) The FCC has never looked at the non-thermal effects of RF radiation [cancer, Alzheimer’s, neurodegenerative diseases, ADHD, birth defects, infertility, disabling headaches, sleep disruption, vertigo]. The FCC only protects us from the effects of heat which includes shocks, burns, and heatstroke; 4) The chairman of the FCC, Ajit Pai, is the former lead attorney for Verizon and may have a conflict of interest. Therefore, **we are looking to our representatives in San Diego County to protect us.**
9. **Because there are no studies proving that 5G is safe, San Diego County should establish a hotline to take complaints from the more than 500,000 residents who live in the County and additional residents who work and come to the County for medical and recreational reasons.** This hotline should be staffed by an individual who has training in radiation sickness, known in Medicare and Medicaid billing as “Exposure to radiofrequency, Sequela”. These complaints should be tabulated and conveyed monthly to the California Department of Public Health, the EPA, the FDA, and the FCC.

Respectfully & Gratefully, [See next page for signatures]

Signature page for: **URGENT MESSAGE FROM YOUR CONSTITUENTS REGARDING
THE 5G WIRELESS ORDINANCE**

Name [Sign & Print]: S. Todd Neal / S. Todd Neal

Address: 6162 Minulus Rancho Santa Fe

Date: 8/5/19 92067

Email Address (optional): todd.neal@procopio.com

Name of Your Supervisor (if you know):

Please send before noon on Tuesday August 6 to the following supervisors. You may select your own supervisor or send to all. Remember, Dianne Jacob is the Chairwoman.

Jim Desmond: jim.desmond@sdcountry.ca.gov

Dianne Jacob: dianne.jacob@sdcountry.ca.gov

Kristin Gaspar: kristin.gaspar@sdcountry.ca.gov

Nathan Fletcher: Nathan.Fletcher@sdcountry.ca.gov

Greg Cox: greg.cox@sdcountry.ca.gov

From: Cox, Greg
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2019 8:52 AM
To: FGG-DL, LSDOCS
Subject: FW: NO 5G
Attachments: 5Gletter.pdf

From: Christine DiVinere [mailto:lucenz1234@att.net]
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2019 4:40 PM
To: Cox, Greg
Subject: NO 5G

San Diego County Resident Comments
on Proposed Wireless Ordinance Changes
as will appear in BOS Meeting Agenda for August 7, 2019

Your Name: **Christine DiVinere**
Your Street Address: **3464 Camino Largo**
City, state, zip: **Carlsbad, CA 92009**
Your phone #: **760.652.6538**
Your email address: **lucenz1234@att.net**

August 5, 2019

(Date)

San Diego County Board of Supervisors
County Administration Center
1600 Pacific Hwy, Rm 335
San Diego, CA 92101

greg.cox@sdcounty.ca.gov, dianne.jacob@sdcounty.ca.gov, kristin.gaspar@sdcounty.ca.gov,
nathan.fletcher@sdcounty.ca.gov, jim.desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov

Dear County Supervisors,

I am writing to express my concern about the installment of 5G/small-cell antennas throughout San Diego County. The threats to public health, safety, privacy, security, property values, landscapes, and more must be addressed in the wireless ordinance. The citizens of San Diego County require your protection. I am grateful that The County is taking measures to incorporate such protections into an updated wireless ordinance, since the version approved in February makes no such provisions.

Based on review of the latest ordinance draft, there are still a number of ways this ordinance could be improved to ensure the best for SD County citizens, which I trust is your primary goal.

I ENCOURAGE YOU NOT TO VOTE IN FAVOR OF THE CURRENT DRAFT ORDINANCE UNTIL IT CONTAINS THE FOLLOWING:

