1. ROLL CALL

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. PRESENTATIONS AND ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

This time is set aside for members of the general public to address the Planning Commission on any item not on the Agenda, which is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Planning Commission. No action or discussion shall be taken on any item presented except that any Commissioner may respond to statements made or questions asked, or may ask questions for clarification. All matters of an administrative nature will be referred to staff. All matters relating to Planning Commission will be noted in the minutes and may be scheduled for discussion at a future meeting or referred to staff for clarification and report. Any Commissioner may place matters brought up under Oral Communications on a future agenda. ALL SPEAKERS ARE ASKED TO FILL OUT A CARD & LEAVE IT AT THE PODIUM, ANNOUNCE THEIR NAME AND ADDRESS IN ORDER TO OBTAIN AN ACCURATE RECORD FOR THE MINUTES.

A. PRESENTATION ON SENATE BILL 743 UPDATE

Attachments: Presentation Slides (for advanced review)

4. CONSENT AGENDA

All items appearing on the Consent Agenda are recommended actions which are considered to be routine and will be acted upon as one consensus motion. Any items removed will be considered immediately after the consensus motion. The Chair will allow public input prior to the approval of the Consent Agenda.

A. MOTION APPROVING MINUTES OF JANUARY 14 AND FEBRUARY 4, 2020 REGULAR MEETINGS

Attachments: January 14, 2020 Minutes
February 4, 2020 Minutes

5. NEW BUSINESS

A. NOMINATIONS AND ELECTION OF PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIRPERSON

1) Nomination Period

2) Public Input

3) Motion Electing Chairperson (roll call vote)
B. NOMINATIONS AND ELECTION OF PLANNING COMMISSION VICE-CHAIRPERSON

1) Nomination Period

2) Public Input

3) Motion Electing Vice-Chairperson (roll call vote)

6. PUBLIC HEARING

A. AN APPLICATION FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT WITH ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW (PP2019-301) TO ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY AT AN EXISTING MINI WAREHOUSE STORAGE FACILITY (EXTRA SPACE STORAGE) LOCATED AT 1478 FREEDOM BOULEVARD (APN: 019-226-13), FILED BY NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC DBA AT&T WIRELESS, APPLICANT, ON BEHALF OF EXTRA SPACE STORAGE 121, PROPERTY OWNER

Attachments:

1478 Freedom Boulevard - Report
Attachment 1 - Site and Vicinity Map
Attachment 2 - Plan Set
Attachment 3 - Alternative Sites Analysis
Attachment 4 - Visual Simulations
Attachment 5 - Proposed Materials
Attachment 6 - CCL03320 Coverage Propogation Map
Attachment 7 - Independent Analysis
Attachment 8 - Radio Frequency Emissions Compliance Report
1478 Freedom Boulevard - Resolution

1) Staff Report

2) Planning Commission Clarifying & Technical Questions

3) Applicant Presentation
4) Planning Commission Clarifying & Technical Questions

5) Public Hearing

6) Appropriate Motion(s)

7) Deliberation

8) Chair Calls for a Vote on Motion(s)

7. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

8. ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, April 7, 2020 at 6:00 p.m., in the City Council Chambers, 275 Main Street, 4th Floor (6th level parking), Watsonville, California.
LOS → VMT
Are we there yet?

Senate Bill 743 Update
Planning Commission | Justin Meek, AICP | March 3, 2020
• SB 743
• What is LOS
• What is VMT
• Needed technical analysis
• Next up: establish significance thresholds
Are we there yet? Are we there yet?
Are we there yet? Are we there yet?
Are we there yet?
Changes CEQA

“Automobile delay, as described solely by level of service or similar measures... shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment...” (PRC § 21099 [b] [2])

New primary metric will be VMT – aligns with climate goals
Enacted in 2013
State guidelines/rule-making process 2014-2018
OPR adopted rules in 2018
Effective July 1, 2020
SB 743

- Brainchild of Senator **Darrell Steinberg** (D-Sacramento)
- Also crafted **SB 375** in 2008
  - Coordinate regional housing needs and transportation planning in an effort to curb GHG emissions
  - Aim: encouraging infill and alternative transportation
• Truism:
  • the more residents a downtown accommodates,
  • the less driving there is in the aggregate

• Example: Santa Barbara
  • Encouraging development – commercial and residential – in its downtown core
  • A development’s traffic impact is less
  • Developments in the core will generate ½ the traffic of developments in outlying areas of the city
Objective: promote infill and reduce GHG

Change from maintaining LOS to reducing VMT
- Base impacts on how much vehicle travel a project generates, not changes to existing traffic conditions
The legislation includes the following language:

- “Upon certification of the guidelines by the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency pursuant to this section, automobile delay, as described solely by level of service or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment...” (PRC § 21099[b][2], emphasis added)

- The Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) was required to develop new CEQA guidelines establishing criteria...
  - “for determining the significance of transportation impacts” that use vehicle miles traveled (VMT), or a similar metric, instead of measures of congestion or delay, such as level of service (LOS)
SB 743

Purpose

- Promote infill
- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions
- Support multimodal transportation networks
- Encourage diversity of land uses
• Removes focus on traffic at intersections and roadways
• New focus on how new development may influence overall auto use
• Focus on reducing GHG emissions
• Promote multi-modal transportation
• Ensure land use diversity within transit priority areas
“Determining the Significance of Transportation Impacts”
- CCR § 15064.3
- Implements PRC § 21099

Focuses on VMT and includes the statement that, except for roadway capacity projects, “a project’s effect on automobile delay shall not constitute a significant impact.”
Applicability. The provisions of this section shall apply prospectively as described in section 15007. A lead agency may elect to be governed by the provisions of this section immediately. **Beginning on July 1, 2020, the provisions of this section shall apply statewide.**
CEQA documents can no longer base a significance determination on an automobile delay-based analysis, such as LOS.

These documents are not precluded from including a LOS analysis for disclosure purposes, such as General Plan Circulation Element or Congestion Management Plan consistency, but the analysis cannot be used as a basis for determining a significant environmental impact.

All EIRs and negative declarations circulated for public review after July 1, 2020, are required to consider VMT when determining whether a project may cause a significant impact.
SB 743

recap/takeaways

• Prohibits automobile delay as a significant impact
• Must evaluate transportation impacts using VMT
• Will go into effect July 1, 2020
What is Level of Service?
What is LOS?

• “Level of service,” or LOS, is a measure of delay or congestion

• Application?
  • Former rules treat auto delay and congestion (i.e., a project’s contribution to a roadway’s LOS) as an environmental impact
What is LOS?

- The LOS approach, born of 1950s-era management approaches, set up the paradoxical situation in which high-density development was often pushed away from city centers – where multiple transportation options are available – and out to urban fringes, where intersections are less congested even if they end up generating more and longer car trips.

- "Over-reliance on level of service as the only indicator of success in our transportation systems is one of the biggest obstacles to infill development," said Jeffery Tumlin, principal and director of strategy at Nelson-Nygaard.
Focus: driver convenience
Volume-to-capacity analysis
Qualitative scoring

A to F letter grades
- “84 seconds of delay” = “LOS F”
- Implies failure

Table 1. LOS for Urban Streets, Adapted from the Highway Capacity Manual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Control Delay (s/veh)</th>
<th>Travel Speed at % Free-Flow Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>≤ 10</td>
<td>&gt; 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>&gt; 10 and ≤ 20</td>
<td>&gt; 67 and ≤ 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>&gt; 20 and ≤ 35</td>
<td>&gt; 50 and ≤ 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>&gt; 35 and ≤ 55</td>
<td>&gt; 40 and ≤ 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>&gt; 55 and ≤ 80</td>
<td>&gt; 30 and ≤ 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt; 80</td>
<td>&lt; 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is it?
- Measure of traffic flow (or delay)
- Assigns qualitative levels of traffic based on performance measures such as vehicle speed, congestion, etc.

When did it start?
- Post World War II
- Context: suburban development and higher auto ownership

Why is it important?
- Used for evaluating traffic impacts
- Obstacle to infill
SPEEDING THE TRANSITION FROM LOS TO VMT
LOS
paradigm shift underway

Changing the Paradigm of Traffic Impact Studies:

How Typical Traffic Studies Inhibit Sustainable Transportation

By Michelle DeRobertis, M.S., P.E., John Eells, MCP, Joseph Kott, Ph.D., AICP, PTP, and Richard W. Lee, Ph.D., AICP

The practice of focusing on automobile level of service (LOS) and traffic flow as part of environmental clearance has, ironically, actually inhibited sustainable transportation, that is, transit, bicycling, and walking. This paper describes the problems with current practices and suggests how transportation studies should be used to improve mobility and livability for all.
Changing values and the performance measures that reflect them
Cities that have adopted VMT-focused transportation analysis policies
- Emeryville (2009 – prior to SB 743)
- Pasadena (2014)
- San Francisco (2016)
- Oakland (2016)
- San Jose (February 2018)
- Los Angeles (2019)

Caltrans working on new guidance for development projects affecting the State Highway System
Memorandum

To: TRANSPORTATION STAKEHOLDERS

From: ELLEN GREENBERG
Deputy Director, Sustainability

CHRIS SCHMIDT
SB 743 Program Manager

Date: February 12, 2020

Subject: Caltrans Implementation of SB 743 – Use of Vehicle Miles Traveled in CEQA

- TAC will provide methodologies for CEQA practitioners
- Draft document: March 2020
- Target publication date: May 2020
Why VMT?

- SB 743 requires the CEQA Guidelines to proscribe an analysis that better accounts for transit and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

- OPR selected **vehicle miles traveled (VMT)** as a replacement measure not only because it satisfies the explicit goals SB 743, but also because VMT is already used in...
  - CEQA to **study greenhouse gas and energy impacts**
  - Planning for **regional sustainable communities strategies**
Because SB 743 preserves local government authority to make planning decisions, LOS and congestion can still be measured for planning purposes. In fact, many general plans contain LOS requirements.

While traffic studies may be required for planning approvals, those studies will not be required to be part of the CEQA process. This would be similar to how some local governments require landscaping plans and site elevations as part of project approval, but not necessarily for the environmental document prepared under CEQA.
Options & other considerations

What benefits come from removing level of service and congestion from CEQA?

• Removing level of service and congestion from CEQA is beneficial for several reasons.

1. It preserves local choice in planning circulation systems (i.e., it does not mandate that local roads have any certain capacity).

2. It gives local governments the ability to make policy trade-offs in dealing with congestion (i.e., balancing free-flow with the cost of building and maintaining roadways and using other modes of travel).

3. Mitigation for congestion impacts (which often entails larger roadway infrastructure) can be quite costly, and cause other adverse environmental impacts.
Using VMT should reduce litigation burdens in several ways.

1. Congestion impacts are frequently litigated in CEQA cases today. Under this approach, however, such effects would not be part of CEQA litigation.

2. This approach presumes that projects located near transit would normally not have a significant impact. In most cases, no study or mitigation would be required for such projects, meaning that there would be fewer issues to litigate in a lawsuit.

3. Even for projects that are not located near transit, the proposal establishes wide discretion for lead agencies in selecting models to estimate VMT, and to apply professional judgment in adjusting model assumptions and outputs to reflect project conditions.

• All of these features should make infill projects more defensible in litigation than they are today.
Options & other considerations

What are the implications for mitigation for enhanced mobility?

- A switch to VMT means that impacts need not be mitigated only by improving vehicular flow.
- Other modes are eligible now – including transit, cycling, pedestrian improvements, etc.
Options & other considerations

What if local general plans call for more roadway capacity?

- SB 743 preserves local government authority to plan the circulation system that is right for their community.
- Local governments may continue to require new projects to contribute to transportation enhancements in connection with project approvals.
- To the extent that local governments adopt policies that have environmental impacts, those impacts would need to be studied. Once addressed in an environmental impact report for a general plan, such impacts would not normally need to be reevaluated for later projects. (PRC § 21083.3.)
Options & other considerations

Local practice?

- SB 743 does not preclude local agencies from applying LOS in policies, codes, conditions, etc.
Options & other considerations

- Local practice?

- New focus may include:
  - Manage congestion
  - Manage traffic volumes
  - Manage how signals operation

- Not adding capacity to mitigate LOS impacts
Now what?

What Are We Doing?
SB 743
Implementation
work plan

- Countywide collaboration
- Convene working group
- Share resources/costs
- Develop countywide VMT tool for land use projects
- Model is trip-based (not activity-based or tour-based)
SB 743 Implementation currently underway

- Baseline VMT modeling
- VMT evaluation tool for land use projects
SB 743 Implementation currently underway

- VMT calculator
- Estimate protect-specific daily...
  - Household VMT per capita
  - Work VMT per employee
preliminary results
SB 743 Implementation

OPR recommended thresholds

- **Residential**: > 15% of existing VMT per capita
- **Office**: > 15% of existing VMT per employee
- **Retail**: Net increase in total existing VMT for region
- **Transportation**: Net increase to VMT “budget” to comply with GHG targets
Exemptions

Screening thresholds
- Identify when a project should be expected to cause a less-than-significant impact without conducting a detailed study. (CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15063(c)(3)(C), 15128, and Appendix G)
- May be based on project size, maps, transit availability, and provision of affordable housing
Exemptions

OPR presumption of less-than-significant impact

- Map-based screening
  - Residential & office project located in areas of low VMT
- Small projects screening
  - < 110 trips per day
  - Local retail < 50K sq ft
- Affordable housing to infill locations
- Within ½ mile of a Major Transit Stop*

*Red flags:
  - Excessive parking
  - Inconsistency with SCS
  - Replaces affordable housing
  - FAR of < 0.75
Mitigation

How to reduce VMT?

