



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Discretionary Review Full Analysis

HEARING DATE FEBRUARY 17, 2011
CONTINUED FROM DECEMBER 2, 2010

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Date: February 10, 2011
Case No.: **2010.0558D**
Project Address: **1763-1767 Stockton Street**
Permit Application: 2009.1105.0626
Zoning: North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District
North Beach Special Use District
40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 0104/024
Project Sponsor: Richard Hirsch of Permit Me for
T-Mobile
1855 Gateway Boulevard, Suite 900
Concord, CA 94520
Staff Contact: Aaron Hollister – (415) 575-9078
aaron.hollister@sfgov.org
Recommendation: **Do not take DR and approve the project as proposed.**

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project proposes to add a T-Mobile micro wireless telecommunications service (WTS) facility consisting of a panel antenna shrouded inside a faux vent pipe structure and equipment cabinets. The faux vent pipe would be mounted on the rooftop of the subject building at a height of approximately 36.5 feet with approximate dimensions of five feet in height and one foot in diameter. The faux vent pipe would also be set back a minimum of 6.5 feet from edge of the building. The equipment cabinets would be mounted to the wall of an existing penthouse stair structure found at the southwest corner of the structure.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND PRESENT USE

The project is located on the southwest corner of Stockton and Greenwich Streets, Assessor's Block 0104, Lot 024. This site is within the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District, the North Beach Special Use District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District

The project site is entirely occupied by a three-story, mixed-use building that contains a ground-floor commercial space and five residential dwelling units on the second and third floors. The subject building was constructed in 1907 and is listed in the North Beach Survey as a strong contributory building.

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES AND NEIGHBORHOOD

The North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD) is located in between Telegraph Hill and Nob Hill north of Broadway, roughly centered on Columbus Avenue. The North Beach NCD functions as a neighborhood-serving marketplace, citywide specialty shopping and dining district and tourist attraction, as well as an apartment and residential hotel zone. Traditionally, the district has provided most convenience goods and services for residents of North Beach and portions of Telegraph and Russian Hills.

The surrounding development is a variety of multi-story, mixed-use buildings. Nearby ground-floor uses include eating and drinking establishments, small-scale retail stores, and nighttime entertainment. The upper stories are generally occupied by apartments, and residential hotels. The scale of development throughout the area consists of low- and mid-rise buildings (one- to four-story structures).

BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION NOTIFICATION

TYPE	REQUIRED PERIOD	NOTIFICATION DATES	DR FILE DATE	DR HEARING DATE	FILING TO HEARING TIME
312 Notice	30 days	June 4, 2010 – July 7, 2010	July 6, 2010	February 17, 2011**	227 days**

* Notification period expired on a holiday weekend, so the last notification date was extended to the next business day following the holiday weekend

** Hearing was originally scheduled for September 30, 2010, but was continued on two occasions at the request of the office of Supervisor D. Chiu.

HEARING NOTIFICATION*

TYPE	REQUIRED PERIOD	REQUIRED NOTICE DATE	ACTUAL NOTICE DATE	ACTUAL PERIOD
Posted Notice	10 days	September 20, 2010	September 20, 2010	10 days
Mailed Notice	10 days	September 20, 2010	September 20, 2010	10 days

* Hearing was continued from the originally schedule date of September 30, 2010.

PUBLIC COMMENT

	SUPPORT	OPPOSED	NO POSITION
Adjacent neighbor(s)	None	None	X
Other neighbors on the block or directly across the street	1	None	X
Neighborhood groups	None	1	X

The Department has received written comments/and or petition signatures from the project sponsor and the DR requestor. The project sponsor has six letters of support from residents of the area, and a petition containing 128 signatures from residents of the area. The project sponsor also submitted letters and petition signatures from residents outside of the area.

The Department has received correspondence in opposition to the project from three residents of the area and has received several telephone calls in opposition of the project.

DR REQUESTOR

Telegraph Hill Dwellers
PO Box 330159
San Francisco, CA 94133

An individual who works full-time at 491 Greenwich Street and lives 0.4 miles away is also an interested party.

DR REQUESTOR'S CONCERNS AND PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES

Issue #1: T-Mobile has failed to show a significant gap or need for service in the area as required by the WTS Siting Guidelines for a Preference 6 (Limited Preference Site) location. T-Mobile has not proven that if such a gap does exist, the proposed antennas are the least intrusive alternative for filling this significant gap in service in the neighborhood.

Issue #2: The project is not in conformance with the City's General Plan, Commerce and Industry Element, in that the project does not "encourage development which provides substantial net benefits and minimizes undesirable consequences" and does not "mitigate negative impacts."

Issue #3: Neighbors have aesthetic concerns regarding the blockage of views.

Issue #4: The industrial/commercial facility is an unrelated change in use of a mixed-use building that is unnecessary to the building's operation and enjoyment.

Issue #5: Applying for a wireless facility at this location as an Accessory Use in an abuse of the Accessory Use process.

Issue #6: If T-Mobile upgrades the site from a micro-cell site to a macro-cell site, the Planning Department has no requirements that wireless carriers inform the Planning Department of such upgrades or seek new permits to do so.

Issue #7: If upgraded to a macro-cell site, the project may not meet Federal Communication Commission regulations regarding radio frequency radiation exposure.

Proposed Alternatives: The project sponsor may locate this wireless facility at a different location, co-locate the facility an already-existing wireless site, or enter into an inter-carrier service agreement with a different carrier to share an existing facility or facilities in the service area.

Please reference the attached *Discretionary Review Application*, dated July 6, 2010.

PROJECT SPONSOR'S RESPONSE

Response to Siting Issue:

T-Mobile believes the site is necessary to increase the quality of services it offers in the area in terms of 3G technology that T-Mobile believes is currently lacking in the area. Existing and proposed coverage maps have been included in the project sponsor's response. T-Mobile also states that customers in the area have complained that dropped calls, weak or no signal, and slow downloading speeds are common in the area.

T-Mobile also explored locating the proposed WTS facility on a publicly-used facility, co-location site and/or wholly industrial/commercial structures in the area, which are generally preferred location sites. However, T-Mobile found these sites to be limited in the project area, which primarily features residential and mixed-use buildings. The public facilities in the area were limited to Washington Square and Pioneer Park, and installing a WTS facility at either location without having visual impacts was difficult. Also, far-reaching coverage could not be extended to the desired coverage area from a co-location or wholly industrial/commercial location because of problems with the operability of a WTS facility due to topographic constraints in the area.

Response to Use Issues: The project sponsor maintains that the project is designed to meet the requirements stipulated in the T-Mobile *Accessory Use Determination* letter signed by Zoning Administrator on May 15, 2006. The project sponsor further maintains that the rooftop antennas are subordinate to the primary uses of the mixed-use building. The applicant noted that the Planning Department staff and the Planning Commission have agreed that rooftop antenna facilities qualify as accessory uses in accord with the *Accessory Use Determination* letter and applicable Planning Code Sections.

Response to Visual and Aesthetic Impacts: The project sponsor noted that the antennas will be hidden within a vent-like enclosure, which resemble standard rooftop vents that are commonly occurring elements on residential buildings, and will blend with the existing rooftop development. The vent pipe enclosure will be set back from the edges of the building and will be located in a position that will minimize its visibility from nearby public rights-of-way. The project sponsor has included drawings, photos and photo simulations for further reference.

Please reference the attached *Response to Discretionary Review Application*, dated September 21, 2010.

PROJECT ANALYSIS

Based on service coverage maps provided by T-Mobile, the project addresses a coverage gap in T-Mobile's service in the North Beach/Western Telegraph Hill area utilizing equipment that is minimal in

both appearance and power. AT&T already has a micro-cellular facility at the subject site, so the proposed site is considered a Preference 2 location, which is defined as Co-Location site in the WTS Siting Guidelines and is considered a preferential location. Because efforts have been made to minimize the project and to locate it at a preferential site as established by the WTS Siting Guidelines, the proposed project appears to be the least intrusive alternative in filling a coverage gap T-Mobile currently has in the project area.

The design of the site and minimal dimensions of the equipment are anticipated to make the proposed installation not visible, or only minimally visible, when viewed from nearby public rights-of-way (please see attached photo simulations), and thus, the site is not expected to create visual impacts. T-Mobile worked with Department staff to minimize the dimensions of the proposed equipment and to provide setbacks that would decrease the visibility of the of faux vent pipe from adjacent rights-of-way. Also of note, private views from residences are not protected.

The practice of approving similar micro-cellular sites as Accessory Uses has been a well-vested practice of the Department since 1998. A Letter of Determination issued by the Zoning Administrator dated May 15, 2006 (attached), established the equipment type, equipment concealment efforts and processing procedures that would be necessary to consider a T-Mobile site an Accessory Use in Neighborhood Commercial Districts as defined in Planning Code Section 703.2(b)(1)(C). The Department has determined that the proposed project would meet the requirements established in the 2006 Letter of Determination. Furthermore, the proposed project would be consistent with Planning Code 703.2(b)(1)(C) as an Accessory Use as the project would be a use that is appropriate, incidental and subordinate to lawful principal uses found at the site. Because the project has been found to be compliant the 2006 Letter of Determination, Planning Code Section 703.2(b)(1)(C) and Department procedures, the project would not represent an abuse of the Accessory Use process.

If the proposed project were to be changed to a larger macro-cellular site, T-Mobile would be required to obtain permits and entitlements for the site modification, contrary to the DR Applicant's claim, and the Planning Commission would have to authorize Conditional Use in order to upgrade to a macro-cellular site. Also, if a macro upgrade were to be proposed, T-Mobile would be required to prove that the upgraded site is compliant with the Federal Communication Commission's (FCC) regulations regarding radio frequency (R.F.) exposure. Locally, the Department of Public Health (DPH) assures that WTS facilities are compliant with FCC R.F. exposure requirements. Under current procedures, a WTS facility applicant must receive approval from DPH regarding compliance with RF exposure requirements before an application for Conditional Use may be submitted to the Planning Department.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The proposed project was determined by the Department to be categorically exempt from the environmental review process pursuant to Class 3 exemptions (Section 15303 of the California Environmental Quality Act) of Title 14 of the California Administrative Code

RESIDENTIAL DESIGN TEAM REVIEW

The request for Discretionary Review was not reviewed by the Department's Residential Design Team as the project represents a change of use.

BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

The Department believes that the project is not exceptional or extraordinary for the following reasons:

- The project sponsor has provided coverage maps indicating gaps in coverage in the project area, and that the proposed Accessory Use site would address these gaps.
- The proposed use will not eliminate space that is currently occupied by commercial or residential building uses.
- The proposed WTS facility constitutes an Accessory Use.
- Review by a number of City departments will ensure that life/safety requirements are met.
- The proposed WTS facility will not visually compromise the building due to its overall size and location on the building relative to the public right-of-way.


RECOMMENDATION: Do not take DR and approve the project as proposed.

Attachments:

Block Book Map
Sanborn Map
Zoning Map
Aerial Photographs
Context Photos
Section 312 Notice
DR Application
Public Correspondence
Applicant's Submittal
 Response to DR Application dated September 21, 2010
 Coverage Map
 Photo Simulations
 Radio Frequency Report
 Department of Public Health Review
 Reduced Plans

AJH G:\DOCUMENTS\Projects\DR\1763 Stockton Street\1763 Stockton Street DR - Full Analysis.doc

Parcel Map




SUBJECT PROPERTY



Discretionary Review
Building Permit No. 2009.1105.0626
Case Number 2010.0558D
1763-1767 Stockton Street

Sanborn Map*




SUBJECT PROPERTY



*The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco have not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.

Discretionary Review
 Building Permit No. 2009.1105.0626
 Case Number 2010.0558D
 1763-1767 Stockton Street

Aerial Photo




SUBJECT PROPERTY



Discretionary Review
Building Permit No. 2009.1105.0626
Case Number 2010.0558D
1763-1767 Stockton Street

Aerial Photo

North-Facing




SUBJECT PROPERTY



Discretionary Review
Building Permit No. 2009.1105.0626
Case Number 2010.0558D
1763-1767 Stockton Street

Aerial Photo

East-Facing




SUBJECT PROPERTY



Discretionary Review
Building Permit No. 2009.1105.0626
Case Number 2010.0558D
1763-1767 Stockton Street

Aerial Photo

South-Facing



SUBJECT PROPERTY



Aerial Photo


West-Facing



SUBJECT PROPERTY



Zoning Map



SUBJECT PROPERTY



Discretionary Review
Building Permit No. 2009.1105.0626
Case Number 2010.0558D
1763-1767 Stockton Street



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1660 Mission Street, Suite 500 San Francisco, California 94103 www.sfgov.org/planning

May 15, 2006

Brian Pudlik,
Parsons
Representing Omnipoint T-Mobile
185 Berry Street, Suite 4300
San Francisco, CA 94107

Re: T-Mobile
Accessory Use Determination for Microcell Facilities

Mr. Pudlik,

This determination is in response to your request for certain types of wireless telecommunication facilities qualification as accessory uses under the Planning Code.

After reviewing previous determinations, the Planning Code (Sections 204 and 703.2(b)(1)(C) for Accessory Uses, General and Accessory Uses in Neighborhood Commercial Districts, respectively) and the information submitted with your letter, I have determined that the proposed antenna installations would fall within the scope of accessory uses as authorized in previous letters of determinations for other wireless service providers.

This authorization shall be limited to the following:

1. The installation of up to one panel antennae, with overall dimensions of no more than 30 inches high, 6.8 inches wide and 3.5 inches deep (mounted on the roof within a false vent, limited to extend up to five feet above the existing roof-line and set back at least five feet from the any edge of the building, these maximum dimensions are to be reduced whenever possible) or up to two omni antennas no more than 24 inches in length and 1.5 inches in diameter (façade mounted and painted to match);
2. The installation of two Erickson equipment cabinets with exterior dimensions of 17" x 30" x 11" and screened from view or within an existing structure;
3. Individual emission calculations for each site shall be provided to the Department of Public Health for their review;
4. The installation of the panel antennas, coax cables and their related equipment cabinets are not to exceed the existing height of the structure to which they are to be attached, painted to match the color of the existing building, concealed, screened and/or otherwise designed to blend with existing architectural features, limiting them from public view; and

5. Any proposed installation must comply with the design review of the Planning Department.

In order to facilitate the review of these "microcell" antennas by the Planning Department and other City agencies, each application shall be accompanied by the Wireless Telecommunications Services (W.T.S.) Facilities Siting Guidelines Application Checklist for Accessory Use Applications.

If for any reason the Zoning Administrator finds that this determination is no longer applicable or an individual site merits review and authorization from the Planning Commission, the Zoning Administrator may initiate the conditional use application process.

If anyone believes this determination represents an error in the interpretation of the Planning Code or an abuse of discretion by the Zoning Administrator, this determination may be appealed to the Board of Appeals within fifteen (15) days from the date of this letter. For information on the appeals process, please contact the Board of Appeals, located at 1660 Mission Street, or call (415) 575-6880.

Sincerely,

Lawrence B. Badiner
Zoning Administrator

**T-Mobile West Corp. • Proposed Base Station (Site No. SF23211A)
1763-1767 Stockton Street • San Francisco, California**

Statement of Hammett & Edison, Inc., Consulting Engineers

The firm of Hammett & Edison, Inc., Consulting Engineers, has been retained on behalf of T-Mobile West Corp., a personal wireless telecommunications carrier, to evaluate the base station (Site No. SF23211A) proposed to be located at 1763-1767 Stockton Street in San Francisco, California, for compliance with appropriate guidelines limiting human exposure to radio frequency (“RF”) electromagnetic fields.

Background

The San Francisco Department of Public Health has adopted a 10-point checklist for determining compliance of WTS facilities with prevailing safety standards. The acceptable limits set by the FCC for exposures of unlimited duration are:

<u>Wireless Service</u>	<u>Frequency Band</u>	<u>Occupational Limit</u>	<u>Public Limit</u>
Microwave (Point-to-Point)	5–23,000 MHz	5.00 mW/cm ²	1.00 mW/cm ²
BRS (Broadband Radio)	2,600	5.00	1.00
AWS (Advanced Wireless)	2,100	5.00	1.00
PCS (Personal Communication)	1,950	5.00	1.00
Cellular	870	2.90	0.58
SMR (Specialized Mobile Radio)	855	2.85	0.57
700 MHz	700	2.35	0.47
[most restrictive frequency range]	30–300	1.00	0.20

The site was visited by Mr. Robert H. Taylor, a qualified field technician contracted by Hammett & Edison, Inc., during normal business hours on June 16, 2010, a non-holiday weekday, and reference has been made to information provided by T-Mobile, including drawings by Michael Wilk Architecture, dated April 19, 2010.

