



City of Carmel-by-the-Sea

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

June 12, 2019

TO: Chair LePage and Planning Commissioners

FROM: Marnie R. Waffle, AICP, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Supplemental Materials for DR 19-129 & UP 19-130 (Verizon Wireless)

Commissioners,

Please find attached 5 additional public comments on the Verizon project as well as a letter from the applicant's legal counsel.



June 12th Planning Commission Meeting Re: Verizon

caldogrun . <drondo@gmail.com>
To: "Marnie R. Waffle" <mwaffle@ci.carmel.ca.us>

Wed, Jun 12, 2019 at 11:01 AM

Dante Rondo (Carmel resident 1967-currently)
"Moontide" [Guadalupe St. 5](#) N.E. Of 6th St.
Carmel, Ca. 93921

Regarding Verizon's request to install 5 Cellular towers in residential area's of Carmel to our city planning commission.

Cellular towers, however, "Discreetly placed" in our neighborhoods? This would set a dangerous and very unesthetic precedent in this town. We should all be saying no to this very loudly! They say these "Towers" are for 4G but will be ready/modified for 5G Rollout. Since 5G RFW signals cannot travel far, they would be installing their modules in nearly every block of this town! Also, 5G does not go through solid objects such as trees...So would they suggest that we cut down the trees, so as to make this technology work in this town...? The F.C.C. is giving the big cellular companies an ok pass to roll out this technology, with NO thorough testing on human health, animal health, and the larger impacts on our entire eco-system. Yet there are thousands of concerned scientists and doctors around the world that are warning of dire mass health effects, cancer, heart disease, Parkinson's disease, cognitive mental health disease and more. Entire countries that care about the health of their people and animals, bees, butterflies, and birds, etc. have rejected 5G. Iceland and Isreal are two. There are scientist's and doctors even calling 5G rollout a potential "Extinction Event", with it's 20,000 something satellites beaming this powerful RFW radiation back to earth's surface, then multiplying the signals through millions and millions of cellular towers and modules, bathing us all in RWF radiation 24/7 with no where to run or hide from it. The WHO or the EPA has also not stepped in to voice concerns on the mass health and environmental concerns of such technology so hastily given a green light! This is corporatocracy rearing its greedy head via the cellular industry and a sham of a government agency, The FCC, made up of many former industry insiders, who likely have big stock investments in the looming 5G rollout. Will our technology destroy us and much of life on this planet if allowed to run rampant for the profit of big corporations, who could care less on the long term impact on human and animal health and our interwoven living environment? Want to know more about the dangers and lies around the 5G rollout? Watch: "5G Apocalypse Extinction Event" on [youtube.com](#)

Back to Carmel. I observe locals and tourists all over this town, neighborhoods and on the beach on their cell phones. So, obviously, cell phone reception is not a problem here. Does everything need to go faster and faster, downloading a movie in 20 seconds, and humans becoming more like robots, attached to the cellular appendages? It seems individuals like Elon Musk (Tesla) and Jeff Bozos (Amazon) who are in on the game on launching 5G satellites into earth's stratosphere will make trillions more in profit. I think we should individually and collectively voice our concerns about a very questionable technology, that makes select individuals financially richer, while it makes the rest of humanity and other life-forms poorer, disturbed and sick. We start right here by prioritizing human and animal health and the long-standing values of Carmel's natural and aesthetic environment.

It is my sincere hope that our planning commission will do the right thing for our residents, human and animal, and say no to cell towers, 5G modules in this town!

Sincerely,
Dante Rondo

[Quoted text hidden]



Verizon cell towers

su huang <sjhdonovan@gmail.com>
To: mwaffle@ci.carmel.ca.us
Cc: pmd12345@gmail.com

Tue, Jun 11, 2019 at 7:30 PM

Resend - Sorry, There was a typo on Peter's email.
Su

On Tue, Jun 11, 2019 at 5:17 PM [su huang <sjhdonovan@gmail.com>](mailto:sjhdonovan@gmail.com) wrote:

Hi Marnie,

We received a flyer on the door step at our property at Monte Verde, 3 SW of 10th. We are very concerned with the installation of cell towers in our neighborhood. Please forward this email to the Planning Commissioners and enter it into the record of the June 12th meeting. . We would appreciate very much to get updates on the meeting date changes.

