

AGENDA ITEM: #7-Verizon
DATE: 10/2/2015

October 2, 2015

DO NOT REMOVE FROM FILE

Minor Use Permit Hearing Officer, RYAN FOSTER
County Board of Supervisors
County Planning Department
County Government Center
1055 Monterey Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

Verizon Small Cell Tower
Case Number: DRC2015-0001
Discrepancy in the APN numbers. Application says 022-227-030 and the plan shows 022-227-016. County URL for documentation: <http://agenda.slocounty.ca.gov/agenda/sanluisobispo/Proposal.html?select=5159>

Dear Airlin Singewald, Minor Use Hearing Officer, Ryan Foster and County Supervisors,

THE NEED?

I drove all over Park Hill and the best cell service was below the top of the hill, at Dorset Street and Whitehall Avenue. There were no places on the hill without service except the back side down on Plymouth where the proposed small cell site will have the least effect.

No statistics have been presented to justify installation of residential small cell equipment. A letter of inquiry was written to the Verizon headquarters by Robert Dees, but ignored. One employee of Verizon informed us that there were three (3) complaints in the month of August in all of Cambria. According to the MUP documentation, there were *no complaint tickets on Park Hill*.

According to Aaron Anderson, the cell service is for future LTE 4G data. The research shows that Apple will continue to support the older 3G phones. Other areas of Cambria lack cell service and suffer from dropped calls, but no small cells have been proposed for these areas.

Site disturbance:

Site disturbance and removal of landscaping is 800 square feet with concrete pads taking up 15 square feet. Plus, additional access area next to the telephone pole must be kept free of vegetation for pole access.

There was no boundary survey conducted. The MUP drawing shows a code violation because the metal boxes are drawn too close to the street edge. The

DO NOT REMOVE FROM FILE

October 5, 2011

Director, Planning Department
County Board of Supervisors
County Planning Department
County Government Center
1100 Monterey Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93403

Wilson Small Cell Tower

Case Number DP02011-00011

The application for APN numbers 028-223-030 and the plan shows
028-223-030. County URL for documents: <http://www.slocounty.gov/government>
Application for Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for Wilson Small Cell Tower

Meet with Planning Director, Wilson Small Cell Tower, Planning Department

THE MEETING

The meeting was held at the Planning Department on October 5, 2011. The meeting was held at the Planning Department on October 5, 2011. The meeting was held at the Planning Department on October 5, 2011.

The meeting was held at the Planning Department on October 5, 2011. The meeting was held at the Planning Department on October 5, 2011. The meeting was held at the Planning Department on October 5, 2011.

The meeting was held at the Planning Department on October 5, 2011. The meeting was held at the Planning Department on October 5, 2011. The meeting was held at the Planning Department on October 5, 2011.

CONCLUSION

The meeting was held at the Planning Department on October 5, 2011. The meeting was held at the Planning Department on October 5, 2011. The meeting was held at the Planning Department on October 5, 2011.

The meeting was held at the Planning Department on October 5, 2011. The meeting was held at the Planning Department on October 5, 2011. The meeting was held at the Planning Department on October 5, 2011.

project should conform to county code. The equipment boxes must be 10' back from the edge of the street. The location is in the public right of way, but well within Mr. and Mrs. Dees's landscaping. The Verizon documentation states they would prefer not to disturb established landscaping. Placing the boxes within the public right of way reduces visibility for drivers and risks an accident.

According to the MUP application, subcontractors are to verify plans dimensions and field conditions on site and notify the engineer. This is further evidence that a proper study was not conducted. There is no plan for pipes, electrical, conduit, or fire hydrant pipes.

Grading and Drainage:

The project will be installed at the top of a hill with a grade in excess of 30%. The Verizon plan says there is NO grade. There is no grading plan or drainage plan for an 800 sq. ft. site disturbance. Also, the concrete pad and site disturbance will have runoff down the hill into the garden, adjacent home and further down the hill.

