Adrienne Thompson

From: Annemarie <aweibel@mcn.org>
Sent: Wednesday, November 4, 2026 11:58 PM
To: pbscommissions; Rob Fitzsimmons
Subject: public comments item 6b UM_2025-0003 11-5-2026

Caution: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioners,

You will be voting on the Coastal Development Use Permit application by T-Mobile USA, Inc. to authorize continued operation of a wireless communication facility and other changes on the Lords Land Ministries on Navarro Ridge Rd. in Albion. You will be basing your vote on a Subsequent MND. See https://www.mendocinocounty.gov/files/assets/public/v/1/pbs/documents/boards-and-commissions/planning-commission/2026/14-november-5-2026/2um_2025-0003-initial-study.pdf

Apparently the neighbors of this wireless facilities tower were notified about this Planning Commission meeting/the application if they live within 300ft. of this tower. In an area where most of the property sizes (16) range between 14 to 211 acres and only 9 properties range between 0.7 and 12 acres. Who would even find out about this meeting? Apparently the nearest residence is approximately 680 feet south of the tower location. What was not mentioned was that this tower was apparently placed next to the children's playground. Not a safe place for little children as children and adolescents are particularly vulnerable to electromagnetic fields. The Lords Land Ministries invites people to come for a vacation and live in RV's, tents, and cabins in close proximity to the wireless facilities tower.

As AT&T used grant money to build the 135 ft. tall original wireless facilities tower there was no colocation available. Now with T-Mobile's application the 155ft. tall wireless facilities tower will provide space for any public emergency service provider to locate communication equipment on the tower.

It was mentioned in the Staff Report under Permit Expiration that Staff recommends removing the expiration date from this permit just like the Planning Commission did with another wireless facilities tower that was not in the Coastal Zone. The Planning Commission explained that they felt requiring regular renewals on cell tower permits was broadly no longer necessary. Given these statements, Staff recommends removing the expiration date from this permit as well. It does not seem to relate to any of the required findings.

I have followed the applications for wireless facilities towers on the Coast since at least 2013. Would now all these towers not be required to regular renewals on cell tower permits?

These comments about removing the expiration date from this permit seem to contradict the information given under # 6 in Exhibit A Conditions of Approval see Resolution which lists: 6**An evaluation of the facility's stealth capability shall be submitted for review and approval by the Department of Planning and Building Services after the initial construction, one year following construction and every five years

thereafter. The report shall assess surrounding vegetation growth, including height and density in the vicinity, and a color assessment to assess fading of material. Replacement or remediation of the wireless facility shall be performed by the applicant if required by the Department of Planning and Building Services.

The Staff Report also lists under Environmental Protection that federal law has rendered certain mitigation measures unenforceable and thus infeasible and therefore it seems that the current staff report based on the Initial Study made sure that conditions have been identified to mitigate impacts to the environment to a less than significant level for the Subsequent MND.

In the Initial Study for the Subsequent MND Wildfire XX a, b & c were thought of as less than significant or having no impact and therefore no mitigations were proposed. This area has a high fire danger and is on a neighborhood dead end road 3 miles east of Highway 1.

Mandatory Findings of Significance XXI b & c were thought of as less than significant and therefore no mitigations were proposed. b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects). c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

I believe the effects on the environment are significant and revisions on the project have not been made by or agreed to by the project component. The Subsequent MND tries to address some of them, but not sufficiently.

Please study this application carefully and do not approve this application before AT&T deals with their past history. Please also look carefully at the documents, and especially before approving "Future changes to the facility that fall within the definition of Eligible Facilities Requests under FCC Guidance as in effect at the time the change is proposed that apparently will also be authorized by this modified permit."

Thanks, Annemarie Weibel

Albion 11-4-2026

.