

CUP-A18-0005 Site 2 Newtown

Printed Name: Kristen Rucker
Signature: 
Phone: 530) 721-3015
Address: 4160 Audubon Dr. Camino CA
E-Mail: orionlace93@gmail.com

This site needs to be moved because of many fatal faults in this location. This is an extreme danger fire area where some can not get fire insurance. This is an updraft area on Snow Ridge with 100mph winds at times a fire on or near this tower will endanger all of Rancho Del Sol. I have started the process to have a possible satellite fire station to house a fire truck that I have purchased.

CUP-A18-0005 Site 2 Newtown

Printed Name: MAKENNA ALFARO

Signature: MAKENNA ALFARO


Phone: 656 79 1722

Address: 4160 Audubon PR Camino CA

E-Mail: MAKENNA.ALFARO.C@Amail.com

This site needs to be moved because of many fatal faults in this location. This is an extreme danger fire area where some can not get fire insurance. This is an updraft area on Snow Ridge with 100mph winds at times a fire on or near this tower will endanger all of Rancho Del Sol. I have started the process to have a possible satellite fire station to house a fire truck that I have purchased.

CUP-A18-0005 Site 2 Newtown

Printed Name: Keenon Sims
Signature: 
Phone: 530 721-3015
Address: 4281 Blair rd. Pollock Pines
E-Mail: 

This site needs to be moved because of many fatal faults in this location. This is an extreme danger fire area where some can not get fire insurance. This is an updraft area on Snow Ridge with 100mph winds at times a fire on or near this tower will endanger all of Rancho Del Sol. I have started the process to have a possible satellite fire station to house a fire truck that I have purchased.

Printed Name: Mark McCann
Signature: 
Phone: (216) 644-6667
Address: 1635 Ingalls St
E-Mail: mccann121@yahoo.com

CUP-A18-0005

AT&T has had 6 months to correct the site location which has been located by 2 of their surveyors 3' too close to the set back. The paper work submitted by them to planning is 3' off according to Peter Brewsters survey. How can you okay a site like that with paperwork in error and so many errors in the environmental assessment.

CUP-A18-0005 Site 2 Newtown

Printed Name: JAMES WILLIAMS
Signature: 
Phone: 407-924-5410
Address: 7040 AMBER WAY PLACERVILLE, CA 95667
E-Mail: BOB@SMALSER@GMAIL.COM

This site needs to be moved because of many fatal faults in this location. This is an extreme danger fire area where some can not get fire insurance. This is an updraft area on Snow Ridge with 100mph winds at times a fire on or near this tower will endanger all of Rancho Del Sol. I have started the process to have a possible satellite fire station to house a fire truck that I have purchased.

Printed Name: Haley Woodward
Signature: 
Phone: (530) 391 7009
Address: 4160 #54 Old Lane El Dorado 95623
E-Mail: music.sawry@gmail.com

CUP-A18-0005

AT&T has had 6 months to correct the site location which has been located by 2 of their surveyors 3' too close to the set back. The paper work submitted by them to planning is 3' off according to Peter Brewsters survey. How can you okay a site like that with paperwork in error and so many errors in the environmental assessment.

Printed Name: SEQUOYAN FOX
Signature: 
Phone: (530) 414-12750
Address: P.O. Box 784 SODA SPRINGS, CA 95728
E-Mail: SEQUOYATRANFOX@GMAIL.COM

CUP-A18-0005


AT&T has had 6 months to correct the site location which has been located by 2 of their surveyors 3' too close to the set back. The paper work submitted by them to planning is 3' off according to Peter Brewsters survey. How can you okay a site like that with paperwork in error and so many errors in the environmental assessment.

CUP-A18-0005 Site 2 Newtown

Printed Name: ^u Matt Pearson
Signature: 
Occupation: Concrete
Phone: _____
Address: _____
E-Mail: _____


We prefer the safety and security of having a real capper pair of wires and the speed and flexibility of fiber, over the placement of a cell tower at an inappropriate location on Snow Ridge in a high fire danger area.

CUP-A18-0005 Site 2 Newtown

Printed Name: Daron Moore
Signature: 
Occupation: Self Employed
Phone: 707-266-4527
Address: _____
E-Mail: _____

We prefer the safety and security of having a real capper pair of wires and the speed and flexibility of fiber, over the placement of a cell tower at an inappropriate location on Snow Ridge in a high fire danger area.

Printed Name: Nikki Lewis

Signature: 

Phone: 916 410 8859

Address: PO Box 2767 Olympic Valley, CA

E-Mail: _____

CUP-A18-0005

AT&T has had 6 months to correct the site location which has been located by 2 of their surveyors 3' too close to the set back. The paper work submitted by them to planning is 3' off according to Peter Brewsters survey. How can you okay a site like that with paperwork in error and so many errors in the environmental assessment.

Printed Name: Natalie Fox

Signature: Natalie Fox

Phone: 530)277-5108

Address: 170B 30th Ave. Santa Cruz, CA 95062

E-Mail: natalie.k.fox.78@gmail.com

CUP-A18-0005

AT&T has had 6 months to correct the site location which has been located by 2 of their surveyors 3' too close to the set back. The paper work submitted by them to planning is 3' off according to Peter Brewsters survey. How can you okay a site like that with paperwork in error and so many errors in the environmental assessment.

CUP-A18-0005 Site 2 Newtown

Printed Name: Rachul Kileep
Signature: Rachul Kileep
Phone: 610 41300 1150
Address: 310 5100007
E-Mail: smarch@yahoo.com

This site needs to be moved because of many fatal faults in this location. This is an extreme danger fire area where some can not get fire insurance. This is an updraft area on Snow Ridge with 100mph winds at times a fire on or near this tower will endanger all of Rancho Del Sol. I have started the process to have a possible satellite fire station to house a fire truck that I have purchased.

