



PC 8-13-20

Julie Saylor <julie.saylor@edcgov.us>

Item #2

Fwd: CUP19-0007 Frenchtown ATT Comments. Please DENY this project and demand BOS redo the Wireless Ordinance

1 message

4 pages

Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>

Thu, Aug 6, 2020 at 7:35 AM

To: Julie Saylor <julie.saylor@edcgov.us>, Debra Ercolini <debra.ercolini@edcgov.us>, Gina Hamilton <gina.hamilton@edcgov.us>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Ken Greenwood <krge@d-web.com>

Date: Thu, Aug 6, 2020 at 4:46 AM

Subject: CUP19-0007 Frenchtown ATT Comments. Please DENY this project and demand BOS redo the Wireless Ordinance

To: Planning EDCo <planning@edcgov.us>

Cc: James Williams <jww3100@yahoo.com>

Project CUP19-0007 ATT Frenchtown Wireless Telecommunication Facility (WTF) Tower

Dear Planning Commission and Planning Staff,

This WTF is another Gem from ATT to provide service to "Underserved Areas" and has once again been poorly reviewed by Planning Staff (even without the failures in the WTF Ordinance).

- The Project does not meet the required Findings for the CUP process as it is NOT compatible with and is in fact DETRIMENTAL to the rural nature of the neighborhood due to Aesthetic impacts on the surrounding developed (and undeveloped) parcels. It is too high above the surrounding vegetation and will be a "Life Sentence" eyesore to the neighbors.

Additionally, the El Dorado County WTF Ordinance (130.40.130) by which this Project is reviewed is outdated and does not have adequate minimum requirements to protect the Public Interest, particularly:

- minimum "fallover" setbacks (this WTF almost makes it, but not quite!),
- meaningful alternative site analysis,
- mandated third Party Review of applicant's Alternative Site Analysis
- inadequate noticing for interested and benefited parties.
- lack of meaningful visual simulation from adjacent residential structures within 1/2 mile (as those are Served and Impacted by the WTFs).
- No requirements to CLEARLY show setbacks on site plans, Noticing Maps and all illustrations (DISTANCE MATTERS!).

You cannot approve a Project using it as a STANDARD as it is inadequate for the above and other reasons described below.

For instance, the Staff Report: Public Comments/Outreach on Page 5 says:

Public Comments/Outreach: No formal public outreach was conducted by the County, and a public outreach plan was not required for this project pursuant to the County Zoning Ordinance. However, the project was duly noticed for a Planning Commission public hearing with a public notification

range of 1,000 feet and a legal advertisement was published in applicable local newspapers. In addition, project notification was also posted on the Planning Department Planning Commission webpage. No physical sign posting is required for Conditional Use Permits.

Why didn't staff go "out of their way" to adequately Notice those impacted (or benefited) by this project? It really wouldn't be that tough to draw a line on a CAD and generate a mailing list and send them out. Big deal! How difficult is it to put a sign on the property along the Public (or Private) road that serves the area? Especially if the so-called "Benefit" is good for the huddled masses and reason ATT is getting a substantial Federal Subsidy to construct these WTFs? I would imagine you would want as many people to know about the proposal so they can support it if it is so beneficial and needed.

As this will be starkly visible (+/- 100 feet above the Oak canopy!!) to numerous neighbors greater than 1000 feet away and the useful service area is one mile, all those potentially benefiting or being impacted by the project should be notified. Therefore this project has not been thoroughly vetted by nearby residents and does not meet the intent of CEQA nor does it give people the ability to reasonably participate in the approval, environmental review or hearing process.

Solution? DENY this project, revise the WTF Ordinance and start over! The WTF Industry knows how to better design and review projects, but they thoroughly enjoy that our WTF Ordinance doesn't force them to do so as it does cost just a bit more to do it right and let the Public see what the true extent of the Project is (as required by Law).

Additionally, the 1000' Notice Map (Exhibit F) is poorly done and does not clearly explain/illustrate a number of important factors important to full disclosure of the nature and extent of the Project (kind of a problem with CEQA Consistency). The 1000' zone goes off the borders and seems to not illustrate the Project Parcel correctly and/or consistent with the rest of the exhibits. Exhibit F does not show the approximate location of the Tower on the parcel so the Public can better understand the location of the actual tower to assist their understanding and evaluation of the project.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW is inadequate as follows:

Alternative Analysis:

P 6. of Initial Study

Alternative Sites Analysis: AT&T considered six alternative sites for facilities to fill the identified coverage gap in this portion of El Dorado County. AT&T searched for, but did not find, feasible co-location opportunities in and around the coverage objective (Attachment 6). Property owners for three candidate sites did not respond to AT&T's letters of interest. Three property owners indicated interest in leasing space for the facility. However, based on viability, siting needs, and/or high visibility, parties were unable to determine an appropriate facility location on two of these properties. The third property was initially identified as the preferred site; however, after further discussion with the property owner, they elected not to encumber their property and passed on leasing the site to AT&T. AT&T's alternative sites analysis is included in Attachment 6.

