File: 11326-18A-18DR
Architecture and Site Approval of a 60-foot tall wireless telecommunications tower and Design Review approval of a 7-foot tall wooden fence along the perimeter of the equipment area.

Summary: Request for Architecture and Site Approval and Design Review approval to construct a 60-foot tall wireless telecommunications tower and 7-foot tall wooden fence along the perimeter of the telecommunications equipment area. The project is located at an existing commercial storage facility adjacent to US Highway 101. The wooden fence would enclose the 30-foot by 30-foot equipment area. No grading is proposed, and no trees would be removed. Portions of the proposed wooden fence are within 100 feet of US Highway 101 and require Design Review. The proposed tower is further than 100 feet from US Highway 101.

Owner: Trinchero Ca Properties, LLC
Applicant: Tom Johnson (for AT&T)
Lot Size: 5.1 Acres
APN: 825-14-053
Supervisory District: 1

Gen. Plan Designation: Rural Residential
Zoning: RR-5Ac-sr-sm
Address: 13585 Sycamore Ave., San Martin, CA
Present Land Use: Commercial
Approved Building Site: Yes

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS
A. Accept the Categorical Exemption, under Section 15303 (Class 3(d)) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Attachment A)

B. Grant Architecture and Site Approval, and Design Review Approval subject to conditions outlined in Attachment B.
ATTACHMENTS INCLUDED

Attachment A – Proposed CEQA Determination
Attachment B – Proposed Conditions of Approval
Attachment C – Location & Vicinity Map
Attachment D – Proposed Plans
Attachment E – Photo Simulations
Attachment F – Existing and Proposed LTE 700 Coverage Maps
Attachment G – Caltrans Letter, dated July 30, 2018
Attachment H – Electromagnetic Energy Compliance Report

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project includes Architecture and Site Approval for a new 60-foot tall wireless telecommunications tower and Design Review for a 7-foot tall wooden fence on the perimeter of the equipment area. The project site is located at an existing commercial storage facility adjacent to US Highway 101. No grading is proposed, and no trees would be removed. Portions of the proposed wooden fence are within 100 feet of US Highway 101 and require Design Review. The proposed tower is further than 100 feet from US Highway 101. A new AT&T generator and equipment shelter would be constructed along with the tower inside a 30-foot by 30-foot equipment area.

Setting/Location Information

The subject property is located within the unincorporated community of San Martin, between Sycamore Avenue and the US Highway 101 entrance from San Martin Avenue.

The neighborhood character consists of commercial and industrial properties along Sycamore Avenue, low-density single-family residential and agricultural properties. The nearest residence is located at least 1,000-feet from the project site on Mammini Ct. San Martin Airport is located across Highway 101 and San Martin Avenue immediately southwest of the site.

Project Options

The original application was for a 60-foot tall mono-pine. Through the review of the application, staff received correspondence from Caltrans recommending that a monopole design be used instead of the mono-pine. The monopole design only requires a 55-foot tall tower. Staff is recommend following Caltrans’ recommendation for a 55-foot tall monopole. The following report is framed assuming the maximum height of a 60-foot tall telecommunications tower.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Environmental Review and Determination (CEQA)

   The proposed project qualifies for a Categorical Exemption, Section 15303 Class 3(d) – new construction of a utility extension of a wireless telecommunications facility.

B. Project/Proposal

   1. General Plan: Rural Residential
2. Zoning Ordinance: New Wireless Telecommunications Facilities require Architecture and Site Approval (ASA) and are subject to supplemental regulations in Zoning Ordinance § 4.10.400. A portion of the wooden perimeter fence is located within 100-feet of US Highway 101, and thus requires Design Review per Zoning Ordinance § 3.30.030 C. Per Note 5 of Zoning Ordinance Table 2.20-2, Wireless Telecommunications Facilities are exempt from development standards listed in Table 2.20-3 (setbacks and height restrictions).

C. Wireless Telecommunications Facilities Findings:
In order to approve a wireless telecommunication facility, the decision-making authority must make the following findings. (Zoning Ordinance § 4.10.400 B.) In the following discussion, the findings are listed in bold, and an explanation of how the project meets the required standard is in plain text below.

1. The proposed facilities have been co-located where feasible; and

   The applicant has demonstrated that co-location on any existing facilities in the area would not be feasible. Attachment F shows how the project would improve wireless telecommunications coverage in the vicinity and shows that there are no existing facilities in the vicinity.

2. The proposed facilities conform to the applicable provisions of the Wireless Telecommunication Facilities Design Guidelines as adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

   See section D, below.

D. Wireless Telecommunications Facilities Design Guidelines – Review Criteria:
The Wireless Telecommunication Facilities Design Guidelines (WTFDG), adopted by the Board of Supervisors, includes guidelines to minimize the visual impact of wireless telecommunication facilities and encourage colocation of those facilities. The guidelines “should be interpreted with flexibility by staff and are not rigorous requirements like adopted ordinance, but rather a means of adapting documentation and review needs to the scope of a particular facility request.” (WTFDG, page 1.) Additionally, “the primary goals of these guidelines are to ensure visually acceptable facility design, colocation of facilities, stealth design where appropriate and to provide a guide to preferred and acceptable design of wireless telecommunications facilities.” (WTFDG, page 2.) In the following discussion, the review criteria are listed in bold, and an explanation of how the project meets the criteria is in plain text below.

1. The proposal minimizes visual impact to the extent possible through design, screening and siting.

   Conditions of approval will require that the tower and antennas are painted with a color that has a light reflectivity value of 30 or less in order to blend into the surroundings. Per
Caltrans recommendation, the tower is designed as a monopole instead of a monopine, tree-like structure in order to mitigate visual impacts. Caltrans “discourages the use of mono-pines because they tend to be more visually intrusive than a single monopole cell tower” and they state that “a mono-pine is not appropriate to this location since it will differ from the surrounding specie’s type and size.” (See Attachment G.) The proposed tower is located near several groupings of existing trees that minimize the visual impact of the tower. The ground-mounted equipment shelter is screened behind a wooden fence and the adjacent, existing storage facility. Additionally, there exists ample trees and shrubs near the property boundary that screen the ground-mounted equipment from public rights-of-way.