CUP-A18-0005 Site 2 Newtown

Printed Name: Sara Gabrielle Silver Jacobs
Signature: 
Occupation: Certified Massage Therapist
Phone: 415-827-6857
Address: Crass Valley, CA
E-Mail: eaAmber.love@gmail.com

We prefer the safety and security of having a real copper pair of wires and the speed and flexibility of fiber, over the placement of a cell tower at an inappropriate location on Snow Ridge in a high fire danger area.

CUP-A18-0005 Site 2 Newtown

Printed Name: VLADIMIR KOJACIĆ
Signature: 
Occupation: SRD
Phone: 075 63 1372
Address: _____
E-Mail: _____

We prefer the safety and security of having a real copper pair of wires and the speed and flexibility of fiber, over the placement of a cell tower at an inappropriate location on Snow Ridge in a high fire danger area.

CUP-A18-0005 Site 2 Newtown

Printed Name: Sam Meteer
Signature: 
Occupation: teacher.
Phone: _____
Address: _____
E-Mail: CrazyMeteer@sbglobal.net

We prefer the safety and security of having a real capper pair of wires and the speed and flexibility of fiber, over the placement of a cell tower at an inappropriate location on Snow Ridge in a high fire danger area.

CUP-A18-0005 Site 2 Newtown

Printed Name: Megan Mortellaro
Signature: Megan Mortellaro
Occupation: State Employee
Phone: 916-380-9596
Address: _____
E-Mail: MeganOdgers@gmail.com

We prefer the safety and security of having a real capper pair of wires and the speed and flexibility of fiber, over the placement of a cell tower at an inappropriate location on Snow Ridge in a high fire danger area.

CUP-A18-0005 Site 2 Newtown

Printed Name: Josh Sumner
Signature: 
Occupation: _____
Phone: _____
Address: _____
E-Mail: _____

We prefer the safety and security of having a real capper pair of wires and the speed and flexibility of fiber, over the placement of a cell tower at an inappropriate location on Snow Ridge in a high fire danger area.

CUP-A18-0005 Site 2 Newtown

Printed Name: Heather Stanmark
Signature: 
Occupation: Sales
Phone: 530-570-6958
Address: 460 Full St
E-Mail: heather_stanmark@gmail.com

We prefer the safety and security of having a real capper pair of wires and the speed and flexibility of fiber, over the placement of a cell tower at an inappropriate location on Snow Ridge in a high fire danger area.

CUP-A18-0005 Site 2 Newtown

Printed Name: Case Pelkey

Signature: 

Occupation: Photographer

Phone: 559 877 2246

Address: 34582 Rd 274 North Fork CA 93643

E-Mail: cpelkey@shskey-camera-network.com

We prefer the safety and security of having a real capper pair of wires and the speed and flexibility of fiber, over the placement of a cell tower at an inappropriate location on Snow Ridge in a high fire danger area.

CUP-A18-0005 Site 2 Newtown

Printed Name: Dana Stehmark
Signature: Dana Stehmark
Occupation: Sales
Phone: 707.478.8905
Address: 11 Conifer Sq. Rohnert Park, CA 94928
E-Mail: sassyphrincess@hotmail.com

We prefer the safety and security of having a real copper pair of wires and the speed and flexibility of fiber, over the placement of a cell tower at an inappropriate location on Snow Ridge in a high fire danger area.

Printed Name: Ruby Oman

Signature: Ruby Oman


Phone: 530 444 0245

Address: 2565 Carla Dr Placerville

E-Mail: RubyOman27@gmail.com

CUP-A18-0005

AT&T has had 6 months to correct the site location which has been located by 2 of their surveyors 3' too close to the set back. The paper work submitted by them to planning is 3' off according to Peter Brewsters survey. How can you okay a site like that with paperwork in error and so many errors in the environmental assessment.

Printed Name: Frank Ray
Signature: 
Phone: 916-225-0950
Address: _____
E-Mail: FrankRay654@yahoo.com

CUP-A18-0005

AT&T has had 6 months to correct the site location which has been located by 2 of their surveyors 3' too close to the set back. The paper work submitted by them to planning is 3' off according to Peter Brewsters survey. How can you okay a site like that with paperwork in error and so many errors in the environmental assessment.

Printed Name: _____
Signature:  _____
Phone: _____
Address: _____
E-Mail: _____

CUP-A18-0005

AT&T has had 6 months to correct the site location which has been located by 2 of their surveyors 3' too close to the set back. The paper work submitted by them to planning is 3' off according to Peter Brewsters survey. How can you okay a site like that with paperwork in error and so many errors in the environmental assessment.

Printed Name: Spencer Malone
Signature: [Handwritten Signature]
Phone: [Handwritten Number]
Address: _____
E-Mail: [Handwritten Email]

CUP-A18-0005

AT&T has had 6 months to correct the site location which has been located by 2 of their surveyors 3' too close to the set back. The paper work submitted by them to planning is 3' off according to Peter Brewsters survey. How can you okay a site like that with paperwork in error and so many errors in the environmental assessment.

Printed Name: Bride Fuhs

Signature: 


Phone: 303 448 3262

Address: 3146 Caballo St

E-Mail: bridefuhs@gmail.com


CUP-A18-0005

AT&T has had 6 months to correct the site location which has been located by 2 of their surveyors 3' too close to the set back. The paper work submitted by them to planning is 3' off according to Peter Brewsters survey. How can you okay a site like that with paperwork in error and so many errors in the environmental assessment.

