

Alyson Stewart

From: Gail McDonald-Tune <gmctune@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2022 9:37 PM
To: DRP Ordinance Studies
Subject: Please pause the proposed Ordinance, amending Title 22 of the Los Angeles Planning and Zoning Code

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

To Whom It May Concern,

It is extremely important that we put a PAUSE on the proposed Ordinance, amending Title 22 of the Los Angeles Planning and Zoning Code. To schedule a hearing on March 23 of the Planning Commission is simply too fast. Key and critical points have not been addressed.

This Ordinance will effectively codify the present illegal practice of bypassing over 30 years of a well-established and balanced Conditional Use Permit Registration system with an accelerated Ministerial Site Review of small cell and macro cell antennas installed on private property. This de facto practice is currently being challenged in the Los Angeles Superior Court in the case of Angela Sherick-Bright v. County of Los Angeles.

The ostensible justification for this precipitous rush to Ordinance is the FCC's shot clock deadlines that aim to accelerate densification of small cell and macro towers antennas emitting Radio Frequency/Electromagnetic Field (RF/EMF) radiation in high and dangerous concentrations within residential communities. **It seems pretty clear that the intention of the proposed Ministerial Site Review Application process, which will effectively replace Conditional Use Permits on new facilities, is to eliminate due process protections for the Los Angeles County community — namely, timely prior notification and an opportunity to be heard in public hearings,** which are guaranteed by the First and Fifth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution and Article I, Section 7 of the California Constitution.

In addition, by what legal authority and on what constitutional grounds can the BOS bypass and strip away due process protections of prior notification and public hearings?

Nowhere in the Telecommunications Act of 1996 is there authority to bypass and to violate the U.S. Constitution or the California Constitution guarantees of due process. To apply the doctrine of preemption as the Board of Supervisors is considering would be to establish the FCC as a supra-constitutional agency. It is not. The shot clock is an excuse. The Los Angeles Planning Authority simply doesn't want to bother to take the time to ensure an opportunity for the public to participate in a meaningful way. The fundamental First Amendment right of the public to be heard was reaffirmed in footnote #6 of the recently decided case of *Children's Health Defense v. FCC*.

Another main point: **Fire Hazards.** Given its record of fire catastrophes, Los Angeles County is justifiably concerned with fire prevention and management. This area is well within the County's authority, jurisdiction, and control. For example, what special protections does the Ordinance provide for fires resulting from combustion of terpenes in conifers? Scientific studies document that continuous RF/EMF radiation exposure is closely tied with increased terpene production in conifers. Terpenes are a combustible organic compound. The Ordinance utterly ignores this risk which would need to be addressed in any CEQA/NEPA compliant EIS. There is no question that Los Angeles County has an absolute right to take reasonable protections for fire protection and management, which are certainly not preempted by the 1996 Telecommunications Act, and addressed in the present Los Angeles Fire Ordinance. Again, from the perspective of the First and Fifth

Amendments noted above, is the Board of Supervisors seriously proposing to deny the public its right of timely notification and hearing before approving a program that will impose pervasive and intensifying fire risks?

There is so much more to address here and my hope is that we will have ample time to discuss these points and many more. It is also prudent to add that there are existing Ordinances that are in place and being used in both Malibu and Encinitas that can help us guide this process in a way where best practices are addressed.

We are asking that you put a PAUSE on this proposed ordinance and process.

Sincerely,
Gail McDonald-Tune
Extremely concerned resident in Topanga, CA

--

--

Please note that this is a new and current email address for Gail McDonald Tune (McTune). Please add to your contact list. I will no longer be using gmctune@netzero.net
Thank you!

Alyson Stewart

From: J Petzold <jpetzold300@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2022 5:12 PM
To: DRP Ordinance Studies; Elida Luna; DRP Info; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Sheila; FourthDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Barger, Kathryn
Subject: TIMELY Opposition to proposed ordinance amending Title 22 of the LA Planning Zoning Code; Represents serious threats to health and wellbeing of all life forms existence

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Respectfully, kindly be aware that:

You have a duty to do no harm to humankind and humanity. As you may well know, your actions may be deemed crimes against humanity if you pass any criminal ordinance notwithstanding the EXTREMELY detrimental and harmful impacts on health, welfare and safety of property of all Americans.

It is extremely important that we put a PAUSE on the proposed Ordinance, amending Title 22 of the Los Angeles Planning and Zoning Code. To schedule a hearing on March 23 of the Planning Commission is simply too fast. Key and critical points have not been addressed.

This Ordinance will effectively codify the present illegal practice of bypassing over 30 years of a well-established and balanced Conditional Use Permit Registration system with an accelerated Ministerial Site Review of small cell and macro cell antennas installed on private property. This de facto practice is currently being challenged in the Los Angeles Superior Court in the case of Angela Sherick-Bright v. County of Los Angeles.

The ostensible justification for this precipitous rush to Ordinance is the FCC's shot clock deadlines that aim to accelerate densification of small cell and macro towers antennas emitting Radio Frequency/Electromagnetic Field (RF/EMF) radiation in high and dangerous concentrations within residential communities. **It seems pretty clear that the intention of the proposed Ministerial Site Review Application process, which will effectively replace Conditional Use Permits on new facilities, is to eliminate due process protections for the Los Angeles County community — namely, timely prior notification and an opportunity to be heard in public hearings,** which are guaranteed by the First and Fifth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution and Article I, Section 7 of the California Constitution.

In addition, by what legal authority and on what constitutional grounds can the BOS bypass and strip away due process protections of prior notification and public hearings?

Nowhere in the Telecommunications Act of 1996 is there authority to bypass and to violate the U.S. Constitution or the California Constitution guarantees of due process. To apply the doctrine of preemption as the Board of Supervisors is considering would be to establish the FCC as a supra-constitutional agency. It is not. The shot clock is an excuse. The Los Angeles Planning Authority simply doesn't want to bother to take the time to ensure an opportunity for the public to participate in a meaningful way. The fundamental First Amendment right of the public to be heard was reaffirmed in footnote #6 of the recently decided case of *Children's Health Defense v. FCC*.

Another main point: Fire Hazards. Given its record of fire catastrophes, Los Angeles County is justifiably concerned with fire prevention and management. This area is well within the County's authority, jurisdiction, and control. For example, what special protections does the Ordinance provide for fires resulting from combustion of terpenes in conifers? Scientific studies document that continuous RF/EMF radiation exposure is closely tied with increased terpene production in conifers. Terpenes are a combustible organic compound. The Ordinance utterly ignores this risk which would need to be addressed in any CEQA/NEPA compliant EIS. There is no question that Los Angeles County has an absolute right to take reasonable protections for fire protection and management, which are certainly not preempted by the 1996 Telecommunications Act, and addressed in the present Los Angeles Fire Ordinance. Again, from the perspective of the First and Fifth Amendments noted above, is the Board of Supervisors seriously proposing to deny the public its right of timely notification and hearing before approving a program that will impose pervasive and intensifying fire risks?

There is so much more to address here and my hope is that we will have ample time to discuss these points and many more. It is also prudent to add that there are existing Ordinances that are in place and being used in both Malibu and Encinitas that can help us guide this process in a way where best practices are addressed.

We are asking that you put a PAUSE on this proposed ordinance and process.

Sincerely,
J. Petzold

I oppose Title 22 Draft Wireless Ordinance as written and urge you to delay approving the ordinance until these problems can be addressed and our voices can be heard. **You have a duty to do no harm to humankind and humanity. As you may well know, your actions may be deemed crimes against humanity if you pass any criminal ordinance notwithstanding the EXTREMELY detrimental and harmful impacts on health, welfare and safety of property of all Americans.**

The following points need to be addressed urgently before finalizing the Title 22 Draft Ordinance:

- The scheduling of the proposed public hearing on March 23 of the Planning Commission, whose recommendations the Board of Supervisors (BOS) will give heavy weight, is way too hasty. In fact, impulsive action and a failure to set a proper legal, scientific, and environmental foundation for consideration of Title 22 are the hallmark of this ill-conceived Ordinance.
- In a nutshell, the Ordinance will effectively codify the present illegal practice of bypassing over 30 years of a well-established and balanced Conditional Use Permit Registration system with an accelerated Ministerial Site Review of small cell and macro cell antennas installed on private property. This de facto practice is currently being challenged in the Los Angeles Superior Court in the case of Angela Sherick-Bright v. County of Los Angeles. The ostensible justification for this precipitous rush to Ordinance is the FCC's shot clock deadlines that aim to accelerate densification of small cell and macro towers antennas emitting Radio Frequency/Electromagnetic Field (RF/EMF) radiation in high and dangerous concentrations within residential communities. It seems pretty clear that the intention of the proposed Ministerial Site Review Application process, which will effectively replace Conditional Use Permits on new facilities, is to eliminate due process protections for the Los Angeles County community — namely, timely prior notification and an opportunity to be heard in public hearings, which are guaranteed by the First and Fifth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution and Article I, Section 7 of the California Constitution.

- It seems the BOS doesn't have legal authority to bypass and strip away due process protections of prior notification and public hearings. Nowhere in the 1996 Telecommunications Act is there authority to bypass and to violate the U.S. Constitution or the California Constitution guarantees of due process.
- The 1996 Telecommunications Act contains no provision for local communities to allow telecom purveyors to convert easements to property rights without just compensation to private property owners.
- Has there been any determination, affirmative or negative, relating to the necessity of assessing the environmental impacts of this project through an EIS interagency consultative process under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)? Has the BOS complied with its obligations under the federal National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), including coordinating with other concerned federal agencies, recognizing that there is substantial federal involvement in Los Angeles County? (so called NEPA “federal handle.”)
- Given its record of fire catastrophes, Los Angeles County is justifiably concerned with fire prevention and management. This area is well within the County’s authority, jurisdiction, and control. For example, what special protections does the Ordinance provide for fires resulting from combustion of terpenes in conifers? Scientific studies² document that continuous RF/EMF radiation exposure is closely tied with increased terpene production in conifers. Terpenes are a combustible organic compound. The Ordinance utterly ignores this risk which would need to be addressed in any CEQA/NEPA compliant EIS. There is no question that Los Angeles County has an absolute right to take reasonable protections for fire protection and management, which are certainly not preempted by the 1996 Telecommunications Act, and addressed in the present Los Angeles Fire Ordinance. Again, from the perspective of the First and Fifth Amendments noted above, is the Board of Supervisors seriously proposing to deny the public its right of timely notification and hearing before approving a program that will impose pervasive and intensifying fire risks?
- The contention that small cell and macro tower densification is essential for emergency response is bogus. As is well documented by the Resolution of 2 E.g. see “Influence of microwave frequency electromagnetic radiation on terpene emission and content in aromatic plants”⁴ the International Association of Fire Fighters, there are far safer well-established alternatives to addressing major fire hazards than by amplifying them.
- What special dangers do the proposed amendments pose for airports in Los Angeles County? How can the BOS reconcile the serious conflicts with current FAA regulations?
- The proposed amendment stipulates that it must comply with existing federal laws, which include: the Historic Preservation Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Fair Housing Amendments Act, to name a few. None of these federal statutes are preempted by the 1996 Telecommunications Act. They are entitled to coequal dignity and consideration. The BOS cannot override these federal statutes by some ministerial gimmick, simply because it doesn’t want to take the time to devise a reasonable and balanced solution.
- What provision has been made for insurance for RF/EMF related harms? What consideration has been given to a bonding requirement, recognizing the hazards of RF/EMF radiation? What process is contemplated to coordinate with the Board of Health to report, investigate, and arrange for compensation of the thousands of victims of RF/EMF radiation exposure over the coming years? What provision is being made to deploy best available community wide radiation monitoring devices and methodologies, recognized by the National Spectrum Management Association, so that the Los Angeles County Health Department will even know the levels of RF/EMF radiation to which County communities are being exposed?