Checklist

1. The location of all existing antennas and facilities at site. Existing RF levels.

There were observed no other wireless telecommunications base stations installed at the site. Existing RF levels at ground near the site were less than 1% of the most restrictive public exposure limit.

2. The location of all approved (but not installed) antennas and facilities. Expected RF levels from approved antennas.

No WTS facilities or other communications facilities are reported to be approved for this site but not yet installed.

3. The number and types of WTS within 100 feet of proposed site and estimates of additive EMR emissions at proposed site.

There were no other WTS facilities observed within 100 feet of the site.



**T-Mobile West Corp. • Proposed Base Station (Site No. SF23211A)
1763-1767 Stockton Street • San Francisco, California**

4. Location (and number) of Applicant's antennas and back-up facilities per building and location (and number) of other WTS at site.

T-Mobile proposes to mount one RFS Model APXV18-206513T-C directional panel antenna inside a cylinder, configured to resemble a vent, to be installed at the north side of the roof of the building. The antenna would be mounted at an effective height of about 39 feet above ground, 3 feet above the roof, and would be oriented toward 50°T.

5. Power rating (maximum and expected operating power) for all existing and proposed backup equipment subject to application.

The expected operating power of the T-Mobile transmitters is reflected in the resulting effective radiated power given in Item 6 below; the transmitters may operate at a power below their maximum rating.

6. Total number of watts per installation and total number of watts for all installations at site.

The maximum effective radiated power proposed by T-Mobile in any direction is 120 watts.

7. Plot or roof plan showing method of attachment of antennas, directionality of antennas, and height above roof level. Discuss nearby inhabited buildings.

The drawings show the proposed antenna to be installed as described in Item 4 above. There were noted buildings of similar height located nearby.

8. Estimated ambient RF levels for proposed site and identify three-dimensional perimeter where exposure standards are exceeded.

For a person anywhere at ground, the maximum ambient RF exposure level due to the proposed T-Mobile operation by itself is calculated to be 0.00035 mW/cm², which is 0.035% of the applicable public exposure limit. Ambient RF levels at the site are therefore estimated to remain less than 1% of the limit. The three-dimensional perimeter of RF levels equal to the public exposure limit is calculated to extend less than 2½ feet in front of the T-Mobile antenna; this does not reach any publicly accessible areas.

9. Describe proposed signage at site.

Due to its mounting location, the T-Mobile antenna would not be accessible to the general public, and so no mitigation measures are necessary to comply with the FCC public exposure guidelines. To prevent occupational exposures in excess of the FCC guidelines, no access within 1 foot in front of the T-Mobile antenna itself, such as might occur during building maintenance activities, should be allowed while the site is in operation, unless other measures can be demonstrated to ensure that



**T-Mobile West Corp. • Proposed Base Station (Site No. SF23211A)
1763-1767 Stockton Street • San Francisco, California**


occupational protection requirements are met. Posting explanatory warning signs at the roof access door and on the cylinder housing the antenna, such that the signs would be readily visible from any angle of approach to persons who might need to work within that distance, would be sufficient to meet FCC-adopted guidelines.*

10. Statement of authorship.

The undersigned author of this statement is a qualified Professional Engineer, holding California Registrations Nos. E-13026 and M-20676, which expire on June 30, 2011. This work has been carried out under his direction, and all statements are true and correct of his own knowledge except, where noted, when data has been supplied by others, which data he believes to be correct.

Conclusion

Based on the information and analysis above, it is my professional opinion that the T-Mobile West Corp. base station proposed to be located at 1763-1767 Stockton Street in San Francisco will comply with the prevailing standards for limiting human exposure to radio frequency energy and, therefore, will not for this reason cause a significant impact on the environment. The highest estimated exposure levels in publicly accessible areas are many times less than the prevailing standards allow for exposures of unlimited duration. This finding is consistent with measurements of actual exposure conditions taken at other operating base stations. Posting of explanatory signs is recommended to establish compliance with occupational exposure limitations.


William F. Hammett, P.E.



June 29, 2010

* Warning signs should comply with OET-65 color, symbol, and content recommendations. Contact information should be provided (e.g., a telephone number) to arrange for access to restricted areas. The selection of language(s) is not an engineering matter; the San Francisco Department of Public Health recommends that all signs be written in English, Spanish, and Chinese.



Review of Cellular Antenna Site Proposals

Project Sponsor : T-Mobile **Planner:** Ionin
RF Engineer Consultant: Hammett and Edison **Phone Number:** (707) 996-5200
Project Address/Location: 1763 Stockton St
Site ID: 926 **SiteNo.:** SF 23211

The following information is required to be provided before approval of this project can be made. These information requirements are established in the San Francisco Planning Department Wireless Telecommunications Services Facility Siting Guidelines dated August 1996. In order to facilitate quicker approval of this project, it is recommended that the project sponsor review this document before submitting the proposal to ensure that all requirements are included.

X 1. The location of all existing antennas and facilities. Existing RF levels. (WTS-FSG, Section 11, 2b)
 Existing Antennas No Existing Antennas: 0

X 2. The location of all approved (but not installed) antennas and facilities. Expected RF levels from the approved antennas. (WTS-FSG Section 11, 2b)
 Yes No

X 3. The number and types of WTS within 100 feet of the proposed site and provide estimates of cumulative EMR emissions at the proposed site. (WTS-FSG, Section 10.5.2)
 Yes No

X 4. Location (and number) of the Applicant's antennas and back-up facilities per building and number and location of other telecommunication facilities on the property (WTS-FSG, Section 10.4.1a)

X 5. Power rating (maximum and expected operating power) for all existing and proposed backup equipment subject to the application (WTS-FSG, Section 10.4.1c)
 Maximum Power Rating: 120 watts.

X 6. The total number of watts per installation and the total number of watts for all installations on the building (roof or side) (WTS-FSG, Section 10.5.1).
 Maximum Effective Radiant: 120 watts.

X 7. Preferred method of attachment of proposed antenna (roof, wall mounted, monopole) with plot or roof plan. Show directionality of antennas. Indicate height above roof level. Discuss nearby inhabited buildings (particularly in direction of antennas) (WTS-FSG, Section 10.4.1d)

X 8. Report estimated ambient radio frequency fields for the proposed site (identify the three-dimensional perimeter where the FCC standards are exceeded.) (WTS-FSG, Section 10.5) State FCC standard utilized and power density exposure level (i.e. 1986 NCRP, 200 $\mu\text{w}/\text{cm}^2$)
 Maximum RF Exposure: 0.00035 mW/cm² Maximum RF Exposure Percent: 0.035

X 9. Signage at the facility identifying all WTS equipment and safety precautions for people nearing the equipment as may be required by any applicable FCC-adopted standards. (WTS-FSG, Section 10.9.2). Discuss signage for those who speak languages other than English.
 Public_Exclusion_Area Public Exclusion In Feet: 3
 Occupational_Exclusion_Area Occupational Exclusion In Feet: 1

X 10. Statement on who produced this report and qualifications.

X **Approved.** Based on the information provided the following staff believes that the project proposal will comply with the current Federal Communication Commission safety standards for radiofrequency radiation exposure. FCC standard 1986-NCRP **Approval of the subsequent Project Implementation Report is based on project sponsor completing recommendations by project consultant and DPH.**

Comments:

There are no existing antennas operated by T-Mobile installed on the roof top of the building at 1763 Stockton St. Existing RF levels at ground level were around 1% of the FCC public exposure limit. There were observed no other antennas within 100 feet of this site. T-Mobile proposes to install 0 new antenna. The antennas are mounted at a height of 39 feet above the ground. The estimated ambient RF field from the proposed T-Mobile transmitters at ground level is calculated to be 0.00035 mW/sq cm., which is 0.035 % of the FCC public exposure limit. The three dimensional perimeter of RF levels equal to the public exposure limit extends 3 feet and does not reach any publicly accessible areas. Warnings signs must be posted at the antennas and roof access points in English, Spanish and Chinese. Worker should not have access to within 1 foot of the front of the antennas while they are in operation.

 Not Approved, additional information required.

 Not Approved, does not comply with Federal Communication Commission safety standards for radiofrequency radiation exposure. FCC Standard

 1 Hours spent reviewing

Charges to Project Sponsor (in addition to previous charges, to be received at time of receipt by S)

Signed:



Dated: 6/30/2010

Patrick Fosdahl

Environmental Health Management Section
San Francisco Dept. of Public Health
1390 Market St., Suite 210,
San Francisco, CA. 94102
(415) 252-3904



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1650 Mission Street Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

NOTICE OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION (SECTION 312)

On November 11, 2009, the Applicant named below filed Building Permit Application No. 2009.11.05.0626 (Alteration) with the City and County of San Francisco.

CONTACT INFORMATION		PROJECT SITE INFORMATION	
Applicant:	Rick Hirsch	Project Address:	1763 Stockton Street
Address:	1855 Gateway Boulevard, Suite 900	Cross Streets:	Intersection of Greenwich
City, State:	Concord, CA 94520	Assessor's Block /Lot No.:	0089/001
Telephone:	(415) 377-7826	Zoning Districts:	North Beach NCD/40-X

Under San Francisco Planning Code Section 312, you, as a property owner or resident within 150 feet of this proposed project, are being notified of this Building Permit Application. You are not obligated to take any action. For more information regarding the proposed work, or to express concerns about the project, please contact the Applicant above or the Planner named below as soon as possible. If your concerns are unresolved, you can request the Planning Commission to use its discretionary powers to review this application at a public hearing. Applications requesting a Discretionary Review hearing must be filed during the 30-day review period, prior to the close of business on the Expiration Date shown below, or the next business day if that date is on a week-end or a legal holiday. If no Requests for Discretionary Review are filed, this project will be approved by the Planning Department after the Expiration Date.

PROJECT SCOPE					
<input type="checkbox"/> DEMOLITION	and/or	<input type="checkbox"/> NEW CONSTRUCTION	or	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ALTERATION	
<input type="checkbox"/> VERTICAL EXTENSION		<input type="checkbox"/> CHANGE # OF DWELLING UNITS		<input type="checkbox"/> FACADE ALTERATION(S)	
<input type="checkbox"/> HORIZ. EXTENSION (FRONT)		<input type="checkbox"/> HORIZ. EXTENSION (SIDE)		<input type="checkbox"/> HORIZ. EXTENSION (REAR)	

PROJECT FEATURES	EXISTING CONDITION	PROPOSED CONDITION
BUILDING USE	Mixed Use	No Change
FRONT SETBACK	N/A	No Change
SIDE SETBACKS	N/A	No Change
BUILDING DEPTH	N/A	No Change
REAR YARD	N/A	No Change
HEIGHT OF BUILDING	36.5 feet	No Change
NUMBER OF STORIES	3	No Change
NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS	N/A	No Change
NUMBER OF OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES	N/A	No Change

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposal is to add a T-Mobile wireless telecommunications service (WTS) facility to the rooftop of the subject building. The WTS facility would consist of a panel antenna shrouded inside a faux vent pipe as well as equipment cabinets. Please see attached plans for more information.

PLANNER'S NAME: Aaron Hollister
 PHONE NUMBER: (415) 575-9078
 EMAIL: aaron.hollister@sfgov.org

DATE OF THIS NOTICE: 6/4/2010
 EXPIRATION DATE: 7/3/2010



awhitd@ix.netcom.com

10/12/2010 07:34 AM

Please respond to
awhitd@ix.netcom.com

To aaron.hollister@sfgov.org, David.Chiu@sfgov.org

cc

bcc

Subject Cell Phones in North Beach

I urge you to ignore the protests of my Luddite neighbors in N. Beach. There is no evidence that cell phone antennas are dangerous. I welcome improved service. David E Whittall, 101 Lombard St



Dan Lorimer
<lorimer@R-1.net>
10/13/2010 06:57 PM

To aaron.hollister@sfgov.org
cc
bcc

Subject cell tower health risk

Dear Mr. Hollister --

I am definitely against the proliferation of cell phone towers that is proposed. Radiation from these towers is treated, in conflict with evidence to the contrary, as being free of hazard to people who spend extended periods of time in proximity to the towers.

<http://www.emwatch.com/Cellmasts.htm>

When these towers go in, the property owner is compensated, but the residents of his building and of adjacent buildings absorb all of the health risk. This is grossly unfair, and could appropriately be treated as an unlawful eviction by the building owner's tenants. Yet what recourse do adjacent tenants/owners have? None! For a small financial benefit, the owners of the properties where the towers are to be located endanger the lives of many people.

Thank you for your consideration,

Dan Lorimer
1315 Montgomery St.
SF 94133



William.J.Reilly.67@Alum.Dar
tmouth.ORG (William J. Reilly
67)

10/12/2010 08:51 AM

To president@thd.org

cc aaron.hollister@sfgov.org, David.Chiu@sfgov.org

bcc

Subject cell phone antennas

Please stop promoting your own agendas and claiming to be the voice of the neighborhood.

I have not seen any information from your partisans or T-Mobile that would enable me to make an informed judgement on this issue.

I can tell you that as a T-Mobile customer I have virtually no service from my house (corner of Union and Montgomery). I have to walk almost to Washington Square to get satisfactory service. Thus, I am certain that T-Mobile customers who live on this portion of Telegraph Hill will welcome new antennas.

Regardless of the actual pros and cons of these three antennas, I find your email this morning with issues #1-9 to be unsupported and substantially groundless. It is the rant of a zealot throwing everything at the wall in the hope that something might stick. It is not the way we should make decisions as a neighborhood and certainly makes the tasks of our elected and appointed representatives more difficult.

It is hard to take pride in being a member of the Hill Dwellers today.

William Reilly
1256 Montgomery

dues paying member of the Hill Dwellers (on and off) since 1977



"Marcy Albert"
<marcy@abcg.com>

10/12/2010 11:37 AM

Please respond to
<marcy@abcg.com>

To <aaron.hollister@sfgov.org>, <David.Chiu@sfgov.org>

cc

bcc

Subject T-Mobile cell phone antennas in North Beach

We are unable to attend this planning meeting but we want you to know that we **DISAGREE** with the views put forth by THD. We feel that we need cell phone towers to increase the service so long as the antennas are either camouflaged or otherwise not unsightly, Item #3 below should probably get careful consideration. Otherwise let progress happen!

Thanks,

Marcy & David Albert
101 Lombard St., #904-W
San Francisco, CA 94111-1121
Home & Office: 415-627-6900


-----Original Message-----

From: THD [mailto:president@thd.org]

Sent: Monday, October 11, 2010 10:05 PM

To: marcy@abcg.com

Subject: PRETEND DEC EVENT



Join your neighbors at the upcoming Discretionary Review hearing before the Planning Commission this **Thursday, October 14th, 5 pm, City Hall, room 400**

THE ISSUE:

T-Mobile is planning to install 3 cell phone antennas within a 3 block radius in North Beach, at the following locations: 1653 Grant Ave @ Greenwich. 1500



Rae Terry
<raeterry@mac.com>
10/12/2010 11:28 AM

To "aaron.hollister@sfgov.org" <aaron.hollister@sfgov.org>
cc
bcc
Subject Antennas

We are residents at 383 Lombard are adamantly opposed to the cell phone towers/antennas.

Rae Terry
Jay Welsh

Sent from my iPhone



"Timothy Ferris"
<tf@timothyferris.com>
10/12/2010 12:11 PM

To <aaron.hollister@sfgov.org>, <David.Chiu@sfgov.org>
cc "Carolyn Zecca Ferris" <cal@calzecc.com>
bcc
Subject Telegraph Hill Dwellers memo

Dear Mr. Hollister and Mr. Chiu:

My wife and I received the email below from the Telegraph Hill Dwellers. It claims that installing additional mobile phone transmitters in North Beach would occasion "great distress to the neighborhood due to outdated health code and health related concerns based on recent findings related to accumulated radiation."

