EXHIBIT BB
PUBLIC COMMENTS
Linda Ritter and the City Counsel,

This is provided to the City under RCW 42.20.100 and 18 U.S.C. § 242 inter alia.

I reside in the proximity of the proposed cell tower. Because I’m exposed to 100 million times more Electromagnetic radiation than my parents were, and cell towers are making that number grow exponentially, being situated contiguous to the proposed cell tower site I’m going to be saturated with cell site microwave radiation. Most of the most powerful cell tower installations are on mountains and hilltops outside of urban areas. These EM fields have impacted humans, animals as well as the ecological balance. Studies of people and farm animals living around high voltage wires point to extreme hazards of living up up-close to a powerful electromagnetic field (EMF) - exhibiting everything from stress and sleep disorders to birth defects, cancer and Alzheimer’s. As such it appears all cell site exposure constitutes health risks.

Often cell tower advocates hire consultants to falsify radiation exposure.

Scientific, epidemiological and medical evidence reveals the danger behind cell phone tower radiation. Data suggests even low levels of RF may have profoundly negative effects on our biological systems. RF can cause damage to cell tissue and DNA. "This bathes our bodies, our children, pets and co-workers in microwave radiation close to the range of a microwave oven."

Cancer, suppressed immune systems, depression, Alzheimer's disease, blood brain barrier leakage problems and neurological problems are just a few of the health problems associated with RF. An increase in fertility problems is on the rise with many blaming the cell phone towers for issues such as low sperm count, miscarriage and birth defects. Every day annoyances are creeping up as cell phone towers are built. Headaches, sleep disorders, nose bleeds, increased heart rates and memory loss are occurring more frequently.

Elderly individuals, the frail and pregnant women are in greater danger from cell phone towers than the normal population. However, it is the children who are at the greatest risk for developing conditions associated with RF. Their thinner skulls and rapid growth rates make them more susceptible to the tower's waves. The United Kingdom issued warnings to people under the age of sixteen to avoid cell phone use completely.

Radiation standards for cell phone towers in the United States are some of the most lenient and least protective in the world! The United States government allows 580 to 1,000 microwatts per sq. cm. Compare our standards to the rest of the world: Australia tolerates...
no more than 200 microwatts per sq. cm. Russia, Italy and Canada only 10 microwatts per sq. cm. China six microwatts per sq. cm. and New Zealand allowing only 0.02 microwatts per sq. cm.

Cell towers (or cell sites) hold antennas and other communications equipment and flood the area for miles around with powerful high frequency radio waves (known as microwaves) to support the use of cellphones as well as Wi-Fi, WiMax, Wireless LANs, 802.11 networks, Bluetooth supported devices, and more.

Cell towers typically contain transmitter/receivers transceivers, control electronics, a GPS receiver for timing, digital signal processors as well as various types of electrical power sources.

These microwaves might travel for as few as 2 miles in hilly areas, and up to 45 miles where there are fewer obstructions, and of course, they easily penetrate brick and metal.

Other forms of cell towers include:

Radio masts - Smaller versions of cell towers, often seen on rooftops and billboards, typically installed 800-1300 feet apart.

Mobile towers are especially dangerous because they emit microwaves at a frequency of 1900 MHz. Recent studies have shown that the intense radioactivity from mobile phone towers adversely impacts every biological organism within 1 square kilometer.

The dangers of microwave radiation from cell towers (as well as satellite dishes) is being examined and debated all over the world, but relatively little in the U.S. Fukushima and Hanford are now infamous for out of control radiation.

The human body itself is electromagnetic (at a very low level—around 10 hertz). It’s been shown that each one of our cells has its own electromagnetic field (EMF). Maintaining balance in those cellular EMFs is critical to staying healthy.

Decades of studies have demonstrated that artificial frequencies higher than 10 hertz can create stress and serious health problems.

Cellphone tower wavelengths, microwaves have a significantly higher frequency than even radio waves. The higher the frequency, the more powerful the wave—and the more powerful effect on biological organisms. (Recall a mobile tower emit microwaves at 1900 MHz.)

These higher energy waves can actually destroy chemical and molecular bonds, creating chaos in our basic biochemical structures.

The negative health effects of EMFs and microwave radiation are well documented. Studies have shown that EMFs can affect:

Enzymes
DNA
Metabolism
Genes
Hormones
And more

Cell Tower Radiation Has Also Been Linked To:
Headaches
Memory loss
Low sperm count
Cancer, birth defects
Heart conditions
Alzheimer’s.

One of the problems is that this damage is cumulative in the tissues, and can take years, even decades to show up.

Please cause an environmental impact study and obtain an independent study from a consultant hired by the City BEFORE permitting a cell tower that not only may destroy property values but also the human inhabitants in the proximity of the cell tower.

Lana Zenkina

7602 Mukilteo Spwy
Mukilteo, WA 98275
(425) 280-3407
Non-ionizing radiation

Non-ionizing (or non-ionising) radiation refers to any type of electromagnetic radiation that does not carry enough energy per quantum to ionize atoms or molecules—that is, to completely remove an electron from an atom or molecule.[1] Instead of producing charged ions when passing through matter, the electromagnetic radiation has sufficient energy only for excitation, the movement of an electron to a higher energy state. Ionizing radiation which has a higher frequency and shorter wavelength than nonionizing radiation, has many uses but can be a health hazard; exposure to it can cause burns, radiation sickness, cancer and genetic damage. Using ionizing radiation requires elaborate radiological protection measures which in general are not required with nonionizing radiation.

The region at which radiation becomes considered as "ionizing" is not well defined, since different molecules and atoms ionize at different energies. The usual definitions have suggested that radiation with particle or photon energies less than 10 electronvolts (eV) be considered non-ionizing. Another suggested threshold is 33 electronvolts, which is the energy needed to ionize water molecules. The light from the Sun that reaches the earth is largely composed of non-ionizing radiation, since the ionizing far-ultraviolet rays have been filtered out by the gases in the atmosphere, particularly oxygen. The remaining ultraviolet radiation from the Sun is in the non-ionizing band, and causes molecular damage (for example, sunburn) by photochemical and free-radical-producing means that do not ionize.[2]

Different biological effects are observed for different types of non-ionizing radiation.[2][3][4] A difficulty is that there is no controversy that the upper frequencies of non-ionizing radiation near these energies (much of the spectrum of UV light and some visible light) is capable of non-thermal biological damage, similar to ionizing radiation. Health debate therefore centers on the non-thermal effects of radiation of much lower frequencies (microwave, millimeter and radiowave radiation). However, the International Agency for Research on Cancer recently stated that non-ionizing radiation could cause cancer in humans.[5]
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Near ultraviolet, visible light, infrared, microwave, radio waves, and low-frequency radio frequency (longwave) are all examples of non-ionizing radiation. By contrast, far ultraviolet light, X-rays, gamma-rays, and all particle radiation from radioactive decay are regarded as ionizing. Visible and near ultraviolet electromagnetic radiation may induce photochemical reactions, or accelerate radical reactions, such as photochemical aging of varnishes\textsuperscript{[6]} or the breakdown of flavoring compounds in beer to produce the "lightstruck flavor".\textsuperscript{[7]} Near ultraviolet radiation, although technically non-ionizing, may still excite and cause photochemical reactions in some molecules. This happens because at ultraviolet photon energies, molecules may become electronically-excited or promoted to free-radical form, even without ionization taking place.

The occurrence of ionization depends on the energy of the individual particles or waves, and not on their number. An intense flood of particles or waves will not cause ionization if these particles or waves do not carry enough energy to be ionizing, unless they raise the temperature of a body to a point high enough to ionize small fractions of atoms or molecules by the process of thermal-ionization. In such cases, even "non-ionizing radiation" is capable of causing thermal-ionization if it deposits enough heat to raise temperatures to ionization energies. These reactions occur at far higher energies than with ionizing radiation, which requires only single particles to ionize. A familiar example of thermal ionization is the flame-ionization of a common fire, and the browning (chemical process) reactions in common food items induced by infrared radiation, during broiling-type cooking.
The energy of particles of non-ionizing radiation is low, and instead of producing charged ions when passing through matter, non-ionizing electromagnetic radiation has only sufficient energy to change the rotational, vibrational or electronic valence configurations of molecules and atoms. This produces thermal effects. The possible non-thermal effects of non-ionizing forms of radiation on living tissue have only recently been studied. Much of the current debate is about relatively low levels of exposure to radio frequency (RF) radiation from mobile phones and base stations producing "non-thermal" effects. Some experiments have suggested that there may be biological effects at non-thermal exposure levels, but the evidence for production of health hazard is contradictory and unproven. The scientific community and international bodies acknowledge that further research is needed to improve our understanding in some areas. Meanwhile the consensus is that there is no consistent and convincing scientific evidence of adverse health effects caused by RF radiation at powers sufficiently low that no thermal health effects are produced.\[2\][4]