- Why does the BOS not take the time to study carefully existing best ordinance practices, such as being implemented in Scarsdale, Malibu, Encinitas, and other local communities which include setbacks in residential areas and other protective features?

- The Planning Department and BOS are advised to take a bold and innovative additional step: that is seriously to consider providing incentives for a far superior broadband option: optical fiber to the premises (OFTP). Optical fiber broadband will accomplish the infrastructural goals of the proposed Ordinance, including bridging the Digital Divide, while optimizing the beneficial uses of wireless and minimizing its hazards. OFTP is faster, safer, private (Accelerating densification of small cell and macro towers raises serious unexamined questions regarding the encroachment on privacy protected under the CA Consumer Privacy Act. Many of these problems may be avoided under an OFTP framework.), more cybersecure, lower latency, energy efficient, and climate change friendly. OFTP must be a serious option for consideration in the BOS' forthcoming NEPA/CEQA EIS. (See: Timothy Schoechle, Reinventing Wires: The Future of Landlines and Networks)

In conclusion, given that the present law and regulations pertaining to RF/EMF are in a state of flux, it would behoove us to remember that the last thing one should do in times of chaos is to plunge in more deeply. The precipitate haste by which Title 22 is being promoted provides a telltale clue to its overall character. The BOS needs to pause and postpone; to think things through clearly and responsibly, especially given the long-term consequences; where necessary to consult with independent, uncompromised experts; to engage the public; and to prevent and correct an imminent folly. Los Angeles County and its Board of Supervisors will never regret taking the time at this critical juncture to discover the path of reasonable balance.

You have a duty to do no harm to humankind and humanity. As you may well know, your actions may be deemed crimes against humanity if you pass any criminal ordinance notwithstanding the EXTREMELY detrimental and harmful impacts on health, welfare and safety of property of all Americans.

Thank you,
JPetzold

To Whom it May Concern:

Will I wake up one day to a macro cell tower being built 20 feet from my door? Will you??

The Proposed Changes to County Code Title 22 are in direct conflict with the law. They eliminate Due Process and our Democratic tradition of timely prior notification and public hearings (please reference the First and Fifth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution and Article I, Section 7 of the California Constitution).

Contrary to what some may believe, the Telecommunications Act of 1996 does not give the FCC the authority to dismiss and violate the US Constitution or the California Constitution. The FCC is still subject to Federal Constitutional Law, and therefore applying a doctrine of preemption is against the law.

In light of this, it is also useful to remember that we do not need to hurry through this process. Indeed, it would serve all of us well to perform our due diligence in assessing all risks of densification of small cell, and macro cell antennas with a proper Environmental Impact Survey. We need the data on safety concerns, fire concerns, and any other possible risk that comes from this sort of densification. There is actually no real reason for the rush, other than perhaps profits for telecommunication companies.

Additionally, there ARE other, safer options to seriously consider: Optical fiber broadband (OFTP) will accomplish the infrastructural goals of the proposed Ordinance, including bridging the Digital Divide. OFTP is faster, safer, more private, more cybersecure, has lower latency, is energy efficient, and climate change friendly. OFTP must be a serious option for consideration in the BOS' forthcoming NEPA/CEQA EIS.

In short, I strongly OPPOSE the proposed changes to LA County Code Title 22; and I strongly support due diligence, proper notification, and the Democratic tradition of public hearings.

You have a duty to do no harm to humankind and humanity. As you may well know, your actions may be deemed crimes against humanity if you pass any criminal ordinance notwithstanding the EXTREMELY detrimental and harmful impacts on health, welfare and safety of property of all Americans.

Respectfully,

Imminent Hazard:

The proposed changes will:

- Compromise the reasonable Balance established over decades under the California Conditional Use Permit System for land use.
- Convert limited easements for public rights of way into fee simple property ownership by a few politically influential and financially powerful telecom companies and their multi-millionaire owners.
- Codify a new legal concept, “ministerial authority,” under a “Ministerial Site Plan Review” designed to rush through all permits without any advance public notice, controls or hearings, and thereby to strip away your fundamental due process right to be heard, guaranteed by the U.S. and California Constitutions and reaffirmed in Children’s Health Defense v. FCC, February 11, 2022.
- Expose our most vulnerable populations—children, disabled persons, pregnant women, fetuses, the elderly, minorities, and economically-disadvantaged populations—to unchecked, unmonitored, continuous, and cumulative Radio Frequency/ElectroMagnetic Field (RF/EMF) Radiation with no compensation or insurance available at all for the victims. The risks are so great no reputable insurance company in the world today will offer RF/EMF radiation damage coverage.
- Eliminate the basic right of self-defense and safeguards under the 2nd Amendment to the U.S. Constitution of your person, home, property, and security of your family. (The U.S. Supreme Court has noted that “the need for defense of self, family, and property is most acute” in the home.)
- Weaken protections under the National Historic Preservation Act.
- Substantially increase risks of fires in high-risk fire zones, without any due consideration to prevention or mitigation.
- Allow interference with aircraft radar altimeters near airports.

· Further erode privacy by taking your most personal information without your consent, packaging and selling it with the intention of enhancing corporate and government surveillance and manipulation of your behavior for corporate profit. You have a duty to do no harm to humankind and humanity. As you may well know, your actions may be deemed crimes against humanity if you pass any criminal ordinance notwithstanding the EXTREMELY detrimental and harmful impacts on health, welfare and safety of property of all Americans.

Alyson Stewart

From: DRP Info
Sent: Tuesday, April 5, 2022 8:19 AM
To: DRP Ordinance Studies
Subject: FW: Opposition to 5G Cell Towers Near our Homes

FYI

Thank you,

Alice Wong, AICP
Principal Planner
Operations and Major Projects (OMP) Section
Department of Regional Planning
320 W. Temple Street, 13th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90012
<http://planning.lacounty.gov/>

Effective March 1, 2022: Due to the recent declines in the spread of COVID-19 in Los Angeles County, Regional Planning is resuming in-person service. Currently, all field offices are open to the public. For the most current information about available services, public meeting schedules, and planning projects, please visit planning.lacounty.gov



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message, including any attachments, from the Department of Regional Planning is intended for the official and confidential use of the recipients to whom it is addressed. It contains information that may be confidential, privileged, attorney work product, or otherwise exempted from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this message in error, be advised that any review, disclosure, use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this message or its contents is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender of this email immediately by reply email that you have received this message in error, and immediately destroy this message, including any attachments.

We Appreciate Your Feedback!

Please take a moment and fill out our EPIC-LA customer experience survey by clicking on the link below:
[https://bit.ly/LACoCSSurvey](https://bit.ly/LACoCSSSurvey)

From: Joyce Romero <joyceiromero@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 5, 2022 6:25 AM
To: DRP Info <info@planning.lacounty.gov>
Subject: Opposition to 5G Cell Towers Near our Homes

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Hi,

My name is Joyce Romero. I live at 12945 Hartsook Street. I am writing to urge you to oppose Title 22 of the Los Angeles Planning and Zoning Code as it stands. It is extremely important that we put a PAUSE on the proposed Ordinance, amending Title 22 of the Los Angeles Planning and Zoning Code. Key and critical points have not been addressed. First and foremost, please take a look at what Malibu and Encinitas are doing with their ordinances and let's

figure out how we can work together to establish a safe neighborhood boundary between where people sleep at night and where these small towers are installed.

This Ordinance will effectively codify the present illegal practice of bypassing over 30 years of a well-established and balanced Conditional Use Permit Registration system with an accelerated Ministerial Site Review of small cell and macro cell antennas installed on private property. This de facto practice is currently being challenged in the Los Angeles Superior Court in the case of Angela Sherick-Bright v. County of Los Angeles.

The ostensible justification for this precipitous rush to Ordinance is the FCC's shot clock deadlines that aim to accelerate densification of small cell and macro towers antennas emitting Radio Frequency/Electromagnetic Field (RF/EMF) radiation in high and dangerous concentrations within residential communities. **It seems pretty clear that the intention of the proposed Ministerial Site Review Application process, which will effectively replace Conditional Use Permits on new facilities, is to eliminate due process protections for the Los Angeles County community — namely, timely prior notification and an opportunity to be heard in public hearings,** which are guaranteed by the First and Fifth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution and Article I, Section 7 of the California Constitution.

In addition, by what legal authority and on what constitutional grounds can the BOS bypass and strip away due process protections of prior notification and public hearings?

Nowhere in the Telecommunications Act of 1996 is there authority to bypass and to violate the U.S. Constitution or the California Constitution guarantees of due process. To apply the doctrine of preemption as the Board of Supervisors is considering would be to establish the FCC as a supra-constitutional agency. It is not. The shot clock is an excuse. The Los Angeles Planning Authority simply doesn't want to bother to take the time to ensure an opportunity for the public to participate in a meaningful way. The fundamental First Amendment right of the public to be heard was reaffirmed in footnote #6 of the recently decided case of *Children's Health Defense v. FCC*.

Another main point: **Fire Hazards.** Given its record of fire catastrophes, Los Angeles County is justifiably concerned with fire prevention and management. This area is well within the County's authority, jurisdiction, and control. For example, what special protections does the Ordinance provide for fires resulting from combustion of terpenes in conifers? Scientific studies document that continuous RF/EMF radiation exposure is closely tied with increased terpene production in conifers. Terpenes are a combustible organic compound. The Ordinance utterly ignores this risk which would need to be addressed in any CEQA/NEPA compliant EIS. There is no question that Los Angeles County has an absolute right to take reasonable protections for fire protection and management, which are certainly not preempted by the 1996 Telecommunications Act, and addressed in the present Los Angeles Fire Ordinance. Again, from the perspective of the First and Fifth Amendments noted above, is the Board of Supervisors seriously proposing to deny the public its right of timely notification and hearing before approving a program that will impose pervasive and intensifying fire risks?

There is so much more to address here and my hope is that we will have ample time to discuss these points and many more. It is also prudent to add that there are existing Ordinances that are in place and being used in both Malibu and Encinitas that can help us guide this process in a way where best practices are addressed.

We are asking that you put a PAUSE on this proposed ordinance and process.

Thanks so much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Joyce Romero
(818) 606-4327

•
•

Alyson Stewart

From: Julia Kantor <pastalovers@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2022 11:06 PM
To: DRP Ordinance Studies
Subject: Opposing Title 22

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

To whom it may concern:

I'm Julia Kantor and I live at 13123 Otsego St. in Sherman Oaks. I don't want a small cell tower anywhere near my house.