- Travel Demand Management (TDM) strategies
- Applied to reduce vehicle trips and VMT estimates
- Typical categories from which users can select strategies include:
  1. **Parking**: Reducing, unbundling, permitting, pricing parking.
  2. **Transit**: Transit subsidies, reduced headways, neighborhood shuttles.
  3. **Education & Encouragement**: Travel behavior change program, promotions/marketing.
  4. **Commute Trip Reductions**: Required commute trip reduction program, vanpool, rideshare.
  5. **Shared Mobility**: Car-share, bike share, school carpool program.
  6. **Bicycle Infrastructure**: On-street bike facilities, bike parking, bike facilities, showers.
  7. **Neighborhood Enhancement**: Traffic calming, pedestrian network improvements
TDM Mitigations

- Transit Tickets
- Trolley Subsidy
- Bike Racks and lockers
- Showers
- Bike share facility (for residents or employers)
- No parking provision
- Unbundling of parking – where applicable

- Shared parking and parking cash-out programs
- Guaranteed ride home
- Flexible schedule
- Company HR policies
- Carpool parking
- Preferential parking
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Demand Management Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike Share Program</td>
<td>Bicycle share programs provide convenient rental bicycles to users. This allows urban residents and visitors to bicycle without needing to purchase, store and maintain a bike.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Lockers/Racks</td>
<td>Provide safe storage for employees to park bicycles for commuting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showers/Changing Room Facilities</td>
<td>Provide showers and changing rooms for those walking/bicycling to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Repair Station</td>
<td>Provide a bicycle repair station on-site to encourage bicycling. This would include bicycle maintenance tools and supplies that are readily available for users of the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Fleet</td>
<td>Project will provide its own fleet of bicycles that can be rented out to users. The number of bicycles would be equivalent to the required number of Class II bicycle spaces, or at a minimum of five (5) bikes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Delivery Services Facility</td>
<td>The project would have a delivery services facility to store food deliveries at work. This would reduce the number of vehicle trips needed to run errands before, during, or after work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Laundry, Dry-Cleaning, and Banking Services</td>
<td>The project would have on-site laundry services, dry cleaning services, and banking services. This would reduce the number of vehicle trips needed to run errands before, during, or after work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare Services</td>
<td>The project can provide on-site childcare services. This would reduce the vehicle trip distance to a childcare facility and then to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Share Membership</td>
<td>Provide an on-site car share vehicle for employees to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed Ride Home Program (GRH)</td>
<td>Provides an occasional subsidized ride to commuters who use alternative modes and eliminates a common constraint to the use of alternative modes. Guaranteed ride home for people if they need to go home in the middle of the day due to an emergency or stay late and need a ride at a time when transit service is not available. GRH programs may use taxies, company vehicles or rental cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidized transit tickets for employees and Shuttle service from transit station to work site</td>
<td>Pay for employees to use transit. This could either be a discounted ticket or a fully-reimbursed transit ticket (e.g. Caltrain Go Pass Program or Caltrain Monthly Pass paid by Company). Provide a shuttle from the project site to nearby transit stations or park and ride lots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanpool Program</td>
<td>Organize a vanpool for employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressed Workweek Program</td>
<td>Employees work a different work week schedule (e.g. four 10-hour days, four 9-hour days and take every other Friday off).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Hours Workweek Program</td>
<td>Employees work non-standard hours (e.g. 10 AM to 6 PM).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommuting</td>
<td>Employees work from home on certain days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe and well-lit and accessible routes to nearby transit or shuttle stops</td>
<td>Enhance the route for employees walking or bicycling to nearby transit (typically off-site).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferential Carpool Parking</td>
<td>Reserved carpool spaces closer to the building entrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferential Vanpool Parking</td>
<td>Reserved vanpool spaces closer to the building entrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated Parking Spaces for</td>
<td>Reserved car share spaces closer to the building entrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Share Vehicles</td>
<td>Provide easy access for carpools or vanpools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbundle Parking</td>
<td>Parking spaces shall be leased or sold separately as part of a residential development. By not automatically providing parking to all tenants, residents have the option to pay for parking. This may result in fewer vehicles on-site and would reduce the number of vehicle trips generated by the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term Daily Parking</td>
<td>The project would only provide hourly parking for a maximum of one day. The project would not provide parking passes for weekly, monthly, or yearly durations. This would result in higher turnover of parking spaces and may discourage users from parking at the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Cash Out</td>
<td>The project would pay users to not utilize their parking spaces. This would incentivize users to find alternative modes of transportation to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Maximums</td>
<td>The project would have a set parking maximum supply, instead of minimum parking required. The reduction in parking supply would result in users finding alternative means of getting to and from the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute Assistance Center</td>
<td>Provide a computer kiosk that allows employees to research other modes of transportation for commuting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY OF SAN JOSE VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED EVALUATION TOOL

Project Information

Project Name: [Enter project name here]
Location: [Enter project address here]

Assessor’s Parcel Number: [Enter number here]
Planned Growth Area: [Enter number here]

Proposed Parking: Vehicle Bike

Land Use Type

RESIDENTIAL
- Single Family: DU
- Multifamily: DU

Percent of All Units:
- Extremely Low Income (<30% MFI): 5% Affordable
- Very Low Income (30% MFI <50% MFI): 5% Affordable
- Low Income (50% MFI <80% MFI): 5% Affordable

OFFICE
- KSF

RETAIL
- KSF

INDUSTRIAL
- KSF

VMT Reduction Strategies

Select each section to show individual strategies

Tier 1: PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS
- Increase Residential Density
- Increase Employment Density
- Increase Development Diversity
- Integrate Affordable and Below Market Rate

Tier 2: MULTIMODAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Tier 3: PARKING

Tier 4: TDM PROGRAMS

Analysis Results

RESIDENTIAL ONLY

EMPLOYMENT ONLY
Regional effort underway
- Boundary condition analysis tool (estimate VMT outside the County)
- VMT data development & analysis (enable screening maps)
- VMT estimation tool

Next steps
- VMT significance thresholds
  - For residential, retail and office development projects
- Mitigation strategies
  - Project level, programmatic and transaction exchanges
  - Legal and administrative framework
- Update CIP program and fees
- California State Legislature | Senate Bill 743 (Steinberg, 2013)
  https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201320140SB743

- OPR | Transportation Impacts | SB 743 website
  http://opr.ca.gov/ceqa/updates/sb-743/

- OPR | Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts
  http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20190122-743_Technical_Advisory.pdf

- Caltrans | SB 743 Implementation
  https://dot.ca.gov/programs/transportation-planning/office-of-smart-mobility-climate-change/sb-743

- Fehr & Peers | California SB 743
  https://www.fehrandpeers.com/sb743/
Questions

Contact:
Justin Meek, AICP, MURP
justin.meek@cityofwatsonville.org
831.768.3050
MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE

COUNCIL CHAMBERS
275 MAIN STREET, 4th FLOOR, WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA

January 14, 2020 6:02 PM

In accordance with City policy, all Planning Commission meetings are recorded on audio and video in their entirety, and are available for review in the Community Development Department (CDD). These minutes are a brief summary of action taken.

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Jenni Veitch-Olson, Vice-Chair Matthew H. Jones, and Commissioners Ed Acosta, Anna Kammer, Jenna Rodriguez, Jenny T. Sarmiento, and Phillip F. Tavarez were present.

Staff members present were City Attorney Alan Smith, Community Development Director Suzi Merriam, Principal Planner Justin Meek, Assistant Planner Sarah Wikle, Assistant Police Chief Thomas Sims, Recording Secretary Deborah Muniz, Administrative Assistant II Maria Elena Ortiz, and City Interpreter Carlos Landaverry.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Veitch-Olson led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. PRESENTATIONS & ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Commissioner Kammer asked if staff could give an update at a future meeting for the Downtown Complete Streets Plan and Vision Zero.

Chair Veitch-Olson encouraged the public to vote during the Presidential Primary Election on March 3, 2020.

4. CONSENT AGENDA

A. MOTION APPROVING MINUTES FOR DECEMBER 3, 2019 MEETING

MOTION: It was moved by Commissioner Kammer, seconded by Commissioner Sarmiento, and carried by the following vote to approve the Consent Agenda:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AYES: COMMISSIONERS:</th>
<th>Acosta, Kammer, Rodriguez, Sarmiento, Tavarez, Jones, Veitch-Olson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOES: COMMISSIONERS:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **PUBLIC HEARING**

A. **AN APPLICATION FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT WITH ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW (PP2019-346) TO ALLOW THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN OFF-SALE BEER AND WINE LICENSE UNDER NEW OWNERSHIP FOR AN EXISTING GAS STATION WITH A 1,061 SQUARE-FOOT CONVENIENCE STORE (32 ENTERPRISES INC) LOCATED AT 1180 MAIN STREET**

1) **Staff Report**

Staff Report was given by Assistant Planner Sarah Wikle.

2) **Planning Commission Clarifying & Technical Questions**

None

3) **Applicant Presentation**

Rahil Hussain, 32 Enterprises Inc. president, expressed gratitude for being able to work in the City of Watsonville.

4) **Planning Commission Clarifying & Technical Questions**

Addressing Commissioner Sarmiento’s questions, Mr. Hussain stated that he has met with the previous business owner and gone over the requirements set forth by the City.

In answering Commissioner Tavarez’ inquiry, Mr. Hussain spoke about his experience through the City's alcohol application process.

Commissioner Kammer commended the applicant for his business model and efforts to keep the neighborhood safe.

In answering Commissioner Kammer's inquiry, Assistant Police Chief Sims gave an overview of the crime statistics for the area.

Addressing Vice-Chair Jones’ question, Mr. Hussain stated that he owns other businesses in the City and spends three days out of the week in Watsonville.

5) **Public Hearing**

Chair Veitch-Olson opened the public hearing.

Hearing no comment, Chair Veitch-Olson closed the public hearing.
6) Appropriate Motion(s)

**MAIN MOTION:** It was moved by Commissioner Kammer, seconded by Chair Veitch-Olson to accept the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION NO. 1-20 (PC):**
RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING A SPECIAL USE PERMIT WITH ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW (PP2019-346) TO ALLOW THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN OFF-SALE BEER AND WINE LICENSE UNDER NEW OWNERSHIP FOR AN EXISTING GAS STATION WITH A 1,061 SQUARE-FOOT CONVENIENCE STORE (32 ENTERPRISES INC.) LOCATED AT 1180 MAIN STREET, WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA (APN: 016-172-19)

7) Deliberation

Chair Veitch-Olson expressed her support for the item as she sees that the applicant has met all of the requirements set forth by the City.

8) Chair Calls for a Vote on Motion(s)

**MAIN MOTION:** The above motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: Acosta, Kammer, Rodriguez, Sarmiento, Tavarez, Jones, Veitch-Olson

NOES: COMMISSIONERS: None

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: None

B. AN APPLICATION FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT WITH ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW (PP2019-347) TO ALLOW THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN OFF-SALE BEER AND WINE LICENSE UNDER NEW OWNERSHIP FOR AN EXISTING GAS STATION WITH A 1,040 SQUARE-FOOT CONVENIENCE STORE (32 ENTERPRISES INC.) LOCATED AT 1597 FREEDOM BOULEVARD

1) Staff Report

Staff Report was given by Assistant Planner Sarah Wikle.

2) Planning Commission Clarifying & Technical Questions

None

3) Applicant Presentation

None
4) Planning Commission Clarifying & Technical Questions

None

5) Public Hearing

Chair Veitch-Olson opened the public hearing.

Hearing no further comment, Chair Veitch-Olson closed the public hearing.

6) Appropriate Motion(s)

MAIN MOTION: It was moved by Vice-Chair Jones, seconded by Commissioner Rodriguez to approve the following resolution:

RESOLUTION NO. 2-20 (PC):
RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING A SPECIAL USE PERMIT WITH ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW (PP2019-347) TO ALLOW THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN OFF-SALE BEER AND WINE LICENSE UNDER NEW OWNERSHIP FOR AN EXISTING GAS STATION WITH A 1,040 SQUARE-FOOT CONVENIENCE STORE (32 ENTERPRISES INC.) LOCATED AT 1597 FREEDOM BOULEVARD, WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA (APN: 016-501-18)

7) Deliberation

None

8) Chair Calls for a Vote on Motion(s)

MAIN MOTION: The above motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: Acosta, Kammer, Rodriguez, Sarmiento, Tavarez, Jones, Veitch-Olson
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: None

C. RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL ON AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 14-16 (DISTRICT REGULATIONS) AND 14-53 (CANNABIS FACILITIES) OF THE WATSONVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING CANNABIS FACILITIES

1) Staff Report

Staff Report was given by Community Development Director Suzi Merriam.
2) Planning Commission Clarifying & Technical Questions

Director Merriam answered Commissioner Kammer’s questions regarding residential zoning versus legal residential use, potential cannabis sites for cultivation, manufacturing, retail, and distribution in the City of Watsonville, and separation requirements from parks and schools.

In answering Vice-Chair Jones’ question regarding the Type 13 non-storefront retail license, Director Merriam clarified that existing businesses would still have to go through the application process.

Director Merriam addressed Chair Veitch Olson’s inquiry regarding additional points on the grading rubric for existing local businesses, minority owned businesses, women-owned businesses and those in the equity program.

Commissioner Sarmiento suggested the idea of giving additional points for businesses that purchase supplies from other local businesses in Watsonville.

Commissioner Tavarez thanked Director Merriam and City staff for all of their efforts and work on the Cannabis Ordinance. Additionally, he inquired about the reasoning for allowing more manufacturing licenses, but restricting the cultivation licenses to six.

