



DATE PISTRIBUTION PLATE DISTRIBUTION PLATE DISTRIBUTION PLATE DISTRIBUTION

EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Appeals to Planning Board Decision regarding AT&T

1 message

carolyn zachry <zachryca@yahoo.com>
Reply-To: "zachryca@yahoo.com" <zachryca@yahoo.com>
To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Mon, Sep 10, 2018 at 7:27 AM

Dear Members of the Board,

I am writing this email as I am not able to attend the Board of Supervisors meeting on September 11th. I live off of Cold Springs Road not far from Gold Hill. In our area, the options for internet connectivity are extremely limited. Those that are available are limiting in upload/download speed as well as monthly data usage. I see the value in the AT&T proposal, but would want to know if the proposed services will be equal to those that AT&T offers which currently includes 1TB of data per month or an unlimited plan for additional fee or free with a bundle (information found on the AT&T website https://www.att.com/internet/). We would be happy to be able to take advantage of such a service if it were equal to other services that AT&T offers.

Additionally, I am wondering what happened with the Central Valley Next Generation Broadband Infrastructure Project which was started in 2012. This project pulled fiber optic cabling along Cold Springs Road as well as many other areas in the county and other counties in the region. This project used \$46.6 million in American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds as well as \$20 million in private funding. This project was supposed to help connect public institutions, homes and businesses in the project area. I have included a link to a Mountain Democrat article describing the project. This was a large investment of public as well as private funds which has not resulted in increased connectivity.

https://www.mtdemocrat.com/news/next-generation-broadband-coming/

As stated earlier, I would be in support of the AT&T plan if and only if the service options will be equal in cost and service provided to other land based internet provided by AT&T.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Zachry

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Fwd: Appealing the Approval of Site #7 Gold Hill S17-0016/AT&T CAF\$

bonnie way <themeannurse@hotmail.com>
To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Mon, Sep 10, 2018 at 12:22 PM

From: bonnie way

Sent: Monday, September 10, 2018 5:11 PM

To: planning@edcgov.us

Subject: Appealing the Approval of Site #7 Gold Hill S17-0016/AT&T CAF\$

To whom this may concern. My name is Bonnie Way and I am appealing the approval of Site 7 - Gold Hill Conditional Use Permit S17-0016/AT&T CAF4. I am enclosing an attachment that lists all the issues regarding this appeal. Please read it. There also may be some last minute information I may be submitting prior to the deadline. I have also printed out my appeal that is in the attachment should you not be able to download this information. Here it is.

I am filing an appeal with the Board of Supervisors against Conditional Use Permit S17-0016/AT&T CAF4 project Site #7. I am also denying the other six sites included in Conditional Use Permit S17-0016/AT&T CAF4.

I am filing an appealing against project Site #7 for the following reasons:

- 1) The tower would be 783 feet from my house and it would be the first thing I see when I step outside my front door. The tower is unsightly and and it would be marringring the landscape and ruining the aesthetics of my property where I have lived for over 25 years and will have to see it there for the rest of my life.
- 2) The AT&T tower would directly affect my own reception for Hughes Net satellite internet reception. I had Richard Talamantez, the owner of The Dish Pros, a satellite sales service and installation company, come out to evaluate my situation if the tower gets erected. I was told by Richard, "That tower would be directly in the line of your satellite signal and it would interfere with your reception. It would cost you a MINIMUM of \$5,000.00 to have your satellite dishes relocated." He said it would cost that much because I would have to get a tower of my own built because the satellite dishes would have to be moved from the edge of my roof where there are currently located. They would have to be moved to a tower that would have to be built to relocate the satellite dish in order to get a clear signal that did not interfere with the AT&T tower. Is AT&T willing to pay for the relocation expenses as it says it will according to thier own documentation? Regardless, I do NOT want an unsightly tower on my own property in order to correct the problem caused by AT&T's tower.
- 3) The Planning Commision was wrong in granting the Conditional Use Permit. The specific rules for the Conditional Use Permit were not considered / followed prior to the approval of the Conditional Use Permit application. Specifically that it "Would not be detrimental to the public health" but it is.
- 4). All other alternative proposed sites for the telecommunications tower did not get full consideration prior to the decision of the site on Gods Way. At the meeting the Planning Commission reported that an additional five properties were considered but AT&T received "no interest or no response" from land owners of other locations. AT&T should continue to look into the properties where they received no response until they do get responses from all other potential tower sites.
- 5) The Planning Commission did not follow the law and notify myself or my neighbors of this project or the upcoming meetings. I did not receive a notice via mail of the first meeting(s) that took place that were intended to discuss the other possible sites for a communications tower. Nor did my neighbors who signed the petition I circulated and submitted to the Board of Supervisors at the last meeting. We each only received one letter in the mail. We were therefore not given a fair opportunity to provide our suggestions to anyone regarding other potential sites including potential sites that would be the most beneficial to EMS.