- **Restrict small cells in residential areas, and sensitive zones where children, elderly and those with special/medical needs will be.** No small cell should be allowed within (a minimum) of 1000 feet from a residential property line, in any direction. Or within 1500 – 3,000 ft of civic areas, including schools, hospitals, libraries, churches, daycares, community centers, senior facilities, police and fire stations, parks, and sports fields - to the property lines. Verizon has a commercial on YouTube where they measured the distance of a 5G signal (through hills and obstacles) at a distance of greater than 3,000 feet, so there should be zero issue with these setbacks, they are a necessity.
- **Restrict proximity of small cells in business areas**
- **Stronger language.** Use words which are definitive, instead of suggestions which can be ignored.
- **Permit approvals must be made to be discretionary rather than ministerial,** with the entire shot clock used, so the public can provide input *that can be acted on*, with a new streamlined system to accommodate objections and ADA Accommodations Requests.
- **ADA language and provisions.** The ordinance lacks language that protects Americans with disabilities, and their use of these rights-of-way and travel paths, where the small cells structures will be deployed. Small cells may make it impossible to occupy one's home or yard, as well, if sensitive to rf radiation. ADA

protection must not be discriminatory toward those who have physical mobility disabilities only. What about citizens with EHS, pacemakers, ADD/ADHD, autoimmune, etc? Also, provide a set of directions for these requests with a timeline for granting them and incorporate into the shot clocks and beyond (which can then hold up the shot clock). These rights-of-way and public streets belong to us too, and this liability belongs to San Diego County.

- **Require a Master Plan.** The master plan needs to be coordinated across all carriers, and provide information for each antenna project like RF exposure levels, power levels, frequencies, and location address. The master plan should also be published online with ample notice, such that citizens can provide input BEFORE the antenna is installed. REQUIRE that these companies have a plan and strategy for where they place the antennas, and enforce their compliance. This will minimize excessive, haphazard installations. If there is no plan, require it as part of permit application.
- **No Colocation!** Co-location means multiple antennas to a single pole. And despite the thinking, it does not reduce clutter. Actually, it produces a huge eyesore of a pole will multiple projections hanging off of it. It DRAWS more attention because of the extra hardware. Colocation allows poles to become scarily top-heavy, and also exposes citizens to higher doses of radiation since multiple antennas will emit from a single location. One antenna per pole, and no antennas within 1000 feet of ANY other antenna, even from other providers.
- **No cutting or disturbance of trees and landscaping – at all.** This must be forbidden! There are other towns and cities with gorgeous, old trees being chopped down or excessively trimmed to allow for small cell deployment. Not going to happen in San Diego!
- **Provide clear-easy-to-reach County support for citizens.** We need to have a dedicated hotline/service to contact The County when issues with the small cells arise, such as noise, safety, health problems, or other complaints need to be reported. This service can be funded by the wireless providers as a part of their application/bond/yearly renewal fees.
- **Insurance for rf radiation and other injuries, and Bonds.** Require proof that the companies, annually, have adequate insurance (\$2 million dollars each small cell) and bonds of \$500,000 per small cell to protect against malfunction, accidents, damages, and injuries, including from exposure to nonionizing radiation. These provide protection for the County too.
- **Random third-party testing.** Random, independent third party inspections, by companies contracting with the County, must be required at least 3-4 times annually, at the expense of the telecom company owning the small cells, to ensure compliance with FCC guidelines for each pole (in total) and for each small cell on the pole.
- **Require notice for any residence within a mile** of a proposed small cell site, to provide ample time for residents to come forward and provide input, particularly those with medical reasons to avoid rf radiation. During noticing, large signage noticing must also be placed on prospective poles with full details of application plans in large print, including frequencies and power, size of small cell.
- **Approvals for permits may only be reissued yearly with new re-application,** with proof of having met all criteria including noticing, liability insurance as above, and bonds. *Small cells may not be upgraded without a full new application process.*
- **Require safety signage on all poles.** All poles must have necessary warning signs and RF safety information as well as company and County contact names and phone numbers. *Include total rf emission levels near bottom ten feet of poles or general area if more than one pole.*
- **Keep small cells away from parks and ball fields – at least 3000 ft away.** The County Parks Dept. income desires do not come ahead of public safety and aesthetics. Cell towers and small cells are a safety hazard and produce clutter in our parks and ballfields.

Thank you for taking the time to consider and apply these suggestions. I look forward to seeing these changes in the ordinance draft before it is voted on.

Sincerely,



Signature

Christine DiVinere

Printed name

From: Jacob, Dianne
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2019 8:41 AM
To: FGG-DL, LSDOCS
Subject: FW: Urgent message to County Supervisors regarding 5G wireless ordinance.
Attachments: 5G Letter to County Supervisors.pdf

From: Kevin Owens <axle2axle@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2019 8:24 AM
To: whyfret1@mac.com; Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Jacob, Dianne <Dianne.Jacob@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Gaspar, Kristin <Kristin.Gaspar@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS) <Nathan.Fletcher@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Cox, Greg <Greg.Cox@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Subject: Urgent message to County Supervisors regarding 5G wireless ordinance.