**Health risks**

Non-ionizing radiation can produce non-mutagenic effects such as inciting thermal energy in biological tissue that can lead to burns. Recently, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) from the WHO (World Health Organization) released a statement indicating that radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (including microwave and millimeter waves) are possibly carcinogenic to humans.\[3\]

In terms of potential biological effects, the non-ionizing portion of the spectrum can be subdivided into:

1. The optical radiation portion, where electron excitation can occur (visible light, infrared light)
2. The portion where the wavelength is smaller than the body. Heating via induced currents can occur. In addition there are claims of other adverse biological effects. Such effects are not well understood and even largely denied. (MW and higher-frequency RF).
3. The portion where the wavelength is much larger than the body, and heating via induced currents seldom occurs (lower-frequency RF, power frequencies, static fields).\[2\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Wavelength</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Biological effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UV-A</td>
<td>318–400 nm</td>
<td>750–950 THz</td>
<td>Eye – photochemical cataract; skin – erythema, inc. pigmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible light</td>
<td>400–780 nm</td>
<td>385–750 THz</td>
<td>Skin photoaging; eye – photochemical &amp; thermal retinal injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR-A</td>
<td>780 nm – 1.4 μm</td>
<td>215–385 THz</td>
<td>Eye – thermal retinal injury, thermal cataract; skin burn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR-B</td>
<td>1.4–3 μm</td>
<td>100–215 THz</td>
<td>Eye – corneal burn, cataract; skin burn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR-C</td>
<td>3 μm – 1 mm</td>
<td>300 GHz – 100 THz</td>
<td>Eye – corneal burn, cataract; heating of body surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microwave</td>
<td>1 mm – 33 cm</td>
<td>1–300 GHz</td>
<td>Heating of body tissue and possible carcinogenic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio-frequency radiation</td>
<td>33 cm – 3 km</td>
<td>100 kHz – 1 GHz</td>
<td>Heating of body tissue, raised body temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-frequency RF</td>
<td>&gt;3 km</td>
<td>&lt;100 kHz</td>
<td>Cumulation of charge on body surface; disturbance of nerve &amp; muscle responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static field</td>
<td>Infinite</td>
<td>0 Hz (technically static fields are not &quot;radiation&quot;)</td>
<td>Magnetic – vertigo/nausea; electric – charge on body surface</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Types of non-ionizing electromagnetic radiation**

**Near ultraviolet radiation**

Ultraviolet light can cause burns to skin and cataracts to the eyes. Ultraviolet is classified into near, medium and far UV according to energy, where near and medium ultraviolet are technically non-ionizing, but where all UV wavelengths can cause photochemical reactions that to some extent mimic ionization (including DNA damage and carcinogenesis). UV radiation above 10 eV (wavelength shorter...
than 125 nm) is considered ionizing. However, the rest of the UV spectrum from 3.1 eV (400 nm) to 10 eV, although technically non-ionizing, can produce photochemical reactions that are damaging to molecules by means other than simple heat. Since these reactions are often very similar to those caused by ionizing radiation, often the entire UV spectrum is considered to be equivalent to ionization radiation in its interaction with many systems (including biological systems).

For example, ultraviolet light, even in the non-ionizing range, can produce free radicals that induce cellular damage, and can be carcinogenic. Photochemistry such as pyrimidine dimer formation in DNA can happen through most of the UV band, including much of the band that is formally non-ionizing. Ultraviolet light induces melanin production from melanocyte cells to cause sun tanning of skin. Vitamin D is produced on the skin by a radical reaction initiated by UV radiation.

Plastic (polycarbonate) sunglasses generally absorb UV radiation. UV overexposure to the eyes causes snow blindness, which is a risk particularly on the sea or when there is snow on the ground.

Visible light

Light, or visible light, is a very narrow range of electromagnetic radiation of a wavelength that is visible to the human eye (about 400–700 nm), or up to 380–750 nm.[4] More broadly, physicists refer to light as electromagnetic radiation of all wavelengths, whether visible or not.

Infrared

Infrared (IR) light is electromagnetic radiation with a wavelength between 0.7 and 300 micrometers, which equates to a frequency range between approximately 1 and 430 THz. IR wavelengths are longer than that of visible light, but shorter than that of terahertz radiation microwaves. Bright sunlight provides an irradiance of just over 1 kilowatt per square meter at sea level. Of this energy, 527 watts is infrared radiation, 445 watts is visible light, and 32 watts is ultraviolet radiation.[4]

Microwave

Microwaves are electromagnetic waves with wavelengths ranging from as long as one meter to as short as one millimeter, or equivalently, with frequencies between 300 MHz (0.3 GHz) and 300 GHz. This broad definition includes both UHF and EHF (millimeter waves), and various sources use different boundaries.[4] In all cases, microwave includes the entire SHF band (3 to 30 GHz, or 10 to 1 cm) at minimum, with RF engineering often putting the lower boundary at 1 GHz (30 cm), and the upper around 100 GHz (3mm). Applications include cellphone (mobile) telephones, weather radars, airport scanners, microwave ovens, earth remote sensing satellites, radio and satellite communications.

Radio waves

Radio waves are a type of electromagnetic radiation with wavelengths in the electromagnetic spectrum longer than infrared light. Like all other electromagnetic waves, they travel at the speed of light. Naturally occurring radio waves are made by lightning, or by astronomical objects. Artificially generated radio waves are used for fixed and mobile radio communication, broadcasting, radar and other navigation systems, satellite communication, computer networks and innumerable other applications.
Different frequencies of radio waves have different propagation characteristics in the Earth's atmosphere; long waves may cover a part of the Earth very consistently, shorter waves can reflect off the ionosphere and travel around the world, and much shorter wavelengths bend or reflect very little and travel on a line of sight.

**Very low frequency (VLF)**

Very low frequency or VLF is the radio frequencies (RF) in the range of 3 to 30 kHz. Since there is not much bandwidth in this band of the radio spectrum, only the very simplest signals are used, such as for radio navigation. Also known as the myriameter band or myriameter wave as the wavelengths range from ten to one myriameter (an obsolete metric unit equal to 10 kilometers).

**Extremely low frequency (ELF)**

Extremely low frequency (ELF) is the range of radiation frequencies from 3 to 30 Hz. In atmosphere science, an alternative definition is usually given, from 3 Hz to 3 kHz.[4] In the related magnetosphere science, the lower frequency electromagnetic oscillations (pulsations occurring below ~3 Hz) are considered to be in the ULF range, which is thus also defined differently from the ITU Radio Bands.

**Thermal radiation**

Thermal radiation, a common synonym for infra-red when it occurs at temperatures commonly encountered on Earth, is the process by which the surface of an object radiates its thermal energy in the form of electromagnetic waves. Infrared radiation that one can feel emanating from a household heater, infra-red heat lamp, or kitchen oven are examples of thermal radiation, as is the IR and visible light emitted by a glowing incandescent light bulb (not hot enough to emit the blue high frequencies and therefore appearing yellowish; fluorescent lamps are not thermal and can appear bluer). Thermal radiation is generated when the energy from the movement of charged particles within molecules is converted to the radiant energy of electromagnetic waves. The emitted wave frequency of the thermal radiation is a probability distribution depending only on temperature, and for a black body is given by Planck's law of radiation. Wien's law gives the most likely frequency of the emitted radiation, and the Stefan–Boltzmann law gives the heat intensity.

Parts of the electromagnetic spectrum of thermal radiation may be ionizing, if the object emitting the radiation is hot enough (has a high enough temperature). A common example of such radiation is sunlight, which is thermal radiation from the Sun's photosphere and which contains enough ultraviolet light to cause ionization in many molecules and atoms. An extreme example is the flash from the detonation of a nuclear weapon, which emits a large number of ionizing X-rays purely as a product of heating the atmosphere around the bomb to extremely high temperatures.

As noted above, even low-frequency thermal radiation may cause temperature-ionization whenever it deposits sufficient thermal energy to raises temperatures to a high enough level. Common examples of this are the ionization (plasma) seen in common flames, and the molecular changes caused by the "browning" in food-cooking, which is a chemical process that begins with a large component of ionization.
Black body radiation

Black body radiation is radiation from an idealized radiator that emits at any temperature the maximum possible amount of radiation at any given wavelength. A black body will also absorb the maximum possible incident radiation at any given wavelength. The radiation emitted covers the entire electromagnetic spectrum and the intensity (power/unit-area) at a given frequency is dictated by Planck's law of radiation. A black body at temperatures at or below room temperature would thus appear absolutely black as it would not reflect any light. Theoretically a black body emits electromagnetic radiation over the entire spectrum from very low frequency radio waves to X-rays. The frequency at which the black body radiation is at maximum is given by Wien's displacement law.

See also

- Ionizing radiation
- Electromagnetic hypersensitivity
- Mobile phone radiation and health
- Electromagnetic radiation and health
- Wireless electronic devices and health
- Electronic harassment
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To: City of Mukilteo
   Linda Ritter

Please, DO NOT ALLOW American Tower install cell tower in our residential community.

