

Novelo, Lilia

Subject: FW: Grand and California antenna location

From: Jomsky, Mark
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2012 7:07 AM
To: Official Records - City Clerk
Subject: Fwd: Grand and California antenna location

Correspondence

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Dana Ostenson <ostenson.brandt@sbcglobal.net>
Date: January 8, 2012 9:12:19 PM PST
To: 'Dana Ostenson' <ostenson.brandt@sbcglobal.net>, <mjomsky@cityofpasadena.net>, <tsuzuki@cityofpasadena.net>, <smadison@cityofpasadena.net>, <drix@cityofpasadena.net>, <RYee@cityofpasadena.net>, <jgutierrez@cityofpasadena.net>, <christophersutton.law@gmail.com>, <gumdoc8@yahoo.com>, <district1@cityofpasadena.net>, <mmcaustin@cityofpasadena.net>, <jmcintyre@cityofpasadena.net>, <nsullivan@cityofpasadena.net>, <vdelacuba@cityofpasadena.net>, <ttornek@cityofpasadena.net>, <bbogaard@cityofpasadena.net>
Cc: <gumdoc8@yahoo.com>, 'Gretchen Brickson' <Gretchen.Brickson@jha.org>
Subject: RE: Grand and California antenna location

Dear Mayor and Members of the City Council:

Here we are again. Just as the last time we were before you, the Planning Department has again said it would do something for the neighborhood before the next meeting which it has not done.

The process

Let me recount the process we have been through:

Initially, the Grand and California location was chosen by Planning without ever consulting with the residents that would be directly affected by the location.

The neighborhood eventually asked the City to hire an independent consultant. It did, and then the consultant proceeded to spend what he described as "hours" with T-Mobile and no time with neighborhood members. Nor did the consultant even attempt contact with the neighborhood.

When the neighborhood asked to meet with the consultant we were told that only a phone call was possible, even though the consultant had met face to face with T-Mobile. Then the call was never set up and at the next hearing certain members of the Council had to move that the matter be put off until the phone call occurred.

On that phone call the consultant was asked by the neighborhood to draw specific maps that show only the coverage of the individual proposed antennas, not a map that shows coverage of

all T-Mobiles locations in combination with the proposed locations. The consultant agreed to do that but never did. As the Holiday weeks went by neither Planning nor the consultant had any contact with the neighborhood. Finally last week when I called Planning to ask where the maps were. Planning disingenuously said that they had misunderstood what the neighborhood had asked for. This would have been impossible if they had been listening to the conference call.

It would have been impossible as I spoke extensively on the call about the need for individual maps showing the coverage only of each individual location. I said on the call that without such maps it would be impossible for the City Council or anyone else to compare the alternative locations. On that call the consultant agreed that without such maps it would be impossible to compare the coverages for each proposed location.

So here we are again, just like the last council meeting where Planning has agreed to do something for the neighborhood that it has not done and, again, just as in all the other instances, continues to ask the Council to approve the first location.

The Issue at hand

Let me put the issue at hand in perspective. As with most public policy questions the issue is simply one of cost. T-Mobile in fact told us all this directly at a recent meeting where a company employee, and not a consultant came to tell the Council about its budget and the cost it had set aside for the location in question.

This is not a question about whether T-Mobile will get an antenna, it is only a question of its "bag for the buck". Everyone is fine with having an antenna. T-Mobile just wants the neighborhood to have its esthetic quality diminished, and therefore, have the neighborhood bear the cost instead of T-Mobile. There are lots of other locations in the area which are not at eye level for the surrounding residents and are not in front of houses; its just that those locations are not quit as efficient for T-Mobile in terms of its plan for coverage expansion or its administrative processing expense given its efforts heretofore.

Let me make absolutely clear what T-Mobile and Planning has never done in this process: it has never presented to the Council individual maps showing only the expected coverage from each antenna for each potential site. The reason that T-Mobile has never done this is that the differences are not that great, and also that it brings into to focus the real issue here, money.

So the Council has a very clear decision in front of it: does it require a foreign multinational corporation to spend a little more money to provide service to one of the oldest, most historic and most beautiful neighborhoods in Pasadena, or does it help the profits of the foreign multinational corporation? Who is the City Council elected to serve? The Council must be very clear on this issue. It is not one of phone service for the neighborhood verses destruction of the esthetic character of the neighborhood; it is cost to T-Mobile verses the destruction of the esthetic character of the neighborhood. Who is the City Council elected to serve? Will the extra cost of an antenna impact to the cell phone rates of the neighborhood or Pasadena as a whole? Of course not. It will also have no impact on T-Mobile which is a multi-billion dollar corporation. It will impact T-Mobile's consultants and team leaders for this specific project, as they will not have accomplished what they set out to do. So the real trade off is the reputation and effectiveness of the T-Mobile consultants and team leaders on this project verses the neighborhood esthetics. Who is the City Council elected to serve?

