

August 18, 2021

Mr. John Ford, Director
Humboldt County Planning Department
All Planning Commissioners by Email
3015 H Street
Eureka, California

Subject: AT&T Foster Avenue Proposed Cellular Tank Installation

Dear Mr. Ford: AT&T has chosen to introduce into these Tower Hearings our currently, not occupied Arcata, South G Street tower as an example and an intent to influence the Planning Commission on why PWM should not be trusted to build the Sun Valley Tower for Cellular occupants. Between my tenure with Cal North Cellular and PWM Towers in Humboldt, Trinity, Del Norte and Siskiyou Counties for 30 plus years, we have constructed over 80 tower facilities all of them heavily occupied due to the design for co-location. AT&T took a great deal of effort to photograph our tower and submit it into their presentation as if they were the only one that could be counted upon to complete a tower project in the Arcata Bottom. In fact, most of our towers are occupied by AT&T. I have included, as an Attachment, a recent summation of a check from Verizon showing a payment for modifications to sixteen (16) existing PWM sites which also includes the new build Arcata South G Street site. These are in the process of being released for construction and were on the way as we have explained to the Commission during the public hearings. I believe Verizon has delayed modifications and new builds to present to the Public the best and most recent Cellular technology available to the Community.

We would emphasize that there are no reasons or requirements set forth in the legally adopted General Plan to allow two towers in that area. PWM now has a permitted Tower available to provide co-location to AT&T which will be submitted for a Building Permit.

The AT&T Planning Document plans contained in the Staff Report are dated October 29, 2020.

1. There are no current photo simulations and no balloon tests. Most information furnished is a duplicate of previously submitted information.
2. The two photo simulations contained in the Planning Documents are for a 100 ft. tower
3. There has been no current, complete documents that have been submitted with a new application, sent out for referrals to Agencies and available for public review
4. The legally required County of Humboldt regulations on projects has been subverted.

The Proposed AT&T project is not compliant with the Legally Adopted Humboldt County General Plan per Section 6 Telecommunications and other standards.

What has changed from the Staff Report dated August 5, 2021? The tower is taller, more visible and generally much more intrusive into the Arcata Bottom Agricultural setting. Yes, it may provide for four carriers now but it is not comparable for carriers locating opportunities with more flexible mounting devices/antennas and a more freely, workable, and accessible, unenclosed lattice tower. The County August 5 Staff Report Findings are listed as follows:

“FINDING: The proposed development is inconsistent with the purposes of the existing zone in which the site is located, and the proposed development (does not?) conforms to all applicable standards and requirements of these regulations.

Mr. John Ford, Director
Humboldt County Planning Department
August 18, 2021
Page two

EVIDENCE: a) b) c) The project area is zoned AG and AE (with the proposed tower to be located on the portion of the site zoned AG). The project is subject to approval of a Special Permit pursuant to the County's zoning requirements. As noted herein, the required findings for approval of the Special Permit cannot be made. The proposed project is inconsistent with County policies and standards for new telecommunications facilities, including with respect to co-location of telecommunications facilities (more than three wireless carriers should be provided for to reduce potential for future placement of additional wireless towers in the Arcata Bottoms; and with respect to facility design (proximity to off-site residences, a school and church, as noted herein), combined with a nominal setback from Foster Avenue of approximately 60 ft.

5. FINDING: The proposed development and conditions under which it may be operated or maintained will be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare; or materially injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity. EVIDENCE: a) As noted above, the proposed project is inconsistent with County General plan policies and standards for new telecommunications facilities, including with respect to co-location"

6.5 Standards T-S1. Communications Siting Standard. Siting of new communications facilities shall comply with standards contained in a Communications Facilities Ordinance that incorporates the following:

The proposed water tank of 120 feet in height is more of an Industrial Designed Structure with heavy steel legs and steel cross bracing and a 41 feet +/- in height simulated tank and is not close to an historical Agricultural product. The height, bulk and heavy steel legs and framework could be seen elsewhere as an Industrial Water Tank (without the windows) in a Manufacturing setting and a Developed Community where height and bulk are necessary to distribute water to an Industrial use and a community under the required water pressure due to height. It is completely out of character for the area.