It will be a hazard for our health and health of our kids, who lives around and goes to school.

It is not a commercial area for lease for commercial purposes. This cell tower has to be away from school and residence.

Do not put us to danger.

Truly yours,

V. Zenkin
7602 Mukilteo spwy, Apt. A
Mukilteo, WA 98275
To: Linda Ritter, Planning department, City of Mukilteo

Dear Linda,

City should take a close look on location of proposed American CELL tower.

We do not want to live within a dangerous distance to RM radiation exposure. Paint Field has a plenty of territory for it and away from residential community.

Proposed location is right in the middle of residential community and in the front of OLYMPIC Middle SCHOOL. Our children will be in the great danger to illegally close to cellphone tower wavelengths.

Please, do not let CELL phone companies install towers in area of SCHOOL where children attend.

Safety of kids should be a first priority to make a decision. THANK YOU.

Alex Iyrudalimets
8609 53rd Pl. W
Mukilteo, WA 98275
My address is 5020 115th Pl SE Everett, WA 98208
Thank you,
Aleksandr Kravchenko

Sent from Samsung Mobile

-------- Original message --------
From: Linda Ritter
Date: 25/06/2014 8:30 AM (GMT-08:00)
To: alex kravchenko
Subject: RE: Cell phone tower

Mr. Kravchenko,

Thank you for your comment. I ask that you please provide your address so that I can add you as a party of record for this project.

Linda Ritter
Associate Planner
City of Mukilteo
11930 Cyrus Way
Mukilteo WA 98275
424-263-8043
'titter@ci.mukilteo.wa.us
Hello Linda Ritter,

My name is Aleksandr Kravchenko. I am a concerned citizen of Snohomish County and a Senior Pastor of the church “Awakening” at 4223 78th St. SW Mukilteo, WA 98275. Our community (500 members) would like to let you know that we do not want a cell phone tower sited on the 2506 Mukilteo Speedway right across the Olympic School and areas where children and seniors spend large amounts of time. I feel that this is an inappropriate site for a cell tower. Please do not put our future generations’ health at risk by allowing this.

Thank you,

Aleksandr Kravchenko

Sr. Pastor of church “Awakening”

alekskr59@yahoo.com
Dear Linda,
I thought that Mukilteo is a one of 10th places to live. Now.. nobody want to live in neighborhood exposed to cell tower radiation.
City tower proposal is only 200' away from school and 100' from residential houses and situated on the sensitive bluff and wildlife habitat.
Do not ALLOW cell phone towers pose health risk to the public, specially to kids.
Tower have to be install in commercial zone and be away from people residence and school.
Please, Do NOT cover up health hazard and parents at school has to be INFORM about your proposal.

Gene Zenkin
Linda, thanks for fast respond.
I'm thinking to buy a lot on 7600 Mukilteo Speedway, Mukilteo, 98275 and this news about sell tower could be critical.

My address now is:
13501 157th ct ne
Redmond, WA 98052

From: lritter@ci.mukilteo.wa.us
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2014 2:29 PM
To: G.

Gene,

Thank you for your comment on the proposed Wireless Communication Facility. Can I please have your address so that I can make sure you are a party of record.

Thanks

Linda Ritter
Associate Planner
City of Mukilteo
11930 Cyrus Way
Mukilteo WA 98275
424-263-8043
lritter@ci.mukilteo.wa.us

From: G. [mailto:gekanya@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2014 2:00 PM
To: Linda Ritter
Subject: sell tower proposal

Dear Linda,
I thought that Mukilteo is a one of 10th places to live. Now.. nobody want to live in neighborhood exposed to cell tower radiation. City tower proposal is only 200' away from school and 100' from residential houses and situated on the sensitive bluff and wildlife habitat.
Do not ALLOW cell phone towers pose health risk to the public, specially to kids. Tower have to be install in commercial zone and be away from people residence and school. Please, Do NOT cover up health hazard and parents at school has to be INFORM about your proposal.

Gene Zenkin
To: City of Mukilteo  
Planning department

Ref: City proposed Cell American Tower at 2506 Mukilteo Spwy.  
SEPA report clarifications

Dear Linda Ritter,

This letter is to clarify important information regarding SEPA application for American Cell Tower proposal.

The ref. property Parcel B is part of 5 Acres subdivision plan which was provided by previous Owner (Pg.5 survey included) and I am a property owner of parcel A, my property adjusted on south and west of ref. site.

The Survey/ Short Plat and GeoTech Report for Parcel A and parcel B (2506 Mukilteo Spwy./ ref. site) was provided by David Evans & Acco., dated Dec. 1999.

1. The site is environmentally sensitive portions on the site (i.e., all of the property lying beyond the top of bluff designated Native Grown Protective Area (NGPA). The site is “Critical Area” lot 2 (location of proposed tower) required 30’ ft backset from top of the slope per Geotech Report dated December 1999. (Pg. 6) Studies have been conducted on impacts of tower electromagnetic radiation on migratory birds, including eagles.

2. By Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife this parcel included proposed site is adjusted to several of six known nest sites within 400’ ft. The eagle nest trees are all located the ravine areas as a Native Grown Protection Area (NGPA). FACTORS CONSIDERED: Bald eagle habitat use was considered by analysis of territory integrity thought time, current surrounding habitat conditions, current status of the bald eagle population and scientific literature considering bald eagle habitat protection. (see page 7 included)

As a concerned adjusted neighbor I worry not only about Environmental issues as Wild life disturbance like bald Eagle and other unique birds and animals sensitivities from Noise, non-ionizing radiation, etc.

3. Our main worry is Human Health HAZARD. The site is situated in the middle of high density urban area in the town of Mukilteo which famous for family oriented people. School boards and parents organizations need to be aware of inherent DANGERS from such an exposure. It’s been clearly shown that microwave radiation
penetrates the head of a child much easier than that of an adult. This is due to the thinner and softer bones in the head of child. Skull bones don’t fully harden until about age 22. Children should not be subjected to non-Ionizing Radiation when science has proven there could clearly be devastating effects.

4. The proposed American Tower is within illegal distance to the OLYMPIC Middle SCHOOL (appr. 250’ ft.) and to nearest Residence on both sides (appr. 140’) (per pg. 4 included) and other numerous single family residence and condos and on the west adjusted to National Grown Protective Area as preserve bald eagle habitat in the ravine.

The moratorium is needed to protect City of Mukilteo residents until reasonable minimum distance of protection from a cell phone tower to the SCHOOL or a private home can be established.

5. In so close distance to school, always will be curious kids teenagers, could be a chance play with fire which a chance of Toxic Fire or explosion next to critical area and residential neighborhood. Do not install Non- Ionizing RADIATION DANGER Sign just in the steps across to School. Kids should not be a subject to DANGER.

6. For huge 125’ ft. tower (within the area of 30’ ft. max.height restriction) with 12 panels could be a huge deep footing which could have a major disturbance to trigger a land slide for whole bluff neighborhood.

7. In SEPA proposal applicant have plans for future addition “possible upgrade of technology or antenna replacement), once the tower is there, even The City officials will be no control of it.

8. The proposed site is not a commercial or even light commercial. We can not resin or build houses next to lot who lease for commercial uses.

The City of Mukilteo is top 10th place to live (per CNNMoney.com). Mukilteo happens to be drop-dead gorgeous, with views of Puget Sound, the Olympic Mountains, and the Cascades. More reason to love it: TOP-NOTCH SCHOOLS. The nice town of Mukilteo is all about good life, safety and health of our next generation.

Do NOT allow to erect the tower.  
Do NOT let the people to leave the City.  
Do NOT destroy the human inhabitants.  
Do NOT destroy property values.
Property owners are increasingly erecting cell phone towers or antennas because cell phone companies are willing to pay rental fees of thousands of dollars a month. But at what cost to the public's health or kids health. I found deeply disturbing data that makes me wonder why the public is not being informed about health risks- and why our government seems intent on covering up troubling truth.

**The American Tower and AT&T Wireless Communication Facility would cause irreparable and irreversible harm to a large developing neighborhood**

Truly Yours,

Lana Zenkina, the adjusted neighbor
Lzenkina@yahoo.com
(425)280-3497
7602 Mukilteo Speedway
Mukilteo, WA 98275
BACKGROUND/JUSTIFICATION
This parcel is adjacent to several of the six known nest sites of the Mukilteo territory. The parcel has frontage on Mukilteo Speedway, but approximately 2/3 of the parcel is in a ravine. The eagle nest trees are all located the ravine. The short plat proposal for this parcel includes setting aside the ravine area as a Native Growth Protection Area (NGPA: Figure 1). This will provide continued protection of the bald eagle habitat in the ravine while allowing the property to be developed.

ACTORS CONSIDERED
Landowner goals were considered through plans received Aug 31, 2005, 2005.

1. Bald eagle habitat use was considered by analysis of territory integrity through time, current surrounding habitat conditions, current status of the bald eagle population and scientific literature concerning bald eagle habitat protection.

CONDITIONS
The following condition(s) apply to protect bald eagles and their habitat.

