

From: DON GREEN [<mailto:familygreen5270@att.net>]

Sent: Sunday, April 11, 2021 11:16 PM

To: Eric Porter <Eric.Porter@lakecountyca.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] cell tower

Hi Eric

My name is Don Green and i was in talking with you Friday about the extension hearing for the cell tower in Clearlake Riviera. I was wondering about the setback distance for a cell tower from a property line. After our appeal hearing last year i thought there was another hearing by the supervisors to increase the setback to 1300'. Could you tell me what the actual setback distance from property lines is for a cell tower project?

The upcoming permit extension hearing states as the reasons for the delay were the Covid shutdown and the Mendo Complex fire of 2018. As chaotic as the Covid pandemic has been, my place of employment in the Geysers has been doing project construction for over six months now. The Mendo fire was in July and August 2018; so I find it hard to believe that either of those incidents would be responsible for holding this project back. This project hasn't even got started in the two years the permit was valid. Article 60 sub sect 1C states the permit may be extended during the period within which substantial physical construction or use commenced. Again there has been no progress in getting this project moving.

In Sect 71.10 Reporting Requirements, it states if any changes occur they need to be submitted within 60 days. Horizon states that an emergency power generator is not proposed at this time but i am told that it is now a mandate that backup power for 3 days be provided due to the fact that in recent disasters the cell phone operations were absolutely useless even though the cell towers are proposed to be an effective safety tool during emergencies. So due to this change in the cell tower application which I think opens it up for discussion again, I would like to propose again that a 50x50 enclosure housing the tower and up to four emergency generators with provisions for storing fuel for at least 3 days of continual operation is not sufficient nor safe due to this project is located inside a EXTREMELY HIGH FIRE DANGER RISK AREA according to CALFIRE. Also if there is fuel to be stored on this site under the HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS sect (G)(5) it states that storage of these materials shall comply with all applicable local, state and Federal safety standards and shall be provided with adequate safety devices against the hazard of fire and explosion and adequate firefighting and fire suppression equipment. NONE of these issues are addressed in the application and as no work has commenced I feel the application is open for discussion for changes and additions. The G2 consulting statement mentions (71.9.n) states other properties were investigated but a lease could not be secured. What actual documentation supports this claim or is it just having to take their word for it? When Horizon makes reference to the photos they submitted I don't think there is any value in what they submitted due to the scale of the area being affected by this project and they have tried to justify this project imposing a fake tree in an 8x11 picture which is absolutely useless. the views they have selected are only to benefit their case and do not represent a true view how their fake tree will actually look to the people in the Riviera. G2 talks of how the fake tree tower will blend in with the trees in the area and the backdrop of the mountain (Konocti). There are no trees anywhere close to this proposed site that come even close to the proposed 85' fake tree tower, it will stand out like a sore thumb. There is one usable photo from Google Earth that shows an overhead view of where the tower site is on the 39 acre property. It shows how much more room there is to move the tower back to the N/NW. That would help the fake tree tower to blend in against the mountain backdrop and put the tower farther from homes that are always occupied not like the landowner who does not even live at the property. When G2 refers to wireless safety they state studies show there is no evidence that RF energy from wireless comm pose a public health threat. There are just as many if not more studies to be found saying that they do pose a health threat. Why can't the tower be moved farther back to increase the distance from the homes in the very near vicinity. We presented numerous signatures against the cell tower at our appeal hearing. I understand the need for increased safety and awareness due to the fire emergencies we experience but why can't we compromise with moving this fake tree tower that stands out like a sore thumb that we will be looking at for many years to come farther back to help with the aesthetics as well as radiation concerns. in fact, why can't it be placed on Konocti where the other radio towers are located. the line of sight requirement that Horizon talks about would be much greater up there as it would increase the line of site area on Clear Lake, include the Riviera West and still cover Clearlake Riviera. A much needed tool to increase safety in the Riviera when it comes to wildfire would be to have an operating Fire Alert siren like other communities in Lake Co. We could really use the weight of the county in getting our siren operating. I feel that the siren would be just as useful of a tool to warn residents of upcoming fire danger in the early stages as a cell tower.

thanks

Don