Best regards.

Su-Jaen Huang and Peter Donovan



Carmel-
by-the-Sea

Marnie R. Waffle <mwaffle@ci.carmel.ca.us>

Verizon cell towers

judith mcdonald <judithmcd@me.com>
To: mwaffle@ci.carmel.ca.us

Tue, Jun 11, 2019 at 8:49 PM

Please forward to Planning Commission and enter into record for June 12 meeting that **we oppose Cell towers in our neighborhood**. Thank you for informing me about upcoming meetings.
Judith McDonald
SW corner of 12th and Camino Real



NO... on cell phone towers

Kirk Schroeder <kirkschroeder7@gmail.com>
To: mwaffle@ci.carmel.ca.us

Wed, Jun 12, 2019 at 10:06 AM

Dear Marnie,

My name is Kirk Schroeder and my wife and I are full-time residents of Carmel-by-the-Sea.

We have lived at 12th and San Carlos for 17 years.

Please forward this email to the planning commissioners letting them know that we are **very much against** the proposed cell phone towers.

Please add my email to the distribution list for further updates.

Sincerely,

Kirk S. Schroeder 734-945-2830



Cell Towers

Nicole Schroeder <cole55@comcast.net>
To: mwaffle@ci.carmel.ca.us

Tue, Jun 11, 2019 at 11:06 PM

Hi Marnie,

My name is Nicole Schroeder. I oppose the cell towers in my neighborhood. I live on the NE Corner of 12th. SanCarlos St. As you can see from the proposal the towers are literally on top of my property. Can you please forward my email to the Planning Commissioners and enter into the record for the June 12th. meeting. Also can you be so kind to add my email to your distribution list to get updates on meeting date changes.

Thanks so much! Nicole Schroeder

Sent from my iPhone

MACKENZIE & ALBRITTON LLP

155 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94104

TELEPHONE 415 / 288-4000
FACSIMILE 415 / 288-4010

June 12, 2019

VIA EMAIL

Chair Michael LePage
Commissioners Christopher Bolton,
Gail Lehman, Stephanie Locke,
and Julie Wendt
City of Carmel-by-the-Sea
Monte Verde Street
Carmel-by-the-Sea, California 93921

Re: Verizon Wireless Applications for Small Cells in the Right-of-Way
Commission Agenda June 12, 2019

Dear Chair LePage and Commissioners:

We write on behalf of Verizon Wireless to encourage you to approve five small cell wireless facilities on utility poles in the right-of-way (the “Proposed Small Cells”). The Staff Report for this item erroneously claims that these facilities do not qualify as small cells as defined by the Federal Communications Commission (the “FCC”). As we explain, the Proposed Small Cells do in fact meet the FCC’s definition, and they should be treated as small cells.

In our May 24, 2019, letter to Senior Planner Marnie Waffle, we explained that several of the City’s findings and standards for wireless facilities are preempted with respect to state and federal law as applied to small cells in the right-of-way. Specifically, a September 2018 FCC order requires that small cells be reviewed under criteria that are objective and reasonable (which, among other things, means they must be technically feasible). We also described how the Commission could approve the Proposed Small Cells based on those City criteria that are consistent with state and federal law. We urge the Commission to follow the guidance in our prior letter and approve the Proposed Small Cells.

In its September 2018 order, the FCC defined “small wireless facilities” to mean that, among other criteria, “each antenna associated with the deployment...is no more than three cubic feet in volume.” 47 C.F.R. § 1.6002(1)(2). In claiming that the Proposed Small Cells do not qualify, staff erroneously calculated an antenna volume of 4.6 cubic feet, based on their four-foot height and the 14.6-inch diameter of the antenna enclosure.