2. The proposal minimizes removal or modification of any site landscaping and provides appropriate replacement landscaping, if necessary.

No landscaping is removed or modified in the proposal and the only ground disturbances are for the foundation of the tower structure.

3. The request does not increase the height of the existing, approved facility.

There is no existing wireless telecommunications facility on the property.

4. For façade-mounted facilities, the antenna and associated equipment is of a scale and design compatible with the building, is mounted to a building façade and does not project beyond 12 inches from the face of the building.

No façade-mounted facilities are proposed.

5. The proposal will blend with and/or complement the color, design, and/or character of the surrounding context, whether natural backdrop, building or existing facility.

Conditions of approval will require that the tower and antennas are painted with a color that has a light reflectivity value of 30 or less in order to blend with the surroundings as much as possible.

6. No exterior, artificial lighting is proposed unless required for safety purposes by State or Federal Law.

No lighting is proposed.

7. Ground equipment and vertical elements have been screened/buffered using landscaping and fencing to the extent possible.

Ground equipment is fully screened with a 7-foot tall wooden fence.

8. Facility incorporates stealth/aesthetic designs such as public art, clock towers, flagpoles or other appropriate visual forms, if possible.
The original proposal included a stealth mono-pine design. Caltrans stated in a letter dated July 30, 2018 that they “discourage the use of mono-pines because they tend to be more visually intrusive than a single monopole cell tower” and that “a mono-pine pole is not appropriate to this location since it will differ from the surrounding specie’s type and size.” (Attachment G) Conditions of approval will require that a monopole design be used and that a medium-grey matte finish be used for the color of the tower to reduce glare, minimize visual impacts and to blend in with surroundings.

9. **No guy wires are used on the structure.**

No guy wires are proposed.

10. **Facility, tower and/or antenna-mounted signage is limited to warning and informational signs.**

Conditions of approval limit signage to warning and informational signs only.

11. **The facility has been designed to discourage unauthorized access.**

A perimeter wooden fence protects the site from unauthorized access.

12. **Facilities have been collocated where feasible.**

The applicant has demonstrated that co-location at existing facilities would not be feasible. Attachment F shows how the project would improve wireless telecommunications coverage in the vicinity and shows that there are no existing facilities in the vicinity.

13. **Ridgeline/hilltop siting has been avoided or the related visual impacts have been eliminated through design and landscaping.**

The project site is located in the valley floor and there are no visual impacts to ridgelines or hilltops.

E. **Architecture and Site Approval Findings:**

ASA may be granted if the Zoning Administrator makes all of the findings in Zoning Ordinance § 5.40.040. In the following discussion, the findings are listed in bold, and an explanation of how the project meets the required standard is in plain text below.

1. **Adequate traffic safety, on-site circulation, parking and loading areas, and insignificant effect of the development on traffic movement in the area;**

This project is an unmanned facility and does not produce additional traffic.
2. **Appearance of proposed site development and structures, including signs, will not be detrimental to the character of the surrounding neighborhood or zoning district;**

The neighborhood character consists of commercial and industrial properties along Sycamore Avenue and low-density single-family residential and agricultural properties in the vicinity. The nearest residence is located at least 1,000-feet from the project site. As a condition of approval, the tower and antennas would be “stealthed” by painting them a color that has a light reflectivity value of less than 30 in order to blend the tower with its surroundings.

A 7-foot tall wooden fence is proposed to conceal the equipment area located near the base of the tower.

There are no signs proposed.

Through the color “stealthing” of the tower, antennas, and the wooden fence concealment of the equipment area, the project’s effect on neighborhood aesthetics is less than significant, and this finding can be made.

3. **Appearance and continued maintenance of proposed landscaping will not be detrimental to the character of the surrounding neighborhood or zoning district;**

There is no proposed landscaping for project approval. There is existing vegetation near the property boundary that screens the ground-mounted equipment from public rights-of-way.

4. **No significant, unmitigated adverse public health, safety and environmental effects of proposed development;**

There will not be any significant environmental impacts, as no known biological or environmental issues were identified on site. The proposal is compliant with FCC guidelines. (See Electromagnetic Energy Compliance Report – Attachment H.)

The October 1, 2018 Cultural Resources Report by Environmental Assessment Specialists concluded that there are no previously recorded prehistoric resources within \( \frac{1}{2} \)-mile of the project site and that there are no National Register of Historic Places listed or eligible historic properties or historic districts located within \( \frac{1}{2} \)-mile of the project site, and that therefore, cultural resources would not be affected by the project.

5. **No adverse effect of the development on flood control, storm drainage, and surface water drainage;**

The proposed project will not have any significant impact to flood control, storm drainage, and surface water drainage as the proposal was reviewed by Land Development Engineering. The project site is located on an existing, paved parking area at the commercial storage facility. There will be no increase in impervious surfaces.
6. Adequate existing and proposed fire protection improvements to serve the development;

The proposed project was reviewed by the County Fire Marshal and the site access is in conformance with the Fire Marshal’s Office standards, subject to conditions of approval outlined in Attachment B.

7. No significant increase in noise levels;

Construction of the project will produce temporary noise. There are no sensitive receptors in the vicinity. The proposed project will not result in a significant, long-term increase in noise levels in the area.

8. Conformance with zoning standards, unless such standards are expressly eligible for modification by the Zoning Administrator as specified in the Zoning Ordinance;

The proposed project satisfies all of the required zoning standards, as stipulated in the County Zoning Ordinance. The zoning district for subject parcel is RR-5Ac-sr-sm (rural residential base district with a 5-acre lot size combining district, scenic road combining district, and San Martin Use Permit area combining district). No proposed modification to these standards is proposed or required. According to Note 5 of Table 2.20-2 of the Zoning Ordinance, “Wireless telecommunications facilities are exempt from the development standards listed in Table 2.20-3.” Therefore, there are no setback or height restrictions applicable to the proposed project.