Dear County Supervisors,

Please find attached our signed letter requesting your action concerning the proposed 5G wireless ordinance.

It is our hope that you will consider our request prior to making a decision concerning the implementation of the 5G wireless network in our County. Please consider our safety, security, privacy and property value when making your decision.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully submitted, Kevin & Pam Owens

URGENT MESSAGE FROM YOUR CONSTITUENTS REGARDING THE 5G WIRELESS ORDINANCE

Dear San Diego County Board of Supervisors:

1. **We are asking for a moratorium because the citizens of San Diego County are unaware that the ordinance you are about to pass on August 7th will allow untested 5G cell towers in front of their homes as early as next week.** These 5G cell towers emit radiation that has never been tested for health or safety for plants, animals or humans. We need to wait for the 9th and 10th Circuit Court cases brought by other cities to be decided before cell towers are put in place. The courts could turn back the FCC directive that stripped local control from municipalities in the first place.
2. **The FCC directive strips San Diego County of nearly all aspects of local control.** This is wrong and we believe San Diego County should fight in court to protect our local rights to decide crucial issues that impact our lives - especially the future well-being of our children.
3. **Our homes comprise the greatest portion of our assets.** We know that before 5G there was a consensus among most realtors and appraisers that a cell tower in front of a home devalued the home by at least 20%. We are concerned that a 5G cell site in front of a home may render the home unmarketable. 5G is a different animal. In all previous generations of wireless – 2G, 3G, 4G – the telecom industry promised the technology would not cause cancer because it did not heat tissue. They are not saying that with 5G, because 5G *does* heat tissue. 5G will exceed the safety limits now in place by the FCC because it heats tissue, and thermal protection was the only protection offered by previous FCC “safety standards”. As soon as the public realizes this, no one will want to buy a house with a 5G tower in front of it.
4. **The Board of Supervisors *must not fail* to protect San Diego County citizens.** Right now these 5G small cells can be installed with telecom submitting a ministerial permit (just a rubberstamp by the County on a piece of paper with no hearing and no appeal) with no consideration for our opinions, our safety, our health, our property values and our privacy. Our privacy is being lost to 5G with the collection of data at every level of our lives. There are no restrictions on who collects this data and who the second, third and fourth party buyers will be. **This mass data collection is a breach of privacy that should demand a moratorium instantly.**
5. **We want 1000 foot setbacks for the following: schools, daycare centers, churches with daycare centers, all hospitals, “quiet zone” laboratories for RF testing of public safety equipment, and fire stations.** We want a minimum of 100 foot setbacks from our homes. We would prefer 500 feet as four other cities in California have done in their ordinances. We find zero setbacks from our homes suggested by County staff *completely unacceptable*. Our intention is not to defy the FCC directive which states an effective ban in residential areas is prohibited if setbacks create such an effect. However, we choose to protect our real estate values over the telecommunication industry’s convenience and profit, and demand setbacks

that protect our residences. We are willing to sit at the table and work with industry to come up with alternate locations for towers.