A. Tiered Permitting. Utilize permit processes that vary depending upon the physical characteristics of the facility, its location, and its compliance with specific development and performance standards, and include provisions for expanded noticing. No current required processing and noticing has been conducted for this new 120-foot tower project.

There has not been adequate notice, clearly identified physical characteristics of the facility, its location and view impacts of the proposed 120-foot Tank structure. Expanding it 20 feet without a new application and the required information, noticing and referral processes is not permitted.

B. Performance Standards. Standards for siting design, visibility, construction impacts, noise, on-going operation, and other characteristics that affect the compatibility and environmental and safety impacts of proposed facilities.

AT&T's location does not minimize construction impacts, noise, on-going operations of the facility and is not compatible with Community standards. It is located next to an existing school facility, outdoor playground, church facilities and extensive residential development. The views of the tank structure are also not compatible with the City of Arcata's existing and expansive proposal for its community park to the North East of the site or Agricultural views in the Arcata Bottom and adjoining residential developments where the full view of the tower will be visible.

C. Site Co-location. When feasible, communications facilities shall be located adjacent to, on, or incorporated into existing or proposed buildings, towers, or other structures. The County shall require new facilities to accommodate future co-location to the maximum extent feasible.

Mr. John Ford, Director
Humboldt County Planning Department
August 18, 2021
Page three

PWM now has a permitted Tower in the Arcata Bottom available to AT&T at the 130-foot tower level that meets this requirement to the maximum extent feasible. The AT&T proposed site does not comply with the “shall” condition. It is a standalone facility in an Agricultural Zoned Field without any adjacent structures. Currently there is a PWM Tower facility with Planning Approval for co-location within slightly more than one-half mile from their proposed site. Ms. Smith’s oral testimony at the last hearing was incorrect that the PWM Site was 1.5 miles away from the AT&T. It is approximately 2,700 ft. or slightly above ½ mile not 1.5 miles or 7,920 feet. The attached letter from FES clearly demonstrates that the PWM Site is superior in coverage.

The AT&T sites is also mapped as wetland under the City of Arcata USFWS 2015 wetland mapping and is located on Prime Agricultural soils and recommended for protection under the North Coast Regional Land Trust study of June 2005 and is listed as a Strategic Conservation Area.

There is no policy in the General Plan that encourages conversion of any Agricultural Land to non-Agricultural Uses.

Especially in this case where there is no reason to allow the conversion when there is a current site, with Planning approval, that will be available for co-location of Communication users that meets the legally adopted General Plan to the maximum extent feasible.

If it is located in a flood zone, towers are not permitted by the FCC in that zone without a comprehensive Federal review process which could include a full NEPA Environmental Review. The proposed tank design will only accommodate two cellular carriers. The project which has been modified to 120 feet during a previous hearing, did not conform to the required County application, review processes and public noticing provisions.

E. Location and Siting. 1) When designing and siting towers, screening should be used, if possible, to minimize visual impacts. 2) Stealth siting methods should be used, if possible, within views of scenic highways, public parks, cultural facilities and coastal scenic areas. 3) Stealthing and/or setbacks shall be used to ensure community compatibility. 4) An alternatives analysis may be required at the time of application that documents why the proposed project is the best way to accomplish project alternatives while minimizing project impacts.

This design cannot be considered “stealthing” as it is too large and has multiple, negative impacts on the surrounding Agricultural properties, residents, schools and church. AT&T has not conducted an alternative site analysis showing that the PWM site will not comply with their proposed Cellular project. The large tank design structure is not compatible with surrounding land uses, public views and is not a historical design used in the Arcata Bottom. In fact, the AES study attached concludes AT&T would have superior coverage if located at the Sun Valley location.

Ms. Smith’s oral testimony that the PWM Site was 1.5 miles away from the AT&T site was incorrect. It is approximately 2,700 ft. or slightly above ½ mile not 1.5 miles or 7,920 feet. The attached letter from FES clearly demonstrates that the PWM Site is superior in coverage.