9. Conformance with the general plan and any applicable area or specific plan, or, where applicable, city general plan conformance for property located within a city’s urban service area; and

The General Plan designation for subject parcel is Rural Residential. The project is located in San Martin and is subject to the San Martin Integrated Design Guidelines, which require that new fences be wooden. The proposed perimeter fence is wooden. Therefore, the project conforms with the General Plan and the San Martin Integrated Design Guidelines.

The project site is located adjacent to the San Martin Airport and within the Airport Influence Area (A.I.A.). As such, the polices of safety, height and noise contained within the San Martin Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) apply. As an unmanned telecommunications tower, the only density of people on the site would be for maintenance. Therefore, the policies of safety and noise would not apply. As a 60-foot tower, the project requires a “No Hazard Determination” from the FAA in order to be consistent with the height policies of the San Martin CLUP. The Applicant has filed for an obstruction study with the FAA and a condition of approval has been added to successfully obtain a No Hazard Determination from the FAA prior to the issuance of building permits.
10. Substantial conformance with the adopted “Guidelines for Architecture and Site Approval” and any other applicable guidelines adopted by the County.

The proposal will be required to adhere to all conditions of approval required by the Zoning Administrator. The intent of the “Guidelines for Architecture and Site Approval” is to maintain the character and integrity of zoning districts by promoting quality development in harmony with the surrounding area, through consideration of all aspects of site configuration and design, and to generally promote the public health, safety and welfare. As the character of the proposal is in harmony with the existing commercial use of the property, and there is no significant effect on traffic or congestion, the proposal secures such general purposes.

F. Design Review Findings:
Pursuant Section 5.50.040 of the County Zoning Ordinance, all Design Review applications are subject to the stated scope of review. The overall purpose of design review is to encourage quality design and mitigate potential adverse visual impacts of development. In the following discussion, the scope of review findings are listed in **bold**, and an explanation of how the project meets the required standard is in plain text below.

1. **Mitigation of any adverse visual impacts from proposed structures, grading, vegetation removal and landscaping;**

   The proposed 7-foot tall wooden fence is designed to screen the proposed equipment shelter. Conditions of approval would require that the fence be painted to match the existing, adjacent structures. The proposed wooden fence would be located on an existing paved parking area at the existing commercial storage facility on the property. The construction of the wooden fence would neither include removal of any existing trees, nor any grading. Therefore, this finding can be made.

2. **Compatibility with the natural environment;**

   The site is located in a suburbanized area with existing commercial and industrial uses. Staff has included conditions of approval requiring adequate painting to mitigate visual impacts of the wooden fence and help it blend into the natural environment. Therefore, this finding can be made.

3. **Conformance with the “Design Review Guidelines,” adopted by the Board of Supervisors;**

   The County Design Review Guidelines were adopted by the Planning Commission in February of 1999 with a primary intent to address viewshed impacts to the valley floor.

   Conditions of approval require that the tower be painted with a color that has a light reflectivity value of less than 30 in order to blend with the surroundings and minimize
visual impacts. The project is located in a flat area in the valley floor and would not impact viewsheds.

4. **Compatibility with the neighborhood and adjacent development:**

The neighboring properties are developed with commercial and industrial development. Other properties in the vicinity are low-density single-family or agricultural uses. The nearest residence is at least 1,000 feet away from the project site. The wireless telecommunications facility is considered infrastructure that is compatible with the mixed neighborhood and adjacent development.

5. **Compliance with applicable zoning district regulations; and**

The Rural Residential zoning district regulates the height and location of fences, particularly where fences may block drivers' line-of-sight. The proposed fence is further than 20-feet from the nearest right-of-way and does not exceed 8-feet in height. Therefore, the fence complies with zoning district regulations.

Per Note 5 of Zoning Ordinance Table 2.20-2, Wireless Telecommunications Facilities are exempt from development standards listed in Table 2.20-3 (setbacks and height restrictions).

6. **Conformance with the general plan, any applicable specific plan, other applicable guidelines.**

The proposed development substantially conforms with the Santa Clara County General Plan as fencing for commercial uses is deemed to be both acceptable and necessary. There are no specific plans or guidelines applicable to the project.

**BACKGROUND**

The original application for this project was submitted on June 27, 2018 and was deemed incomplete on July 27, 2018. After submitting all required information, the application was deemed complete on December 3, 2018. A newspaper notification was sent January 25, 2019, and notices were mailed on January 28, 2019 to neighboring property owners within 300 feet of the project site.

**STAFF REPORT REVIEW**

Prepared by: Christopher Hoem, AICP, Senior Planner

Reviewed by: Mark Connolly, Senior Planner & Deputy Zoning Administrator
ATTACHMENT A

Notice of Exemption from CEQA

To: County Clerk-Recorder
County of Santa Clara

Project Title
13585 Sycamore Cell Tower
Architecture and Site Approval and Design Review

Project Location
Address: 13585 Sycamore Avenue, San Martin, CA 95046
Zoning: RR-5Ac-sm

Public Agency Approving Project
County of Santa Clara

Person or Agency Carrying Out Project
Christopher Hoem, AICP, Senior Planner

Project Description (including purpose and beneficiaries of project)
Architecture and Site Approval and Design Review approval to construct a 60-foot tall wireless telecommunications tower and 7-foot tall wooden fence along the perimeter of the telecommunications equipment area. The project is located at an existing commercial storage facility adjacent to US Highway 101. The wooden fence would enclose the 30-foot by 30-foot equipment area. No grading is proposed, and no trees would be removed. Portions of the proposed wooden fence are within 100 feet of US Highway 101 and require Design Review. The proposed tower is further than 100 feet from US Highway 101.