I am unaware of any findings published in refereed scientific journals upon which such concerns might legitimately be based. The sole exception known to me is a pair of papers published in 2005 in a European journal, *Mutation Research*. One of these papers has since been withdrawn as fraudulent; the other was also withdrawn by its author but he later said he'd changed his mind.

My purpose in writing you is simply to affirm that "concerns" are only as good as the empirical data upon which they are based. In this case, the quantity of such data approximates zero.

Yours,

Timothy Ferris

97 Telegraph Hill Blvd.

SF CA 94133





Daniel Macchiarini
<danny1mac@sbcglobal.net>

10/12/2010 01:08 PM

To aaron.hollister@sfgov.org

cc THD President <president@thd.org>, Kathleen Dooley
<kathleendooley@att.net>, David Chiu
<david.chiu@sfgov.org>, Stefano Cassolato

bcc

Subject No to T-Mobil Antena Towers in North Beach

Ciao Aaron,

As a business and property owner at 1544 Grant Ave. I wish to go on record opposing the installation and industrialization of our roof tops here in our North Beach community via installation of cellular antenna for the purposes of amplified concentration of micro-cell radiation. My property and business would literally be sandwiched in-between two of these T-mobil towers currently under consideration for installation at 1500 and 1653 Grant Ave. While there is no scientific evidence of health hazards which could be created by these towers there has, in fact, been no scientific studies which have conclusively reviewed what effects, if any, either low or high frequency cellular radiation has on the human body when constantly bombarded by concentrated Tower radiation amplification at all times, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. You should be aware that a major amount children will be subject to this concentrated amplified radiation as there are numerous families in the buildings in and around the these proposed towers as well as Garfield Elementary school at 120 Filbert St being less than a block away. Further, these towers are unnecessary as cell phone communications in North Beach as well as the rest of San Francisco is currently of a very high quality. The installation of these high concentration micro-cell Towers directly within any community will do nothing to improve service in a real, tangible, way. It will only serve one corporate cellular company to boost it signal over others which in tern will, most likely, facilitate and usher in an era of "cellular signal wars" where competing companies are constantly installing new and more powerful micro cellular radiation amplification towers in our neighborhoods. This is neither desirable from either a health or cultural visual point of view. Having industrial towers of any kind proliferating above our roof tops in neighborhoods is clearly inappropriate in character to our city. My understanding of one major aspect of the job of the SF Planning Dept. is to safeguard the character and architecture of our neighborhoods and thereby their culture here in our city. It is said that North Beach, being among the very first neighborhoods of our city, should have particular interests to our Planning Department in this regard. I would respectfully asked that you and our SF Planning Department keep all this in mind when considering any architectural changes which may negative affect the powerful and positive visual assets we currently have here in many of our city neighborhoods and in our North Beach community in particular. Please opposed T-Mobils' attempt to industrialize North Beach architecture at this time.

Thank You,
Dan Macchiarini
Native Working Artist
Macchiarini Creative Design
1544 Grant Ave.
San Francisco



"Tina"
<tinamoysf@yahoo.com>
10/12/2010 03:19 PM

To <aaron.hollister@sfgov.org>
cc
bcc
Subject support of DR request on cell phone antennas in North
Beach

Dear Mr. Hollister,
I support the need for a DR in relation to cell phone antennas in North
Beach.
Respectfully,
Tina Moylan
Member SF Neighborhood Network
Board of Russian Hill Neighbors




SCau1321@aol.com
10/13/2010 08:48 AM

To aaron.hollister@SFgov.org
cc
bcc
Subject Fwd: PRETEND DEC EVENT

I object to the proposed cell phone installations in North Beach.

Sue Cauthen
1321 Montgomery Street
San Francisco, California 94133
415 391 0737

From: president@thd.org
To: scau1321@aol.com
Sent: 10/11/2010 10:05:06 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
Subj: PRETEND DEC EVENT



Join your neighbors at the upcoming Discretionary Review hearing before the Planning Commission this **Thursday, October 14th, 5 pm, City Hall, room 400**

THE ISSUE:

T-Mobile is planning to install 3 cell phone antennas within a 3 block radius in North Beach, at the following locations: 1653 Grant Ave @ Greenwich. 1500 Grant Ave. @ Union. 1763 Stockton @ Greenwich. Further research shows that over time up to 150 additional cell phone antennas are planned for installation in North Beach alone, by T-Mobile and other cell phone companies. Should the cell phone company decide to upgrade the currently proposed low-grade frequency antennas to high frequency antennas in the future, they are not required to apply for another permit or inform the neighborhood.



Scott King
<scott@hanumanmedical.co
m>

12/02/2010 10:12 AM

To David.Chiu@sfgov.org, aaron.hollister@sfgov.org

cc

bcc

Subject Please permit cell phone

As a scientifically literate member of THD, let me urge you to approve the cell antenna without further trouble. The hazards to humans in infinitesimals. These people are as silly as climate change deniers.

Scott King
1360 Montgomery 7



"William Moisson"
<bill@billmoisson.com>
02/02/2011 11:27 AM

To <frank@fnstrategy.com>, <aaron.hollister@sfgov.org>,
<c_olague@yahoo.com>

cc

bcc

Subject Better Cell Phone Service for North Beach

I am writing to encourage your support of better cell phone service for North Beach, and specifically the new transmission facilities being proposed for T-Mobile.

This is equally important for residents and visitors alike. It would be terrible for North Beach to get a reputation as a place that is anti-communications.

Thank you,
Bill Moisson



ellen_byrnes@comcast.net
02/02/2011 07:49 AM

To aaron.hollister@sfgov.org
cc
bcc
Subject T-Mobile micro-cell antennas in North Beach

2/2/11

Dear Aaron Hollister,

It has come to my attention that there is a debate over the proposed installation of T-Mobile micro-cell wireless antennas in North Beach. As a long time resident of North Beach I have noticed many problems with phone calls being dropped and/or poor reception in certain pockets of the neighborhood. Perhaps this is due to the hilly nature of North Beach and Telegraph Hill, but that's no excuse in this day and age to be lagging behind technologically. Dropped phone calls are a problem. In business or an emergency a dropped phone call could seriously jeopardize a pivotal conversation or even somebody's life. I am a firm proponent of having high-speed wireless in my neighborhood. To resist this improvement in technology is really to go against the general contemporary trend to improve infrastructure in this country. This can happen at the neighborhood level as well, and this is a perfect instance of that. My business depends upon good wireless connections. I cannot do business without it. Incidentally I am located in North Beach and I have had problems with internet connections and cell phone malfunctions. The three proposed low-wattage antennas in my view are completely innocuous visually, and non-invasive physically, emitting less than one-half of 1% of the federal radio frequency safety standard. Those opposed to the installation of these towers must not have urgent business, nor a need to communicate with loved ones in the event of an emergency. Please give your informed consideration to this matter as it is of vital importance to the residents and businesses in North Beach and Telegraph Hill.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Ellen Byrnes



Jim Weston
<jaweston@weston-sf.com>
01/31/2011 04:13 PM

To aaron.hollister@sfgov.org
cc
bcc

Subject T-Mobile and Other Cellular Carrier Proposals for Additional
Towers in North Beach

Please do not block the subject proposals. The red tape and delays for approval of such towers in San Francisco is well known and reflects unfavorably on our image as both a tourist and business destination city.

Spotlighting iPad, iPhone 4, iPod touch 4, New Apple TV, MobileMe, Slingbox

Jim Weston
jaweston@weston-sf.com
Computer Consulting
facetime@weston-sf.com
Weston & Associates
jawestonskype2
San Francisco, California
<http://gallery.mac.com/jawestonb>
Voice: 415-986-1503

E-mail:

Apple FaceTime Test:

Skype accounts: jawestonskype,

Video Gallery:



Paul Switzer
<switzer@stanford.edu>

01/31/2011 05:56 PM

To aaron.hollister@sfgov.org

cc

bcc

Subject T-mobile cell towers in North Beach -- please approve

As a residents of the neighborhood, I endorse the inconspicuous placement of new 5-foot roof-top cell towers in North Beach. We are not T-mobile customers.

As a statistician, I'm not aware of peer-reviewed consensus evidence of harmful effects to human health that this emplacement would generate. If such evidence were forthcoming I would then reconsider my support.

--Paul Switzer
341 Filbert St



Elmore Patrick
<elmorep9@gmail.com>

02/08/2011 04:01 AM

To "aaron.hollister@sfgov.org" <aaron.hollister@sfgov.org>,
Marsha Garland <marshagarland@att.net>

cc

bcc

Subject

I am writing you to encourage your support of the cell towers on Telegraph Hill. I totally welcome these towers and want to encourage technological business in our city and neighborhood.

Elmore Patrick



Adam Slote
<adam@slotelaw.com>
02/03/2011 02:28 PM

To frank@FNstrategy.com, aaron.hollister@sfgov.org,
c_olague@yahoo.com

cc

bcc

Subject T-Mobile's North Beach Antenna Installation

Dear Commissioners:

San Francisco's geography is a challenge to wireless services in San Francisco. I support T-Mobile's effort to improve service in North Beach by investing in new infrastructure. Excellent high speed wireless data services are critical if San Francisco is to continue to be at the center of high technology innovation and business start-ups.

Thank you for your consideration.

--

Adam G. Slote
SLOTE & LINKS
100 Pine Street, Suite 750
San Francisco, CA 94111
415-393-8001
adam@slotelaw.com



sffd22@aol.com
02/02/2011 09:13 PM

To frank@FNstrategy.com, aaron.hollister@sfgov.org,
c_olague@yahoo.com

cc

bcc

Subject T-Mobile antenna sites in North Beach

Dear Commissioners,

This letter is in support of the (3) antenna locations proposed by T-Mobile on Grant, Stockton, and Greenwich Streets in North Beach.

Permit applications for all antenna installations, including minor equipment modifications to existing sites, go through an arduous process for approval. These applications are not only reviewed by the Planning Department, but also by the Building, Fire, and the Health Departments. To protect the public, these agencies ensure the structural integrity and environmental safety of all antenna sites. Numerous signs, warnings, and painted striping must be installed to inform firefighters, window washers, painters, and anyone else who may have to work in close proximity to antennas of their presence and any dangers. An "RF Report" must be included on all plans submitted for antenna installations, signed by a Professional Engineer with expertise in communications technology. These reports clearly indicate the level of exposure to the public per FCC standards and list the distances from the antennas at which any exposure limitations could be exceeded. These distances are generally a few meters or less, indicating that a person would have to remain just a few feet directly in front of these devices for an extended period of time to receive even a minimal amount of RF energy. To address some residents' concerns about the appearance of these devices, T-Mobile has modified their plans to reduce the visibility of antennas from the street.

San Francisco's permit process is already extensive and cumbersome. Certainly no additional review is necessary. San Francisco, arguably a part of Silicon Valley, should be a leader in providing its' citizens with the latest technological advances instead of causing inordinately long delays. Please approve the permit for these antenna installations. Thank you.

Ms. Micki Jones
North Beach



Fun Guy
<funguyfungi@gmail.com>

02/02/2011 04:58 PM

Please respond to
FunGuyFungi@gmail.com

To Ffoto@gcastrategies.com, frank@FNstrategy.com, Christina
Olague <c_olague@yahoo.com>, aaron.hollister@sfgov.org
cc
bcc
Subject North Beach Antennae

T-Mobile has a plan to improve leading edge mobile phone and data communications coverage for North Beach and Telegraph Hill. Three small microcell wireless antennas are proposed for rooftops on 501 Greenwich, 1763 Stockton and 1500 Grant Avenue to improve wireless infrastructure to meet customer needs and improve coverage.

I totally support this project and urge its approval.

--

Paul Hansbury
415-987-9540

APPLICATION REQUESTING DISCRETIONARY REVIEW ("D.R.")

This application is for projects where there are exceptional and extraordinary circumstances that justify further consideration, even though the project already meets requirements of the Planning Code, City General Plan and Priority Policies of the Planning Code.

D.R. Applicant's Name Telegraph Hill Dwellers
President, Vedica Puri Telephone No: (415) 433-8000

D.R. Applicant's Address PO Box 330159
San Francisco (Apt. #) 94133
City Zip Code

D.R. Applicant's telephone number (for Planning Department to contact): (415) 433-8000
If you are acting as the agent for another person(s) in making this request please indicate the name and address of that person(s) (if applicable):

Name Julie Jaycox Telephone No: (415) 630-0715

Address 307 Green Street
San Francisco (Apt. #) 94133
City Zip Code

Address of the property that you are requesting the Commission consider under the Discretionary Review: 1763-1767 Stockton Street

Name and phone number of the property owner who is doing the project on which you are requesting D.R.: Peter Iskander, (415) 297-5185

Building Permit Application Number of the project for which you are requesting D.R.: 2009.11.05.0626

Where is your property located in relation to the permit applicant's property?
Julie Jaycox's property is 0.4 miles from 1763-1767 Stockton but works full-time at 491 Greenwich, 1 block from 1763-1767 Stockton

A. ACTIONS PRIOR TO A DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REQUEST

Citizens should make very effort to resolve disputes before requesting D.R. Listed below are a variety of ways and resources to help this happen.

- 1. Have you discussed this project with the permit applicant? YES NO
- 2. Did you discuss the project with the Planning Department permit review planner? YES NO
- 3. Did you participate in outside mediation on this case? Community Board Other NO

10-0558D
RECEIVED
JUL 08 2010
By

4. If you have discussed the project with the applicant, planning staff or gone through mediation, please summarize the results, including any changes that were made to the proposed project so far.

SEE ATTACHMENT A.

B. DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REQUEST

1. What are the reasons for requesting Discretionary Review? The project meets the minimum standards of the Planning Code. What are the exceptional and extraordinary circumstances that justify Discretionary Review of the project? How does the project conflict with the City's General Plan or the Planning Code's Priority Policies?

SEE ATTACHMENT B.

2. If you believe your property, the property of others or the neighborhood would be adversely affected, please state who would be affected, and how:

SEE ATTACHMENT C.

3. What alternatives or changes to the proposed project, beyond the changes (if any) already made would respond to the exceptional and extraordinary circumstances and reduce the adverse effects noted above (in question B1)?

SEE ATTACHMENT D.

Please write (in ink) or type your answers on this form. Please feel free to attach additional sheets to this form to continue with any additional information that does not fit on this form.

CHECKLIST FOR APPLICANT:

Indicate which of the following are included with this Application:

REQUIRED:

- X Check made payable to Planning Department (see current fee schedule).
- X Address list for nearby property owners, in label format, plus photocopy of labels.
- X Letter of authorization for representative/agent of D.R. applicant (if applicable).
- X Photocopy of this completed application.

OPTIONAL:

- Photographs that illustrate your concerns.
- Covenants or Deed Restrictions.
- Other Items (specify).

File this objection in person at the Planning Information Center. If you have **questions** about this form, please contact Information Center Staff from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday to Friday.

Plan to attend the Planning Commission public hearing which must be scheduled after the close of the public notification period for the permit.

Signed 
Applicant

July 6, 2010
Date

Building Permit Application 2009.11.05.0626
1763-1767 Stockton Street, San Francisco, CA 94133
Block 0089 Lot 001

ATTACHMENT A

Julie Jaycox has been in communication with the Planner assigned to this case, Aaron Hollister via email. On June 30, 2010, North Beach residents conducted a community meeting with representatives of project sponsor T-Mobile at the Telegraph Hill Neighborhood Center at 660 Lombard Street. At this meeting, existing T-Mobile customers and residents discussed proposed plan details, coverage necessities, exposure studies and alternative site considerations for the proposed wireless facility not only at 1763-1767 Stockton Street but two other proposed wireless facilities located within 2 blocks at 1653 Grant Avenue (aka 501 Greenwich Street) and 1500 Grant Avenue. Despite requests that T-Mobile not locate its wireless facilities on these residential buildings, the project sponsor did not offer to withdraw its applications for these locations, and given the July 6 deadline for filing this DR (and two others), Community Boards mediation was not a viable option.

ATTACHMENT B

In 2007, Board of Supervisors President Aaron Peskin introduced, and the full Board of Supervisors passed, legislation requiring public notification and the opportunity for members of the public to file a DR application in situations where wireless carriers seek to install wireless facilities as an Accessory Use on residential and mixed-use buildings rather than as a Conditional Use as required by the City's Wireless Telecommunications Services (WTS) Facilities Siting Guidelines. By doing so, the Board of Supervisors recognized and acknowledged the exceptional and extraordinary nature of such requests by wireless carriers.