Vehicle Safety:

According to MUP note #11 no study was conducted or Verizon would have seen the poor visibility. One needs to drive up Dorset to actually experience the problem. We've had many near collisions, and trucks have gotten stuck on our hill. The last one nearly hit the very pole that is proposed to hold cell equipment.

Dorset Street is very steep because land broke off during an earthquake from the Cambria Fault. Tolerances for wind and earthquake movement has not been tested or provided. Winds come in bursts up the hill from the ocean one block away. A physical assessment and traffic study was not conducted.

In order to get to the top of the hill, especially with a manual transmission, the driver must accelerate to Whitehall. It's dangerous to get stuck on the hill. The through traffic on Whitehall is a flat surface, but drivers cannot see the cars coming up or down the hill until they are cresting the hill. The property owner had to remove **native** trees and tall shrubbery to maintain visibility.

Notification to property owners:

No one from Verizon contacted the adjacent homeowner or neighbors. Aaron Anderson told me that such contacts are not done. The disregard for our quiet neighborhood is evident in the fact they started plans in March of 2014 and never told the affected neighbors. Verizon mentioned future plans to the North Coast Advisory Council (NCAC), but the Land Use Committee (LUC) didn't address the MUP and plans until August 1, 2015. On August 19, 2015, the NCAC, with a unanimous vote, recommended the Dorset and Whitehall small cell tower be moved out of the encroachment and vehicle site line. All of the adjacent Park Hill neighbors suggested moving the entire site to Whitehall and Hastings or another less dangerous site. The NCAC letter to the county does not reflect the recommendation of the Land Use

Committee or the specific recommendations and concerns. Further, the letters written to the NCAC and county are not attached to the county staff report. **See Attachment B**

According to the MUP application, the small cell tower is a commercial/Industrial project proposed for a residential neighborhood operating 24 hours a day every day of the year, with large service trucks driving up and down our narrow, steep streets, creating noise and pollution.

Visual Impacts:

The PVC pipe and equipment on the telephone pole is to be painted a color to coordinate, not match the telephone pole. The salt air will quickly corrode and cause the paint to peel and become unsightly. The green metal boxes do not blend with the landscaping as stated in the staff report. They will also corrode and become eyesores.

We love our quaint residential streets without sidewalks. It's the part of the charm of living near the ocean among the trees. We long-time residents prefer the quiet atmosphere and abhor the idea of looking at cell tower/boosters and equipment. The telephone pole looks like a tree trunk, but with boxes on the pole and bright colored signage, the extension with equipment will forever destroy our beautiful views and the characteristics of our small town.

Property Values:

It's proven to decrease property values and obstructs our expensive ocean view. Anyone living or driving down Dorset Street will have the pole marring the unique panoramic view of the ocean. It is imperative we preserve the views of our ocean, trees, and hills. The visual impact to all the neighbors will decrease the resale value of our homes, from 3% to 17% in some studies. Any amount is unacceptable. Small cell towers can make it difficult to acquire Federal Home Loans for homes within the "fall zone."

Cumulative Affects: AT&T is already looking at adding their equipment to small cell site. We're being made the guinea pigs for a Pandora's box of problems.

According to Airlin Singewald, other cell phone providers are allowed to add equipment to existing poles. In fact they are encouraged to share sell sites. This unknown factor will further impair views and exacerbate the hazards. An overall plan needs to be provided by the applicant. And future applicants.

Environmental impacts:

Park Hill is in the Coastal Zone and Environmentally Sensitive Habitat (ESHA). An EIR needs to be conducted to assess the overall and cumulative effects of small cells in all of Cambria.

Noise:

Verizon's application says there is no sound, but MSDS says there is a buzz or whine. In our quiet neighborhood this can be disturbing to humans, migratory birds, bats, bees and other flying creatures. A May 2014 Virginia Tech paper concludes: electromagnetic noise in frequencies ranging from 50 kilohertz to 5 megahertz affect migratory birds, such as robins, and doves

Air Pollution:

There is no assessment of the pollution from the materials used such as the carbon and exhaust from trucks installing and maintaining equipment. Aaron Anderson, the Verizon project coordinator, says Verizon personnel in trucks will check the equipment once a month.

