Cell Tower Opposition Revisited

The letter below is being resubmitted from third level residents who would be in closest proximity (within 1200 feet) to the proposed cell tower and therefore stand to bear a disproportionate impact. Thank you for considering us when you cast your vote regarding the cell tower.

We would like to reemphasize our health concerns regarding RF emanations from cell installations. We do not want to risk our children or our children’s children because “the data is inconclusive;” we are talking about the lack of longitudinal studies and have no reason to believe in the accuracy or good intentions of corporate reporting with regards to health hazards. Let us makes this very clear: some of us have young children, they roam freely, and would be less than twelve hundred feet from the proposed site. We are concerned about the disregard for the current and future generations.

It appears that the litmus test as to whether or not we allow AT&T to build a tower is whether you can see the tower and not long term ramifications of RF exposure, noise pollution from the generator and monthly tests and service trucks going in and out of the third level where children play.

Corporations have no business in a private community; corporations are not responsive to community interests and are above liability. As far as corporate responses to health concerns go we can cite Exxon’s oil spill in Alaska; Exxon’s knowledge of their complicity in climate change dating back forty years; Union Carbide in Bhopal; British Petroleum and their oil spill offshore Louisiana; tobacco companies dissembling with regards to cigarettes as cancer causing agents; PG&E and pollutants in drinking water, et al.

Danny and Janine Maurer

Ann Collins

Pete Bailey

Peter and Robin Mechlowitz Kaukonen

Ian and Cynthia Scrivner (Hirsch cottage)

Resubmitted Letter from Several Years Ago:

Dear Fellow Twilighters:

1. Many opinions have been expressed on the erection of a cell tower in Twilight Park. We third level residents oppose the current proposal to build a tower on the third level. We do not want the tower in our "neighborhood". We have composed the following summary of reasons we oppose this proposal.

We begin with reason #1 which we feel is most compelling:

1. Community Discord - Pursuing a proposal, that places a cell tower in a neighborhood where there is nearly universal opposition by contiguous cottagers and those most closely impacted is against the ethos of the Park and the clear history of our process. It creates division and disharmony and undermines community cohesion which is so integral to our lives as Twilighters.

2. Health Concerns are Real - Because long term studies have not been conclusive, it is impossible to determine that no health risk exists for the proximate cottagers. The law firm hired by the Board to negotiate terms for the tower (Steel in The Air, Inc.) reports on its web site that guarantees regarding health issues are “premature”. See [http://www.steelintheair.com/celltower101/rf-safety.htmlhttp://www.steelintheair.com/celltower101/rf-safety.html](http://www.steelintheair.com/celltower101/rf-safety.html)

<http://www.steelintheair/>[www.steelintheair](http://www.steelintheair).com/celltower101/ rh-safety.html.

Other credible research suggests that RF waves emitted by cell towers may be strong enough to break chemical bonds in DNA molecules which can lead to cancer. On this issue the American Cancer Society quotes the EPA which has stated:not enough to break chemical bonds in DNA molecules, which is how these stronger forms of radiation may lead to cancer.

“Exposure to radio frequency (RF) radiation has climbed rapidly with the advent of cell phones and other wireless technologies. Studies of the link between exposure to RF and to electric and magnetic frequency (EMF) radiation have found RF and EMF to be ‘potential carcinogens,’ but the data linking RF and EMF to cancer is not conclusive. World wide, health physicists … continue to study the issue.”

See <http://www.cancer.org/cancer/cancercauses/othercarcinogens/athome/cellular-phone-towers>

See also: [http://www.powerwatch.org.uk/news/20050207\_israel.pdfwww.powerwatch.org.uk/news/20050207\_israel.pdf](http://www.powerwatch.org.uk/news/20050207_israel.pdf);

[http://www.islandparknews.com/atf.php?sid=8385http://www.islandparknews.com/atf.php?sid=8385](http://www.islandparknews.com/atf.php?sid=8385).

