

Jacob, Melinda

---

**From:** Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB)  
**Subject:** FW: Cell phone towers newly proposed in the City of Berkeley

-----Original Message-----

From: chimey lee [<mailto:chimey2@yahoo.com>]  
Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2013 11:36 AM  
To: Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB)  
Subject: Cell phone towers newly proposed in the City of Berkeley

To the Zoning Department, City of Berkeley

It has come to my attention that ATT is petitioning the City of Berkeley, Cal., to put new cell phone towers in three locations this year: 1632 University, 2517 Sacramento, and 2995 Rose Street.

I am a senior very proactive regarding my health since i "had" four sisters with cancer. I plan to live more than thirty more healthy, productive years, unlike my father who lived to one hundred and two.

I do not object to cell towers but there are so many cases reported of cancer to cell phone uses and the research is still continuing. Until both ATT and the scientist can now at this present time produce irrefutable proof that cell phone towers does not cause cancer or any form of it. I would have to request that the City of Berkeley withhold any permits and/or petitions by any cell phone business(s) besides ATT, until this proof is established.

I also question the argument in some material that the radiation from the cell towers is minimal by the time it hits ground level, ignoring the residents who are close to the roof or any floor above the ground.

It is well know that cancer is a slow growing process and may take years in some cases to appear, I cannot understand why cell phone companies are not more concerned with the quality of human life and health unless their interest is solely for the "bottom line".

I do pray that all the above is taken in consideration for the good health of all residents and visitors of Berkeley and by all persons and businesses proposing these new cell towers.

Sincerely yours

Shang-Mei Lee  
1501 Blake Street  
Berkeley, Ca. 94703

Jacob, Melinda

---

**From:** Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB)  
**Subject:** FW: Please deny 2095 Rose cell towers (Use Permit #12-10000058)

---

**From:** Michael Katz [mailto:way.new@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 18, 2013 2:10 AM  
**To:** Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB)  
**Subject:** Please deny 2095 Rose cell towers (Use Permit #12-10000058)

Dear Zoning Adjustments Board Officers and Staff,  
I am writing as a neighbor of this proposed installation. (I live slightly to the east of the project site.) I am also a longtime customer/user, through a reseller, of applicant AT&T's wireless phone services.

Based on what I can decipher from the zoning application (whose elevations don't seem to fully depict the opaque "rooftop screen wall" that the text describes), I believe that the appropriately named "WTF" would create at least two significant detriments for residential neighbors.

I also question the applicant's rationale of a "significant service coverage gap" in this area, and the applicant's claim that this location constitutes the "least intrusive means to fill" this alleged gap.

Based on these assumption, I strongly urge you to deny the use permit.

The detriments are as follows:

(1) The proposed antennae -- together with the proposed equipment cabinets, "camouflage radomes," and "screen wall" -- would appear to add the equivalent of an extra story to the 2095 Rose Street structure.

This is a visual detriment, threatening to block what views of the Bay (and particularly of the Golden Gate) neighbors currently enjoy.

The proposed "camouflage" structures and "screen wall" are not a mitigation; rather, they worsen the detriment. This detriment would be much smaller if AT&T were genuinely proposing to "match the existing T-Mobile installation on the building" -- that is, to install antennae no higher than the current T-Mobile antennae, in a similarly slim footprint, in similarly simple cylinders, and without bulky opaque structures.

(2) The Radio Frequency (RF) radiation emissions from these powerful antennae appear to create a significant health concern for residential neighbors.

As an AT&T Wireless customer, I can prudently control my exposure to RF emissions by using my cell phone only when a land line is unavailable, and by keeping my phone away from my head and body with a wired earpiece/microphone. But the proposed installation would dramatically increase my RF exposure, while denying me any way to control it.

I am not persuaded by the RF exposure compliance data included in the application. (I used to help publish applications like this, incorporating similar cookie-cutter compliance statements.) In fact, the data on RF radiation's health effects are fragmentary and incomplete.

There has been far too little research effort and investment. But more importantly, mobile phones (and

associated transmission facilities) have been in widespread use for less than the latency period for the development of common cancers. This proposed facility -- and the RF exposure data included in the application -- are simply part of the massive uncontrolled experiment that the wireless industry and its regulators are conducting on human subjects.

My father died of a painful bone cancer when he was eight years older than my current age. I have been advised to minimize my exposure to radiation sources, and I take all reasonable and feasible steps to control this exposure. This proposed installation would deny me control over my radiation exposure.

Turning to the project's rationale: The applicant claims that this facility is "needed to close a significant service coverage gap in...an area roughly bounded by Eunice Street to the north, Vine Street to the south, Grant Street to the west, and Euclid Avenue to the east." As a longtime user of AT&T's wireless network, I do not find this claim credible.

I have never noticed any dropped calls, nor other coverage or service issues, anywhere in this area. I currently live near the area's center, but used to live near its southeastern boundary (at Vine and Euclid), and routinely use my cell phone near its southwestern boundary (at Vine and Grant).

I have experienced genuine gaps in AT&T's network -- for example, San Francisco's museum cluster around Yerba Buena Gardens was long a blackout zone -- but have never noticed any service issues in the area for which this installation is presented as a "needed" gap filler. AT&T has long been criticized for the overall quality of its wireless service; perhaps it needs to better analyze where its service gaps really are. Based on my own experience, 2095 Rose Street appears to be an inappropriate site for a new antenna facility.

Finally, I was surprised to learn that the 2095 Rose Street structure's owner -- and the project's co-applicant -- is architect Peter Calthorpe. Mr. Calthorpe is renowned for advocating automobile-restricted areas, "livability," and other shiny, happy, boutique and trendy ideas.

Calthorpe Associates' home page states that his firm is busy "improving communities from coast to coast and overseas." His application lists a residential address in a leafy neighborhood behind the Claremont Hotel, from which I'm confident he bicycles or skateboards (but does not drive) to our neighborhood.

I can't imagine why Mr. Calthorpe would want to reduce the livability of his office's neighbors by imposing two significant detriments -- that is, by blocking our views, and by introducing a significant radiation source with ultimately unknown health effects. As with AT&T's claimed "service gap" that doesn't seem to affect AT&T wireless users, there must have been some mistake.

I hope that the ZAB will help Mr. Calthorpe preserve his reputation -- and will help our neighborhood preserve its quality of life and well-being -- by denying this inappropriate application.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Respectfully yours,  
Michael Katz