

# Exhibit J

This page intentionally left blank.

**From:** nbeety@netzero.net  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 4:56 PM  
**To:** ceqacomment  
**Cc:** nbeety@netzero.net  
**Subject:** PLN 150082, comments on neg dec  
**Attachments:** Dept of Interior comments on FirstNet 2-7-14.pdf; Cell tower fires, collapses, liist 2014.doc

April 25, 2017

Anna V. Quenga, Associate Planner  
Monterey County Resource Management Agency – Planning  
168 West Alisal, 2nd Floor, Salinas, Ca 93901



Comments on Negative Declaration  
PLN 150082

This Negative Declaration is an Inadequate investigation of the Indian Springs proposal PLN 150082. The proposed project would have a significant effect on the county. An EIR is necessary.

The four findings stated at the outset of the report (p. 1) are not supported by the evidence provided in the report, and there is ample evidence that contradicts these conclusions.

A major omission in the report is the significant impact of overturning the scenic easement restriction throughout Monterey County. This is a significant change in use.

Overturning the scenic easement restriction would impact Monterey County's scenic resources and every item on the list below on a countywide basis.

In addition to project-specific impacts, this change opens the door for other industries to claim discrimination and take the easement as well.

Also omitted in the Negative Declaration is the impact from broadcasting transmitters – a wholly different entity than cabled utilities. They cannot be conflated as being equal or the same. Cell towers have significant emissions.

Page 15, (2) of the Neg Dec says clearly:

All answers must take into account the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

Yet, this has not been done

Further, California government code Section 65850.6 covers cell tower projects where co-location can occur. California CEQA law requires certain procedures, yet the impact of future buildout to this location has not been assessed, nor have the co-location impacts on scenic easements throughout the county been considered. That would appear to be a violation of state law.

Flawed findings, and omissions:

1. p. 14: Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants – "No effect"

Horses and humans are sensitive receptors, as well as birds, pollinators, trees, etc.. RF is a Class 2B carcinogen according to the WHO IARC. Last year, the National Toxicology Program of the NIH released findings that RF caused malignant brain tumors, malignant heart tumors and precancerous lesions in 8.5% of male rats studied, and there was DNA damage – RF is also a mutagen. A spokesperson for industry association IEEE expects CalEPA to add RF to its Prop. 65 list of carcinogens. This is a pollutant, and it will be sprayed over a large area, exposing sensitive receptors to its effects

2. Ignores commonplace non-compliance of cell towers to “projected” emission levels and that the county cannot compel carriers to undergo regular assessment on emission levels – impacts can increase in significance when emissions exceed FCC thermal guidelines for exposure.
3. Aesthetics 1B – “No impact”

This will significantly impact scenic resources, and cumulatively impact by placement in scenic easements in other locations and via co-location

4. Agriculture/Forest Resources

Though the summary mentions “impacts to forest resources”, it doesn’t ask the question, Will there be impacts to forest resources? Restricts discussion to loss of forest land, but does not assess loss of trees

5. Air Quality

Ignores change to air quality with the emissions from microwave transmitters in the scenic easement

6. Air Quality p. 19: “No sensitive receptors within vicinity”

Horses, children, disabled people, adults, trees, wildlife are all within the vicinity

7. Biological Resources – “No impact”

Lacks any basis for its claim, despite abundant research showing it will have a very significant impact on birds, insects, trees, horses, other wildlife, and humans

Reference: Department of Interior memo on impacts to birds from RF radiation [1]

8. Greenhouse gas emissions

Ignores the operation of the cell tower and its power needs which inherently create greenhouse gas emissions

9. Population and Housing

Ignores displacement of people who are currently or become disabled by EMF emissions

10. Recreation

Omits question: Will this negatively impact recreation facilities?

11. p. 34 Mandatory findings: “not next to dwellings”

Ignores stables, offices, and facilities where people congregate

12. Fire danger –

This project area and other scenic easements contain and are surrounded by grassland and brush. Cell towers have caught fire and collapsed. A grass fire here would be disastrous and result in the deaths of humans and horses.[2] The danger and impact of this is completely ignored in the Neg Dec.

13. Is there P.E, certification of a third party evaluation of this project?

The above is not an exhaustive list. However, these serious omissions and flaws make an EIR necessary on this facility and for the scenic easement change.

