

Attachment D

Comments Received in Response to the Notice of Opportunity for Public Comment for a Wireless Telecommunications Facility Located with the Public Right-of-Way Adjacent to 558 S. Grand Avenue

Public notices mailed and posted:	February 22, 2011 to March 24, 2011
Public noticing extended at the request of WPRA:	March 23, 2011 to April 21, 2011
WPRA meeting held:	April 13, 2011
Approval letter dated:	May 2, 2011
Addendum letter sent:	May 13, 2011
Appeal filed with City Clerk:	May 16, 2011
Public hearing	July 11, 2011
Neighborhood field meeting	July 18, 2011
Community meeting at La Casitas	July 27, 2011

Comments and questions from residents	Response
<p>1. Received March 21, 2011 by email (BH): I just heard from one of our members that a cell tower is planned for the corner of Grand and California.</p> <p>What type of installation is planned, and what is the status of the tower? WPRA has not been informed that a tower is planned in our area.</p>	<p>At the request of the President of WPRA, the city extended the public comment period through April 21, 2011 to cover the board meeting scheduled for April 13, 2011.</p> <p>See comment #10 for WPRA response.</p>
<p>2. Received March 22, 2011 by email (JW): I am the owner of 520 W. California Blvd. in Pasadena. I live approximately 5 houses to the east of the proposed site of the Cable Engineering Services wireless antenna on the City's utility pole identified #10266PBM.</p> <p>I would like to be recognized by you and your department as being strongly in support of this proposal.</p>	<p>No comment, constituent in favor of installation.</p>
<p>3. Received April 1, 2011 by email (GY): I live at 558 South Grand Ave, right at the NE corner of where the proposed antenna is to be placed. The telephone is already an eye-sore and would only be even more of an issue if an additional antenna were to be</p>	<p>The proposed antenna is 7.9" diameter by 74.1" tall and will be installed on an existing utility pole. The antenna is approximately the same diameter as the utility pole and will be painted brown to match. There are a number of existing</p>

<p>placed on top of that. Not only is this a visual disturbance for myself, but also would be a detriment to the neighborhood as this is a highly frequented intersection. Please do not allow corporations to bring their equipment into our neighborhood.</p>	<p>utility poles on Grand Avenue and on California Boulevard that have power and telecommunications facilities that are much more visually obtrusive than the proposed 6 foot extension on top of the wood utility guy pole. The equipment for this proposed facility will be placed in underground vaults. See attached photos of a similar installation at Oak Knoll and Alpine as well as the photo simulation.</p>
<p>4. Received April 5, 2011 via mail (L&JS): We are writing with our concerns regarding the application for a wireless telecommunications facility located within the public right-of-way on the N/E corner of Grand Avenue and California Boulevard.</p> <p>We would like to register our opposition to this permit. We are two houses above the site being considered. It is in a very inappropriate location and would be an eyesore. We are also concerned about any unknown health risks with the installation of this facility as it is in a heavily populated area.</p> <p>It seems there could be a much better location to put this facility and hope the Department of Public Works will consider this. We also hope that someone from the department has actually come to look at the currently chosen site.</p>	<p>The applicant submitted a justification study, the rationale for selecting the proposed use, a detailed explanation of the coverage gap and proposed locations for installation. City staff met with the applicant to determine the most appropriate location for installation.</p> <p>The proposed telecommunications facility will result in levels of radio frequency emissions within Federal Communications Commission standards, including, but not limited to, FCC Office of Engineering Technology (OET) Bulletin 65, Evaluating Compliance with FCC Guidelines for Human Exposure to Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields, as amended. Per the decision letter, the City is requiring the applicant to take annual readings at this site and send results to residents within 300' and to the West Pasadena Residents Association (WPRA).</p>
<p>5. Received April 9, 2011 (BM): I am opposed to the installation of the wi-fi antenna that is being planned for the corner of Grand and California in West Pasadena. This antenna will create a visual blight and will conflict with the character of this lovely neighborhood.</p>	<p>See comment #3.</p>
<p>6. Received April 11, 2011 (JP): I live five blocks from the corner of Grand and California. I drive through this intersection every day.</p>	<p>T-Mobile installed a similar antenna on top of a streetlight standard at Oak Knoll Avenue and Alpine Street. At that location, the antenna is painted to match</p>