An earlier FCC order clarified that antenna enclosures do not count toward the volume calculation. In March 2018, the FCC excluded small wireless facilities from certain historic and environmental review obligations. The March 2018 order was the first to describe “small wireless facilities” in codified terms. 47 C.F.R. § 1.1312(e)(2). The FCC used the language from the March 2018 order verbatim when defining “small wireless facilities” in its September 2018 order. 47 C.F.R. § 1.6002(l)(2).¹ According to the March 2018 order, “Although antennas may be in enclosures, the three-cubic foot limit applies specifically to the antenna, and not the enclosure.” *In Re: Accelerating Wireless Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment, Second Report and Order*, FCC 18-30, ¶ 75 note 134 (March 30, 2018).

The proposed four-foot-tall small cell antennas are manufactured with a cylindrical enclosure to protect the internal antennas from the elements and to screen them from view. The visible, cylindrical enclosure does not itself generate radio frequency emissions. Rather, there are three small antennas within to provide 360-degree coverage, all concealed within a single enclosure. The volume of each sectorized antenna is 1.6 cubic feet as highlighted in the “Antenna Volume per Sector” item shown in the antenna specifications sheet attached as Exhibit A. In other words, none of the individual antenna sectors exceed three cubic feet in volume, and all three could be mounted on the pole without an enclosure in full compliance with the “small wireless facility” specifications as defined in the FCC’s September 2018 order.

Because there are no antennas over three cubic feet, and they meet other height and associated equipment volume criteria of the FCC’s definition, the Proposed Small Cells must be considered as “small wireless facilities.” They are subject to the FCC’s September 2018 order which requires review under reasonable, objective criteria that preempt certain City findings and standards.


Even if staff persists in disagreeing with our understanding that is based on FCC orders, Verizon Wireless can substitute a 3.5-foot tall antenna with an exterior enclosure volume that does not exceed three cubic feet. An alternate antenna approved by Verizon Wireless for these facilities is attached as Exhibit B. If there is any concern, the Planning Commission can easily approve the Proposed Small Cells with a condition of approval that “no individual antenna on the facility will exceed three cubic feet.”

We encourage the Commission to disregard staff’s erroneous claim that the Proposed Small Cells are not subject to the objective, reasonable review required by the FCC. We also encourage you to approve the Proposed Small Cells by adopting findings and standards that are consistent with state and federal law.

¹ In the September 2018 order, the FCC specifically referenced the definition already codified in the March 2018 order. See *In Re: Accelerating Wireless Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment*, Declaratory Ruling and Third Report and Order, FCC 18-133, ¶ 11 note 9 (September 27, 2018).

Planning Commission
City of Carmel-by-the-Sea
June 12, 2019
Page 3 of 3

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Paul Albritton".

Paul B. Albritton

Schedule of Exhibits

- A. Proposed Antenna Specifications
- B. Alternate Antenna Specifications

cc: Jon Giffen, Esq.
Glen Mozingo, Esq.
Mark Wiener
Marnie Waffle

CUUT360X12Fxyz0

Exhibit A

TRI BAND | OMNI | CANISTER ENCLOSURE | X-POL | FIXED TILT | 1219 MM (48.0 IN)



Features

- Omni configuration with 6 connectors
- Tri-sector antennas with internal power splitters creating a quasi-omni pattern
- Ideal for Small Cell / DAS applications
- Available with 4.3-10 or 7/16-DIN connectors
- Available for order with a grey, brown or black radome

Connector Description

The antenna has 6 connectors located at the bottom.

Low Band	■ R1	696-960 MHz	(2x) 4.3-10 or 7/16-DIN Female
Mid Band #1	■ Y1	1695-2700 MHz	(2x) 4.3-10 or 7/16-DIN Female
Mid Band #2	■ Y2	1695-2700 MHz	(2x) 4.3-10 or 7/16-DIN Female