This explanation DOES NOT protect the Public Health, Safety and Welfare as "shucks gee whiz, we really tried but they wouldn't answer our letters, so we didn't bother to call them, so guess it just doesn't work for us at this time..." What?? Seriously?? that's NOT and Altenrative Analysis.

If El Dorado County truly wants "Broadband Access" for our residents, then we should be looking at EVERY site that shows promise and facilitate these "Needed for Public Safety" WTF's up to and including condemning the properties in the name of the "Public Good." Let's face it, that's what we are doing to the neighbors who will be facing a "Life Sentance" of looking at this Tower for the rest of their lives WITHOUT any monetary compensation from ATT or El Dorado County. Whereas the applicant in

this an other projects receives a monthly lease payment and this person doesn't even have to live with the consequences he or she has poured upon his neighbors.

Sound absurd? Why yes it does, but that basically is the end product of these projects and the manner which El Dorado County processes these applications for WTF's.

Aesthetics:

P 8 of Initial Study (NOT CHECKED AS SIGNIFICANT???)

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS: 3.1 AESTHETIC/VISUAL RESOURCES:

Would the proposal: Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

- a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
- b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
- c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?
- d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? Setting:

Really? Minimally "a-c" and certainly "a" for the neighbors. You honestly determine these have no SIGNIFICANT impact on Aesthetics?

How can a "MONOPINE" be compatible with the "Oak Woodland" as it sticks out like a "SORE TREE" from the significantly smaller Oaks?

The Visual Simulations are adequate for traveled routes, but in no way demonstrate the visual impacts on adjacent and nearby Residential parcels. These are the people impacted the most by these "Stealth Monopines" that "no one will notice" (that are so "in your face" visible).

- Solution: Visual Simulations to illustrate how each nearby neighbor's views and vistas will be impacted. As of now, we have NO IDEA how the will dominate the Aesthetics of the residents nearby.

Another discussion from the "Alternative Site Analysis" is disturbing and absolutely untrue:

The Monopine Tower design has been chosen to blend into the tree line and skyline and This site is the least intrusive location while filling AT&T's gap in coverage

This is equally absurd and is wishful thinking. The 100' portion of the tower ABOVE THE OAK CANOPY will be visible from adjacent residential properties!

P 16 Initial Study: Biological Resources:

(e) Conflict With Policies Protecting Biological Resources: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The proposed project would require the removal of 0.07 acre of oak woodland. None of the trees to be removed are considered heritage trees (as defined in the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance Section 130.39.030). According to El Dorado County Ordinance Section 130.39.070.C, Oak Tree and Oak Woodland Removal Permits (Discretionary Development Projects), identifies mitigation options for development projects, including an inlieu fee payment based on the percent of on-site Oak Woodland impacted by the development. The proposed project would be conditioned to mitigate for impacts to oak woodlands through payment of the

County's in-lieu fee. The current in-lieu fee is \$8,285 per acre, as specified in the County Oak Resources Management Plan (ORMP). The in-lieu fee cost for a 0.07-acre impact to oak woodland is \$579.95. In addition, the proposed project would incorporate Biological Resources Mitigation Measure BIO-2, below, to avoid potential impacts to oak trees in oak woodlands bordering the project site, which may be affected by project operation and project construction activities such as clearing, grading, and pruning for clearance requirements.

Seems the 0.07 Acre of Oak Woodland is a bit LOW as the minimum footprint of the 12' X 790' ROAD will be 0.19 Acre and will NEVER be "Oak Woodland" for at least the life of the project (which is how long?? Can't see info on that in the materials). Also wondering how is the 0.42

P 93 Alternative review: (ATT Study) (My underlines for emphasis)

Conclusion: Candidate Lippman, meets the FCC's mandated objectives for the targeted area of Frenchtown 2 and is the best choice for the surrounding area. The chosen location will meet and exceed the FCC's mandated coverage objectives with providing hi-speed broadband internet to homes in the Shingle Spring's Targeted area of El Dorado County. The Monopine Tower design has been chosen to blend into the tree line and skyline and the lower portion of the tower will be totally stealthed by the surrounding trees from all nearby dwellings. This site is the least intrusive location while filling AT&T's gap in coverage. Significant Coverage Gaps will be filled along all of the main corridors and the surrounding community. Impacts of oak woodlands will be impacted/removed for this location which AT&T intends to mitigate for impacts to oak woodlands through payment of an in-lieu fee. No special species or protected animals will be impacted per the completed BRE by Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc.