6. **We propose wireless free conservation areas/parks to be set aside by San Diego County to protect wildlife and to protect the migratory path of birds.** We are aware the FCC “safety standards” do not protect bees, birds, and animals. Because wildlife is unprotected, and because it is known through thousands of peer reviewed studies that EMFs (wireless radiation) jeopardize the ecosystem as a whole, we would like to create quiet zones without wireless so that animals do not lose their protected habitat. We need to protect certain airways for migratory birds and other wildlife just as the Board of Supervisors has voted to protect hundreds of thousands of acres of land in San Diego County.
7. **Require a certificate of completion from each telecommunications applicant.** Because the law allows for additional telecommunications equipment to be added to each pole, and because this equipment may be in the form of microphones, cameras, surveillance technology, Homeland Security and other carriers with their own small cells, a certificate of completion tells the County and tells us as homeowners when the job is completed and advises us if additional technology is being added subsequent to the initial installation. All additional equipment should require a separate permit.
8. **There has not been a single study done by the FCC, the EPA, or the FDA showing 5G is safe,** yet 5G cell antennas are going to spring up outside our children’s bedroom windows. We refuse to be part of a human experiment that benefits the needs of industry and fails to protect our basic human rights. Our profound concern is heightened for the following reasons: 1) We do not trust the federal government to look out for our health and public safety; 2) We do not trust the FCC “safety standards” to be protective because the World Health Organization’s cancer committee, IARC, classified everything on the RF – EMF spectrum a 2b “possible human” carcinogen at levels *below* the FCC “safety” standard, putting RF in the same category as DDT and diesel fumes; 3) The FCC has never looked at the non-thermal effects of RF radiation [cancer, Alzheimer’s, neurodegenerative diseases, ADHD, birth defects, infertility, disabling headaches, sleep disruption, vertigo]. The FCC only protects us from the effects of heat which includes shocks, burns, and heatstroke; 4) The chairman of the FCC, Ajit Pai, is the former lead attorney for Verizon and may have a conflict of interest. Therefore, **we are looking to our representatives in San Diego County to protect us.**
9. **Because there are no studies proving that 5G is safe, San Diego County should establish a hotline to take complaints from the more than 500,000 residents who live in the County and additional residents who work and come to the County for medical and recreational reasons.** This hotline should be staffed by an individual who has training in radiation sickness, known in Medicare and Medicaid billing as “Exposure to radiofrequency, Sequela”. These complaints should be tabulated and conveyed monthly to the California Department of Public Health, the EPA, the FDA, and the FCC.

Respectfully & Gratefully, [See next page for signatures]

Signature page for: **URGENT MESSAGE FROM YOUR CONSTITUENTS REGARDING
THE 5G WIRELESS ORDINANCE**

 Pamela L. Owens

Name [Sign & Print]: Kevin C & Pamela L Owens

Address: 5632 La Crescenta Road, P.O. Box 546, RSF, 92067

Date: August 6th, 2019

Email Address (optional): axle2axle@gmail.com

Name of Your Supervisor (if you know): To all County supervisors

Please send before noon on Tuesday August 6 to the following supervisors. You may select your own supervisor or send to all. Remember, Dianne Jacob is the Chairwoman.

Jim Desmond: jim.desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov

Dianne Jacob: dianne.jacob@sdcounty.ca.gov

Kristin Gaspar: kristin.gaspar@sdcounty.ca.gov

Nathan Fletcher: Nathan.Fletcher@sdcounty.ca.gov

Greg Cox: greg.cox@sdcounty.ca.gov

From: Cox, Greg
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2019 8:53 AM
To: FGG-DL, LSDOCS
Subject: FW: 5G Wireless Rancho Sant

From: mili smythe [mailto:milismythe@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2019 4:55 PM
To: Laurel Lemarie; Desmond, Jim; Jacob, Dianne; Gaspar, Kristin; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS); Cox, Greg
Subject: 5G Wireless Rancho Sant

**URGENT MESSAGE FROM YOUR CONSTITUENTS REGARDING
THE 5G WIRELESS ORDINANCE**

Dear San Diego County Board of Supervisors:

1. **We are asking for a moratorium because the citizens of San Diego County are unaware that the ordinance you are about to pass on August 7th will allow untested 5G cell towers in front of their homes as early as next week.** These 5G cell towers emit radiation that has never been tested for health or safety for plants, animals or humans. We need to wait for the 9th and 10th Circuit Court cases brought by other cities to be decided before cell towers are put in place. The courts could turn back the FCC directive that stripped local control from municipalities in the first place.
2. **The FCC directive strips San Diego County of nearly all aspects of local control.** This is wrong and we believe San Diego County should fight in court to protect our local rights to decide crucial issues that impact our lives - especially the future well-being of our children.
3. **Our homes comprise the greatest portion of our assets.** We know that before 5G there was a consensus among most realtors and appraisers that a cell tower in front of a home devalued the home by at least 20%. We are concerned that a 5G cell site in front of a home may render the home unmarketable. 5G is a different animal. In all previous generations of wireless – 2G, 3G, 4G – the telecom industry promised the technology would not cause cancer because it did not heat tissue. They are not saying that with 5G, because 5G *does* heat tissue. 5G will exceed the safety limits now in place by the FCC because it heats tissue, and thermal protection was the only protection offered by previous FCC “safety standards”. As soon as the public realizes this, no one will want to buy a house with a 5G tower in front of it.
4. **The Board of Supervisors must not fail to protect San Diego County citizens.** Right now these 5G small cells can be installed with telecom submitting a ministerial permit (just a rubberstamp by the County on a piece of paper with no hearing and no appeal) with no consideration for our opinions, our safety, our health, our property values and our privacy. Our privacy is being lost to 5G with the collection of data at every level of our lives. There are no restrictions on who collects this data and who the second, third and fourth party buyers will be. This mass data collection is a breach of privacy that should demand a moratorium instantly.
5. **We want 1000 foot setbacks for the following: schools, daycare centers, churches with daycare centers, all hospitals, “quiet zone” laboratories for RE testing of public safety equipment, and fire stations.** We want a minimum of 100 foot setbacks from our homes. We would prefer 500 feet as four other cities in California have done in their ordinances. We find zero setbacks from our homes suggested by County staff *completely unacceptable*. Our intention is not to defy the FCC directive which states an effective ban in residential areas is prohibited if setbacks create such an effect. However, we choose to protect our real estate values over the telecommunication industry’s convenience and profit, and demand setbacks