1) Within the NGPA (Figure 1), retain all native vegetation. No trees may be cut or killed. Invasive non-native species (ivy, etc) may be removed, and their removal is encouraged.

2) Outside the NGPA, no restrictions on vegetation removal. No timing restrictions apply.

DURATION OF PROTECTION
This Plan applies to the landowner who signs the Plan. Since eagles return to the same traditional use areas each year, the conditions of this Plan shall apply indefinitely, unless a breeding territory has been unoccupied for 5 consecutive years. Please contact WDFW if the eagles change the location of their nest. Do not assume that the conditions of this Plan no longer apply.

REVIEW AND AMENDMENT
This Plan will be subject to the following review and amendment procedures. The Plan may be reviewed periodically by the Department and the landowner to determine whether: 1) the Plan requires amendment in response to changing eagle and landowner circumstances; or, 2) the terms of the Plan comply with applicable laws and regulations; or, 3) the parties to the Plan are complying with its terms.
March 6, 2006

Gene Zenkin
13501—157th Ct NE
Redmond, WA 98052

Contact Number: 425-891-8412
Project: Zenkina Single-Family Residence
Site Address: 7602—Mukilteo Speedway

Thank you for your application submittals. This letter is your official notice that your application submitted on February 28, 2006 is considered:

- Complete
- Incomplete — Please submit the following information:

1. Geotechnical Report. All development proposals which include land that is within a designated geologic sensitive area must submit a geotechnical report and site assessment per MMC 17.52A.

2. Grading and Erosion Control Plan. All development proposals within a geologic sensitive area shall submit grading, excavation, and erosion control plans approved and sealed by a licensed professional in accordance with Mukilteo Municipal Code (MMC) Chapter 15.16. TESCP measures should be shown on the site plan.

3. Revised Site Plan. The following needs to be shown on the site plan:

There shall be no clearing, excavation, or fill within a native growth protection area shown on the face of this site plan/plat, with the exception of required utility installation, removal of dangerous trees, thinning of woodlands for the benefit of the woodlands as determined by a certified landscape architect or arborist, and removal of obstructions on drainage courses, or as allowed under Section 17.52A.070, Vegetation management on steep slopes.

Also, please include grading calculations on the face of the site plan. Submit two (2) copies of revised site plans, minimum 11” x 17”.

Note: The side yard setbacks for the RD 7.5 Zoning District must total at a minimum 15 feet. As shown on your current site plan, your side yard setbacks total only 10 feet (5 feet on each side). As is, your site plan cannot be approved. Please revise your site plan and construction drawings in order to meet the 15’ total side-yard setback requirement.
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BEST PLACES TO LIVE  Money's list of America's best small towns

Full List  Near You  Housing  Financial  Quality of Life

10. Mukilteo, WA

WINNER
Top 100 rank: 10
Population: 20,500
Unemployment: 7.1%

Compare Mukilteo to Top 10 Best Places

Much of the West Coast is an economic mess. Not this picturesque waterfront community.

Mukilteo (pronounced muck-ill-tee-oh) benefits from the Seattle area's diverse job market, including high tech, aerospace, and retail 2.0 pioneers Amazon and Drugstore.com. Its unemployment rate is half that of some other towns along the Pacific.

Mukilteo also happens to be drop-dead gorgeous, with views of Puget Sound, the Olympic Mountains, and the Cascades. More reasons to love it: top-notch schools and low property taxes.

"We considered Seattle, but the cost of living is cheaper here," says Michael Chun, 47, a neurologist who moved to town in 2007 with his wife, Tina, 42, a realtor. "Restaurants are great, but I can get a great dinner locally for less."

Become a Facebook fan of Mukilteo!

Is Mukilteo a great town, or what?

Mukilteo stats
Project Narrative Guidelines

A project narrative should include:

1) Basic description of project including:
   - The square footage and intended use of the proposed buildings.
   - The square footage, number of units and number of buildings if the project is residential.
   - The number of proposed parking spaces.
   - The type of building construction.
   - Proposed landscaping.

2) Location:
   - The legal description and street address of the property.
   - Describe the characteristics of the surrounding neighborhood.

3) Describe the existing site characteristics including:
   - General site topography.
   - Existing vegetation and any plans for retention.
   - Critical or sensitive areas including streams, wetlands and geologic hazards.
   - Any existing improvements or structures.

4) Ownership:
   - Identify property owner(s).
   - Identify party responsible for the project.

5) Infrastructure:
   - Describe proposed infrastructure improvements, including
     - Street and frontage improvements
     - Water, sewer, power,
     - Other planned utilities
   - Describe method to treat and regulate stormwater runoff.

6) Grading:
   - Proposed grading quantities
   - Proposed erosion control

7) Scheduling: Outline a general project schedule and anticipated construction start date and time to completion.
• Disturbed areas shall be protected from storm water runoff impacts through the use of silt fences, check dams, detention and filtration of storm water runoff, and other means of limiting erosion/sedimentation.

3. Grading and associated site development must follow recommendations presented in the Geotechnical Report for this property.

4. As presented in the Geotechnical Report, a 25’ setback from the top of slope for the building pad locations must be adhered to.

5. The environmentally sensitive portions of the site (i.e., all of the property lying beyond the top of slope) shall be designated NGPA.

6. This site is within a bald eagle management area. Retain all known perch trees and all conifers ≥24 inches diameter at breast height (d.b.h). Retain all cottonwoods ≥20 inches diameter at breast height (d.b.h). Also retain ≥50% of pre-clearing or pre-construction conifer stand with diameter distributions representative of the original stand, and hardwood/conifer ratios representative of the original stand (>6 feet tall). Windowing and low limbing of trees is acceptable provided no more than 30% of the live crown is removed. Topping of trees is not allowed.

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that it does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030 (2)(c). This decision was made after review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public on request.

PROJECT CONTACT:
Brian Lee, Assistant Planner (425) 355-4141 ext. 249

RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:
Heather McCartney, Planning Director, FAICP
City of Mukilteo
4480 Chennault Beach Road, Mukilteo, WA 98275
(425) 355-4141 ext. 226

Signature: Heather McCartney Date: 7/13/05
Responsible Official

DATE OF ISSUANCE: Friday, July 15, 2005

This project was previously circulated for agency review on May 5, 2005.

Appeals: You may appeal this determination by filling out the appeal form and submitting it with the applicable appeal fee, which is non-refundable, to the “City of Mukilteo.” Submit the appeal form and fee to the City of Mukilteo Planning Department at 4480 Chennault Beach Road, Mukilteo, WA 98275 by written comment no later than 4:30 p.m. on Friday, July 29, 2005.

At a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) hearing, all testimony shall be “under oath”. You should be prepared to make specific factual objections. Contact the Planning Department to read or ask about the procedures for SEPA appeals.
Part Eleven WAC 197-11-960 Environmental Checklist

4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?

The proposed use will not cause unreasonably adverse affects to sensitive areas or areas designated for government protection. There is no existing development on proposed site. No parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, prime farmlands or other sensitive areas were identified.

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:

None proposed.

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land uses incompatible with existing plans?

The proposed use will not cause unreasonably adverse affects to wetlands, shorelines, wildlife habitat, and other sensitive areas.

There is an existing development on proposed site. No wetlands, shorelines, wildlife habitat, or other sensitive areas were identified.

Preliminary 4 lots subdivision

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are:

None proposed.

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

The site will be unmanned, requiring only infrequent visits by maintenance personnel, typically once a month. On-site construction is proposed between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, for a time period of approximately one month. Vehicular access to the project site during the construction and operational phases of the proposal will be made from Mukilteo Speedway. Due to the limited amount of traffic generated by the proposal, the proposed wireless telecommunications facility will not create a burden on the traffic circulation system in the vicinity.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:

None proposed.

7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

None known. Dept. of Interior Standards for Wildlife (pg. )

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:

None proposed.
Part Eleven WAC 197-11-960 Environmental Checklist

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT:

d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:

Five (5) foot landscaping buffer proposed. Please refer to landscape plan - Arboviteae, drought resistant ground cover. Please refer to Exhibit D, Site Plan:

10' FT OR 5' FT

5. ANIMALS

a. Circle any birds and animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:

Birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:
Mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:
Fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other:

Robins, songbirds, deer.

Bald Eagle nests within < 400'

b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site:

None known.

Bald Eagle nests (6 total)

6. ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

Minimal emissions would result from the proposal. Any possible emissions will be from vehicles entering and

b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe:

None.

c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

None proposed.
Part Eleven WAC 197-11-960 Environmental Checklist

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT:

b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe:
   Site has not been used for agriculture.

c. Describe any structures on the site:
   Residential structure.

d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?
   No structures will be demolished.

e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?
   Current zoning is RD7.5 Single Family Residential.

f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?
   Residential.

g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?
   Not Applicable, proposal is not within the shoreline master program.

h. Has any part of the site been classified as an "environmentally sensitive" area? If so, specify:
   No part of the site has been classified as an environmentally sensitive area.
   IT IS AN ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREA PER GEOTECH REPORT DATED DEC, 1999 BY D. EVANS AS

i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?
   None, this is an unstaffed wireless telecommunications facility.

j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?
   None, this is an unstaffed wireless telecommunications facility.

k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:
   Proposed monopole design will blend in with residential setting in the surrounding area.
Part Eleven WAC 197-11-960 Environmental Checklist

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description):

Proposal is for the installation of a new 120' tall monopole WCF. Proposal will include (12) new antennas and ancillary ground equipment.