The residential character of the neighborhood is not conserved and protected, as required by Sec. 101.1 (b)(2) of the Planning Code's Priority Policies, by the placement of an industrial/commercial facility at this location. This is evidenced by the fact that the antenna is proposed for an NCD, making it a Preference 6 (Limited Preference Site) location pursuant to the WTS Facilities Siting Guidelines. Under Preference 6 (a)-(d), the applicant must show:

- (a) what publicly-used building, co-location site or other Preferred Location Sites are located within the geographic service area;
- (b) what good faith efforts and measures were taken to secure these more preferred location [*sic*] . . . ;
- (c) why such efforts were unsuccessful; and
- (d) how and why the proposed site is essential to meet service demands for the geographic service area and the Applicant's citywide network.

The project sponsor has provided none of this information.

ATTACHMENT B (cont.)

Nor has T-Mobile proved that it has a 'significant gap' in its coverage in the area and, if it does have a significant gap in its coverage, that the proposed location at 1763-1767 Stockton Street is the 'least intrusive alternative' for filling that gap. See *MetroPCS v. City and County of San Francisco*, 400 F.3d 715 (9th Cir. 2005).

In addition, the project does not conform with the City's General Plan, Commerce and Industry Element, Objective 1, Policy 1, which states, "Encourage development which provides substantial net benefits and *minimizes undesirable consequences*." (Emphasis added.) The project conflicts with Policy 2 of the same section, which requires development to "mitigate negative impacts." Neighbors have aesthetic concerns as well as concerns regarding the blockage of views that may result from this installation. The project sponsor has not shown that this industrial/commercial use is necessary at this location or demonstrated any effort to consider alternative locations with lesser impacts.

D.R. requestor also disagrees that the project meets the requirements of Planning Code §§204, 204.1 and 703.2(C) because this industrial/commercial facility is an unrelated change in use of this residential apartment building that is inappropriate and unnecessary to the building's operation and enjoyment. Applying for a wireless facility at this location in an NCD as an Accessory Use is an abuse of the Accessory Use process and runs counter to the letter and intent of the City and County of San Francisco's WTS Facilities Siting Guidelines.

There are additional concerns as to whether the project sponsor may attempt to change or upgrade the equipment from a microcell to a macrocell base station wireless facility at a later date, since the Planning Department has no requirements that wireless carriers inform the Department of such upgrades or seek new permits to do so, and whether the project as proposed or the project as possibly later modified meets FCC guidelines concerning radiofrequency radiation (RFR) emissions.

ATTACHMENT C

This project would adversely affect residents in the neighborhood who are uncomfortable with this type of an industrial/commercial facility in their predominantly residential neighborhood. The project specifications submitted by T-Mobile state "NO BATTERIES TO BE INSTALLED," which would render the facility inoperable in the event of a power failure or emergency involving a power failure. If backup batteries were to be installed, they would pose a potential safety hazard for residents of the apartment building as well as emergency personnel such as firefighters at this location. Some neighbors' views may be adversely affected by the proposed installation. Property owners in the vicinity would be adversely affected by decreased property valuation. Neighbors in the affected area have already begun to record their opposition to this project.

Building Permit Application 2009.11.05.0626
1763-1767 Stockton Street, San Francisco, CA 94133
Block 0089 Lot 001

ATTACHMENT D

The project sponsor may locate this wireless facility at a different location, co-locate this facility at an already-existing wireless site, or enter into an inter-carrier service agreement (also known as a roaming agreement) with a different cellular carrier to share an already existing facility or facilities in the service area. Since project sponsor has not provided an alternative analysis as required by the WTS Facilities Siting Guidelines, the absence of this analysis hinders the ability to review and consider what alternatives are available.

MACKENZIE & ALBRITTON LLP

423 WASHINGTON STREET, SIXTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111

TELEPHONE 415 / 288-4000
FACSIMILE 415 / 288-4010

February 9, 2011

VIA HAND DELIVERY

President Christina Olague
Vice President Ron Miguel
Commissioners Michael Antonini, Gwyneth Borden,
Kathrin Moore, Hisashi Sugaya and Rodney Fong
San Francisco Planning Commission
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103-2414

Re: T-Mobile Micro Wireless Telecommunications Service Facilities:
Case No. 2010.0556D, 1500 Grant Avenue
Case No. 2010.0557D, 1563 Grant Avenue (aka 501 Greenwich Street)
Case No. 2010.0558D, 1763-1767 Stockton Street

Dear Commissioners:

We write to you on behalf of our client, T-Mobile West Corporation (“T-Mobile”) to ask that you follow the clear recommendation of Planning Department Staff¹ and reject the requests for Discretionary Review for each of the three separate building permit applications for the above-referenced T-Mobile microcell facilities. All three sites are in North Beach, an area of the City that is densely populated and requires improved coverage (the need for which is conclusively shown in submitted drive tests), not only for its residents, but also for emergency personnel, City visitors (who expect up-to-date wireless service) and City business owners. While each microcell facility must be reviewed by the Commission separately, as further described below, the arguments in favor of rejecting Discretionary Review and for approving the microcells under applicable law are sufficiently similar that we review them collectively in this document.

There are simply no extraordinary or exceptional circumstances nor significant impacts to the community from the three microcell facilities that, in the exercise of the Planning Commission’s “utmost restraint”², could conceivably warrant the level of Discretionary Review sought by the Discretionary Review Requestor for each microcell (collectively “Requestor”). Similarly, given the substantial evidence for approval, absence of substantial evidence for denial, identified significant gap in T-Mobile service,

¹ Page 1 of each Staff Report for each microcell, each dated October 7, 2010

² City Attorney Opinion No. 845, May 26, 1954

and unavailability of any less intrusive means to serve the identified significant gap, federal law compels approval of the proposed microcell facilities. We urge you to follow the recommendation of Planning Department Staff and approve the building permits for the proposed microcell facilities in an area of the City which, as reflected in over 200 signatures, emails and letters of support, demands improved wireless service.

As a preliminary matter, the Requestor argues that the cumulative impacts of all three applications must be taken together as one project under the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”). Each of the three microcells has been deemed by Staff to be categorically exempt under CEQA as Class 3 (small structures). Lacking any significant impact on the environment individually, it is impossible under California law for the three facilities to cumulatively impose a significant impact. Further, where each microcell is individually designed to provide wireless service to a specific individual gap in coverage, the approval of any one microcell is not dependant upon the approval of another microcell. In other words, if any of the microcells is permitted, it would be constructed regardless of the outcome of the permitting of the other microcells. In this way, the microcells cannot be considered piecemeal approval of a larger project. As noted above, while the arguments supporting each microcell are consistent, the Planning Commission must evaluate each on its own merits if at all.

I. Summary of Microcell Designs

Three microcell facilities are proposed to fill three distinct coverage objectives in the North Beach area of San Francisco. The “de minimus” microcell design utilized by T-Mobile for each microcell was approved by the Zoning Administrator in a Letter of Determination dated May 15, 2006 (“LOD”) attached as Exhibit A to this letter. While the approved design in the LOD permits a single-panel antenna inside a five foot tall faux chimney mounted on the roof and set back 5feet from any edge of the building, the proposed microcells are each designed with an approximately five foot tall, 10-inch diameter faux vent set back no less than six and one half feet from the roof line to further minimize aesthetic impact. In each case, radio equipment servicing the antennas will be attached to an existing penthouse stair structure. The individual microcell locations are as follows:

1500 Grant Avenue: A microcell facility on the roof of a mixed use building, consisting of one antenna hidden within a faux vent enclosure set back a minimum of seven feet from the roofline, with supporting equipment to be mounted on the existing penthouse stair structure (collectively “The 1500 Grant Microcell”). A photograph of the full scale mockup of the faux vent presently installed at the site is attached as Exhibit B1.

1763 Stockton Street: A microcell facility on the roof of a mixed use building, consisting of one antenna hidden within a faux vent enclosure set back a minimum of six and one-half feet from the roofline, with supporting equipment to

be mounted on the existing penthouse stair structure (collectively “The 1763 Stockton Microcell”). A photograph of the full scale mockup of the faux vent presently installed at the site is attached as Exhibit B2.

501 Greenwich Street: A microcell facility on the roof of a mixed use building consisting of one antenna hidden within a faux vent enclosure set back a minimum of seven feet from the roofline, with supporting equipment to be mounted on the existing penthouse stair structure (collectively “The 501 Greenwich Microcell”). A photograph of the full scale mockup of the faux vent presently installed at the site is attached as Exhibit B3.

II. Discretionary Review Not Warranted

As this Commission well knows, Discretionary Review is a “special power” of the Commission, outside the normal building permit application approval process. It is intended to be used only when there are “exceptional and extraordinary” circumstances associated with a proposed project. The Planning Commission derives its discretionary review authority from San Francisco’s Municipal Code under the Business & Tax Regulations Code, Article 1 Permit Procedures, Section 26 (a). The authority to review permit applications that meet the minimum standards applicable under the Planning Code is set forth by City Attorney Opinion No. 845, dated May 26, 1954. The opinion states that the authority for the exercise of discretionary review is “a sensitive discretion...which must be exercised with the utmost restraint” to permit the Commission “to deal in a special manner with exceptional cases.”³

As confirmed by Planning Staff, each microcell fully complies with the Planning Code and poses no significant adverse impacts to the community while providing an enormous community benefit of necessary wireless service. The public benefit is overwhelmingly confirmed by the more than 400 signatures, emails and letters of support that have been received for the three microcells attached as Exhibit C.⁴

In the face of those more than 400 supporters, Requestor identifies no extraordinary or exceptional circumstances that warrant modification of the microcells to protect the public interest. Indeed, Requestor’s sole argument for the exceptional nature of microcells is that Section 312 of the Planning Code was modified in 2007 to require community notice of building permits for microcell facilities. In fact, this codification of microcell approval through building permits confirms that such facilities do not impose extraordinary impacts that require Discretionary Review in each case by this Commission, but because of their “micro” design and are a preferred means to provide wireless services in the public interest with minimal impacts. Other Requestor arguments

³ *ibid.*

⁴ This number includes the 128 emails and petition signatures included in the October 7, 2010 Staff Reports for these microcells.

for this commission to accept Discretionary Review, addressed below, relate to federal limitations on the City's ability to deny approval of the microcells under federal law and are inapplicable to the extraordinary circumstances that must be found for this commission to accept discretionary review. We urge you to follow Staff's recommendation to decline these requests for Discretionary Review of the microcells.

III. Federal Law

Federal law is applicable to the Commission's review of the microcells should it accept Discretionary Review. T-Mobile USA, Inc. through its subsidiaries is licensed by the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") to provide wireless telecommunications services in San Francisco and its authority to place wireless facilities in San Francisco is governed by the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the "Telecommunications Act"). The Telecommunications Act contains fundamental limits on the right of a local jurisdiction to regulate the placement of wireless facilities. Section 332 states:

No State or local government or instrumentality thereof may regulate the placement, construction, and modification of personal wireless service facilities on the basis of the environmental effects of radio frequency emissions to the extent that such facilities comply with the Commission's regulations concerning such emissions.⁵

In addition to pre-empting regulation on the basis of concerns over radio frequency ("RF") emissions, the Telecommunications Act also:

- Requires the City to take final action on a permit application within a reasonable period of time;⁶
- Requires that any permit denial be in writing and based on substantial evidence in the record;⁷
- Prohibits unreasonable discrimination among competing wireless carriers;⁸ and
- Bars local regulation that would prohibit or have the effect of prohibiting the provision of personal wireless services.⁹

⁵ 47 USC § 332(c)(7)(B)(iv)

⁶ 47 USC § 332(c)(7)(B)(iii)

⁷ 47 USC § 332(c)(7)(B)(iii)

⁸ 47 USC 332(c)(7)(B)(i)(I)

⁹ 47 USC 332(c)(7)(B)(i)(II)

As we will explain, the three microcell applications implicate every one of these provisions.

IV. Substantial Evidence for Approval, Lack of Substantial Evidence for Denial

The “substantial evidence” requirement means that a local government’s decision must be “authorized by applicable local regulations and supported by a reasonable amount of evidence (i.e., more than a ‘scintilla’ but not necessarily a preponderance).” See *Metro PCS, Inc. v. City and County of San Francisco*, 400 F.3d 715, 725 (9th Cir. 2005); see also *Sprint PCS Assets, LLC v. City of Palos Verdes Estates*, 583 F.3d 716, 726 (9th Cir. 2009) (a local government decision must be valid under local law and supported by “such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as acceptable to support a conclusion”). Generalized concerns or opinions about aesthetics are insufficient to constitute substantial evidence upon which a local government could deny a permit. See *City of Rancho Palos Verdes v. Abrams*, 101 Cal.App.4th 367, 381 (2002). While a local government may regulate the placement of wireless facilities based on aesthetics, it must have specific reasons that are both consistent with the local regulations and supported by substantial evidence in the record to deny a permit.

In the instant case, Planning Department Staff has fully documented the substantial evidence for approval of the microcell building permits. As noted above, each microcell complies with the design requirements set forth and approved by the Zoning Administrator under the LOD. By their nature, microcell designs are diminutive and pose insignificant impacts in comparison to the alternative of installing full macrocell facilities. Here, each faux vent is set back from the roof’s edge farther than required and, as demonstrated by existing mock installations, do not impact scenic vistas or protected views. In addition, each microcell has received approval by the San Francisco Department of Public Health. Finally, each microcell has been deemed by the Planning Department to be categorically exempt, posing no significant adverse environmental impacts, under CEQA. T-Mobile propagation tools, drive test data, and customer emails confirm the need for improved wireless service while coverage maps submitted by T-Mobile reflect that the desired coverage objective is achieved by the proposed microcells.

In contrast, Requestor has provided only generalized concerns and no evidence, let alone the substantial evidence, to support denial of each application under federal law. Requestor’s generic criticisms of each microcell for aesthetic and community compatibility reasons are not credible and do not rise to the level of specific and significant adverse impacts required for denial of facilities under federal law – and plainly do not qualify as “substantial evidence for denial required under federal law.

V. Requestor's Concerns Over Radio Frequency Emissions Are Misguided and Preempted by Federal Law

Requestor's public comments and indeed two of seven alleged grounds for Discretionary Review are based on misinformed concerns over radio frequency emissions from the microcell facilities and cannot form the basis for denial of the microcell facilities under federal law. Radio frequency engineering analyses provided by Hammett & Edison Consulting Engineers for each microcell (the "H&E RF Reports") confirm that the microcell facilities will operate well within (and actually far below) all applicable FCC public exposure limits. As noted above, local governments are specifically precluded from considering any alleged health or environmental effects of RF emissions in making siting decisions "to the extent such facilities comply with the FCC's regulations concerning such emissions."¹⁰ The H&E RF Reports verify that the microcell facilities will operate far below all applicable FCC public exposure limits.

It is well established under federal law that a local agency may not deny an application for the installation for a wireless telecommunication facility based on concerns related to the effects of radio frequency emissions. See *SPRINTCOM INC. v. Puerto Rico Regulations and Permits Admin.* (2008) 553 F.Supp.2d 87. Each H&E RF Report states that with the microcell facility operating at maximum theoretical power levels, the RF exposure from any one of the microcells for a person anywhere at ground level would be 350 times less than the applicable public limit.¹¹

VI. Approval Required to Avoid Federal Prohibition of Service

T-Mobile has demonstrated both that there is a "significant gap" in coverage and that the microcell facilities are the least intrusive alternatives for meeting the coverage needs in North Beach. Under the federal law, if these two criteria are shown, the facility *must* be approved.¹² This is because when these factors are present, denial of the microcell facilities would impermissibly result in the denial of wireless services within the coverage gap area. See *Metro PCS*, 400 F.3d at 734-35; *Sprint PCS*, 583 F.3d at 726.

In compliance with Planning Department requirements, T-Mobile submitted detailed coverage maps and drive test data of the geographic area to be served by each of the microcell facilities. Satellite images of the proposed coverage areas reveal how ridgelines from Telegraph Hill and Russian Hill and sloping topography to Columbus Avenue shadow the residential areas of North Beach from service by nearby T-Mobile

¹⁰ 47 USC §332(c)(7)(B)(iv)

¹¹ Statements of Hammett & Edison, Inc., Consulting Engineers: August 14, 2009 (1500 Grant Microcell); June 29, 2010 (1763 Stockton Microcell); June 22, 2009 (501 Greenwich Microcell). These statements are attached to each of the October 7, 2010 Staff Reports.