I am writing to urge you to oppose Title 22 of the Los Angeles Planning and Zoning Code as it stands. It is extremely important that we put a PAUSE on the proposed Ordinance, amending Title 22 of the Los Angeles Planning and Zoning Code. Key and critical points have not been addressed. First and foremost, please take a look at what Malibu and Encinitas are doing with their ordinances and let's figure out how we can work together to establish a safe neighborhood boundary between where people sleep at night and where these small towers are installed.

This Ordinance will effectively codify the present illegal practice of bypassing over 30 years of a well-established and balanced Conditional Use Permit Registration system with an accelerated Ministerial Site Review of small cell and macro cell antennas installed on private property. This de facto practice is currently being challenged in the Los Angeles Superior Court in the case of Angela Sherick-Bright v. County of Los Angeles.

The ostensible justification for this precipitous rush to Ordinance is the FCC's shot clock deadlines that aim to accelerate densification of small cell and macro towers antennas emitting Radio Frequency/Electromagnetic Field (RF/EMF) radiation in high and dangerous concentrations within residential communities. **It seems pretty clear that the intention of the proposed Ministerial Site Review Application process, which will effectively replace Conditional Use Permits on new facilities, is to eliminate due process protections for the Los Angeles County community — namely, timely prior notification and an opportunity to be heard in public hearings,** which are guaranteed by the First and Fifth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution and Article I, Section 7 of the California Constitution.

In addition, by what legal authority and on what constitutional grounds can the BOS bypass and strip away due process protections of prior notification and public hearings?

Nowhere in the Telecommunications Act of 1996 is there authority to bypass and to violate the U.S. Constitution or the California Constitution guarantees of due process. To apply the doctrine of preemption as the Board of Supervisors is considering would be to establish the FCC as a supra-constitutional agency. It is not. The shot clock is an excuse. The Los Angeles Planning Authority simply doesn't want to bother to take the time to ensure an opportunity for the public to participate in a meaningful way. The fundamental First Amendment right of the public to be heard was reaffirmed in footnote #6 of the recently decided case of *Children's Health Defense v. FCC*.

Another main point: **Fire Hazards**. Given its record of fire catastrophes, Los Angeles County is justifiably concerned with fire prevention and management. This area is well within the County's authority, jurisdiction, and control. For example, what special protections does the Ordinance provide for fires resulting from combustion of terpenes in conifers? Scientific studies document that continuous RF/EMF radiation exposure is closely tied with increased terpene production in conifers. Terpenes are a combustible organic compound. The Ordinance utterly ignores this risk which would need to be addressed in any CEQA/NEPA compliant EIS. There is no question that Los Angeles County has an absolute right to take reasonable protections for fire protection and management, which are certainly not preempted by the 1996 Telecommunications Act, and addressed in the present Los Angeles Fire Ordinance. Again, from the perspective of the First and Fifth Amendments noted above, is the Board of Supervisors seriously proposing to deny the public its right of timely notification and hearing before approving a program that will impose pervasive and intensifying fire risks?

There is so much more to address here and my hope is that we will have ample time to discuss these points and many more. It is also prudent to add that there are existing Ordinances that are in place and being used in both Malibu and Encinitas that can help us guide this process in a way where best practices are addressed.

We are asking that you put a PAUSE on this proposed ordinance and process.

Sincerely,

Julia Kantor

Alyson Stewart

From: Angela <angelapelusochillemi@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 1, 2022 1:14 PM
To: firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; Sheila; FourthDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Barger, Kathryn; DRP Ordinance Studies; Elida Luna; DRP Info
Subject: Title 22 of the Los Angeles Planning and Zoning Code // 5G

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Hello all,

I am writing to urge you to oppose Title 22 of the Los Angeles Planning and Zoning Code as it stands. It is extremely important that we put a PAUSE on the proposed Ordinance, amending Title 22 of the Los Angeles Planning and Zoning Code. Key and critical points have not been addressed. First and foremost, please take a look at what Malibu and Encinitas are doing with their ordinances and let's figure out how we can work together to establish a safe neighborhood boundary between where people sleep at night and where these small towers are installed.

This Ordinance will effectively codify the present illegal practice of bypassing over 30 years of a well-established and balanced Conditional Use Permit Registration system with an accelerated Ministerial Site Review of small cell and macro cell antennas installed on private property. This de facto practice is currently being challenged in the Los Angeles Superior Court in the case of Angela Sherick-Bright v. County of Los Angeles.

The ostensible justification for this precipitous rush to Ordinance is the FCC's shot clock deadlines that aim to accelerate densification of small cell and macro towers antennas emitting Radio Frequency/Electromagnetic Field (RF/EMF) radiation in high and dangerous concentrations within residential communities. **It seems pretty clear that the intention of the proposed Ministerial Site Review Application process, which will effectively replace Conditional Use Permits on new facilities, is to eliminate due process protections for the Los Angeles County community — namely, timely prior notification and an opportunity to be heard in public hearings,** which are guaranteed by the First and Fifth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution and Article I, Section 7 of the California Constitution.

In addition, by what legal authority and on what constitutional grounds can the BOS bypass and strip away due process protections of prior notification and public hearings?

Nowhere in the Telecommunications Act of 1996 is there authority to bypass and to violate the U.S. Constitution or the California Constitution guarantees of due process. To apply the doctrine of preemption as the Board of Supervisors is considering would be to establish the FCC as a supra-constitutional agency. It is not. The shot clock is an excuse. The Los Angeles Planning Authority simply doesn't want to bother to take the time to ensure an opportunity for the public to participate in a

meaningful way. The fundamental First Amendment right of the public to be heard was reaffirmed in footnote #6 of the recently decided case of *Children's Health Defense v. FCC*.

Another main point: **Fire Hazards**. Given its record of fire catastrophes, Los Angeles County is justifiably concerned with fire prevention and management. This area is well within the County's authority, jurisdiction, and control. For example, what special protections does the Ordinance provide for fires resulting from combustion of terpenes in conifers? Scientific studies document that continuous RF/EMF radiation exposure is closely tied with increased terpene production in conifers. Terpenes are a combustible organic compound. The Ordinance utterly ignores this risk which would need to be addressed in any CEQA/NEPA compliant EIS. There is no question that Los Angeles County has an absolute right to take reasonable protections for fire protection and management, which are certainly not preempted by the 1996 Telecommunications Act, and addressed in the present Los Angeles Fire Ordinance. Again, from the perspective of the First and Fifth Amendments noted above, is the Board of Supervisors seriously proposing to deny the public its right of timely notification and hearing before approving a program that will impose pervasive and intensifying fire risks?

There is so much more to address here and my hope is that we will have ample time to discuss these points and many more. It is also prudent to add that there are existing Ordinances that are in place and being used in both Malibu and Encinitas that can help us guide this process in a way where best practices are addressed.

We are asking that you put a PAUSE on this proposed ordinance and process.

Sincerely,
Angela Peluso Chillemi

--

Angela Peluso Chillemi
Cell: 646-522-5946
Email: angelapelusochillemi@gmail.com

Per Los Angeles County Planning Board Proposed Changes to County Code Title 22:

Just as I opted out of Smartmeters, avoid my cellphone except in emergencies, and turn off all the wireless at my brother's house just to do the laundry, I want to exercise my right to opt out of small cell millimeter wave broadcasters on or near my house. This right is protected under the CA Consumer Privacy Act.

In 2015, the fire stations of LA County were able to remove mandated RICS towers on their roofs before they could do any harm.

Title 22 is an illegal taking (inverse condemnation) of property and a violation of due process under the First, Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendments.

"Instead of an Application for Conditional Use Permit as historically required by law and typically Notarized for Recordation, this new Application, see Exhibit A hereto, and titled Application for Land Use, contains specialized language apparently derived through concerns of industry and County administrators to streamline applications for telecommunications antennas, *by cutting the public out of the loop.*" ~ current case (Feb 2022) against the COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

- **Case Number**

*****4767

Also the 2nd Amendments Re. self-defense and safeguards: The U.S. Supreme Court has noted that "the need for defense of self, family, and property is most acute" in the home - of course that was in reference to firearms, but I will take what I can get as far as the law goes.

I ask you to require BOS compliance with the FCC's own regulations affecting compliance with NEPA. Contrary to the BOS's own guidelines, the reckless densification of small cell and macro towers, exposing the general population to RF/EMF radiation is fundamentally an anti-social practice.

"Densification" means every 250 meters, so the recent discovery of damage to altimeters in airplanes/helicopters flying near them is upsetting esp. as, in Malibu, planes and choppers fly either directly over my house to the ocean for LAX, or follow the whitewater along the beach to get to accidents (including Sheriff, Coast Guard and press). If they were less than 2 miles from one of these 5G devices (new FAA airport parameters for safe flying as of Feb 2022), this could impact their ability to know how close they are to the ocean surface... "including autothrottle, ground proximity warning, thrust reversers and Traffic Collision Avoidance System."

"AT&T and Verizon will limit 5G access near **50 US airports...** (creating a C-band "buffer zone") at Chicago O'Hare International, Dallas-Fort Worth and Los Angeles International. As *The Wall Street Journal* notes, it also includes airports **in foggy and cloudy locations** That would be us...

All the Best, Beate Nilsen
25136 Malibu Rd, Malibu, CA 90265

Alyson Stewart

From: corlisslee@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2022 2:35 PM
To: Elida Luna; DRP Ordinance Studies; DRP Info; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; Sheila; FourthDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Barger, Kathryn
Subject: 5g - Public comments for Title 22 Draft Wireless Ordinance
Attachments: Title 22 ordinances comments C Lee.docx

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

I oppose Title 22 Draft Wireless Ordinance as written and urge you to delay approving the ordinance until these problems can be addressed and the public has been duly engaged.

Please consider my attached comments and record them in your records.

Corliss Lee
President Eastside Voice
Long Beach Ca
(714) 401 7063

Alyson Stewart

From: diana hinek <diana.hinek@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 28, 2022 5:23 PM
To: Elida Luna; DRP Ordinance Studies; DRP Info; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov; Sheila; FourthDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Barger, Kathryn
Subject: STOP 5G Towers

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear All,

I am writing to request that you:

- 1) Delay approving Title 22 Draft Wireless Ordinance for more public input.
- 2) Consider a more protective ordinance with a carve out for a minimum of 500 feet in front of residences
- 3) Require telecom to do periodic emissions tests

Thank you kindly,
Diana Hinek

Alyson Stewart

From: Susan Foster <susan.foster04@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 4, 2022 2:52 PM
To: DRP Info; Sup. Hilda Solis; Sup. Holly J. Mitchell; Sheila; Sup. Janice Hahn; Barger, Kathryn
Cc: Lew Currier; Julie Levine; Larry Ortega; Julian Gresser; Elida Luna; DRP Ordinance Studies
Subject: Urgent Safety Issue, Item 79/Title 16 & Title 22
Attachments: Ltr LA Cnty BOS Item 79 4-5-22.pdf; Resolution No. 21-17 (NonPROW).pdf

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Los Angeles County Supervisors:

I was a resident of Southern California for over three decades and just recently moved to Colorado, though my work as a Fire and Utility Consultant continues in California. I have worked with the firefighters of California for over 20 years.