that protect our residences. We are willing to sit at the table and work with industry to come up with alternate locations for towers.

6. **We propose wireless free conservation areas/parks to be set aside by San Diego County to protect wildlife and to protect the migratory path of birds.** We are aware the FCC "safety standards" do not protect bees, birds, and animals. Because wildlife is unprotected, and because it is known through thousands of peer reviewed studies that EMFs (wireless radiation) jeopardize the ecosystem as a whole, we would like to create quiet zones without wireless so that animals do not lose their protected habitat. We need to protect certain airways for migratory birds and other wildlife just as the Board of Supervisors has voted to protect hundreds of thousands of acres of land in San Diego County.
7. **Require a certificate of completion from each telecommunications applicant.** Because the law allows for additional telecommunications equipment to be added to each pole, and because this equipment may be in the form of microphones, cameras, surveillance technology, Homeland Security and other carriers with their own small cells, a certificate of completion tells the County and tells us as homeowners when the job is completed and advises us if additional technology is being added subsequent to the initial installation. All additional equipment should require a separate permit.
8. **There has not been a single study done by the FCC, the EPA, or the FDA showing 5G is safe,** yet 5G cell antennas are going to spring up outside our children's bedroom windows. We refuse to be part of a human experiment that benefits the needs of industry and fails to protect our basic human rights. Our profound concern is heightened for the following reasons: 1) We do not trust the federal government to look out for our health and public safety; 2) We do not trust the FCC "safety standards" to be protective because the World Health Organization's cancer committee, IARC, classified everything on the RF - EMF spectrum a 2b "possible human" carcinogen at levels below the FCC "safety" standard, putting RF in the same category as DDT and diesel fumes; 3) The FCC has never looked at the non-thermal effects of RF radiation [cancer, Alzheimer's, neurodegenerative diseases, ADHD, birth defects, infertility, disabling headaches, sleep disruption, vertigo]. The FCC only protects us from the effects of heat which includes shocks, burns, and heatstroke; 4) The chairman of the FCC, Ajit Pai, is the former lead attorney for Verizon and may have a conflict of interest. Therefore, we are looking to our representatives in San Diego County to protect us.
9. **Because there are no studies proving that 5G is safe, San Diego County should establish a hotline to take complaints from the more than 500,000 residents who live in the County and additional residents who work and come to the County for medical and recreational reasons.** This hotline should be staffed by an individual who has training in radiation sickness, knows in Medicare and Medicaid billing as "Exposure to radiofrequency, Sequela". These complaints should be tabulated and conveyed monthly to the California Department of Public Health, the EPA, the FDA, and the FCC.

Respectfully & Gratefully. [See next page for signatures]

Signature page for: URGENT MESSAGE FROM YOUR CONSTITUENTS REGARDING
THE 5G WIRELESS ORDINANCE

Name (Sign & Print): Mili Smythe MILLANI SMYTHE
Address: 5610 La Crescenta Road, Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067
Date: 8/5/19
Email Address (optional): milismythe@sbglobal.net
Name of Your Supervisor (if you know):
Jim Desmond

Please send **before noon on Tuesday August 6** to the following supervisors. You may select your own supervisor or send to all. Remember, Dianne Jacob is the Chairwoman.