Sincerely,

Nina Beety  
Monterey, CA  
[nbeety@netzero.net](mailto:nbeety@netzero.net)  
831-655-9902

[1] [http://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/us\\_doi\\_comments.pdf](http://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/us_doi_comments.pdf)

[2] <http://www.electronicsilentspring.com/primers/cell-towers-cell-phones/cell-tower-fires-collapsing/>



# United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20240

**FEB - 7 2014**



In Reply Refer To: (ER 14/0001) (ER 14/0004).

Mr. Eli Veenendaal  
National Telecommunications and Information  
Administration  
U.S. Department of Commerce  
1401 Constitution Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20230

Dear Mr. Veenendaal:

The Department of the Interior (Department) has reviewed the above referenced proposal and submits the following comments and attachment for consideration. Because the First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet) is a newly created entity, we commend the U.S. Department of Commerce for its timely proposals for NEPA implementing procedures.

The Department believes that some of the proposed procedures are not consistent with Executive Order 13186 Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds, which specifically requires federal agencies to develop and use principles, standards, and practices that will lessen the amount of unintentional take reasonably attributed to agency actions. The Department, through the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), finds that the proposals lack provisions necessary to conserve migratory bird resources, including eagles. The proposals also do not reflect current information regarding the effects of communication towers to birds. Our comments are intended to further clarify specific issues and address provisions in the proposals.

The Department recommends revisions to the proposed procedures to better reflect the impacts to resources under our jurisdiction from communication towers. The placement and operation of communication towers, including un-guyed, unlit, monopole or lattice-designed structures, impact protected migratory birds in two significant ways. The first is by injury, crippling loss, and death from collisions with towers and their supporting guy-wire infrastructure, where present. The second significant issue associated with communication towers involves impacts from non-ionizing electromagnetic radiation emitted by them (See Attachment).

In addition to the 147 Birds of Conservation Concern (BCC) species, the FWS has listed an additional 92 species as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act. Together with the bald and golden eagle, this represents 241 species of birds whose populations are in trouble or otherwise merit special protection, according to the varying criteria of these lists. The Department suggests that FirstNet consider preparing a programmatic environmental impact statement (see attachment) to determine and address cumulative impacts from authorizing FirstNet projects on those 241 species for which the incremental impact of tower mortality, when

added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, is most likely significant, given their overall imperiled status. Notwithstanding the proposed implementing procedures, a programmatic NEPA document might be the most effective and efficient method for establishing best management practices for individual projects, reducing the burden to individual applicants, and addressing cumulative impacts.

#### *Categorical Exclusions*

The Department has identified 13 of the proposed categorical exclusions (A-6, A-7, A-8, A-9, A-10, A-11, A-12, A-13, A-14 A-15, A-16, A-17, and A-19) as having the potential to significantly affect wildlife and the biological environment. Given this potential, we want to underscore the importance of our comments on FirstNet's procedural guidance under Environmental Review and Consultation Requirements for NEPA Reviews and its list of extraordinary circumstances in Appendix D.

#### *Environmental Review and Consultation Requirements for NEPA Reviews*

To ensure there are no potentially significant impacts on birds from projects that may otherwise be categorically excluded, the Department recommends including the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act to the list of requirements in this section.

#### *Extraordinary Circumstances*

To avoid potentially significant impacts on birds from projects that may otherwise be categorically excluded, the Department recommends including species covered under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act to the list of environmentally sensitive resources. Additionally, adding important resources to migratory birds such as sites in the Western Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Network and Audubon Important Bird Areas to the paragraph on areas having special designation or recognition would help ensure their consideration when contemplating use of a categorical exclusion.

#### *Developing the Purpose and Need*

The Department recommends inclusion of language that would ensure consideration of all other authorities to which NEPA is supplemental as opposed to simply the FirstNet mission. As currently written, the procedures are limited to ensuring the purpose and need considers the FirstNet mission. If strictly applied, this approach would severely limit the range of reasonable alternatives, and likely preclude consideration of more environmentally benign locations or construction practices.


#### *Environmental Review Process, Apply NEPA Early in the Process, Where Action is by Non-Federal Entity*

The Department recommends that FirstNet be required to coordinate with federal agencies having jurisdiction by law or special expertise on construction and lighting of its network of towers.



Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft document. If you have any questions concerning the comments, please contact Diana Whittington, NEPA Migratory Bird lead, at (703) 358-2010. If you have any questions regarding Departmental NEPA procedures, contact Lisa Treichel, Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance at (202) 208-7116.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Willie R. Taylor". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Willie" being the most prominent part.

Willie R. Taylor  
Director, Office of Environmental Policy  
and Compliance

Enclosure



### **Literature Cited**

- Longcore, T., C. Rich, P. Mineau, B. MacDonald, D.G. Bert, L.M. Sullivan, E. Mutrie, S.A. Gauthreaux, Jr., M.L. Avery, R.C. Crawford, A.M. Manville, II, E.R. Travis, and D. Drake. 2013. Avian mortality at communication towers in the United States and Canada: which species, how many, and where? *Biological Conservation* 158: 410-419.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2008. Birds of Conservation Concern, 2008. United States Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Migratory Bird Management, Arlington, VA. 85 pages. <http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds>.

## Enclosure A

### Background

The placement and operation of communication towers, including un-guyed, unlit, monopole or lattice-designed structures, impact protected migratory birds in two significant ways.

The first is by injury, crippling loss, and death from collisions with towers and their supporting guy-wire infrastructure, where present. Mass mortality events tend to occur during periods of peak spring and fall songbird bird migration when inclement weather events coincide with migration, and frequently where lights (either on the towers and/or on adjacent outbuildings) are also present. This situation has been well documented in the U.S. since 1948 in the published literature (Aronoff 1949, see Manville 2007a for a critique). The tallest communication towers tend to be the most problematic (Gehring *et al.* 2011). However, mid-range (~400-ft) towers as proposed by the First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet, a newly created entity under the Department of Commerce) can also significantly impact protected migratory birds, as can un-guyed and unlit lattice and monopole towers (Gehring *et al.* 2009, Manville 2007a, 2009, 2013a). Mass mortalities (more than several hundred birds per night) at unguyed, unlit monopole and lattice towers were documented in fall 2005 and 2011 in the Northeast and North Central U.S. (e.g., Manville 2007a). It has been argued that communication towers including “short” towers do not impact migratory birds, including at the population level (e.g., Arnold and Zink 2011), but recent findings have contradicted that assertion (Manville 2007a, 2013a, Longcore *et al.* 2012, 2013).

The second significant issue associated with communication towers involves impacts from non-ionizing electromagnetic radiation emitted by these structures. Radiation studies at cellular communication towers were begun circa 2000 in Europe and continue today on wild nesting birds. Study results have documented nest and site abandonment, plumage deterioration, locomotion problems, reduced survivorship, and death (e.g., Balmori 2005, Balmori and Hallberg 2007, and Everaert and Bauwens 2007). Nesting migratory birds and their offspring have apparently been affected by the radiation from cellular phone towers in the 900 and 1800 MHz frequency ranges – 915 MHz is the standard cellular phone frequency used in the United States. However, the electromagnetic radiation standards used by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) continue to be based on thermal heating, a criterion now nearly 30 years out of date and inapplicable today. This is primarily due to the lower levels of radiation output from microwave-powered communication devices such as cellular telephones and other sources of point-to-point communications; levels typically lower than from microwave ovens. The problem, however, appears to focus on very low levels of non-ionizing electromagnetic radiation. For example, in laboratory studies, T. Litovitz (personal communication) and DiCarlo *et al.* (2002) raised concerns about impacts of low-level, non-thermal electromagnetic radiation from the standard 915 MHz cell phone frequency on domestic chicken embryos – with some lethal results (Manville 2009, 2013a). Radiation at extremely low levels (0.0001 the level emitted by the average digital cellular telephone) caused heart attacks and the deaths of some chicken embryos subjected to hypoxic conditions in the laboratory while controls subjected to hypoxia were unaffected (DiCarlo *et al.* 2002). To date, no independent, third-party field studies have been conducted in North America on impacts of tower electromagnetic radiation on migratory birds. With the European field and U.S. laboratory evidence already available,

independent, third-party peer-reviewed studies need to be conducted in the U.S. to begin examining the effects from radiation on migratory birds and other trust species.