[http://www.infowars.com/news-study-links-over-700-cancer-deaths-to-cell-phone-tower-radiation-exposureswww.infowars.com/news-study-links-over-700-cancer-deaths-to-cell-phone-tower-radiation-exposures](http://www.infowars.com/news-study-links-over-700-cancer-deaths-to-cell-phone-tower-radiation-exposures)

We live in a community where one cannot cut a tree without neighbors’ consent. Imposing a tower on cottagers who do not want it because of rational health related concerns is unfair and antithetical to Twilight’s process. No one who lives near the tower should have to come to their place of respite and wonder if a serious health risk is present.[http://www.infowars.com/new-study-links-over-7000-cancer-deaths-to-cell-phone-tower-radiation-exposures/http://www.infowars.com/new-study-links-over-7000-cancer-deaths-to-cell-phone-tower-radiation-exposures/](http://www.infowars.com/new-study-links-over-7000-cancer-deaths-to-cell-phone-tower-radiation-exposures/)  
  
[http://www.cancer.org/cancer/cancercauses/othercarcinogens/athome/cellular-phone-towershttp://www.cancer.org/cancer/cancercauses/othercarcinogens/athome/cellular-phone-towers](http://www.cancer.org/cancer/cancercauses/othercarcinogens/athome/cellular-phone-towers)  
  
[http://www.powerwatch.org.uk/news/20050207\_israel.pdfhttp://www.powerwatch.org.uk/news/20050207\_israel.pdf](http://www.powerwatch.org.uk/news/20050207_israel.pdf)

3. Historical Impact and Viewscapes – The National Historic Registry was sought to protect us from intrusions to our historical integrity, such as cell towers. (See letter of Joe Gelmis dated November 2006.) The value and spirit of the Park’s placement on the national and state registries is abrogated by placing a cell tower within the district. By voluntarily placing a tower within our Park, we jeopardize our “historical” enforcement arm should a neighbor seek to impose an infringement on us and we risk alienating the State Office of Historic Preservation who partnered with us in seeking these registries. (Please refer to Ms. Kathleen LaFrank, NYSOHP for confirmation.)

We are of the view that a tower outside of Twilight would be preferable to one inside. Some are of the opinion that if we fail to take this tower, we run the risk of spoiling our views. While Twilight Park sits within the Catskill State Park, all of the land to our east and most of the land to our south and north is "State Forest Preserve". This is a special legal designation that provides an absolute bar to commercial intrusion. While the State Parks include private lands, the Preserve does not. These public lands are deemed to be "forever wild" and constitutionally protected for recreational and natural habitat purposes only. A tower could not mar our view of, for example, the clove. For more information please see [http://www.dec.ny.gov/lands/5265.htmlhttp://www.dec.ny.gov/lands/5265.html](http://www.dec.ny.gov/lands/5265.html)

Private landowners, like the heirs to the Dunn property across 23A, are not within the Preserve and are free to entertain AT&T's offer. However, because we are designated as a historic district on both the national and state registers, an application for a tower near us triggers review by the NY State Office of Historic Preservation. This review requires an "impact analysis" which considers aesthetic infringement to our district, visual impact and viewscapes. The consideration of alternative sites and mitigation by AT&T is mandated as part of this process. Because our views are of "national historical significance," (per the NYSHPO), AT&T has the burden to demonstrate that no other option is available to it and that it has done what it can to mitigate infringement of viewscapes. Moreover, the Town of Hunter has an ordinance that prohibits the erection of a cell tower within the viewshed of a historic registrant. See <http://www.townofhuntergov.com/pdf/Town%20of%20Hunter%20Cell%20Tower%20Law.pd>