- Jim Desmond: jim.desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov
- Dianne Jacob: dianne.jacob@sdcounty.ca.gov
- Kristin Gaspar: kristin.gaspar@sdcounty.ca.gov
- Nathan Fletcher: Nathan.Fletcher@sdcounty.ca.gov
- Greg Cox: greg.cox@sdcounty.ca.gov

On Aug 5, 2019, at 11:02 AM, Laurel Lemarie <whyfret1@mac.com> wrote:

Hi Guys,

There is an attached letter below you could sign and email

to: lsdocs@sdcounty.ca.gov

Laurel

From: Susan Foster <susan.foster04@gmail.com>

Subject: URGENT MESSAGE TO SUPERVISORS REGARDING THE 5G WIRELESS ORDINANCE

Date: August 4, 2019 at 10:43:23 PM PDT

To: Susan Foster <susan.foster04@gmail.com>

On 8/1/2019 11:20 PM, Susan Foster wrote:

Dear Friends & Neighbors,

PLEASE SIGN ATTACHED LETTER ASAP & email either to me or to the Board of Supervisors!!!

A crucial 5G vote is to take place on August 7, 2019 at the San Diego County Board of Supervisors meeting. This is their final meeting on the ordinance that is required to "synchronize" with a land and power grabbing move by the FCC to take over county and city land across the country to install 5G "small cells" as close as a few feet away from your home. The way the ordinance came out of Zoning & Planning after many months of deliberation – and threats of lawsuits by AT&T and Verizon – is, in a word: horrible. The zoning staff was going to give a setback so that these towers were not right up against our property lines or our homes. But the industry pushed and threatened and so the zoning staff took away the setbacks. Right now these extremely powerful 5G cells will be going on top of our street lights and the beams will be going out in all directions, including beams capable of penetrating our walls and coming into our homes to deliver service but also to gather data.

There are other, better, safer ways to deliver service. This is the cheapest way the industry could do it, and we need to tell our supervisors that the way things are written now is unacceptable.

Gratefully, after last week's San Diego County Planning Commission meeting, the Commissioners gave us 100' setbacks from the homes, but they took away the 1000' setbacks from schools where our children/grandchildren will be in attendance all day. We would like the 1000' setback for schools, and we want *at least* 100 feet from our homes, and preferably more. The final say rests with the Board of Supervisors on August 7.

There are nine key points contained in this message to our supervisors. We refuse to accept an untested technology for which there has not been a single safety study done by the FCC, EPA, or the FDA. Not a single one.

Signature instructions are on the last page. If you have any trouble scanning this after you print and sign, feel free to call Holly Manion (858-395-5287) or myself, Susan Foster (858-756-3532). Please send this on to your friends. We need hundreds of letters to go to the supervisors before some of these changes can be made. For over a year the supervisors have heard from the telecommunications

industry. Most people don't even know that the small cells are going to be rolled out. Some of you have seen unusual extensions going on some of the telephone poles in the area. These are small cells, and they will all be turned on at a time of the industry's choosing. There is going to be a substantial increase in radiation over what we currently experience.

You may wish to look at the International Scientist Appeal On Electromagnetic Fields and Wireless Technology
<https://www.saferemr.com/2019/07/international-scientist-appeal-on.html> for more information on the current science. The Bioinitiative Report is an excellent compilation of global science, both industry and independent:
<https://bioinitiative.org/>.

Thank you so much,

Susan

SUSAN FOSTER
U.S. Adviser, Radiation Research Trust (UK)
Honorary Firefighter, San Diego Fire Department
Medical Writer
Rancho Santa Fe CA 92091
858 756-3532
susan.foster04@gmail.com

A reminder to please contact your supervisor, or all five of the supervisors if you possibly can. Thank you so much. It would be great to get these in on Monday, April 5, but absolutely by noon on Tuesday, August 6.

Thank you!