¹² 47 USC §332(c)(7)(B)(i)(II)

macrocells, necessitating the use of microcells. The significant gaps in coverage to be served by the microcells are further confirmed by the correspondence (including over 400 signatures, emails and letters seeking improved wireless service in this area, as referenced above). Each gap in coverage is described below and shown in attached drive test, area and coverage maps as follows:

1500 Grant Microcell: T-Mobile has identified a significant gap in its 3G indoor residential (637 potential customers) and indoor commercial coverage (923 potential customers) in the North Beach District of San Francisco that is bounded by Filbert St. to the north, Montgomery St. to the east, Stockton St. to the west and Vallejo St. to the south. A drive test and existing coverage map demonstrating this significant gap is attached as Exhibit D1.

1763 Stockton Microcell: T-Mobile has identified a significant gap in its 3G indoor residential (1,252 potential customers) and indoor commercial (734 potential customers) coverage in the North Beach district of San Francisco bounded by Lombard St. to the north, Grant Ave. to the east, Powell St. to the west and Filbert St. to the south. A drive test and existing coverage map demonstrating this significant gap is attached as Exhibit D1.

501 Greenwich Microcell: T-Mobile has identified a significant gap in its 3G indoor residential (1,828 potential customers) and indoor commercial (1,364 potential customers) coverage in the North Beach District of San Francisco bounded by Chestnut St. to the north, Telegraph Hill Blvd. to the east, Grant Ave. to the west and Filbert St. to the south. A drive test and existing coverage map demonstrating this significant gap is attached as Exhibit D1.

In each instance, the coverage gap to be filled by a microcell facility constitutes 3G indoor residential and indoor commercial coverage over two city blocks, a gap which has been deemed significant for San Francisco by the Federal District Court¹³. It is also significant that T-mobile sites in this active area of San Francisco currently handle over 4 E911 calls per day.

VII. The Approved Facility is the “Least Intrusive” Alternative

The evidence before the Planning Commission demonstrates that the microcell facilities are the “least intrusive” alternatives to address the coverage gap. T-Mobile in locating these sites sought to identify the facilities that would be least intrusive to the community while providing the necessary wireless service. In this regard, T-Mobile followed the direction of Planning Staff and the San Francisco Planning Code in seeking to place diminutive microcells with an approved design rather than more cumbersome macrocells to fulfill its coverage objectives.

For over a decade, approved microcell designs have been recognized by the Planning Commission and Planning Department as a preferred less intrusive means to provide wireless service than macrocell facilities that require conditional use

¹³ See *MetroPCS, Inc. v. City and County of San Francisco* (N.D. CA 2006) 2006 WL 1699580 (unpublished)

authorization. For this reason, microcells do not require Section 303(c) findings of necessity, compatibility, desirability and convenience and are afforded administrative approval due to their minimized impacts on the community. While each of the proposed microcells is located in a limited siting preference level 6 under the San Francisco WTS Facilities Siting Guidelines, this is mitigated by the each site's smaller microcell design.

In identifying the proposed microcell locations, T-Mobile first reviewed possible publicly used structures (Preference 1), collocation opportunities (Preference 2) and industrial and commercial structures (Preferences 3 and 4). As fully detailed in the Alternatives Analyses, submitted separately to the Planning Commission, public structures at Pioneer Park (Coit Tower), Washington Square Park, the Garfield Elementary School and Saints Peter and Paul Church were neither feasible nor aesthetically acceptable. Due to the principally residential use of the North Beach area, there are no collocation (macrocell) opportunities available to serve the identified gaps in coverage. Commercial and industrial locations reviewed in the Alternatives Analyses were also infeasible due to low building heights that prohibited adequate radio signal propagation. Finally, none of the preference 6 sites reviewed by T-Mobile, in cooperation with the Planning Department, and as described in the Alternatives Analyses, prove to be any less intrusive than the proposed microcell facility locations.

Having identified three significant gaps in coverage, and also having shown that each microcell facility is the least intrusive means to fill those gaps, T-Mobile has met its burden of establishing that the facilities must be approved under applicable federal law. In such circumstances, the burden shifts to the local government to provide substantial evidence that other alternatives are available, that they are technologically feasible, and that they will provide adequate signal coverage with less impact than the proposed microcells. See *T-Mobile USA, Inc. v. City of Anacortes*, 572 F.3d at 998-999.

VIII. Denial of the Proposed Facility Would Constitute Unreasonable Discrimination Under Federal Law

Finally, since the first approval of microcell facilities in a Letter of Determination in 1998, hundreds of such facilities have been approved and constructed in San Francisco by various wireless carriers operating in the City and County of San Francisco. Of these hundreds of facilities, many of which pose greater aesthetic impacts with exposed un-camouflaged antennas, none have ever been granted discretionary review by this Planning Commission. As determined by the Planning Department Staff, the proposed T-Mobile microcell facilities pose no significant impacts. Under the circumstances, denial of the T-Mobile microcell facilities would plainly constitute an additional violation of the Telecommunications Act provision that prohibits unreasonable discrimination among competing wireless carriers.¹⁴

¹⁴ 47 USC 332(c)(7)(B)(i)(I)

IX. Conclusion

T-Mobile has worked in good faith to meet the wireless telecommunications needs of San Francisco, and to do so in a manner consistent with both federal law and City land use regulations and guidelines. In a densely populated area of the City, T-Mobile's proposal will bring life-saving technology to a very large number of San Francisco residents, service providers, emergency service personnel and visitors. We urge the Planning Commission to reject the requests for Discretionary Review for each of the three microcell facility building permits.

Very truly yours,



Paul B. Albritton

cc: Marian Vetro, Esq.
Kevin Brinkley, Esq.

Schedule of Exhibits:

- Exhibit A: Letter of Determination of the Zoning Administrator, May 15, 2006
- Exhibit B1: The 1500 Grant Microcell—Photograph of faux vent mockup
- Exhibit B2: The 1763 Stockton Microcell—Photograph of faux vent mockup
- Exhibit B3: The 501 Greenwich Microcell—Photograph of faux vent mockup
- Exhibit C: Letters, emails and signed petitions of support*
- Exhibit D1: The 1500 Grant Microcell—Drive test, area and coverage maps
- Exhibit D2: The 1763 Stockton Microcell—Drive test, area and coverage maps
- Exhibit D3: The 501 Greenwich Microcell— Drive test, area and coverage maps

* Also attached are the signatures of six disgruntled construction workers who lack cellular service at Saints Peter and Paul Church.



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1660 Mission Street, Suite 500 San Francisco, California 94103 www.sfgov.org/planning

May 15, 2006

Brian Pudlik,
Parsons
Representing Omnipoint T-Mobile
185 Berry Street, Suite 4300
San Francisco, CA 94107

Re: T-Mobile
Accessory Use Determination for Microcell Facilities

Mr. Pudlik,

This determination is in response to your request for certain types of wireless telecommunication facilities qualification as accessory uses under the Planning Code.

After reviewing previous determinations, the Planning Code (Sections 204 and 703.2(b)(1)(C) for Accessory Uses, General and Accessory Uses in Neighborhood Commercial Districts, respectively) and the information submitted with your letter, I have determined that the proposed antenna installations would fall within the scope of accessory uses as authorized in previous letters of determinations for other wireless service providers.

This authorization shall be limited to the following:

1. The installation of up to one panel antennae, with overall dimensions of no more than 30 inches high, 6.8 inches wide and 3.5 inches deep (mounted on the roof within a false vent, limited to extend up to five feet above the existing roof-line and set back at least five feet from the any edge of the building, these maximum dimensions are to be reduced whenever possible) or up to two omni antennas no more than 24 inches in length and 1.5 inches in diameter (façade mounted and painted to match);
2. The installation of two Erickson equipment cabinets with exterior dimensions of 17" x 30" x 11" and screened from view or within an existing structure;
3. Individual emission calculations for each site shall be provided to the Department of Public Health for their review;
4. The installation of the panel antennas, coax cables and their related equipment cabinets are not to exceed the existing height of the structure to which they are to be attached, painted to match the color of the existing building, concealed, screened and/or otherwise designed to blend with existing architectural features, limiting them from public view; and

5. Any proposed installation must comply with the design review of the Planning Department.

In order to facilitate the review of these "microcell" antennas by the Planning Department and other City agencies, each application shall be accompanied by the Wireless Telecommunications Services (W.T.S.) Facilities Siting Guidelines Application Checklist for Accessory Use Applications.

If for any reason the Zoning Administrator finds that this determination is no longer applicable or an individual site merits review and authorization from the Planning Commission, the Zoning Administrator may initiate the conditional use application process.

If anyone believes this determination represents an error in the interpretation of the Planning Code or an abuse of discretion by the Zoning Administrator, this determination may be appealed to the Board of Appeals within fifteen (15) days from the date of this letter. For information on the appeals process, please contact the Board of Appeals, located at 1660 Mission Street, or call (415) 575-6880.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lawrence B. Badiner". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Lawrence B. Badiner
Zoning Administrator

Full Scale Mockup of Faux Vent



01.26.2011 14:46

1763 Stockton St.

Full Scale Mockup of Faux Vent



501 Greenwich St.

02.01.2011 12:20



Exhibit C

EDDIE JIMENEZ
705 VALLEJO STREET, #32
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94133


FEBRUARY 2, 2011

TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

I HAVE BEEN A RESIDENT OF NORTH BEACH FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS. I DEPEND 100% ON MY CELL PHONE FOR BOTH PERSONAL AND BUSINESS USE. I DO NOT HAVE A LAND LINE. DROPPED CALLS AND BLACK SPOTS ARE VERY FRUSTRATING.

I SUPPORT THE INSTALLATION OF THREE MICRO CELL ANTENNAS IN NORTH BEACH. WE DESERVE BETTER COVERAGE IN THIS PART OF SAN FRANCISCO.

SINCERELY,



EDDIE JIMENEZ

FEB 2, 2011

Dear Planning Commission,

My name is Mark Coriello and I live at the Castro hotel on Valles and Stockton. I was recently approached about some new cell towers being put up in my neighborhood. This person said they would destroy the views and pose health problems and said they should not put up. I declined to sign his petition and decided to do more research on my own. Upon further investigation I found that these towers would be put up in low impact areas and its health problems have been proven. After this another person approached me on the pro side and I decided to voice my opinion. As someone who works and lives in the North Beach area and am a avid cell phone user I believe that these towers would benefit the residents and the businesses alike. Faster mobile speeds will allow more customers easier access to one of the most culturally prosperous neighborhoods in San Francisco. I am in full support of the new towers and hope they are in place in a timely manner.

Thank You for your time!

— 

Frank Lucchese
523 Vallejo St
San Francisco, CA 94133

2-1-11

To the Planning Commission,

I have lived at the above address for 12 years, although I know the technology exists my T-Mobile is very poor. I welcome the micro antennas at the three proposed locations in North Beach. I give my full support for this conditional use permit.

Thank you,
Frank Lucchese

TO SF PLANNING COM

I Support the Microcell
At the Three North Beach
Cell Tower / I Have A Business
that was started in 1984 -
ON Columbus -

James P. Lee
James Lee's
owner

North Beach San Francisco

947 Columbus

SF CA 94133

Marthe Schreder
71 Water Street, #101
San Francisco, CA 94133

To whom it may concern/ Planning Commission

I have lived at the above address since 1981. I am also the owner of Ricos Restaurant, Inc, located at 943 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94133. I have owned Ricos since 1984.

Improved cell phone coverage and reception is greatly needed in North Beach. I support the new towers proposed by T. Mobile.

Marthe Schreder

To: Planning Commission

I, Salvatore Navigato, owner of
Colosseo Ristorante located
at 414 Columbus Ave in S.F.

Support the cell phone towers
in North Beach. I understand
that these towers will have minimal
visible impact and ~~do not~~ not
pose any health and or safety risks.

These towers are being constructed
throughout the City and should
also be permitted in North Beach
as we have had numerous complaints about
cell phone service in our area.

Thank you,
Salvatore

To Planning Commission (support cu for cell towers
I am James ABBEDUTO
I support cell phone towers in north beach
I live at home home Eupore at 310 Cloumbas I am tired of
my cell phone getting disconta all the time.
I found evidence pose a risk to public safety

James ABBEDUTO
James abbeduto

GRANT & GREEN MARKET
1401 Grant Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94133

February 1, 2011

Dear Planning Commissioner O'ague, Planner Aaron Hollister:


I am the owner/operator of a small neighborhood grocery/liquor store at the above address.

Although I didn't grow up having cell phones, my kids grew up using computers and cell phones and the technology is here to stay. I haven't seen any evidence that this is going to bring any hazards.

As far as the aesthetics go, I understand the design will not be obtrusive. Therefore, I have not seen enough information that would sway me to go against having three cell phone towers in the North Beach area. The nearest site proposed to me is 1500 Grant Avenue. I am located at 1401 Grant Avenue, in close proximity.

I urge you to support the T-Mobile towers so that North Beach will have be competitive with other parts of the city. We want people to come to our area and have the best coverage available.

Sincerely,



Ayman El-Halees

PIZZELLE DI NORTH BEACH

314 COLUMBIAS AVE

S. F. , CA 94133

Dear Planner Commissioners,

I own and operate Pizzelle located at 314 Columbus Ave and I'm writing, to in favor of installing 3 micro-antennas on STOCKTON, GRANT, and Greenwich locations. The benefits of improve the coverage far out weigh any minor inconveniences. I don't understand how the rest of the city approved other installation w/ minimal oppositions. Some people just raise some fear factors with no clear evidence of their previous claims. Please do feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

Alex. AVADALLA

650-307-5731

GIANNI INGARGIOLA
1935 Stockton Street
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94133

This letter is to express my support of the three proposed micro-
cell antennas in North Beach. It is ridiculous that this part of
our city is not better served.


GIANNI INGARGIOLA
2/1/11

4/4/2011

MONALISA Rest.
353 Columbus Av
S.F. Ca. 94133

RE: NO DR ON Micro ANTENNAS
IN North Beach

I AM A BUSINESS OWNER
IN North Beach (MONALISA Restaurant)
for over 14 years. I realize that
my customers were getting some disease
so if installing 3 Micro Antennas are
going to improve coverage I'm
all for it. I also looked
into the Health Dept. finding about
product safety and could not
determine that there are any health
hazard affiliated. Please look forward,
on the installations in North Beach.


Filomena Florose

435 BROADWAY SF, LLC
BROADWAY STUDIOS, LLC
435 BROADWAY
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94133

2/3/11

RE: DR APPROVAL FOR INSTALLATION OF ANTENNAS
IN NORTH BEACH AREA.

IF LANDLORD AND BUSINESS OWNER IN
NORTH BEACH AND MOBIL COVERAGE IS NOT
ON STANDARD ~~WILL~~ LIKE OTHER PART OF
SAN FRANCISCO.

PLEASE INSTALL ADEQUATE ANTENNAS THAT
MY CUSTOMER CAN BENEFIT AND NOT
TO BE DISCONNECTED AS IS HAPPENING IN
PRESENT TIME.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR SUPPORT.

Karl B. Pleskot

KARL B. PLESKOT

PROPERTY OWNER AND BUSINESS OWNER.