4. Speculative Revenue - The cell tower idea was pursued - and AT&T was initially contacted by the Board - to create a future revenue stream for the Park. (See Board of Director Minutes dated Sept. 4 2010, page 2.) While we applaud the desire to generate supplemental income to defray expenses, the revenue production, per cottage, is de minimus, estimated to be approximately $20/month. Moreover, it is speculative. Cell companies are looking toward more advanced means of enabling cell phone connections and hence towers may become obsolete in the near future. See: [http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5jXqacfGLMiQMz4a3hft87PjsEKbA?docId=7a058a62ee33449b854981bc0c1904behttp://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5jXqacfGLMiQMz4a3hft87PjsEKbA?docId=7a058a62ee33449b854981bc0c1904be](http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5jXqacfGLMiQMz4a3hft87PjsEKbA?docId=7a058a62ee33449b854981bc0c1904be) and also [http://www.spacedaily.com/reports/Boeing\_built\_LightSquared\_Space\_Based\_Network\_Ready\_to\_Begin\_Service\_999.htmlhttp://www.spacedaily.com/reports/Boeing\_built\_LightSquared\_Space\_Based\_Network\_Ready\_to\_Begin\_Service\_999.html](http://www.spacedaily.com/reports/Boeing_built_LightSquared_Space_Based_Network_Ready_to_Begin_Service_999.html) [http://www.spacedaily.com/reports/Boeing\_built\_LightSquared\_Space\_Based\_Network\_Ready\_to\_Begin\_Service\_999.htmlhttp://www.spacedaily.com/reports/Boeing\_built\_LightSquared\_Space\_Based\_Network\_Ready\_to\_Begin\_Service\_999.html](http://www.spacedaily.com/reports/Boeing_built_LightSquared_Space_Based_Network_Ready_to_Begin_Service_999.html); and http://<http://www.informationweek.com/news/storage/data_protection/showArticle.jhtml?articleID=228200971>[www.informationweek.com./news/storage/data\_protection/showarticle.jhtml.?articleID=228200971](http://www.informationweek.com./news/storage/data_protection/showarticle.jhtml.?articleID=228200971)

5. Adverse Impact on Fair Market Value of Cottagers - Third level residents are virtually assured of a decline in their home values if a tower is erected. Knowledgeable people involved with the issue have suggested that properties near the towers may lose from 4 to 10% of their value "See [http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/29/realestate/29Lizo.html?\_r=1&ref=realestatehttp://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/29/realestate/29Lizo.html?\_r=1&ref=realestate](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/29/realestate/29Lizo.html?_r=1&ref=realestate)

6. The Noise and Disruption is significant- We have been advised by an attorney for a cell tower company that a cell tower requires a generator. That generator runs continuously and must be tested once/month. We have further been advised that the generator testing is disruptively loud and that this noise and disruption will likely negatively impact the lives of those most closely situated. See: mosthttp://[www.youtube.com/watch?v=QCaOazQauvc&feature=player\_embedded](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QCaOazQauvc&feature=player_embedded)

7. Fidelity to the Founder’s Statement- While benefits may be derived from the erection of a cell tower, its placement within Twilight Park is antithetical to the raison d’etre for our community: “We are creating a community in which the interest of each are the concerns of all…..and the pillars of our structure [are] the love of home, the love of children and the desire for wholesome recreation, the need of rest and refreshment… and the enjoyment which comes from simple comfort, congenial society and beautiful surroundings.”

See Founder’s Statement at [http://www.twilightpark.com/img/jb/twilight\_parkGreenBook20079.htmhttp://www.twilightpark.com/img/jb/twilight\_parkGreenBook20079.htm](http://www.twilightpark.com/img/jb/twilight_parkGreenBook20079.htm)

We are not a commercial enterprise but a place of rest. A cell tower interrupts the very concern for neighbor, rest and quiet enjoyment about which our founder writes.

Based on the above stated reasons, we residents of Squirrel Road, Squirrel Hill Road and Eagles’ Nest Road, object to this matter proceeding. We invite all members of the community to join us in opposition to this proposal.

Shay and George Hirsch

Peter and Robin Mechlowitz Kaukonen

Ann Collins

Kathleen and Steve Francis

Casey and Teri Barrett

David Maurer

Dan and Janine Maurer