## **Discussion**

### ***Collision Deaths and Categorical Exclusions***

Attempts to estimate bird-collision mortality at communication towers in the U.S. resulted in figures of 4-5 million bird deaths per year (Manville 2005, 2009). A meta-review of the published literature now suggests, based on statistically determined parameters, that mortality may be 6.8 million birds per year in Canada and the U.S.; the vast majority in the United States (Longcore *et al.* 2012). Up to 350 species of birds have been killed at communication towers (Manville 2007a, 2009). The Service's Division of Migratory Bird Management has updated its voluntary, 2000 communication tower guidelines to reflect some of the more recent research findings (Manville 2013b). However, the level of estimated mortality alone suggests at a minimum that FirstNet prepare an environmental assessment to estimate and assess the cumulative effects of tower mortality to protected migratory birds.

A second meta-review of the published mortality data from scientific studies conducted in the U.S. and Canada (Longcore *et al.* 2013) strongly correlates population effects to at least 13 species of Birds of Conservation Concern (BCC, USFWS 2008). These are mortalities to BCC species based solely on documented collisions with communication towers in the U.S. and Canada, ranging from estimated annual levels of mortality of 1 to 9% of their estimated total population. Among these where mortality at communication towers was estimated at over 2% annually are the Yellow Rail, Swainson's Warbler, Pied-billed Grebe, Bay-breasted Warbler, Golden-winged Warbler, Prairie Warbler, and Ovenbird. Longcore *et al.* (2013) emphasized that avian mortality associated with anthropogenic sources is almost always reported in the aggregate, *i.e.*, "number of birds killed," which cannot detect species-level effects necessary to make effective and meaningful conservation assessments, including determining cumulative effects. These new findings strongly suggest the need for at least an environmental assessment by FirstNet, or more likely, an environmental impact statement.

### ***Radiation Impacts and Categorical Exclusions***

There is a growing level of anecdotal evidence linking effects of non-thermal, non-ionizing electromagnetic radiation from communication towers on nesting and roosting wild birds and other wildlife in the U.S. Independent, third-party studies have yet to be conducted in the U.S. or Canada, although a peer-reviewed research protocol developed for the U.S. Forest Service by the Service's Division of Migratory Bird Management is available to study both collision and radiation impacts (Manville 2002).

As previously mentioned, Balmori (2005) found strong negative correlations between levels of tower-emitted microwave radiation and bird breeding, nesting, and roosting in the vicinity of electromagnetic fields in Spain. He documented nest and site abandonment, plumage deterioration, locomotion problems, reduced survivorship, and death in House Sparrows, White Storks, Rock Doves, Magpies, Collared Doves, and other species. Though these species had historically been documented to roost and nest in these areas, Balmori (2005) did not observe these symptoms prior to construction and operation of the cellular phone towers. Balmori and Hallberg (2007) and Everaert and Bauwens (2007) found similar strong negative correlations

among male House Sparrows. Under laboratory conditions, DiCarlo *et al.* (2002) raised troubling concerns about impacts of low-level, non-thermal electromagnetic radiation from the standard 915 MHz cell phone frequency on domestic chicken embryos – with some lethal results (Manville 2009). Given the findings of the studies mentioned above, field studies should be conducted in North America to validate potential impacts of communication tower radiation – both direct and indirect – to migratory birds and other trust wildlife species.