F. Design and Screening. 1) Support structures shall be designed to minimize visibility with a preference towards each of the following in the order so listed: 1) use of existing structures, 2) stealth designs for concealment, and 3)

PWM INC.



monopoles. 2) Component parts, equipment cabinets, buildings, and security fencing shall be designed to achieve a

Mr. John Ford, Director
Humboldt County Planning Department
Humboldt County Planning Department
August 18, 2021
Page four

minimum profile through painting, screening, landscaping, and architectural compatibility with surrounding structures. 3) Photo simulations or balloon tests with views from various vantage points may be required to show visual impact of the proposed facility.

AT&T's site does not consist of locating within existing structures and is incompatible with surrounding structures. The only screening are the trees along Foster Avenue and the full 120 tank structure will be completely visible from most directions. It does extend 80 feet approximately above the trees along Foster Avenue but the full structure will be visible with no screening to the North, East, and West from homes along Upper Bay Road and other City of Arcata Residential areas to the East. To our knowledge no balloon tests have not been conducted and no accurate and complete photo simulations have been conducted and available for review by the Commission or public.

The proposed PWM project offers better and more complete coverage as demonstrated in the attached letter from AES and is compliant with the Humboldt County legally adopted General Plan and will be available for AT&T at rental rates commensurate with our current AT&T rates for an initial tower location. We would work with AT&T to make the site a reasonable and valuable location.

The General Plan is clear on reducing the number of towers in a specific area and this can be accomplished with the permitted PWM tower and AT&T and others located there.

Respectfully,

PWM Inc. Pacific Coast Towers

Thomas J. McMurray Jr.

Attachments: PWM Verizon Fees
FES-Sun Valley Group Site Zoning
County Denial of New Cingular Arcata Bottom Tower Findings

TMO addl. app fees horse generator

Freshwater Mod Permit Fees

TMO Kneeland Generator App

USCC Henderson NIER

AT&T Baywood Initial

~~Furnish Geotech.~~

Sprint/TMO Fickle Hill SA

Outstanding RF/Bp 2nd St

Outstanding RF/Bp Del N.

Outstanding RF/BP F/H

Outstanding RF/BP Hoopa

Outstanding RF/BP MCSD

Outstanding RF/BP North Bank

Outstanding RF/BP Red/WA

Outstanding RF/BP W/C

Application Fees 2nd St

Application Fees Del N.

Application Fees F/H

Application Fees Hoopa

Application Fees MCSD

Application Fees North Bank

Application Fees Red/WA

Application Fees W/C

Application Fees Arcata

Generator Application Fees N.Bank

Henderson Mod Drawings

Henderson Mod Drawings

Tower Guy Wire Mods Fickle Hill

HTA Generator ATS install

Harrison Hospital Generator App fee

NIER Sprint FH

USC North Bank Permit Fees

It was sent to PO BOX 1032 Eureka, CA 95502. Please let me know if I can answer any other questions.

Bill Payment Information

Payment Confirmation [P21080301 - 6839448](#)

Vendor [PWM, Inc.](#)

Process Date 08/06/21

Payment Amount \$128,292.96

Payment Method CashPro BillPay

Status Paid

Payment Account [1072 CPO BillPay Money Out Clearing](#)

Memo Multiple inv. (details on stub)-- bill.com Ct

Paid From BACNCA318 *****1237

Check Information

Check Number 55639688

Check Date 08/10/21

Estimated Arrival Date 08/13/21

Cleared Date

Check Amount \$128,292.96

Memo Multiple inv. (details on stub)

Expiration Date 11/08/21



Sun Valley Group Communication Tower Zoning Letter

July 14, 2021

1777 Sentry Pkwy, Bldg. 11, Suite 201
Blue Bell, PA 19422

July 14, 2021

Mr. Cliff Johnson, Supervising Planner
Humboldt County Planning and Building Department
3015 H Street
Eureka, CA 95521

RE: Sun Valley Group vs. AT&T CCL02143 Humboldt County Arcata Bottoms
Communication Tower comparison

Dear Mr. Johnson,

With respect to the two (2) proposed communication towers within the Humboldt County Arcata Bottoms boundary namely:

Site 1 – Sun Valley Group, 3160 Upper Bay Rd., Arcata, CA 95521

Site 2 – CCL02143 ARCATA (AT&T), Foster Ave., Arcata CA 95521

Note that based on ATOLL Planning Software simulations conducted by Further Enterprise Solutions (FES), Site 1 (Sun Valley Group) is recommended over Site 2 (CCL02143 ARCATA). The Sun Valley Group site would provide reliable indoor coverage to the low-, medium- and high-density residential areas traversed by Lamphere, Mad River and Upper Bay Roads to the North; 27th, 29th & 17th Streets, Wyatt Lane, Roberts Way, Foster, and Stewart Avenues to the East; Foster Avenue, Bayschool, Dolly Vardan, Vaissade and Pacheco Roads, Moxon Lane and Mariann Court to the South. Furthermore, it would provide reliable outdoor coverage to the residential areas of Alliance and the immediate vicinities traversed by Highways 101 & 255.