<p>I am quite certain that an antenna 7.9" in diameter and 6' tall, attached to the top of the power pole on the northeast corner of the intersection would likely go unnoticed by at least 99% of citizens passing by, on foot or on wheels.</p> <p>I'm very surprised that the WPRA is opposed to the antenna, which will only be of help to all T-Mobile customers in West Pasadena.</p> <p>On second reading of the flyer I found in my mailbox, it's not really clear that the WPRA has taken a position on this issue, but some may have that impression upon reading the anti-antenna flyer. The flyer claims that the antenna would create a "visual blight", and would conflict with the character of the neighborhood. That is not so. As I have opined, no one will ever notice the thing.</p> <p>The detractors have hung their propaganda all over the city's sign at the scene of the proposed project. This surely is against policy and regulations, and I feel that the materials should be removed, just out of fairness. The flyer depicts the antenna as a fifties-type television antenna, which is a deliberate misrepresentation.</p> <p>I am a subscriber of T-Mobile services. Apart from that, I have no interest in the project. I just don't like false advertising.</p>	<p>the streetlight standard. In this proposal, the antenna would be painted brown to match the existing utility pole.</p>
<p>7. Received April 13, 2011 (JM): I am a neighbor, and I oppose the proposed wi-fi antenna. I am unable to attend the meeting at Westridge tonight, unfortunately.</p>	<p>Unable to comment since no specific issue noted.</p>
<p>8. Received April 13, 2011 (CW): I am against allowing antenna (6 FEET IN HEIGHT) on the power pole at California & Grand. This would destroy our beautiful street with something that does not need to be placed there. Please E mail the results of your meeting.</p>	<p>See comment #6.</p>

<p>9. Received April 13, 2011 (RS): I left a message on your office voice mail.</p> <p>I have seen the large sign/notice posted near the proposed site and I also received a flyer from a group opposed to the installation which is having a community meeting this evening.</p> <p>Is this the first installation in Pasadena of the exact type and model of antenna proposed?</p> <p>I would like to be knowledgeable about exactly what is being proposed.</p> <p>Can you provide any of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Picture of the antenna with dimensions 2. The location in Pasadena where I can see an installation of the very same type and model of antenna that is being proposed 	<p>City staff provided a copy of the installation at Oak Knoll Avenue at Alpine Street as well as a copy of the project plans which shows the type and model of the proposed antenna.</p>
<p>10. Received April 15, 2011 via email (BH): The West Pasadena Residents Association thanks you for extending the comment period for the cell antennas on California at Grand and on Orange Grove Boulevard. The WPRA Board discussed the antennas at its meeting Wednesday night. The Board decided to take no action. We believe the current configuration is minimally invasive and the price we have to pay for improved communications.</p>	<p>No further comment.</p>
<p>11. Received April 15, 2011 (GY): This email is just to express concern for a 6 ft antenna being placed at the corner of our neighborhood on California and Grand Ave...this is an even greater eye-sore than the telephone pole that is already in place, so to add to this would be even more of a visual disturbance to our home. My home is directly on the corner of California and Grand (NE corner).</p>	<p>See comment #3.</p>

<p>12. Received April 17, 2011 via email (GB): I am writing to express my strong opposition to the wi-fi antenna that is being planned for Grand and California. Grand is a beautiful, historic street where neighbors and visitors stroll, bike and walk their pets. The antenna will create a visual blight and interfere with the lovely character of the neighborhood. The antenna could be placed outside of the residential area in one of the nearby commercial areas—for example on Pasadena Avenue.—and still provide the needed cell phone and internet connection.</p>	<p>See comment #3.</p>
<p>13. Received April 18, 2011 (JB): I am writing to express my opposition to placing a wi-fi antenna at Grand & California. This is a beautiful street that I enjoy walking every day & I suggest the antenna should go to another location, say Pasadena Ave.</p>	<p>See comment #3.</p>
<p>14. Received April 25, 2011 (PW): I'm a neighborhood resident and I'm amused at the hysterical opposition that someone's mounting to the "massive" 6-foot extension for a WiFi antenna on the power pole at California and Grand. I walked through there yesterday and was amazed to see a big sign bidding interested parties to a city hearing for such a "large new development."</p> <p>If it's a 6-foot extension—why not just do it rather than inviting all this fuss? (I see many new palm trees have recently been planted all along South Orange Grove and its side streets; where there meeting for concerned parties before they were put in, or did the city just do it?)</p> <p>We need better Internet connections; we're in constant need of improvements and expansions in technology and those things are a great benefit to the city and its residents, hysterical and selfish</p>	<p>Pasadena Municipal Code Section 12.22.080 specifies special noticing requirements pursuant to Section 17.76.020 similar to minor variances and minor use permits.</p>