Susan Foster

<We the people of San Diego County 1.docx>

From: Jacob, Dianne
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2019 9:01 AM
To: FGG-DL, LSDOCS
Subject: FW: 5G Small Cell Network- maximize local control

From: Sarah Neal <snealrsf@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2019 8:49 AM
To: Sarah Neal <snealrsf@gmail.com>
Cc: Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Jacob, Dianne <Dianne.Jacob@sdcounty.ca.gov>; kristin.gaspr@sdcounty.ca.gov; Fletcher, Nathan (BOS) <Nathan.Fletcher@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Cox, Greg <Greg.Cox@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Subject: 5G Small Cell Network- maximize local control

Jim Desmond: jim.desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov

Dianne Jacob: dianne.jacob@sdcounty.ca.gov

Kristin Gaspar: kristin.gaspar@sdcounty.ca.gov

Nathan Fletcher: Nathan.Fletcher@sdcounty.ca.gov

Greg Cox: greg.cox@sdcounty.ca.gov

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As you consider allowing the rollout of substantial infrastructure for 5 G to move forward, I am requesting that you please use your authority as our local representatives to exercise the **maximum local control legally allowed**.

Other county supervisors like you have done this by implementing the following:

- avoiding residential and historic areas
- maintaining minimum setbacks from homes, schools (1000 feet)
- limit to placing infrastructure on existing poles only and no closer than 1000 feet apart
- requiring telecom agencies to report radiation levels annually to ensure they do not exceed federal standards.

The federal government nor the telecom companies have not done their due diligence to prove that constant 24/7 exposure to this significantly higher R/F is safe, and in fact, studies and science is emerging raising safety and health concerns even the lower R/F a not especially for children whose brains and bodies are still developing. New infrastructure is unsightly and will devalue homes if placed in residential areas. Additionally, changes are expected to the federal laws and there are many organizations fighting the laws.

These above reasons support you taking most conservative approach and roll out which which is within your legal authority.

This is an interesting interview from the Senator in Connecticut:
<http://ct-n.com/ctnplayer.asp?odID=15794&jump=0:00:01>

Sincerely,

Sarah Neal
President, Rancho Santa Fe School Board

From: Jacob, Dianne
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2019 9:43 AM
To: FGG-DL, LSDOCS
Subject: FW: Perception of Harm, Wireless Ordinance POD 17-004 5G and Small Cell Antennas, SD County Board of Supervisors
Attachments: Perception of Harm Letter to Board of Supervisors.docx

From: Carol Cole <caroleco@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2019 9:40 AM
To: Jacob, Dianne <Dianne.Jacob@sdcounty.ca.gov>; Gaspar, Kristin <Kristin.Gaspar@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Perception of Harm, Wireless Ordinance POD 17-004 5G and Small Cell Antennas, SD County Board of Supervisors

CALL TO ACTION: Email must be sent before 4 pm Tuesday 8/6/19, and really ASAP Monday to have the most effect. "What to ask for" a draft letter is included below and as an attachment. The letter is self explanatory. (Consider testifying at the hearing on August 7 2019 . *If you plan to testify, you must sign up prior to the 9:00 a.m. start of the hearing.* County Administration Center, Hearing Chambers (Room 310) 1600 Pacific Highway, San Diego, CA 92101) **Please share this email with your friend and colleagues.**

Instructions

copy the email letter below or from the attachment into a new email Alternatively, edit the word document for your situation, sign it and attach to an email same subject same addresses

send to lsdocs@sdcounty.ca.gov

and to supervisors:

greg.cox@sdcounty.ca.gov

dianne.jacob@sdcounty.ca.gov kristin.gaspar@sdcounty.ca.gov

nathan.fletcher@sdcounty.ca.gov

jim.desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov

subject Perception of Harm, Wireless Ordinance POD 17-004 5G and Small Cell Antennas

edit the email letter for your situation and concern, including address info and signature
send it ASAP and before 4 pm Tuesday 8/6/19

Name Carol Cole

August 06, 2019

Address 1541 Stargaze Court

City CA San Marcos

County of San Diego Board of Supervisors lsdocs@sdcounty.ca.gov

Subject: Perception of Harm, Wireless Ordinance POD 17-004 5G and Small Cell Antennas

Dear San Diego County Planning Commissioners

My residence is in **San Marcos** CA. I am writing this letter to the County Supervisors because I believe that **92078** and other cities within San Diego will be adopting the SD County Ordinance.