Printed Name: J Mon Rusta
Signature: 
Phone: _____
Address: _____
E-Mail: _____


CUP-A18-0005

AT&T has had 6 months to correct the site location which has been located by 2 of their surveyors 3' too close to the set back. The paper work submitted by them to planning is 3' off according to Peter Brewsters survey. How can you okay a site like that with paperwork in error and so many errors in the environmental assessment.

Printed Name: Jonathan B
Signature: 
Phone: _____
Address: _____
E-Mail: _____


CUP-A18-0005

AT&T has had 6 months to correct the site location which has been located by 2 of their surveyors 3' too close to the set back. The paper work submitted by them to planning is 3' off according to Peter Brewsters survey. How can you okay a site like that with paperwork in error and so many errors in the environmental assessment.

Printed Name: BRE ROSS
Signature: 
Phone: _____
Address: _____
E-Mail: _____

CUP-A18-0005

AT&T has had 6 months to correct the site location which has been located by 2 of their surveyors 3' too close to the set back. The paper work submitted by them to planning is 3' off according to Peter Brewsters survey. How can you okay a site like that with paperwork in error and so many errors in the environmental assessment.

Printed Name: Jordan Thornock
Signature: 
Phone: _____
Address: _____
E-Mail: _____


CUP-A18-0005

AT&T has had 6 months to correct the site location which has been located by 2 of their surveyors 3' too close to the set back. The paper work submitted by them to planning is 3' off according to Peter Brewsters survey. How can you okay a site like that with paperwork in error and so many errors in the environmental assessment.

Printed Name: ALICIA LAS SANTANA
Signature: 
Phone: 559-764-5076
Address: 276 N. ADOLINE FREEMAN 93705
E-Mail: laroccat@ya.com

CUP-A18-0005

AT&T has had 6 months to correct the site location which has been located by 2 of their surveyors 3' too close to the set back. The paper work submitted by them to planning is 3' off according to Peter Brewsters survey. How can you okay a site like that with paperwork in error and so many errors in the environmental assessment.

Printed Name: Jesus Alfaro
Signature: 
Phone: 8316336334
Address: 1014 Santiago St. San Francisco, CA 94116
E-Mail: basamate@aol.com

CUP-A18-0005

AT&T has had 6 months to correct the site location which has been located by 2 of their surveyors 3' too close to the set back. The paper work submitted by them to planning is 3' off according to Peter Brewsters survey. How can you okay a site like that with paperwork in error and so many errors in the environmental assessment.

Printed Name: Jennifer Bishop
Signature: [Handwritten Signature]
Phone: 916 - 380 - 7930
Address: Joonbuggs@gmail.com
E-Mail: 9424 Golden dr. Orangevale, CA 95762

CUP-A18-0005

AT&T has had 6 months to correct the site location which has been located by 2 of their surveyors 3' too close to the set back. The paper work submitted by them to planning is 3' off according to Peter Brewsters survey. How can you okay a site like that with paperwork in error and so many errors in the environmental assessment.

Printed Name: Aubrey Bishop Fowler
Signature: Aubrey Bishop Fowler
Phone: 916-380-2930
Address: 9424 Golden Dr. Orangevale CA 95662
E-Mail: aubreybjfayamoon@gmail.com

CUP-A18-0005

AT&T has had 6 months to correct the site location which has been located by 2 of their surveyors 3' too close to the set back. The paper work submitted by them to planning is 3' off according to Peter Brewsters survey. How can you okay a site like that with paperwork in error and so many errors in the environmental assessment.

Printed Name: Jocelyn Bravo
Signature: Jocelyn Bravo
Phone: (209) 725-8485
Address: 1414 Steel Creek Dr. Patterson CA 95363
E-Mail: jocelyn_bbr@yahoo.com

CUP-A18-0005

AT&T has had 6 months to correct the site location which has been located by 2 of their surveyors 3' too close to the set back. The paper work submitted by them to planning is 3' off according to Peter Brewsters survey. How can you okay a site like that with paperwork in error and so many errors in the environmental assessment.

Printed Name: X Mark Smith
Signature: X Mark Smith
Phone: 43
Address: _____
E-Mail: _____

CUP-A18-0005

AT&T has had 6 months to correct the site location which has been located by 2 of their surveyors 3' too close to the set back. The paper work submitted by them to planning is 3' off according to Peter Brewsters survey. How can you okay a site like that with paperwork in error and so many errors in the environmental assessment.

El Dorado County Board Of Supervisors
330 Fair Lane Placerville, CA 95667

EDC BOS ROWD
SEP 6 2018 AM10:57

District 1-John Hidahl
District 2-Shiva Frentzen
District 3-Brian Veerkamp
District 4-Michael Ranalli
District 5-Sue Novasel

Re:September 11, 2018, Appealing the Planning Commissions July 26, 2018 approval of Conditional use Permits S17-0016/AT&T CAF4 for Site 2-Newtown; Site 3-Peasant Valley; Site 4-Soapweed; Site 5-Latrobe; Site 6-Zee Estates; Site 7- Gold Hill.

Dear El Dorado County Board Of Supervisors,

I live near Site 3 and OPPOSE the Approval of Conditional use Permits S17-0016. This will directly impact my most precious investment in my life, my home!

It will be "Injurious to Our Neighborhood" and my day to day life, especially on our site # 3.

I have also discovered that all seven Sites associated with S17-0016 have similar issues and Are governed by the "Wireless Ordinance" that does NOT appear to be adequately addressing the issues below at Site 3 AND County-wide. The Ordinance clearly needs to be revisited, and by denying these Towers, you can start this new process.

I OPPOSE S17-0016 because:

> Alternative analysis is inadequate. CA Environmental Law requires a study of all practical alternative locations. AT&T/Epic Wireless AND the County have not done so. They chose the site that was most convenient and cost effective for them, not the best choice for the community served. There are OVER a dozen Sites More Suitable for Tower #3 that WOULD NOT need to be in the MIDDLE of a cluster of Homes as this location is.