Director Merriam explained the reasons why, among them the fact that the City of Watsonville does not have the expansive area to accommodate large cultivation facilities, as opposed to manufacturing facilities.

Director Merriam answered Commissioner Tavarez’ questions regarding the current application process and forthcoming changes to both the requirements and the application itself.

In answering Commissioner Sarmiento and Acosta’s questions, Director Merriam clarified that there can be multiple license holders per parcel, and provided some scenarios.

Commissioner Kammer inquired about the number of cannabis retail establishments for the neighboring cities.

Director Merriam provided her with some of those numbers.

In answering Vice-Chair Jones’ question, Director Merriam stated that the flavored tobacco ordinance will apply to cannabis, therefore, regardless of what is being vaped, it cannot be flavored.

3) Public Hearing

Chair Veitch-Olson opened the public hearing.
Seth Smith, Santa Cruz Veterans Alliance, spoke in support of the item and listed his reasons. Additionally, he addressed Commissioner Sarmiento’s question regarding procedure for verification of age for those doing store pick-ups.

Laura del Castillo, Eden Infusions, voiced her support of the item and the expansion of retail zones.

Wesley Clark, Marina Trading Company, spoke in support of the item and feels that three retail businesses is a good number for the size of the City. Additionally, he listed a number of reasons for his support.

Colin Disheroon, Santa Cruz Naturals owner, spoke in support of the item and is happy to hear the City is removing the real estate condition, which puts an undue burden on the businesses during the lengthy application process. Additionally, he spoke about the possibility of bringing his business to Watsonville one day.

Rebecca Garcia, City of Watsonville Mayor, spoke about the lack of information regarding the safety and health implications of the growing cannabis business. She asked that the Planning Commission postpone making a decision and inform themselves first.

Patricia Mata, Community Prevention Partner (CPP), listed a number of health and safety practices they are concerned with, and praised City staff for incorporating some of these in the ordinance.

McKenna, Pajaro Valley Prevention and Student Assistance, asked that the Planning Commission consider adopting the CPP recommendations and not allow cannabis facilities in thoroughfare zones.

Alan Flores, District 3 resident/cannabis business owner, requested that the Planning Commission recommend to City Council a special equity license type, and listed his reasons.

James Cunningham, cannabis cultivator at 1000 West Beach Street, spoke in support of the item.

Crystal Gonzalez, Community Prevention Partners, provided information regarding the number of dispensaries for neighboring cities, and asked the Planning Commission adopt CPP’s recommendation.

Erika Vazquez, PVPSA tobacco prevention specialist, expressed concern over the number of businesses proposed and asked that the Planning Commission adopt CPP’s recommendation.

Hearing no further comment, Chair Veitch-Olson closed the public hearing.
4) Appropriate Motion(s)

**MAIN MOTION:** It was moved by Chair Veitch-Olson, seconded by Commissioner Sarmiento to approve the following resolution as proposed by staff:

**RESOLUTION NO. 3-20 (PC):**
RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA, RECOMMENDING TO THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPTION OF TEXT AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 14 (ZONING) OF THE WATSONVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE, AMENDING CHAPTER 14-16 (DISTRICT REGULATIONS) AND CHAPTER 14-53 (CANNABIS FACILITIES) FOR THE REGULATION OF CANNABIS BUSINESSES LOCATED WITHIN THE CITY

Chair Veitch-Olson stated she would like to pursue an equity program to help disadvantaged residents increase their probability of receiving a cannabis permit.

5) Deliberation

In answering Commissioner Tavarez, Chair Veitch-Olson explained who would benefit from a potential equity program.

Seth Smith, Santa Cruz Veterans Alliance, explained what the State Equity Program funds and mentioned that the City of Watsonville currently has no equity program, but was looking toward implementing something in the future.

**MOTION TO AMEND MAIN MOTION 1:** It was moved by Commissioner Tavarez, seconded by Chair Veitch-Olson, to amend the Main Motion to include criteria that grants disadvantaged applicants more points on the rating scale in the application process.

In answering Commissioner Sarmiento, Director Merriam clarified that the Planning Commission can make a recommendation to City Council, whom will ultimately decide if they will adopt an equity program.

In answering Commissioner Acosta, Director Merriam explained the cannabis permitting process once applicants are graded.

**MOTION TO AMEND MAIN MOTION 1:** The above motion carried by the following vote:

**AYES:** COMMISSIONERS: Acosta, Kammer, Rodriguez, Sarmiento, Tavarez, Jones, Veitch-Olson

**NOES:** COMMISSIONERS: None

**ABSENT:** COMMISSIONERS: None
MOTION TO AMEND MAIN MOTION 2: It was moved by Commissioner Sarmiento, seconded by Vice-Chair Jones, to amend the Main Motion to include requirements for vendors to ensure purchasers, and those who would consume delivered cannabis products, are over 21 years old.

Both Director Merriam and Sharon, Aptos dispensary manager, answered Commissioner Kammer’s question regarding the cannabis delivery procedure.

MOTION TO AMEND MAIN MOTION 2: The above motion failed by the following vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: Sarmiento
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: Acosta, Kammer, Rodriguez, Tavarez, Jones, Veitch-Olson
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: None

MOTION TO AMEND MAIN MOTION 3: It was moved by Commissioner Kammer, seconded by Vice-Chair Jones, to amend the Main Motion to prohibit any cannabis retail establishments in the CT-Thoroughfare Commercial zones.

MOTION TO AMEND MAIN MOTION 3: The above motion failed by the following vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: Acosta, Kammer, Jones
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: Rodriguez, Sarmiento, Tavarez, Veitch-Olson
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: None

Assistant Police Chief Sims answered Vice-Chair Jones’ questions regarding police enforcement on cannabis retail establishments, and mentioned that there is very limited information regarding cannabis related hospital visits or DUI’s, as it is all relatively new.

Chair Veitch-Olson thanked city staff and Community Prevention Partners for their research and work on the ordinance.

Chair Calls for a Vote on Motion(s)

MAIN MOTION: The above motion carried by the following vote as amended:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: Acosta, Kammer, Rodriguez, Sarmiento, Tavarez, Jones, Veitch-Olson
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: None
6. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

Director Merriam shared that the City was awarded two State grants to fully fund the Downtown Specific Plan.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Veitch-Olson adjourned the meeting at 8:31 PM. The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 4, 2020, at 6:00 PM in the City Council Chambers.

Suzi Merriam, Secretary
Planning Commission

Jenni Veitch-Olson, Chair
Planning Commission
MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE

COUNCIL CHAMBERS
275 MAIN STREET, 4th FLOOR, WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA

February 4, 2020

In accordance with City policy, all Planning Commission meetings are recorded on audio and video in their entirety, and are available for review in the Community Development Department (CDD). These minutes are a brief summary of action taken.

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Jenni Veitch-Olson, Vice-Chair Matthew H. Jones, and Commissioners Anna Kammer and Phillip F. Tavarez were present. Commissioners Ed Acosta, Jenna Rodriguez and Jenny T. Sarmiento were absent.

Staff members present were City Attorney Alan Smith, Principal Planner Justin Meek, Assistant Planner Sarah Wikle, Principal Engineer Murray Fontes, Recording Secretary Deborah Muniz, Administrative Assistant II Maria Elena Ortiz, and City Interpreter Carlos Landaverry.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Veitch-Olson led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. PRESENTATIONS & ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Chair Veitch-Olson encouraged the public to vote during the Presidential Primary Election on March 3, 2020.

4. REPORTS TO PLANNING COMMISSION

A. PRESENTATION ON THE COMPLETE STREETS PLAN FOR DOWNTOWN

Staff presentation was given by Principal Engineer Murray Fontes.

In answering Chair Veitch-Olson, Principal Engineer Fontes went over what will be presented to the City Council at their February meeting, and what the next steps are for the road diet.

Principal Planner Justin Meek added that because it is a Caltrans facility, the decision to allow a road diet would be up to agency to decide.
B. PRESENTATION ON THE COMPLETE STREETS PLAN FOR SCHOOLS

Staff presentation was given by Principal Engineer Murray Fontes.

In answering Commissioner Kammer’s inquiry, Principal Engineer Fontes went over some of the funding sources for this project.

C. PRESENTATION ON VISION ZERO

Staff presentation was given by Principal Engineer Murray Fontes.

Commissioner Kammer thanked Principal Engineer Fontes and the Public Works staff for all of their work and outreach efforts to get the information out to the public.

Principal Engineer Fontes shared that Watsonville was the first city in Santa Cruz County to adopt Vision Zero.

Commissioner Kammer invited the Planning Commission and members of the public to attend the South County Bike and Pedestrian Work Group meetings, which are held at the Watsonville Public Library every other month.

Principal Engineer Fontes responded to Commissioner Tavarez’ question regarding traffic enforcement.

Chair Veitch-Olson also thanked staff for their creative approach in engaging the public.

5. PUBLIC HEARING

A. AN APPLICATION FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT (PP2019-430) TO ALLOW THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN OFF-SALE GENERAL (TYPE 21) LICENSE UNDER NEW OWNERSHIP FOR AN EXISTING 775 SQUARE FOOT CONVENIENCE STORE (LALO’S LIQUORS) LOCATED AT 338 EAST RIVERSIDE DRIVE (APN: 017-282-05), FILED BY EDUARDO CASILLAS CERVANTES, APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER

1) Staff Report

Staff Report was given by Assistant Planner Sarah Wikle.

2) Planning Commission Clarifying & Technical Questions

None

3) Applicant Presentation

Eduardo “Lalo” Casillas Cervantes, applicant, gave a brief background on his business and shared his excitement about becoming a business owner.
4) **Planning Commission Clarifying & Technical Questions**

In answering Commissioner Kammer’s question, Mr. Casillas Cervantes mentioned his intent to move into the one-bedroom unit that is attached to the store, but not until the proper renovations are complete.

5) **Public Hearing**

Chair Veitch-Olson opened the public hearing.

Hearing no comment, Chair Veitch-Olson closed the public hearing.

6) **Appropriate Motion(s)**

**MAIN MOTION:** It was moved by Commissioner Kammer, seconded by Chair Veitch-Olson to accept the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION NO. 4-20 (PC):**
RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING A SPECIAL USE PERMIT (PP2019-430) TO ALLOW THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN OFF-SALE GENERAL LICENSE UNDER NEW OWNERSHIP FOR AN EXISTING 775 SQUARE-FOOT EXISTING CONVENIENCE STORE (LALO’S LIQUORS) LOCATED AT 338 EAST RIVERSIDE DRIVE, WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA (APN 017-282-05)

7) **Deliberation**

None

8) **Chair Calls for a Vote on Motion(s)**

**MAIN MOTION:** The above motion carried by the following vote:

**AYES:** COMMISSIONERS: Jones, Kammer, Tavarez, Veitch-Olson

**NOES:** COMMISSIONERS: None

**ABSENT:** COMMISSIONERS: Acosta, Rodriguez, Sarmiento

B. **AN APPLICATION FOR A MAJOR VARIANCE (PP2019-411) TO ALLOW THREE MENU-TYPE BOARDS TOTALING 35.68± SQUARE FEET IN AGGREGATE AREA FOR THE DRIVE-THROUGH FACILITY ON A 2.4+ ACRE PARCEL LOCATED AT 73 LEE ROAD (APN 018-302-06) WITHIN A 7.3± ACRE SITE APPROVED FOR HOTEL, RESTAURANT AND RETAIL DEVELOPMENT (APNS 018-302-04, -05 & -06), FILED BY DAVID FORD WITH ALL SIGNS SERVICES, APPLICANT, ON BEHALF OF J & H RETAIL LLC, PROPERTY OWNER
1) Staff Report

Staff Report was given by Principal Planner Justin Meek.

2) Planning Commission Clarifying & Technical Questions

None

3) Applicant Presentation

Dave Coberly, Superior Signs, asked Principal Planner Meek if staff would approve the Major Variance with all boards, except the preview board.

Principal Planner Meek clarified that if they had originally submitted a plan with multiple menu boards with an aggregate area of less than 30 square-feet, staff would have recommended that it not go through the Major Variance process and approved administratively.

Mr. Coberly stated that he was under the impression they were under the 30 square-feet, as he did not believe the order screen was considered a menu screen, and asked what the next step would be should the major variance be denied.

Principal Planner Meek stated that they would have to submit plans with a configuration of menu boards with an aggregate area of less than 30 square-feet combined, an example being the order screen and menu board only.

Mr. Coberly stated that Starbucks would like to keep the preview menu board, as studies show that it expedites drive-through traffic.

4) Planning Commission Clarifying & Technical Questions

None

5) Public Hearing

Chair Veitch-Olson opened the public hearing.

Hearing no further comment, Chair Veitch-Olson closed the public hearing.

6) Appropriate Motion(s)

MAIN MOTION: It was moved by Commissioner Kammer, seconded by Chair Veitch-Olson, to approve the following resolution:

RESOLUTION NO. 5-20 (PC):
RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA, DENYING A MAJOR VARIANCE
(PP2019-411) TO ALLOW THREE MENU-TYPE BOARDS SIGNS TOTALING 35.68± SQUARE FEET IN AGGREGATE AREA FOR THE DRIVE-THROUGH FACILITY ON A 2.4± ACRE PARCEL LOCATED AT 73 LEE ROAD, WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA (APN 018-302-06) WITHIN A 7.3± ACRE SITE APPROVED FOR HOTEL, RESTAURANT AND RETAIL DEVELOPMENT (APNs 018-302-04, -05 & -06)

7) Deliberation

Principal Planner Meek answered Commissioner Tavarez’ question regarding what the next steps are for getting the sign permit approved.

