

From: Ron Peled <ron@bigflow.co>
Sent: Friday, September 22, 2023 11:01 AM
To: Romo, Sammy
Cc: brad.ladua@crowncastle.com; Gaspar, Mate; Demitri, Yanni; Spies, Beatriz
Subject: Re: Wireless facility at 5587 Sepulveda blvd

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you confirm the content is safe.

Hi Sammy,

Feel free to classify my response in any way you see fit. On behalf of a small group of neighbors our stand remains the same: choose a different location - we recommend closer to the highway and away from residential homes.

Sincerely,
Ron

On Thu, Sep 21, 2023 at 1:45 PM Romo, Sammy <sammy.romo@culvercity.org> wrote:

Hi Ron. Is this your official appeal?

Sammy Romo, P.E.

Senior Civil Engineer, City of Culver City, Dept. of Public Works/Engineering
Office: 310-253-5619; Cell Phone: 310-487-0211; Email: Sammy.romo@culvercity.org
City Hall Address: 9770 Culver Boulevard, Culver City, CA 90232

From: Ron Peled <ron@bigflow.co>
Sent: Wednesday, September 20, 2023 12:25 PM
To: Romo, Sammy <sammy.romo@culvercity.org>
Cc: brad.ladua@crowncastle.com; Gaspar, Mate <mate.gaspar@culvercity.org>; Demitri, Yanni <Yanni.Demitri@culvercity.org>; Spies, Beatriz <Beatriz.Spies@culvercity.org>
Subject: Re: Wireless facility at 5587 Sepulveda blvd

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you confirm the content is safe.

Hi Sammy,

Thanks for the heads up. My biggest concern is that the transmitter is at the same height of all bedrooms of the town homes in our community. If you notice, Playa Pacific HOA has 3 floors town homes. The bedrooms are typically at the 3rd floor. Hence there's direct proximity that is closer than what one would normally calculate.

I've already responded with a request to move this new transmitter to another location and the city have dismissed my concerns. My notion remains the same: we reserve the right to measure radiation levels and if at any point in the future there's a deviation from what is safe and acceptable the city and the operator will bear responsibility. I would like to re-emphasize that in case that sickness levels in our community rise and can be shown to be statistically different from the time before the approved transmitter to the time after it was approved, the city and operator will bear the responsibility. Time is on our side while the risk is on your side.

Here's a study that backs the risks I am trying to raise:

Sincerely,
Ron
on behalf of a small group of concerned neighbors.

On Wed, Sep 20, 2023 at 10:51 AM Romo, Sammy <sammy.romo@culvercity.org> wrote:

Hi Ron. I just approved the subject application. You have 48 hours to appeal the approval. Please keep in mind that as long as the application satisfies FCC guidelines and City design standards, we (City) are obligated to approve the application.

If you decide to appeal, it will be taken before the City Council at one of their meetings. Your appeal should state why the application is deficient.

Sammy Romo, P.E.

Senior Civil Engineer, City of Culver City, Dept. of Public Works/Engineering
Office: 310-253-5619; Cell Phone: 310-487-0211; Email: Sammy.romo@culvercity.org
City Hall Address: 9770 Culver Boulevard, Culver City, CA 90232

From: Ron Peled <ron@bigflow.co>
Sent: Tuesday, September 12, 2023 2:50 PM
To: Romo, Sammy <sammy.romo@culvercity.org>
Cc: brad.ladua@crowncastle.com
Subject: Re: Wireless facility at 5587 Sepulveda blvd

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you confirm the content is safe.

Hi Sammy,

Thank you for the documents. After reviewing the packets, please consider this my official **rejection** of the proposed new wireless transmitter. I strongly **object** to the location of the transmitter since it is too close for comfort. Notice that while I understand that the applicant and the city may have complied with all federal and state laws I have not seen any report of electromagnetic and/or wireless signal emission studies done in the packet you provided. I believe that I speak on behalf of a bunch of concerned neighbors.

In the case that you disregard this and the city grants approval for the transmitter in the location you shared with me, please note that we reserve the right to make random surveys of the radiation emitted from the device and if at any given moment it will exceed what is authorized by regulation both the applicant and the city will be held liable. Additionally, given that we know that radiation in many cases is linked to cancer, any resident in the neighborhood that will have the misfortune to fall ill with cancer can possibly look back at this moment and make a direct connection to this new device installed 500 feet away from their bedroom.

Hence I highly encourage the city to move the location of this device elsewhere where it is not near residents.

Sincerely,
Ron

On Wed, Aug 30, 2023 at 5:21 PM Romo, Sammy <sammy.romo@culvercity.org> wrote:

Hi Ron. Here is the information you requested.

Sammy Romo, P.E.

Senior Civil Engineer, City of Culver City, Dept. of Public Works/Engineering
Office: 310-253-5619; Cell Phone: 310-487-0211; Email: Sammy.romo@culvercity.org
City Hall Address: 9770 Culver Boulevard, Culver City, CA 90232

From: Ron Peled <ron@bigflow.co>
Sent: Tuesday, August 29, 2023 12:28 PM
To: Romo, Sammy <sammy.romo@culvercity.org>
Subject: Wireless facility at 5587 Sepulveda blvd

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you confirm the content is safe.

Hi Sammy,

Can you please share all the details you have about this application?

Please share any technical specs regarding the usage, radio frequencies, power consumption and power emissions from this new possible system.

Please notice that my initial concern is possible radiation pollution to my property which stands nearby. If you have any radiation pollution studies that the city has to offer please share as well.

Sincerely,
Ron

The City of Culver City keeps a copy of all E-mails sent and received for a minimum of 2 years. All retained E-mails will be treated as a Public Record per the California Public Records Act, and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the terms, and subject to the exemptions, of that Act.

The City of Culver City keeps a copy of all E-mails sent and received for a minimum of 2 years. All retained E-mails will be treated as a Public Record per the California Public Records Act, and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the terms, and subject to the exemptions, of that Act.

The City of Culver City keeps a copy of all E-mails sent and received for a minimum of 2 years. All retained E-mails will be treated as a Public Record per the California Public Records Act, and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the terms, and subject to the exemptions, of that Act.