

Sheila de la Guerra

General Public Comment

Group 3

From: Lesley Weinstock <lesleyweinstock@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, January 6, 2025 3:56 PM
To: sbcob
Cc: Lesley Weinstock
Subject: Public Comments for Jan. 7, 2025 BOS Meeting
Attachments: Lesley Weinstock Public Comments BOS 1-7-2025.docx



Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Supervisors:

January 6, 2025

Though this is not on the Jan.7th agenda, this is important information for the Feb 4th agenda item related to fire risks and property values.

On Dec. 4th, 2024, the Santa Barbara County Planning Commission presented proposed wireless ordinance amendments and cross-outs. The county planning commissioners voted for the proposed wireless ordinance amendments, in a combined vote with CA Senate Bill 9 (SB 9). This will be on your agenda, February 4, 2025.

In this amended county wireless ordinance, notification and ability to oppose were taken away, including but not limited to the opportunity to be notified, attend hearings, oppose and appeal "so called" small wireless facilities. Also, the planning commission proposed zero setbacks and exemptions for environmental, CEQA and coastal permit hearings. There is no attention to 20% decreased property values, no fire protections or emergency shut-offs, no monitoring of radiation, no inspections, no insurance for harm or death, no allowance for disability, no protection for the environment, health and public safety, no attention to fire risks, etc. In addition, with unregulated, "ministerial" aka rubber stamped wireless facility applications and permits, the proliferation of cell towers will cause a huge increase of greenhouse gases and the digital waste-stream, which reverses the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisor's (BOS) multiple proclamations to reduce greenhouse gases and the climate crisis.

Main topics:

De-couple SB 9 from Wireless Ordinance Amendments and vote on these 2 unrelated items separately.

VOTE NO on the wireless ordinance amendments, or abstain if you are not sure.

Do not rush this through!

Your hands are not tied! Other local governments in CA have created protective ordinances that not only follow federal regulations, but also protect public safety.

Direct the BOS and Santa Barbara County Planning Commission staff to do collaborative workshops with Safe Technology for Santa Barbara County (SafeTechSBC), BBILAN and their legal experts for wireless ordinance red-lines, in order to include legal protections, including codified check lists for applications and

permits.

There are urgent fire, public health, and safety risks. The BOS is receiving money for fire risks, floods that follow fires, and emergency management, while ignoring the electrical fire risks associated with wireless infrastructure that could cost the county billions of dollars. If this risk continues to be ignored, it will impact evacuations and emergency management.

Do not exempt wireless facilities from CEQA aka environmental protection laws and coastal permit hearings from this ordinance.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,

Lesley Weinstock, PA, ED and Coordinator Safe Technology for Santa Barbara County (SafeTechSBC)
representing 500 members

Attachment: "Lesley Weinstock Public Comments BOS 1-7-2025"

Sheila de la Guerra

From: Anne-Odile Thomas <aomthomas@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, January 6, 2025 4:05 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Public Comment for Jan 7, 2025, Board of Supervisors Meeting

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Members of the Board,

On February 4, 2025, I urge you to pause voting on the telecom wireless ordinance that the Planning Commission approved on Dec 4, 2024. Or vote No on the ordinance.

This ordinance is not protective for the residents of Santa Barbara county and is very industry-friendly. This ordinance does not offer the opportunity for residents to adequately get notified of upcoming wireless tower facilities being installed in the vicinity of their residence, nor the option to properly oppose such installation, and to discuss alternative locations.

It is time to sit down with the residents of the County and have a thorough detailed review of the current ordinance, and update it to turn it into a protective ordinance for the residents, while adhering to federal and State laws. Other California cities have been successful at doing so, and the County can draw on that expertise to come up with the best protective ordinance for its residents. This would still offer the wireless industry the chance to install wireless facilities, but would do so within the protective parameters stated in the ordinance.

Thank you,
Anne-Odile Thomas
Santa Barbara, CA

Sheila de la Guerra

From: katie sbbti.com <katie@sbbti.com>
Sent: Monday, January 6, 2025 5:00 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: General Public Comment for Jan 7th

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Thank you for the opportunity to make general public comment. I am the Director of the Santa Barbara Body Therapy Institute (our Counties only Vocational Massage School) since 1989 and County resident since 1981.

In 2001 the roof of my school was the sight of three AT&T cell towers within feet of where I worked. My landlord arranged for me to meet with two AT&T's engineers. They assured me I would incur no harm from working proximal to the towers, they asserted if I was in danger AT&T would be put out of business by law suits. What they did not tell me is that Lloyd's London and other insurance providers refuse to insure the telecom industry. Instead, telecoms are self insured and go into cities with shell corporations that have no assets so they may pay out a few million dollars but then go bankrupt so their liability is limited. The changes that occurred within my brain due to working in proximity to AT&T's three cell tower's Radiating Frequency radiation, are why I am here today.

On Feb. 4th you will be asked to vote on SB 9 coupled with amendments to your wireless ordinance.