Proposed lease area will be within a 50'x50' compound, proposed equipment shelter will be within a 12'-0"x28'-0"

12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist:

Proposed WCF will be located at 2005 Mukilteo Speedway, Mukilteo, WA. The APN is 0006911-00000801. The legal description is as follows:
That portion of Tract 37, WEST AND WHEELER'S SEA VIEW 5 ACRE TRACTS, according to the plat thereof recorded in Volume 7 of Plats, Page(s) 12-13, records of Snohomish County, Washington and that portion of Tract 8, SUNNYSIDE LAND COMPANY'S FIRST PLAT OF SOUTH EVERETT, according to the plat thereof recorded in Volume 6 of Plats, Page(s) 4, records of Snohomish County, Washington and that portion of the vacated 50 feet right of way vacated by Ordinance No. 73, all in records of Snohomish County, Washington, lying Southwesterly of State Highway No. 1-1 (SR 525) described as

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT:  

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS:  

1. EARTH  

a. General description of this site (circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other NGPA  

Steep slope  
FLAT SITE AND STEEP OVER THE BLUFF  

b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximately percent slope)?  

25-70% 0°-70°  

C. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland:

Alderwood-Everett gravelly sandy loams, 25 to 70 percent slopes  

D. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe:  

PER GEOTECH REPORT DATED DEC. 1999 BY DAVID EVANS AND ASSO.  

E. Describe the purpose, type and approximate quantities of any filling or
Part Eleven WAC 197-11-960 Environmental Checklist

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT:

with views?

Proposed lighting will comply with all FAA lighting requirements.

c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?

None. Proposed lighting will comply with all FAA lighting requirements.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:

Proposed lighting will comply with all FAA lighting requirements.

12. RECREATION

a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?

Inapplicable. This is an existing residential property with no designate or informal recreational areas in the immediate vicinity.

b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so describe:

Proposed project will not displace any existing recreational uses.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

None proposed.

13. HISTORIC AND CULTURAL PRESERVATION

a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe:

Not Applicable.

HISTORIC DOUGLAS FIR TREE

b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site:

Not Applicable.

PER WASHINGTON DEPT. FISH & WILDLIFE (PG.)

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any:

None proposed.
Cell Tower Health Risks

More cell tower radiation

Cellular Tower Lease?

Cell Towers are the base stations which control cell phone communication. The generic term "cell site" can also be used to include all cell phone towers, antenna masts and other base station forms. Each cell site services one or more "cells".

Cell tower numbers have grown exponentially in recent years, as service providers raced to improve their coverage.

Increased cell phone traffic also contributes to cell tower density. When a cell becomes too busy, a frequent solution is to divide it into smaller cells, which then require more cell sites.

In 2009 there were over 200,000 cell sites in the USA alone, and 50,000 in U.K.

Cell tower radiation from chimneys?

Cell sites may take the form of a mast or tower, but may also be disguised, in some cases so they cannot be visually discerned at all.

You might notice the camouflaged "trees"; but perhaps not the cell sites on top of buildings, looking like elongated loudspeaker boxes:

You'd almost certainly miss the cell sites installed inside chimneys and church steeples, even flagpoles.

Where a base station is installed on top of a building where people live or work, those occupants may be quite unaware that they are in very close proximity to equipment which produces substantial electromagnetic radiation.

Cell tower health dangers

Cellular phone industry spokespersons continue to assert that cell phone towers pose no health risk. Almost all scientists in this field would disagree, at the very least claiming that no such assurance can be given.

There is strong evidence that electromagnetic radiation from cell phone towers is damaging to human (and animal) health.

A study into the effects of a cell tower on a herd of dairy cattle was conducted by the Bavarian state government in Germany and published in 1998. The erection of the tower caused adverse health effects resulting in a measurable drop in milk yield. Relocating the cattle restored the milk yield. Moving
been exhausted.

**Cell phone tower radiation limits**

The current US standard for cell site radiation in the US is 580-1000 microwatts per square centimetre.

Many other countries have set levels hundreds of times lower.

The reason for the disparity is that no one really knows what level of cell tower radiation is safe.

Current limits have been influenced more by economic and political imperatives than by research into health and safety.

More important than the intensity of electromagnetic radiation emitted at the tower is the strength of the resulting EMF wherever people live and work. This depends on the intensity at the source - and one's distance from it.

**Cell towers safe distance**

Different cell sites emit different amounts of radiation.

Radiation levels from a single cell site vary, depending on usage. Even maintenance issues can affect how much radiation a cell site is currently producing.

Radiation around a single cell tower may not be uniform - there can be hot and cold spots.

Measurement with a suitable meter is the only way to know how much radiation you are receiving at a particular spot.

But it seems that 400 metres is a safe distance for most people, and smaller distances may also be safe in some cases.

**Cell tower health effects**

Individuals differ in their response to similar levels of EMF radiation.

For some people, short term effects from cell tower radiation exposure may include headaches, sleep disorders, poor memory, mental excitation, confusion, anxiety, depression, appetite disturbance and listlessness.

This list is not intended as a diagnostic aid, as each symptom here can have many causes.

But if you and your family do not experience any of these symptoms you are probably not being overwhelmed by cell tower radiation.

**Cell tower safety - personal action plan**

If you are still concerned, try to obtain the use of an RF (radio frequency) gauss meter designed for measuring electromagnetic radiation in the cell phone frequency (microwave) range.

Switch off all wireless devices including computer networks, modems and mobile phones before measuring RF radiation. What remains will probably be mainly cell tower
radiation, although TV and radio station signals may also contribute.

How much cell tower radiation is too much for your long-term health? No one is exactly sure. But if you detect more than 100 mv/m (millivolts per metre) in places where you spend several hours a day, you might consider moving.

If you cannot obtain a meter, you must rely on estimating the distance to the nearest cell site. If that distance exceeds 400 metres you are probably not being harmed - although high risk groups may need to be more cautious. See our page **Who is at Risk?**

Also bear in mind that it is getting harder and harder to be sure where the nearest cell site is situated, especially in built-up areas.

Cell sites are often disguised. And many units are much smaller than the old familiar towers (though probably not less potent), and installed in unexpected locations.

When you next change your job or your house, find out how far away you are going to be from the nearest cell site, and let that influence your decision. Do the same when you decide where to send your child to school.

If you have reason to be concerned about your exposure to cell tower radiation - but there is nothing you can do about it yet - then concentrate on reducing EMFs from other sources. For suggestions see our page **EMF Protection**.

In the long term, we need to find ways of providing cell phone convenience without exposing people to the existing dangers of cell tower radiation.

Tower Communications LLC

© towercommunications.info
Cell Towers For Lease Low Rates, Brokers Welcome
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Cell Tower Health Risks
min distance from cell tower to residence
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New policy seeks to allow cell towers beyond 3 metres of ...
indianexpress.com/new-policy-seeks-to-allow-cell...
Feb 26, 2014 - A distance of 100 metre for cellphone towers from schools and hospitals is ... Prakash Munshi, resident of Malabar Hill and leader of the Forum ...

I want to live near a Cell Tower, Urgent Help? - Mast Victims
www.mast-victims.org > www.mast-victims.org forum > Health
Jan 2, 2011 - 26 posts - 9 authors
but it's unclear whether the cell tower I would like to live next to is operating within ... Originally, 300m was given as a minimum distance for people to ... How much am I affecting by the radiation? Should I change my residence?
You visited this page on 6/20/14.

Bridgton eyes cell tower moratorium | The Bridgton News
www.bridgton.com/bridgton-eyes-cell-tower-moratorium/ by Gail Geraghty
May 30, 2014 - Resident Judy Veit told selectmen the cell tower would cause ... until a reasonable minimum distance of protection from a cell phone tower to a ...

Is mobile phone tower radiation a health hazard ...
www.hindustantimes.com/mob.../article1-88...
Jul 15, 2012 - Does radiation from cellphone towers cause cancer? Is the impact higher in Delhi? [Min32°C / Max42°C] | city weather | rss ... "It is not legal to install cellular towers in residential areas without taking formal consent. People can ... California; Warning for cars used less than 25 miles a dayConsumer Daily.

Is there a minimum mobile tower radius? - The Times of India
hindustantimes.com/timescity > The Times of India
Apr 2, 2014 - India's mobile tower companies are struggling to sell the idea of the ... a minimum distance of 100 metres between tower antennas and ... the cell phone towers creating havoc with the residents' health but that has ...

