

**From:** Long Beach Accountability Action Group [mailto:updates@laag.us]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 17, 2022 12:12 PM  
**To:** CityClerk <CityClerk@longbeach.gov>  
**Cc:** Mayor <Mayor@longbeach.gov>; Council District 5 <District5@longbeach.gov>; City Manager <CityManager@longbeach.gov>; Council District 3 <District3@longbeach.gov>  
**Subject:** Comment Oct 18 City Council meeting: Hearing for an appeal of a Small Cell Wireless Application at 4351 Clark Avenue.

**-EXTERNAL-**

Im writing to address this issue above on the agenda:

Hearing for an appeal of a Small Cell Wireless Application at 4351 Clark Avenue.

The city council is fully familiar with this history of this application and all the hearings that have taken place concerning it. I am not going to repeat all of the evidence that was put forth by the homeowner opposing the permit. Its rather obvious that all studies relied on by the FCC in greelighting these 5g small cell sites is woefully outdated and non representative. It all relied on the 2g and 3g technology which has nothing to do with current 5 g frequencies. Also this biggest problem in my mind is that 2g/3g/4g cell towers were always something miles away from 99% of people homes. Now virtually every light pole will have one of these antennas. Some less that 50 ft from people's bedrooms. This is a giant long term exposure problem that has not been studied regarding long term effects on humans AT ALL. It will personally affect me as Im sure the city will decide soon to speed up all the many permits now silently pending for the 5g antenna sites. ( I assume this will be one of Rex's priorities)

The city needs to deny the this permit and stand up on the homeowners behalf. This will clearly need to go into litigation to stop the 5g train wreck that is about to happen. This permit denial is the first step in forcing that to happen. The cell phone companies are so ruthless and greedy about these antennas that they came close to [allowing planes to crash in order to promote 5g cell sites](#). From the article: "It's a pattern of ignoring consequences beyond the consequences to the profitability of the telecom industry; that's their only focus," Rep. Peter DeFazio said of the FCC.

I also believe that given Rex Richardson's connection to the cell industry and "backhaul" his company undoubtedly sells, he needs to recuse himself from this vote. More troubling of course is that the city govt itself will profit off these 5g antenna sites in many ways over many years. NO ONE on the council would want one of these cell sites outside of their or their child's bedroom. They will negatively affect homes resale values.

For once do the right thing and stop this 5g permit on Clark and all others that are pending. Only then will the cell phone cos realize that their hush money campaigns need to stop and that a real "independent" long term study will need to be conducted.

**Long Beach Accountability Action Group "LAAG"**

A California Non Profit Association | Demanding action and accountability from local government

[updates@laag.us](mailto:updates@laag.us) | voice 562-726-3047

[main LAAG website](#) | LAAG on [Twitter](#)

"The most important political office is that of the private citizen". - Louis D. Brandeis

read the LAAG Privacy Notice [here](#) and our Mission Statement [here](#).

NOTICE TO PUBLIC AGENCY/ENTITY RECIPIENTS: This email constitutes a "public record" under Govt. code sec. 6252(e) and (g) regardless of the system upon which it is stored or email address it is addressed to and must be archived and produced in public records requests to the "public agency" to which it has been sent. There is a duty to preserve and not destroy this communication and related email and or attachments per Govt. Code secs. 6200, 6201, 34090 and 34090.5. Public officials must retain all records related to public business, even when the records only exist on personal accounts and devices. *City of San Jose v. Superior Court* (2017) 2 Cal.5th 608. This email also establishes "actual" or "constructive" notice of any condition noted in this email to any "public entity" receiving it (see Govt. code sec. 835.2).