In answering Commissioner Jones’ inquiry, Principal Planner Meek provided an example of an approved Major Variance.

Both Chair Veitch-Olson and Commissioner Kammer spoke in support of staff’s recommendation.

8) Chair Calls for a Vote on Motion(s)

MAIN MOTION: The above motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: Jones, Kammer, Jones, Veitch-Olson
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: Acosta, Rodriguez, Sarmiento

6. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

A. PROCEDURES FOR ELECTING PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

City Attorney Alan Smith explained the procedure.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Veitch-Olson adjourned the meeting at 7:20 PM. The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, March 3, 2020, at 6:00 PM in the City Council Chambers.

Suzi Merriam, Secretary
Planning Commission

Jenni Veitch-Olson, Chair
Planning Commission
DATE: February 11, 2020

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Suzi Merriam, Community Development Director
Sarah Wikle, Assistant Planner

SUBJECT: Public Hearing to consider approval of a Special Use Permit with Environmental Review (PP2019-301) to allow a new telecommunications facility located at 1478 Freedom Boulevard (APN: 019-226-13).

AGENDA ITEM: March 3, 2020 Planning Commission

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt a Resolution approving a Special Use Permit with Environmental Review to permit a new telecommunications facility located at 1478 Freedom Boulevard (APN: 019-226-13).

The recommendations are based on the attached findings and conditions of approval.

BASIC PROJECT DATA

APPLICATION NO.: PP2019-301
APN: 019-226-13
LOCATION: 1478 Freedom Boulevard
LOT SIZE: 75,097± square feet

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Special Use Permit with Environmental Review (PP2019-301) to allow a new telecommunications facility. The proposed project includes installing a new unmanned telecommunications facility consisting of a 10 foot by 33 foot, eight inch lease area with 12 new panel antennas and 24 new RRUs (two per antenna) installed on a 75 foot tall monopine.

GENERAL PLAN: General Commercial (GC)
ZONING: Thoroughfare Commercial (CT)

SURROUNDING GENERAL PLAN/ZONING: Public/Quasi Public in the Institutional (N) Zoning District (southeast), Residential High Density in the Multiple Residential-High Density (RM-3)/ Planned Development (PD) Zoning Districts (northeast), General Commercial in the Thoroughfare Commercial (CT) Zoning District (west, south) and Residential High Density in the Multiple Residential (RM-3) Zoning District (west).
EXISTING USE: Mini Warehouse – Storage Facility
PROPOSED USE: Mini Warehouse – Storage Facility with a telecommunications facility
SURROUNDING USES: Single family residential along Riverside Drive; educational use across Riverside Drive at Watsonville High School

FLOOD ZONE: N/A

CEQA REVIEW: The project qualifies for a Class 3 Categorical Exemption from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), pursuant to Section 15303 of the CEQA Guidelines.

APPLICANT: New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC dba AT&T Wireless, 605 Coolidge Drive #100, Folsom, CA 95630
PARCEL OWNER: Extra Space Storage Properties 121 LLC, 1478 Freedom Boulevard, Watsonville, CA 95076

BACKGROUND

On July 16, 1979, the Planning Commission approved Special Use Permit (U-810-79) to locate and maintain a temporary truck parking and storage facility on a rental basis at 1478 Freedom Boulevard.

On December 2, 1985, the Planning Commission approved Special Use Permit (U-53-85) for Crocker’s Lockers to develop a mini-warehouse facility located at 1478 Freedom Boulevard. The approval consisted of 250 mini storage units. The City Council denied an appeal of the project on January 14, 1986.

On June 2, 1986, the Design Review Committee approved conditionally Design Review Permit No. 263 for a mini-warehouse facility for Crocker’s Lockers.

On May 9, 2007, the Zoning Administrator approved a Business License (BL2007-16) for a change in ownership of the mini-warehouse facility from Susa Partnership LB dba “Storage USA” to Extra Space Storage.

Extra Space Properties 52 LLC transferred the property to the present owner Extra Space Properties 121 LLC by deed recorded February 18, 2016 as Document Number 2016-0006614.

Proposal

On July 25, 2019, Sara King with New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC dba AT&T Wireless, applicant, on behalf of Extra Space Storage 121 LLC, property owner, applied for a Special Use Permit with Environmental Review to construct a new telecommunications facility located at 1478 Freedom Boulevard.
PROCESS

Special Use Permit

Watsonville Municipal Code (WMC) Section 14-16.1203(b) allows for the construction of a new telecommunications facility upon approval of a Special Use Permit by the Planning Commission in the Thoroughfare Commercial (CT) Zoning District. WMC Section 14-12.513 specifies the findings required for approval of a Special Use Permit. WMC Section 14-35.110 specifies the additional findings required for a telecommunication site facility.

The provisions for approval of a Special Use Permit, as set forth in WMC Section 14-12.513 requires findings that the proposed use is consistent with the General Plan, compatible with surrounding land uses and adjacent development, incorporates features that minimize adverse effects, and that the proposed special use will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, convenience and welfare nor result in damage to adjacent development.

WMC Section 14-35.110 includes required findings that the telecommunications site has appropriate design and zoning for a telecommunications facility, that the proposed site is in compliance with Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and California Public Utilities Commission (PUC) requirements, that the facility is necessary, by evaluation of the City, to address current demand, and that the facility incorporates stealth technology to minimize visual impacts.

Pursuant to WMC Section 14-35.100, the public hearing notice of a proposed telecommunications facility shall be conducted in accordance with WMC 14-10.300 with a noticing radius of 500 feet measured from parcel boundaries. GIS Staff prepared a site vicinity map (Attachment 1) to properly notice adjacent properties in accordance with this requirement.

Congress passed the Telecommunications Act of 1996 which amended the Communications Act of 1934. Section 704(a) of the Telecommunications Act amends the Communications Act by adding subdivision 7. Subdivision 7 allows state and local government to make decisions regarding placement, construction, and modification of personal wireless facilities. Section 704(a) requires a state or local government to act upon a request for authorization to place, construct, or modify personal wireless service facilities within a reasonable timeframe.

Based on the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and the City of Watsonville’s Zoning Ordinance, the proposed project is being processed as a Special Use Permit with Environmental Review.

Environmental Review

The California Environmental Quality Act requires local and state governments to consider the potential environmental effects of a project before making a decision on it. CEQA’s purpose is to disclose any potential impacts of a project and suggest methods to minimize identified impacts. Certain classes of projects, however, have been identified that do not have a significant effect on the environment, and are considered categorically exempt from the requirement for the preparation of environmental documents. State CEQA Guidelines §15300.
STANDARD OF REVIEW & APPEAL PROCESS

Whether a particular decision is adjudicative or legislative affects the requirements for findings to support the decision. Legislative decisions involve the adoption of broad policies applicable to many situations (for example, general plan amendments and zoning ordinance changes). Legislative decisions need not be accompanied by findings, unless a State law or City ordinance requires them.

Adjudicative (or “quasi-judicial”) decisions, on the other hand, are not policy decisions. Adjudicative/quasi-judicial decisions apply already adopted policies or standards to individual cases, such as a variance or conditional use permit application. Adjudicative/quasi-judicial decisions are based on evidence and must always be supported by findings.¹

The decision before the Planning Commission—a Special Use Permit—is an adjudicative/quasi-judicial decision and requires findings, either for denial, or as recommended, for approval that is supported by substantial evidence. Toigo v Town of Ross (1998) 70 Cal App 4th 309

If the Planning Commission’s decision is appealed, the City Council will consider whether the action taken by the Planning Commission was erroneously taken and may sustain, modify or overrule the action. In order for an official action to be overturned by an appeal, the City Council must find that the action taken by the Planning Commission was taken erroneously and was inconsistent with the intent of the Zoning District regulations that regulate the proposed action. WMC § 14-10.1106

A lawsuit is required to challenge a Council’s decision. A reviewing court will consider whether an adjudicative/quasi-judicial decision by the Council was supported by adequate findings. Courts scrutinize adjudicative/quasi-judicial decisions closely. An action may be overturned if the City (1) exceeded its authority, (2) failed to provide a fair hearing, or (3) made a decision not supported by substantial evidence (also called “a prejudicial abuse of discretion”).

Another important difference between legislative and adjudicative/quasi-judicial decisions is the substantial evidence standard: in weighing evidence of what happened at the Council meeting, courts go beyond whether a decision was “reasonable” (the legislative standard). Court’s reviewing adjudicative/quasi-judicial decisions look to make sure the decision is supported by substantial evidence. Denied applicants argue the there is no substantial evidence to support the decision. Cities usually assert there is substantial evidence to support the decision and rely on (1) the written words in the staff findings, (2) the statements by those presenting at the hearing, and (3) the words of the Planning Commission or Council.

¹ Quasi-judicial decisions require the decision-making body to take evidence and use its judgment to make factual as well as legal determinations about whether a particular property or project meets the standards established by the land use ordinance.
DISCUSSION

Existing Site

The 1.72± acre subject site (APN 019-226-13) is developed with a single story mini warehouse storage facility with surface parking. The site has been operated as a mini warehouse storage facility since 1987, following approval of Special Use Permit U-53-85 and Design Review Permit DRC 263. The property is currently owned by Extra Space Properties 121 LLC.

Parking is located on the side yard property line next to Odd Fellows Cemetery and near storage units. The front of the parcel along Freedom Boulevard is fully paved with one driveway approach, measuring 43± feet. The adjacent parcels are the Independent Order of Oddfellows Cemetery, Wendy’s drive through restaurant and apartments directly behind the site. See Figure 1 below for an existing site plan.

![Figure 1: Existing Site and Surrounding Area](source: Google Earth, 2019)
Proposed Project
The project consists of a new unmanned telecommunications facility with 12 new antennas on a 75 foot tall monopine in a 10 foot by 33 foot eight inch AT&T lease area. Additionally, three small equipment cabinets within an existing storage unit would house additional equipment for the facility. As shown on Figure 2, the proposed telecommunications facility would be located adjacent to an existing mini warehouse storage building.

The proposed 75 foot tall monopine must be located at least 150 feet from residentially zoned or designated property. The proposal is located approximately 155 feet away from the apartments located off Arista Lane meeting the separation requirements set forth in WMC Section 14-35.050(c).

FIGURE 2 Proposed Site Plan
Source: Project File, 2019

Other key components of the project include the following:
- Install three new AT&T wireless antennas per sector for a total of 12;
- Install new remote radio units (RRUs) two per antenna for a total of 24;
- Install four new wireless surge suppressors;
- Remove an existing roll up door and frame in new entry;
- Install new underground power and fiber;
- Install new outdoor equipment cabinets;
- Install new D/C and fiber trunks from equipment to new monopine; and
- Install new chain link fence and protective steel bollards around outside equipment area.

Support equipment would be housed in an existing storage unit adjacent to the facility, with an emergency generator located onsite in the event of a commercial power failure. No additional supplies or materials would be stored on the site. The facility would be served by technicians on a maintenance basis only. There would be no more than two technicians’ onsite at a time. These periodic maintenance activities would not result in a significant increase in traffic.

Submittal Requirements for Telecommunications Facilities
WMC Section 14-35.080 lists application submittal requirements for any new telecommunications facility, including an alternative site analysis, visual simulations of the proposed facility, a radio frequency analysis, a search ring analysis, and a report detailing operational and capacity needs within the City of Watsonville and the immediate area adjacent to the City.

Alternative Site Analysis
According to the alternative site analysis in Attachment 3, AT&T researched collocation alternatives within the area of interest. Upon further review there were no collocation sites available. Therefore, AT&T is proposing a new telecommunications facility at 1478 Freedom Boulevard.

Visual Simulation – Stealth Technology
The applicant proposes a monopine structure to minimize the visual impact of the telecommunications facility. Chameleon Engineering provides the branching material and foliage for the monopine. See Figure 3 for visual simulations from the adjacent residential area. The monopine design incorporates stealth technology and accessory equipment is located within an existing mini warehouse storage unit. These techniques assist in screening the telecommunications facility from adjacent residential and public right of way. Please see Attachment 4 for additional visual simulations and Attachment 5 for proposed materials.

Search Ring Analysis
AT&T proposes a 75 foot tall monopine at 1478 Freedom Boulevard to meet service needs near Freedom Boulevard and Alta Vista Avenue. The applicant provided a search ring analysis to justify the proposed height. Additional information is available in Attachment 6.
Radio Frequency Emissions Compliance Report

The applicant provided a radio frequency (RF) report to ensure the radio frequencies are within the limits allowed by the FCC.


A Radio Frequency - Electromagnetic Energy (RF-EME) Compliance Report dated January 15, 2020 was prepared by David H Kiser, of Waterford Consultants LLC, to determine whether the proposed project complies with FCC rules and regulations for RF emissions. The Report indicates that projected maximum RF exposure levels at the ground level would not exceed FCC standards. At the ground level, the maximum power density is estimated to be 8.5 percent of the general population maximum public exposure limit. Incident at adjacent buildings, the maximum power density is estimated to be at 12.6 percent of the general population maximum public exposure limit. The proposed operation would not expose
members of the General Public to hazardous levels of RF energy at ground level or in adjacent buildings.

The January 15, 2020 Waterford RF-EME Compliance Report recommends posting RF altering signage with contact information at the base of the monopine to inform authorized climbers of potential conditions near the antennas. Additionally, the Report recommends restricting access to reduce the risk of exposure and injury. The project is being conditioned to address these two recommendations.