I have been consulting with Malibu Planning Commissioners and City Councilmembers since the fall of 2020. I work with a former telecommunications attorney and an electrical engineer and together we have come up with a protocol for minimizing the fire risks from cell towers and telecommunications equipment.

I have been asked to review and critique Title 16 and Title 22, the cell tower ordinances that should be designed to conform to the General Plan 2035.

I believe your outside telecommunications consultant has not given the Department of Regional Planning the best advice regarding the cell tower ordinances for small cells or for macro towers. For the most part all will be allowed in under ministerial permits and in my opinion, ministerial permits should be allowed as infrequently as possible. You have, by law, the right as the Board of Supervisors to implement safety precautions for telecommunications equipment necessary to protect the residents of Los Angeles County. Both ordinances fail to do so in the ways I describe in my attached letter.

Our team identified four (4) major wildfires, including the \$6 billion Woolsey Fire, that were started as a result of telecommunications equipment – either electrical or structural engineering design flaws.

Please see the attached Malibu Resolution No. 21-17, Basic Application Requirements, and specifically 8.a. In Malibu we are telling the carriers their applications must be accompanied by the documents required by our protocol. If the applications are incomplete, a written letter is sent to the carrier and then the shot clock is tolled. This section is for macro towers and will soon apply to small cells, as well.

We would be more than happy to advise or answer any of your questions.

Respectfully,

SUSAN FOSTER
Medical Writer
Fire & Utility Consultant
PO Box 1444
Lyons, CO 80540
858-756-3532
susan.foster04@gmail.com

Susan Foster

PO Box 1444
Lyons, CO 80540
susan.foster04@gmail.com
(858) 756-3532

April 3, 2022

To: Hilda L. Solis, 1st District
Holly J. Mitchell, 2nd District
Sheila Kuehl, 3rd District
Janice Hahn, 4th District
Kathryn Barger, 5th District

Re: Agenda Item 79; August 5, 2022

Dear Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors:

As a Fire and Utility Consultant who assisted in writing both the Encinitas Small Cell Ordinance and the Malibu NPROW Ordinance, and testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Energy, Utilities and Communications against SB 556 which Gov. Newsom vetoed, I am urging you to take a serious and discerning look at the telecommunications ordinances, Title 16 & Title 22, and note they lack critical engineering requirements that you as the Board of Supervisors have the right to demand.

Neither of these ordinances should be passed in their present form. They fail to conform to fundamental safety requirements in LA County's General Plan 2035. Safety is not just about having a cell tower in a select place to call for help. Safety is first about prevention, and both ordinances fail on structural and electrical engineering rigor and would thus present potential fire risks, as well as collapse risks. Please understand that if the cell towers are not structurally sound and electrically engineered to the highest standard, the cell towers themselves become part of the problem you are trying to avoid.

Even though the ordinances say that applicable codes apply, not all of the electrical and fire codes are indeed applicable. The National Electric Code chooses to defer significantly to the states when it comes to telecommunications facilities. The CPUC under General Order 159 prefers that counties and cities regulate telecom design – and in this instance design includes electrical and structural safety. LA County has previously stated under Deference to Local Government as follows:

The provisions of this Code shall not apply to public utilities; or to electrical wiring for street lighting or traffic signals located primarily in a public way; or to mechanical equipment not specifically regulated in this Code.

This includes telecommunications which is a utility. I believe the outside telecommunications advisor to DRP has misled Staff as to the best practices for permitting macro towers and small cells in Los Angeles County. Ministerial permit should be used as infrequently as possible. As Title 22 stands now, macro towers would come into LA County under ministerial permits. Yet macro towers present one of the most significant of all cell tower fire risks; with ministerial permits you have lost your ability to scrutinize engineering designs.

If you make extremely clear what is required in the application checklist, carriers that do not provide LA County with a complete application are subject to tolling agreements that are indeed allowed by the FCC. Staff must write a letter to the carrier and immediately the shot clock would be tolled. The shot clocks should not present an impediment to good governance. We don't bow to the shot clocks; we work with them.

There is, in the proposed ordinances, a glaring deficiency of electrical, structural and fire prevention rigor. Every cell tower that is allowed into Los Angeles County introduces an additional fire risk. Allow me to explain.

In 2020 I was asked by Malibu's then-Mayor Mikke Pierson to assist in coming up with a fire safety protocol because Malibu was then and still is living with the devastating effects of the \$6 billion 2018 Woolsey Fire. Mayor Pierson knew that the 2007 Malibu Canyon Fire was the fault of structural overloading of telecommunications antenna on SCE power poles. We had not yet discovered that the Woolsey Fire was also the result of faulty telecommunications equipment.

I was part of a team that included a telecommunications attorney, an electrical engineer and myself, a fire and utility consultant. We examined the fire risks present in Malibu and advised the Malibu Planning Commission and City Council of the legal steps they could take to minimize such risks. Cell towers are electrical devices, so all cell tower fires are electrical fires. This means they cannot be fought through conventional means. The policy of LA County Fire Department, like most fire departments, is to stand down in the presence of a cell tower fire. Cutting the power takes between 10 - 60 minutes. Only then can firefighters attack the fire.

Imagine this scenario amidst a Santa Ana wind event. A single burning ember can be carried for miles. If a cell tower fire is caused by internal arcing, the temperature can reach 4000° in less than half a second. A steel cell tower can turn to molten plasma in a matter of minutes as was the case at Otay Ranch High School in Chula Vista, California on March 9, 2021. Before the representative of SDG&E arrived on scene to say the power had been cut, the cell tower had collapsed and burned into the track and destroyed the stands. This was 7:30 on a Tuesday evening. Imagine if this had been 7:30 on a Friday evening during a track meet or football game.

SETBACKS: Your current ordinances do not allow for setbacks in critical areas. Setbacks, particularly in "special zones" are legal. Los Angeles County must exclude cell towers from residential, schools and other densely populated areas because residents and schools/daycare centers need time to evacuate in the event of an electrical cell tower fire.

Our team in Malibu discovered the following four California wildfires had been initiated, at least in part, by telecommunications equipment:

- **Guejito Fire (2007)** in San Diego which became part of the Witch Creek Fire, the worst fire in San Diego history.
- **Malibu Canyon Fire (2007)**; three utility poles overloaded with equipment from the following carriers snapped in the wind and ignited the grass below: Sprint (now T-Mobile), AT&T, Verizon, and NextG (now owned by Crown Castle). All four carriers as well as SCE were accused by the CPUC of attempting to mislead fire investigators.
- **Woolsey Fire (2018)**; a telecommunications lashing wire came loose igniting at least one of the two ignition points for the \$6 billion fire. The Woolsey Fire is still under criminal investigation, so we do not know who the carrier is.
- **Silverado Fire in Irvine (2020)** involved SCE and a T-Mobile lashing wire. Silverado merged with a second fire causing the evacuation of 130,000 people.

Knowing that the telecommunications industry was policing itself when it came to engineering rigor, together with an electrical engineer, we came up with a protocol which requires tests, diagrams and documents sealed and signed by a Professional Engineer (PE) from telecom to be attached to the application before it hits the planning department's desk.

Again, safety is yours to regulate at the local level. You have every right to expect and demand engineering rigor when carriers apply in LA County. To emphasize, your Staff may toll the shot clock if that application is incomplete. You simply need to provide an application checklist or have specific written requirements within your ordinance so that legal complications do not arise. **Do not resort to ministerial permits. They are basically a rubberstamp and an invitation to the carriers to cut corners when it comes to engineering rigor. Los Angeles County will pay the price.**

What we have said in Malibu, unanimously, is that telecom may not apply until they have proven that their cell towers have adhered to our Electric Fire Safety protocol and the federal government's structural engineering requirements of APCO/ANSI Public Safety Grade Site Hardening Requirements – APCO ANS 2. 106.1-2019. APCO/ANSI is required by federal law.

I do not see APCO/ANSI in either of your ordinances. We have found it is helpful to spell out to telecom exactly what is expected when they apply. It is helpful not only to telecom, but it is helpful to Staff to know what to look for. The last place corners should be cut is in telecommunications equipment that is being placed in the midst of densely populated high fire risk and earthquake prone areas. LA County has five active faults and over 100 faults total. Structural engineering rigor is paramount.

A great deal of Los Angeles County is in an extremely high-risk fire zone and the benefits that are being touted by DRP as allowing people to quickly call 911 in the event of a fire are benefits that are already in place courtesy of the CPUC. Do not be misled by the outside consultant to believe you need small cells to call 911. Your residents' ability to call for help has already been secured by the CPUC. In July 2020, CPUC passed the attached Resiliency Plan which mandates 72-hour backup for every cell tower in the state of California after the power has been cut.

Every cell tower in California must have a rechargeable battery pack or a generator (sometimes portable) for the 72-hour backup. The generators will be powered by diesel fuel. This can be

dangerous in the public right-of-way so it appears the only waivers that will be granted will most likely be for small cells in the public right-of-way to minimize the danger.

To emphasize, small cells should not be billed to the Board of Supervisors and/or the residents as a means of calling 911. That would be false advertising.

I have submitted the Electric Fire Safety Protocol and a white paper I wrote to the Department of Regional Planning but am happy to provide it to the Board of Supervisors, as well. In addition to the CPUC's Resiliency Plan for 72-hour backup after the power has been cut, I am attaching Malibu's Resolution 21-17 which includes our Electric Fire Safety Protocol. Please let me know if our team can be of any assistance to any of you.

Respectfully submitted,



SUSAN FOSTER
Fire and Utility Consultant

Attachments: 1. CPUC's Resiliency Plan for 72-hour backup
2. Malibu's Resolution No. 21-17 [Electric Fire Safety Protocol]

Cc: Lew Carrier, 1st VP, IAFF Local 1014

RESOLUTION NO. 21-17

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF MALIBU ADOPTING ENGINEERING, DESIGN AND LOCATION STANDARDS, CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AND BASIC APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES ON LAND OTHER THAN PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY; AND FINDING THE SAME EXEMPT FROM THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

The City Council of the City of Malibu does hereby find, resolve and order as follows:

SECTION 1. Recitals

A. Malibu Municipal Code (MMC) Chapter 17.46 governs the permitting, installation, and regulation of wireless communications facilities in the City, other than those in the public right-of-way, which are subject to MMC Chapter 12.02.

B. Section 17.46.060(D) provides that “[a]ll applicants shall engineer, design and locate the wireless communications facilities in accordance with the standards and wireless regulations set forth separately though the resolution adopted by the City Council.”

C. Being authorized to do so, the City wishes to establish engineering, design and development standards applicable to wireless installations.

D. The City also wishes to set standard conditions of approval and basic application requirements applicable to wireless permits.

E. On April 12, 2021 the City Council conducted a duly noticed public hearing and received testimony from City staff and all interested parties regarding the and the standards, conditions and requirements.

SECTION 2. Purpose. The purpose of this document is to (1) establish design and location standards (Standards) for wireless communications facilities on land other than public right-of-way; (2) set standard conditions of approval for Wireless Permits (WPs); and (3) set basic application requirements for WPs.