> County lacks a Countywide, systematic plan to deal with this comprehensive issue and consequently AT&T is the one 'in control'.

County policy states that co-location should be the first option, however, the County has no master map of where the existing towers are, and so it is unable to enforce the Code. AT&T/Epic Wireless 'is financially motivated' to build their own tower, NOT to Co-locate.

> Access is not not satisfied or guaranteed (pictures of before and after are being suggested as "mitigation" for damage. NO! Only a CASH BOND insures damage will be fixed, now and in the future as Antenna Panels are added).

> Increased use of these roads, ESPECIALLY on Site 3, have a multitude of impacts: dust, traffic, noise etc.

> Aesthetics. The project is "injurious to the neighborhood" as they are always close to Property Lines and in the face of neighbors...ESPECIALLY on our Site #3. It is a degradation of the 'Natural' aesthetics of the Area. Despite the disguise of a tree, these towers are not fooling anyone. They are UGLY and WILL be a Blight to our Neighborhood.

> Setbacks do not protect "Public Health, Safety, And Welfare" from Tower Operation and failure (and make Aesthetic issues more significant) and FIRE-SAFE Clearance (50 feet).

> "NOTICING" of neighbors only goes out 1000 feet, yet "service" from that tower extends out a mile or more. Therefore, people within a mile can potentially "see" the tower. Yes they should be notified to help them be aware of this important decision making and environmental review process.

> No "Balloon" demonstration of the height of towers- It has NOT been provided (and could be announced in the "1 Mile Notice" for neighbors to view and video). The only "idea" we have of the impacts are "Photo Simulation" that cannot truly illustrate the scale of the Towers.

> The County "Wireless Ordinance" is not addressing the above issues and is in need of revision and recognition of the new "Broadband" technology that requires Towers every two miles.

> The addition in the future of additional "Panels" on the Towers that will require additional power, air conditioning units, servicing by multiple

"carriers" and other annoying impacts have not been properly analyzed for the initial tower!

This is a 'new' realization of what is allowed and encouraged by the "Wireless Ordinance" for "Co-Location", but NOT adequately analyzed for the "Additional Carriers" nature of continued expansion of the tower's number of Antenna and support needs.

For site #3, AT&T/Epic Wireless have already declared that there will be at least 4 "Additional Carriers" on this Tower! This is "Totally Unacceptable" for our small Community, "Right Smack in The Middle" of all our Homes.

> The ENTIRE "Project" Sites 1 through 7 were DENIED by the Planning Commission on February 8 and "history was re-written" on the February 22nd Meeting. We all thought "Problem Solved" but the Planning Commission 'changed their mind' after AT&T threatened a lawsuit!

*See [https://eldorado.legistar.com/View.ashx?](https://eldorado.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5820795&GUID=774A7B44-272A-4372-8565-476D58512C41)

M=F&ID=5820795&GUID=774A7B44-272A-4372-8565-476D58512C41

*See "Findings for Denial" at: [https://eldorado.legistar.com/](https://eldorado.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5820793&GUID=9BB754FF-4D10-4767-95DF-CC04BC69CCFB)

View.ashx?M=F&ID=5820793&GUID=9BB754FF-4D10-4767-95DF-CC04BC69CCFB

Based on the above reasons PLEASE DENY Site #3 and All the rest of the Sites.

Thank You for your Consideration and NO VOTE on S17-0016,

Carmen E M
From

8-26-18
Date

Carmen MUNOZ
Printed Name

57carmen.munoz@gmail
e-mail address

4671 MOUNTAIN AVENUE 95667
Address

408 644533
Phone

El Dorado County Board Of Supervisors
330 Fair Lane Placerville, CA 95667

EDC BOS Rcvd
SEP 5 2018 AM 10:56

District 1-John Hidahl
District 2-Shiva Frentzen
District 3-Brian Veerkamp
District 4-Michael Ranalli
District 5-Sue Novasel

Re:September 11, 2018, Appealing the Planning Commissions July 26, 2018 approval of Conditional use Permits S17-0016/AT&T CAF4 for Site 2-Newtown; Site 3-Peasant Valley; Site 4-Soapweed; Site 5-Latrobe; Site 6-Zee Estates; Site 7- Gold Hill.

Dear El Dorado County Board Of Supervisors,

I live near Site 3 and OPPOSE the Approval of Conditional use Permits S17-0016. This will directly impact my most precious investment in my life, my home!

It will be "Injurious to Our Neighborhood" and my day to day life, especially on our site # 3.

I have also discovered that all seven Sites associated with S17-0016 have similar issues and Are governed by the "Wireless Ordinance" that does NOT appear to be adequately addressing the issues below at Site 3 AND County-wide. The Ordinance clearly needs to be revisited, and by denying these Towers, you can start this new process.

I OPPOSE S17-0016 because:

> Alternative analysis is inadequate. CA Environmental Law requires a study of all practical alternative locations. AT&T/Epic Wireless AND the County have not done so. They chose the site that was most convenient and cost effective for them, not the best choice for the community served. There are OVER a dozen Sites More Suitable for Tower #3 that WOULD NOT need to be in the MIDDLE of a cluster of Homes as this location is.

> County lacks a Countywide, systematic plan to deal with this comprehensive issue and consequently AT&T is the one 'in control'.

County policy states that co-location should be the first option, however, the County has no master map of where the existing towers are, and so it is unable to enforce the Code. AT&T/Epic Wireless 'is financially motivated' to build their own tower, NOT to Co-locate.

> Access is not not satisfied or guaranteed (pictures of before and after are being suggested as "mitigation" for damage. NO! Only a CASH BOND insures damage will be fixed, now and in the future as Antenna Panels are added).