Exempt Status check one/indicate type of State CEQA Guidelines section number:

- Categorical Exemption [CEQA Guidelines 15301-15333]:

Reasons the project is exempt:
This project would qualify as a Categorical Exemption pursuant to Section 15303 (d) of the California Environmental Quality Act, Class 3, which exempts the construction of new small structures related to utility extensions. In this case, the utility is a wireless telecommunications facility. This project is not on any lists of hazardous waste sites enumerated under Government Code Section 65962.5. Under Section 15300.2 of the California Environmental Quality Act, a Class 3 (Section 15303) cannot be used if environmental sensitivities exist at the site or if there will be cumulative impacts. The proposed project is aimed to improve and enhance AT&T’s wireless communication coverage in the San Martin area since there are no other facilities available in the vicinity. There are no environmental sensitivities, hazardous waste sites, nor historic resources identified on the site, and no cumulative impact associated with the location of this telecommunication tower. Therefore, this exemption is appropriate, and this proposal meets the requirements for this Categorical Exemption as discussed above.

County Contact Person
Christopher Hoem, AICP

Title
Senior Planner

Telephone Number
(408) 299-5784

Date: 1/27/2019
ATTACHMENT B

Preliminary Conditions of Approval

ARCHITECTURE AND SITE APPROVAL AND DESIGN REVIEW

Owner/Applicant: Trincher Ca Properties
File Number: PLN18-11326
Location: 13585 Sycamore Avenue, San Martin, CA

Project Description: Architecture and Site Approval and Design Review approval to construct a 60-foot tall wireless telecommunications tower and 7-foot tall wooden fence along the perimeter of the telecommunications equipment area. The project is located at an existing commercial storage facility adjacent to US Highway 101. The wooden fence would enclose the 30-foot by 30-foot equipment area. No grading is proposed, and no trees would be removed. Portions of the proposed wooden fence are within 100 feet of US Highway 101 and require Design review. The proposed tower is further than 100 feet from US Highway 101.

If you have any question regarding the following preliminary conditions of approval, call the person whose name is listed as the contact for that agency. He or she represents a particular specialty or office and can provide details about the conditions of approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Christopher Hoem</td>
<td>(408) 299-5784</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Christopher.Hoem@pln.sccgov.org">Christopher.Hoem@pln.sccgov.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health</td>
<td>Darrin Lee</td>
<td>(408) 299-5748</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Darrin.Lee@pln.sccgov.org">Darrin.Lee@pln.sccgov.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Development</td>
<td>Darrell Wong</td>
<td>(408) 299-5735</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Darrell.Wong@pln.sccgov.org">Darrell.Wong@pln.sccgov.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads and Airports</td>
<td>Rocelia Kmak</td>
<td>(408) 573-2464</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Rocelia.Kmak@rda.sccgov.org">Rocelia.Kmak@rda.sccgov.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Marshal</td>
<td>Alex Goff</td>
<td>(408) 299-5763</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Alex.Goff@sccfd.org">Alex.Goff@sccfd.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STANDARD CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Planning

1. Development of the proposed scope shall take place in accordance with approved plans, received date stamped January 28, 2019.

2. All painted, or otherwise treated, surfaces of the tower, antenna and fence shall be maintained at all times. If the surfaces are improperly maintained, the approval may be revoked and subject to violation and fines.

3. The permittee shall keep the project site free of graffiti. “Graffiti” means any unauthorized inscription, writing, lettering, word, figure, mark, design or other inscribed material that is written, marked, etched, scratched, drawn, painted or otherwise placed on any structures, fences, or other permanent or temporary surfaces.
4. All telecommunications equipment installed on-site shall comply with the standards of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) for health, safety, and other pertinent requirements.

5. No signs are approved at this time except for (1) an informational sign that provides phone numbers to be used in case of an emergency, and (2) a bilingual NIER hazard warning sign posted at the outer perimeter of the project site. These signs must be in compliance with FCC rules regarding required telecommunication facility signage. Such signs shall be limited to an area of one square foot.

6. Flags, banners, streamers, or other devices are not approved and may not be attached to the tower, antennas, fence enclosure, or any supporting structures.

7. The access easement will be adequate for monthly service and any non-scheduled emergency maintenance personnel accessing the proposed facility. Maintenance of these improvements is the responsibility of the property owner.

8. All telecommunications related equipment shall be removed from the site within six (6) months of cessation of use. This shall require obtaining a demolition permit from the Santa Clara County Building Division.

Environmental Health

9. All construction activities shall be in conformance with the Santa Clara County Noise Ordinance Section B11-154 and prohibited between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays and Saturdays, or at any time on Sundays for the duration of construction.

CONDITIONS REQUIRED PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMIT

Planning

10. Pursuant to §5.20.125, record a Notice of Permit and Conditions with the County Office of Clerk-Recorder, to ensure that successor property owners are made aware that certain conditions of approval shall have enduring obligation. Evidence of such recordation shall be provided prior to building permit issuance.

11. Ensure the GPS coordinates of the center of the tower are listed on the title page of the Building Permit plans.

12. Prior to Building Permit issuance, submit paint color samples for the tower, fence enclosure, and any mechanical or electrical equipment visible above the fence. The color for the fence enclosure must match the existing, adjacent structures. The painted color of the tower and antennas must be a medium-grey matte and have a light reflectivity value of 30 or less. The color samples shall include the name, number, and manufacturer of the proposed color(s). Show the color sample information on the Building Permit plans.

13. Apply for and obtain necessary Building Permits for the facility and fencing.

14. Submit and obtain a “No Hazard Determination” from the Federal Aviation Administration for this project.
Land Development Engineering

15. The building plans submittal shall include an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan and acknowledgment form. The form shall be signed prior to building permit issuance.

16. All applicable easements affecting the parcel(s) with benefactors and recording information shall be shown on the improvement plans.

17. Property owner is responsible for the adequacy of any drainage facilities and for the continued maintenance thereof in a manner that will preclude any hazard to life, health or damage to adjoining property.

18. All new on-site utilities, mains and services shall be placed underground and extended to serve the proposed development. All extensions shall be included in the building plans. Off-site work should be coordinated with any other undergrounding to serve other properties in the immediate area.


