

ITEM 4

From: [Danny P. Giometti](#)
To: [Martha Ochoa](#)
Subject: Fwd: Opposition to Antenna Use Permit AUP24-0001
Date: Friday, July 5, 2024 1:49:18 PM
Attachments: [Opposition to View Obstruction 7-5-2024.pdf](#)

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: JR Grofik <rgrofik@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2024 8:04:52 AM
To: Danny P. Giometti <DGIOMETTI@DanaPoint.org>
Subject: Opposition to Antenna Use Permit AUP24-0001

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning Mr. Giometti,

Attached and below you will find a letter in opposition to the antennas being proposed. Unfortunately, I will be out of town on the date of the Planning Commission hearing on this matter and will be unable to attend.

However, I did want to make sure our resident concerns were on record. Please let me know if you need any additional information and thank you for your assistance.

Regards,
John Grofik

Date: July 5, 2024

To: Mr. Danny Giometti
Senior Planner
Planning Division | City of Dana Point

Re: Opposition to Antenna Use Permit AUP24-0001

This letter is a follow up to our conversation regarding the antenna's being proposed for installation on the roof of the building located at 34085 Pacific Coast Highway (PCH).

As you will recall, my concerns were regarding the ocean view obstructions.

During our conversation I informed you that the trees I thought were planted by the City of Dana Point in front of this property were already obstructing Regatta resident ocean views. Specifically, the trees planted in front of The Point Restaurant on the corner of PCH and Green lantern. (This obstruction can be seen in the picture below.)

To provide some context, there were no trees in front of this business for several years. Then, these trees were planted and were below the roofline. Now the trees have grown past the roofline and negatively impact resident's ocean views.

You informed me that I should follow up with Al Jacobo with Dana Point General Services regarding tree concerns. I met with Mr. Jacobo to discuss this problem and he informed me these trees were the responsibility of the property owners and not the city. This clarification brings the responsibility for addressing this view obstruction back to the property owners.

If these new antennas are approved, they will only add to the current problem. Please let me know what you can do to address these concerns and protect our property values.

Thank you,

John Grofik
Regattas Homeowner



Date: July 5, 2024

To: Mr. Danny Giometti
Senior Planner
Planning Division | City of Dana Point

Re: Opposition to Antenna Use Permit AUP24-0001

This letter is a follow up to our conversation regarding the antenna's being proposed for installation on the roof of the building located at 34085 Pacific Coast Highway (PCH).

As you will recall, my concerns were regarding the ocean view obstructions. During our conversation I informed you that the trees I thought were planted by the City of Dana Point in front of this property were already obstructing Regatta resident ocean views. Specifically, the trees planted in front of The Point Restaurant on the corner of PCH and Green lantern. (This obstruction can be seen in the picture below.)

To provide some context, there were no trees in front of this business for several years. Then, these trees were planted and were below the roofline. Now the trees have grown past the roofline and negatively impact resident's ocean views.

You informed me that I should follow up with Al Jacobo with Dana Point General Services regarding tree concerns. I met with Mr. Jacobo to discuss this problem and he informed me these trees were the responsibility of the property owners and not the city. This clarification brings the responsibility for addressing this view obstruction back to the property owners.

If these new antennas are approved, they will only add to the current problem. Please let me know what you can do to address these concerns and protect our property values.

Thank you,

John Grofik
Regattas Homeowner



ITEM 4

RECEIVED
JUL 8 2024 PM 3:11

Attn: Dana Point Planning Commission
Meeting Date: July 8, 2024

My name is Dr. Daniel Kimbley, I'm a Dana Point resident residing in Niguel Shores.

This letter serves as public comment on the Planning Commission Agenda Item #4 addressing the AUP24-0001, CDP24-0007, CUP24-0002(M) - 34085 Pacific Coast Highway project.

I own a family chiropractic practice, Nexus Family Chiropractic, which is located within in the Blue Lantern Plaza. As a tenant of the building and because we see a high volume of whole-families (from pregnant mommas to infants, to young kids, and adults) I have serious concerns about the level of EMFs emitted from these antennae.

From a public health and safety perspective I strongly encourage you to reconsider the approval of this project: not only for my clients, but for my family, my team, and even the unsuspecting general public who will be placed at risk from this project.

My largest concern is the amount of radio frequency emitted from these antennae which is 8158.02%. This is 81.5 times higher than the MPE (Maximum Permissible Exposure), as stated in Section 6 of the conclusions and recommendations. Last month on the agenda, this number was 6000% which is a significant increase from sixty times the MPE to eighty-one times the MPE.

Here are a few facts about the public effects of EMF exposure:

In 2002, Santini found that 100 meters of distance from a cell antenna significantly increased diagnoses of fatigue, sleep disturbance, headaches, difficulty concentrating and depression.¹ The outlined Section 2.1 of the planning commission proposal report outlines multiple areas with 8000+ percent increase in MPE and exposure levels that are NOT considered safe for the public. Santini's work also shows that even at more than 300 meters, base stations can cause profound, negative human physiological impacts.

The last time safety standards for RF radiation were updated was 1996—which is clearly stated in the project proposal that discusses the FCC regulations.² 1996 was twenty-eight (28) years ago. To put this into perspective, 3G wireless service was not released until 2001.