SECTION 3. Definitions. For the purposes of these Standards, the definitions set forth in Malibu Municipal Code (MMC) Section 17.46.040 are incorporated by reference into this Resolution and in addition the following definitions apply:

- A. “Park” A parcel, parcels of land or a portion of a parcel intended for active public recreation uses. Parks may include sports fields, playgrounds community buildings and unique or specialized activity areas. Land dedicated for open space and trails are not considered parks for the purposes of this Chapter.

- B. “Playground” A portion of land used for and equipped with public facilities for recreation specially by children. A playground includes the sand or rubberized floor around the apparatus.
- C. “Pole-mounted facility” means a wireless communications facility that is, or is proposed to be, attached to or contained in a pole.
- D. “School” any building, campus or sports field which is designed, constructed or used for education, instruction or school sports, whether public or private, in any branch of knowledge.
- E. “Stealth facility” (or “stealth facilities”) means a wireless communications facility designed to look like something other than a wireless tower or base station.

SECTION 4. General Standards for all Facilities The following general requirements apply at all times to all wireless communications facilities located in all zoning districts:

- A. All wireless communications facilities shall be engineered and designed to minimize the visual impact by means of placement, screening, camouflaging, painting and texturing and to be compatible with existing architectural elements, building materials and other site characteristics. The applicant shall use the smallest and least visible antenna possible to accomplish the facility’s objectives. All antennas and support structures shall be painted and/or textured to achieve architectural compatibility with the structures for which they are attached and/or located.
- B. Each facility must comply with any and all applicable provisions of the Malibu Municipal Code, including but not limited to provisions of the California Building Code, California Electric Code, California Plumbing Code, California Mechanical Code, and California Fire Code, and any conditions of approval imposed as part of the approval process.
- C. Each facility must comply with any and all applicable regulations and standards promulgated or imposed by any state or federal agency, including, but not limited to, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). Further, all wireless communications facilities, associated equipment and services shall comply with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements.
- D. Fire and Electrical Safety Standards. All wireless communications facilities shall contain:
 - 1. Surge protection for lightning discharge or other significant electrical disturbances; and

2. Signage as required by the permit conditions, the National Electric Code or the Los Angeles County Fire Department Chief or their designee.
- E. The facility must at all times comply with all applicable health requirements and standards pertaining to radio frequency emissions.
- F. All antennas shall meet the minimum siting distances to habitable structures required for compliance with FCC regulations and standards governing the environmental effects of radio frequency emissions.
- G. Noise. Wireless communications facilities and equipment must comply with the City's noise ordinance in MMC Chapter 8.24, or any successor provisions, and be designed to prevent noise and sound from being plainly audible at a distance of fifty (50) feet from the facility or within ten (10) feet of any residence.
- H. Signs. No facility may display any signage or advertisement unless it is expressly allowed by this paragraph, necessary for stealth concealment purposes, or required by law or a permit condition. Every facility shall at all times display signage that accurately identifies the facility owner and provides the owner's unique site number and a local or toll-free telephone number to contact the facility owner's operations center.
- I. Landscaping. Where appropriate, facilities shall be installed so as to maintain and enhance existing landscaping on the site, including trees, foliage and shrubs, whether or not utilized for screening. In addition to any landscaping used for concealment or screening purposes, the applicant shall replace any existing landscaping displaced during construction or installation of the applicant's facility. The applicant's landscaping plan shall be subject to the City's review and approval but shall, at a minimum, match the existing landscaping and foliage surrounding the installation site consistent with MMC Section 17.53.090. The permittee shall ensure that any vegetation allowed to remain in place under the Fire Code, including vegetation provided for screening, is properly maintained and watered.
- J. All electrical support equipment located within cabinets, shelters, or similar structures shall be screened from public view. Roof-mounted electrical support equipment shall be discouraged. Ground-mounted electrical support equipment shall be encouraged. In addition, under grounding of support equipment is required wherever practicable.
- K. All antennas shall be located such that any person walking adjacent to the transmitting surface of the antenna will be walking on a grade that is a minimum of eight and one-half feet below the transmitting surface.

- L. Lighting of antenna structures and their electrical support equipment is prohibited, except as required by any order or regulation of the FCC or the FAA and except for manually operated emergency lights for use when official operating personnel are on site.
- M. A backup power supply must be required for all new wireless communications facilities to the extent allowed by law [and in compliance with California Fire Code 1206.2.2](#).

SECTION 5. Location Standards for All Facilities The location standards for all wireless communications facilities, other than those that qualify as eligible facilities requests, are as follows:

- A. No wireless telecommunication facility shall be located within five hundred (500) feet of any school, playground, or park unless a finding is made, based on technical evidence acceptable to the reviewing authority showing a clear need for the facility and that no technically feasible alternative site exists. Except for facilities installed on the same pole or tower as an existing wireless telecommunication facility, wireless telecommunication facilities located within any residential zone district shall not be located within ~~five hundred~~ [one thousand \(5001,000\)](#) feet of any other wireless communications facility, except from those facilities placed on utility poles along Pacific Coast Highway, unless a waiver is granted.
- B. All new freestanding wireless communications facilities and monopoles shall be set back a minimum distance of at least one hundred ~~and ten-twenty (4001+20)~~ percent of the height of the facility or monopole from any property line abutting a residentially zoned property. This minimum setback is not subject to the waivers allowed under Section 7 of this Resolution.
- C. Location preference for wireless communications facilities should be given to the following:
 - 1. Property designated non-residential (except for public open space and recreational vehicle park zoning districts), unless otherwise prohibited pursuant to this title.
 - 2. Facilities attached or sited adjacent to existing structures. Whenever possible, facilities shall be located on and/or inside existing structures. Appropriate types of existing structures may include, but are not limited to: buildings, water tanks, telephone poles and utility towers and poles, sign standards, light standards and roadway overpasses.
 - 3. Sites with minimum separation. Sites that are more than five hundred (500) feet from school, playgrounds, and parks.

4. Sites that are not highly visible from adjacent roadways.
5. Unless otherwise indicated in MMC Chapter 17.46 or these Standards, no wireless facility shall be installed on an exposed ridgeline unless the facility blends with the surrounding existing natural and man-made environment and a finding is made that no other location is technically feasible.
6. The City expressly designates residential, public open space and recreational vehicle park zoning districts, parks and schools as the least appropriate possible locations, and the absolute last choices for siting.

SECTION 6. Engineering and Design Standards for all Facilities The general design standards for wireless communications facilities subject to MMC Chapter 17.46 are as follows:

- A. **Basic Requirements.** The proposed wireless facility and its supporting structure (if needed) shall be limited to the minimum size necessary to serve the defined service objectives of the wireless service provider or providers that will be using the facility, except where a larger facility has superior concealment elements.
- B. **Materials.** The materials used shall be non-reflective and non-flammable.
- C. **Cabinet doors and other openings** must be designed to stay securely closed, and openings in all facilities shall be shielded or made the smallest size feasible to protect against fire and wind-blown embers.
- D. **The tower, or other support structure, and all equipment** shall be designed to withstand forces from seismic events. To that end, all wireless facility sites must be built to the applicable standards of Hardening Requirements including but not limited to APCO ANSI 2.106.1–2019, or their replacements. The telecommunications tower, pole or structure when fully loaded with antennas, transmitters, and other equipment and camouflaging shall be designed as determined by the Building Official. All equipment mounting racks and equipment used shall be anchored in such a manner that such a quake will not tip them over, throw the equipment off its shelves, or otherwise act to damage it.
- E. **All connections between various components of the facility, power lines, and conduit** shall be designed in a manner to protect against damage by a natural disaster, a vehicular accident, an act of vandalism or similar external forces.
- F. **Stealth.** The wireless facility shall be stealth. Stealth elements and techniques should be used to blend the facility with surrounding materials

and colors of the support structure and make the facility appear to be something other than a wireless facility. Stealth elements include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Radio frequency (RF) transparent screening or shrouds;
 2. Matching the color of the existing support structure by painting, coating, or otherwise coloring the wireless facility, equipment, mounting brackets, and cabling;
 3. Placing cables and wires inside the pole or beneath conduit of the smallest size possible;
 4. Minimizing the size of the site;
 5. Installing new infrastructure that matches existing infrastructure in the area surrounding the proposed site; and
 6. Using paint of durable quality.
 7. Built with weather-resistant materials while permitting weathered treatment for aesthetic reasons and to avoid reflective material.
- G. **Minimum Height.** All antennas shall be located such that: (1) any person walking adjacent to the transmitting surface of the antenna will be walking on a grade that is a minimum of eight and one-half feet below the transmitting surface; and (2) no person at ground level will be exposed to an exposure level that is higher than allowed by the FCC's general population exposure rules.
- H. **Facade-Mounted Equipment.** Facade-mounted antennas and equipment shall be architecturally integrated into the building, or other support structure, design and otherwise made as unobtrusive as possible so that the facility does not appear to be a wireless facility. Antennas and equipment should be located entirely within an existing or newly created architectural feature so as to be completely screened from view. Facade-mounted facilities shall generally not extend more than eighteen (18) inches out from and may not project above the building face. Façade-mounted wireless telecommunication facilities shall not exceed twenty-eight (28) feet in height above the ground. However, antenna elements, mounted flush on the facade of an existing structure that exceeds twenty-eight (28) feet, may have a height equal to the height of the building.
- I. **Ground-Mounted Equipment.** Outdoor ground-mounted equipment associated with base stations shall be avoided whenever feasible. In locations visible or accessible to the public, applicants shall conceal outdoor

ground-mounted equipment, including ancillary power generation equipment, with opaque fences or landscape features that mimic the adjacent structure(s) (including, but not limited to, dumpster corrals and other accessory structures) and by painting, texturing, or otherwise concealing the facility as much as possible. Ground-mounted wireless communications facilities shall be located near existing structures or trees at similar heights for screening purposes where feasible. Not more than one ground-mounted antenna, provided that licensed amateur radio station antennas consistent with MMC 17.46.020(B)(2), shall also be permitted on each site.

- J. **Roof-Mounted Facilities.** Roof-mounted antennas and necessary equipment shall be screened from above if visible from higher elevations. Rooftop-mounted wireless telecommunication facilities shall not exceed twenty-eight (28) feet in height or three (3) feet above the roof parapet from which they are attached, whichever is less restrictive. Associated roof-mounted equipment cabinets shall not extend more than three (3) feet above the roof from which it is attached and shall be set back a minimum of ten (10) feet from the edge of the roof. All roof-mounted equipment cabinets shall be located behind a mechanical screen wall. In the event that a roof parapet wall screens the equipment cabinets, a mechanical screen wall will not be required.
- K. **Freestanding Facilities.** Freestanding facilities requiring a new monopole or other new support structure shall be stealth facilities. Further, they shall be located as close as possible to existing above-ground utilities, such as electrical towers or utility poles (which are not scheduled for removal or under grounding for at least 18 months after the date of application), light poles, trees of comparable heights, and in areas where they will not detract from the appearance of the City.
 - 1. Freestanding wireless telecommunication facilities, including monopoles, shall not exceed twenty-eight (28) feet in height and shall not extend higher than the top of the ridgeline nearest the antenna. The height of a freestanding facility shall be measured from the natural undisturbed ground surface below the center of the base of the tower itself to the tip of the highest antenna or piece of equipment attached thereto.
 - 2. Aside from the antenna itself, no additional equipment may be visible. All cables, including, but not limited to, electrical and utility cables, shall be run within the interior of the freestanding facility and shall be camouflaged or hidden to the fullest extent feasible without jeopardizing the physical integrity of the facility.

