



LUP Hearings <lup-hearings@multco.us>

Case no. T2-2023-16960, Concerns Regarding Proposed Cell Tower Location in Our Neighborhood

3 messages

Neslihan <neslihan.strelka@gmail.com>

Mon, Jun 22, 2026 at 3:18 PM

To: LUP Hearings <lup-hearings@multco.us>, LUP-comments@multco.us

Cc: Izze Liu <isabella.liu@multco.us>, "Joseph D. Strelka" <wakeforest@hotmail.com>

This Message Is From an External Sender

External Sender - Be Suspicious of Attachments, Links, and Requests for Payment or Login Information.

I am writing to formally express my strong opposition to the proposed cell tower project in our neighborhood and respectfully request that this application be rejected.

I previously shared my concerns, and after reviewing the proposal further, I remain deeply concerned about the potential health, environmental, aesthetic, and quality-of-life impacts this project would have on our community. Therefore sending additional content below for the hearing officer to review.

Many residents may not be aware of the ongoing discussions and differing perspectives regarding potential health impacts associated with radiofrequency (RF) radiation. I was also someone who did not think much about this topic until I was diagnosed with thyroid cancer in 2021.

My doctors, Dr. Olga Senashova and Dr. Maisie Shindo at the OHSU Thyroid and Parathyroid Center, cannot determine the exact cause of my cancer, but they did explain that the thyroid is known to be particularly susceptible to radiation. If you would like their medical perspective, they can be reached through the OHSU Thyroid and Parathyroid Center at 503-494-2544.

We are exposed to different forms of radiation every day, and some exposure is unavoidable. However, when we have the ability to reduce unnecessary exposure, I believe we should take reasonable steps to protect our families and community. I do not want my loved ones or neighbors to face additional risks when there may be alternatives available.

I also encourage you to review the position of the International Association of Fire Fighters regarding cell towers and RF exposure: <https://www.iaff.org/cell-tower-radiation/>. Their report calls for additional research and expresses concern about placing wireless communication antennas in locations where people regularly live and work.

Additional research and discussions regarding RF exposure and cell towers have also been compiled by Environmental Health Trust:

<https://ehtrust.org/cell-towers-and-cell-antennae/compilation-of-research-studies-on-cell-tower-radiation-and-health/>. Some of the concerns raised in ongoing research are below. I also listed a few published papers to review at the bottom of this email.

- Cell towers emit radiofrequency radiation.

Exhibit I.3

- RF radiation has been classified by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) as a “possible” carcinogen.
- Studies continue to examine potential impacts related to cancer risk, brain development, thyroid function, reproduction, sleep, and cellular changes.
- Children may be more vulnerable because their bodies and brains are still developing.
- FCC RF exposure guidelines have not been substantially updated since 1996 despite significant changes in wireless technology and usage.

My family has personally taken steps to reduce unnecessary wireless exposure in our home. We hired an electromagnetic radiation specialist to evaluate our house and educate us on ways to reduce exposure. We hardwired our internet connection, limit wireless use, and avoid unnecessary nighttime exposure when our bodies are undergoing repair and recovery processes.

I understand the importance of reliable communication infrastructure. However, I believe this specific project is not appropriate for this location. The burden of this infrastructure should not be placed on one neighborhood. I have several concerns regarding this proposal:

Health and Safety Concerns

- Why does this tower need to be located this close to homes and parks?
- What evidence demonstrates that this location presents no meaningful risk to residents who would be exposed continuously?
- Were alternative locations evaluated that would reduce potential exposure to nearby residents?

Lack of Demonstrated Necessity -There was a Blanket Comment About Band 14 (public safety justification)

- Is there documented evidence of a coverage deficiency in the Bethany area?
- Are there coverage maps, dropped-call data, or emergency communication gaps supporting this exact location?
- Is this tower the only feasible solution, or simply the most convenient option?

Visual and Environmental Impact - including questionable necessity of height and inconsistency with land use zoning codes

A cell tower disguised as a tree is still a cell tower — it does not become a natural tree.

The proposed design does not blend naturally with the surrounding environment and inconsistent with land use zoning codes:

- The rendering provided was black and white and does not show realistic colors or long-term appearance.
- The artificial branches and proportions do not resemble a real tree.
- A 150-foot structure significantly exceeds the height of most trees in many areas (especially farmland or semi-rural landscapes).
 - When no comparable natural trees exist nearby: the "tree" concept fails immediately and the structure becomes the dominant skyline feature rather than blending into the landscape.
- A 150-foot structure is significantly out of scale with surrounding vegetation and is comparable to a 9–10 story building.
 - In agricultural or rural zones similar height structures would not be permitted (barns, homes, or commercial office buildings etc.)