- AT&T shall post RF altering signage with contact information at the base of the monopine to warn of potential conditions near the antennas.
- AT&T shall ensure that access to the antenna and areas associated with the active antenna installation are restricted and secured, where possible.

The RF report can be found in Attachment 7.

Operational Needs Assessment
The purpose of the proposed facility at this location is to improve cellular coverage and capacity near Freedom Boulevard and Alta Vista Avenue. Based on AT&T’s analysis, the new telecommunications facility at 1478 Freedom Boulevard would provide increased in-building and in-vehicle service for AT&T customers near Freedom Boulevard and Alta Vista Avenue.

An independent evaluation of the proposed telecommunications facility was conducted by Global RF Solutions. The analysis concluded that the proposed site should improve the quality of services in the area identified as needing improvement by this new site build. The Global RF Solutions Report can be found in Attachment 8.

Telecommunications Uses Findings
The Planning Commission shall approve or conditionally approve a telecommunications use if the following findings can be made (WMC Section 14-35.110):

(a) The proposed telecommunications site/facility has been designed to minimize its visual and environmental impacts, including the utilization of stealth technology, when applicable.

The proposed project involves the construction of a 75 foot tall monopine at 1478 Freedom Boulevard. As shown on the visual simulations, the project will incorporate stealth technology, in the form of a monopine, to minimize visual impact on adjacent development. The monopine foliage and construction screen attached telecommunications equipment from public view. Remaining accessory equipment will be located within an existing mini warehouse storage locker, screened from public view.

The proposed project is eligible for a Class 3 Categorical Exemption per Section 15303 of the State CEQA Guidelines as it involves new construction of a
telecommunications facility on a developed parcel located with an urban services area. The project would not change the size of the existing mini warehouse storage facility. The proposed use – a telecommunications facility – is conditionally permitted in the CT Zoning District. The project is in an area where all public services and facilities are available to allow for maximum development permissible in the General Plan and the area in which the project is located is not environmentally sensitive.

(b) **That the proposed site has the appropriate zoning, dimensions, slope, design, and configuration for the development of a telecommunications site/facility.**

The proposed telecommunications facility is located at 1478 Freedom Boulevard, which is large, flat and zoned Thoroughfare Commercial. The proposed project is permitted with the issuance of a Special Use Permit. The project involves the construction a 75 foot tall telecommunications facility with 12 panel antennas on a developed parcel with an existing mini warehouse storage facility. The proposed construction of a new telecommunications facility meets all zoning requirements of the Thoroughfare Commercial (CT) Zoning District.

(c) **That general landscaping considerations as outlined in Section 14-35.060(g), when applicable, have been complied with to complement the structures and antennae, provide an attractive environment for the enjoyment of the public, and preserve natural features and elements.**

The proposed telecommunications facility is located on impervious surface area within a developed parcel located in the Thoroughfare Commercial Zone. Based on Sheet A-1, the facility is located adjacent to an existing mini warehouse storage building, screening the base of the facility from public right of way. Additionally, the proposed monopine screens attached telecommunications equipment from public view. Based on the attached findings, no additional screening or landscaping improvements are necessary.

(d) **That the proposed telecommunications site/facility is in compliance with all Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and the California Public Utilities Commission (PUC) requirements.**

The applicant has submitted a Radio Frequency-Electromagnetic Energy (RF-EME) Compliance Report completed by Waterford Consultants LLC confirming compliance of the proposed telecommunications facility with current FCC regulations. The report indicates that projected maximum RF exposure levels at the ground level would not exceed FCC standards for general population and/or occupational exposure limits. Recommended safety measures to ensure compliance with appropriate guidelines limiting human exposure to RF-EME for any workers potentially accessing the site have been included as conditions of project approval.
(e) That the applicant has demonstrated and confirmed, by independent evaluation of the City, that the site/facility is necessary to address current demand, capacity or other technical limitations of the system in order to maintain service levels.

Based on current and proposed coverage maps for AT&T, the proposed telecommunications facility will increase in building and in vehicle service for customers located near Freedom Boulevard and Alta Vista Avenue. Within AT&Ts area of interest, there were no collocation facilities available, prompting the construction of a new telecommunications facility to address current demand needs.

An independent analysis conducted by Global RF Solutions determined the empirical data collected by this company confirms that the coverage for AT&T is only fair and the data quality is slow in the area to be served by this site. It appears that the proposed site should improve quality of service in the area identified as needing improvement by this new site build.

Parking
The project involves building a new telecommunications facility on a developed parcel with an existing mini storage warehouse facility. The telecommunications facility will not be expanding the existing use. Therefore, no additional parking is required for the proposed telecommunications facility.

Environmental Review
The proposed project is eligible for a Class 3 Categorical Exemption per Section 15303 of the State CEQA Guidelines as it involves new construction of a telecommunications facility on a developed parcel located with an urban services area. The project would not change the size of the existing mini warehouse storage facility. The proposed use – a telecommunications facility – is conditionally permitted in the CT Zoning District. The project is in an area where all public services and facilities are available to allow for the maximum development permissible in the General Plan and is not located within an environmentally sensitive area.

CONCLUSION
The construction of a new telecommunications facility located at 1478 Freedom Boulevard complies with the Federal Telecommunications Act, WMC Chapter 14-35 on Telecommunications Uses and WMC Chapter 14-16 on Zoning. Therefore, staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the project, as conditioned.
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CCL03320 – Freedom Blvd
1478 Freedom Blvd, Watsonville, CA 95076

Alternative Site Location Analysis
CCL03320 – Service Improvement Objective

The purpose of the proposed site is to improve coverage and capacity in the area of Watsonville near the cross street of Freedom Boulevard and Alta vista Avenue. For the best desired improvement to coverage we need to remain within or as close to the circle shown in the image above as possible.
Locations Analyzed:
Project Location: Public Storage, 1478 Freedom Blvd, Watsonville, CA 95076
Alternative Locations Analyzed:
1. Wells Fargo, 1503 Freedom Blvd, Watsonville, CA 95076
Upon review of the region, AT&T found only one potential location within or near to our area of interest that might provide collocation at 1503 Freedom Boulevard; however, upon physically visiting the site it was determined that the data was incorrect as there was no existing tower at the location. In addition, this location was outside the main area of interest and therefore a new build here would be inferior to a location closer to our interest area. Therefore, this alternative was discarded.

Once the potential collocation site above was determined unsuitable we determined that a new build tower in the area was going to be necessary. We reached out via phone calls and physical visits and only identified one interested property owner located at 1478 Freedom Boulevard. This became our selected site for our proposal. This site location is pictured above.
CCL03320 – Current Coverage Map

- This map represents the coverage without the proposed site.
- Significant coverage gaps appear in the primary coverage area presented during High Demand Periods.
- For the express purpose of meeting AT&T’s coverage objectives for this area, AT&T proposes the following Alternative Site Location Analysis.
• RF modeling predicts this will be the expanded coverage with the proposed site installed.
• This location and elevation is considered to be “optimal” as a permanent site.
This map represents the location of existing on air sites surrounding the proposed site location.
Conclusion

Based on AT&T’s analysis of alternative sites, our engineering staff has confirmed that the Primary site location at 1478 Freedom Boulevard remains the most appropriate site for new build construction in this area.
RF Tools

• **ATOLL**

The ALT Sites Analysis is compiled using a wireless coverage prediction tool from Forsk called ATOLL. The tool has several GIS layers as inputs such as ground clutter data and average ground elevation height. The tool also knows about our antennas that we use for the cell sites and the transmit powers and everything in the link budget. This tool simulates what a customer will receive as a signal power. This tool is used to compare future site choices so that the optimal coverage can be attained.

• **Google Earth Pro**

A powerful GIS tool which is used to overlay the ATOLL prediction and drive test data. With this data and the topography models in this program, further analysis of data and graphic displays of coverage areas can be generated for reference.
Site Name: Freedom Blvd
Site Address: 1478 Freedom Blvd, Watsonville, CA 95076
APN: 019-226-13-000

Jurisdiction Tracking Number: ____________________
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Evaluation of Wireless Facility Submittal

AT&T Wireless Site
“Freedom Blvd”
Watsonville, CA
LIMITED WARRANTY

Global RF Solutions warrants that this analysis was performed using substantially the methods that are referenced and described in this report and based entirely upon the information on the antenna site that was provided by AT&T. Global RF Solutions disclaims all other warranties either expressed or implied, including, but not limited to, implied warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose.

In no event will Global RF Solutions be liable to you or by any other person for damages, including any loss of profits, lost savings, or other special, exemplary, punitive, incidental or consequential damages arising out of your use or inability to use the analysis whether such claim is based on breach of warranty, contract, tort or other legal theory and regardless of the causes of such loss or damages. In no event shall Global RF Solutions entire liability to you under this Agreement exceed an amount equal to the price paid to for the analysis.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Ordinance 14-35.010 Purpose.
The Council finds that this Ordinance will protect and promote the public health, safety, welfare and the aesthetic quality of the community when considering applications for telecommunications facilities and not regulate the placement, construction and modification of personal wireless service facilities on the basis of environmental effects of radio frequency emissions to the extent that such facilities comply with the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) regulations concerning such emissions. This chapter is intended to foster, through appropriate zoning and land use controls, a competitive economic environment for telecommunications carriers that does not unreasonably discriminate among providers of functionally equivalent services and shall not prohibit or have the effect of prohibiting the provisions of personal wireless services. Additionally, this chapter is intended to protect Watsonville’s built and natural environment by promoting compatible urban design standards for telecommunications facilities.

(Ord. 1153-03 C-M, eff. April 24, 2003)

The City of Watsonville, CA Ordinance 14-35 deals with Telecommunications Uses within the city. The City of Watsonville has chosen Global RF Solutions to evaluate reports submitted on behalf of AT&T per section 14-35.080 (a) (7) of the ordinance. Marvin Wessel is the CEO of Global RF Solutions and is the engineer that personally reviewed all reports and data associated with this AT&T “Freedom Blvd” submittal to the City of Watsonville and is the author of this report.

The following reports have been submitted to the City of Watsonville on behalf of AT&T and reviewed by Global RF Solutions:

- Alternative Site Location Analysis (dated 7/15/2019)
- Project Description & Justification Letter (dated 7-15-2019)

The requested Scope of Work for this review is listed below:

1. Evaluate the veracity of the radio frequency (RF) analysis conducted by Waterford Consultants.
2. Confirm probable outputs of the proposed telecommunications site, and compare those outputs with the maximum allowable radio frequency outputs allowed by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).
3. Evaluate the veracity of the written statement indicating the technical reasons why there is no alternative collocation site/facility available.
4. Evaluate the veracity of the search ring analysis that determined the area where a wireless site/facility must be placed to meet stated service needs.
5. Evaluate the report detailing operational and capacity needs of the provider’s system within the City of Watsonville and the immediate areas adjacent to the City, including why and how the proposed site is technically necessary to address current demand and technical limitations of the current system.

© 2020 Global RF Solutions
2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Global RF Solutions has carefully reviewed each report submitted on AT&T’s behalf and have the following comments specific to the Scope of Work questions from Section 1.

1. Evaluate the veracity of the radio frequency (RF) analysis conducted by Waterford Consultants.
   a. The Waterford report analysis is confirmed to be thorough and complete. Clear documentation has predicted that the FCC Public limit will not be exceeded in any readily accessible location on the ground (8.5702% FCC Public limit maximum). Any rooftops adjacent to the site will not exceed the FCC Public limit as well (12.5926% FCC Public limit maximum).
   b. RF Alerting signage was also recommended for workers accessing the mono-pine in areas not considered “readily accessible” to the general public.

2. Confirm probable outputs of the proposed telecommunications site, and compare those outputs with the maximum allowable radio frequency outputs allowed by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).
   a. I performed an independent analysis of this proposed site installation and similar results were obtained by utilizing the RoofView™ calculation software (see figure 3a).

3. Evaluate the veracity of the written statement indicating the technical reasons why there is no alternative collocation site/ facility available.
   a. The search ring area is small and apparently only one available location within the search ring to build a site. No collocation opportunities appear to be available per the “Alternative Site Location Analysis” supplied.

4. Evaluate the veracity of the search ring analysis that determined the area where a wireless site/facility must be placed to meet stated service needs.
   a. The search ring plots (figures 3c and 3d) provided by AT&T show the neighboring sites coverage as well as the proposed coverage including the proposed Freedom Blvd site.
   b. Global RF Solutions does not possess the ATOLL software utilized by AT&T to produce coverage plots nor do we have the technical parameters they used to generate these plots. However, the plots appear to be appropriate representations of proper RF propagation analysis based on my experience using propagation software and the terrain to provide coverage for.

5. Evaluate the report detailing operational and capacity needs of the provider’s system within the City of Watsonville and the immediate areas adjacent to the City, including why and how the proposed site is technically necessary to address current demand and technical limitations of the current system.
   a. A third party data Collection Company’s plot (RootMetrics®) was used to analyze the quality of service (signal strength and data speed) in the area to be provided service by the new site build at the 1478 Freedom Blvd site. The empirical data collected by this company confirms that coverage for AT&T is only Fair and the data quality is Slow in the area to be served by this site (see figures 3e & 3f). It appears that the proposed site
should improve quality of service in the area identified as needing improvement by this new site build.
3. REPORT EVALUATION DISCUSSIONS

Waterford Consultants Report

The report contains an analysis of the readily accessible locations on the ground and adjacent rooftops. The report states that the FCC Public limits will not be exceeded in any area considered readily accessible. The report also recommends alerting signage to be placed at the worker access locations to the mono-pine (climbers, etc.).

