

Oct. 18, 2020

Roy Ted Geller

Ref: Cell tower proposed on Nixon Property, Pine Mountain, Willits, Ca.

Dear Supervisor,

After reading the appellant Presentation, I feel I need to address some of the false and/or misleading information presented in their report. I certainly don't want to waste your time reviewing everything I believe to be misleading, but only the most important.

The first point is the need for this project. Based on the statement of Eryn Schon-Brunner, who lives within the boundaries of the C.C.&R's and currently runs a business within the said area, "THERE IS CLEARLY NO NEED FOR THIS TOWER". I drove to their mailbox and checked the availability of a good cell signal. My phone listed "no service". They clearly have installed special antenna's and or boosters and possibly satellite systems in order to get the services they claim to have. Additionally, they say there is no need because "soon there will be Starlite Satellite Service that will provide additional INTERNET to rural areas." I researched Starlite Satellite Service, and they have started launching satellites serving the northern United States and Canada. They currently have over 500 out of the planned 42,000 they plan to eventually install someday! I don't have the possibly decades it will take to get this service completed.

I personally went door to door to talk with the residents along Ridgewood Drive and Chinquapin Road. I wasn't able to contact everyone before the Covid 19 restrictions were put in place. Of those I personally spoke with, over 80% agreed with the need as they did not have adequate nor reliable cell and/or internet service and certainly not at an affordable price. THERE IS NO OTHER SERVICE THAT HAS ALL THE FEATURES OF THE CELL PHONE! Not even the satellite phone that one of the residents against the tower has resorted to using. Land lines can take weeks to repair.

Another point they made is existing service vs. AT&T Gap. I am sure the applicant will address this, but I would just like to point out that everyone living in the area knows we do not get the same services as provided to most of the nation. The CAFII grants purpose is to provide services similar to those received by most of the country at prices similar to what they pay. The appellant specifically points out that only 41 buildings could purchase in-house coverage. This system uses very low power that requires an antenna to be mounted on the outside of the homes which then provides in home service. This tower will provide cellular and internet as needed for the entire subdivision. This system puts out just over one one-thousands of the limit of emissions allowed. This is the most efficient and least costly system available today. There are approximately 130 lots within the Pine Mountain Estates. I would guess maybe 100 hundred more in the surrounding areas. This could easily equate to the 450 people referenced.

Yes, we have earthquakes. Metal structures are the safest structure to withstand an earthquake.

As far as "Valley Oaks Park" intentionally being used to mislead the Planning Department and public is NOTHING MORE THAN A RED HERRING. The application clearly shows maps and addresses showing exactly where the tower will be located.

This site is the best available location that would serve the intended area. In order to be effective, the towers must be close to the area intended to be served.

This is not located in the most densely populated area, it is located in a horse pasture. I don't know of anyone else owning 65 adjoining acres anywhere within the area. The tower won't be 50 feet above the other trees on the horizon as claimed. The tower is separated from the appellant by a ridge. The tower is located on the opposite side possibly 100 feet below the ridgetop. There are several pine and fir trees along the ridge, some being over 100 feet tall. I don't believe the top of the tower will be more than 10 feet above those trees when observed from someone standing outside the appellant's home.

The only buried phone lines I am aware of are the copper wires buried at least sixty years ago connecting the Willits Phone center with the towns to the south of us. There were no fiber optics cables laid in Ridgewood Road as claimed.

Bottom line is, the property in question, is not subject to the C.C.&R's referred to. Even if it were, utilities are not meant to be included in the businesses restricted in the C.C.&R.s. The C.C.&R.'s specifically lists right of ways or easements for utilities including phone, electricity, we even have a natural gas line.

Next point is shared roads. The road in question lies entirely on Nixon's property. The property ownership is not shared. The appellant and a couple other lots were given a right-of-way or easement. Whom ever else uses the road is up to the owners of the property. The C.C.&R.'s do not prohibit the utility companies from installing and maintaining the equipment necessary to provide the services to the residents.

It must be pointed out that a very high percentage of those opposed to this project do not live within the area served by the cell tower. Many are from other areas or cities such as Fort Bragg, Ukiah, Redwood Valley, Little lake Valley, and Brooktrails. Many living out of the area intentionally left off their place or residence or simply listed as residents of Mendocino County. Their comments should not be weighed equally with those that live within the service area.

It is easy to oppose anything if you don't have to offer a solution. We all know any suitable location suggested would be opposed by most of the same people opposing this project. If anyone opposed to the tower has a viable solution, that could be implemented for sure within a year, I would be happy to listen with an open mind. If this turns out not to be the best option in the future, it can be removed, with no lasting bad effects on the environment. We need solutions not more delays.

Procedural errors in Process as claimed. Any good lawyer or judge knows a juror or judge should never announce or even decide how they are to vote until all the evidence has been heard. Commissioner Holtkamp specifically announced to all, she would vote against the tower without hearing all the evidence. As for as the process pushing the legal deadline, those opposed to the tower kept pushing to get the decision delayed. And lastly, even if Commissioner Holtkamp voted, they did not have the four votes needed to stop the tower.

Thank you

Roy "Ted" and Carolyn Geller

Residents of Pine Mountain since the 1960's