Is a cell tower radiating dangerous - SlideShare
www.slideshare.net/waloo66/cell-tower-radiating-dangerous
According to attached report from Washington’s Department of Fish and Wildlife, the applicant’s representations, in the SEPA Checklist, are false and the proposed cell tower area is habitat for Eagles and other birds that may be endangered.

Applicant’s response is not true. Per the GeoTech Report prepared by D. Evans & Associates, the contiguous property is comprised of steep slopes, a drainage that empties into Puget Sound and habitat for endangered species. Par. 13 “Historic and Cultural Preservation” is not answered truthfully. Per the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, most of the area is comprised of a historic Douglas Fir Tree(s) and a NGPA.

What happens if certain City officials approve the permit, reasonably knowing excess radiation is a valid concern a.k.a. “an attempt to kill” based upon false reports or concealment (18 U.S.C. § 1001), and a child dies from excess radiation poisoning?

Do children have the Constitutional Right to life?

Are parents or the school board to be reprimanded for the “… free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him/her by the Constitution or the laws of the United States?”

If “…reduced survivorship, and death…” is a valid reason to prohibit cell towers for wildlife, is the same premise true for children in the immediate proximity?

According to the following online article there are insufficient studies to ascertain if electromagnetic radiation poisoning should be a concern for wildlife:

Dept. of Interior Attacks FCC regarding Adverse Impact of Cell Tower Radiation on Wildlife

The Department of Interior charges that the FCC standards for cell phone radiation are outmoded and no longer applicable as they do not adequately protect wildlife.

The Director of the Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance of the United States Department of the Interior sent a letter to the National Telecommunications and Information Administration in the Department of Commerce which addresses the Interior Department’s concern that cell tower radiation has had negative impacts on the health of migratory birds and other wildlife.

The Interior Department accused the Federal government of employing outdated radiation standards set by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), a federal agency with no expertise in health. The standards are no longer applicable because they control only for overheating and do not protect organisms from the adverse effects of exposure to the low-intensity radiation produced by cell phones and cell towers:

"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."

The Department criticized the Federal government’s proposed procedures for placement and operation of communication towers, and called for “independent, third-party peer-reviewed studies” in the U.S. to examine the effects of cell tower radiation on "migratory birds and other trust species."
"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 unguied, 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)."

Enclosure A

"The second significant issue associated with communication towers involves impacts from nonionizing 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."

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."

The full text of the letter, the addendum and citations are available at: http://1.usa.gov/1jn3CZg

The above letters and letters precedent comprise suspicions and permissible presumptions. A presumption shifts the burden of production or proof to the opposing party, who can then attempt to overcome the presumption. The purpose of a presumption is to require a party against whom a presumption operates to come forward with any evidence of the nonexistence of the presumed fact. A presumption reallocates the burden of persuasion to the party against whom the presumption operates. In the absence of adequate legal basis or material facts, by a preponderance of the evidence, the presumptions shall survive as uncontrovertable.
Lana Zenkina  
Lzenkina@yahoo.com  
June 17, 2014

Linda Ritter and the City Counsel,

This is provided to the City under RCW 42.20.100 and 18 U.S.C. § 242 inter alia.

I reside in the proximity of the proposed cell tower. Because I’m exposed to 100 million times more Electromagnetic radiation than my parents were, and cell towers are making that number grow exponentially, being situated contiguous to the proposed cell tower site I’m going to be saturated with cell site microwave radiation.

Most of the most powerful cell tower installations are on mountains and hilltops outside of urban areas. These EM fields have impacted humans, animals as well as the ecological balance. Studies of people and farm animals living around high voltage wires point to extreme hazards of living up up-close to a powerful electromagnetic field (EMF) - exhibiting everything from stress and sleep disorders to birth defects, cancer and Alzheimer’s. As such it appears all cell site exposure constitutes health risks.

Often cell tower advocates hire consultants to falsify radiation exposure.

Scientific, epidemiological and medical evidence reveals the danger behind cell phone tower radiation. Data suggests even low levels of RF may have profoundly negative effects on our biological systems. RF can cause damage to cell tissue and DNA. "This bathes our bodies, our children, pets and co-workers in microwave radiation close to the range of a microwave oven.”

Cancer, suppressed immune systems, depression, Alzheimer’s disease, blood brain barrier leakage problems and neurological problems are just a few of the health problems associated with RF. An increase in fertility problems is on the rise with many blaming the cell phone towers for issues such as low sperm count, miscarriage and birth defects. Every day annoyances are creeping up as cell phone towers are built. Headaches, sleep disorders, nose bleeds, increased heart rates and memory loss are occurring more frequently.

Elderly individuals, the frail and pregnant women are in greater danger from cell phone towers than the normal population. However, it is the children who are at the greatest risk for developing conditions associated with RF. Their thinner skulls and rapid growth rates make them more susceptible to the tower's waves. The United Kingdom issued warnings to people under the age of sixteen to avoid cell phone use completely.

Radiation standards for cell phone towers in the United States are some of the most lenient and least protective in the world! The United States government allows 580 to 1,000 microwatts per sq. cm.

Compare our standards to the rest of the world: Australia tolerates no more than 200 microwatts per sq. cm. Russia, Italy and Canada only 10 microwatts per sq. cm. China six microwatts per sq. cm. and New Zealand allowing only 0.02 microwatts per sq. cm.

Cell towers (or cell sites) hold antennas and other communications equipment and flood the area for miles around with powerful high frequency radio waves (known as microwaves) to support the use of cellphones as well as Wi-Fi, WiMax, Wireless LANs, 802.11 networks, Bluetooth supported devices, and more.

Cell towers typically contain transmitter/receivers transceivers, control electronics, a GPS receiver for
timing, digital signal processors as well as various types of electrical power sources.

These microwaves might travel for as few as 2 miles in hilly areas, and up to 45 miles where there are fewer obstructions, and of course, they easily penetrate brick and metal. Other forms of cell towers include:

**Radio masts** - Smaller versions of cell towers, often seen on rooftops and billboards, typically installed 800-1300 feet apart.

Mobile towers are especially dangerous because they emit microwaves at a frequency of 1900 MHz. Recent studies have shown that the intense **radioactivity from mobile phone towers adversely** impacts every biological organism within 1 square kilometer.

The **dangers of microwave radiation** from cell towers (as well as satellite dishes) is being examined and debated all over the world, but relatively little in the U.S. Fukushima and Hanford are now infamous for out of control radiation.

The human body itself is electromagnetic (at a very low level—around 10 hertz). It’s been shown that each one of our cells has its own electromagnetic field (EMF). Maintaining balance in those cellular EMFs is critical to staying healthy.

Decades of studies have demonstrated that artificial frequencies higher than 10 hertz can create stress and serious health problems.

**Cellphone tower wavelengths, microwaves** have a significantly higher frequency than even radio waves. The higher the frequency, the more powerful the wave—and the more powerful effect on biological organisms. (Recall a mobile tower emit microwaves at 1900 MHz.)

These higher energy waves can actually destroy chemical and molecular bonds, creating chaos in our basic biochemical structures.

The negative health effects of EMFs and microwave radiation are well documented. Studies have shown that EMFs can affect:

- Enzymes
- DNA
- Metabolism
- Genes
- Hormones
- And more

**Cell Tower Radiation Has Also Been Linked To:**

- Headaches
- Memory loss
- Low sperm count
- Cancer, birth defects
- Heart conditions
- Alzheimer’s.

One of the problems is that this damage is cumulative in the tissues, and can take years, even decades to
show up.

Please cause an environmental impact study and obtain an independent study from a consultant hired by the City BEFORE permitting a cell tower that not only may destroy property values but also the human inhabitants in the proximity of the cell tower.

Lana Zenkina

[Signature]
Need Cell Tower Lease Assistance?  
Contact Our Cell Tower Lease Consultants.  
Please Fill Out The Form Below.

By Steve Kazella

AirWave Management provides cell tower lease assistance for property owners in need of cell tower lease review or negotiation services. We specialize in maximizing cell tower lease rates and profitability of cellular antenna sites, and level the playing field between property owners and wireless carriers. As a nationwide cell site lease consulting service, we negotiate directly on your behalf with wireless carriers to maximize the revenue of your cellular site, or advise you on your cell tower buyout. We help property owners with newly proposed cell towers and we also help landlords with existing cell site leases that need to be extended or amended. Our Principals have 40+ years of combined experience in cell tower lease negotiations. Leverage AirWave's industry knowledge and take advantage of the following Cell Site Leasing Services we offer:

- Rooftop Cellular Lease Negotiations and Review
- Cell Tower Ground Lease Negotiations
- Cell Tower Lease Amendments for 4G LTE Upgrades
- Rooftop Cell Site Audit
- Cell Tower Lease Buyout Offer Analysis
- Cell Tower Valuation and Cellular Lease Appraisal
- Expiring Cellular Tower Lease Renewal Negotiations
- Protection From Rent Reduction and Lease Optimization Offers
- Municipal Cellular Bid or Wireless Ordinance Architecture
- Review of Attorney Wireless Lease Comments
- Questions about Cell Tower Lease Rates
- Information regarding Cell Tower Locations
- Carrier Interface for Verizon Wireless, T-Mobile, Sprint, AT&T, US Cellular, Rogers, Telus, Bell Mobility, SBA, American Tower and Crown Castle lease negotiations

We can be reached by submitting our secure contact form.