> Increased use of these roads, ESPECIALLY on Site 3, have a multitude of impacts: dust, traffic, noise etc.

> Aesthetics. The project is "injurious to the neighborhood" as they are always close to Property Lines and in the face of neighbors...ESPECIALLY on our Site #3. It is a degradation of the 'Natural' aesthetics of the Area. Despite the disguise of a tree, these towers are not fooling anyone. They are UGLY and WILL be a Blight to our Neighborhood.

> Setbacks do not protect "Public Health, Safety, And Welfare" from Tower Operation and failure (and make Aesthetic issues more significant) and FIRE-SAFE Clearance (50 feet).

> "NOTICING" of neighbors only goes out 1000 feet, yet "service" from that tower extends out a mile or more. Therefore, people within a mile can potentially "see" the tower. Yes they should be notified to help them be aware of this important decision making and environmental review process.

> No "Balloon" demonstration of the height of towers- It has NOT been provided (and could be announced in the "1 Mile Notice" for neighbors to view and video). The only "idea" we have of the impacts are "Photo Simulation" that cannot truly illustrate the scale of the Towers.

> The County "Wireless Ordinance" is not addressing the above issues and is in need of revision and recognition of the new "Broadband" technology that requires Towers every two miles.

> The addition in the future of additional "Panels" on the Towers that will require additional power, air conditioning units, servicing by multiple

"carriers" and other annoying impacts have not been properly analyzed for the initial tower!

This is a 'new' realization of what is allowed and encouraged by the "Wireless Ordinance" for "Co-Location", but NOT adequately analyzed for the "Additional Carriers" nature of continued expansion of the tower's number of Antenna and support needs.

For site #3, AT&T/Epic Wireless have already declared that there will be at least 4 "Additional Carriers" on this Tower! This is "Totally Unacceptable" for our small Community, "Right Smack in The Middle" of all our Homes.

> The ENTIRE "Project" Sites 1 through 7 were DENIED by the Planning Commission on February 8 and "history was re-written" on the February 22nd Meeting. We all thought "Problem Solved" but the Planning Commission 'changed their mind' after AT&T threatened a lawsuit!

*See <https://eldorado.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5820795&GUID=774A7B44-272A-4372-8565-476D58512C41>
*See "Findings for Denial" at: <https://eldorado.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5820793&GUID=9BB754FF-4D10-4767-95DF-CC04BC69CCFB>

Based on the above reasons PLEASE DENY Site #3 and All the rest of the Sites.

Thank You for your Consideration and NO VOTE on S17-0016,

Bob Kotch
From

9/2/18
Date


Printed Name

Na
e-mail address

4695 manat Avila Rd
Address Placerville CA 95667

Phone

El Dorado County Board Of Supervisors
330 Fair Lane Placerville, CA 95667

EDC BOS ROOM
SEP 5 2018 AM 10:54

District 1-John Hidahl
District 2-Shiva Frentzen
District 3-Brian Veerkamp
District 4-Michael Ranalli
District 5-Sue Novasel

Re:September 11, 2018, Appealing the Planning Commissions July 26, 2018 approval of Conditional use Permits S17-0016/AT&T CAF4 for Site 2- Newtown; Site 3-Peasant Valley; Site 4-Soapweed; Site 5-Latrobe; Site 6-Zee Estates; Site 7- Gold Hill.

Dear El Dorado County Board Of Supervisors,

I live near Site 3 and OPPOSE the Approval of Conditional use Permits S17-0016. This will directly impact my most precious investment in my life, my home!

It will be "Injurious to Our Neighborhood" and my day to day life, especially on our site # 3.

I have also discovered that all seven Sites associated with S17-0016 have similar issues and Are governed by the "Wireless Ordinance" that does NOT appear to be adequately addressing the issues below at Site 3 AND County-wide. The Ordinance clearly needs to be revisited, and by denying these Towers, you can start this new process.

I OPPOSE S17-0016 because:

> Alternative analysis is inadequate. CA Environmental Law requires a study of all practical alternative locations. AT&T/Epic Wireless AND the County have not done so. They chose the site that was most convenient and cost effective for them, not the best choice for the community served. There are OVER a dozen Sites More Suitable for Tower #3 that WOULD NOT need to be in the MIDDLE of a cluster of Homes as this location is.

> County lacks a Countywide, systematic plan to deal with this comprehensive issue and consequently AT&T is the one 'in control'.

County policy states that co-location should be the first option, however, the County has no master map of where the existing towers are, and so it is unable to enforce the Code. AT&T/Epic Wireless 'is financially motivated' to build their own tower, NOT to Co-locate.

> Access is not not satisfied or guaranteed (pictures of before and after are being suggested as "mitigation" for damage. NO! Only a CASH BOND insures damage will be fixed, now and in the future as Antenna Panels are added).

> Increased use of these roads, ESPECIALLY on Site 3, have a multitude of impacts: dust, traffic, noise etc.

> Aesthetics. The project is "injurious to the neighborhood" as they are always close to Property Lines and in the face of neighbors...ESPECIALLY on our Site #3. It is a degradation of the 'Natural' aesthetics of the Area. Despite the disguise of a tree, these towers are not fooling anyone. They are UGLY and WILL be a Blight to our Neighborhood.

> Setbacks do not protect "Public Health, Safety, And Welfare" from Tower Operation and failure (and make Aesthetic issues more significant) and FIRE-SAFE Clearance (50 feet).

> "NOTICING" of neighbors only goes out 1000 feet, yet "service" from that tower extends out a mile or more. Therefore, people within a mile can potentially "see" the tower. Yes they should be notified to help them be aware of this important decision making and environmental review process.