In 2011 the International Agency for Research on Cancer classified EMFs emitted from cell phones and their antennae as Group 2B “possible carcinogens”—finding that this form of radiation can trigger abnormal cell growth and cancer.³

In February of 2018, The National Toxicology Program published not one, but **TWO** **government funded** studies that showed that male rats were more likely to develop heart tumors and DNA damage from EMFs.⁴ In March of 2018, the Ramazzini Institute showed a clear link between EMF radiation and Schwann cell tumors, the same kind found by the government funded studies. It's important to note here that the Ramazzini Institute studies used power levels one-thousand times (1000) lower than those used in the National Toxicology Program studies.⁵

Martin Pall Ph.d has done numerous studies to confirm the findings of the Ramazzini Institute. In the process, he discovered that microwave radiation actually weakens our immune systems and negatively affects our brains and nervous systems.⁶

One of the many reasons that my wife and I were drawn to Dana Point six years ago, and the reason that we started our family here was because of the city's mission statement, which at the time was all about a healthy, happy community. Since, Dana Point's mission statement has been updated "*to set the standard for an exceptionally livable city*".

The research clearly shows cancer growth, abnormal cell growth, DNA damage, weaker brains and weaker immunity.^{7,8,9,10} Clearly these risk factors don't make for an exceptionally livable city. High exposure to EMFs won't allow us to live exceptional lives.

How are we setting the standard if we allow the install of something that we know is not only harming us, but our future generations as well?

Outside of the government reproduced studies that confirm the dangers of EMFs. I'd like to ask that you take a few other things into consideration.

In our office, we take care of quite a few pregnant moms. Research from JAMA and NIH show that:

- Maternal EMF exposure during pregnancy can decrease fertility later in life for a child⁹
- Maternal EMF exposure during pregnancy can cause a child to develop asthma later in life^{9,11}

In 2011, researchers found that a child's head can absorb 10x the amount of EMFs as an adult head.³

I don't think anyone reading this would willingly put pregnant mommas, children, families, or contributing business owners to the city in danger if you had the choice. We value the health and safety of every single one of our clients in our office—and this community. To approve the installation of these antennae would directly put families at more risk.

I strongly urge you to consider that the public benefit of better wireless service does not outweigh the dangers to the business owners and patrons who spend time each and every day inside of the Blue Lantern Plaza.

In Good Health,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Daniel Kimbley', written in a cursive style.

Dr. Daniel Kimbley
Owner, Nexus Family Chiropractic

Sources

1. Santini, R., Santini, P., Danze, J. M., Le Ruz, P., & Seigne, M. (2002). Study of the health of people living in the vicinity of mobile phone base stations: Influences of distance and sex. *Pathological Biology*. <https://www.vws.org/documents/Cell-Project-Documents/PathologicalBiology.pdf>
2. *Guidelines For Evaluating the Environmental Effects of Radiofrequency Radiation*. Federal Communications Commission. (1996, August 1). https://transition.fcc.gov/Bureaus/Engineering_Technology/Orders/1996/fcc96326.pdf
3. De-Kun Li, M. (2011, October 1). *Maternal exposure to magnetic fields during pregnancy in relation to the risk of asthma in offspring*. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*. <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamapediatrics/fullarticle/1107612>
4. Mercola, J. (2023, March 20). *Cellphone radiation linked to brain and heart tumors*. Mercola.com. <https://articles.mercola.com/sites/articles/archive/2018/04/10/cellphone-radiation-linked-to-brain-heart-tumors.aspx>
5. Baan, R., Alison, R. H., Anderson, L. E., Belyaev, I. Y., Berridge, B. R., Carlberg, M., Elmore, S. A., Giovannini, M., Hardell, L., & Hasegawa, T. (2018, March 7). Report of final results regarding brain and heart tumors in Sprague-dawley rats exposed from prenatal life until natural death to mobile phone radiofrequency field representative of a 1.8 ghz GSM base station environmental emission. *Environmental Research*. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0013935118300367?via%3Dihub>
6. Pall, M. L. (2013, August). Electromagnetic fields act via activation of voltage-gated calcium channels to produce beneficial or adverse effects. *Journal of cellular and molecular medicine*. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3780531/>
7. Suliman A., Yasir M. (2021/01/05) *5G Radiofrequency -RF EMF Health Effects*. *5G Radiofrequency -RF EMF Health Effects*. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.16257.5360. https://www.researchgate.net/figure/G-RF-EMFs-frequency-spectrum-band-width_fig1_362068441
8. Rakkar, K., & Bayraktutan, U. (2015, October 23). *Increases in intracellular calcium perturb blood–brain barrier via protein kinase C-alpha and apoptosis*. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA) - Molecular Basis of Disease*. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0925443915003166>
9. Alberts, B. (1970, January 1). *Energy conversion: Mitochondria and chloroplasts*. *Molecular Biology of the Cell*. 4th edition. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK21063/>
10. Degtyarenko, K. N., Omura, T., Ichikawa, Y., Murakami, K., Mansuy, D., Bernhardt, R., Gotoh, O., Porter, T. D., Lu, A. Y., Katagiri, M., Narhi, L. O., Schiffler, B., Taylor, M., Trower, M. K., Green, A. J., Peterson, J. A., Poulos, T. L., Sevrioukova, I. F., Ziegler, G. A., ... Hunter, D. J. (2006, August 2). *Cytochrome P450 systems-biological variations of electron transport chains*. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA) - General Subjects*. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304416506002133>
11. Turedi, S., Hanci, H., Colakoglu, S., Kaya, H., & Odaci, E. (2016, March 23). Disruption of the ovarian follicle reservoir of prepubertal rats following prenatal exposure to a continuous 900-mhz electromagnetic field. *International journal of radiation biology*. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27007703/>