Cell-Tower-Leases.com  
Contact Form

Please note that all fields followed by an asterisk must be filled in.

First Name*  Lane
Last Name*  Zenkina
E-Mail Address*  lzenkina@yahoo.com
Street Address
City
State*  WASHINGTON
Zip Code
Nearest Metro Area*  Select—
Contact Phone*  425-280-3497
cell tower health hazard
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Is Cell Tower Radiation Dangerous?
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Indian Express - 3 days ago
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www.geengineeringwatch.org/health-effects-from-cell-phone-tower_radiation - Feb 13, 2012 - "Over 100 physicians and scientists at Harvard and Boston University Schools of Public Health have vocated cellular towers a radiation hazard.
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www.earthcalm.com/cell-tower-health-risks/ - Cell tower health risks are a growing concern. Cancer, ADHD and fatigue are among the dangers of cell tower radiation. Don't panic, solutions are available.
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Ad www.helping2heal.org/ - Get the facts about wireless radiation dangers and how to avoid,
Dear Linda,
I thought that Mukilteo is a one of 10th places to live. Now.. nobody want to live in neighborhood exposed to cell tower radiation.
City tower proposal is only 200' away from school and 100' from residential houses and situated on the sensitive bluff and wildlife habitat.
Do not ALLOW cell phone towers pose health risk to the public, specially to kids.
Tower have to be install in commercial zone and be away from people residence and school.
Please, Do NOT cover up health hazard and parents at school has to be INFORM about your proposal.

Gene Zenkin
Linda Ritter

From: G. <gekanya@msn.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2014 3:48 PM  
To: Linda Ritter  
Subject: Re: sell tower proposal

Linda, thanks for fast respond.  
I’m thinking to buy a lot on 7600 Mukilteo Speedway, Mukilteo, 98275 and this news about sell tower could be critical.

My address now is:  
13501 157th ct ne  
Redmond, WA 98052

From: lritter@ci.mukilteo.wa.us  
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2014 2:29 PM  
To: G.  

Gene,

Thank you for your comment on the proposed Wireless Communication Facility. Can I please have your address so that I can make sure you are a party of record.

Thanks

Linda Ritter  
Associate Planner  
City of Mukilteo  
11930 Cyrus Way  
Mukilteo WA 98275  
424-263-8043  
lritter@ci.mukilteo.wa.us

From: G. <mailto:gekanya@msn.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2014 2:00 PM  
To: Linda Ritter  
Subject: sell tower proposal

Dear Linda,

I thought that Mukilteo is a one of 10th places to live. Now.. nobody want to live in neighborhood exposed to cell tower radiation.

City tower proposal is only 200' away from school and 100' from residential houses and situated on the sensitive bluff and wildlife habitat.
Do not ALLOW cell phone towers pose health risk to the public, specially to kids. Tower have to be install in commercial zone and be away from people residence and school. Please, Do NOT cover up health hazard and parents at school has to be INFORM about your proposal.

Gene Zenkin
My address is 5020 115th Pl SE Everett, WA 98208
Thank you,
Aleksandr Kravchenko

Sent from Samsung Mobile

-------- Original message --------
From: Linda Ritter
Date: 25/06/2014 8:30 AM (GMT-08:00)
To: alex kravchenko
Subject: RE: Cell phone tower

Mr. Kravchenko,

Thank you for your comment. I ask that you please provide your address so that I can add you as a party of record for this project.

Linda Ritter
Associate Planner
City of Mukilteo
11930 Cyrus Way
Mukilteo WA 98275
424-263-8043
lriter@ci.mukilteo.wa.us
Hello Linda Ritter,

My name is Aleksandr Kravchenko. I am a concerned citizen of Snohomish County and a Senior Pastor of the church “Awakening” at 4223 78th St. SW Mukilteo, WA 98275. Our community (500 members) would like to let you know that we do not want a cell phone tower sited on the 2506 Mukilteo Speedway right across the Olympic School and areas where children and seniors spend large amounts of time. I feel that this is an inappropriate site for a cell tower. Please do not put our future generations’ health at risk by allowing this.

Thank you,

Aleksandr Kravchenko

Sr. Pastor of church “Awakening”

alekskr59@yahoo.com
To: Linda Ritter, Planning department, City of Mukilteo

Dear Linda,

City should take a close look on location of proposed American CELL tower.

We do not want to live within a dangerous distance to RM radiation exposure. Paint Field has a plenty of territory for it and away from residential community.

Proposed location is right in the middle of residential community and in the front of OLYMPIC Middle SCHOOL. Our children will be in the great danger to illegally close to cellphone tower wavelengths.

Please, do not let CELL phone companies install towers in area of SCHOOL where children attend.

Safety of kids should be a first priority to make a decision. THANK YOU.

Alex lyrudalimets

8609 53rd Pl. W

Mukilteo, WA 98275
cell tower health hazard
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Jan 31, 2013 ... Cell phone towers are not known to cause any health effects. But if you are concerned about possible exposure from a cell phone tower near
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Are Cellphone Towers Hazardous to Your Health? | Fox News
www.foxnews.com/.../despite-lack-evidence-alarms-continue-to-question-cell-phone-safety/...Aug 1, 2011 ... "People who live near cell towers and antennas are in jeopardy," Dr. no established health risks from using phones or living near antennas.
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A Greenfield-type tower used in base stations for Cell phone due to the power relationship appropriate for that
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Feb 13, 2012 ... [2] Over 100 physicians and scientists at Harvard and Boston University Schools of Public Health have called cell towers a radiation hazard

New study links over 7,000 cancer deaths to cell phone tower...
www.naturalnews.com/049055_cell_phone_towers_radiation_cancer.html
Jun 21, 2013 ... (NaturalNews) Could exposure to radiation from cell phone towers be the public's right to protest cell tower locations based on health hazards

Cell Tower Health Risks, Radiation Symptoms and Solutions
www.earthcall.com/cell-tower-health-risks/
Cell tower health risks are a growing concern. Cancer, ADHD and fatigue are among the symptoms of cell tower radiation, Don't panic, solutions are available.

Cellular Phone and Base Station - Health Physics Society
hps.org/publicinformation/telefaqs/cellphoneqs.html
Is there any risk for health with the installation of a cellular tower near a home? Is there any reason to believe that such towers could constitute a potential health hazard to
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Cell Phone Dangers
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Get the facts about wireless radiation dangers and how to avoid.
Hi Linda


Since there are proximity issues with the tower and an eagle nest, we can work with you or the communication company when appropriate. We are updating our eagle permit self-certification website that should help with these projects once it is online.

Mark

Mark G. Miller
Washington Fish and Wildlife Office
510 Desmond Dr.
Acy, WA 98503
(360) 534-9347

On Mon, Jul 7, 2014 at 2:31 PM, Linda Ritter <lriter@ci.mukilteo.wa.us> wrote:

Hi Mark,

I know that bald eagles are not listed on the State’s endangered list anymore, but what is needed if a cell tower is being proposed within 400 feet of an eagle’s nest? I getting ready to issue SEPA on this project and wanted to know what would be required for the applicant to move forward. The property is located at 2605 Mukilteo Speedway and the eagle’s nest is on the adjacent property along the ravine.

Thanks!

Linda Ritter
Associate Planner
City of Mukilteo
1930 Cyrus Way
Mukilteo WA 98275
424-263-8043
lritter@ci.mukilteo.wa.us
Dear Linda:

I have many concerns regarding the proposed cell tower at 2605 Mukilteo Speedway. I live quite close to where it is proposed at 2601 Mukilteo Speedway. I think I am the neighbor referred to as being 150 feet away in the Noise Report, although there was another one listed at 77 feet. My concerns are as follows:

1. Noise.
The noise report said the tolerances were less than 45db. But I wonder if the noise level also took into account that the proposed site has a constant noise battering from ferry traffic, and was this current noise level added or at least taken into consideration when the Noise report was made. Given that the proposed tower will have back-up power generators, and AC which kick in during power outages, there will be a considerable addition to what we already have. Additionally the constant light flashing from towers can be very intrusive and is worrisome for someone living close by.

2. Drilling.
The proposed tower at 125 feet will require a deep drilling in order to stabilize it. The site proposed is very close to where we had a slide some years ago, I can't recall exactly when this happened, but if you check the records, that slide was quite dangerous and even took some of the Speedway away. I am convinced that drilling in a currently unstable area is an accident waiting to happen. Who would be responsible if this happened? The City? AT&T?