20. The improvement plans shall include at a minimum, one of the Low Impact Development site design measures. These measures include directing roof runoff into; cisterns or rain barrels for reuse, onto vegetated areas and; directing runoff from sidewalks, walkways, patios, driveways and uncovered parking onto vegetated areas; and constructing sidewalks, walkways, patios, driveways with permeable surfaces.

Roads and Airports

21. ENCROACHMENT PERMIT: Obtain a Santa Clara County Roads and Airports Department (RAD) Encroachment Permit prior to any work performed in the County Road Right of Way (ROW) and prior to Building Permit issuance. The Encroachment Permit application shall address all work to be performed in the Sycamore Avenue ROW. The process for obtaining an Encroachment Permit and the forms that are required can be found at: www.countyroads.org > Services > Apply for Permits > Encroachment Permit.

22. CONSTRUCTION: Complete all work within the ROW prior to release of final Building occupancy. Construction staking within the ROW is required and shall be the responsibility of the developer.

Fire Marshal

23. Prior to Building Permit issuance, submit a detail of how many batteries will be installed and the quantities of flooded lead-acid, nickel cadmium, valve-regulated lead-acid and lithium ion/metal polymer for each battery. Installation of any stationary lead-acid battery system shall comply with 2016 Edition, California Fire Code Section 608. A permit will be required if electrolyte capacity exceeds 50 gallons.

24. A separate permit is required from the Fire Marshal’s Office for any fuel storage in excess of exempt amounts, including integral tanks for equipment, such as generators. NOTE: Storage of fuel on site may also require permits from the Building Division and
the County Hazardous Material Compliance Division of the County Department of Environmental Health. Additional requirements will be made when a complete set of construction drawings is submitted for Building Permit application.

**Environmental Health**

25. Submit plans and associated documentation along with any fees required to the Hazardous Materials Compliance Division (HMCD) of the Department of Environmental Health. Contact HMCD at 408-918-3400 to ensure all the appropriate applications, information and documents are included in the plan submittal. Submit the plans to 1555 Berger Drive, Suite 300, San Jose, CA 95112-2716.


**CONDITIONS REQUIRED PRIOR TO FINAL INSPECTION**

**Planning**

27. Prior to final inspection, contact Christopher Hoem at 408-299-5784 to schedule an inspection to ensure compliance with all conditions of approval. The inspection will ensure correct paint color and finish of the tower-mounted and ground-based components. Call one week prior to requested final inspection date to schedule an appointment.
ATTACHMENT C
Location & Vicinity Map

13585 Sycamore Ave
Proposed Tower Site
ATTACHMENT D

Proposed Plans
PROPOSED ANTENNA LAYOUT
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KEY NOTES:
1. G1A and G1B to be mounted on P1 in sector A.
2. G1A and G1B to be mounted on P2 in sector B.
3. G1A and G1B to be mounted on P3 in sector C.
4. G1A and G1B to be mounted on P4 in sector D.
5. G1A and G1B to be mounted on P5 in sector E.
6. G1A and G1B to be mounted on P6 in sector F.
7. G1A and G1B to be mounted on P7 in sector G.
8. G1A and G1B to be mounted on P8 in sector H.
9. G1A and G1B to be mounted on P9 in sector I.
10. G1A and G1B to be mounted on P10 in sector J.
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DATE: 01/10/16

INFINIGY8 ENGINEERING, LLP
5600 RANCHOS PARKWAY SOUTH
LAKESIDE, CA 92037
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ATTACHMENT E

Photo Simulations
CCL05136
Windmill Mini Storage
13585 Sycamore Avenue
San Martin, CA 95046

VIEW 1

APPLICANT
AT&T Mobility
5001 Executive Parkway
San Ramon, CA 94583

CONTACT
TSJ Consulting Inc,
Tom Johnson
27130 Paseo Espada
Suite #A-1426
San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675
p 925.785.3727

BLUE WATER DESIGN
bluewater-design.net
michelle@bluewater-design.net
p 425.615.0944

Photo simulation accuracy is based on information provided to Blue Water Design by the applicant.
PROPOSED

EXISTING

PROPOSED MONOPINE LOCATION

Location

CCL05136
Windmill Mini Storage
13585 Sycamore Avenue
San Martin, CA 95046

VIEW 2
Photo simulation accuracy is based on information provided to Blue Water Design by the applicant.
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Existing and Proposed LTE 700 Coverage Maps
July 30, 2018

Christopher Hoem
Santa Clara County Planning Office
County Government Center, East Wing, 7th Floor
70 W. Hedding Street
San Jose, CA 95112

AT&T Wireless Communication Facility at Windmill Mini Storage (13585 Sycamore Ave) – Early Application Involvement

Dear Mr. Hoem:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the AT&T Wireless Communication Facility at Windmill Mini Storage (13585 Sycamore Ave). In tandem with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s (MTC) Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), Caltrans’ mission signals a modernization of our approach to evaluate and mitigate impacts to the State Transportation Network (STN). Caltrans’ Strategic Management Plan 2015-2020 aims to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) by tripling bicycle and doubling both pedestrian and transit travel by 2020. Our comments are based on the July 3, 2018 Application Referral.

Project Understanding
Architectural and Site Approval and Design Review for installation of a new 60-foot tall wireless communications facility with a supporting equipment shelter and backup generator. The project is adjacent to the US Route (US) 101 interchange at E. San Martin Ave.

Visual Impacts
US Route 101 is not a classified Scenic Highway at post mile (PM) 12.576 in Santa Clara County. The project is located outside of Caltrans’ right-of-way (ROW), but it will be visible to highway users. Caltrans discourages the use of mono-pines because they tend to be more visually intrusive than a single monopole cell tower. A mono-pine pole is not appropriate to this location since it will differ from the surrounding specie’s type and size. A monopole should be used instead. Please specify medium-grey or medium-brown color (matte finish) monopole to reduce glare, minimize visual impacts and to blend in with surroundings.
Lead Agency
As the Lead Agency, the County of Santa Clara is responsible for all project mitigation, including any needed improvements to the STN. The project’s fair share contribution, financing, scheduling, implementation responsibilities and lead agency monitoring should be fully discussed for all proposed mitigation measures.