 *****SPECIFICALLY, ONE OF THE FOUR UNMANNED FIRE STATIONS WITHIN THE TEN MILE RADIUS OF GODS WAY*****
- 6) There is a potential increase in fire danger from the tower.
- 7) There is a potential reduction of my property value caused by the tower.

- 8). The Biological Resources Evaluation done on Site #7 was completely inaccurate. It failed to mention an abundance of wildlife that are found in that area. The tower will cause harm to all the birds and wildlife in this area that were not even mentioned in that report. This is not being considered despite the fact that laws and regulations from the California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife will be violated.
- 9) The decline in my health since the approval of the tower and the potential worsening of my health if the tower gets built.
- 10) Several neighbors living near the proposed site do not want the tower built for various reasons of their own and signed a petition that I submitted to the Board of Supervisors at the last meeting.
- 11) There was no off calendar "Public outreach with the community" with the applicant (AT&T) as intended and mentioned by the Planning Commission in the meeting minutes on 2/22/2018 to allow anyone to voice their concerns regarding the tower.
- 12) District 4 Planning Commissioner was not present at the meeting when it was decided to go ahead with the plan to erect the tower on site #7 and his presence may have had some influence on the the decision that was made by the commission.
- 13) The unfairness to other telecommunications companies that serve the area. There are other telecommunications providers who offer both cell phone and internet service including ViaSat, Hughes Net, T Mobile and Verizon.
- 14) El Dorado County has a law / ordinance that states: DOGS HARMING OR WORRYING LIVESTOCK MAY BE SHOT" yet it does not care if a telecommunications tower harms or worries the residents.

Sincerely, Bonnie Way

Appeal Sept 10, 2018.pages 139K	

Edcgov.us Mail - Help expand internet access in El Dorado County!



LATE DISTRIBUTION

also 2014

EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Help expand internet access in El Dorado County!

1 message

Diana Mittelberger < Diana. Mittelberger. 126721010@p2a.co> Reply-To: dmittelberger@gmail.com
To: Clerk of the Board < edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Mon, Sep 10, 2018 at 1:03 PM

Dear El Dorado County Clerk of the Board,

I am writing in support of the construction of new wireless communications facilities in El Dorado County.

Wireless and high speed broadband has many positive benefits for vital institutions like schools, hospitals and police and fire departments, and residents. New infrastructure delivers community benefits including enhanced public safety, educational access, health care and more.

The approval of this wireless communications facility will help increase network coverage and improve call quality, including emergency response services to improve public safety.

I ask for your support of the proposed new wireless communications facility in El Dorado County.

Regards,

Diana Mittelberger 3820 Cherry Acres Rd Cool, CA 95614



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Help expand internet access in El Dorado County!

1 message

Richard Black <Richard.Black.126768875@p2a.co>

Mon, Sep 10, 2018 at 1:09 PM

Reply-To: rb5232@att.com

To: Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Dear El Dorado County Clerk of the Board,

I am writing in support of the construction of new wireless communications facilities in El Dorado County.

Wireless and high speed broadband has many positive benefits for vital institutions like schools, hospitals and police and fire departments, and residents. New infrastructure delivers community benefits including enhanced public safety, educational access, health care and more.

The approval of this wireless communications facility will help increase network coverage and improve call quality, including emergency response services to improve public safety.

I ask for your support of the proposed new wireless communications facility in El Dorado County.

Regards,

Richard Black Big Oak Rd , CA 95667