From: ellen_byrnes@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, February 02, 2011 12:14 PM
To: Frank Noto
Subject: T-Mobile micro-cell antennas in North Beach

2/2/11

Dear Frank,

It has come to my attention that there is a debate over the proposed installation of T-Mobile micro-cell wireless antennas in North Beach. As a long time resident of North Beach I have noticed many problems with phone calls being dropped and/or poor reception in certain pockets of the neighborhood. Perhaps this is due to the hilly nature of North Beach and Telegraph Hill, but that's no excuse in this day and age to be lagging behind technologically. Dropped phone calls are a problem. In business or an emergency a dropped phone call could seriously jeopardize a pivotal conversation or even somebody's life. I am a firm proponent of having high-speed wireless in my neighborhood. To resist this improvement in technology is really to go against the general contemporary trend to improve infrastructure in this country. This can happen at the neighborhood level as well, and this is a perfect instance of that. My business depends upon good wireless connections. I cannot do business without it. Incidentally I am located in North Beach and I have had problems with internet connections and cell phone malfunctions. The three proposed low-wattage antennas in my view are completely innocuous visually, and non-invasive physically, emitting less than one-half of 1% of the federal radio frequency safety standard. Those opposed to the installation of these towers must not have urgent business, nor a need to communicate with loved ones in the event of an emergency. Please give your informed consideration to this matter as it is of vital importance to the residents and businesses in North Beach and Telegraph Hill.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Ellen Byrnes

2/9/2011

From: "Rosemary Slade" <rslade@dinova.net>
Date: February 7, 2011 9:27:18 AM PST
To: <marshagarland@att.net>
Subject: yes, more antenna's in any neighborhood in SF!
Reply-To: <rslade@dinova.net>

Sincere Regards,
Rosemary Slade

Manager, Restaurant Partnerships
415-656-4323 - rslade@dinova.net
Dinova LLC, Corporate Dining Connection®
www.dinova.net

From: "Theodore Brown" <Theodore@tbrownarchitect.com>
Date: January 31, 2011 1:31:24 PM PST
To: "Marsha Garland" <marshagarland@att.net>
Subject: RE: Cell Phone Towers
Reply-To: <Theodore@tbrownarchitect.com>

THE CELL SERVICE IN North Beach and Telegraph Hill is terrible. I can not believe how many dropped calls I have in this neighborhood that happens with my cell service. I feel that I am in a 3rd world tech culture. This is crazy!

My tenants are always complaining to me about this.
Theodore Brown

Theodore W. Brown
Theodore Brown & Partners, Inc.
1620 Montgomery Street, Suite 320
San Francisco, CA 94111
T (415) 986-6100
F (415) 986-5112

From: Robert Mittelstadt <rm@rmarch.net>

Date: February 4, 2011 4:38:19 PM PST

To: marshagarknd@att.net

I'm sick of all this obstructionist hogwash about the "dangers of cell radiation" and want the naysayers to cease and desist! Let's have many, many more cell towers-- they help minimize dropped calls which, in my view are far more critical to life quality than fear!

Thanks for the tip.

Bob Mittelstadt

From: Elmore Patrick <elmorep9@gmail.com>

Date: February 8, 2011 4:01:44 AM PST

To: "aaron.hollister@sfgov.org" <aaron.hollister@sfgov.org>,
<marshagarland@att.net>

I am writing you to encourage your support of the cell towers on Telegraph Hill. I totally welcome these towers and want to encourage technological business in our city and neighborhood.

Elmore Patrick

From: Geler, Martin [martingel@mac.com]

Sent: Wednesday, February 09, 2011 11:27 AM

To: mdney@waxmuseum.com; Frank Noto; aaron.hollisier@sfgov.org; c_pisagale@yahoo.com


Subject: T-Mobile Microcell Antennas

I am a T-Mobile customer and resident of the Marina District. I support the 3 North Beach T-Mobile microcell antennas.

This leading edge infrastructure will provide quality, high-speed coverage to San Franciscans who rely on their mobile phones and wireless devices. Unless we site additional antennas, we will discourage local technology-oriented businesses from locating in San Francisco.

These micro sites have been approved by the Health Department, and radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Martin Geler
3246 Baker Street
SF, CA, 94122



North Beach E-mails of Support

The following are e-mails from San Francisco residents who support T-Mobile's three proposed site applications in North Beach.

Honorable Commissioners, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I appreciate the opportunity for you to hear my voice.

I am a San Francisco citizen, and like my fellow citizens, I look to the voices of reason and guidance from the City and its plans so as to create the best city in the world. I expect and demand that we continuously improve upon our plans to stay abreast of technology, urban planning and development, and overall quality of life for us all.

Like many of us, I believe that wireless phones have become vital personal and public safety tools. I use my phone for countless thousands of minutes a month for my business and my personal needs. It has become so important that I have done away with a regular 'landline' -- I now only carry this mobile phone.

In times where consumers are faced with questionable signal coverage (how many of us have heard about problems where cell phones don't work indoors, or where there are "dead zones"?), I voice my wholehearted support for the North Beach area to receive better coverage.

In particular, T-Mobile's application for the three proposed wireless broadband facilities to be located in North Beach should be approved.

As a father of two small kids, it is imperative that I have access to 911 and other public information and safety services while I am on the go. North Beach offers some of the best San Francisco has to offer, and it would be a terrible blow to not provide to the public at large, like me, increased signal coverage.

My many thanks for your time in reviewing my support for this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Neil Haldar
2819 Baker Street #2

I am a t-mobile customer and I strongly feel that good coverage helps me run my small business. During these tough economic times one missed phone call could have tragic consequences for a small business owner. I am traveling out other country at this time so I will not be able to attend the commission meeting but San Francisco is a hub for technology and we should be leading the way, not hindering progress.

Brando Jessie
1854 Mason Street

Please make this happen. We need to be the most progressive city in America on staying out in front in Technology.

Michael Kustra
2516 Gough Street

I recently read that building permits for wireless facilities in San Francisco can take up to three years to process while, in Dallas, the same permit takes just 3 months. That's not right. It's time for San Francisco to stop delaying infrastructure for wireless technology.

My work schedule prevents me from attending a Planning Commission meeting in the middle of a work day. Please accept this e-mail as a show of my strong support for T-Mobile's wireless facility proposals.

Poor coverage anywhere in North Beach and the surrounding area is simply unacceptable. That's why I support, and encourage you to approve, T-Mobile's three proposed wireless broadband facilities to be located in North Beach.

Patrick Davis
1380 Greenwich St

To whom it may concern,

My work schedule prevents me from attending a Planning Commission meeting in the middle of a work day. Please accept this e-mail as a show of my strong support for T-Mobile's wireless facility proposals.

Wireless phones have become vital personal and public safety tools. Please make certain that citizens continue to have the best coverage possible throughout our community.

No matter where I am, my wireless phone has become my lifeline to the world. It needs to work when I want to make a call, send an e-mail or get online.

Stefan Irion
5 Rico Way

Hello,

As a long-time resident of North Beach (32 years) and living within one block of the planned antenna installation on Stockton (for 29 years), I support the planned antenna.

Sometimes while going from one room to the next in my apartment, I lose my calls. I am a T-Mobile customer because they have good customer service, they had the phone I wanted (the Google Nexus One) and they are one of only two service providers that have technology that is compatible in Europe.

As I frequently visit San Francisco's sister city Barcelona, it more 'green' to have one phone and just swap out the chip, which is what T-Mobile's technology allows me to do.

Phones are no longer just phones: Recently, in North Beach, on the corner directly across the street from the proposed Stockton Street antenna site, I was able to engage in what felt like necessary Chinese medicine only because of my phone. The clinic's doctor only spoke Mandarin.

By using my phone's translation capacity, I was able to communicate with the doctor. And while it worked, it was a bit frustrating waving my phone around looking for a signal. By the way, the prescribed herbs also worked. I highly recommend the place, but I don't know the name of it.

Also, as a public employee in Alameda County, I have often used my phone for emergencies, the most recent being our response the pertussis outbreak and also for the planned response to relocate some of our Public Health services from downtown Oakland during the civil strife after the ruling in the Mehserle case (Oscar Grant). There were conference calls at 8pm, 11pm and 6am and I used my phone (in the one room that has stable coverage) for all of these.

One last thing - when possible, I do watch the Planning Commission meetings on SFTV.

I am amazed at the good mix of people (and ideas) that are represented on the commission. But more importantly, I'm impressed with how you all 'process' and listen to one another. Makes me proud to be a San Franciscan. Good job!

Anyway, as I am flying back to SF from BCN on the 27th, and work is piling-up, I may not be able to make it to the Planning Commission meeting.

But feel free to contact me via email or telephone about this or anything else (the library, the closure of Mason, etc). because I have plenty of friendly opinion to dole out!

Gary Oliver
1869 Stockton #2

Poor coverage anywhere in North Beach and the surrounding area is simply unacceptable. That's why I support, and encourage you to approve, T-Mobile's three proposed wireless broadband facilities to be located in North Beach.

My work schedule prevents me from attending a Planning Commission meeting in the middle of a work day. Please accept this e-mail as a show of my strong support for T-Mobile's wireless facility proposals.

I recently read that building permits for wireless facilities in San Francisco can take up to three years to process while, in Dallas, the same permit takes just 3 months. That's not right. It's time for San Francisco to stop delaying infrastructure for wireless technology.

No matter where I am, my wireless phone has become my lifeline to the world. It needs to work when I want to make a call, send an e-mail or get online.

My wireless phone has become a necessity. I use it to check in with my children wherever they are in our community. More importantly, I want my children to always be able to reach me or a 9-1-1 operator in an emergency.

Let's get this taken care of straight away. Thank You

Steven Jones
96 Toledo Way

A major international technology hub like San Francisco should have access to the best wireless services available. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to help ensure our residents and employers have the quality wireless coverage they deserve.

Teng Wu
2210 Stockton St. #309

Hey,

As you know cell phone coverage in the city is really a problem. Don't listen to the hippies - the ability to communicate readily is really important.

Good luck.

Austin Moorhead
3631 19th St

My work schedule prevents me from attending a Planning Commission meeting in the middle of a work day. Please accept this e-mail as a show of my strong support for T-Mobile's wireless facility proposals.

Serena Satyasai
41 Valparaiso Street

A major international technology hub like San Francisco should have access to the best wireless services available. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to help ensure our residents and employers have the quality wireless coverage they deserve.

Poor coverage anywhere in North Beach and the surrounding area is simply unacceptable. That's why I support, and encourage you to approve, T-Mobile's three proposed wireless broadband facilities to be located in North Beach.

Nancy Bernard
2459 Larkin St. Apt. 7

A major international technology hub like San Francisco should have access to the best wireless services available. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to help ensure our residents and employers have the quality wireless coverage they deserve.

Brenda Whiteaker
1619 Gough Street, #2

I live in the Marina and often shop or go to restaurants in North Beach. My wireless phone has become a necessity. I use it to check in with my children and wife wherever they are in our community. More importantly, I want my family to always be able to reach me or a 9-1-1 operator in an emergency.

A major international technology hub like San Francisco should have access to the best wireless services available particularly for phone service. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to help ensure our residents and employers have the quality wireless coverage they deserve.

Martin Gellen
3248 Baker Street

Poor coverage anywhere in North Beach and the surrounding area is simply unacceptable. That's why I support, and encourage you to approve, T-Mobile's three proposed wireless broadband facilities to be located in North Beach.

A major international technology hub like San Francisco should have access to the best wireless services available. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to help ensure our residents and employers have the quality wireless coverage they deserve.

I recently read that building permits for wireless facilities in San Francisco can take up to three years to process while, in Dallas, the same permit takes just 3 months. That's not right. It's time for San Francisco to stop delaying infrastructure for wireless technology.

Wireless phones have become vital personal and public safety tools. Please make certain that citizens continue to have the best coverage possible throughout our community.

Cathy L. Morgan
1327 Vallejo Street

Please enable T-Mobile to enhance their service in North Beach.

It is your duty as a public servant to promote commerce, competition and progress for the benefit of the community. This investment T-Mobile is trying to make in my neighborhood represents an opportunity for you to support a real tangible improvement to the residents and visitors to our city, and to spur commerce and competition.

As evidence that this is a needed upgrade: since switching to T-Mobile from AT&T about a year ago, my overall service (around the Bay Area and other places I've traveled) is quite good, but I have been disappointed by frequent dropped calls and trouble connecting from my home in North Beach. I can't afford to break my contract with T-Mobile, nor would I want to if they could solve their service problems in North Beach. I hope that this installment will help improve T-Mobile's service in North Beach and I hope that you will help make it happen.

Mike Rather
767 Union St.

A major international technology hub like San Francisco should have access to the best wireless services available. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to help ensure our residents and employers have the quality wireless coverage they deserve.

Jaime Smith
1001 Broadway St

Please allow T-Mobile to install its rather unobtrusive wireless broadband antenna in the North Beach neighborhood. San Francisco should always be supportive of making our city a leader in technology.

Poor coverage anywhere in North Beach and San Francisco in general is simply unacceptable.

I recently read that building permits for wireless facilities in San Francisco can take up to three years to process while, in Dallas, the same permit takes just 3 months. That's not right. It's time for San Francisco to stop delaying infrastructure for wireless technology.

A major international technology hub like San Francisco should have access to the best wireless services available. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to help ensure our residents and employers have the quality wireless coverage they deserve.

Ned Gerhold
7 Vandewater St #402

Dear Planning Commission,

I'm interested in communicating to you that, as both a long-time T-mobile subscriber and a San Francisco native, I can honestly see no reason why the applications in order to provide service should not be allowed. A handful of complainants cannot be allowed to restrict the wireless services that we, perhaps particularly as San Franciscans, have come to rely on—for work, for personal communication, and even for safety. Please govern your decision according to how well you serve the communities of North Beach and the surrounding neighborhoods, and now how well you serve an extreme minority with loud voices.

Ryan Gallagher
1433 Clay Street #5

Please help increase the cell phone coverage in San Francisco to a level that we deserve. I am with T-Mobile, and the coverage in North Beach is sub-par. From what I can tell of the plans, the proposed antennas do not clutter the roofscape. Do the right thing, help bring SF to the forefront of cell coverage.

Tomas Boman
1450 Green St

Commission President Ron Miquel:

Please support us in expanding coverage in North Beach. As a resident, it is important to have decent and safe phone coverage. I would strongly encourage you to approve this proposal in North Beach.

My work schedule prevents me from attending a Planning Commission meeting in the middle of a work day. Please accept this e-mail as a show of my strong support for T-Mobile's wireless facility proposals.

Wireless phones have become vital personal and public safety tools. Please make certain that citizens continue to have the best coverage possible throughout our community.

Thank you for your assistance with this matter.

Mary Paganini
1402 Kearny Street #5

Please help us get coverage in North Beach, My name is Ismail and poor coverage anywhere in North Beach and the surrounding area is simply unacceptable. That's why I support, and encourage you to approve, T-Mobile's three proposed wireless broadband facilities to be located in North Beach.

Ismail Kacimi
2360 Chestnut St

Please support T-Mobile's application. It appears that the apparatus will not obstruct residents' views. Enhanced coverage would be greatly appreciated.

I am a voting resident (Russian Hill) of San Francisco.

My work schedule prevents me from attending a Planning Commission meeting in the middle of a work day. Please accept this e-mail as a show of my strong support for T-Mobile's wireless facility proposals.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

S M Blanchard
1175 Chestnut Street

My work schedule prevents me from attending a Planning Commission meeting in the middle of a work day. Please accept this e-mail as a show of my strong support for T-Mobile's wireless facility proposals.

Helena Jausas
317 Chestnut Street

Poor coverage anywhere in North Beach and the surrounding area is simply unacceptable. That's why I support, and encourage you to approve, T-Mobile's three proposed wireless broadband facilities to be located in North Beach.

My work schedule prevents me from attending a Planning Commission meeting in the middle of a work day. Please accept this e-mail as a show of my strong support for T-Mobile's wireless facility proposals.

A major international technology hub like San Francisco should have access to the best wireless services available. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to help ensure our residents and employers have the quality wireless coverage they deserve.

I recently read that building permits for wireless facilities in San Francisco can take up to three years to process while, in Dallas, the same permit takes just 3 months. That's not right. It's time for San Francisco to stop delaying infrastructure for wireless technology.

Wireless phones have become vital personal and public safety tools. Please make certain that citizens continue to have the best coverage possible throughout our community.

Wireless phones have become vital personal and public safety tools. Please make certain that citizens continue to have the best coverage possible throughout our community.

No matter where I am, my wireless phone has become my lifeline to the world. It needs to work when I want to make a call, send an e-mail or get online.

My wireless phone has become a necessity. I use it to check in with my children wherever they are in our community. More importantly, I want my children to always be able to reach me or a 9-1-1 operator in an emergency.

Inez Lee
1818 Hyde Street, Apt. 5

To whom it may concern,

I live on Telegraph Hill and poor coverage anywhere on Telegraph Hill/North Beach and the surrounding area is simply unacceptable.

No matter where I am, my wireless phone has become my lifeline to the world. It needs to work when I want to make a call. T-Mobile has great coverage in the City, except I have poor coverage in my house and in front of my house. Having connectivity in my house is essential, especially in an emergency situation.