neighborhood watchdogs notwithstanding.	
15. Received June 24, 2011 (BY) Property owner is frustrated with poor cell reception. He believes the plan is reasonable and unobtrusive. Requesting to deny the appeal.	No comment, constituent in favor of the proposed installation.
16. Received July 8, 2011 (RT) Resident that lives near the pole had a question about whether T-Mobile was bought by ATT.	Defer the comment to T-Mobile staff.
17. Received June 28, 2011 (L&JS) Residents opposed to the proposed location.	See comment #3.
18. Received July 6, 2011 (DL) Resident in favor of the proposed location. Cell reception is horrible and anything that can be done to fix it is fine by him. No one will even notice the pole.	No comment, constituent in favor of the proposed installation.
19. Received July 8, 2011 (BU) Email to Councilmember Madison from West Pasadena Resident's Association urging City Council to consider three issues raised in Gretchen Brickson's appeal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Works to post accurate pictures on the city website for 30 days to allow for review and comment. • Require Public Works to post a report on the proposed installation on the City of Pasadena website. • Require that telecommunications antennas be installed on City-owned poles or other structures. 	The email was part of the public record and issues were discussed at the public hearing on July 11, 2011.
20. Received July 11, 2011 (JT) Resident on S. Grand Avenue in support of the T-Mobile request. Complaints of poor cell service.	No comment, constituent in favor of proposed installation.

The following comments were received by the city after the public hearing on July 11, 2011. The comments are summarized:

<p>21. Received July 22, 2011 (BH): Questions to T-Mobile about the distance the RF readings were taken as compared to Police transmissions and cell phones.</p>	<p>T-Mobile staff presented additional RF information at the community meeting on July 27, 2011.</p>
<p>22. Received July 25, 2011 (BM): Resident concerns for health risks and devalued home prices.</p>	<p>See enclosed summary of health effect studies ("Cell Sites and Your Health"). All peer review scientific studies to date have found no impact.</p> <p>Exposure levels are a function of power level and distance. Examples of common household items and relative exposure levels to radio frequency emissions: Wi-fi router is 1.5 times more, baby monitor is 10 times more, cordless phone is 150 times more.</p> <p>Numerous studies have found no effect on home values. See enclosed article, "Cell Sites and Property Values."</p>
<p>23. Received July 26, 2011 (BE): Resident in opposition to the placement of a cell tower in the neighborhood.</p>	<p>See comment #4.</p>
<p>24. Received July 26, 2011 (CG): Resident on record strongly supporting the installation of the proposed cell phone antenna. Improved signal coverage will be a huge benefit and does not see a problem on top of the utility pole.</p>	<p>No comment, constituent in favor.</p>
<p>25. Received July 28, 2011 (GB): Formal request for independent consultant to work with the city staff to review the alternative locations. Also requested coverage maps to include the approved antenna at Avenue 64 turned on.</p>	<p>The city retained Kramer Telecom Law Firm as the independent consultant to review the alternate sites. T-Mobile staff provided the city with the requested coverage maps with Avenue 64 turned on.</p>
<p>26. Received August 01, 2011 (CS): Comments on the credibility of the T-Mobile coverage maps and recommended the alternate site at Arroyo Boulevard and La Loma Road. Also suggested changes in the existing telecommunications ordinance and commented on the interpretation of the "shot clock".</p>	<p>The site at Arroyo Boulevard and La Loma Road was analyzed as an alternative. This alternate site has significant elevation and tree canopy challenges and the radome assembly along with support pole needed precludes this site from being viable.</p>