Electrical Characteristics

Frequency Bands (MHz)	■ R1		■ Y1 ■ Y2			
	696-960 MHz		(2x) 1695-2700 MHz			
	696-806	824-960	1695-1880	1850-1990	1920-2200	2300-2700
Polarization	±45°		(2x) ±45°			
Horizontal Beamwidth	360°	360°	360°	360°	360°	360°
Vertical Beamwidth	20.9° ± 1.3°	18° ± 1.8°	9.4° ± 0.7°	9.5° ± 0.4°	9.4° ± 0.5°	9.1° ± 2.4°
Gain (dBi)	8.6 ± 0.9	9.1 ± 0.6	12.0 ± 0.7	11.7 ± 0.7	10.9 ± 0.8	10.1 ± 2.4
Electrical Downtilt (°)	(x) 0, 6, 12		(y) 0, 4			
Impedance	50Ω		50Ω			
VSWR	≤ 1.5:1		≤ 1.5:1			
Upper Sidelobe Suppression	> 14 dB	> 11 dB	> 13 dB	> 12 dB	> 11 dB	> 11 dB
Cross Polar Isolation	20 dB		25 dB			
Interband Isolation	25 dB		25 dB			
IM3 (2x20W carrier)	< -153 dBc		< -153 dBc			
Input Power	(2x) 500 W		(4x) 300 W			
Diplexed	No					
Number of Sectors, Sector Spacing and/or Pattern Shape	Omni					
Lightning Protection	Direct Ground					

Mechanical Characteristics

Antenna Dimensions (Height x Diameter)	1219 x 371 mm	48.0 x 14.6 in
Weight without Mounting Bracket Kit	17.3 kg	38.1 lbs
Antenna Volume	0.13 m ³	4.7 ft ³
Antenna Volume per Sector	0.4 m ³	1.6 ft ³
Survival Wind Speed	241 km/hr	150 mph
Wind Area	0.47 m ²	5.0 ft ²
Wind Load (160 km/hr or 100 mph)	391 N	88 lbf

Quoted performance parameters are provided to offer typical, peak or range values only and may vary as a result of normal testing, manufacturing and operational conditions. Extreme operational conditions and/or stress on structural supports is beyond our control. Such conditions may result in damage to this product. Improvements to products may be made without notice.

Product Specifications

COMMSCOPE®

POWERED BY



CommScope—Proprietary and Confidential. Preliminary specifications are for illustrative purposes only and will be updated prior to publication.



NH360QM-DG-2XR

Andrew® Dualband Quasi Omni Metro Cell Antenna, 698-896 and 1710-2170 MHz with internal RETs, internal duplexer and active GPS L1 band antenna

Electrical Specifications

Frequency Band, MHz	698-806	806-896	1710-1880	1850-1990	1920-2170
Gain, dBi	5.4	6.0	8.7	9.0	9.1
Beamwidth, Horizontal, degrees	360	360	360	360	360
Beamwidth, Vertical, degrees	30.0	24.0	12.0	11.0	10.0
Beam Tilt, degrees	0-24	0-24	0-16	0-16	0-16
USLS, dB	14	14	12	12	12
Isolation, dB	25	25	25	25	25
Isolation, Intersystem, dB	30	30	30	30	30
VSWR Return Loss, dB	1.5 14.0	1.5 14.0	1.5 14.0	1.5 14.0	1.5 14.0
PIM, 3rd Order, 2 x 20 W, dBc	-153	-153	-153	-153	-153
Input Power per Port, maximum, watts	125	125	125	125	125
Polarization	±45°	±45°	±45°	±45°	±45°
Impedance	50 ohm	50 ohm	50 ohm	50 ohm	50 ohm

General Specifications

Antenna Brand	Andrew®
Antenna Type	Metro Cell
Band	Multiband
Brand	DualPol®
Operating Frequency Band	1710 - 2170 MHz 698 - 896 MHz
Internal GPS frequency band	1575.42 MHz
Internal GPS VSWR	2.0

Mechanical Specifications

Color	Light gray
GPS Connector Interface	4.1-9.5 DIN Female
GPS Connector Quantity	1
Lightning Protection	dc Ground
Radiator Material	Aluminum Low loss circuit board
Radome Material	ASA
Reflector Material	Aluminum
RF Connector Interface	7-16 DIN Female
RF Connector Location	Bottom
RF Connector Quantity, total	2