



Regarding Use Permit UP-24;4-1

Daniel Perano <djperano@gmail.com>
To: planning@amadorgov.org

Sat, Jun 8, 2024 at 9:20 PM

To the Planning Commission,

I am writing to request and urge you to deny the requested Use Permit UP-24;4-1. My wife and I and our two young daughters (a 4 year old and a 1 year old) live in one of the closest houses to the proposed tower, and while we strongly support the expansion of infrastructure in Amador County (including cellular service), we have numerous concerns about this specific location. Before getting into that, however, please allow me to introduce myself.

I'm a professional software engineer for a large healthcare company. I hold a bachelor's degree in computer science, and I have very little patience for "Internet science" - if someone is going to make scientific claims, I'm quite unlikely to be persuaded without a corpus of peer-reviewed studies conducted and published by credentialed researchers. When a neighbor knocked on my door with information about the project and a petition to request denial of the permit, I did not expect to find myself in opposition to the location. After reviewing the packet posted to the Planning Commission's website and after spending quite a bit of time assessing the current scientific consensus on the health impacts of locating towers quite close to homes, I'm now in opposition for the following reasons, in increasing order of importance.

1. Views & Property Values. We live two houses away from the project and I'm quite familiar with the area. The renderings in the permit package showing what a 90' tower would look like there do not at all match the trees immediately next to the tower, which I would estimate in the 40'-50' height range. The tower will be much taller than the immediately surrounding trees, with a corresponding impact on the view from nearby properties. Considering how prized the wild and scenic views of upcountry Amador County are, I think it quite likely that this project will depress property values for multiple neighbors (in addition to damaging the view for those who live here) - myself included.
2. Generalized health concerns. In reviewing the current state of scientific studies on this subject, I expected to find no good reason for any concern at all. This is not what I found - I found numerous conflicting studies from many sources, including some conducted or advocated for by very highly credentialed and respected academic researchers (one of them a professor at UC Berkeley). The situation to the best of my understanding is that there is a lack of scientific consensus on the subject, and there are numerous studies that suggest there is indeed a risk to human health beyond current understanding. There is no "gotcha" for either the "it's perfectly safe" or "it's terribly harmful" point of view. The greatest and best-substantiated concerns seem to correlate to situations where the exposure is constant and long-term - such as living within 300-400 meters of a tower, and several populational studies have identified living within that radius as a point of concern for several very serious health issues. The bedrooms in our house are closest to the tower, at approximately 275 meters to the exterior walls.
3. Specific health concerns. What Verizon does not and could not know is that their proposal would place a tower within 300 meters of a child with a severe genetic illness. My youngest daughter has Cystic Fibrosis, a severe, incurable, genetic disease that involves numerous bodily systems and requires constant medical treatment and daily therapy. While Cystic Fibrosis is genetic with a specific and well-known cause, gene expression (how severely the symptoms present and the long-term health picture) is unpredictable. Multiple studies I've reviewed suggest that it is possible

for low-mid frequency EMFs (such as those that carry cellular signals) to interact with gene expression and other genetic processes. With only about 100,000 Cystic Fibrosis patients alive worldwide (and only 36,000 of them in the U.S.), nobody has studied if or how living close to a cell tower could impact them specifically. We live quite close to where the "penumbra" (the portion of the signal field that spills out of primary focus and partially re-focuses at ground level) should be the strongest. In short: my daughter is permanently in an elevated risk group, and nobody, including Verizon, knows how this tower's placement could impact her. I am not willing to sign my daughter up for Verizon's unwitting human experiment on how living next to a cell tower impacts a CF patient.

In short: I support expanding Amador County's infrastructure, including cell towers. I hope that my Verizon-subscribing neighbors will soon have better signal strength in this area, but I oppose the specific placement of this tower because it is a poorly chosen location for numerous reasons - my baby daughter's health foremost (in my mind) among them. Amador County has many, many mountain ridges in this area where the tower could be placed at 400 meters or further from residences, and as a bonus, with little to no disturbance of anybody's view. Cell towers and similar infrastructure create unique risk conditions when placed close to homes due to their relatively high transmission power and the fact that they are constantly transmitting, as opposed to home Wi-Fi units (very low transmission power) and the cell phones themselves (only periodic transmission except when making a call). I ask the commission to please deny this permit and refer Verizon back to a search for a better location.

Thank you for your consideration,
Daniel Perano