> No "Balloon" demonstration of the height of towers- It has NOT been provided (and could be announced in the "1 Mile Notice" for neighbors to view and video). The only "idea" we have of the impacts are "Photo Simulation" that cannot truly illustrate the scale of the Towers.

> The County "Wireless Ordinance" is not addressing the above issues and is in need of revision and recognition of the new "Broadband" technology that requires Towers every two miles.

> The addition in the future of additional "Panels" on the Towers that will require additional power, air conditioning units, servicing by multiple

"carriers" and other annoying impacts have not been properly analyzed for the initial tower!

This is a 'new' realization of what is allowed and encouraged by the "Wireless Ordinance" for "Co-Location", but NOT adequately analyzed for the "Additional Carriers" nature of continued expansion of the tower's number of Antenna and support needs.

For site #3, AT&T/Epic Wireless have already declared that there will be at least 4 "Additional Carriers" on this Tower! This is "Totally Unacceptable" for our small Community, "Right Smack in The Middle" of all our Homes.

> The ENTIRE "Project" Sites 1 through 7 were DENIED by the Planning Commission on February 8 and "history was re-written" on the February 22nd Meeting. We all thought "Problem Solved" but the Planning Commission 'changed their mind' after AT&T threatened a lawsuit!

*See [https://eldorado.legistar.com/View.ashx?](https://eldorado.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5820795&GUID=774A7B44-272A-4372-8565-476D58512C41)

M=F&ID=5820795&GUID=774A7B44-272A-4372-8565-476D58512C41

*See "Findings for Denial" at: [https://eldorado.legistar.com/](https://eldorado.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5820793&GUID=9BB754FF-4D10-4767-95DF-CC04BC69CCFB)

View.ashx?M=F&ID=5820793&GUID=9BB754FF-4D10-4767-95DF-CC04BC69CCFB

Based on the above reasons PLEASE DENY Site #3 and All the rest of the Sites.

Thank You for your Consideration and NO VOTE on S17-0016,



From

Ayla Golden

Printed Name

3555 ALAMEDA Court, RUCSON RD
95647

Address

09/04/2018

Date

bonus adds@gmail.com

e-mail address

(916) 467-2388

Phone

El Dorado County Board Of Supervisors
330 Fair Lane Placerville, CA 95667

District 1-John Hidahl
District 2-Shiva Frentzen
District 3-Brian Veerkamp
District 4-Michael Ranalli
District 5-Sue Novasel

Re:September 11, 2018, Appealing the Planning Commissions July 26, 2018 approval of Conditional use Permits S17-0016/AT&T CAF4 for Site 2- Newtown; Site 3-Peasant Valley; Site 4-Soapweed; Site 5-Latrobe; Site 6-Zee Estates; Site 7- Gold Hill.

Dear El Dorado County Board Of Supervisors,

I live near Site 3 and OPPOSE the Approval of Conditional use Permits S17-0016. This will directly impact my most precious investment in my life, my home!

It will be "Injurious to Our Neighborhood" and my day to day life, especially on our site # 3.

I have also discovered that all seven Sites associated with S17-0016 have similar issues and Are governed by the "Wireless Ordinance" that does NOT appear to be adequately addressing the issues below at Site 3 AND County-wide. The Ordinance clearly needs to be revisited, and by denying these Towers, you can start this new process.

I OPPOSE S17-0016 because:

> Alternative analysis is inadequate. CA Environmental Law requires a study of all practical alternative locations. AT&T/Epic Wireless AND the County have not done so. They chose the site that was most convenient and cost effective for them, not the best choice for the community served. There are OVER a dozen Sites More Suitable for Tower #3 that WOULD NOT need to be in the MIDDLE of a cluster of Homes as this location is.

> County lacks a Countywide, systematic plan to deal with this comprehensive issue and consequently AT&T is the one 'in control'.

County policy states that co-location should be the first option, however, the County has no master map of where the existing towers are, and so it is unable to enforce the Code. AT&T/Epic Wireless 'is financially motivated' to build their own tower, NOT to Co-locate.

> Access is not not satisfied or guaranteed (pictures of before and after are being suggested as "mitigation" for damage. NO! Only a CASH BOND insures damage will be fixed, now and in the future as Antenna Panels are added).

> Increased use of these roads, ESPECIALLY on Site 3, have a multitude of impacts: dust, traffic, noise etc.

> Aesthetics. The project is "injurious to the neighborhood" as they are always close to Property Lines and in the face of neighbors...ESPECIALLY on our Site #3. It is a degradation of the 'Natural' aesthetics of the Area. Despite the disguise of a tree, these towers are not fooling anyone. They are UGLY and WILL be a Blight to our Neighborhood.

> Setbacks do not protect "Public Health, Safety, And Welfare" from Tower Operation and failure (and make Aesthetic issues more significant) and FIRE-SAFE Clearance (50 feet).

> "NOTICING" of neighbors only goes out 1000 feet, yet "service" from that tower extends out a mile or more. Therefore, people within a mile can potentially "see" the tower. Yes they should be notified to help them be aware of this important decision making and environmental review process.

> No "Balloon" demonstration of the height of towers- It has NOT been provided (and could be announced in the "1 Mile Notice" for neighbors to view and video). The only "idea" we have of the impacts are "Photo Simulation" that cannot truly illustrate the scale of the Towers.

> The County "Wireless Ordinance" is not addressing the above issues and is in need of revision and recognition of the new "Broadband" technology that requires Towers every two miles.

> The addition in the future of additional "Panels" on the Towers that will require additional power, air conditioning units, servicing by multiple

"carriers" and other annoying impacts have not been properly analyzed for the initial tower!