So the landowners NEVER responded to what probably looks like Junk Mail?? WOW, there's a surprise!!!! Perhaps another letter (via El Dorado County?? or a phone call or two could have made a difference. But I guess ONE letter is to be sufficient to deem a site infeasible. REALLY!! I don't think that meets anyone's definition of "Adequate Effort" to find out if they are truly interested. This is why I am suggesting an independent 3rd Party review of these poorly done "Alternative Locations" reports. They are a complete farce!

And the suggestion that The Monopine Tower design has been chosen to blend into the tree line and skyline and This site is the least intrusive location while filling AT&T's gap in coverage is equally absurd and is a discussion for the Aesthetics section. The 100' portion of the tower will be visible from adjacent

So please send the appropriate message to the WTF Industry and deny this project (due to inadequate Environmental Review, Failure to make CUP Findings regarding Aesthetics and incompatibility with the Neighborhood, and recognizing the inadequacy of the existing WTF Ordinance) and do the RIGHT THING! Too much time has gone by since 2016 and 2018 when all of these issues were identified, and have STILL not been resolved by the Planning Department upon direction by the Board of Supervisors.

Start today!

Thank you,

Ken Greenwood
Citizens for a New WTF Ordinance (CNNWTFO)
530-306-6390 (C) krg@d-web.com



PC 8.13.20
Julie Saylor <julie.saylor@edcgov.us>

Item #2

Fwd: CUP19-0007 Frenchtown ATT Comments. Please DENY this project and demand BOS redo the Wireless Ordinance

1 message

5 pages

EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Thu, Aug 6, 2020 at 8:07 AM

To: Donald Ashton <don.ashton@edcgov.us>, Jeanette Salmon <jeanette.salmon@edcgov.us>, Julie Saylor <julie.saylor@edcgov.us>, Tiffany Schmid <tiffany.schmid@edcgov.us>, Robert Peters <robert.peters@edcgov.us>

FYI

Office of the Clerk of the Board
El Dorado County
330 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA 95667
530-621-5390

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s), except as otherwise permitted. Unauthorized interception, review, use, or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, or authorized to receive for the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication. Thank you for your consideration.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Ken Greenwood <krge@d-web.com>

Date: Thu, Aug 6, 2020 at 4:54 AM

Subject: CUP19-0007 Frenchtown ATT Comments. Please DENY this project and demand BOS redo the Wireless Ordinance

To:

Cc: edc cob <edc.cob@edcgov.us>, Brian Veerkamp <bosthree@edcgov.us>, John Hidahl <bosone@edcgov.us>, Lori Parlin <bosfour@edcgov.us>, Shiva Frentzen <bostwo@edcgov.us>, Sue Novasel <bosfive@edcgov.us>

Project CUP19-0007 ATT Frenchtown Wireless Telecommunication Facility (WTF) Tower

Dear Planning Commission and Planning Staff,

This WTF is another Gem from ATT to provide service to "Underserved Areas" and has once again been poorly reviewed by Planning Staff (even without the failures in the WTF Ordinance).

- The Project does not meet the required Findings for the CUP process as it is NOT compatible with and is in fact DETRIMENTAL to the rural nature of the neighborhood due to Aesthetic impacts on the surrounding developed (and undeveloped) parcels. It is too high above the surrounding vegetation and will be a "Life Sentence" eyesore to the neighbors.

Additionally, the El Dorado County WTF Ordinance (130.40.130) by which this Project is reviewed is outdated and does not have adequate minimum requirements to protect the Public Interest, particularly:

- minimum "fallover" setbacks (this WTF almost makes it, but not quite!),
- meaningful alternative site analysis,
- mandated third Party Review of applicant's Alternative Site Analysis
- inadequate noticing for interested and benefited parties.
- lack of meaningful visual simulation from adjacent residential structures within 1/2 mile (as those are Served and Impacted by the WTFs).