My first request is that you decouple these two items. They may both be land use items, but they have no relationship.

My second request is that you understand there are inherent risks in cell tower installations that the amended ordinance does not adequately address. **Safety is yours to regulate**. The FCC has repeatedly stated that safety belongs to the municipalities to regulate. *In the Matter of acceleration of Broadband Deployment by Improving Wireless Facilities Siting Policies; Acceleration of Broadband Deployment: Expanding the Reach and Reducing the Cost of Broadband deployment by Improving Policies Regarding Public Rights of Way and Wireless Facilities: 2-12 Biennial Review of Telecommunications Regulations 29 FCC Rcd 12865, 12945, 188 (2014).*

We are all grateful for the work of our fireman and the policies you have adopted and the federal funding allotted to keep us safe. We would like to add to that list of policies, emergency management for electrical fires. Within the last 18 years there have been four major wildfires in Southern California that have been caused, in whole or in part, by telecommunications equipment. The Woolsey fire alone caused over \$6 billion in damages as well as lives lost. A fire from a cell tower is electrical. Malibu was ravaged by two of those fires, they now have the Malibu protocol that requires rigorous electrical and structural engineering requirements unlike our telecom ordinance. There are several municipalities within the state that have created robust check lists that applications need to meet or they are deemed incomplete and the shot clock stops for the installer to complete. Safe Technology for Santa Barbara would like to hand you time tested protocols for you to consider.

My third request is that you meet with community experts to get informed about the complexities involved in this issue well before you are called on to vote on the amendments to the Telecom Ordinance on Feb 4th.

Sincerely,

Katie Mickey, Director of the Santa Barbara Body Therapy Institute,
Vice President of Safe Technology of Santa Barbara

Katie Mickey
Director, Santa Barbara Body Therapy Institute
516 N. Quarantina St.
Santa Barbara, CA 93103
Office: 805-966-5802
Email: Katie@sbbti.com
www.sbbti.com

Sheila de la Guerra

From: Ronald Buckley <ronald.buckley@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 6, 2025 5:02 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Ron Buckley's public comment 1/6/2025
Attachments: BOS Jan 7 Rons public comment.docx



Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.



Good day County Supervisors



January 7, 2025

I'm Ron Buckley, a county resident since 1971.

I'd like to talk about things that go together:

Like coffee  and a doughnut 

Like paper  and a pencil 

Like a bread  and butter  They all go together.

Now I'd like to bring your attention to an agenda item for your Feb. 4th meeting.

You have Senate Bill 9, and Telecom Ordinance as one item.

Say Senate Bill 9 is a pineapple  and the Telecom Ordinance is Swiss cheese 

My there is a lot of holes in the Telecom Ordinance aren't there? (more about that Feb. 4th)

My point here is that they have NOTHING to do with each other. Yet you have to vote on them as if they are one entity. There is NOTHING in the Senate bill about telecom and NOTHING in the Telecom Ordinance about housing.

Please have these two items separated, so that you can vote on each one independently.

Doesn't that make sense?

Thank you!

Ron Buckley

Sheila de la Guerra

From: Miriam Lindbeck <miriam@weddingsantabarbara.com>
Sent: Monday, January 6, 2025 5:01 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Public Comment for the rjecxord
Attachments: Public Copmment BOS 1 07 25.docx

To the County Board of Supervisors and To The
General Public

I ask this be added to the record:

You have been made aware of a number of
concerns regarding the suggested amendments to
the existing County Wireless Ordinance.

The concerns over energy consumption, fires, legal
matters, and the belief that “your hands are tied”,
clearly delineated by Katie Mickey, Business Owner,
Educator and Activist, Environmental Attorney Julian
Gresser, and county resident, watchdog and Activist,
Lesley Weinstock, are more than significant. They
are critical and precipitous.

I will give one brush stroke to energy consumption. It
is all I have time for. Energy Consumption is a local,
regional, state, national and international issue.
Bloomberg Magazine just came out with an article
about AI needing so much power, it’s making ours
worse—in our homes and appliances.:

also be distorting the normal flow of electricity for millions of Americans. This map shows readings from about 770,000 home sensors, with red zones indicating areas with the most distorted power.

The problem is threatening billions in damage to home appliances and aging power equipment, especially in areas like Chicago and "data center alley" in Northern Virginia, where distorted power readings are above recommended levels.

<https://www.bloomberg.com/graphics/2024-ai-power-home-appliances/>

On just this point alone, I am asking you as leaders, to take the time this serious endeavor deserves and calculate its over all impact on multiple systems and on the environment.

We do not need to rush. We need to move mindfully with a deeper awareness of how the local decisions impact the bigger picture and what the environmental limits just may be with saturating every square inch of our lives with non-native frequencies that are entirely opposite natural life.

Pause this vote, vote no, or abstain. We have a lot at stake.

Miriam Lindbeck
Santa Barbara
SafeTechSBCounty