Fire Hazards:

Cell towers and small cells are reported to burst into flame and even explode.

Health & Safety:

Some people argue that cell phones are essential in case of fire. Studies show that cell service becomes over-loaded, making connection impossible. Even the proponents of cell towers agree that, in Cambria, the best defense is the connection we have to our neighbors. We are not Los Angeles or New York. We're a small town with small town values. Most of us know our neighbors and we look out for each other. This type of communication continues to work after the power fails. Cell service will not work without electricity, but the human voice can be heard.

The Land Use Committee reported to the NCAC:

If power goes out cells have battery backup for 72 hours approximately. Said San Diego cell phones went out in a fire 2 years ago. Said Cambria's forest and hills make 100% cell coverage virtually impossible i.e, if topography was flat we would need less boosters. Agreed that land lines are probably the most reliable in Cambria for those worried about health and safety.

Rental Fee:

Does financial compensation enter into the county decision making regarding small cells?

Health Risks:

Mitigation measures are recommended for the cell antennas. Stay a minimum of 12' away while in operation. The small cell tower will operate continually, 24 hours a day

365 days a year. People out walking each day will be exposed to hazardous materials. Mr. and Mr. Dees may be in physical danger from working in the garden without proper protection. Since the FCC ruling in 1996, health risks are inadmissible. However, it is now determined that the FCC allowable limits for Radio Frequency (RF) and microwaves is vastly underestimated, especially with the cumulative exposure. A minimum approach is recommended according to the bright colored FCC vinyl signs that will be placed on the pole and visible from the ground. Protective shields are recommended. Admittedly, there will be hazardous materials on the property, such as lead acid batteries stored in our neighbors' landscaping.

The Land Use Committee reported to the NCAC:

International scientists are currently appealing to the United Nations (UN) and, all member States in the world, "to encourage the World Health Organization (WHO) to exert strong leadership in fostering the development of more protective International EMF guidelines." <https://www.emfscientist.org/index.php/emf-scientist-appeal>

Solution:

- The majority of the neighbors surrounding the proposed Park Hill small cell tower are opposed to any cell tower/boosters in our residential neighborhoods.
- Upon further study, the Verizon alternative site plan and discussion with Airlin Singewald, other locations may be more acceptable and offer service where none exists.
- A straw poll indicates stronger cell service is desired, but not in residential neighborhoods.
- Install cell towers within the commercial districts and possibly the old Airforce site.
- Encourage residents to order FREE home cell phone boosters. Verizon and Sprint offer these for free or at a low cost, giving freedom of choice instead of forcing people to have unwanted equipment near their homes.
- If Verizon is allowed to install small cell towers in Cambria, place them on county right of way adjacent to vacant lots, not within landscaping. With the drought, building moratorium, and lot reduction program, build-out is unlikely. If a site becomes buildable, **existing** cell equipment in public right of ways should not be a consideration.

Rather than allowing multiple carriers, consider one company like Crown Castle who lease DAS systems to all carriers to jointly use. Montecito uses this system.

- We urge you to
- Postpone a decision regarding approval of a MUP application until further study and justification with a master plan with propagation maps are presented. It appears unprofessional to approve a project without all the facts and consequences.
- North Coast Advisory Council's Land Use Committee recommendations Date: 8/3//2015

•

Recommendation: Motion to deny due to absence of a long range master plan that limits cell installations area wide or motion to approve if cell site and cabinets are moved to either of two poles at Hastings/Whitehall (one block north) adding that "a precautionary approach should be taken until the controversy among international scientists in regards to setting standards for limits to human exposures to radio-frequency (RF) and extremely low frequency electromagnetic field (ELF-EMF) fields is resolved." See Further comments form the LUC Attachment A

Thank you,

Claudia Harmon Worthen on behalf of neighbors living on or near Dorset Street and Whitehall Avenue:

Robert and Van Dees
Brenda Keen
Barbara Austin Holt
Sandi King & Doug Lut

Attachment A

LUC Notes from August 3 , 2015 meeting pertinent to the Park Hill small cell tower application.