Encroachment Permit
Please be advised that any work or traffic control that encroaches onto the state ROW requires an encroachment permit that is issued by the Department. To apply, a completed encroachment permit application, environmental documentation, and five (5) sets of plans clearly indicating state ROW must be submitted to: Office of Permits, California DOT, District 4, P.O. Box 23660, Oakland, CA 94623-0660. Traffic-related mitigation measures should be incorporated into the construction plans during the encroachment permit process. See the website link below for more information: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/developserv/permits/.

Thank you again for including Caltrans in the environmental review process. Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Jake Freedman at 510-286-5518 or jake.freedman@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA MAURICE
District Branch Chief
Local Development - Intergovernmental Review
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Electromagnetic Energy Compliance Report
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The proposed AT&T installation will be in compliance with FCC regulations upon proper installation of recommended signage.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose of Report

EnviroBusiness Inc. (dba EBI Consulting) has been contracted by AT&T Mobility, LLC to conduct radio frequency electromagnetic (RF-EME) modeling for AT&T Site CCL05136 located at 13585 Sycamore Avenue in San Martin, California to determine RF-EME exposure levels from proposed AT&T wireless communications equipment at this site. As described in greater detail in Section 1.0 of this report, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has developed Maximum Permissible Exposure (MPE) Limits for general public exposures and occupational exposures. This report summarizes the results of RF-EME modeling in relation to relevant FCC RF-EME compliance standards for limiting human exposure to RF-EME fields.

This report contains a detailed summary of the RF EME analysis for the site, including the following:

- Site Plan with antenna locations
- Graphical representation of theoretical MPE fields based on modeling
- Graphical representation of recommended signage and/or barriers

This document addresses the compliance of AT&T’s transmitting facilities independently and in relation to all collocated facilities at the site.

Statement of Compliance

A site is considered out of compliance with FCC regulations if there are areas that exceed the FCC exposure limits and there are no RF hazard mitigation measures in place. Any carrier which has an installation that contributes more than 5% of the applicable MPE must participate in mitigating these RF hazards.

As presented in the sections below, based on worst-case predictive modeling, there are no modeled exposures on any accessible rooftop or ground walking/working surface related to ATT’s proposed antennas that exceed the FCC’s occupational and/or general public exposure limits at this site.

As such, the proposed AT&T installation is in compliance with FCC regulations upon proper installation of recommended signage and/or barriers.

AT&T Recommended Signage/Compliance Plan

AT&T’s RF Exposure: Responsibilities, Procedures & Guidelines document, dated October 28, 2014, requires that:

1. All sites must be analyzed for RF exposure compliance;
2. All sites must have that analysis documented; and
3. All sites must have any necessary signage and barriers installed.

Site compliance recommendations have been developed based upon protocols presented in AT&T’s RF Exposure: Responsibilities, Procedures & Guidelines document, dated October 28, 2014, additional guidance provided by AT&T, EBI’s understanding of FCC and OSHA requirements, and common industry practice. Barrier locations have been identified (when required) based on guidance presented in AT&T’s RF Exposure: Responsibilities, Procedures & Guidelines document, dated October 28, 2014.
The following signage is recommended at this site:

- Yellow CAUTION 2B sign posted at the base of the monopole climbing ladder.

The signage proposed for installation at this site complies with AT&T's RF Exposure: Responsibilities, Procedures & Guidelines document and therefore complies with FCC and OSHA requirements. Barriers are not recommended on this site. More detailed information concerning site compliance recommendations is presented in Section 4.0 and Appendix B of this report.
1.0  **FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION (FCC) REQUIREMENTS**

The FCC has established Maximum Permissible Exposure (MPE) limits for human exposure to Radiofrequency Electromagnetic (RF-EME) energy fields, based on exposure limits recommended by the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP) and, over a wide range of frequencies, the exposure limits developed by the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc. (IEEE) and adopted by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) to replace the 1982 ANSI guidelines. Limits for localized absorption are based on recommendations of both ANSI/IEEE and NCRP.

The FCC guidelines incorporate two separate tiers of exposure limits that are based upon occupational/controlled exposure limits (for workers) and general public/uncontrolled exposure limits for members of the general public.

**Occupational/controlled exposure limits** apply to situations in which persons are exposed as a consequence of their employment and in which those persons who are exposed have been made fully aware of the potential for exposure and can exercise control over their exposure. Occupational/controlled exposure limits also apply where exposure is of a transient nature as a result of incidental passage through a location where exposure levels may be above general public/uncontrolled limits (see below), as long as the exposed person has been made fully aware of the potential for exposure and can exercise control over his or her exposure by leaving the area or by some other appropriate means.

**General public/uncontrolled exposure limits** apply to situations in which the general public may be exposed or in which persons who are exposed as a consequence of their employment may not be made fully aware of the potential for exposure or cannot exercise control over their exposure. Therefore, members of the general public would always be considered under this category when exposure is not employment-related, for example, in the case of a telecommunications tower that exposes persons in a nearby residential area.

Table 1 and Figure 1 (below), which are included within the FCC’s OET Bulletin 65, summarize the MPE limits for RF emissions. These limits are designed to provide a substantial margin of safety. They vary by frequency to take into account the different types of equipment that may be in operation at a particular facility and are “time-averaged” limits to reflect different durations resulting from controlled and uncontrolled exposures.