3. Monopole installations shall be situated so as to utilize existing natural or man-made features including topography, vegetation, buildings, or other structures to provide the greatest amount of visual screening.
 4. All antenna components and accessory wireless equipment shall be treated with exterior coatings of a color and texture to match the predominant visual background or existing architectural elements so as to visually blend in with the surrounding development. Subdued colors and non-reflective materials that blend with surrounding materials and colors shall be used.
 5. Monopoles shall be no greater in diameter or other cross-sectional dimensions than is necessary for the proper functioning of the facility.
- L. All wireless telecommunication facilities shall be designed to prevent unauthorized climbing and graffiti.
- M. Fire Safety Standards. All wireless facilities designs shall include:
1. a power shut off, such as by means of rapid entry Knox or similar type systems shall be installed;
 2. surge protection devices capable of mitigating a direct or partial direct lightning discharge; and
 3. surge protection devices capable of mitigating significant electrical disturbances that may enter the facility via conductive cables.
- N. Satellite dish or parabolic antennas shall be situated as close to the ground as possible to reduce visual impact without compromising their function.
- O. Support equipment pads, cabinets, shelters and buildings require architectural, landscape, color, fencing, or other camouflage treatment to minimize visual impacts to the extent deemed necessary by the Planning Director. Landscaping screening should also be provided if irrigation water is available.
- P. No freestanding facility or ancillary support equipment may be located between the face of a building and a public street, bikeway, park or residence.

SECTION 7. Waivers of These Standards.

- A. A waiver of one or more of these Standards may be granted in the following circumstances:
1. Pursuant to MMC Section 17.46.060(D), if an applicant demonstrates to the Planning Commission through clear and convincing evidence that denial of an application would, within the meaning of federal law, prohibit or effectively prohibit the provision of personal wireless services, or otherwise violate applicable laws or regulations;
 2. If an applicant demonstrates to the Planning Commission through clear and convincing evidence set forth in a feasibility study that compliance with a requirement of these Standards would be technically infeasible and the proposed wireless facility complies with the requirements of these Standards to the greatest extent technically feasible. For example, an exception to a requirement to conceal antennas in a shroud may be granted if shrouding is shown to be technically infeasible and an alternative concealment such as a colored film wrap is proposed; or
 3. If an applicant demonstrates to the Planning Commission with clear and convincing evidence that the particular engineering, design or location proposed involves an alternative that better meets the purposes of Chapter 17.46 and only minor non-compliance with a requirement of these design Standards and results in no increase in public visual impact to the community or provides other benefits. For example, an exception to the wireless facility location limitations may be granted when the applicant can demonstrate that the placement is less visible from viewsheds of residences or shielded by vegetation or existing infrastructure (such as barriers), or is less physically intrusive (for example, less impactful to tree roots or reduces noise). Among other factors, in deciding whether or not to grant an exception, the Planning Commission may consider the impact of expansions to the facility that the applicant would be entitled to make as of right if granted.
- B. Waivers may only be requested at the time an application is initially submitted for a discretionary permit. The request must include both the specific provision(s) from which waiver is sought and the basis of the request, including all supporting evidence on which the applicant relies. Any request for waiver after the City has deemed an application complete constitutes a material change to the proposed wireless facility and shall be considered a new application. A request for waiver from one or more

requirements does not relieve the applicant from compliance with all other applicable provisions of law or of MMC Section 17.46.060.

SECTION 8. Standard Conditions of Approval for Permits Under MMC Chapter 17.46.

- A. **Generally.** In addition to any supplemental conditions imposed by the Planning Director or Planning Commission, as the case may be, all development permits or conditional use permits granted for wireless communications facilities subject to this Chapter 17.46 shall be subject to the following conditions, unless modified by the approving authority:
1. The permittee shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the city or any of its boards, commissions, agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the city, its boards, commission, agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul, the approval of the project, or to hold the City liable in whole or in part as a result of the engineering, design, construction or operation of the facility. The City shall promptly notify the provider(s) of any such claim, action or proceeding if the city bears its own attorney's fees and costs, and the city defends the action in good faith.
 2. The permittee shall be strictly liable for interference caused by its facilities with city communications systems. The permittee shall be responsible for costs for determining the source of the interference, all costs associated with eliminating the interference (including but not limited to filtering, installing cavities, installing directional antennas, powering down systems, and engineering analysis), and all costs arising from third party claims against the city attributable to the interference.
 3. Subsequent submittals for this project shall be in substantial compliance with the plans date-stamped received by the Planning Department on _____. The project shall comply with all conditions of approval stipulated in the referral sheets attached to the agenda report for this project. In the event the project plans conflict with any condition of approval, the condition shall take precedence and revised plans shall be submitted and approved by the Planning Director prior to the Environmental Sustainability Department for plan check.
 4. The permit and rights conferred in this approval shall not be effective until the permittee signs, notarizes and returns the Acceptance of Conditions Affidavit accepting the conditions set forth herein. The applicant shall file this form with the Planning Department within 30 days of this decision or prior to issuance of

any development, conditional use, building, electrical or encroachment permit.

5. The applicant shall digitally submit a complete set of plans, including the items required in Condition No. 6 to the Planning Department for consistency review and approval prior to plan check and again prior to the issuance of any building or development permits.
6. The Notice of Decision (including the signed and notarized Acceptance of Conditions Affidavit) shall be copied in its entirety and placed directly onto a separate plan sheet(s) to be included in the development plans prior to submitting any development permits from the City of Malibu Environmental Sustainability Department and encroachment permit.
7. A development permit or conditional use permit, as applicable, shall be valid for a period of ten (10) years from issuance, unless pursuant to another provision of the Code or these conditions, it expires sooner or is terminated. At the end of ten (10) years from the date of issuance, such development or conditional use permit shall automatically expire, unless an extension or renewal has been granted. A person holding a development permit or conditional use permit must either (1) remove the facility within thirty (30) days following the permit's expiration (provided that removal of support structure owned by City, a utility, or another entity authorized to maintain a support structure need not be removed, but must be restored to its prior condition, except as specifically permitted by the City); or (2) prior to expiration, submit an application to renew the permit, which application must, among all other requirements, demonstrate that the impact of the wireless facility cannot be reduced. The wireless facility must remain in place until it is acted upon by the City and all appeals from the City's decision exhausted.
8. The installation and construction authorized by a permit shall be completed within three (3) years after its approval, or it will expire without further action by the City unless prior to the three (3) years the applicant submit an extension request and the City, in its sole discretion, grants a time extension for due cause. The installation and construction authorized by a permit shall conclude, including any necessary post-installation repairs and/or restoration to the property, within thirty (30) days following the day construction commenced. The permittee must provide written notice to City within ten (10) days after completing construction, and may not begin operations until all City and Fire Department (if applicable) inspections have been completed and the project is found to be

consistent with the permit. The expiration date shall be suspended until an appeal and/or litigation regarding the subject permit is resolved.

9. The Planning Director may grant up to four one-year extensions of the timeline, in Condition 7 above, for completing the installation and construction authorized by a development or condition use permit, if the Planning Director finds that the conditions, including but not limited to changes in the wireless ordinance under which the permit approval was issued, have not significantly changed.
10. Any questions of intent or interpretation of any condition of approval will be resolved by the Planning Director upon written request of such interpretation.
11. All structures shall conform to the requirements of the Environmental Sustainability Department, City Public Works Department, FCC and Los Angeles County Fire Department requirements, as applicable. Notwithstanding this review, all required permits, including but not limited to an encroachment permit from the City, shall be secured.
12. Minor changes to the approved plans or the conditions of approval may be approved by the Planning Director, provided such changes achieve substantially the same results and the project is still in compliance with the MMC. An application with all required materials and fees shall be required.

Cultural Resources

13. In the event that potentially important cultural resources are found in the course of geologic testing, work shall immediately cease until a qualified archaeologist can provide an evaluation of the nature and significance of the resources and until the Planning Director can review this information. Where, as a result of this evaluation, the Planning Director determines that the project may have an adverse impact on cultural resources, a Phase II Evaluation of cultural resources shall be required pursuant to MMC Section 17.54.040(D)(4)(b).
14. If human bone is discovered, the procedures described in Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code shall be followed. These procedures require notification of the coroner. If the coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American, the applicant shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission by phone within 24 hours. Following notification of the Native

American Heritage Commission, the procedures described in Section 5097.94 and Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code shall be followed.

Wireless Facility Conditions

15. All antennas shall meet the minimum siting distances to public/uncontrolled areas required for compliance with the FCC regulations and standards governing the environmental effects of radio frequency emissions. Permittee shall keep up-to-date on current information from the FCC in regards to maximum permissible radio frequency exposure levels. In the event that the FCC changes its guidelines for human exposure to radio frequency, permittee shall, within 30 days after any such change, submit to the Planning Director a report prepared by a qualified engineer that demonstrates actual compliance with such changed guidelines. The Director may, at permittee's sole cost, retain an independent consultant to evaluate the compliance report and any potential modifications to the permit necessary to conform to the FCC's guidelines. Failure to submit the compliance report required under this condition, or failure to maintain compliance with the FCC's guidelines for human exposure to radio frequency at all times shall constitute grounds for permit revocation.
16. All antennas shall be located so that any person walking adjacent to the transmitting surface of the antenna will be walking on a grade, which is a minimum of eight and one-half feet below the transmitting surface.
17. All antennas, equipment, and support structures shall be engineered and designed to prevent unauthorized climbing.
18. The wireless facility shall be erected, operated, and maintained in compliance with the general requirements set forth in the Standards and any specific requirements in the permit.
19. The antenna and electrical support equipment shall, at all times, be operated in a manner that conforms to the applicable health and safety standards, including those imposed by MMC Chapter 17.46 and this Resolution.
20. Wireless communications facilities and equipment must comply with the City's noise ordinance in MMC 8.24, or any successor provisions, and prevent noise and sound from being plainly audible at a distance of fifty (50) feet from the facility or within ten (10) feet of any residence.