<p>27. Received August 02, 2011(RT): Comments in favor of the proposed antenna citing poor cell service in the Arroyo and the community need for improved reception for convenience, modernization and safety reasons.</p>	<p>No comment, constituent in favor.</p>
<p>28. Received August 03, 2011 (B&SY): Comments in favor of the proposed antenna citing poor cell service. Attended two meetings and commented on need for improved service and that the proposed installation would be well camouflaged.</p>	<p>No comment, constituent in favor.</p>
<p>29. Received August 03, 2011 (CG): Comments in favor of the proposed antenna citing poor cell service. Resident did not agree with concerns that antenna would mar historic nature of the neighborhood.</p>	<p>No comment, constituent in favor.</p>
<p>30. Received August 03, 2011 (BE): Resident is in favor of the proposed cell antenna installation. She cited reasons of poor cell coverage and the inconveniences of not having cell reception. Also countered arguments of the appellant.</p>	<p>No comment, constituent in favor.</p>
<p>31. Received August 03, 2011 (JT): Resident on Grand citing terrible cell reception. Strongly agrees with proposed site as public benefit and compatible with the existing tower.</p>	<p>No comment, constituent in favor.</p>
<p>32. Received August 03, 2011 (JW): Resident on California Terrace strongly supports the proposed installation. Cell service on California Terrace completely unreliable. Cited situation with delayed emergency response and inconvenience with visitors and tradesmen. States proposed design is very inconspicuous.</p>	<p>No comment, constituent in favor.</p>
<p>33. Received August 03, 2011 (RS): Resident in favor of the proposed installation citing the need for reliable cell phone service. He attended three meetings and welcomes improved service. He provided comments countering the claims of the appellant regarding the aesthetics and structural integrity of the pole.</p>	<p>No comment, constituent in favor.</p>

<p>34. Received August 07, 2011 (SB): Resident lives 3 houses from the proposed location and in favor of the installation. She noted lousy cell service and welcomed any improved service.</p>	<p>No comment, constituent in favor.</p>
<p>35. Received August 08, 2011 (J&MS): Residents on South Arroyo Boulevard in support of the proposed cell antenna installations citing lack of signal coverage. They were very concerned about the lack of cell coverage from a safety standpoint and cited two examples.</p>	<p>No comment, constituent in favor.</p>
<p>36. Received August 09, 2011 (Mr. W): Resident was in favor of the proposed installation and did not see the reason to delay the installation.</p>	<p>No comment, constituent in favor.</p>
<p>37. Received August 09, 2011 (JP): Resident was in favor of the proposed installation and did not see the reason for objections.</p>	<p>No comment, constituent in favor.</p>
<p>38. Received August 15, 2011 (MU): Letter from West Pasadena Resident's Association President discussing the need for thorough analysis of issues and alternatives. Recommended the city's use of independent consultant to work with staff and that the coverage maps for the alternative sites include the coverage for the proposed site at Avenue 64.</p>	<p>See comment #19.</p>
<p>39. Received August 15, 2011 (JM): Comments from resident on California Boulevard requesting consideration of an alternative location rather than Grand at California citing conspicuity.</p>	<p>See comment #3, city staff reviewed a number of alternatives to the proposed site.</p>
<p>40. Received September 26, 2011 (BK): Letter from the Pasadena Neighborhood Coalition regarding compliance with the city's telecommunications ordinance specifically addressing the requirements for submittals, application of "least intrusive" for location and appearance, and neighborhood involvement during the process.</p>	<p>City staff conducted a review of the proposed site as well as the alternative sites based on the guidelines referenced in PMC 12.22. There has been lengthy discussion on "least intrusive" along with neighborhood involvement during this appeal process.</p>
<p>41. Received October 13, 2011 (GC): Resident on California Terrace in favor of the proposed location and he does not see</p>	<p>No comment, constituent in favor.</p>

the problem with the design in terms of reasonableness.	
42. Received October 25, 2011 (BU): Further discussion at WPRA board meeting on progress of the permit. They are pleased with the steps that City and T-Mobile have taken to involve the community and develop the best possible solution. The prior issues raised, which were procedural, have been addressed.	No further comment.