Compliance with the Code

The proposed California and Grand location violates the City Code on its face.

1. The proposed antenna would not go on an existing pole, but new pole. It must go on a new pole as the existing pole is so crooked that an antenna could not go on top it.
2. It is in front of houses on both sides of the street, not on the side of the houses.
3. It is not 30 feet above grade, but at eye level or below, for the surrounding houses.
4. The City never has analyzed the specific coverages of specific sites but rather has allowed T-Mobile to present maps showing the coverage of all it surrounding antenna, which obfuscates the issue.
5. The City has never performed a simple cost benefit analysis for the residents of Pasadena.
6. The City has not performed a design review of the proposed location in connection with the grandfathering of the proposed location in the event that the utilities in the area are under-grounded.

On the conference call with the City's consultant, the consultant told the neighborhood that T-Mobile was litigious and the City was afraid that if it didn't grant T-Mobile the proposed location, T-Mobile would sue the City. There is one thing that I can say with certainty: if the City does grant the location, the neighborhood members will sue the City. The approval of the Grand and California location by the City will be the beginning not the end of the process. The after consulting with counsel, and not any of the attorneys who have been involved heretofore, the neighborhood has concluded that it will also, seek a TRO against T-Mobile and the City. As the esthetics of the neighborhood will be violated, damage for which can not be cured by monetary compensation at a later date, the TRO has high likelihood of being granted. It will also be made a media and campaign issue. That the City Counsel would side with a multinational corporation's balance sheet over the esthetics of a beautiful neighborhood will be front and center in the litigation and with the media.

So the counsel is absolutely clear: the neighborhood is supportive of an antenna, but only one that complies with the code and does not violated the esthetic character of the neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Dana A. Ostenson

555 S. Grand Ave

Pasadena, CA 91105

Ph: 310.722.8972

email: Ostenson.brandt@sbcglobal.net

Novelo, Lilia

Subject: FW: Automatic reply: I WANT the Cell Antenna at Grand Ave/California Blvd.

From: Jomsky, Mark
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2012 3:04 PM
To: Official Records - City Clerk
Cc: Nagahiro, Lorain
Subject: Fwd: Automatic reply: I WANT the Cell Antenna at Grand Ave/California Blvd.

Please print and distribute for tonight's meeting. Thanks.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Sbabco@aol.com
To: cholden@ci.pasadena.ca.us, bbogaard@cityofpasadena.net, district1@cityofpasadena.net,
mfuller@cityofpasadena.net, nsullivan@cityofpasadena.net, vdelacuba@cityofpasadena.net,
smadison@cityofpasadena.net, ttornek@cityofpasadena.net
CC: tsuzuki@cityofpasadena.net, Sbabco@aol.com
Sent: 1/9/2012 12:45:02 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
Subj: I WANT the Cell Antenna at Grand Ave/California Blvd.

Dear City Council Members,

Once again, the debate over the cell tower at Grand Ave and California Blvd. will be on the agenda tonight. PLEASE vote to let this installation proceed. I live less than 100 yards from the proposed site and am desperate for better cell coverage in my home. I have installed a "mini-tower" in my home, with some improvement, but still have to depend on my land line. I am a single mom with two small children and the poor coverage can be frightening. It frustrates me immensely that I cannot enjoy the same good coverage that Gretchen Blickson (the woman who appealed this installation) has in HER neighborhood. She doesn't live anywhere near the proposed (and ideal) spot, but she has still managed to derail the installation for nearly a year! There is something VERY wrong with this scenario.

Hello?!? I LIVE right by it, and currently have to run to a corner of my house just to see who is calling so that I can call them back on a land line. This is absurd, especially given my nice neighborhood.

Mr. Madison, I know you think you are supporting your constituents, but I am one too, and I DESPERATELY WANT THE CELL ANTENNA AT THE PROPOSED LOCATION.

Thank you for your concern.

Sincerely,

Susan Babcock

629 S Grand Ave 91105

p.s. I hope to be at the meeting tonight, given I can find a babysitter.