21. The Planning Director's approval is required if a generator is to be placed onsite for temporary or permanent use.
22. All non-ground-mounted equipment associated with the application shall be located no lower than eight feet above grade or ground level on the monopole or support structure.
23. The City or its designee may enter onto the facility area to inspect the facility upon 48 hours prior notice to the permittee. The permittee shall cooperate with all inspections and may be present for any inspection of its facility by the City. The City reserves the right to enter or direct its designee to enter the facility and support, repair, disable, or remove any elements of the facility in emergencies or when the facility threatens imminent harm to persons or property. The City shall make an effort to contact the permittee prior to disabling or removing any facility elements, but in any case, shall notify permittee within 24 hours of doing so.
24. Testing of any equipment shall take place on weekdays only, and only between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., except that testing is prohibited on holidays that fall on a weekday. In addition, testing is prohibited on weekend days.
25. Permittee shall obtain and maintain throughout the term of the permit commercial general liability insurance with a limit of five million dollars (\$5,000,000) per occurrence for bodily injury and property damage and six million dollars (\$6,000,000) general aggregate including premises operations, contractual liability, personal injury, and products completed operations. The relevant policy(ies) shall name the City, its elected/appointed officials, commission members, officers, representatives, agents, and employees as additional insureds. A true and correct copy of the policy of insurance shall constitute proof of insurance required by this Subsection. Permittee shall use its best efforts to provide thirty (30) days' prior notice to the City of to the cancellation or material modification of any applicable insurance policy. Failure to maintain insurance consistent with this Condition shall automatically void the permit, and the permittee shall immediately deenergize and remove the facility from operation. [The policy shall not have a pollution or other exclusion which excludes injuries or damages from EMF/RF exposures.](#)
26. Prior to issuance of a City permit or encroachment permit, the permittee shall file with the City, and shall maintain in good standing throughout the term of the approval, a performance bond or other surety or another form of security for the removal of the

facility in the event that the use is abandoned or the permit expires, or is revoked, or is otherwise terminated. The security shall be in the amount equal to the cost of physically removing the facility and all related facilities and equipment on the site, based on the higher of two contractor's quotes for removal that are provided by the permittee. The permittee shall reimburse the city for staff time associated with the processing and tracking of the bond, based on the hourly rate adopted by the City Council. Reimbursement shall be paid when the security is posted and during each administrative review.

27. Permittee shall not move, alter, temporarily relocate, change, or interfere with any existing structure, improvement, or property without the prior consent of the owner of that structure, improvement, or property. No structure, improvement, or property owned by the City shall be moved to accommodate a permitted activity or encroachment, unless the City determines that such movement will not adversely affect the City or any surrounding businesses or residents, and the Permittee pays all costs and expenses related to the relocation of the City's structure, improvement, or property. Prior to commencement of any work pursuant to any permit, the permittee shall provide the City with documentation establishing to the city's satisfaction that the permittee has the legal right to use or interfere with any other structure, improvement, or property to be affected by permittee's facilities.
28. No possessory interest is created by a Wireless Permit. However, to the extent that a possessory interest is deemed created by a governmental entity with taxation authority, permittee acknowledges that City has given to permittee notice pursuant to California Revenue and Taxation Code Section 107.6 that the use or occupancy of any public property pursuant to a development or conditional use permit may create a possessory interest which may be subject to the payment of property taxes levied upon such interest. Permittee shall be solely liable for, and shall pay and discharge prior to delinquency, any and all possessory interact taxes or other taxes, fees, and assessments levied against permittee's right to possession, occupancy, or use of any public property pursuant to any right of possession, occupancy, or use created by this development or conditional use permit.
29. If not already completed, permittee shall enter into the appropriate agreement with the City, as determined by the City, prior to

constructing, attaching, or operating a facility on municipal infrastructure. This permit is not a substitute for such agreement.

30. If a facility is not operated for a continuous period of three (3) months, the Wireless Permit and any other permit or approval therefor shall be deemed abandoned and terminated automatically, unless before the end of the three (3) month period (i) the Director has determined that the facility has resumed operations, or (ii) the City has received an application to transfer the permit to another service provider. No later than ninety (90) days from the date the facility is determined to have ceased operation, or the permittee has notified the Director of its intent to vacate the site, the permittee shall remove all equipment and improvements associated with the use and shall restore the site to its original condition to the satisfaction of the Director. The permittee shall provide written verification of the removal of the facilities within thirty (30) days of the date the removal is completed. If the facility is not removed within thirty (30) days after the permit has been discontinued pursuant to this subsection, the site shall be deemed to be a nuisance, and the City may cause the facility to be removed at permittee's expense or by calling any bond or other financial assurance to pay for removal. If there are two (2) or more users of a single facility or support structure, then this provision shall apply to the specific elements or parts thereof that were abandoned but will not be effective for the entirety thereof until all users cease use thereof.
31. In the event the City determines that it is necessary to take legal action to enforce any of these conditions, or to revoke a permit, and such legal action is taken, the permittee shall be required to pay any and all costs of such legal action, including reasonable attorney's fees, incurred by the City, even if the matter is not prosecuted to a final judgment or is amicably resolved, unless the City otherwise agrees, in its complete discretion, to waive said fees or any part thereof.
32. Interference with city communications systems and other governmental emergency systems is prohibited. Further, no permits issued pursuant to this chapter of the City Code establish any guarantee or warranty that Licensee's facility will be free from interference from city or third-party communication systems.

Construction

33. Installation hours shall be limited to Monday through Friday from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. and Saturdays from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. No installation activities shall be permitted on Sundays and City-

designated holidays. The restricted work hours described in this condition do not apply to emergency maintenance necessary to protect health or property. The City of Malibu may issue a Stop Work Order if permittee violates this condition. Construction activities shall be conducted in compliance with, and abide by, all applicable safety codes and permit conditions.

34. All sites must be designed and build to the standards of ANSI/APCO Public Safety Grade Site Hardening Requirements, also referred to as “APCO ANSI 2.106.1-2019”.

Site Specific Conditions

35. In the event that the electric service provider does not currently offer an alternative metering option, the permittee shall remove the above-grade electric meter when such option becomes available. Prior to removing the above-grade electric meter, the permittee shall apply for any encroachment and/or other ministerial permit(s) required to perform the removal. Upon removal, the permittee shall restore the affected area to its original condition that existed prior to installation of the equipment.
36. The permittee acknowledges that the City specifically includes conditions of approval related to (a) painting, coloring or finishing the equipment to match the monopole or support structure; (b) undergrounding all equipment to the extent possible; (c) installing equipment within shrouds, conduits and risers as concealment elements engineered and designed to integrate the wireless facility with the surrounding built and natural environment; and (d) specific structural, seismic, electrical, fire and operating/maintenance requirements. Any future modifications to the permittee’s wireless facility must maintain or improve all concealment elements and safety precautions.
37. Before the permittee submits any applications for construction, encroachment, excavation or other required permits in connection with this permit, the permittee must incorporate a true and correct copy of this permit, all conditions associated with this permit and any approved photo simulations into the project plans (collectively, the “Approved Plans”). The permittee must construct, install and operate the wireless facility in substantial compliance with the Approved Plans as determined by the Director or the Director’s designee. Any substantial or material alterations, modifications or other changes to the Approved Plans, whether requested by the permittee or required by other departments or public agencies with jurisdiction over the wireless facility, must be submitted in a written

request subject to the Director's prior review and approval, who may refer the request to the original approval authority if the Director finds that the requested alteration, modification or other change substantially deviates from the Approved Plans or implicates a significant or substantial land-use concern.

38. The permittee shall install and at all times maintain in good condition a "Network Operations Center Information" and "RF Caution" sign on the utility pole no less than three (3) feet below the antenna (measured from the top of the sign) and no less than nine (9) feet above the ground line (measured from the bottom of the sign). Signs required under this condition shall be installed so that a person can clearly see the sign as he or she approaches within three (3) feet of the antenna structure. If any person on or within the property is or may be exposed to emissions that exceed applicable FCC uncontrolled/general population limits at any time the sign shall expressly so state, and provide instructions on how persons can avoid any such exposure. The sign shall also include the name(s) of the facility owner(s), equipment owner(s) and operator(s)/carrier(s) of the antenna(s), property owner name, as well as emergency phone number(s) for all such parties. The sign shall not be lighted, unless applicable law, rule or regulation requires lighting. No signs or advertising devices other than required certification, warning, required seals or signage, other signage required by law, this Chapter, any City or applicable state code or the Los Angeles County Fire Department Chief or his or her designee shall be permitted. The sign shall be no larger than two (2) square feet.
39. The permittee shall ensure that all signage complies with FCC Office of Engineering and Technology Bulletin 65, CPUC General Order 95 or American National Standards Institute C95.2 for color, symbol, and content conventions. All such signage shall at all times provide a working local or toll-free telephone number to its network operations center, and such telephone number shall be able to reach a live person who can exert transmitter power-down control over this site as required by the FCC.
40. In the event that the FCC changes any of radio frequency signage requirements that are applicable to the project site approved herein or ANSI Z535.1, ANSI Z535.2, and ANSI C95.2 standards that are applicable to the project site approved herein are changed, the permittee, within 30 days of each such change, at its own cost and expense, shall replace the signage at the project site to comply with the current standards.

41. The permittee shall maintain the paint, color and finish of the facility in good condition at all times.
42. All improvements, including foundations, and appurtenant ground wires, shall be removed from the property and the site restored to its original pre-installation conditions within 90 days of cessation of operation or abandonment of the facility.
43. Build-Out Conditions.
 - a. Permittee shall not commence any excavation, construction, installation or other work on the project site until and unless it demonstrates to the City Public Works Department that the project complies with these Conditions along with all applicable laws, regulations, codes and other rules related to public health and safety, including without limitation all applicable provisions in California Public Utilities Commission General Order 95 and MMC Chapters 8.12, 8.24 and 15.08.
 - b. To the extent that a pole owner or any provision in the MMC or this resolution require greater or more restrictive standards than California Public Utilities Commission General Order 95, if applicable, those standards shall control.
44. Permittee shall at all times maintain compliance with all applicable federal, State and local laws, regulations, ordinances and other rules, including Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements.
45. The permittee shall cooperate with all inspections. The City and its designees reserve the right to support, repair, disable or remove any elements of the facility in emergencies or when the facility threatens imminent harm to persons or property.
46. Permittee shall at all times maintain accurate contact information for all parties responsible for the facility, which shall include a phone number, street mailing address and email address for at least one natural person. All such contact information for responsible parties shall be provided to the Planning Department at the time of permit issuance and within one business day of permittee's receipt of City staff's written request.
47. Permittee shall undertake all reasonable efforts to avoid undue adverse impacts to adjacent properties and/or uses that may arise

from the construction, operation, maintenance, modification and removal of the facility.

48. The site and the facility must be maintained in a neat and clean manner and in accordance with all approved plans and conditions of approval.
49. Permittee shall promptly remove any graffiti on the wireless facility at permittee's sole expense within 48 hours after notice.

Prior to Operation

50. The applicant shall request a final Planning Department inspection and final building inspection by the City of Malibu Environmental Sustainability Department immediately after the wireless facility has been installed and prior to the commencement of services.
51. Within thirty (30) calendar days following the installation of any wireless communications facilities, the applicant shall provide to the Planning Department with a field report prepared by a qualified engineer verifying that the unit has been inspected, tested, and is operating in compliance with FCC standards. Specifically, the on-site post-installation radiofrequency (RF) emissions testing must demonstrate actual compliance with the FCC OET Bulletin 65 RF emissions safety guidelines for general population/uncontrolled RF exposure in all sectors. For this testing, the transmitter shall be operating at maximum operating power, and the testing shall occur outwards to a distance where the RF emissions no longer exceed the uncontrolled/general population limit. Such report and documentation shall include the make and model (or other identifying information) of the unit tested, the date and time of the inspection, a certification that the unit is properly installed and working within applicable FCC limits, and a specific notation of the distance from the transmitter at which the emissions are equal to or less than the uncontrolled/general population limit.
52. The operation of the approved facility shall commence no later than one (1) month after the City completes its post-installation inspections of the facility, any issues with the facility are resolved, and the City receives the RF testing report required in the condition of approval above, or the development or conditional use permit will expire without further action by the City.