In terms of simulated Long-Term Evolution (LTE) coverage, Sun Valley Group provides 114.3% greater LTE700 footprint with larger indoor and outdoor coverage areas at 145.98% and 112.63% respectively compared to CCL02143 ARCATA. While LTE 2100 simulations show 119.3% greater footprint compared to CCL02143 ARCATA, indoor and outdoor coverage areas are 157.66% and 117.65% respectively larger with Sun Valley Group site.

With the above advantages of Sun Valley Group over CCL02143 ARCATA (AT&T), it appears the Sun Valley Group site would be a better site option to provide wireless connectivity to the Arcata target coverage area. The bigger LTE footprint from Sun Valley Group would enable the mostly residential dwellings and business establishments to access various wireless services and applications from the Wireless Service Providers (WSP).

For further details, Appendix 1 presents site coverage comparisons between Sun Valley Group and CCL02143 ARCATA (AT&T) with LTE coverage simulations in ATOLL 3.4.1. Appendix 2 contains KMZ files for viewing the LTE coverage plots of both Sun Valley Group and CCL02143 ARCATA (AT&T) sites in Google Earth.

Thank You and Best Regards,

Peter Mann

FES - Further Enterprise Solutions

1777 Sentry Pkwy, Bldg. 11, Suite 201

Blue Bell, PA 19422

pmann@furtherllc.com

Cell# 530 301 6420

Attachments:

Appendix 1: Arcata California Tower Site Coverage Summary (PDF)



Humboldt County
Arcata Bottoms CA_1

Appendix 2: Arcata California Tower Google Earth KMZ files (ZIP)



Humboldt County
Google Earth KMZ P

The project would be subject to compliance with County development standards and Use Permit conditions of approval for this project.

§6.5 B., Performance Standards: "Standards for siting design, visibility, construction impacts, on-going operation, and other characteristics that affect the compatibility and environmental and safety impacts of proposed facilities."

The proposed tower would be located within approximately 400 ft of an off-site residence, and 550 ft to an off-site school and church (to the south). Combined with the proposed setback of approximately 60 ft from Foster Avenue, the project would have increased visibility to area residents, the school and church, as well as users of the Arcata Bottoms area.

- b) The project complies with the County's Housing Element as it will not add to nor subtract from the County Housing Inventory. No housing is located on the project site, which is in agricultural use.

4. FINDING:

The proposed development is inconsistent with the purposes of the existing zone in which the site is located, and the proposed development conforms to all applicable standards and requirements of these regulations.

EVIDENCE:

- a) The project area is zoned AG and AE (with the proposed tower to be located on the portion of the site zoned AG).
- b) The project is subject to approval of a Special Permit pursuant to the County's zoning requirements. As noted herein, the required findings for approval of the Special Permit cannot be made.
- c) The proposed project is inconsistent with County policies and standards for new telecommunications facilities, including with respect to co-location of telecommunications facilities (more than three wireless carriers should be provided for to reduce potential for future placement of additional wireless towers in the Arcata Bottoms; and with respect to facility design (proximity to off-site residences, a school and church, as noted herein), combined with a nominal setback from Foster Avenue of approximately 60 ft.

5. FINDING:

The proposed development and conditions under which it may be operated or maintained will be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare; or materially injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity.

EVIDENCE:

- a) As noted above, the proposed project is inconsistent with County General plan policies and standards for new telecommunications facilities, including with respect to co-location of telecommunications facilities and facility design, and therefore, the required public health and safety findings cannot be made. The project proposes collation of two wireless carrier equipment groupings within the faux water tank, and a third carrier on the lattice