3. Emissions
I'm not familiar enough with the dangers of RFI emissions to quote technical figures, but anything I've read on-line suggests this is an issue that should be considered - since Cancers have been reported at much higher levels for people living in/around & under these types of towers. The tower is also very close to an elementary school - another concern for our precious children. Shouldn't parents of these children be warned of the proposed tower?

4. Anecdotally
Anyone I've talked to has regretted allowing these towers to be built close to their house, because of the environmental dangers & changes caused. They've all said they would never do it again. This is something we can only change prior to approval, not after the fact.

5. Lastly
This is a neighborhood, already impacted by noise, speeding cars, ferry traffic, school buses, train noise, much more than the usual amount of noise pollution. Do we really need more?

Personally, I expect the City of Mukilteo to protect our environment. But I almost always feel let down by their unwillingness to say NO!. Please make me change my mind and feel like the City of Mukilteo actually cares for long-term residents like me - who dutifully pay taxes and keep you all employed.

Sincerely,
Teresa Flynn
Dear Linda Ritter,

I encourage you to reject the cell tower proposal near Olympic View Middle School. Due to the mysteries of cell phone/tower radiation and how it may affect the health of humans (not to mention wildlife, but that is another battle), I feel it is important to keep these towers away from homes, especially schools and athletic facilities.

It really upsets me that I can see a cell phone tower while I dine on my front deck at home, and would hate to see another tower near the track at OV where I work-out several times each day after work. Do we really need so many towers???? I know they can be an income producer, but in addition to health concerns, they are an eyesore.

Please think of our beautiful city, our communities, and our citizens, and reject this tower proposal!

Sincerely,

Cindy Weyers
623 Possession View Lane
Mukilteo, WA 98275
425-353-7220
Vasily Zenkin
7602 Mukilteo Speedway
Mukilteo, WA 98275
9-3-14

I am a disabled person within the meaning of the Fair Housing Act.

Please consider this my 42 U.S.C. § 3604(f)(3)(B) request that no tower be situated in the proximity of my “dwelling” (within the meaning of 42 U.S.C. § 3602(b)) that may emit any form of radiation that could conceivably harm my fragile health.

This is also my 42 U.S.C. § 3604(f)(3)(B) request that no tower be situated within 50’ of the striking distance of my “dwelling.”

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Vasily Zenkin
Dear Linda,

According to the letter originating from Terracon, they provided recommendations limited to a 50' x 50' leased area "...and did not perform a quantitative analysis of the stability of the slope in either the current or proposed conditions."

If Terracon is willing to overwrite a full geotech analysis authored by Evans and Associates dated Dec. 1999, Terracon should perform a complete geotech analysis for the entire lot and limited in scope to a 50' x 50' leased area. The subject area is only 5' ft from a critical sensitive area / steep (100%) slope / bluff with a history of numerous failures / old slides...slopes steeply down ..350'-400' feet.

Per CMM 17B.52A C:
projects "within geological sensitive areas should be evaluated based on their impacts on the surrounding terrain and geological conditions, NOT IN ISOLATION."

17B.52A.040
Analysis required.

A. Full Geotechnical Analysis...

B. Area mapped on the city Hazard Map as a moderate or higher rating ( ref.site within high landslide)

H. Area of steep slopes 40% ( Leased site within 5 ft. of 100% slope w/ old slides.."slopes steeply down ..350'-400' feet"

Per CMM17B.52D:
2. "...the project area and potentially affected adjacent properties, and a review of the site history regarding landslides.

According to the Terracon letter:

"While on the site we did not observe obvious signs of previous slope instability."

Such statement is insufficient to overwrite a conflicting study / report of slope instability.

An independent review of design, calculations and Geotechnical recommendations will be axiomatic to clarify the conflicts in the two reports.
In particular, the Recommendations by Evans & Associates state:

"the project will include minimal excavations and should not extend to depths greater than 3 feet below the existing grade"

Recommendations by Terracon:
"...foundation with a minimum of 15 feet of embedment."

"...mat dimensions - minimum 10 feet"

"...tower foundation area should be excavated to the minimum depth of 4 feet."

Terracon does not indicate a maximum depth limit for soil disturbance; only the minimum. Terracon does not indicate maximum mat dimensions, only the minimum.

On information and belief a "maximum" of soil disturbance is critical when discussing constructing a life or death tower installation.

Recommendations by Evans & Associates:

setback for the potential building pad locations of 30 feet" which is "minimum no disturbance buffer from end of foundation to the bluff."

Recommendation by Terracon:

"...a 25-foot wide buffer from the top of the steep slope adjustment to the site."

Does "site" mean a 50' x 50' leased area/ fence or end of tower footing??

Please define the minimum "no disturbance buffer dimension" from the top of the steep slope to the end of tower foundation or mat.

Based on the Terracon Report compared to the Evan's Report, the presumption is the Terracon Report is skewed to favor the client.

Sincerely,

'ana
Thanks Linda, as long as need it ..I'm not in a hurry at all. Just looking forward to get a correct result in the future in such unusual matter/structure as 125 ft. tower which is so close to unstable 400 ft bluff ref. site. Definitely, it is not a typical house construction with 2 ft deep footing..we are talking of 35 feet deep foundation/ soil disturbance. Why I am so concern- just because I am right next to the site. And safety for me and my family is a number one priority. I know for City -it is also most important, so please take your time. Thanks again.

As Zenkina,

There are different rules for the shoreline area (17B.52A) than in the other geological sensitive areas (17.52A). Your quotes were from the geological section of the shoreline code. I don't know how long it will take until the applicant resubmits. They have 90 days from the date of the letter requesting additional information which was sent on July 21, 2014.

-----Original Message-----
From: Lana Zenkina [mailto:lzenkina@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2014 1:53 PM
To: Linda Ritter
Cc: lzenkina@yahoo.com
Subject: Cell TOWER/ Geotech recommendation

How long it takes..no problem at all. Actually I quoted not a shoreline but "Geologic sensative area regulation" which sensative portions of the site (i.e., all of property lying the top of slope).

From my understanding, setback is undisturbed buffer of exist. soil which is distance from the top of slope to tower pad/ mat ( not from top of the bluff to the center line of tower as per Terracut).

May be you want to look my schetch ( attached).
Thank you Linda, talk to you soon.

---------------------------------------------
In Fri, 9/12/14, Lana Zenkina <lzenkina@yahoo.com> wrote:

Subject: Cell TOWER/ Geotech recommendation
To: "lritter@ci.mukilteo.wa.us" <liritter@ci.mukilteo.wa.us>
Dear Linda,

According to the letter originating from Terracon, they provided recommendations limited to a 50’ x 50’ leased area "...and did not perform a quantitative analysis of the stability of the slope in either the current or proposed conditions..."

If Terracon is willing to overwrite a full geotech analysis authored by Evans and Associates dated Dec. 1999, Terracon should perform a complete geotech analysis for the entire lot and limited in scope to a 50’ x 50’ leased area. The subject area is only 5’ ft from a critical sensitive area / steep (100%) slope / bluff with a history of numerous failures / old slides...slopes steeply down ..350’-400’ feet.

Per CMM 17B.52A C:
projects "within geological sensitive areas should be evaluated based on their impacts on the surrounding terrain and geological conditions, NOT IN ISOLATION."

17B.52A.040
Analysis required.

A. Full Geotechnical Analysis...

B. Area mapped on the city Hazard Map as a moderate or higher rating ( ref.site within high landslide)

H. Area of steep slopes 40% ( Leased site within 5 ft. of 100% slope w/ old slides..."slopes steeply down ..350’-400’ feet")

Per CMM17B.52D:

2. ".the project area and potentially affected adjacent properties, and a review of the site history regarding landslides.

According to the Terracon letter:

" While on the site we did not observe obvious signs of previous slope instability.."

Such statement is insufficient to overwrite a conflicting study/report of slope instability.

An independent review of design, calculations and Geotechnical recommendations will is axiomatic to clarify the conflicts in the two reports.

In particular the Recommendations by Evans & Associates
state:

the project will include minimal excavations and should not extend to depths greater than 3 feet below the existing grade"

Recommendations by Terracon:
"..foundation with a minimum of 15 feet of embedment.."

"..mat dimensions- minimum 10 feet"

"..tower foundation area should be excavated to the minimum depth of 4 feet".

Terracon does not indicate a maximum depth limit for soil disturbance; only the minimum. Terracon does not indicate maximum mat dimensions, only the minimum.

On information and belief a "maximum" of soil disturbance is critical when discussing constructing a life or death tower installation.

Recommendations by Evans & Associates:

"setback for the potential building pad locations of 30 feet" which is "minimum no disturbance buffer from end of foundation to the bluff."

Recommendation by Terracon:

"..a 25- foot wide buffer from the top of the steep slope adjustment to the site.."
Does "site" mean a 50’ x 50’ leased area/ fence or end of tower footing??

Please define the minimum "no disturbance buffer dimension"
from the top of the steep slope to the end of tower foundation or mat.

Based on the Terracom Report compared to the Evan’s Report, the presumption is the Terracom Report is skewed to favor the client.

Sincerely,

Lana