From a business standpoint Aaron Anderson told Mary Webb, committee chair, that Verizon wants as few cell boosters as possible as they are expensive to permit and construct. The proposals are reactionary, based on customer complaints and number of dropped calls which automatically generate algorithms to improve service. Although requested, the committee received no actual data on numbers of complaints or dropped calls.

Emails were received from approx. 6-8 Park Hill neighbors who are opposed to the installation at Dorset and Whitehall. The steep incline and 3-4' high Cabinets at this location block driver line of vision of Whitehall as drivers accelerate coming up the steep Dorset hill. Installation would also disturb a garden area. Emails received include complaints that equipment cabinets are not properly maintained around town, that cell installations should be limited to protect local character, and that the Dorset pole is highly visible and additions to it will impact homeowner ocean views and property values. Letters are attached.

Alternative location proposed at Hastings St. contains two usable poles and dead ends at Whitehall which avoids the traffic issue. LUC majority agrees Hastings is a preferable location.

Poles are in the public right of way - not on private property. Space is limited on each pole Residential cell boosters have not been installed anywhere else in SLO County which is a concern to several committee members. Verizon submitted four proposals and the committee has received and reviewed three of four.

Propagation maps were received following our meeting, but they are vague. Requests for detailed customer complaint/dropped call logs and a Cambria master plan analyzing cell service and forecasting future cell installations from all carriers is needed but was not provided.

Attachment B, Sampling of letters from Park Hill neighbors

On Jul 29, 2015, at 4:10 PM, Pat Heineman <pheineman@charter.net> wrote:

Claudia,

Thank you for informing me. It appears the proposed cell sites have been in the works for a long time, yet, the public has not been informed via the local newspaper. Citizens cannot be part process unless they know about it.

Will affected neighbors have any say in the sites that are selected? I certainly hope so.

The site at Dorset and Whitehall is directly across the street from my property.

I have reviewed the pdfs for all three sites. The Dorset location is the only one where there are no trees to mitigate the "ugly". It would be most intrusive if this location if selected. Therefore I oppose it.

However, I do want a cell site that serves my area. As you know, I am a senior, I live alone and being able to use a cell phone for emergencies, such as a health issue, is vital. I weigh that against any possible radio frequency issues, and I land on the side of being able to make, what could be, a life-saving call.

This is the old issue of "not in my neighborhood," but not quite. There are no trees at this intersection to soften the equipment required. I believe there must be a better location than this one that would serve Park Hill.

I would like to attend the meeting on August 3rd, but have a commitment until at least 4:00. Would it be acceptable to arrive late? In case I can't make it, I wanted you to know my thinking, because I am probably the one who would be the most visually effected.

Also, I would be interested in knowing how the statistics were arrived to determine the percentages for property values being diminished. The range of 5% to 36% is too great for me to take seriously. Who did the study? What area was studied? What year? Which properties were used to evaluate the loss? Specific data is required to back up that assertion.

Again, I appreciate being alerted to proposals effecting my neighborhood.

Pat Heineman

On Aug 11, 2015, at 11:15 AM, Elizabeth Bettenhausen <elizabethbettenhausen@gmail.com> wrote:

Thanks, Mary.

That is quite the list of signatories around the world. They are astute in addressing the controversy:

"Since there is controversy about a rationale for setting standards to avoid adverse health effects, we recommend that the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) convene and fund an independent multidisciplinary committee to explore the pros and cons of alternatives to current practices that could substantially lower human exposures to RF and ELF fields. The deliberations of this group should be conducted in a transparent and impartial way. Although it is essential that industry be involved and cooperate in this process, industry should not be allowed to bias its processes or conclusions. This group should provide their analysis to the UN and the WHO to guide precautionary action."