### Literature Cited

- Arnold, T. W., and R.M. Zink. 2011. Collision mortality has no discernable effect on population trends of North American birds. *Plos ONE* 6:e24708.
- Aronoff, A. 1949. The September migration tragedy. *Linnaean News-Letter* 3(1):2.
- Balmori, A. 2005. Possible effects of electromagnetic fields from phone masts on a population of White Stork (*Ciconia ciconia*). *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine* 24:109-119.
- Balmori, A., and O. Hallberg. 2007. The urban decline of the House Sparrow (*Passer domesticus*): a possible link with electromagnetic radiation. *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine* 26:141-151.
- DiCarlo, A., N. White, F. Guo, P. Garrett, and T. Litovitz. 2002. Chronic electromagnetic field exposure decreases HSP70 levels and lowers cytoprotection. *Journal Cellular Biochemistry* 84: 447-454.
- Everaert, J., and D. Bauwens. 2007. A possible effect of electromagnetic radiation from mobile phone base stations on the number of breeding House Sparrows (*Passer domesticus*). *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine* 26:63-72.
- Gehring, J., P. Kerlinger, and A.M. Manville, II. 2009. Communication towers, lights, and birds: successful methods of reducing the frequency of avian collisions. *Ecological Applications* 19:505-514.
- Gehring, J., P. Kerlinger, and A.M. Manville, II. 2011. The role of tower height and guy wires on avian collisions with communication towers. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 75: 848-855.
- Longcore, T., C. Rich, P. Mineau, B. MacDonald, D.G. Bert, L.M. Sullivan, E. Mutrie, S.A. Gauthreaux, Jr., M.L. Avery, R.C. Crawford, A.M. Manville, II, E.R. Travis, and D. Drake. 2012. An estimate of avian mortality at communication towers in the United States and Canada. *PLoS ONE* 7(4) 17 pp, Open Access.
- Longcore, T., C. Rich, P. Mineau, B. MacDonald, D.G. Bert, L.M. Sullivan, E. Mutrie, S.A. Gauthreaux, Jr., M.L. Avery, R.C. Crawford, A.M. Manville, II, E.R. Travis, and D. Drake. 2013. Avian mortality at communication towers in the United States and Canada: which species, how many, and where? *Biological Conservation* 158: 410-419.
- Manville, A.M., II. 2002. Protocol for monitoring the impacts of cellular telecommunication towers on migratory birds within the Coconino, Prescott, and Kaibab National Forests, Arizona. Peer-reviewed research monitoring protocol requested by and prepared for the U.S. Forest Service. Division of Migratory Bird Management, USFWS. 9 pp, March 2002.
- Manville, A.M., II. 2005. Bird strikes and electrocutions at power lines, communication towers, and wind turbines: state of the art and state of the science – next steps toward mitigation. Pages 1051-1064 *In* C.J. Ralph and T.D. Rich (eds), *Bird Conservation Implementation in the Americas: Proceedings 3<sup>rd</sup> International Partners in Flight Conference*, U.S.D.A. Forest Service Gen. Technical Report PSW-GTR-191, Albany, CA.
- Manville, A.M., II. 2007a. Comments of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service submitted electronically to the FCC on 47 CFR Parts 1 and 17, WT Docket No. 03-187, FCC 06-164, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, “Effects of Communication Towers on Migratory Birds.” February 2, 2007. 32 pp.
- Manville, A.M., II. 2007b. U.S. Fish and Wildlife concerns over potential radiation impacts from cellular communication towers on migratory birds and other wildlife – research opportunities. Invited Presentation to “Congressional Staff Briefing on the Environmental and Human Health Effects of Radiofrequency (RF) Radiation,” House Capitol 5, Washington, DC. 16 page PowerPoint presentation. May 10, 2007.

- Manville, A.M., II. 2009. Towers, turbines, power lines and buildings – steps being taken by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to avoid or minimize take of migratory birds at these structures. Pages 262-272 in T.D. Rich, C. Arizmendi, D.W. Demarest, and C. Thompson (eds.). *Tundra to Tropics: Connecting Birds, Habitats and People*. Proceedings 4<sup>th</sup> International Partners in Flight Conference, McAllen, Texas.
- Manville, A.M., II. 2011. Estimates of annual human-caused mortality to North American birds (with literature citations). Division of Migratory Bird Management, USFWS, for public distribution. 12 pages.
- Manville, A.M., II. 2013a. Anthropogenic-related bird mortality focusing on steps to address human-caused problems. A White Paper for the Anthropogenic Panel, 5<sup>th</sup> International Partners in Flight Conference, Snowbird, Utah. August 27, 2013. 16 page peer-reviewed White Paper.
- Manville, A.M., II. 2013b. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) revised guidelines for communication tower design, siting, construction, operation, retrofitting, and decommissioning -- Suggestions based on previous USFWS recommendations to FCC regarding WT Docket No. 03-187, FCC 06-164, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, "Effects of Communication Towers on Migratory Birds," Docket No. 08-61, FCC's Antenna Structure Registration Program, and Service 2012 Wind Energy Guidelines. Division of Migratory Bird Management, Arlington, VA. 5 pages.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2008. *Birds of Conservation Concern*, 2008. United States Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Migratory Bird Management, Arlington, VA. 85 pages. <http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds>.