- No requirements to CLEARLY show setbacks on site plans, Noticing Maps and all illustrations (DISTANCE MATTERS!).

You cannot approve a Project using it as a STANDARD as it is inadequate for the above and other reasons described below.

For instance, the Staff Report: Public Comments/Outreach on Page 5 says:

Public Comments/Outreach: No formal public outreach was conducted by the County, and a public outreach plan was not required for this project pursuant to the County Zoning Ordinance. However, the project was duly noticed for a Planning Commission public hearing with a public notification range of 1,000 feet and a legal advertisement was published in applicable local newspapers. In addition, project notification was also posted on the Planning Department Planning Commission webpage. No physical sign posting is required for Conditional Use Permits.

Why didn't staff go "out of their way" to adequately Notice those impacted (or benefited) by this project? It really wouldn't be that tough to draw a line on a CAD and generate a mailing list and send them out. Big deal! How difficult is it to put a sign on the property along the Public (or Private) road that serves the area? Especially if the so-called "Benefit" is good for the huddled masses and reason ATT is getting a substantial Federal Subsidy to construct these WTFs? I would imagine you would want as many people to know about the proposal so they can support it if it is so beneficial and needed.

As this will be starkly visible (+/- 100 feet above the Oak canopy!!) to numerous neighbors greater than 1000 feet away and the useful service area is one mile, all those potentially benefiting or being impacted by the project should be notified. Therefore this project has not been thoroughly vetted by nearby residents and does not meet the intent of CEQA nor does it give people the ability to reasonably participate in the approval, environmental review or hearing process.

Solution? DENY this project, revise the WTF Ordinance and start over! The WTF Industry knows how to better design and review projects, but they thoroughly enjoy that our WTF Ordinance doesn't force them to do so as it does cost just a bit more to do it right and let the Public see what the true extent of the Project is (as required by Law).

Additionally, the 1000' Notice Map (Exhibit F) is poorly done and does not clearly explain/illustrate a number of important factors important to full disclosure of the nature and extent of the Project (kind of a problem with CEQA Consistency). The 1000' zone goes off the borders and seems to not illustrate the Project Parcel correctly and/or consistent with the rest of the exhibits. Exhibit F does not show the approximate location of the Tower on the parcel so the Public can better understand the location of the actual tower to assist their understanding and evaluation of the project.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW is inadequate as follows:

Alternative Analysis:

P 6. of Initial Study

Alternative Sites Analysis: AT&T considered six alternative sites for facilities to fill the identified coverage gap in this portion of El Dorado County. AT&T searched for, but did not find, feasible co-location opportunities in and around the coverage objective (Attachment 6). Property owners for three candidate sites did not respond to AT&T's letters of interest. Three property owners indicated interest in leasing space for the facility. However, based on viability, siting needs, and/or high visibility, parties were unable to determine an appropriate facility location on two of these properties. The third property was initially identified as the preferred site; however, after further

discussion with the property owner, they elected not to encumber their property and passed on leasing the site to AT&T. AT&T's alternative sites analysis is included in Attachment 6.

This explanation DOES NOT protect the Public Health, Safety and Welfare as "shucks gee whiz, we really tried but they wouldn't answer our letters, so we didn't bother to call them, so guess it just doesn't work for us at this time..." What?? Seriously?? that's NOT and Alternative Analysis.

If El Dorado County truly wants "Broadband Access" for our residents, then we should be looking at EVERY site that shows promise and facilitate these "Needed for Public Safety" WTF's up to and including condemning the properties in the name of the "Public Good." Let's face it, that's what we are doing to the neighbors who will be facing a "Life Sentence" of looking at this Tower for the rest of their lives WITHOUT any monetary compensation from ATT or El Dorado County. Whereas the applicant in this an other projects receives a monthly lease payment and this person doesn't even have to live with the consequences he or she has poured upon his neighbors.

Sound absurd? Why yes it does, but that basically is the end product of these projects and the manner which El Dorado County processes these applications for WTF's.

Aesthetics:

P 8 of Initial Study (NOT CHECKED AS SIGNIFICANT??)

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS: 3.1 AESTHETIC/VISUAL RESOURCES:

Would the proposal: Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

- a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
- b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
- c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?
- d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? Setting:

Really? Minimally "a-c" and certainly "a" for the neighbors. You honestly determine these have no SIGNIFICANT impact on Aesthetics?

How can a "MONOPINE" be compatible with the "Oak Woodland" as it sticks out like a "SORE TREE" from the significantly smaller Oaks?