My work schedule prevents me from attending a Planning Commission meeting in the middle of a work day. Please accept this e-mail as a show of my strong support for T-Mobile's wireless facility proposals.

That's why I support, and encourage you to do all you can to approve, T-Mobile's three proposed wireless broadband facilities to be located in North Beach. Thank you in advance for your support. I would greatly appreciate it.

Debbie Hemingway
47 Telegraph Place

Dear Commissioners:

I am a 16-year North Beach resident (at the corner of Powell and Greenwich) and my wife and I are both T-Mobile customers. I won't be able to make it to the Planning Commission because it's during my work hours, so I'm writing you an email.

I would like to voice my support for T-Mobile's plan to install new wireless facilities in my neighborhood. Good mobile phone service makes a difference both for San Franciscans and visitors you judge our city based on the quality of its infrastructure.

Tom Faulhaber
1861 Powell St.

A major international technology hub like San Francisco should have access to the best wireless services available. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to help ensure our residents and employers have the quality wireless coverage they deserve.

Serena Satyasai
41 Valparaiso Street

Poor service in the North Beach area is an unacceptable public safety issue. Irrational NIMBY luddites who are selfishly objecting to this essential infrastructure of the modern world are putting citizens and visitors at risk by not ensuring adequate coverage.

Joy Crosser
35 Telegraph Pl

I am a T-mobile customer, please support us. BANG

Bang Nguyen
359 Hyde St. Apt. 202

Dear SF Officials: I am a homeowner in North Beach, residing on Kearny St. between Green and Vallejo Sts. I am also a surgeon on emergency call to SF hospitals, and rely on my T-Mobile phone service to enable me to respond to life-threatening emergencies.

I request you to facilitate improvements in T-Mobile's network to allow me to provide the best possible care to SF area patients. The thought that I might miss a life-or-death call because City bureaucracy prevents T-Mobile from improving their network is unacceptable to me and should be unacceptable to you.

Richard Grossman
1230 Kearny

As a T-Mobile user I support the North Beach applications by T-Mobile. San Francisco is a world class city and it must be able to accommodate improvements to cell phone networks.

Martin Gellen
248 Baker Street

Poor coverage anywhere in North Beach and the surrounding area is simply unacceptable. That's why I support, and encourage you to approve, T-Mobile's three proposed wireless broadband facilities to be located in North Beach.

A major international technology hub like San Francisco should have access to the best wireless services available.

I strongly urge the Planning Commission to help ensure our residents and employers have the quality wireless coverage they deserve.

No matter where I am, my wireless phone has become my lifeline to the world. It needs to work when I want to make a call, send an e-mail or get online.

Mike Agarwal
3600 Fillmore St. #104

Poor coverage anywhere in North Beach and the surrounding area is simply unacceptable. That's why I support, and encourage you to approve, T-Mobile's three proposed wireless broadband facilities to be located in North Beach.

A major international technology hub like San Francisco should have access to the best wireless services available. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to help ensure our residents and employers have the quality wireless coverage they deserve.

I recently read that building permits for wireless facilities in San Francisco can take up to three years to process while, in Dallas, the same permit takes just 3 months. That's not right. It's time for San Francisco to stop delaying infrastructure for wireless technology.

Wireless phones have become vital personal and public safety tools. Please make certain that citizens continue to have the best coverage possible throughout our community.

Jennifer Millier
55 Casa Way #101

My work schedule prevents me from attending a Planning Commission meeting in the middle of a work day. Please accept this e-mail as a show of my strong support for T-Mobile's wireless facility proposals.

My wireless phone has become a necessity, we actually do not have a land line. I plan on using it to check in with my children wherever they are in our community. More importantly, I want my children to always be able to reach me or a 9-1-1 operator in an emergency.

This is very important to the Mullikin's at 20 Nobles Aly (Near union and grant).

Patrick and Gail Mullikin
20 Nobles Aly

I Support T-Mobile's North Beach Applications

Pierre Nallet
20 Darrell place

Wireless phones have become vital personal and public safety tools. Please make certain that citizens continue to have the best coverage possible throughout our community.

Poor coverage anywhere in North Beach and the surrounding area is simply unacceptable. That's why I support, and encourage you to approve, T-Mobile's three proposed wireless broadband facilities to be located in North Beach.

A major international technology hub like San Francisco should have access to the best wireless services available. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to help ensure our residents and employers have the quality wireless coverage they deserve.

I recently read that building permits for wireless facilities in San Francisco can take up to three years to process while, in Dallas, the same permit takes just 3 months. That's not right. It's time for San Francisco to stop delaying infrastructure for wireless technology.

No matter where I am, my wireless phone has become my lifeline to the world. It needs to work when I want to make a call, send an e-mail or get online.

My work schedule prevents me from attending a Planning Commission meeting in the middle of a work day. Please accept this e-mail as a show of my strong support for T-Mobile's wireless facility proposals.

Maria Wu
1214 Polk St, apt 328

Dear SF City Officials,

Wireless phones have become vital personal and public safety tools. Please make certain that citizens continue to have the best coverage possible throughout our community.

A major international technology hub like San Francisco should have access to the best wireless services available. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to help ensure our residents and employers have the quality wireless coverage they deserve.

Unfortunately my work schedule prevents me from attending a Planning Commission meeting in the middle of a work day. Please accept this e-mail as a show of my strong support for T-Mobile's wireless facility proposals.

Jay Wolberg
1540 Hyde St #6

There is absolutely no coverage in North Beach, and very much needed. I think T-Mobile's plans to improve the coverage by placing low-top rooftop antennas in only three locations is very reasonable, and should be done. Thank you.

Mary Anne Kayiatos
1735 Van Ness Ave., Apt. 501

Seems as though the aesthetic impact will be minimal, other than 'on principle' I can't see why people are so concerned. There is as yet no confirmed proof of such antennae causing health issues.

My work schedule prevents me from attending a Planning Commission meeting in the middle of a work day. Please accept this e-mail as a show of my support for T-Mobile's wireless facility proposals.

Eóin O' Toole
1555 Greenwich St, Apt 9

I'm a part-time Russian Hill, San Francisco resident, currently on travel in Europe, but feel strongly to take the time to point out San Francisco can NOT afford to fall behind in developing a world class communication infrastructure.

What T-Mobile is proposing for North Beach wireless communications seems reasonable and should be considered as a benefit for the 'many', with little/no risk to the few.

Thanks for your consideration and assistance.

Richard Hess
1338 Unions St, Apt. 6

Poor coverage anywhere in North Beach and the surrounding area is simply unacceptable. That's why I support, and encourage you to approve, T-Mobile's three proposed wireless broadband facilities to be located in North Beach.

My work schedule prevents me from attending a Planning Commission meeting in the middle of a work day. Please accept this e-mail as a show of my strong support for T-Mobile's wireless facility proposals.

Marc Cooper
1200 Francisco St Apt 1

If there is an earthquake in SF cell phones will still work when landlines won't. To not allow wireless service providers to put the necessary facilities in our city endangers our safety.

Poor coverage anywhere in North Beach and the surrounding area is simply unacceptable. That's why I support, and encourage you to approve, T-Mobile's three proposed wireless broadband facilities to be located in North Beach.

My work schedule prevents me from attending a Planning Commission meeting in the middle of a work day. Please accept this e-mail as a show of my strong support for T-Mobile's wireless facility proposals.

A major international technology hub like San Francisco should have access to the best wireless services available. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to help ensure our residents and employers have the quality wireless coverage they deserve.

I recently read that building permits for wireless facilities in San Francisco can take up to three years to process while, in Dallas, the same permit takes just 3 months. That's not right. It's time for San Francisco to stop delaying infrastructure for wireless technology.

Wireless phones have become vital personal and public safety tools. Please make certain that citizens continue to have the best coverage possible throughout our community.

My wireless phone has become a necessity. I use it to check in with my children wherever they are in our community. More importantly, I want my children to always be able to reach me or a 9-1-1 operator in an emergency.

Robert Spencer
1568 Union Street #302

From: "Jeff Coe" <lowcoes@gmail.com>
Subject: T mobile coverage no good
Date: February 8, 2011 8:06:34 PM PST
To: stefanocassolato@att.net
Reply-To: lowcoes@gmail.com

My name is Jeff Coe I've lived in the neighborhood of north beach for 16 years, and T Mobile coverage was so bad I had to switch to Verizon.

Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

From: Jim Weston <jaweston@weston-sf.com>
Subject: T-Mobile and Other Cellular Carrier Proposals for Additional Towers in North Beach
Date: January 31, 2011 4:13:16 PM PST
To: aaron.hollister@sfgov.org

Please do not block the subject proposals. The red tape and delays for approval of such towers in San Francisco is well known and reflects unfavorably on our image as both a tourist and business destination city.

Spotlighting iPad, iPhone 4, iPod touch 4, New Apple TV, Mac OS X, Slingbox

Jim Weston	E-mail: jaweston@weston-sf.com
Computer Consulting	Apple iMacTime Test: facetime@weston-sf.com
Weston & Associates	Skype accounts: jawestonskype, jawestonskype2
San Francisco, California	Video Gallery: http://gallery.mac.com/jawestonib
Voice: 415-985-1503	

From: "All Things Accordion" <tom@ladyofspain.com>
Subject: Support for towers
Date: January 31, 2011 7:37:25 PM PST
To: <frank@FNstrategy.com>, <aaron.hollister@sfgov.org>, <c_olague@yahoo.com>

I work and frequent North beach regularly and I support the T-Mobile cell towers to improve wireless coverage.

Tom Torriglia
415 440 0800
San Francisco

From: "William Moisson" <bill@billmoisson.com>
Subject: **Better Cell Phone Service for North Beach**
Date: February 2, 2011 11:27:21 AM PST
To: <frank@frncstrategy.com>, <aaron.hollister@sfgov.org>, <sc_olague@yahoo.com>

I am writing to encourage your support of better cell phone service for North Beach, and specifically the new transmission facilities being proposed for T-Mobile.

This is equally important for residents and visitors alike. It would be terrible for North Beach to get a reputation as a place that is anti-communications.

Thank you,
Bill Moisson

From: Fun Guy <funguyfungi@gmail.com>
Subject: **North Beach Antennae**
Date: February 2, 2011 4:58:32 PM PST
To: Fhoto@gcastrategies.com, frank@FNstrategy.com, Christina Olague <cc_olague@yahoo.com>,
aaron.hollister@efgov.org
Reply-To: FunGuyFungi@gmail.com

T-Mobile has a plan to improve leading edge mobile phone and data communications coverage for North Beach and Telegraph Hill. Three small microcell wireless antennas are proposed for rooftops on 501 Greenwich, 1761 Stockton and 1500 Grant Avenue to improve wireless infrastructure to meet consumer needs and improve coverage.

I totally support this project and urge its approval.

Paul Hansbury
415-987-0540

From: sffd22@aol.com
Subject: T-Mobile antenna sites in North Beach
Date: February 2, 2011 9:13:59 PM PST
To: frank@FNstrategy.com, aaron.holister@sfgov.org, c.oleague@yahoo.com

Dear Commissioners

This letter is in support of the (3) antenna locations proposed by T-Mobile on Grant, Stockton, and Greenwich Streets in North Beach.

Permit applications for all antenna installations, including minor equipment modifications to existing sites, go through an arduous process for approval. These applications are not only reviewed by the Planning Department, but also by the Building, Fire, and the Health Departments. To protect the public, these agencies ensure the structural integrity and environmental safety of all antenna sites. Numerous signs, warnings, and painted striping must be installed to inform freighters, window washers, painters, and anyone else who may have to work in close proximity to antennas of their presence and any dangers. An "RF Report" must be included on all plans submitted for antenna installations, signed by a Professional Engineer with expertise in communications technology. These reports clearly indicate the level of exposure to the public per FCC standards and list the distances from the antennas at which any exposure limitations could be exceeded. These distances are generally a few meters or less, indicating that a person would have to remain just a few feet directly in front of these devices for an extended period of time to receive even a minimal amount of RF energy. To address some residents' concerns about the appearance of these devices, T-Mobile has modified their plans to reduce the visibility of antennas from the street.

San Francisco's permit process is already extensive and cumbersome. Certainly no additional review is necessary. San Francisco, arguably a part of Silicon Valley, should be a leader in providing its citizens with the latest technological advances instead of causing inappropriately long delays. Please approve the permit for these antenna installations. Thank you.

Ms. Micki Jones
North Beach

From: Adam Slate <adam@slate.law.com>
Subject: T-Mobile's North Beach Antenna Installation
Date: February 3, 2011 2:28:28 PM PST
To: frank@FNstrategy.com, aaron.hollister@sfgov.org, a.oleague@yahoo.com

Dear Commissioners:

San Francisco's geography is a challenge to wireless services in San Francisco. I support T-Mobile's effort to improve service in North Beach by investing in new infrastructure. Excellent high speed wireless data services are critical if San Francisco is to continue to be at the center of high technology innovation and business start-ups.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Adam G. Slate
SLATE & LINKS
100 Pine Street, Suite 750
San Francisco, CA 94111
415-393-8001
adam@slate.law.com

From: Darla Bernard <darlabernard@yahoo.com>
Subject: FW:
Date: February 3, 2011 4:29:57 PM PST
To: nmarshaganard@att.net

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Darla Bernard <darlabernard@yahoo.com>
To: c. o'leary@yahoo.com
Sent: Wed, February 2, 2011 10:32:21 AM
Subject:








Please **support this safe and much needed technology** in our neighborhood.

To Whom it may concern at the hearing slated for September 23rd, 2010 at the Planning Commission for the hearing to allow T-Mobile to install a micro cellular antenna located at
1500 Grant Ave.

As Merchants and residents living and working in the North Beach area, do not oppose this installation and feel it would better the wireless communication of our neighbors and friends.

We understand that this micro site poses no threat due to it being

1% of the safety guidelines set forth by the federal communication regulations and standards.

Signed:	Address:	email: zip.
	1500 Grant Ave	94133
UPV	1165 2 nd ARMY	94133
Elaine	1327 Grant	94133
Memo (R. Anderson)	310 Columbus Ave	94133
Mike Bold	817 Columbus #155	94133
Paul Acub	601 Vallejo	94133
	1230 Grant Ave	94133
	242 - Columbus	94133
	1264 Grant Ave	94133
	1314 Grant Ave	94133
	1322 Grant Ave	94133
	1307 Green Ave	94133
	1609 Powell St	94133
	501 Union St # C	94133
	1336 Green St	94133
John Sear	1215 Grant Ave	94133
Ramona C	1350 Grant Ave	94133
Michelle	524 Green St	94133
	578 Green St	94133
	542 Green St	94133
	552 Grant St	94133

To Whom it may concern at the hearing slated for September 23rd, 2010 at the Planning Commission for the hearing to allow T-Mobile to install a micro cellular antenna located at
1500 Grant Ave.










As Merchants and residents living and working in the North Beach area, do not oppose this installation and feel it would better the wireless communication of our neighbors and friends.
We understand that this micro site poses no threat due to it being

1% of the safety guidelines set forth by the federal communication regulations and standards.

Signed:

Address:











email:

	1546 Kearny SF, CA 94133	
	459 Greenwich St, SF, CA 94133	
	NORTH BEACH - 1490 GRANT 94137	
	1601 Grant Ave 2B 94133	
Melissa Kuchberg	1420 Grant Ave SF, CA 94133	
Rod Jeffries	139 VARENNES SF, CA 94133	
Joni [unclear]	439 - Lombard SF 94133	
Charles [unclear]	4683 - [unclear] St SF 94111	
	1540 Grant Ave SF 94133	
	393 Missouri St SF 94133	
	8 Nobles Alley, SF 94133	
	462 NB pizza	94133
Ken [unclear]	456 Filbert.	94133
	18 Nobles Aly 94133	
	137 Varennes 94133	
	1501 THE GRANT 94133	
	143 VARENNES 94133	
	1401 GRANT AVE S.F. CA 94133	
	523 Green St SF 94133	
	513 Green St. 94133	
	1353 GRANT AVE. 94133	

To Whom it may concern at the hearing slated for September 23rd, 2010 at the Planning Commission for the hearing to allow T-Mobile to install a micro cellular antenna located at
1500 Grant Ave.

As Merchants and residents living and working in the North Beach area, do not oppose this installation and feel it would better the wireless communication of our neighbors and friends. We understand that this micro site poses no threat due to it being

1% of the safety guidelines set forth by the federal communication regulations and standards.