<http://www.electronicssilentspring.com/primers/cell-towers-cell-phones/cell-tower-fires-collapsing/>

## Cell Tower Fires and Collapsing Towers

Compiled by Dr. David M. Stupin,  
retired physicist, Los Alamos National Lab  
A joint project of the EMR Policy Institute ([www.emrpolicy.org](http://www.emrpolicy.org))  
and [electronicssilentspring.com](http://electronicssilentspring.com)

Cellular phone gear (antennas) have snapped and caused severe fires.  
Towers have also collapsed due to construction errors (31%), to ice (29%),  
to special wind (19%), to aircraft (11%) and to anchor failure (10%).  
Here are reports of cell towers that have caught fire and collapsed.

Under the list, please find more information from science writer B. Blake Levitt  
about cell tower fires and collapses.

## Cell Tower Fires

Compiled by Dr. David M. Stupin, retired physicist from Los Alamos National Laboratory.

4/14/2006 [Temple Hills, Prince George County, MD](#)  
7/4/2007 [Howell, MI](#)  
10/2007 [Malibu, CA](#)  
5/10/2010 [Madison, WI](#)  
5/10/2010 [Madison, WI](#)  
1/13/2011 [Rancho Cucamonga, CA](#)  
1/21/2011 [Poulsbo, WA](#)  
1/22/2011 [Wall, NJ, Tinton Falls, NJ and Neptune, NJ](#)  
1/22/2011 [Wall, NJ, Tinton Falls, NJ and Neptune, NJ](#) (video)  
12/2/2011 [Lilburn, GA](#)  
12/2/2011 [Lilburn, GA](#)  
5/16/2013 [Middletown, NJ](#)  
5/16/2013 [Middletown, NJ](#) (video)  
6/21/2013 [Bensalem, PA](#)  
7/8/2013 [West Salem, OR](#)  
7/8/2013 [Bensalem, PA](#)  
7/8/2013 [Bensalem, PA](#)  
8/21/2013 [Sanford, FL](#)  
1/6/2014 [Brownsville, TX](#)  
1/6/2014 [Brownsville, TX](#)  
2/4/2014 [Las Vegas, NV](#)

## Collapsing Towers

Compiled by Dr. David M. Stupin, retired physicist from Los Alamos National Laboratory.

5/10/2003 [Peoria, IL](#)  
11/2/2003 [Oswego, New York](#)  
3/18/2008 [La Merida, CA](#)  
1/24/2009 [Wellesley, MA](#)

11/10/2009 [Torrance, CA](#)  
12/14/2009 [Tulsa, OK](#)  
2/18/2011 [Clinton, PA](#)  
4/4/2011 [Ballard County, KY](#)  
10/31/2012 [Associated Press – Hurricane Sandy takes out 25% of cell towers in US](#)  
3/6/2013 [St Louis, MO](#)  
3/19/2013 [Laredo, TX](#)  
5/16/2013 [Middletown, NJ](#)  
5/28/2013 [Copiah County, MS](#)  
7/8/2013 [Bensalem, PA](#)  
7/8/2013 [Bensalem, PA](#)  
7/20/2013 [San Ramon, CA](#)  
10/1/2013 [Willow, AK](#)  
10/20/2013 [Jefferson County, MO](#)  
10/25/2013 [Alascom, AK](#)  
1/13/2014 [Chewelah, WA](#)  
2/2/2014 [Clarksburg, WV \(2 towers\)](#)  
3/14/2014 [North Adams, MA](#)  
3/26/2014 [Blaine, KS](#)  
5/10/2014 [Hudsonville, MI](#)

For a list of videos showing cell tower collapses, please click [here](#).

[Cell tower worker deaths](#)  
[Girl's cell phone catches fire under her pillow while she sleeps](#)

## Other Resources

[The Canyon Area Residents for the Environment](#)  
[Ethics in Engineering at Texas A&M University](#)

### Notes from B. Blake Levitt

[www.blakelevitt.com](http://www.blakelevitt.com)

*Electromagnetic Fields: A Consumer's Guide to the Issues and How to Protect Ourselves*  
*Cell Towers, Wireless Convenience? Or Environmental Hazard? Proceedings of the 'Cell Towers Forum' —*  
*State of the Science, State of the Law*

Such potential problems are among the reasons why large setbacks from dwellings/schools/businesses are recommended — 1500' minimum. Check out the two videos of burning towers — one has useful info for fire departments. Looks like these kinds of fires are unusual to fight and require creative approaches. Among the causes: overheating of equipment, improper cooling, lightning strikes, and others. One industry report found that if there's a tower, there is a 100%+ chance per year it will attract lightening. Even proper grounding does not always offset potential equipment damage/failure from such massive jolts and sudden ground current, including accessory building and generator explosions. Accessory buildings and generators contain sulphuric acid in batteries and diesel. That's why large setbacks — 400' minimum — are recommended for accessory buildings from wetlands. These can be complicated sites.