This is a 'new' realization of what is allowed and encouraged by the "Wireless Ordinance" for "Co-Location", but NOT adequately analyzed for the "Additional Carriers" nature of continued expansion of the tower's number of Antenna and support needs.

For site #3, AT&T/Epic Wireless have already declared that there will be at least 4 "Additional Carriers" on this Tower! This is "Totally Unacceptable" for our small Community, "Right Smack in The Middle" of all our Homes.

> The ENTIRE "Project" Sites 1 through 7 were DENIED by the Planning Commission on February 8 and "history was re-written" on the February 22nd Meeting. We all thought "Problem Solved" but the Planning Commission 'changed their mind' after AT&T threatened a lawsuit!

*See [https://eldorado.legistar.com/View.ashx?](https://eldorado.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5820795&GUID=774A7B44-272A-4372-8565-476D58512C41)


M=F&ID=5820795&GUID=774A7B44-272A-4372-8565-476D58512C41

*See "Findings for Denial" at: [https://eldorado.legistar.com/](https://eldorado.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5820793&GUID=9BB754FF-4D10-4767-95DF-CC04BC69CCFB)

View.ashx?M=F&ID=5820793&GUID=9BB754FF-4D10-4767-95DF-CC04BC69CCFB

Based on the above reasons PLEASE DENY Site #3 and All the rest of the Sites.

Thank You for your Consideration and NO VOTE on S17-0016,


From

Frank Johnson
Printed Name

4688 Mt Hickum Rd
Address
Placerville, CA 95667

9/2/18
Date

fjohn2929@yahoo.com
e-mail address

(530) 647-1607
Phone

El Dorado County Board Of Supervisors
330 Fair Lane Placerville, CA 95667

EDC BOS ROWD
SEP 6 2018 AM 10:54

District 1-John Hidahl
District 2-Shiva Frentzen
District 3-Brian Veerkamp
District 4-Michael Ranalli
District 5-Sue Novasel

Re:September 11, 2018, Appealing the Planning Commissions July 26, 2018 approval of Conditional use Permits S17-0016/AT&T CAF4 for Site 2- Newtown; Site 3-Peasant Valley; Site 4-Soapweed; Site 5-Latrobe; Site 6-Zee Estates; Site 7- Gold Hill.

Dear El Dorado County Board Of Supervisors,

I live near Site 3 and OPPOSE the Approval of Conditional use Permits S17-0016. This will directly impact my most precious investment in my life, my home!

It will be "Injurious to Our Neighborhood" and my day to day life, especially on our site # 3.

I have also discovered that all seven Sites associated with S17-0016 have similar issues and Are governed by the "Wireless Ordinance" that does NOT appear to be adequately addressing the issues below at Site 3 AND County-wide. The Ordinance clearly needs to be revisited, and by denying these Towers, you can start this new process.

I OPPOSE S17-0016 because:

> Alternative analysis is inadequate. CA Environmental Law requires a study of all practical alternative locations. AT&T/Epic Wireless AND the County have not done so. They chose the site that was most convenient and cost effective for them, not the best choice for the community served. There are OVER a dozen Sites More Suitable for Tower #3 that WOULD NOT need to be in the MIDDLE of a cluster of Homes as this location is.

> County lacks a Countywide, systematic plan to deal with this comprehensive issue and consequently AT&T is the one 'in control'.

County policy states that co-location should be the first option, however, the County has no master map of where the existing towers are, and so it is unable to enforce the Code. AT&T/Epic Wireless 'is financially motivated' to build their own tower, NOT to Co-locate.

> Access is not not satisfied or guaranteed (pictures of before and after are being suggested as "mitigation" for damage. NO! Only a CASH BOND insures damage will be fixed, now and in the future as Antenna Panels are added).

> Increased use of these roads, ESPECIALLY on Site 3, have a multitude of impacts: dust, traffic, noise etc.

> Aesthetics. The project is "injurious to the neighborhood" as they are always close to Property Lines and in the face of neighbors...ESPECIALLY on our Site #3. It is a degradation of the 'Natural' aesthetics of the Area. Despite the disguise of a tree, these towers are not fooling anyone. They are UGLY and WILL be a Blight to our Neighborhood.

> Setbacks do not protect "Public Health, Safety, And Welfare" from Tower Operation and failure (and make Aesthetic issues more significant) and FIRE-SAFE Clearance (50 feet).

> "NOTICING" of neighbors only goes out 1000 feet, yet "service" from that tower extends out a mile or more. Therefore, people within a mile can potentially "see" the tower. Yes they should be notified to help them be aware of this important decision making and environmental review process.

> No "Balloon" demonstration of the height of towers- It has NOT been provided (and could be announced in the "1 Mile Notice" for neighbors to view and video). The only "idea" we have of the impacts are "Photo Simulation" that cannot truly illustrate the scale of the Towers.

> The County "Wireless Ordinance" is not addressing the above issues and is in need of revision and recognition of the new "Broadband" technology that requires Towers every two miles.

> The addition in the future of additional "Panels" on the Towers that will require additional power, air conditioning units, servicing by multiple

"carriers" and other annoying impacts have not been properly analyzed for the initial tower!

This is a 'new' realization of what is allowed and encouraged by the "Wireless Ordinance" for "Co-Location", but NOT adequately analyzed for the "Additional Carriers" nature of continued expansion of the tower's number of Antenna and support needs.

For site #3, AT&T/Epic Wireless have already declared that there will be at least 4 "Additional Carriers" on this Tower! This is "Totally Unacceptable" for our small Community, "Right Smack in The Middle" of all our Homes.

> The ENTIRE "Project" Sites 1 through 7 were DENIED by the Planning Commission on February 8 and "history was re-written" on the February 22nd Meeting. We all thought "Problem Solved" but the Planning Commission 'changed their mind' after AT&T threatened a lawsuit!