I have prepared my independent analysis (figure 3a) with RoofView™ calculation software utilizing RF data (table 3a) supplied by Waterford Consultants. I have also determined that the FCC Public limit will not be exceeded at any readily accessible location near the proposed site. The recommendation for signage at the base of the monopine is also a prudent recommendation.

**Table 3a.** Data utilized for RoofView™ analysis.
Figure 3a. RoofView™ calculated RF Exposure plot for FCC Public limit.
Search Ring Analysis/Operational Needs

AT&T has provided a description of an area with marginal coverage (figure 3b) and coverage plots without the proposed site (figure 3c) and a coverage plot with the proposed site (figure 3d) showing improved coverage to the area described having marginal coverage.

Figure 3b. Area identified as needing improvement in coverage and capacity by AT&T (1478 Freedom Blvd).

CCL03320 – Service Improvement Objective

The purpose of the proposed site is to improve coverage and capacity in the area of Watsonville near the cross street of Freedom Boulevard and Alta vista Avenue. For the best desired improvement to coverage we need to remain within or as close to the circle shown in the image above as possible.
Figure 3c. Current AT&T coverage without the 1478 Freedom Blvd site.

- This map represents the coverage without the proposed site.
- Significant coverage gaps appear in the primary coverage area presented during High Demand Periods.
- For the express purpose of meeting AT&T’s coverage objectives for this area, AT&T proposes the following Alternative Site Location Analysis.
Figure 3d. Predicted AT&T coverage with the 1478 Freedom Blvd site operational.

CCL03320 – Proposed Coverage from Primary Site Location

- RF modeling predicts this will be the expanded coverage with the proposed site installed.
- This location and elevation is considered to be “optimal” as a permanent site.
Empirical data (observed data) is one of the best methods to determine system performance or verify a need for coverage improvement in a wireless system. This plot is from an objective third party (RootMetrics®) displaying the empirical data for coverage in the area surrounding the proposed site. The plot (figure 3e) confirms that coverage from AT&T is only rated “Fair” or nonexistent (untested) in the area surrounding the proposed site. The next plot (figure 3f) measures the data quality to be “Slow” or untested.

**Figure 3e.** Tested signal strength (source RootMetrics®) in the area identified by AT&T needing coverage improvement.
Figure 3f. Tested data plot (source RootMetrics®) for current AT&T data speed in the proposed coverage area.
Radio Frequency Emissions Compliance Report For AT&T Mobility

Site Name: Freedom Boulevard  
Address: 1478 Freedom Boulevard, Watsonville, CA  
Report Date: January 15, 2020  
Site Structure Type: Monopine  
Latitude: 36.929667  
Longitude: -121.766375  
Project: New Build

Compliance Statement
Based on information provided by AT&T Mobility and predictive modeling, the Freedom Boulevard installation proposed by AT&T Mobility will be compliant with Radiofrequency Radiation Exposure Limits of 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.1307(b)(3) and 1.1310. RF alerting signage and restricting access to the antenna to authorized personnel that have completed RF safety training is required for Occupational environment compliance. The proposed operation will not expose members of the General Public to hazardous levels of RF energy at ground level or in adjacent buildings.

Certification
I, David H. Kiser, am the reviewer and approver of this report and am fully aware of and familiar with the Rules and Regulations of both the Federal Communications Commissions (FCC) and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) with regard to Human Exposure to Radio Frequency Radiation, specifically in accordance with FCC’s OET Bulletin 65. I have reviewed this Radio Frequency Exposure Assessment report and believe it to be both true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

General Summary
The compliance framework is derived from the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Rules and Regulations for preventing human exposure in excess of the applicable Maximum Permissible Exposure (“MPE”) limits. At any location at this site, the power density resulting from each transmitter may be expressed as a percentage of the frequency-specific limits and added to determine if 100% of the exposure limit has been exceeded. The FCC Rules define two tiers of permissible exposure differentiated by the situation in which the exposure takes place and/or the status of the individuals who are subject to exposure. General Population / Uncontrolled exposure limits apply to those situations in which persons may not be aware of the presence of electromagnetic energy, where exposure is not employment-related, or where persons cannot exercise control over their exposure. Occupational / Controlled exposure limits apply to situations in which persons are exposed as a consequence of their employment, have been made fully aware of the potential for exposure, and can exercise control over their exposure. Based on the criteria for these classifications, the FCC General Population limit is considered to be a level that is safe for continuous exposure time. The FCC General Population limit is 5 times more restrictive than the Occupational limits.
In situations where the predicted MPE exceeds the General Population threshold in an accessible area as a result of emissions from multiple transmitters, FCC licensees that contribute greater than 5% of the aggregate MPE share responsibility for mitigation.

Based on the computational guidelines set forth in FCC OET Bulletin 65, Waterford Consultants, LLC has developed software to predict the overall Maximum Permissible Exposure possible at any location given the spatial orientation and operating parameters of multiple RF sources. The power density in the Far Field of an RF source is specified by OET-65 Equation 5 as follows:

\[ S = \frac{\text{EIRP}}{4\pi R^2} \text{ (mW/cm}^2\text{)} \]

where EIRP is the Effective Radiated Power relative to an isotropic antenna and R is the distance between the antenna and point of study. Additionally, consideration is given to the manufacturers’ horizontal and vertical antenna patterns as well as radiation reflection. At any location, the predicted power density in the Far Field is the spatial average of points within a 0 to 6-foot vertical profile that a person would occupy. Near field power density is based on OET-65 Equation 20 stated as

\[ S = \left(\frac{180}{\theta_{BW}}\right) \frac{100 \cdot P_{in}}{\pi \cdot R \cdot h} \text{ (mW/cm}^2\text{)} \]

where \( P_{in} \) is the power input to the antenna, \( \theta_{BW} \) is the horizontal pattern beamwidth and \( h \) is the aperture length.

For any area in excess of 100% General Population MPE, access controls with appropriate RF alerting signage must be put in place and maintained to restrict access to authorized personnel. Signage must be posted to be visible upon approach from any direction to provide notification of potential conditions within these areas. Subject to other site security requirements, occupational personnel should be trained in RF safety and equipped with personal protective equipment (e.g. RF personal monitor) designed for safe work in the vicinity of RF emitters. Controls such as physical barriers to entry imposed by locked doors, hatches and ladders or other access control mechanisms may be supplemented by alarms that alert the individual and notify site management of a breach in access control. Waterford Consultants, LLC recommends that any work activity in these designated areas or in front of any transmitting antennas be coordinated with all wireless tenants.
Analysis

AT&T Mobility proposes the following installation at this location:

- INSTALL NEW ANTENNAS AND MISC EQUIPMENT ON NEW 75' TALL MONOPINE

The antenna will be mounted on a 75-foot Monopine with a centerline 67 feet above ground level. Proposed antenna operating parameters are listed in Appendix A. Other appurtenances such as GPS antennas, RRUs and hybrid cable below the antennas are not sources of RF emissions. No other antennas are known to be operating in the vicinity of this site.

Figure 1: Antenna Locations

Power density decreases significantly with distance from any antenna. The panel-type antennas to be employed at this site are highly directional by design and the orientation in azimuth and mounting elevation, as documented, serves to reduce the potential to exceed MPE limits at any location other than directly in front of the antennas. For accessible areas at ground level, the maximum predicted power density level resulting from all AT&T Mobility operations is 8.5702% of the FCC General Population limits. Incident at adjacent
buildings depicted in Figure 1, the maximum predicted power density level resulting from all AT&T Mobility operations is 125926% of the FCC General Population limits. The proposed operation will not expose members of the General Public to hazardous levels of RF energy at ground level or in adjacent buildings.

Waterford Consultants, LLC recommends posting RF alerting signage with contact information (Caution 2B) at the base of the Monopine to inform authorized climbers of potential conditions near the antennas. These recommendations are depicted in Figure 2.
## Appendix A: Operating Parameters Considered in this Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antenna #</th>
<th>Carrier</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Band (MHz)</th>
<th>Mech Az (deg)</th>
<th>Mech Dt (deg)</th>
<th>H BW (deg)</th>
<th>Length (ft)</th>
<th>TPO (W)</th>
<th>Channels</th>
<th>Loss (dB)</th>
<th>Gain (dB)</th>
<th>ERP (W)</th>
<th>EIRP (W)</th>
<th>Rad Center (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 02DT</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>3343</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 02DT</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>2625</td>
<td>4306</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 03DT</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>3883</td>
<td>6370</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 03DT</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>5118</td>
<td>8397</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 03DT</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>3343</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 03DT</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>4266</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 02DT</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>3343</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 02DT</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>2625</td>
<td>4306</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 03DT</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>3883</td>
<td>6370</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 02DT</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>5118</td>
<td>8397</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 03DT</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>3343</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 03DT</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>4266</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 02DT</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>3883</td>
<td>6370</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 03DT</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>3343</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 03DT</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>4266</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 03DT</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>3883</td>
<td>6370</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 03DT</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>5118</td>
<td>8397</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 02DT</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>3343</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 03DT</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>3883</td>
<td>6370</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 02DT</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>1671</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 03DT</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>4266</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CCL03320 – Freedom Blvd
1478 Freedom Blvd, Watsonville, CA 95076

Alternative Site Location Analysis
The purpose of the proposed site is to improve coverage and capacity in the area of Watsonville near the cross street of Freedom Boulevard and Alta vista Avenue. For the best desired improvement to coverage we need to remain within or as close to the circle shown in the image above as possible.
Locations Analyzed:
Project Location: Public Storage, 1478 Freedom Blvd, Watsonville, CA 95076
Alternative Locations Analyzed:
1. Wells Fargo, 1503 Freedom Blvd, Watsonville, CA 95076
Upon review of the region, AT&T found only one potential location within or near to our area of interest that might provide collocation at 1503 Freedom Boulevard; however, upon physically visiting the site it was determined that the data was incorrect as there was no existing tower at the location. In addition, this location was outside the main area of interest and therefore a new build here would be inferior to a location closer to our interest area. Therefore, this alternative was discarded.

Once the potential collocation site above was determined unsuitable we determined that a new build tower in the area was going to be necessary. We reached out via phone calls and physical visits and only identified one interested property owner located at 1478 Freedom Boulevard. This became our selected site for our proposal. This site location is pictured above.
This map represents the coverage without the proposed site.

Significant coverage gaps appear in the primary coverage area presented during High Demand Periods.

For the express purpose of meeting AT&T’s coverage objectives for this area, AT&T proposes the following Alternative Site Location Analysis.
RF modeling predicts this will be the expanded coverage with the proposed site installed.

This location and elevation is considered to be “optimal” as a permanent site.
This map represents the location of existing on-air sites surrounding the proposed site location.
Conclusion

Based on AT&T’s analysis of alternative sites, our engineering staff has confirmed that the Primary site location at 1478 Freedom Boulevard remains the most appropriate site for new build construction in this area.
RF Tools

• **ATOLL**

  The ALT Sites Analysis is compiled using a wireless coverage prediction tool from Forsk called ATOLL. The tool has several GIS layers as inputs such as ground clutter data and average ground elevation height. The tool also knows about our antennas that we use for the cell sites and the transmit powers and everything in the link budget. This tool simulates what a customer will receive as a signal power. This tool is used to compare future site choices so that the optimal coverage can be attained.

• **Google Earth Pro**

  A powerful GIS tool which is used to overlay the ATOLL prediction and drive test data. With this data and the topography models in this program, further analysis of data and graphic displays of coverage areas can be generated for reference.
Existing

Proposed

view from property looking northeast at site

CCL03320 Freedom Boulevard
1478 Freedom Boulevard, Watsonville
Photosims Produced on 5-20-2019
July 15, 2019

Project Description & Justification Statement

Re: Proposed new AT&T Wireless Facility at: 1478 Freedom Boulevard, Watsonville, CA 95076; APN: 019-226-13-000

Project Description

The proposed project consists of installing a new unmanned telecommunication facility consisting of a 10’ × 33’-8” AT&T Lease area with 12 panel antennas installed on a proposed 75’ tall monopine. And installing three small equipment cabinets inside a 10’ x 22’-8” existing storage unit on the property.

Project Justification.

AT&T Wireless is currently improving the existing wireless network in City of Watsonville. The proposed installation of this new telecommunications facility will improve wireless coverage to the area and will also increase the network capacity. This network will provide an extremely valuable service to those who live, travel, and do business in the local area. It will give people the ability to call for emergency services in the event of an accident, the ability to communicate with employees or clients outside of the office, and the ability to communicate with family members when needed. The project engineer has indicated that the proposed location will provide the necessary coverage and capacity with the ability to hand off the wireless signal to the next telecommunications site. This will enable travelers and community members to have reliable and continuous wireless coverage.

- Operation of the project will occur 12 months a year, 7 days a week, 24 hours a day consistent with the continuous schedule of normal telephone company operations.
- The facility is “unmanned” and will be visited on an “as needed” basis only. No more than two technicians will ever attend the facility. Their schedule will be on a 24 hour basis. No more than two service vehicles, being either a van or a four-wheel drive vehicle, will visit the facility.
- The equipment located in the shelter will be used for telephone operations.
- There will be no supplies or materials stored on the site.
- In the applicants opinion the proposed facility does not cause any unsightly appearance. There will be no noise, glare, dust or odors associated with the facility with the exception of an emergency generator which will operate in the event of a commercial power failure.
- The communication equipment will be housed inside one of the already existing storage units.

Should you have questions regarding this project, please do not hesitate to contact me at (916) 296-2011.