The FCC’s MPEs are measured in terms of power (mW) over a unit surface area (cm²). Known as the power density, the FCC has established an occupational MPE of 5 milliwatts per square centimeter (mW/cm²) and an uncontrolled MPE of 1 mW/cm² for equipment operating in the 1900 MHz frequency range. For the AT&T equipment operating at 850 MHz, the FCC’s occupational MPE is 2.83 mW/cm² and an uncontrolled MPE of 0.57 mW/cm². For the AT&T equipment operating at 700 MHz, the FCC’s occupational MPE is 2.33 mW/cm² and an uncontrolled MPE of 0.47 mW/cm². These limits are considered protective of these populations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Range (MHz)</th>
<th>Electric Field Strength (E) (V/m)</th>
<th>Magnetic Field Strength (H) (A/m)</th>
<th>Power Density (S) (mW/cm²)</th>
<th>Averaging Time ([E]^2, [H]^2), or S (minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.3-3.0</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>(100)*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0-30</td>
<td>1842/f</td>
<td>4.89/f</td>
<td>(900/f)*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-300</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-1,500</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>f/300</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Limits for Maximum Permissible Exposure (MPE)
### Table 1: Limits for Maximum Permissible Exposure (MPE)

**A) Limits for Occupational/Controlled Exposure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Range (MHz)</th>
<th>Electric Field Strength (E) (V/m)</th>
<th>Magnetic Field Strength (H) (A/m)</th>
<th>Power Density (S) (mW/cm²)</th>
<th>Averaging Time [E]^2, [H]^2, or S (minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,500-100,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B) Limits for General Public/Uncontrolled Exposure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Range (MHz)</th>
<th>Electric Field Strength (E) (V/m)</th>
<th>Magnetic Field Strength (H) (A/m)</th>
<th>Power Density (S) (mW/cm²)</th>
<th>Averaging Time [E]^2, [H]^2, or S (minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.3-1.34</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>(100)^*</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.34-30</td>
<td>824/f</td>
<td>2.19/f</td>
<td>(180/f)^*</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-300</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-1,500</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>f/1,500</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500-100,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f = Frequency in (MHz)

* Plane-wave equivalent power density

---

Based on the above, the most restrictive thresholds for exposures of unlimited duration to RF energy for several personal wireless services are summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Wireless Service</th>
<th>Approximate Frequency</th>
<th>Occupational MPE</th>
<th>Public MPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Communication (PCS)</td>
<td>1,950 MHz</td>
<td>5.00 mW/cm²</td>
<td>1.00 mW/cm²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellular Telephone</td>
<td>870 MHz</td>
<td>2.90 mW/cm²</td>
<td>0.58 mW/cm²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Mobile Radio</td>
<td>855 MHz</td>
<td>2.85 mW/cm²</td>
<td>0.57 mW/cm²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Evolution (LTE)</td>
<td>700 MHz</td>
<td>2.33 mW/cm²</td>
<td>0.47 mW/cm²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Restrictive Freq, Range</td>
<td>30-300 MHz</td>
<td>1.00 mW/cm²</td>
<td>0.20 mW/cm²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MPE limits are designed to provide a substantial margin of safety. These limits apply for continuous exposures and are intended to provide a prudent margin of safety for all persons, regardless of age, gender, size, or health.
Personal Communication (PCS) facilities used by AT&T in this area operate within a frequency range of 700-1900 MHz. Facilities typically consist of: 1) electronic transceivers (the radios or cabinets) connected to wired telephone lines; and 2) antennas that send the wireless signals created by the transceivers to be received by individual subscriber units (PCS telephones). Transceivers are typically connected to antennas by coaxial cables.

Because of the short wavelength of PCS services, the antennas require line-of-site paths for good propagation, and are typically installed above ground level. Antennas are constructed to concentrate energy towards the horizon, with as little energy as possible scattered towards the ground or the sky. This design, combined with the low power of PCS facilities, generally results in no possibility for exposure to approach Maximum Permissible Exposure (MPE) levels, with the exception of areas directly in front of the antennas.

2.0 AT&T RF EXPOSURE POLICY REQUIREMENTS

AT&T's RF Exposure: Responsibilities, Procedures & Guidelines document, dated October 28, 2014, requires that:

1. All sites must be analyzed for RF exposure compliance;
2. All sites must have that analysis documented; and
3. All sites must have any necessary signage and barriers installed.

Pursuant to this guidance, worst-case predictive modeling was performed for the site. This modeling is described below in Section 3.0. Lastly, based on the modeling and survey data, EBI has produced a Compliance Plan for this site that outlines the recommended signage and barriers. The recommended Compliance Plan for this site is described in Section 4.0.

3.0 WORST-CASE PREDICTIVE MODELING

In accordance with AT&T’s RF Exposure policy, EBI performed theoretical modeling using RoofView® software to estimate the worst-case power density at the site rooftop and ground-level and nearby rooftops resulting from operation of the antennas. RoofView® is a widely-used predictive modeling program that has been developed by Richard Tell Associates to predict both near field and far field RF power density values for roof-top and tower telecommunications sites produced by vertical collinear antennas that are typically used in the cellular, PCS, paging and other communications services. The models utilize several operational specifications for different types of antennas to produce a plot of spatially-averaged power densities that can be expressed as a percentage of the applicable exposure limit.

For this report, EBI utilized antenna and power data provided by AT&T, and compared the resultant worst-case MPE levels to the FCC’s occupational/controlled exposure limits outlined in OET Bulletin 65. For this report, EBI utilized antenna and power data provided by AT&T and compared the resultant worst-case MPE levels to the FCC’s occupational/controlled exposure limits outlined in OET Bulletin 65. The assumptions used in the modeling are based upon information provided by AT&T and information gathered from other sources. There are no other wireless carriers with equipment installed at this site.

Based on worst-case predictive modeling, there are no modeled exposures on any accessible rooftop or ground walking/working surface related to AT&T’s proposed antennas that exceed the FCC’s occupational and/or general public exposure limits at this site.