*See <https://eldorado.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5820795&GUID=774A7B44-272A-4372-8565-476D58512C41>
*See "Findings for Denial" at: <https://eldorado.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5820793&GUID=9BB754FF-4D10-4767-95DF-CC04BC69CCFB>

Based on the above reasons PLEASE DENY Site #3 and All the rest of the Sites.

Thank You for your Consideration and NO VOTE on S17-0016,

Ricky Landa
From

9-2-18
Date

Ricky Landa
Printed Name

rickylanda@gmail.com
e-mail address

4445 Heavenly ridge rd
Address
Placerville, CA 95667

530-903-3233
Phone

El Dorado County Board Of Supervisors
330 Fair Lane Placerville, CA 95667

District 1-John Hidahl
District 2-Shiva Frentzen
District 3-Brian Veerkamp
District 4-Michael Ranalli
District 5-Sue Novasel

Re:September 11, 2018, Appealing the Planning Commissions July 26, 2018 approval of Conditional use Permits S17-0016/AT&T CAF4 for Site 2- Newtown; Site 3-Peasant Valley; Site 4-Soapweed; Site 5-Latrobe; Site 6-Zee Estates; Site 7- Gold Hill.

Dear El Dorado County Board Of Supervisors,

I live near Site 3 and OPPOSE the Approval of Conditional use Permits S17-0016. This will directly impact my most precious investment in my life, my home!

It will be "Injurious to Our Neighborhood" and my day to day life, especially on our site # 3.

I have also discovered that all seven Sites associated with S17-0016 have similar issues and Are governed by the "Wireless Ordinance" that does NOT appear to be adequately addressing the issues below at Site 3 AND County-wide. The Ordinance clearly needs to be revisited, and by denying these Towers, you can start this new process.

I OPPOSE S17-0016 because:

> Alternative analysis is inadequate. CA Environmental Law requires a study of all practical alternative locations. AT&T/Epic Wireless AND the County have not done so. They chose the site that was most convenient and cost effective for them, not the best choice for the community served. There are OVER a dozen Sites More Suitable for Tower #3 that WOULD NOT need to be in the MIDDLE of a cluster of Homes as this location is.

> County lacks a Countywide, systematic plan to deal with this comprehensive issue and consequently AT&T is the one 'in control'.

County policy states that co-location should be the first option, however, the County has no master map of where the existing towers are, and so it is unable to enforce the Code. AT&T/Epic Wireless 'is financially motivated' to build their own tower, NOT to Co-locate.

> Access is not not satisfied or guaranteed (pictures of before and after are being suggested as "mitigation" for damage. NO! Only a CASH BOND insures damage will be fixed, now and in the future as Antenna Panels are added).

> Increased use of these roads, ESPECIALLY on Site 3, have a multitude of impacts: dust, traffic, noise etc.

> Aesthetics. The project is "injurious to the neighborhood" as they are always close to Property Lines and in the face of neighbors...ESPECIALLY on our Site #3. It is a degradation of the 'Natural' aesthetics of the Area. Despite the disguise of a tree, these towers are not fooling anyone. They are UGLY and WILL be a Blight to our Neighborhood.

> Setbacks do not protect "Public Health, Safety, And Welfare" from Tower Operation and failure (and make Aesthetic issues more significant) and FIRE-SAFE Clearance (50 feet).

> "NOTICING" of neighbors only goes out 1000 feet, yet "service" from that tower extends out a mile or more. Therefore, people within a mile can potentially "see" the tower. Yes they should be notified to help them be aware of this important decision making and environmental review process.

> No "Balloon" demonstration of the height of towers- It has NOT been provided (and could be announced in the "1 Mile Notice" for neighbors to view and video). The only "idea" we have of the impacts are "Photo Simulation" that cannot truly illustrate the scale of the Towers.

> The County "Wireless Ordinance" is not addressing the above issues and is in need of revision and recognition of the new "Broadband" technology that requires Towers every two miles.

> The addition in the future of additional "Panels" on the Towers that will require additional power, air conditioning units, servicing by multiple

"carriers" and other annoying impacts have not been properly analyzed for the initial tower!

This is a 'new' realization of what is allowed and encouraged by the "Wireless Ordinance" for "Co-Location", but NOT adequately analyzed for the "Additional Carriers" nature of continued expansion of the tower's number of Antenna and support needs.

For site #3, AT&T/Epic Wireless have already declared that there will be at least 4 "Additional Carriers" on this Tower! This is "Totally Unacceptable" for our small Community, "Right Smack in The Middle" of all our Homes.

> The ENTIRE "Project" Sites 1 through 7 were DENIED by the Planning Commission on February 8 and "history was re-written" on the February 22nd Meeting. We all thought "Problem Solved" but the Planning Commission 'changed their mind' after AT&T threatened a lawsuit!

*See [https://eldorado.legistar.com/View.ashx?](https://eldorado.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5820795&GUID=774A7B44-272A-4372-8565-476D58512C41)

M=F&ID=5820795&GUID=774A7B44-272A-4372-8565-476D58512C41

*See "Findings for Denial" at: [https://eldorado.legistar.com/](https://eldorado.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5820793&GUID=9BB754FF-4D10-4767-95DF-CC04BC69CCFB)

View.ashx?M=F&ID=5820793&GUID=9BB754FF-4D10-4767-95DF-CC04BC69CCFB

Based on the above reasons PLEASE DENY Site #3 and All the rest of the Sites.

Thank You for your Consideration and NO VOTE on S17-0016,


From

Todd Johnston
Printed Name

4264 Shangri-la^{cn}
Address
Placerville CA 95667

9/2/2018
Date

Toddzzja@gmail.com
e-mail address

(530) 957 4673
Phone