I have the perception of harm from 5G and small cell microwave antennas in my front yard. I am afraid that the antennas will cause physical harm and financial harm. The evidence is conclusive that microwaves at levels less than the FCC limits cause physical harm. The financial harm is the devaluation of real property because other people have the perception of harm also and won't want to live in my home with an antenna there. I ask the following:

1. Please protect us from the placement of antennas near our residences. Require a minimum of 100' setback from 5G and small cell antennas to residential property lines (as was ordered by the planning commissioners).
2. Make the construction of 5G and small cell antennas as rigorous as other telecom antennas, require compliance testing to FCC OET 65 and require the following:
 - i) Administrative or higher level permit
 - ii) Noticing of all the occupants within 500 feet
 - iii) Supporting structure must meet ANSI TIA 222 class III pole requirements certified by an independent third-party
 - iv) Prohibit new supporting structures in residential areas unless all other remedies have been exhausted
 - v) Application processing fees including consultants are to be borne by the applicants
3. Give the county the power to disapprove an application for any of the reasons stated here:
 - i) Conflict with safety and safety-related codes and requirements;
 - ii) The facility would not conform to the County's policy of concealment;
 - iii) Conflict with the character of a neighborhood or district;
 - iv) The use or construction of facilities is contrary to an already stated purpose of a specific zoning or land use designation;
 - v) The placement and location of facilities would create an unacceptable safety or financial risk to residents or the safety of the general public, employees and agents of the City or employees of the service provider or other service providers, or the reasonable probability of such;
 - vi) The placement and location of a facility would result in a conflict with, compromise in or change in the nature or character of the adjacent surrounding area.
4. Make the San Diego County wireless ordinance tough for our protection. Use the example of the city of Hercules that was written by a telecom company found at this link (update for small cell pending):
<https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Hercules/#!/Hercules10/Hercules1016.html#10-16>

Please consider that the purpose of this ordinance is to protect citizens San Diego County. It is not to provide convenience to telecommunication companies or license to put antennas anywhere they want.

Carol Cole

Name
Address
City CA

August XX, 2019

County of San Diego Board of Supervisors lsdocs@sdcountry.ca.gov

Subject: Perception of Harm, Wireless Ordinance POD 17-004 5G and Small Cell Antennas

Dear San Diego County Planning Commissioners

if you know your supervisor, consider addressing that person by name in addition to board of supervisors

If you live in an incorporated areas of SD then delete this paragraph

My residence is in xxxxx CA. I am writing this letter to the County Supervisors because I believe that xxxxx and other cities within San Diego will be adopting the SD County Ordinance.

I have the perception of harm from 5G and small cell microwave antennas in my front yard. I am afraid that the antennas will cause physical harm and financial harm. The evidence is conclusive that microwaves at levels less than the FCC limits cause physical harm. The financial harm is the devaluation of real property because other people have the perception of harm also and won't want to live in my home with an antenna there. I ask the following:

1. Please protect us from the placement of antennas near our residences. Require a minimum of 100' setback from 5G and small cell antennas to residential property lines (as was ordered by the planning commissioners).
2. Make the construction of 5G and small cell antennas as rigorous as other telecom antennas, require compliance testing to FCC OET 65 and require the following:
 - i) Administrative or higher level permit
 - ii) Noticing of all the occupants within 500 feet
 - iii) Supporting structure must meet ANSI TIA 222 class III pole requirements certified by an independent third-party
 - iv) Prohibit new supporting structures in residential areas unless all other remedies have been exhausted
 - v) Application processing fees including consultants are to be borne by the applicants
3. Give the county the power to disapprove an application for any of the reasons stated here:
 - i) Conflict with safety and safety-related codes and requirements;
 - ii) The facility would not conform to the County's policy of concealment;
 - iii) Conflict with the character of a neighborhood or district;
 - iv) The use or construction of facilities is contrary to an already stated purpose of a specific zoning or land use designation;
 - v) The placement and location of facilities would create an unacceptable safety or financial risk to residents or the safety of the general public, employees and agents of the City or employees of the service provider or other service providers, or the reasonable probability of such;
 - vi) The placement and location of a facility would result in a conflict with, compromise in or change in the nature or character of the adjacent surrounding area.
4. Make the San Diego County wireless ordinance tough for our protection. Use the example of the city of Hercules that was written by a telecom company found at this link (update for small cell pending):
<https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Hercules/#!/Hercules10/Hercules1016.html#10-16>

Please consider that the purpose of this ordinance is to protect citizens San Diego County. It is not to provide convenience to telecommunication companies or license to put antennas anywhere they want.

Printed name (paste your signature here if you can do that)