That's the only way to deal with profit-making bias in the industry. Let's hope the UN follows through.

Elizabeth

On Tue, Aug 11, 2015 at 10:47 AM, Mary Webb <webbmarye@me.com> wrote:
Just to provide the possible health effects; cumulative impacts and long term exposures are probably not sufficiently addressed:

<https://www.emfscientist.org/index.php/emf-scientist-appeal>

Scientists call for Protection from Non-ionizing Electromagnetic Field Exposure
We are scientists engaged in the study of biological and health effects of non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (EMF). Based upon peer-reviewed, published research, we have serious concerns regarding the ubiquitous and increasing exposure to EMF generated by electric and wireless devices. These include—but are not limited to—radiofrequency radiation (RFR) emitting devices, such as cellular and cordless phones and their base stations, Wi-Fi, broadcast antennas, smart meters, and baby monitors as well as electric devices and infra-structures used in the delivery of electricity that generate extremely-low frequency electromagnetic field (ELF EMF).

Scientific basis for our common concerns

Numerous recent scientific publications have shown that EMF affects living organisms at levels well below most international and national guidelines. Effects include increased cancer risk, cellular stress, increase in harmful free radicals, genetic damages, structural and functional changes of the reproductive system, learning and memory deficits, neurological disorders, and negative impacts on general well-being in humans. Damage goes well beyond the human race, as there is growing evidence of harmful effects to both plant and animal life.

These findings justify our appeal to the United Nations (UN) and, all member States in the world, to encourage the World Health Organization (WHO) to exert strong leadership in fostering the development of more protective EMF guidelines, encouraging precautionary measures, and educating the public about health risks, particularly risk to children and fetal development. By not taking action, the WHO is failing to fulfill its role as the preeminent international public health agency.

Inadequate non-ionizing EMF international guidelines

The various agencies setting safety standards have failed to impose sufficient guidelines to protect the general public, particularly children who are more vulnerable to the effects of EMF.

The International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) established in 1998 the “Guidelines For Limiting Exposure To Time-Varying Electric, Magnetic, and Electromagnetic Fields (up to 300 GHz)”[1]. These guidelines are accepted by the WHO and numerous countries around the world. The WHO is calling for all nations to adopt the ICNIRP guidelines to encourage international harmonization of standards. In 2009, the ICNIRP released a statement saying that it was reaffirming its 1998 guidelines, as in their opinion, the scientific literature published since that time “has provided no evidence of any adverse effects below the basic restrictions and does not necessitate an immediate revision of its guidance on limiting exposure to high frequency electromagnetic fields[2]. ICNIRP continues to the present day to make these

On this page, you will find information about the possible health effects of electromagnetic fields (EMF) and radio frequency (RF) electromagnetic fields (RF-EMF). This information is provided for informational purposes only and is not intended to be used as a substitute for professional medical advice.

<http://www.fda.gov/oc/ohrt/ohrt.html>

Scientists call for protection from non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (EMF) exposure. A scientific review of the study of biological and health effects of non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (EMF) has been published, published research, with some authors concluding that the biological and health effects of EMF generated by electric and wireless devices. These include but are not limited to: cell phones, cordless phones, mobile phones, and other wireless devices, such as cellular and cordless phones and their base stations, (WIFI) broadcast antennas, smart meters, and body monitors as well as electric devices and structures used in the delivery of electricity that generate extremely-low frequency electromagnetic fields (ELF EMF).

Scientific basis for our common concerns

Recent scientific publications have shown that EMF fields living organisms in levels well below most international and national guidelines. EMF fields have been associated with increased cancer risk, cellular stress, increased oxidative DNA damage, and changes in neuronal and functional changes of the reproductive system, learning and memory, cellular neurological disorders, and negative impacts on general well-being in humans. EMF fields go well beyond the human race, as there is growing evidence of harmful effects to both plant and animal life.