At the nearest walking/working surfaces to the AT&T antennas, the maximum power density generated by the AT&T antennas is approximately 17.60 percent of the FCC’s general public limit (3.52 percent of the FCC’s occupational limit). The composite exposure level from all carriers on this site is
approximately 17.60 percent of the FCC’s general public limit (3.52 percent of the FCC’s occupational limit) at the nearest walking/working surface to each antenna. Based on worst-case predictive modeling, there are no areas at ground level related to the proposed AT&T antennas that exceed the FCC’s occupational or general public exposure limits at this site. At ground level, the maximum power density generated by the antennas is approximately 8.50 percent of the FCC’s general public limit (1.70 percent of the FCC’s occupational limit).

A graphical representation of the RoofView® modeling results is presented in Appendix B. It should be noted that RoofView® is not suitable for modeling microwave dish antennas; however, these units are designed for point-to-point operations at the elevations of the installed equipment rather than ground-level coverage. Based on AT&T’s RF Exposure: Responsibilities, Procedures & Guidelines document, dated October 28, 2014, microwave antennas are considered compliant if they are higher than 20 feet above any accessible walking/working surface. There are no microwaves installed at this site.
4.0 **Recommended Signage/Compliance Plan**

Signs are the primary means for control of access to areas where RF exposure levels may potentially exceed the MPE. As presented in the AT&T guidance document, the signs must:

- Be posted at a conspicuous point;
- Be posted at the appropriate locations;
- Be readily visible; and
- Make the reader aware of the potential risks prior to entering the affected area.

The table below presents the signs that may be used for AT&T installations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informational Signs</th>
<th>Alerting Signs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="INFO 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="NOTICE 1" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3" alt="INFO 2" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="NOTICE 2" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5" alt="INFO 3" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="NOTICE DECAL" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image7" alt="INFO 4" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="CAUTION 1 - ROOFTOP" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="CAUTION 2 - ROOFTOP" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="WARNING" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based upon protocols presented in AT&T’s RF Exposure: Responsibilities, Procedures & Guidelines document, dated October 28, 2014, and additional guidance provided by AT&T, the following signage is recommended on the site:

- Yellow CAUTION 2B sign posted at the base of the monopole climbing ladder.

No barriers are required for this site. Barriers should be constructed of weather-resistant plastic or wood fencing. Barriers may consist of railing, rope, chain, or weather-resistant plastic if no other types are permitted or are feasible. Painted stripes should only be used as a last resort and only in regions where there is little chance of snowfall. If painted stripes are selected as barriers, it is recommended that the stripes and signage be illuminated. The signage and any barriers are graphically represented in the Signage Plan presented in Appendix B.

5.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

EBI has prepared this Radiofrequency Emissions Compliance Report for the proposed AT&T telecommunications equipment at the site located at 13585 Sycamore Avenue in San Martin, California.

EBI has conducted theoretical modeling to estimate the worst-case power density from AT&T antennas to document potential MPE levels at this location and ensure that site control measures are adequate to meet FCC and OSHA requirements, as well as AT&T’s corporate RF safety policies. As presented in the preceding sections, based on worst-case predictive modeling, there are no modeled exposures on any accessible rooftop or ground walking/working surface related to ATT’s proposed antennas that exceed the FCC’s occupational and/or general public exposure limits at this site.

Signage is recommended at the site as presented in Section 4.0 and Appendix B. Posting of the signage brings the site into compliance with FCC rules and regulations and AT&T’s corporate RF safety policies.

6.0 LIMITATIONS

This report was prepared for the use of AT&T Mobility, LLC to meet requirements outlined in AT&T’s corporate RF safety guidelines. It was performed in accordance with generally accepted practices of other consultants undertaking similar studies at the same time and in the same locale under like circumstances. The conclusions provided by EBI are based solely on the information provided by the client. The observations in this report are valid on the date of the investigation. Any additional information that becomes available concerning the site should be provided to EBI so that our conclusions may be revised and modified, if necessary. This report has been prepared in accordance with Standard Conditions for Engagement and authorized proposal, both of which are integral parts of this report. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made.
Appendix A

Personnel Certifications
Reviewed and Approved by:

Michael McGuire
Electrical Engineer

Note that EBI’s scope of work is limited to an evaluation of the Radio Frequency – Electromagnetic Energy (RF-EME) field generated by the antennas and broadcast equipment noted in this report. The engineering and design of the structure, as well as the impact of the antennas and broadcast equipment on the structural integrity of the structure, are specifically excluded from EBI’s scope of work.
Preparer Certification

I, Adam Piombino, state that:

- I am an employee of EnviroBusiness Inc. (d/b/a EBI Consulting), which provides RF-EME safety and compliance services to the wireless communications industry.

- I have successfully completed RF-EME safety training, and I am aware of the potential hazards from RF-EME and would be classified “occupational” under the FCC regulations.

- I am familiar with the FCC rules and regulations as well as OSHA regulations both in general and as they apply to RF-EME exposure.

- I have been trained in on the procedures outlined in AT&T’s RF Exposure: Responsibilities, Procedures & Guidelines document (dated October 28, 2014) and on RF-EME modeling using RoofView® modeling software.

- I have reviewed the data provided by the client and incorporated it into this Site Compliance Report such that the information contained in this report is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Adam Piombino
Appendix B

Compliance/Signage Plan
At the nearest walking/working surfaces to the AT&T antennas, the maximum power density generated by the AT&T antennas is approximately 17.60 percent of the FCC’s general public limit (3.52 percent of the FCC’s occupational limit). The composite exposure level from all carriers on this site is approximately 17.60 percent of the FCC’s general public limit (3.52 percent of the FCC’s occupational limit) at the nearest walking/working surface to each antenna. Based on worst-case predictive modeling, there are no areas at ground level related to the proposed AT&T antennas that exceed the FCC’s occupational or general public exposure limits at this site. At ground level, the maximum power density generated by the AT&T antennas is approximately 8.50 percent of the FCC’s general public limit (1.70 percent of the FCC’s occupational limit).

Compliance/Signage Plan
Facility Operator: AT&T Mobility
Site Name: WINDMILL MINI STORAGE
AT&T Site Number: CCL05136
USID Number: 175617
Report Date: 06-13-18