Fixed Conditions

53. Violation of any of the conditions of this approval shall be cause for revocation and termination of all rights thereunder.

Eligible Facilities Requests

All permits for an eligible facilities requests under MMC Chapter 17.46 shall be subject to the following conditions and all of the other conditions of approval placed on a Wireless Permit, unless modified by the approving authority:

54. Any permit granted in response to an application qualifying as an eligible facilities request shall be subject to the terms and conditions of the underlying permit.
55. The City's grant or grant by operation of law of an eligible facilities request permit constitutes a federally-mandated modification to the underlying permit or approval for the subject tower or base station. Notwithstanding any permit duration established in another permit condition, the City's grant or grant by operation of law of a eligible facilities request permit will not extend the permit term for the underlying permit or any other underlying regulatory approval, and its term shall be coterminous with the underlying permit or other regulatory approval for the subject tower or base station.
56. The City's grant or grant by operation of law of an eligible facilities request does not waive, and shall not be construed to waive, any standing by the City to challenge Section 6409(a) of the Spectrum Act, any FCC rules that interpret Section 6409(a) of the Spectrum Act, or any modification to Section 6409(a) of the Spectrum Act.

Small Cell Facilities

In addition to the other conditions of approval placed on a Wireless Permit, all permits for a small cell facility under MMC Chapter 17.46 shall be subject to the following additional condition, unless modified by the approving authority:

57. The City's grant of a permit for a small cell facility request does not waive, and shall not be construed to waive, any standing by the city to challenge any FCC orders or rules related to small cell facilities, or any modification to those FCC orders or rules.

SECTION 9. Basic Application Requirements for Permits Under MMC Chapter 17.46.

- A. Generally. In addition to providing all required fees, all wireless telecommunication facility carriers or providers shall provide the information required by a separate application form published, and updated

from time to time, by the City. If no such form is available, then the applicant must submit all documents, information, and any other materials necessary to allow the City to make required findings and ensure that the proposed facility will comply with applicable laws and not endanger the public health, safety, or welfare. Such information may include:

1. Contact information for:
 - a. Applicant and their representatives
 - b. Owner of proposed wireless communications facility
 - c. If different from facility owner, the identity of the person or entity responsible for operating the proposed wireless facility
 - d. The property owner or owner of the structure on which the proposed wireless facility would be installed
 - e. Names, addresses, telephone numbers, and email addresses of anyone acting on behalf of the applicant with regard to the application;
 - f. The name, address and phone number of all persons that prepared or assisted in preparing the application and any required reports;
 - g. The postal address, parcel number, or utility pole identifier of the property;
 - h. The location of the schools, playgrounds and parks within 500 feet of the project site;
 - i. Local contact person for emergencies
 - j. Assessor's Parcel Number
2. Purpose of new wireless communications facility or amendment
3. Type of Application (Select all that apply)
 - a. Eligible Facilities Request
 - b. Small Cell – Collocation
 - c. Small Cell – New Structure
 - d. Collocation (Non-Small Cell)
 - e. All Other Wireless Communications Facilities
 - f. Permit Renewal
 - g. Waiver
4. Letter of authorization signed by the property owner authorizing the applicant to submit and process the application, including executed copies of any leases, letters of agency, or proof of ownership, of private property involved in the project.
5. Authorizations, and Licenses
6. Provide previous approvals, if applicable, and Certificate of Completion. Site inspection fees may apply if a final inspection was never requested
7. Identify all other required permits and approvals for the subject facility.

8. Electrical and Structural Safety Information. The following engineering documents prepared under the responsible charge of and sealed by a California licensed Professional Engineer must be included in the application:
 - a. A short circuit and coordination study (“SCCS”) calculated pursuant to the IEEE 551-2006: Recommended Practice for Calculating AC Short-Circuit Currents in Industrial and Commercial Power Systems or the latest version of that standard. The study must demonstrate the protection devices will ensure the equipment enclosure will not be breached. The SCCS must include analysis of Voltage Transient Surges due to contact of conductors of different voltages;
 - b. A one-line diagram of the electrical system;
 - c. Voltage Drop & Load Flow Study;
 - d. Load Calculation;
 - e. Panel Directories;
 - f. A plot plan showing the location of the mounting structure including address, or structure designation, or GPS location on the front sheet;
 - g. A plot plan showing the location of the service disconnecting means; and
 - h. An elevation drawing of the equipment and the service disconnecting means.
 - ~~i. A demonstration there will be signage as required by the California Electric Code or the Los Angeles County Fire Department Chief or their designee~~
 - ~~j. A demonstration the service disconnecting means shall be mounted at an elevation determined by the Los Angeles County Fire Chief or their designee in conjunction with the electric utility;~~
 - ~~k. A demonstration there will be instructions for deenergizing the equipment by First Responders.~~
9. Structural Safety Information. The structural/civil engineering documents prepared under the responsible charge of and sealed as recommended by a California licensed professional civil engineer.
 - a. Photo simulations, from at least three different angles, showing the pole and streetscape before and after installation. In some cases, more than three different angles may be required;
 - b. The azimuth, size and center-line height location of all proposed and existing antenna(s) on the supporting structure;
 - c. The number, type and model of the antenna(s) that will be used with a copy of the specification sheet;

- d. The make, model, type and manufacturer of any tower involved and a design plan stating the tower's capacity to accommodate multiple users;
- e. Site and Construction Plans. Complete and accurate plans, drawn to scale, signed, and sealed by a California-licensed engineer, land surveyor, and/or architect, which include the following items.
 - (1) A site plan and elevation drawings for the facility as existing and as proposed with all height and width measurements explicitly stated.
 - (2) A site plan describing the proposed tower and antenna(s) and all related fixtures, structures, appurtenances and apparatus, including height above pre-existing grade, materials, color and lighting;
 - (3) A depiction, with height and width measurements explicitly stated, of all existing and proposed transmission equipment.
 - (4) A depiction of all existing and proposed utility runs and points of contact.
 - (5) A depiction of the leased or licensed area of the site with all rights-of-way and easements for access and utilities labeled in plan view.
- f. Detailed map with locations of the poles or other property on which equipment is to be located, including specific pole identification number, if applicable, and the areas it will service;
- g. Description as to why the desired location is superior to other similar locations, from a community perspective, including, but not limited to:
 - (1) Proximity to residential buildings and descriptions of efforts to prevent any blocking of views of impressive scenes; and
 - (2) Written documentation demonstrating a good faith effort to locate the proposed facility in the least intrusive location in accordance with the location requirements of this Resolution.;
- h. A description in writing and a visual rendering demonstrating effective screening of all ground-mounted or roof-mounted equipment of the facility from view.
- i. Color-coded carrier-generated RF Coverage (propagation) maps, at a scale no smaller than 1 inch (1") to a quarter (1/4) mile with all appropriate legends, showing the coverage for the highest and lowest frequencies to be used by the facility. Frequencies are to be stated numerically, not qualitatively.

- Provide a represented value in dB of each colors it specifically represents.
- j. If the project involves, modifies or will use an existing facility or structure, a description of the type of structure (e.g., guyed, self-supporting lattice or monopole), and a report on the physical condition of the facility certified by a professional engineer licensed in the state of California.
 - k. If the application is for a new tower, clear and convincing technical evidence by a carrier or wireless service provider justifying the total height of the proposed facility and the need for such to the exclusion of all reasonable alternatives. Evidence in the form of propagation studies must include all modeling data and assumptions used to produce the studies at the requested height and should take into consideration the ability to collocate other carriers in the future.
 - l. A siting analysis which identifies other feasible locations within or outside the City which could serve the area intended to be served by the facility, unless the applicant provides compelling technical reasons for providing fewer than the minimum.
 - m. An affirmation, under penalty of perjury, that the proposed installation will be FCC compliant, in that it will not cause members of the general public to be exposed to RF levels that exceed the emissions levels deemed safe by the FCC. A copy of the fully completed FCC form “A Local Government Official’s Guide to Transmitting Antenna RF Emission Safety: Rules, Procedures, and Practical Guidance: Appendix A” titled “Optional Checklist for Determination of Whether a Facility is Categorically Excluded” for each frequency band of RF emissions to be transmitted from the proposed facility upon the approval of the application. All planned radio frequency emissions on all frequency bands must be shown on the Appendix A form(s) attached to the application. All planned radio frequency emissions are to be entered on each Appendix A form only in wattage units of “effective radiated power.”
 - n. A statement detailing the frequency, modulation and class of service of radio or other transmitting equipment;
 - o. A copy of the FCC license applicable for the intended use of the proposed facilities;
 - p. A HazMat Business Plan for all new generators, and any storage and/or use of hazardous materials during the project, to include:

- i. A list of toxic substances that may develop during arcing or fire that may impede fire suppression efforts;
- ii. A list of hazards that may develop during arcing or fire that may impede fire suppression efforts;
- q. A demolition plan, if applicable.
- r. A written statement of the applicant's willingness to allow other carriers to co-locate on the proposed personal wireless service facility where technically and economically feasible and aesthetically desirable, subject to the qualification that colocation should not occur when public exposures from the resulting higher cumulative sources would exceed FCC limits.
- s. Such other information as the Director shall establish.
- t. A statement signed by a person with legal authority to bind the applicant attesting under penalty of perjury to the accuracy of the information provided in the application. If attester not an authorized employee of the applicant, then the attester must demonstrate that it is an authorized agent of the applicant, with lawful Power of Attorney from the applicant.

SECTION 10. Environmental Review

This Resolution is not a project within the meaning of Section 15378 of the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, because it has no potential for resulting in physical change in the environment, directly or indirectly. The Resolution does not authorize any specific development or installation on any specific piece of property within the City's boundaries. Moreover, when and if an application for installation is submitted, the City will at that time conduct preliminary review of the application in accordance with CEQA. Alternatively, even if the Resolution is a "project" within the meaning of State CEQA Guidelines section 15378, the Resolution is exempt from CEQA on multiple grounds. First, the Resolution is exempt CEQA because the City Council's adoption of the Resolution is covered by the general rule that CEQA applies only to projects which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment. (State CEQA Guidelines, § 15061(b)(3)). That is, approval of the Resolution will not result in the actual installation of any facilities in the City. In order to install a facility in accordance with this Resolution, the wireless provider would have to submit an application for installation of the wireless facility. At that time, the City will have specific and definite information regarding the facility to review in accordance with CEQA. And, in fact, the City will conduct preliminary review under CEQA at that time. Moreover, in the event that the Resolution is interpreted so as to permit installation of wireless communications facilities on a particular site, the installation would be exempt from CEQA review in accordance with either State CEQA Guidelines section 15302 (replacement or reconstruction), State CEQA Guidelines section 15303 (new construction or conversion of small structures), and/or State CEQA Guidelines section 15304 (minor alterations to land).

SECTION 11. This Resolution will become effective immediately upon adoption.

SECTION 12. The City Clerk shall certify to the passage and adoption of this resolution and enter it into the book of original resolutions.

PASSED, APPROVED, and ADOPTED this 12th day of April 2021.

MIKKE PIERSON, Mayor

ATTEST:

(seal)

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REVIEWED
BY THE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

JOHN COTTI, Interim City Attorney