**From:** annie griffin  
**To:** [Quenga, Anna V. x5175](#)  
**Subject:** Re: PLN150082  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 16, 2017 12:49:37 PM

---

Comments for the PLN150082

Dear Anna,

I requested months ago to be put on your list to alert me when the comment periods would begin. I was never notified. Therefore I *hope you will accept my comments now as a result of that missed opportunity.*

*As a TV Producer on local cable network I am reporting this tragic and dangerous Neg/Declaration outcome to all listeners and showing the YouTube clips below.*

*Thank you,*

Comments for the PLN150082

The Negative Declaration disregards all independent research done on the harmful effects of cell towers.

There is no mention of the impact Verizon's will have on it's ability to circumvent Scenic Easement restrictions on all future Scenic Easements which opens a flood gate of opportunity for other cell phone company's to exemplify upon.

This flawed representation of a Declaration is a disgrace and poses a real danger of blatant disregard for all that EIR's are suppose to stand for.

I present evidence collected from farms harmed by these cell towers as well as scientist, such as Dr. George Carlo, who was hired by the cell phone industry to prove cell phones were safe. If cell phones are not safe how can cell towers carrying so much more EMF radiation be safe? When our own people , in the Planning Department become so corrupt as to disregard all science but the science that represents money, power and greed, we have indeed lost all ability to defend ourselves against that corruption..

Sincerely, Lorna Moffat

PO Box 545,

Monterey, Calif. 93942

831-582-1705



[Cell Phone Tower Radiation Experiment Results](#)

[Environmental Radiation LLC](#)

•  
3.7K views 4 years ago

After several months of plant experiments, I now have the results. The Dieffenbachia (Dumb Cane) does indeed

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tP45u4EFnYc>



### [Cell Towers Radiation Effects On Humans And Animals In Warangal | iNews](#)

[iNews](#)

24 views 3 weeks ago

People are so much affected by the **radiation cell towers** in Warangal as people are getting cancers and

6:48


### [Electric Magnetic Radiation Antennas EMR Killing Us and Our Animals!](#)

[Truth-worx Cornelia](#)

•

588 views 1 year ago

Electric Magnetic **Radiation** Australia EMR EMF Killing Us and our **Animals!** Base Stations EMF's Phone **Tow**



### [Dr. George Carlo EMF Cell Phone Dangers Interview](#)

[Paul Fitzgeralds](#)

•

95K views 10 years ago

<http://www.emfnews.org/headset.html> TV Interview with **Dr. Carlo** (Campbell Live, TV3) **Dr. Carlo** talks a

On Tue, May 9, 2017 at 9:37 AM, Quenga, Anna V. x5175 <[QuengaAV@co.monterey.ca.us](mailto:QuengaAV@co.monterey.ca.us)> wrote:

Dear Lorna,

Thank you very much for your message. Attached you will find the Initial Study/Negative Declaration for the Indian Springs wireless communication facility.

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

Anna V. Quenga, Associate Planner

Long Range Planning

Monterey County RMA-Planning

168 West Alisal Street ~ Second Floor

Salinas, CA 93901

[\(831\) 755-5175](tel:8317555175) work [\(831\) 757-9516](tel:8317579516) fax

[www.co.monterey.ca.us/pbi](http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/pbi)



Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

**From:** annie griffin [mailto:[stallionsavers@gmail.com](mailto:stallionsavers@gmail.com)]

**Sent:** Monday, May 8, 2017 1:13 PM

**To:** Quenga, Anna V. x5175 <[QuengaAV@co.monterey.ca.us](mailto:QuengaAV@co.monterey.ca.us)>

**Subject:** PLN150082

Please send me the Negative declaration for PLN 150082.

I missed the deadline for comment period but requested to be put on the list last year so I hope my comments will, in all fairness, still be considered. Thank you,

Sincerely,

Lorna Moffat