These findings justify our appeal to the United Nations (UN) and all member states in the world to encourage the World Health Organization (WHO) to exist and to continue its leadership in fostering the development of more protective EMF guidelines. Encouraging precautionary measures, and educating the public about health risks, particularly with children and fetal development. By not taking action, the WHO is failing to fulfill its role as the premier international public health agency.

International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) has issued guidelines for limiting EMF exposure to the general public, particularly children who are more vulnerable to the effects of EMF.

The International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) was established in 1988 the "Guidelines for Limiting Exposure to Time-Varying Electric, Magnetic, and Electromagnetic Fields (up to 300 GHz)". These guidelines are supported by the WHO and numerous countries around the world. The WHO is calling on all nations to adopt the ICNIRP guidelines to encourage international harmonization of standards. In 2002, the ICNIRP released a statement saying that it was reaffirming its position as in their opinion, the scientific literature published since that time has provided no evidence of any adverse effects from the basic restrictions and does not necessitate an immediate revision of its guidance on limiting exposure to high frequency electromagnetic fields. ICNIRP continues to the present day to make these

assertions, in spite of growing scientific evidence to the contrary. It is our opinion that, because the ICNIRP guidelines do not cover long-term exposure and low-intensity effects, they are insufficient to protect public health.

The WHO adopted the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) classification of extremely low frequency electromagnetic field (ELF EMF) in 2002[3] and radiofrequency radiation (RFR) in 2011[4]. This classification states that EMF is a possible human carcinogen (Group 2B). Despite both IARC findings, the WHO continues to maintain that there is insufficient evidence to justify lowering these quantitative exposure limits.

In another article, the WHO has been studying the issue for years.
Weston Price article discusses health hazards
<http://www.westonprice.org/> See what they say about Smart Meters and Cell towers

AGENDA ITEM: #7- Verizon
DATE: 10/2/2015

From: Ronald M Cohen <ronaldmcohen@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Cell Tower
Date: July 31, 2015 at 9:17:43 PM PDT
To: Robert Dees <rdees37@yahoo.com>
Cc: Van Dees <vannguyendees@yahoo.com>, Pamela Pick <pamelajpick@gmail.com>

DO NOT REMOVE FROM FILE

Bob,

Pam and I just returned from a walk across Fiscalini forest and then back along the bluff trail. We took Windsor to Hastings and went east to the short trail that is in that area of shrubbery where Hastings Street formerly went through but does not any longer. I understand from others who lived here before I moved in back in 1998 that the closure of the connection between the 300 and 400 block of Hastings resulted from the same dangerous situation as you describe in your letter. Your situation looks equal to what Hastings must have been back then, and could even be slightly worse.

Even though our house is closer to the area than to the proposed site near you is, I, too, would favor Verizon choosing a spot in that shrubbery area over where it is currently planned. By this, I mean about half way up the hill from the east-most 300 block of Hastings to where that shrubbery area meets Whitehall Avenue. There is an area just to the south of where a current pole triangulation type support goes into the ground that I would think would make it least noticeable to everyone in this area and most desirable for those ground level equipment boxes. In fact, that pole with the triangulation type support might even be an ideal one for the other pole-mounted antennas and using it would place the antennas very close to the aforementioned area on that slope that I think suitable for the boxes, thus minimizing the length of the run for the wires. If for any reason that area is not suitable for their equipment, I find it inconceivable that there isn't a better place for it nearby than where it is currently proposed.

Should you think it helpful, please feel free to use this email to support the position you present in your letter.

Thanks again for sharing this issue with us.