Sincerely,

Sara King
Site Acquisition Specialist
Epic Wireless Group LLC
Compliance Statement
Based on information provided by AT&T Mobility and predictive modeling, the Freedom Boulevard installation proposed by AT&T Mobility will be compliant with Radiofrequency Radiation Exposure Limits of 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.1307(b)(3) and 1.1310. RF alerting signage and restricting access to the antenna to authorized personnel that have completed RF safety training is required for Occupational environment compliance. The proposed operation will not expose members of the General Public to hazardous levels of RF energy at ground level or in adjacent buildings.

Certification
I, David H. Kiser, am the reviewer and approver of this report and am fully aware of and familiar with the Rules and Regulations of both the Federal Communications Commissions (FCC) and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) with regard to Human Exposure to Radio Frequency Radiation, specifically in accordance with FCC’s OET Bulletin 65. I have reviewed this Radio Frequency Exposure Assessment report and believe it to be both true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

General Summary
The compliance framework is derived from the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Rules and Regulations for preventing human exposure in excess of the applicable Maximum Permissible Exposure (“MPE”) limits. At any location at this site, the power density resulting from each transmitter may be expressed as a percentage of the frequency-specific limits and added to determine if 100% of the exposure limit has been exceeded. The FCC Rules define two tiers of permissible exposure differentiated by the situation in which the exposure takes place and/or the status of the individuals who are subject to exposure. General Population / Uncontrolled exposure limits apply to those situations in which persons may not be aware of the presence of electromagnetic energy, where exposure is not employment-related, or where persons cannot exercise control over their exposure. Occupational / Controlled exposure limits apply to situations in which persons are exposed as a consequence of their employment, have been made fully aware of the potential for exposure, and can exercise control over their exposure. Based on the criteria for these classifications, the FCC General Population limit is considered to be a level that is safe for continuous exposure time. The FCC General Population limit is 5 times more restrictive than the Occupational limits.
Table 1: FCC Limits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency (MHz)</th>
<th>Power Density (mW/cm²)</th>
<th>Averaging Time (minutes)</th>
<th>Power Density (mW/cm²)</th>
<th>Averaging Time (minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-300</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-1500</td>
<td>f/1500</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>f/300</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500-100,000</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f=Frequency (MHz)

In situations where the predicted MPE exceeds the General Population threshold in an accessible area as a result of emissions from multiple transmitters, FCC licensees that contribute greater than 5% of the aggregate MPE share responsibility for mitigation.

Based on the computational guidelines set forth in FCC OET Bulletin 65, Waterford Consultants, LLC has developed software to predict the overall Maximum Permissible Exposure possible at any location given the spatial orientation and operating parameters of multiple RF sources. The power density in the Far Field of an RF source is specified by OET-65 Equation 5 as follows:

$$S = \frac{E_{\text{IRP}}}{4\pi R^2} \text{ (mW/cm}^2\text{)}$$

where EIRP is the Effective Radiated Power relative to an isotropic antenna and R is the distance between the antenna and point of study. Additionally, consideration is given to the manufacturers’ horizontal and vertical antenna patterns as well as radiation reflection. At any location, the predicted power density in the Far Field is the spatial average of points within a 0 to 6-foot vertical profile that a person would occupy. Near field power density is based on OET-65 Equation 20 stated as

$$S = \left(\frac{180}{\theta_{BW}}\right) \cdot \frac{100 \cdot P_{in}}{\pi \cdot R \cdot h} \text{ (mW/cm}^2\text{)}$$

where $P_{in}$ is the power input to the antenna, $\theta_{BW}$ is the horizontal pattern beamwidth and h is the aperture length.

For any area in excess of 100% General Population MPE, access controls with appropriate RF alerting signage must be put in place and maintained to restrict access to authorized personnel. Signage must be posted to be visible upon approach from any direction to provide notification of potential conditions within these areas. Subject to other site security requirements, occupational personnel should be trained in RF safety and equipped with personal protective equipment (e.g. RF personal monitor) designed for safe work in the vicinity of RF emitters. Controls such as physical barriers to entry imposed by locked doors, hatches and ladders or other access control mechanisms may be supplemented by alarms that alert the individual and notify site management of a breach in access control. Waterford Consultants, LLC recommends that any work activity in these designated areas or in front of any transmitting antennas be coordinated with all wireless tenants.
Analysis
AT&T Mobility proposes the following installation at this location:

- INSTALL NEW ANTENNAS AND MISC EQUIPMENT ON NEW 75' TALL MONOPINE

The antenna will be mounted on a 75-foot Monopine with a centerline 67 feet above ground level. Proposed antenna operating parameters are listed in Appendix A. Other appurtenances such as GPS antennas, RRUs and hybrid cable below the antennas are not sources of RF emissions. No other antennas are known to be operating in the vicinity of this site.

Power density decreases significantly with distance from any antenna. The panel-type antennas to be employed at this site are highly directional by design and the orientation in azimuth and mounting elevation, as documented, serves to reduce the potential to exceed MPE limits at any location other than directly in front of the antennas. For accessible areas at ground level, the maximum predicted power density level resulting from all AT&T Mobility operations is 8.5702% of the FCC General Population limits. Incident at adjacent
buildings depicted in Figure 1, the maximum predicted power density level resulting from all AT&T Mobility operations is 12.5926% of the FCC General Population limits. The proposed operation will not expose members of the General Public to hazardous levels of RF energy at ground level or in adjacent buildings.

Waterford Consultants, LLC recommends posting RF alerting signage with contact information (Caution 2B) at the base of the Monopine to inform authorized climbers of potential conditions near the antennas. These recommendations are depicted in Figure 2.

Figure 2: Mitigation Recommendations
Caution 2B posted at base of monopine
## Appendix A: Operating Parameters Considered in this Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 02DT</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>3343</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 02DT</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>2625</td>
<td>4306</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 03DT</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>3883</td>
<td>6370</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 03DT</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>5118</td>
<td>8397</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 02DT</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>1671</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 03DT</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>4266</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 02DT</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>3343</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 02DT</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>2625</td>
<td>4306</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 03DT</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>3883</td>
<td>6370</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 02DT</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>5118</td>
<td>8397</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 02DT</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>2625</td>
<td>4306</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 03DT</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>3883</td>
<td>6370</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 03DT</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>5118</td>
<td>8397</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 02DT</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>3343</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 03DT</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>3883</td>
<td>6370</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 02DT</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>1671</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>TPA45R-KU6A 03DT</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>4266</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION NO. ______-20 (PC)

RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING A SPECIAL USE PERMIT (PP2019-301) TO ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY AT AN EXISTING MINI WAREHOUSE STORAGE FACILITY (EXTRA SPACE STORAGE, 121 LLC) LOCATED AT 1478 FREEDOM BOULEVARD, WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA (APN 019-226-13)

Project: New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC DBA AT&T Wireless
APN: 019-226-13

WHEREAS, on July 25, 2019, an application for a Special Use Permit (PP2019-301) to allow the construction of a new 75 foot tall telecommunications facility located at 1478 Freedom Boulevard, Watsonville, California, was filed by New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC dba AT&T Wireless, applicant on behalf of Extra Space Properties 121 LLC, property owner; and

WHEREAS, the project site is designated General Commercial on the General Plan Land Use Map and is within the Thoroughfare Commercial (CT) Zoning District; and

WHEREAS, the project qualifies for a Class 3 Categorical Exemption from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), pursuant to Section 15303 of the CEQA Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, On December 2, 1985, Planning Commission approved Special Use Permit (U-53-85) for Crocker’s Lockers to develop a mini-warehouse facility located at 1478 Freedom Boulevard. The approval consisted of 250 mini storage units. The City Council denied an appeal of the project on January 14, 1986. On June 2, 1986, the Design Review Committee conditionally approved Design Review Permit No. 263 a mini-warehouse facility for Crocker’s Lockers; and
WHEREAS, On May 9, 2007, the Zoning Administrator approved a Business License (BL2007-16) for a change in ownership of the mini-warehouse facility from Susa Partnership LB dba “Storage USA” to Extra Space Storage; and

WHEREAS, notice of time and place of the hearing to consider Special Use Permit (PP2019-301) was given at the time and in the manner prescribed by the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Watsonville. The matter called for hearing evidence both oral and documentary introduced and received, and the matter submitted for decision; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has considered all written and verbal evidence regarding this application at the public hearing and has made Findings, attached hereto and marked as Exhibit “A,” in support of the Special Use Permit (PP2019-301) to allow the construction of a new telecommunications facility at an existing mini warehouse storage facility located at 1478 Freedom Boulevard, Watsonville (APN 019-226-13).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Commission of the City of Watsonville, California, as follows:

Good cause appearing, therefore, the Planning Commission of the City of Watsonville does hereby grant approval of Special Use Permit (PP2019-301), attached hereto and marked as Exhibit “C,” subject to the Conditions attached hereto and marked as Exhibit “B,” to allow the construction of a new telecommunications facility at an existing mini warehouse storage facility located at 1478 Freedom Boulevard, Watsonville (APN 019-226-13).
I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution was introduced at a regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Watsonville, California, held on the 3rd day of March, 2020, by Commissioner______________, who moved its adoption, which motion being duly seconded by Commissioner______________, was upon roll call, carried and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners: 
Noes: Commissioners: 
Absent: Commissioners: 

_______________________________  
Suzi Merriam, Secretary  
Planning Commission  

_______________________________  
Jenny Veitch-Olson, Chairperson  
Planning Commission  


SPECIAL USE PERMIT FINDINGS (WMC § 14-12.513)

The purpose of the Special Use Permit is to allow construction of a new telecommunications facility at an existing mini warehouse storage facility pursuant to WMC Chapter 14-16.

1. The proposed use at the specified location is consistent with the policies embodied in the adopted General Plan and the general purpose and intent of the applicable district regulations.

Supportive Evidence
The construction of a new telecommunications facility located at 1478 Freedom Boulevard in the Thoroughfare Commercial (CT) Zoning District is allowed with the approval of a Special Use Permit. The new telecommunications facility will be compliant with Federal Communications Commission (FCC) guidelines for human exposure to radio frequency electromagnetic fields, and the project meets all pertinent requirements outlined in the Telecommunications Ordinance (WMC Chapter 14-35).

2. The proposed use is compatible with and preserves the character and integrity of adjacent development and neighborhoods and includes improvements or modifications either on-site or within the public rights-of-way to mitigate development related adverse impacts such as traffic, noise, odors, visual nuisances, or other similar adverse effects to adjacent development and neighborhoods.

Supportive Evidence
The project proposes a 75 foot tall telecommunications facility above ground level. As shown on the visual simulations, the proposed telecommunications facility incorporates stealth technology in the form of a monopine structure to minimize visual nuisances. All related support equipment will be located in an existing storage facility and out of public view. The project meets all pertinent requirements outlined in the Telecommunications Ordinance (WMC Chapter 14-35). As conditioned, the proposed use is compatible with and preserves the character of adjacent development.
3. The proposed use will not generate pedestrian or vehicular traffic which will be hazardous or conflict with the existing and anticipated traffic in the neighborhood.

**Supportive Evidence**
The telecommunications facility is un-manned and is visited on an “as needed” basis only. A maximum of two service vehicles will be on-site to service the facility at one time. As a result, no additional traffic will be generated by the project.

4. The proposed use incorporates roadway improvements, traffic control devices or mechanisms, or access restrictions to control traffic flow or divert traffic as needed to reduce or eliminate development impacts on surrounding neighborhood streets.

**Supportive Evidence**
Because of the limited scope of the project, no additional improvements are necessary.

5. The proposed use incorporates features to minimize adverse effects, including visual impacts and noise, of the proposed special use on adjacent properties.

**Supportive Evidence**
The proposed telecommunications facility meets all pertinent requirements outlined in the Telecommunications Ordinance, as well as State and Federal regulations regarding telecommunications uses. The telecommunication facility utilizes stealth technology in the form of a monopine to limit the visual impact of the site on adjacent properties. No additional measures are required for the project.

6. The proposed special use complies with all additional standards imposed on it by the particular provisions of this chapter and all other requirements of this title applicable to the proposed special use and uses within the applicable base zoning district.

**Supportive Evidence**
Standard conditions have been applied to the project in reference to construction, telecommunications uses, and all other applicable requirements. The project is conditioned to provide provisions for removal of all equipment if the carrier abandons the site.

7. The proposed special use will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, convenience and welfare, and will not result in material damage or prejudice to other property in the vicinity.

**Supportive Evidence**
The proposed telecommunications facility meets all pertinent requirements of the Telecommunications Ordinance, and has demonstrated compliance with FCC guidelines for human exposure to radio frequency electromagnetic fields. The
applicant has submitted a Radio Frequency-Electromagnetic Energy (RF-EME) Compliance Report completed by David H Kiser, registered professional engineer of Waterford Consultants LLC, confirming compliance of the proposed telecommunications facility with current FCC regulations. The report indicates that projected maximum RF exposure levels at the ground level would not exceed FCC standards for general population and/or occupational exposure limits.

The telecommunications facility complies with all applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance (WMC Chapter 14-16), the Telecommunications Ordinance (WMC 14-35), and the Federal Telecommunications Act. As conditioned, the proposed site will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, convenience or welfare.
TELECOMMUNICATIONS USE FINDINGS (WMC § 14-25.013)

1. The proposed telecommunications site/facility has been designed to minimize its visual and environmental impacts, including the utilization of stealth technology, when applicable.

   Supportive Evidence
   The proposed project involves the construction of a 75 foot tall monopine at 1478 Freedom Boulevard. As shown on the visual simulations, the project will incorporate stealth technology, in the form of a monopine, to minimize visual impact on adjacent development. The monopine foliage and construction screen attached telecommunications equipment from public view. Remaining accessory equipment will be located within an existing mini warehouse storage locker, screened from public view.