The concept of “Goodness of Fit,” discussed by Christopher Alexander in *A Pattern Language*, explains that elements that truly belong in an environment tend to blend in and become unnoticed, while elements that do not fit draw attention. A 150-foot artificial tree structure in this setting does not appear integrated with the surrounding landscape, and it would be inconsistent with the character and scale of many rural or semi-rural areas.

The proposed tower would fundamentally change the character of this area. Required setbacks and the height of the structure prevent it from being naturally integrated into the landscape. Instead of preserving the environment, it would introduce a large industrial structure into a residential community.

Reliable communication infrastructure is important, but it should be balanced with responsible planning, community impact, and protection of residents' quality of life. I strongly believe this location is not appropriate for a 150-foot cell tower and that this proposal should not move forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Neslihan Sener Strelka

Few examples of published research to review:

1. European Parliament requested a research report "[Health Impact of 5G](#)" which was released in July 2021 and concluded that commonly used RFR frequencies (450 to 6000 MHz) are probably carcinogenic for humans and clearly affect male fertility with possible adverse effects on the development of embryos, fetuses and newborns.
2. A review entitled "[Evidence for a health risk by RF on humans living around mobile phone base stations: From radiofrequency sickness to cancer](#)" reviewed the existing scientific literature and found radiofrequency sickness, cancer and changes in biochemical parameters ([Balmori 2022](#)).
3. Zothansiam, et al. "[Impact of radiofrequency radiation on DNA damage and antioxidants in peripheral blood lymphocytes of humans residing in the vicinity of mobile phone base stations.](#)" *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine* 36.3 (2017): 295-305. This study evaluated effects in the human blood of individuals living near mobile phone base stations (within 80 meters) compared with healthy controls (over 300 meters). The study found higher radiofrequency radiation exposures and statistically significant differences in the blood of people living closer to the cellular antennas. The group living closer to the antennas had for example, statistically significant higher frequency of micronuclei and a rise in lipid peroxidation in their blood. These changes are considered biomarkers predictive of cancer.
4. Anthony B. Miller, L. Lloyd Morgan, Iris Udasin, Devra Lee Davis, [Cancer epidemiology update, following the 2011 IARC evaluation of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields \(Monograph 102\)](#), *Environmental Research*, Volume 167, 2018, Pages 673-683, ISSN 0013-9351
 - Radiofrequency radiation is emitted by cell towers. This review paper concludes that "Based on the evidence reviewed it is our opinion that IARC's current categorization of RFR as a possible human carcinogen (Group 2B) should be upgraded to Carcinogenic to Humans (Group 1)."
5. Rodrigues NCP, Dode AC, Andrade MKdN, O'Dwyer G, Monteiro DLM, Reis INC, Rodrigues RP, Frossard VC, Lino VTS. [The Effect of Continuous Low-Intensity Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields from Radio Base Stations to Cancer Mortality in Brazil.](#) *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2021; 18(3):1229. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18031229>
 - "Conclusions: The balance of our results indicates that the exposure to radiofrequency electromagnetic fields from an RBS increases the rate of mortality by all cancers and specifically by breast, cervix, lung, and esophageal cancers. These conclusions are based on the fact that the findings of this study indicate that, the higher the RBS radiofrequency exposure, the higher the cancer mortality rate, especially for cervix cancer (adjust RR = 2.18). The spatial analysis showed that the highest RBS radiofrequency exposure was observed in a city located in the southern region of Brazil, which also showed the highest mortality rate for all types of cancer and specifically for lung and breast cancers."

As a reminder, please only send to submissions to the hearing inbox, not the comments inbox.

lup-hearings@multco.us

Multnomah County

Department of Community Services - Land Use Planning Division
1600 SE 190th Ave., Portland OR 97233

T: 503-988-3043

E: lup-hearings@multco.us

<https://multco.us/landuse>

[Quoted text hidden]

Neslihan <neslihan.strelka@gmail.com>
To: Hearings LUP <lup-hearings@multco.us>

Tue, Jun 23, 2026 at 8:29 AM

This Message Is From an External Sender

External Sender - Be Suspicious of Attachments, Links, and Requests for Payment or Login Information.

Understood. Thank you.

On Jun 23, 2026, at 7:44 AM, LUP Hearings <lup-hearings@multco.us> wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]