Ronald M. Cohen
419 Hastings St
Cambria CA 93428-3235
Phone: (805) 927-1471
Fax: (805) 926-1903

AGENDA ITEM: _____
DATE: _____

DO NOT REMOVE FROM FILE

From: Ronald W. Linton - ron.linton@planning.com
Subject: Re: Call Tower
Date: July 31, 2015 at 3:07:43 PM EDT
To: Robert Goss <rgoss7@planning.com>
Cc: Van Goss <van.goss@planning.com>, Pamela Pick <p.pick@planning.com>

Bob,

From and just returned from a walk across fiscal line and then back along the line. We took a look at the location to Hastings and went east to the street that is in that area of street where Hastings Street formerly went through but does not any longer. I was there from where I lived here before I moved in back in 1988 that the location on the connection between the 800 and 400 block of Hastings resulted from the same dangerous situation as you describe in your letter. Your situation looks equal to what Hastings must have been back then, and could even be slightly worse.

Even though our house is closer to the area than to the proposed site, you talk about a "level" or "vertical" crossing a spot in that sidewalk area over where it currently stands. By that I mean about half way up the hill from the east-most 800 block of Hastings to where the sidewalk area meets W. 1st Avenue. There is an area just to the south of where a current pole transition type support goes into the ground that would make it least noticeable to everyone in the area and most noticeable for those general electrical equipment boxes. In fact that pole with the transition type support might even be an ideal one for the other pole-mounted antennas and using it would place the antennas very close to the aforementioned area on that pole that I think would be the best. The boxes that minimize the length of the run for the wires. If the reason for that is not suitable for their equipment, I find it inconceivable that there isn't a better place for it nearby than where it is currently proposed.

Should you think it helpful, please feel free to use this email to support the position you present in your letter.

Thanks again for sharing this issue with us.

Ronald W. Linton
118 Hastings St
Oakdale, CA 95323-3288
Phone: (925) 937-4474
Fax: (925) 937-1808

PLANNING DEPARTMENT HEARINGS

AGENDA ITEM: #7 - Verizon
DATE: 10/2/2015

DO NOT REMOVE FROM FILE

July 31, 2015

Dear Claudia,

Thank you for sharing with us the information about the recent proposal by Verizon to install additional telecommunications equipment at the corner of Whitehall and Dorset streets in Cambria. I am opposed to the proposal for the reasons discussed below. I hope you will share this letter and my and our neighbors' concerns with those responsible for responding to what Verizon has proposed.

For the record, my wife and I have been permanent residents of Cambria for nearly three years now. We retired here from Orange County, California, where she was a professor at Golden West Community College in Huntington Beach and I was president of Orange Coast Community College in Costa Mesa. Since settling in Cambria, we have both been active in supporting the community, she by volunteering at the local elephant seal rookery, and I by serving at the Piedras Blancas Light Station. I am also a member of the Central Coast Biological Association and the Cambria Fishing Club. Since moving to Cambria, I have also taken marine biology classes at Cuesta College. I feel I have a good sense of this community and what it means to me and others. We are proud of our home here and greatly appreciate living in a beautiful place like Cambria. That is why we are concerned about the recent request by Verizon to establish a cell tower unit adjoining our property at 399 Dorset, Cambria.

As you are aware, Verizon's proposal includes adding cellular equipment to the existing telephone pole at the corner of Whitehall and Dorset streets, as well as installing two large communications equipment boxes on the ground, a few feet from the pole.

According to Verizon, the purpose of these additions is to improve cellular communications services in the Cambria area.

I appreciate the need for such proposed improvement and, were such installation planned in an acceptable way, would very likely endorse Verizon's proposal. However, I--as well as all of the surrounding neighbors I have spoken with--believe Verizon's current proposal will result in unmistakable degradation of my own and my neighbors' property values. Furthermore, the proposed installation will undoubtedly only further increase the already hazardous traffic conditions that have historically made the intersection of Whitehall and Dorset one of the most dangerous in this city.

The following points elaborate my position more fully:

1. The proposed additions would be unattractive and degrade property values.

As anyone who has seen other examples of what Verizon is proposing knows, my neighbors and I are rightly concerned that the planned additions at the corner of Whitehall and Dorset will be singularly unattractive and ultimately lower our property values. Such additions are not only obtrusive and unappealing; they will also interfere with the view of the ocean now enjoyed by those living anywhere north of the proposed site.