   The proposed project is eligible for a Class 3 Categorical Exemption per Section 15303 of the State CEQA Guidelines as it involves new construction of a telecommunications facility on a developed parcel located with an urban services area. The project would not change the size of the existing mini warehouse storage facility.

   The proposed use – a telecommunications facility – is conditionally permitted in the CT Zoning District. The project is in an area where all public services and facilities are available to allow for maximum development permissible in the General Plan and the area in which the project is located is not environmentally sensitive.

2. That the proposed site has the appropriate zoning, dimensions, slope, design, and configuration for the development of a telecommunications site/facility.

   Supportive Evidence
   The proposed telecommunications facility is located at 1478 Freedom Boulevard, which is large, flat and zoned Thoroughfare Commercial. The proposed project is permitted with the issuance of a Special Use Permit. The project involves the construction a 75 foot tall telecommunications facility with 12 panel antennas on a developed parcel with an existing mini warehouse storage facility. The proposed construction of a new telecommunications facility meets all zoning requirements of the Thoroughfare Commercial (CT) Zoning District.

3. That general landscaping considerations as outlined in Section 14-35.060(g), when applicable, have been complied with to complement the structures and antennae, provide an attractive environment for the enjoyment of the public, and preserve natural feature and elements.

   Supportive Evidence
   The proposed telecommunications facility is located on impervious surface area within a developed parcel located in the Thoroughfare Commercial Zone. Based on Sheet A-1, the facility is located adjacent to an existing mini warehouse storage building, screening the base of the facility from public right of way.
Additionally, the proposed monopine screens attached telecommunications equipment from public view. Based on the attached findings, no additional screening or landscaping improvements are necessary.

4. That the proposed telecommunications site/facility is in compliance with all Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and the California Public Utilities Commission (PUC) requirements.

Supportive Evidence
The applicant has submitted a Radio Frequency-Electromagnetic Energy (RF-EME) Compliance Report completed by Waterford Consultants LLC confirming compliance of the proposed telecommunications facility with current FCC regulations. The report indicates that projected maximum RF exposure levels at the ground level would not exceed FCC standards for general population and/or occupational exposure limits. Recommended safety measures to ensure compliance with appropriate guidelines limiting human exposure to RF-EME for any workers potentially accessing the site have been included as conditions of project approval.

5. That the applicant has demonstrated and confirmed, by independent evaluation of the City, that the site/facility is necessary to address current demand, capacity or other technical limitations of the system in order to maintain service levels.

Supportive Evidence
Based on current and proposed coverage maps for AT&T, the proposed telecommunications facility will increase in building and in vehicle service for customers located near Freedom Boulevard and Alta Vista Avenue. Within AT&Ts area of interest, there were no collocation facilities available, prompting the construction of a new telecommunications facility to address current demand needs.

An independent analysis conducted by Global RF Solutions determined the empirical data collected by this company confirms that the coverage for AT&T is only fair and the data quality is slow in the area to be served by this site. It appears that the proposed site should improve quality of service in the area identified as needing improvement by this new site build.
CITY OF WATSONVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION

EXHIBIT B

Application No: PP2019-301
APNs: 019-226-13
Applicant: New Cingular Wireless
Hearing Date: March 3, 2020

SPECIAL USE PERMIT
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

General Conditions:

1. **Approval.** This approval applies to plans marked "CCL03320, Freedom Boulevard" filed by Epic Wireless, on behalf of AT&T, date stamped by the Community Development Department on July 25, 2019 and revised September 22, 2019. (CDD-P)

2. **Conditional Approval Timeframe.** This Special Use Permit (PP2019-301) shall be null and void if not acted upon within **24 months** from the effective date of the approval thereof. Time extensions may be considered upon receipt of written request submitted no less than forty-five (45) days prior to expiration and in accordance with the provisions of Section 14-10.1201 of the Watsonville Municipal Code (WMC). (CDD-P)

3. **Substantial Conformance.** Project development shall be accomplished in substantial conformance with the approved Plan Set. Any required revisions to the Plan Set shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director or designee. (CDD-P)

4. **Modifications.** Modifications to the project or conditions imposed may be considered in accordance with WMC Section 14-10.1305. (CDD-P)

5. **Compliance.** The proposed use shall be in compliance with Use Permit Conditions of Approval, all local codes and ordinances, appropriate development standards, and current City policies. Any deviation will be grounds for review by the City and may possibly result in revocation of the Use Permit, pursuant to Part 13 of WMC Chapter 14-10. (CDD-P)

6. **Grounds for Review.** The project shall be in compliance with the conditions of approval, all local codes and ordinances, appropriate development standards, and current City policies. Any deviation will be grounds for review by the City and may possibly result in revocation of the Special Use Permit, pursuant to Part 13 of WMC Chapter 14-10, or other code enforcement actions, pursuant to WMC Chapter 14-14. (CDD-P)

7. **Appeal Period/Effective Date.** This Special Use Permit shall not be effective until **14 days** after approval by the decision-making body or following final action on any appeal. (CDD-P)
8. **Necessary Revisions.** The applicant shall make and note all revisions necessary to comply with all conditions of approval. The applicant shall certify in writing below the list(s) of conditions that the building plans comply with the conditions of approval. (CDD-P)

9. **Conditions of Approval.** A copy of the Conditions of Approval shall be printed on the front sheet of plans submitted for future permits. *Plans without the conditions of approval printed directly on the front page will not be accepted at the plan check phase.* (CDD-B, P)

10. **Required Statement.** The applicant and contractor who obtains a building permit for the project shall be required to sign the following statement, which will become conditions of the building permit:

    "I understand that the subject permit involves construction of a building (project) with an approved Special Use Permit. I intend to perform or supervise the performance of the work allowed by this permit in a manner which results in a finished building with the same level of detail, articulation, and dimensionality shown in the plans submitted for building permits. I hereby acknowledge that failure to construct the building as represented in the building permit plans, may result in delay of the inspections process and/or the mandatory reconstruction or alteration of any portion of the building that is not in substantial conformance with the approved plans, prior to continuation of inspections or the building final."

    ____________________________
    Signature of Building Contractor

    ____________________________
    Date

**Project Specific Conditions**

11. **FCC Requirements.** The telecommunications facility shall comply with all Federal Communications Commission (FCC) rules, regulations and standards, including compliance with non-ionizing electromagnetic radiations standards set by the FCC. (CDD-P)

12. **Access to Telecommunications Facility.** AT&T, or its successor, shall ensure access to the telecommunications facility or areas associated with the active antenna installation to be restricted and secured where possible, in accordance with the recommendations of the RF-EME Compliance Report prepared by David H. Kiser, of Waterford Consultants LLC, on January 15, 2020. (CDD-B)

13. **Sign Permit.** Any other proposed signage on the site or the equipment area advertising AT&T, or any other carrier, must be approved by the Zoning Administrator in conjunction with a sign permit. No signage is permitted on the tower itself. (CDD-P)
14. **Maintenance.** The area within and around the monopine and equipment enclosure are to be kept clear of trash, weeds, and other debris. (CDD-P)

15. **Cease of Operation.** Non-operation of the telecommunications facility for a period of six (6) months or more (180 days), of if the site falls into disrepair, the site shall be considered abandoned. (CDD-P)

16. **Removal.** The owner of an abandoned telecommunications facility shall remove the facility/site and appurtenant equipment within (6) months of its abandonment. (CDD-P)

17. **City Initiated Removal.** If the facility is not removed within six (6) months, the City may remove the site at the owner's expense. (CDD-P)

18. **Deemed Abandoned.** The facility shall not be deemed abandoned unless all users cease operation. (CDD-P)

19. **Revocation of Permit.** Failure to comply with the provisions of WMC Chapter 14-35 or the Conditions of Approval of this Use Permit shall be grounds for revocation of the permit. (CDD-P)

20. **RF Report Recommendations.** AT&T shall post RF altering signage with contact information at the base of the monopine to inform authorized climbers of potential conditions near the antennas. AT&T shall ensure that access to the antenna and areas associated with the active antenna installation are restricted and secured, where possible. (CDD-P)

21. **Collocation Opportunities.** The applicant shall provide proof of notification to an offer of collocation opportunities on the new site/facility to other service providers. (CDD-P)

22. **Cost Share.** Where deemed feasible by the City as a collocation opportunity site/facility, the applicant shall sign and record with the Santa Cruz County Recorder’s Office a legally binding agreement limiting any collocation costs assessed to other service providers to a pro rata share of the ground lease, site acquisition cost, design, capital costs for construction of the site/facility including associated permitting costs, and reasonable maintenance, repair and replacement costs. (CDD-P)

**Prior to or concurrent with the submittal of a Building Permit application, the following information shall be submitted:**

23. **Removal of Facility.** The applicant shall submit a copy of the lease agreement, omitting any financial information, that includes provisions for removal of the site, as outlined in the Watsonville Municipal Code. (CDD-P)

24. **Building Permit.** The applicant shall obtain all required building permits (Building & Electrical) for this project to ensure that all telecommunications facility modifications comply with current California Codes. (CDD-P, B)
25. **Design Professional Required.** A design professional is required to prepare construction drawings for proposed improvements per the State of California Business and Profession’s Code. (CDD-B)

26. **Construction Plans.** Comprehensive detailed construction plans are required at the time of submittal to be reviewed for adequate content prior to intake by the Building Official. (CDD-B)

27. **Work Hours.** No work for which a building permit is required shall be performed within the hours of 7:00 PM – 7:00 AM Monday through Friday, nor prior to 8:00 AM or after 5:00 PM on Saturday. No work shall be performed on Sundays or holidays. A sign shall be posted at a conspicuous place near the main entry to the site, prominently displaying these hour restrictions and identifying the phone number of the Job Superintendent. Any exception to these hours shall require a minimum 48 hours’ notice to the Community Development Department. (CDD-P, B)

**Post-Construction Conditions:**

28. **Post Construction NIER Measurement Reporting.** Monitoring of NIER/RF radiation to verify compliance with the FCC’s NIER standards shall be required for all new or modified wireless communication facilities through submission of a report documenting NIER measurements at the site or facility within ninety (90) days after the commencement of normal operations or within ninety (90) days after any major or minor modification of the site or facility. The NIER measurements shall be made, at the applicant’s expense, by a qualified independent tele-communications radio-frequency engineer licensed by the State of California, during typical peak use periods, utilizing the monitoring guideline described in Section 14-35.090(a)(1), with measurements taken at various locations, including those from which public RF exposure levels are expected to be the highest. The report shall list and describe each transmitter/antenna present at the site/facility, indicating the effective radiated power of each (for collocated sites/facilities, this would include the antennae of all other carriers at the site/facility). The report shall include field measurements of NIER emissions generated by the facility and also any other nearby emissions sources from various directions and particularly from adjacent areas with habitable structures. The report shall compare the measured results to the FCC NIER standards for such sites/facilities. (CDD-P)

29. **Liability Insurance.** The applicant or site/facility operator shall provide proof of a current occurrence-based, comprehensive general liability insurance policy evidencing coverage of at least one million dollars and no/100ths ($1,000,000.00) per occurrence for bodily injury and property damage claims, naming the applicant and owner of the facility as insureds, and an endorsement thereof naming the City of Watsonville, its appointed and elected officials, and its employees as additional insureds. The report documenting the measurements and findings, with respect to compliance with the established FCC NIER exposure standard, and proof of general liability insurance for the site/facility, shall be submitted to the Community Development Department prior to
commencement of facility operation. Failure to comply with this requirement may result in the initiation of permit revocation proceedings by the City. (CDD-P)

**Indemnity Provision:**

30. **Indemnity Provision.** The applicant shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City of Watsonville, its elected and appointed officials, officers, employees, and agents from and against any claim, action, or proceeding against the City of Watsonville, its elected and appointed officials, officers, employees, or agents to attack, set aside, void, or annul any approval or condition of approval of the City of Watsonville concerning this Use Permit, including but not limited to any approval or condition of approval of the City Council, Planning Commission, or Community Development Director, which action is brought within the time period provided for in Government Code Section 66499.37. The City shall promptly notify the applicant of any claim, action, or proceeding concerning the Use Permit and the City shall cooperate fully in the defense of the matter. The City reserves the right, at its own option, to choose its own attorney to represent the City, its elected and appointed officials, officers, employees, and agents in the defense of the matter. (CDD-P)

**Key to Department Responsibility**

CDD-B – Community Development Department (Building)
CDD-P – Community Development Department (Planning)
CITY OF WATSONVILLE
EXHIBIT C
PLANNING COMMISSION

Application No: PP2019-301
APNs: 019-226-13
Applicant: New Cingular Wireless
Hearing Date: March 3, 2020

Applicant: New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC dba AT&T Wireless
Address: 605 Coolidge Drive, #100, Folsom, CA 95630
Project: Special Use Permit with Environmental Review
Location: 1478 Freedom Boulevard, Watsonville, CA 95076
Purpose: Allow a new telecommunications facility at an existing mini warehouse storage facility

Property Owner: Extra Space Properties 121
Address: 1478 Freedom Boulevard, Watsonville, CA 95076

A Special Use Permit (PP2019-301) to allow construction of a new telecommunications facility at an existing mini warehouse storage facility located at 1478 Freedom Boulevard, Watsonville (APN 019-226-13), was reviewed by the Planning Commission at a public hearing on March 3, 2020, and was conditionally approved by adoption of Planning Commission Resolution No.____________ (PC) together with findings and conditions of approval attached hereto and made a part of this permit.

CITY OF WATSONVILLE
Planning Commission

Suzi Merriam
Community Development Director