

## EXTERNAL CORRESPONDENCE

The City Clerk's Office received  
the attached correspondence regarding  
**Agenda Item #6-B on the  
5-19-15 City Council Agenda**

## LARA WEISIGER

---

**From:** Trish Spencer  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 19, 2015 10:49 AM  
**To:** Liz Warmerdam  
**Cc:** LARA WEISIGER  
**Subject:** Fwd: Agenda Item 6B- 2015-1640

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Jessica Reed <jessreed12@gmail.com>  
**Date:** May 19, 2015 at 10:30:05 AM PDT  
**To:** Tony Daysog <tdaysog@alamedaca.gov>, Frank Matarrese <fmatarrese@alamedaca.gov>, <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>  
**Cc:** "carrie.sheret@gmail.com" <carrie.sheret@gmail.com>, Sarah Cruz <sarahcruz2011@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** Agenda Item 6B- 2015-1640

Honorable Mayor and Council Members:

Tonight you will hear the appeal of the installation of an AT&T cell antenna atop 1777 Shoreline Drive, and there are a few things I would ask you to keep in mind while you consider their application. This is not a FCC tower, as some have stated; while the FCC requires that emissions not go into the decision whether or not to approve a cell installation- that is it. This is a private development over which you can determine its appropriateness to the location.

No doubt, Mr. Mintz from AT&T will delve into the history and expansion of cell use, and the community does not question that at all. We just ask "why here?" Why in line of sight of a school and a very popular park? If they truly want to be community partners, why did they not come to the community when choosing a location, keeping in mind the school board's recent action? I know they don't have to do that, but would that not have been the right thing to do?

Most of the alternatives offered by AT&T are not meaningful: they know the schools are not options, nor is the beach. They then consider alternatives that would not fulfill their needs.

I ask you to question the statement that the antenna cannot be collocated even one building over. They say that it is because there is no room for the ground equipment, but that is not what I heard more recently from AT&T. The equipment may not fit into the same exact enclosure, but there are other enclosures. Also, the property owner's representative told me it was AT&T who said there was not room, but AT&T is stating that it is the property owner who doesn't want it there.

I ask you to question why does the alternatives analysis not include any of the other buildings further south along this stretch of road, for example, the building at the corner of Kitty Hawk and Franciscan Way?

Thank you for your time and consideration,  
Jessica Reed

P.S. I request that if AT&T is given additional time to respond, that community members be allowed the same.

I would also point out that the concerns that the children have as to their safety at school are our responsibility. This is separate from emissions.

I also request that if you decide that you are okay with the location, and you decide to approve the development, that you condition it with the removal of the stealth structures so that it is not so disruptive of the skyline as the big ugly box. I also ask that it be made clear that the notice required to the residents/tenants be on a separate letter-size paper and that there be some form of continuing condition compliance checks.