In addition, a quick drive anywhere around Cambria today will readily demonstrate that similar communications panels or equipment boxes such as Verizon plans to install on the ground quickly become corroded, rusty, and paint-faded eyesores (e.g., the corner of Windsor and Pembroke or the ocean-end of Windsor and DeVault). I don't want junky- looking, worn-out scrap equipment sitting on the corner next to my house, and

neither do other residents of Cambria. Note that Verizon's proposal says nothing about maintaining the appearance of such equipment in future years.

2. The proposed additions at the corner of Whitehall and Dorset will increase dangers to drivers and pedestrians.

It is important to note also that Verizon's proposal indicates no traffic study was included in its planning preparation. As my neighbors will attest, the intersection of Whitehall and Dorset has a long history of collisions between vehicles coming up or down the steep incline on Dorset and traveling on Whitehall. Neighbors tell me that before I moved to Cambria there were four to five accidents a year at that corner. During my first week in my current house, I stood at my kitchen window and witnessed a collision between a truck and a car. One reason for such accidents, I was told, was the presence of two Madrone trees and a small pine tree on my property and at the corner of Whitehall and Dorset. After moving into my house, I removed those trees during the first month I lived here. I re-landscaped the corner and adjacent hillside with low-growing plants and, with the exception of the existing telephone pole, removed all visual obstructions to ensure a completely unblocked view for drivers going south on Whitehall and any cars or trucks coming up Dorset. I am aware of no traffic accidents at that intersection since I re-landscaped it.

My neighbors and I believe that Verizon's current plan will only re-introduce the hazards that I tried to eliminate. Because of the steep incline on Dorset above and below Whitehall, cars speed up Dorset to climb the grade to the intersection. Because there are no stop signs at the intersection, they are traveling at a good speed when they get there and then cross it without pausing in order to make their way again up the rest of the steep Dorset incline. This is a hazardous enough condition, but it is made all the worse by the fact that cars coming up Dorset are also partially hidden by the incline itself from the view of vehicles traveling south along Whitehall. The intersection of Whitehall and Dorset is risky enough now. Does anyone really think putting two big equipment boxes on that corner is not going to make conditions even more dangerous?

3. Other alternatives need to be looked at.

Because of the reasons stated above, I do not want the changes Verizon is proposing. If the proposed corner location of the accessorized pole were absolutely necessary, I would suggest locating the equipment boxes away from the corner--perhaps to the north end of the street, say, where the mailboxes are now. That way they would not interfere with the view of drivers coming to the intersection at Whitehall and Dorset, and they would not be so visible from my property or my neighbors'.

Another, even more preferable idea, would be to locate the boxes (and if need be, an additional new pole) at the south-side vacant area where Hastings street deadends into Whitehall. That would avoid most or all of the issues I have mentioned here, as well as prevent needlessly cluttering highly visible corners like the one at Whitehall and Dorset with unattractive equipment. Installed at the bottom of Hastings, the equipment could be placed behind existing or added shrubbery to further hide it. Note that such planting by me or anyone else to hide the equipment at the proposed Whitehall-Dorset corner site

would be a very bad idea: it would only obstruct drivers' views of the intersection even more.

4. Cambria needs to protect the appearance of its community.

The current proposal by Verizon is not the best plan for bringing improved cellular service to the city of Cambria. It increases the likelihood of traffic accidents, and it harms the economic value and human pleasures of living in a beautiful coastal community. We may need cell towers in Cambria, but how many more corners of this city are going to be cluttered with them in the future? Is it one corner for Verizon today, another for T-Mobile tomorrow, and a third and fourth and so on every time a commercial entity wants a space? We may need the cell towers, but we also need to protect the quality of life and the safety of those who live here. I hope Verizon's proposal is refused and other, more community-sensitive alternatives sought.

I hope you will share my thoughts with others who will be considering an official response to Verizon's proposal. Thank you for all your help in this matter.

Sincerely,

Robert Dees
805-927-2520
rdees37@yahoo.com