

May 27th, 1980

City Council
Sacramento, California

Honorable Members In Session:

SUBJECT: Hearing on the Engineers Report, Confirming Assessment and Public Convenience and Necessity, Etc. for Del Rio Junction Street Assessment District No. 2, Improvement Proceeding No. 5065 (24th Street and 47th Avenue)

SUMMARY

Adoption of various Resolutions to commence construction of the proposed improvements.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

On April 22nd, 1980, the Council commence the assessment proceedings for Del Rio Junction Street Assessment District No. 2 by adopting several Resolutions and setting a Hearing for this date on the Engineers Report, Confirming of the Assessment and a Hearing on the Public Convenience and Necessity.

Bids were received by the City Clerk on May 13th, 1980 and the results of said bids were reported to Council that evening.

We have been informed by the City Clerk that no protests have been received as of May 22nd, 1980 concerning the proposed work or assessment.

FINANCIAL DATA

In the 1979-80 City Budget, the City Council budgeted \$510,000.00 of CDBG Funds and \$14,604.00 from Water Fund for the acquisition of right of way and construction of this project and as of this date, there is an unencumbered balance of \$520,413.16. Based on the lowest bid for the project from Teichert Construction, the total estimated cost is as follows:

Construction Cost Based on Teichert Construction's
Bid: \$538,135.40

Incidental Expenses

Engineering	\$10,000.00
Bond Counsel Fee	3,190.68
Bond Printing Cost	780.00
Acquisition of	767.64
Prior Assessments	10,767.58

Total Incidental Expenses 24,738.32

Estimated Total Cost \$562,873.72

Property Owners Share 190,913.89

Total City Contribution \$371,959.93

Source of Funds

Remaining in Budget (CDBG) \$520,413.16

Water Fund 14,604.00

\$535,017.16

RECOMMENDATION

As no written or oral protests were presented prior to or at this meeting, it is recommended that the Hearing be closed and the attached Resolutions be adopted in the order listed below:

1. Resolution Determining That the Public Convenience and Necessity Requires Improvements and Acquisitions to be Made and Paid For By Special Assessments, Etc. (Requires 4/5 vote of the Council, or 8 aye votes)

2. Resolution Approving Amended Report, Confirming Assessment, Etc.
3. Resolution Awarding Contract to Teichert Construction

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. Parker
City Engineer

For Transmittal to City Council

Walter J. Slipe
City Manager

RHP:IEM:bd
Attachments
File # 5065

May 27th, 1980
DISTRICT NO. 7

File 5-27-80

Wednesday, May 28th, 1980
4196-1st Avenue, Sacto., 95817

Lorraine Magana
Clerk, City of Sacramento

RECEIVED
OFFICE
CITY CLERK'S
CITY OF SACRAMENTO
MAY 33 9 15 AM '80

Lorraine;

Please enter this copy of my testimony into the record of the GTE appeal hearing of May 27th, 1980. Except for the second sentence, it is a verbatim, written record of what I said last night before the city council. I will forward copies to other council members with my comments, so if any wish to have copies immediately, please refer them to me so that I can make a legible copy from my original. Since this is a precedent-setting issue, I would like the opportunity to make further statements to council members. I furthermore understand that the record is closed; the issue is, however, far from being dead.

Please forward my original copy of my initial appeal to me at the above address. (It was lost in other papers that you had, and I have not received it yet.)

Thank you for your time and consideration on this matter. If there are outstanding pieces of business on this matter, please feel free to contact me. My phone is 457-6922.

Sincerely,
Michael Monasky
Michael Monasky

Honorable members of the Council of the City of Sacramento, California:

The study of the biological effects of microwaves demands a multidisciplinary approach, involving the scientific areas of Medicine, Botany, Zoology, Physics, Electronics, Mathematics, Biomechanics, and others. Asking an Electrical Engineer to alone describe the biological safety of such a project as this one is comparable to requesting a dishwasher to create a culinary work of art. That is not to preclude, however, their assistance in the matter.

Many very important questions remain unanswered regarding the safety of this project, and include the following; 1) the length and width of the near and far fields are unknown, as are the dimensions of the sidelobes of the incident beams; 2) what is the type of the power source? how well is it shielded? 3) does the council anticipate changes in the airport noise abatement plans if planes must be diverted around the transmitter? 4) citation of a guideline is not equivalent to guaranteeing hygiene. Radiation levels were predicted and not measured, and theoretical exposure levels were given with GTE testimony. What are the actual, recorded levels of currently operating, comparable antennas? And, do these on-site recordings include off-site impacts? (Remember: microwaves create "hot-spots" where this energy form accumulates.) 5) the GTE "expert" testimony is at best, confusing. Bernhard Keiser said that sixty(60) milliwatts per square centimeter of energy reaches us from the sun. He neglected to indicate that this energy is ultraviolet in form, and not microwave energy at all. Most microwave energy is reflected back into space, away from the earth, by the ionosphere, the blanket which protects our planet from excessive radiation. Furthermore, Keiser indicated that the power density of the antenna thirteen feet away is ten microwatts per square centimeter. In response to the question of signal intensity, William Chalmers of GTE indicated that the power density of the transmitting antenna twenty-five (25) feet away, near the fence line, is twelve (12) microwatts per square centimeter. And, in response to the question

regarding artificial, cardiac pacemakers, Chalmers said that the approximate signal levels along the fence line, twenty-five (25) feet from the antenna, are one-hundred and twenty (120) microwatts per square centimeter. And furthermore, the City Planning Staff report has an inherent contradiction. It speaks to the issue of a local television transmitter/receiver, (channel 40), and says that the antenna operates on a power density of twenty-five (25) watts, which, it adds, is equivalent to the GTE antenna power density. In a later paragraph, the report indicates that the power density for the GTE antenna is (120) one-hundred and twenty microwatts per square centimeter. Amongst all this contradicting testimony, which and whose are we to take as true and correct??