The Visual Simulations are adequate for traveled routes, but in no way demonstrate the visual impacts on adjacent and nearby Residential parcels. These are the people impacted the most by these "Stealth Monopines" that "no one will notice" (that are so "in your face" visible).

- Solution: Visual Simulations to illustrate how each nearby neighbor's views and vistas will be impacted. As of now, we have NO IDEA how they will dominate the Aesthetics of the residents nearby.

Another discussion from the "Alternative Site Analysis" is disturbing and absolutely untrue:

The Monopine Tower design has been chosen to blend into the tree line and skyline and This site is the least intrusive location while filling AT&T's gap in coverage

This is equally absurd and is wishful thinking. The 100' portion of the tower ABOVE THE OAK CANOPY will be visible from adjacent residential properties!

P 16 Initial Study: Biological Resources:

(e) Conflict With Policies Protecting Biological Resources: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The proposed project would require the removal of 0.07 acre of oak woodland. None of the trees to be removed are considered heritage trees (as defined in the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance Section 130.39.030). According to El Dorado County Ordinance Section 130.39.070.C, Oak Tree and Oak Woodland Removal Permits (Discretionary Development Projects), identifies mitigation options for development projects, including an inlieu fee payment based on the percent of on-site Oak Woodland impacted by the development. The proposed project would be conditioned to mitigate for impacts to oak woodlands through payment of the County's in-lieu fee. The current in-lieu fee is \$8,285 per acre, as specified in the County Oak Resources Management Plan (ORMP). The in-lieu fee cost for a 0.07-acre impact to oak woodland is \$579.95. In addition, the proposed project would incorporate Biological Resources Mitigation Measure BIO-2, below, to avoid potential impacts to oak trees in oak woodlands bordering the project site, which may be affected by project operation and project construction activities such as clearing, grading, and pruning for clearance requirements.

Seems the 0.07 Acre of Oak Woodland is a bit LOW as the minimum footprint of the 12' X 790' ROAD will be 0.19 Acre and will NEVER be "Oak Woodland" for at least the life of the project (which is how long?? Can't see info on that in the materials). Also wondering how is the 0.42

P 93 Alternative review: (ATT Study) (My underlines for emphasis)

Conclusion: Candidate Lippman, meets the FCC's mandated objectives for the targeted area of Frenchtown 2 and is the best choice for the surrounding area. The chosen location will meet and exceed the FCC's mandated coverage objectives with providing hi-speed broadband internet to homes in the Shingle Spring's Targeted area of El Dorado County. The Monopine Tower design has been chosen to blend into the tree line and skyline and the lower portion of the tower will be totally stealthed by the surrounding trees from all nearby dwellings. This site is the least intrusive location while filling AT&T's gap in coverage. Significant Coverage Gaps will be filled along all of the main corridors and the surrounding community. Impacts of oak woodlands will be impacted/removed for this location which AT&T intends to mitigate for impacts to oak woodlands through payment of an in-lieu fee. No special species or protected animals will be impacted per the completed BRE by Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc.

So the landowners NEVER responded to what probably looks like Junk Mail?? WOW, there's a surprise!!!! Perhaps another letter (via El Dorado County?? or a phone call or two could have made a difference. But I guess ONE letter is to be sufficient to deem a site infeasible. REALLY!! I don't think that meets anyone's definition of "Adequate Effort" to find out if they are truly interested. This is why I am suggesting an independent 3rd Party review of these poorly done "Alternative Locations" reports. They are a complete farce!

And the suggestion that The Monopine Tower design has been chosen to blend into the tree line and skyline and This site is the least intrusive location while filling AT&T's gap in coverage is equally absurd and is a discussion for the Aesthetics section. The 100' portion of the tower will be visible from adjacent

So please send the appropriate message to the WTF Industry and deny this project (due to inadequate Environmental Review, Failure to make CUP Findings regarding Aesthetics and incompatibility with the Neighborhood, and recognizing the inadequacy of the existing WTF Ordinance) and do the RIGHT THING! Too much time has gone by since 2016 and 2018 when all of these issues were identified, and have STILL not been resolved by the Planning Department upon direction by the Board of Supervisors.

8/6/2020

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: CUP19-0007 Frenchtown ATT Comments. Please DENY this project and demand BOS redo the Wireless Ordinance

Start today!

Thank you,

Ken Greenwood
Citizens for a New WTF Ordinance (CNNWTFO)
530-306-6390 (C) krg@d-web.com