



ATTACHMENT G
PUBLIC COMMENTS

Corina Flores

From: Scott Nightingale
Sent: Tuesday, January 7, 2025 9:36 AM
To: Corina Flores
Cc: Sean del Solar
Subject: FW: SEH Cell Tower PRA-2023-388

From: John Signorino [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 25, 2023 8:00 AM
To: Scott Nightingale <snightingale@san-marcos.net>
Subject: Re: SEH Cell Tower PRA-2023-388

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Scott,

Thank you for the response. I appreciate you getting back to me.

We still have health and safety concerns. Has AT&T and T-Mobile audited surrounding neighborhood RF readings, they should. If so please notify us and post the results. We understand the FCC's guidance, so now since the site is in SEH perhaps little can be done. That said, we still do not understand why the City did not approve the original ATT site and thereby moved it next to a neighborhood. Could you tell us why the City moved the site to SEH.

AT&T made promises regarding the use and maintenance of our private road and reneged on both. Please see the San Marcos CUP hearing video with John Osborn of AT&T promising to provide some road maintenance beyond any damages, as part of their CUP approval. This was not done.

The easement owners requested some road repair/maintenance, above actual AT&T road damages (recorded by road owners). This was in keeping with AT&T's promise. Both John Osborn's **video** promise and request for residents' repair are in the City files. Road use, which has been greater than what AT&T communicated at their CUP hearing and maintenance should be addressed with them as part of this CUP. Fulfilling their promise may help get support from some community members.

After the San Marcos wildfire, wildfire hazard zones should be disclosed and I would think San Marcos Fire would require additional fire mitigation. Since the cell towers are right next to a neighborhood (300 feet from homes) this is in effect in a "inhabited structures" area so an abundance of caution should be applied. I suggest SMF reconsider this.

Scott, thank you again for your prompt response. I look forward to the cell tower signage and suggest the City and AT&T consider the above, especially the road usage issue, for it will help with some of the community members' objections to the towers.

John Signorino

C [REDACTED]

This transmission is Private, Confidential and Privileged, it and any attachments are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and protected by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. Any disclosure or distribution is prohibited so, please delete it and destroy any copies and notify the sender. Thank you.

On Tue, Sep 19, 2023 at 10:38 AM Scott Nightingale <snightingale@san-marcos.net> wrote:

John,

See below for our responses in red to your comments and questions regarding the Golden Eagle Conditional Use Permit (CUP23-0005). Attached is the receipt of the CUP fees paid. Please feel free to reach out if you have further questions.

Thanks,

SCOTT NIGHTINGALE | Principal Planner | Development Services
City of San Marcos | 1 Civic Center Drive, San Marcos CA 92069
T: (760) 744-1050 x 3281 **C:** (619) 782-8036
snightingale@san-marcos.net | www.san-marcos.net

In a cursory review of the PRA info it appears there are no changes or modifications being made so there are no visual, traffic or noise impacts, is this correct. **This is correct. This application is to renew the Conditional Use Permit for another 10-year term.**

Regarding SEH Cell Tower PRA-2023-388 I have a few questions and concerns:

- Cooling fans; Are they within existing structures and not visible? Any noise implications? **The cooling system is existing, fully screened in an open top enclosure, and not visible. No changes to the existing cooling system are proposed by the CUP renewal application. As part of the CUP renewal process,**

verification that the existing cooling system continues to comply with noise standards will be conducted.

- Photo survey; Please provide legible cell tower signs (e.g.: caution signs etc)? Required safety signage on the enclosure and tower are installed. An expanded photo survey of the site has already been requested from the applicant. The additional photos should be with the next submittal and will be available for the public.

- The Application:

-- What fees is ATT providing for the city service (CUP approval). Note the city is not requesting any fees for environmental studies, general plan, site development plan, wireless telecom" fees....? \$14,878.75 is the total fee paid. See attached for the receipt for the payment of application filing fees paid to the City.

-- There is no "Project Description" - Points 7 through 17 nor contact (see "D") Updated and additional information provided on the application, including the project description, has already been request and will be available to the public once submitted.

-- Point 31 notes the cell tower "surrounding area is mostly residential" but does not state it is also in a wild fire zone. I saw no fire safety and prevention measures in the CUP or in PRA materials. Has the SM Fire department reviewed this CUP renewal and established fire mitigation and safety plans. Also why was the original ATT agricultural area permit not approved. Renewal application proposes no changes to the existing facility. Wildfire hazard zones are not required to be disclosed on this form. The project has been reviewed by San Marcos Fire Department for compliance with fire applicable requirements. Compliance with regulations does not require additional fire mitigation and/or safety plans for non-inhabited structures. Original project and renewal does not: involve agricultural activities regulated by the City, impact any existing agricultural activities, and the project site is not located on farmland identified by the California Department of Conservation.

When will this go to the planning commission for approval. The project will be scheduled for Planning Commission and a notice to the public within the mailing radius will be sent of the details of the meeting. At this time the project is under review and a Planning Commission date has not been scheduled due to the

incomplete status of the application (an incomplete status of an application after initial review is normal for all projects; generally there are 3-4 submittals before a development application is deemed complete). When a Planning Commission hearing is scheduled for the project, a public notice will be sent.

From: John Signorino <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 9:57 AM
To: Scott Nightingale <snightingale@san-marcos.net>
Subject: Re: SEH Cell Tower PRA-2023-388

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Scott, Thank you very much for the update.

John Signorino

C [REDACTED]

This transmission is Private, Confidential and Privileged, it and any attachments are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and protected by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. Any disclosure or distribution is prohibited so, please delete it and destroy any copies and notify the sender. Thank you.

On Mon, Sep 18, 2023 at 5:29 PM Scott Nightingale <snightingale@san-marcos.net> wrote:

John,

I wanted to touch base and let you know that I am still gathering my responses for your questions. We have some internal conversations that I would like to address before releasing my comments. I should have a response sent to the PRA request and to you directly tomorrow.