6) if thermal effects aren't anticipated, why was the question of ATHERMAL effects ignored and left unanswered? (The history of industrial and governmental ignorance of athermal effects of microwaves forms the basis of the current guidelines.) 7) The denial that artificial, cardiac pacemakers and hearing devices are or can be effected by microwaves of this intensity is based on theoretical predictions--no actual facts are given, such as the real trigger levels for pacemakers, and hearing aids; what are those trigger levels that effect these prostheses? 8) the microwave effects on wildlife weren't properly researched; no reference was given, and the type of radiofrequency is in question; this is in regards to information about a Scientific American article on migratory paths of pigeons. 9) there is a corporate claim that nobody has ever been adversely effected by microwave emanations at or below the ten (10) milliwatt per square centimeter intensity. First, this level is a guideline, and not a standard; second, men and women exposed to these emanations parent significantly more Down's babies (mongoloid idiot syndrome) than the general population; third, research on experimental animals has demonstrated that damage can occur far below the ten (10) milliwatt level; fourth, a blanket, corporate denial of

adverse carcinogenic, teratogenic, and mutagenic effects doesn't make them disappear; this question is simply not adequately addressed. 10) Councilman Lloyd Connolly's questions are important as well, and are these: a) are there any studies on the potential, adverse effects of long-term, low-dose exposures? The answer is an unfortunate NO. Many researchers, including Baranski and Czerski, encourage future studies by governments, industries, and private laboratories into the long-term, low-dose effects of microwaves, including the one to ten microwatt per square centimeter exposure levels. b) are the values given by the GTE "experts" accurate quantifications of the proposed antenna's emissions? We can rest assured that at this point in time much confusing and subsequently contradictory information has been given, so as to preclude the current accuracy of corporate claims. 11) this last question is based on testimony by NIOSH's director of the division of Biomedical and Behavioural Science, Dr. Elliott S. Harris. His statements include the fact that estimates include anywhere from fifty-thousand (50,000) to twenty-one million (21,000,000) persons are currently under occupational exposure to microwave and radiofrequency emissions; that long-term studies, beginning in 1977, of three to five (3-5) year duration, were undertaken because of the absence of radiofrequency and microwave standards; and that, "In the meantime, there are no standards.", and, when asked about R.F. sealing equipment in factories and excessive exposure levels, he said, "These are guidelines, not standards."; in reference to permissible microwave exposure levels, he stated, " The possibility of a recommended change, or the direction of change in the microwave region is also unknown at this time." He further indicates in his testimony that equipment has not been developed to measure the near-field radiofrequency exposure levels, due to lags in technology, and that industry must be stimulated to develop such monitoring devices through requirements to research such instrumentation. Dr. Harris conceded

that he did not know what resources were necessary to develop the technology for such a microwave emission monitoring instrument.

Finally, the City Planning Department Staff report indicates that the GTE installation WILL NOT be monitored on a regular basis!

The eleventh area of question from the above data is, therefore: Who will monitor the antenna's emissions? How often? What parts of the beam or beams will be monitored?(i.e., will levels outside the plant be monitored?) Why should we expect the industry or the federal government to monitor the emissions when no equipment to do that exists?

In conclusion, we expect the Environmental Impact Report to do the following things: 1) to fulfill C.E.Q.A. requirements by demonstrating responsibility to an apprehensive citizenry, to prioritize the study of long-term effects of microwaves, to define the impact of the project and to answer controversial questions; 2) to mitigate the impact of the microwave emissions by putting up screening, adequate monitoring through field studies, research programs, hazards evaluations, morbidity and mortality studies, dissemination of information to employees and to the general public, and technical assistance to develop proper monitoring instrumentation; 3) to enlighten and educate the general public and public agencies on the subject of electronic smog, and to encourage public participation in the discussion of the potential biohazards of this project, and to include data from the available public and private agencies; 4) to clarify and to differentiate between data on safe absorbed dosage levels and exposure level guidelines; 5) to determine the impact of the microwave emissions on bird and fish populations; 6) to completely, adequately, and objectively respond to all current and future questions on the project's proposed microwave emissions; 7) to define the area of electro-pollution and the intensity of exposure and absorbed dosage levels; 8) and,

finally, to guarantee frequent monitoring of the device. This should include constant, continuous recording of emission levels while the antenna is operating in the transmit-mode. This last guarantee shall insure a renaissance in technology to produce the equipment necessary to check the emanations from the antenna.

It is our hope that the Council will act tonight in support of an Environmental Impact Report on this project. Thank You.

Michael P. Monasky
4196-1st Avenue
Sacramento, California, 95817
(916) 457-6922

Tuesday, May 27th, 1980

Michael P. Monasky