

James Feenan

From: Annemarie <aweibel@mcn.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 27, 2023 2:15 AM
To: pbscommissions
Cc: Nash Gonzalez; Julia Krog; James Feenan; Kraemer, Melissa@Coastal
Subject: public comments CDP_2021-0051, 7-27-2023

Mendocino County

JUL 27 2023

Planning & Building Services

To Coastal Permit Administrator Nash Gonzalez, Planning and Building Services Department, Planning Commission, and Coastal Commission

County staff: Please accept my public comments, post them on your web page, and confirm that you have received them. Thank you.

I would like to know what would happen if AT&T would choose to move the poles that are on the South side of Navarro Ridge Rd. to the North side? It seems to me that a new "limited biological survey" and a new wetlands survey would need to be done? What if the cables would go underground? It seems to me that a new complete CDP would need to take place.

As you might know AT&T's wireless communication facility on Navarro Ridge Road was grant funded (federal money). I believe that so far AT&T itself did not suffer any financial damage. Why can they not put the fiber optic cables in the ground? That would probably also be covered with the grant money. I know that the money maybe had to be spent within a certain time frame, but it is not the public's problem when AT&T takes all this time to follow through. Why not do it right from the get go? Why not make it clear that there needs to be additional infrastructure? AT&T promised to give the public fiber optic connections. Now they want to sell us wi-fi which endangers our health. There is something wrong with this picture! We already paid for their infrastructure and in some places they were installed. They could accommodate the cables.

Mr. Serious Stratavarius in his comments listed under #11 5G. The application that was approved on 5-16-2019 included 2 Future 4 ft. microwave dishes that will be needed when FirstNet will co-locate at this site. I have not been given an answer yet when these "Future" microwave dishes will go in, or if they are already installed. As all it takes is a building permit, the public will not be informed or asked to comment. This is worrisome as 5G is not a communication patent, but a military patent and dangerous to people, plants, and animals much more so than 1G, 2G, 3G, 4G ever were or more dangerous than all of these together. Neither the FCC's outdated safety guidelines from 1996, nor the County's outdated Wireless Guidelines from 2015 will keep us safe. And the County has no interest to follow the Precautionary Principle voted on on 6-27-2006.

The coast is considered a scenic resource, and policies in the County's Coastal Element are designed to protect its scenic value. The staff report lists Coastal Element Policy 3.5-1, but the analysis that AT&T poles are similar to power poles is incorrect. The staff report indicates that "given the AT&T poles are similar in scope to power poles, staff has used policies related to power transmission lines to guide review of this application."

As listed in in the staff report the "Navarro Ridge Road is unique in the sense that actually much of the utility infrastructure is not directly adjacent to the roadway or limited to the north side of the roadway." Nowhere is it analyzed that it is not only the poles that have an effect on the highly scenic area, the visual resources, and special treatment areas, but also the fat dangling cables. Not only are many of these power poles farther away from the road, but they are also taller, so that a driver who is focusing on the road does not see the entire power pole and notices them way less than these fat AT&T poles and cables that criss cross back and forth across the road and are positioned immediately next to the road.

The staff report does not address County's Coastal Element Policy 3.5-3 which again addresses the "highly scenic areas", within which new development shall be subordinate to the character of the setting. AT&T's poles and cables are not subordinate of the setting! 3.5-3 indicates that "Any development permitted in these areas shall provide for the protection of ocean and coastal views from public areas including highways, roads, coastal trails, vista points, beaches, parks, coastal streams, and waters used for recreational purposes."

Has the Coastal Permit Administrator actually been driving that 3 mile stretch to see for himself the site? If not, that should happen before this CDP gets approved.

This After-the-fact Standard CDP consists of an incomplete impact analysis (see also comments by Mr. Serious Stratavarius); has an incomplete project description; has an incomplete setting description; and there is no mitigation of the impacts. The Public Noticing was inadequate. You would think that 3 signs should do the trick. One sign was clearly visible across from the Lord's Land. The others can not easily be seen while driving on this curvy, narrow road where drivers need to pay attention to the road. To not advertise in a local newspaper is against the practices used in the past and seems illegal. It is because of a small notice in a local newspaper that I found out about the meeting on 5-16-2019 (CDP 2017-0034) about the Navarro Ridge wireless communication facility which I attended. Just because the Mendocino Beacon only appears one time per week is not an excuse not to advertise in a local newspaper.

Please deny this After-the-fact Standard CDP_2021-0051.

Sincerely, Annemarie Weibel, Albion