Signed:	Address:	email:
	492 UNION ST.	wax-126@hotmail.com
	1501 GRANT 1525 Grant St	
	1519 Grant	info@abfits.com
	1519 Grant / 137 Pfeiffer St	sanleehello@aol.com
	1535 GRANT AVE	
	510 Union St	
	1461 Grant Ave	slau182@yahoo.com
	1461 Grant Ave	
	1455 GRANT AVE.	
	457 UNION ST.	LAURO-MAXIMONE@LVN.COM
	1445 GRANT AVE	alix.odonnell@comcast.net
	1435 Grant Ave	
	1415 Grant St.	
	1411 GRANT STG.	
	1400 GRANT AVE.	
	1402 Grant Ave	thabakerrecordbore@gmail.com
	1402 Grant Ave	benjaminandrewsst@gmail.com
	1412 GRANT	
	1422 Grant Ave	Diana.Bedigan@gmail.com
	4955 A UNION ST #133	wendellworks@yahoo.com

To Whom it may concern at the hearing slated for September 23rd, 2010 at the Planning Commission for the hearing to allow T-Mobile to install a micro cellular antenna located at
1500 Grant Ave.

As Merchants and residents living and working in the North Beach area, do not oppose this installation and feel it would better the wireless communication of our neighbors and friends.

We understand that this micro site poses no threat due to it being

1% of the safety guidelines set forth by the federal communication regulations and standards.

Signed:

Address:

email:

C. Murtientz	1644 Church St ⁹⁴¹³¹	FEASRAIS@aol.com
Michael Barber	1416 Grant Ave	MICHAEL@BARBERZIZSF.COM
Serguei L. Dargis	1454 Grant Ave	
Doc	404A Union St.	butters@fsu.edu
Gregory Taylor	1462 Grant	N. B. P.
Joseph K. Boston	1402 Grant Ave	bettinasf@cs.com
Maya Pappas	1402 Grant St.	
DAVID ANSTED	405 UNION #3	
Jan Chavez	148 Varennes St.	
HOWARD MUNSON	64 DARRELL	
JOHN MATTOS	1540 Grant	john@johnmattos.com
Ray Duristag	28 Bob Kaufman	Rayduristag@yahoo.com
COVEN FENWEST	801 COLUMBIA AVE	covfn@covfnfennescy.com
Theresa Baker	1522 Grant Ave.	
Theresa Baker	328 Union St.	
Louise Taylor	448 Union St.	
BLAKE MATTOS	17 Bob Kaufman	
Jan P. L.	947 Columbia Ave.	N. B. LOCKE SAFE
ROBERT CELL	511 FREENWICK ST.	
Joe DeRover	115 VARENNE ST	JosephDeRover@yahoo.com
N. Ching	470 Union St.	

To Whom it may concern at the hearing slated for September 23rd, 2010 at the Planning Commission for the hearing to allow T-Mobile to install a micro cellular antenna located at
1500 Grant Ave.

As Merchants and residents living and working in the North Beach area, do not oppose this installation and feel it would better the wireless communication of our neighbors and friends. We understand that this micro site poses no threat due to it being

1% of the safety guidelines set forth by the federal communication regulations and standards.

Signed:	Address:	email: ^{2W}
<i>[Signature]</i>	180 Columbus Ave	94133
<i>[Signature]</i>	505 Green St.	94133
<i>[Signature]</i>	1730 KEARNY ST A-1	94133
<i>[Signature]</i>	443 FILBERT	94133
<i>[Signature]</i>	1443 Grant	94133
<i>[Signature]</i>	1507 GRANT AVE	94133
<i>[Signature]</i>	1415 Grant Ave	94133
<i>[Signature]</i>	526 Green St.	94133
<i>[Signature]</i>	400 UNION	94133
<i>[Signature]</i>	436 UNIOS.	94153
<i>[Signature]</i>	8-14 1/2 Nables	94133
<i>[Signature]</i>	38 Lombard	94133
<i>[Signature]</i>	153 VARANES	94133
<i>[Signature]</i>	1400A Montgomery St	94133
<i>[Signature]</i>	130 Greenwich	94133
<i>[Signature]</i>	1991 (15th St)	94133
<i>[Signature]</i>	1226 Grant St #30	94133
<i>[Signature]</i>	793 UNION ST	94133
<i>[Signature]</i>	1519 Grant St	94133
<i>[Signature]</i>	535 Broadway St.	94133
<i>[Signature]</i>	5 Sonoma St #2	94133

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: Liz Diaz
Address: 600 Chestnut #303 ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: liz@earthlink.net

2. PRINTED Name: GAYNOR LLOYD
Address: 760 Columbus ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

3. PRINTED Name: Elika Weinstein
Address: 1000 Sansome St #150 ZIP Code: 94111
Phone: _____ Email: _____

4. PRINTED Name: EDWARD FONG
Address: 45 JASPER ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 392.7344 Email: _____

5. PRINTED Name: De Kong Yu
Address: 790 Vallejo #14 ZIP Code: _____
Phone: _____ Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: GORDON MANK
Address: 1550 MASON ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: David Ho
Address: 1657 Stockton St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

2. PRINTED Name: Luigi Barassi
Address: 1714 Clay St ZIP Code: 94109
Phone: _____ Email: _____

3. PRINTED Name: LOUIS CARBALLIDO
Address: 1855 KERR ST ZIP Code: 94132
Phone: _____ Email: _____

4. PRINTED Name: Sabrina Barja
Address: 2190 Powell St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: (415) 359-3331 Email: _____

5. PRINTED Name: Rebecca Barja
Address: 2190 Powell St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: Yemmi Fivas
Address: 2190 Powell St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1 PRINTED Name: Diana Ng Du
Address: 740 Powell ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

2 PRINTED Name: Amanda Ho
Address: 1968 Powell St. ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

3 PRINTED Name: Nidunbur
Address: 830 Chestnut ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

4 PRINTED Name: Holly Leach
Address: 2151 Mason ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

5 PRINTED Name: Anna Phung - LLC
Address: 756 Columbus ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: (415) 391-3183 Email: _____

8 PRINTED Name: Jason Zhou
Address: 706 Columbus Ave ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 415-986-0886 Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: Tracy Fore
Address: 577 Union ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 415-982-4412 Email: _____

2. PRINTED Name: MILLIE STARBUCK
Address: 2012 POLAR ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

3. PRINTED Name: Adam Brown
Address: 2131 Mason St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

4. PRINTED Name: Jeremiah Johnson
Address: 570 Francisco St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

5. PRINTED Name: Kimberly Mark
Address: 1532 Mason St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: LAURA MCERLANE
Address: 657 LOMBARD ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1765 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: R STEWART
Address: 1847 STOCKTON ZIP Code: 94122
Phone: _____ Email: _____
2. PRINTED Name: GIANGIULIA FORTI
Address: 545 Lombard St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 415-272-0557 Email: _____
3. PRINTED Name: Elisa Garibay
Address: 545 Lombard St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: (909) 533-1528 Email: elisa.garibay@yahoo
4. PRINTED Name: Blake Lugar
Address: 1705 Stockton St ZIP Code: _____
Phone: _____ Email: _____
5. PRINTED Name: JEFF PAGE ~~AA~~
Address: 670 MILBURN ZIP Code: 94122
Phone: _____ Email: _____
6. PRINTED Name: Gerhard Stornicola
Address: 657 Clay St #39 ZIP Code: 94111
Phone: (415) 362-7828 Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: Katrina
Address: 474 Filbert Street ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

2. PRINTED Name: SUSANNA YU
Address: 1545A GRANT AVE ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

3. PRINTED Name: Alex Black
Address: 371 COLUMBUS AVE Apt 34 ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

4. PRINTED Name: 朱世强 HBM
Address: 534 Union St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

5. PRINTED Name: Leo P. Colucci WRC
Address: 1164 Grant ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: Foxtime Chan
Address: 404 Union St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: Larry Hanson
Address: 1350 Kearny ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____
2. PRINTED Name: David Joy
Address: 1068 Montgomery St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____
3. PRINTED Name: Xi Juan Li
Address: 1244 Kearny ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 788-6889 Email: _____
4. PRINTED Name: LIN
Address: 20 VAREMBES ST ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____
5. PRINTED Name: P. ANSTED
Address: 405 UNION ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____
6. PRINTED Name: Andrew Davis
Address: 472 Union St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 215-776-4066 Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (Insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: RAYMOND A. C. CHAN
Address: 1005 POWELL ST. #403 S.F. CA. ZIP Code: 94108-1503
Phone: 415-652-2012 Email: _____

2. PRINTED Name: SARAH MOFFAT
Address: 460 COLUMBUS ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 415 828 7065 Email: SMOFF@MCA.COM

3. PRINTED Name: Jonathan Sherman
Address: 475 A Union St. ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

4. PRINTED Name: CHRIS WEE
Address: 524 UNION ST. ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: (415) 860-1142 Email: _____

5. PRINTED Name: Nick Paolli
Address: 116 Joseph Pl. ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: Mark Reit
Address: 741 Green St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

✓

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: Lynn Clark
Address: 823 Lombard St. ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

2. PRINTED Name: Josée Adamson
Address: 823 Lombard St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

3. PRINTED Name: VIDA GHASSEMI-HERSINI
Address: 440 LOMBARD ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

4. PRINTED Name: TIM GOODRICH
Address: 440 LOMBARD ST ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

5. PRINTED Name: STAN CHAN
Address: 1343 POWELL ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: TOMMY CHAN
Address: 1660 FIBBER ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1760 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (Insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: Sue Blankman
Address: 1660 Powell ~~1500 Grant~~ ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: SKIGIKISJOY@aol.com
2. PRINTED Name: FELICE A. FRANKLIN
Address: 615 Union St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____
3. PRINTED Name: MURAM KASDAN
Address: 1440 Union #106 ZIP Code: 94109
Phone: _____ Email: _____
4. PRINTED Name: Eileen McLarty
Address: 1440 Union ZIP Code: 94109
Phone: 5 Email: _____
5. PRINTED Name: RUFUS McDonnell
Address: 624 Union ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____
6. PRINTED Name: Michele Zing
Address: 536 Greenwich ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: ROBERT KLOTZ
Address: 467 FILBERT ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____
2. PRINTED Name: Daniel Wilcox
Address: 2750 Mission #40 ZIP Code: 94103
Phone: (650) 265-3859 Email: danielwilcox@gmail.com
3. PRINTED Name: Sherman Lau
Address: 1461 Grant Ave ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____
4. PRINTED Name: Robin Lau
Address: 1461 Grant Ave ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____
5. PRINTED Name: Johnny
Address: 1329 GRANT ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____
6. PRINTED Name: Sita Shapiro
Address: 521 Union St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: CHI CHOW WU
Address: 15 SONOMA Street ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 415 362 8248 Email: clainewu08@gmail.com

2. PRINTED Name: Hanna Chedyak
Address: 1300 Kearny ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

3. PRINTED Name: Teresa Johnson
Address: 365 Green ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

4. PRINTED Name: EHAD
Address: 383 GARRON ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

5. PRINTED Name: KERIN THOMPSON
Address: 1236 KEARNY St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: Andrew Gutierrez
Address: 378 Green St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we do not oppose installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1753 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: Rigerman
Address: 576 Union St ZIP Code: _____
Phone: 415-391-8667 Email: _____

2. PRINTED Name: DIEGO DE LEO
Address: 566 CHESTNUT ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

3. PRINTED Name: Haty Fleischman
Address: 1729 Stockton ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

4. PRINTED Name: Carman Dunning
Address: 1367 Wallis ZIP Code: 94109
Phone: _____ Email: _____

5. PRINTED Name: Elfreda Cabrera
Address: Pom 416 Hill Street ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 415-250-4000 Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: Fabrizio Vol
Address: 210 AVILA St ZIP Code: 94127
Phone: 346 6771 Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these mini sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: Danielle Mora *SA 7/20/11*
Address: 1402 Grant St. ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

2. PRINTED Name: Maddalena Petragalli
Address: 435 Lombard St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

3. PRINTED Name: Ron Casare
Address: 1416 Grant ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

4. PRINTED Name: Stephen Phillips
Address: 485 Union St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

5. PRINTED Name: Lino Li
Address: 1465 Grant Ave. #4 ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: Ben Karl
Address: 1654 Stockton St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 5 _____ Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: Tiffany Larr
Address: 900 Union St - 273 ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

2. PRINTED Name: [Signature]
Address: 1525 Powell ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

3. PRINTED Name: DON WHITE
Address: 579 COLUMBUS ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

4. PRINTED Name: Jason Ovarth
Address: 1st College Ave 94132 ZIP Code: 94112
Phone: _____ Email: _____

5. PRINTED Name: Nick Babistoff
Address: 1329 GRANT ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: MARILYN M. KITAGAWA
Address: 526 VALLEJO ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 415 986 5089 Mail: M.M.KITAGAWA@YAHOO.COM

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: Jeanne Louie
Address: 120 Jasper Pl. 2nd floor. ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

2. PRINTED Name: Tina Louie
Address: 120 Jasper Pl. 2nd floor ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

3. PRINTED Name: KHUY EN
Address: 580 Union ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

4. PRINTED Name: KEESB KARON
Address: 156 COM BARRE ZIP Code: 94111
Phone: _____ Email: _____

5. PRINTED Name: TAMM MIR
Address: 746 Broadway ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: CINDY CHAN
Address: 560 Filbert St. ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1768 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (Insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: Allen Cayao
Address: 1025 Powell ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

2. PRINTED Name: CHRISTINA BSW
Address: 844 JACKSON ST ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 415-0127 Email: _____

3. PRINTED Name: EDUARDO VEG
Address: 1531 POWELL ST ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 519-2528 Email: _____

4. PRINTED Name: FOSIN FONG
Address: JASPER ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 3427344 Email: _____

5. PRINTED Name: ROSE GPC
Address: 808 VALLEJO ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 999.1114 Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: ED GREE
Address: 808 VALLEJO ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 999.1114 Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: Maria Garcia
Address: 700 Columbus ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

2. PRINTED Name: Stephen Hollis
Address: 1529 Grant Ave ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

3. PRINTED Name: David Wong
Address: 1200 Union ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 6734873 Email: _____

4. PRINTED Name: Gordon Mark
Address: 1526 MASON ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: Gordonm@comcast.net

5. PRINTED Name: MEI WONG
Address: 1201 UNION ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 673-4873 Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: MICHAEL FOOTE
Address: 558 FILBERT ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: ROBERT MITTELSTAUB
Address: 1736 STOCKTON ZIP Code: _____
Phone: 5F Email: 94133
2. PRINTED Name: David Booth
Address: 1847 B STOCKTON ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____
3. PRINTED Name: Laura Williams
Address: 1847 B STOCKTON ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____
4. PRINTED Name: MR PARACCHINI
Address: 652 GRANT ST ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____
5. PRINTED Name: Nicoles Avolio
Address: 600 FALSBURT ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____
6. PRINTED Name: Yvonne G.
Address: 1625 Powell ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: BABAK YOUSEF ZADEH
Address: 451 Union St. #3 ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

2. PRINTED Name: Shuyi Liang
Address: 484 Union ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 397-0970 Email: _____

3. PRINTED Name: MEL MEL STA
Address: 16 HARWOOD AVE ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

4. PRINTED Name: LUM CHAN
Address: 441 UNION ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

5. ADDRESS 39 BARNAM 94133
PRINTED Name: _____
Address: NAMU RUMIN LI ZIP Code: _____
Phone: _____ Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: Chao Chan
Address: 9 NOBLES AVE ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we do not oppose installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: FRIE TURGES
Address: 602 FULBERT ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

2. PRINTED Name: MARY PARDY-REED
Address: 855 FULBERT ST. ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 415-471-2860 Email: _____

3. PRINTED Name: MARY SHAW
Address: 250 DIVISADERO ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 415-372-9109 Email: _____

4. PRINTED Name: Joe P. Price
Address: 2154 Union St ZIP Code: 94123
Phone: _____ Email: _____

5. PRINTED Name: ghadi
Address: 585 Columbus ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: Anne
Address: 657 Union ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: STOJIC
Address: 1245 KERNAN ST ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____
2. PRINTED Name: BUSSENIUS, Paul
Address: 1420 Kearny St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 415 342 9585 Email: _____
3. PRINTED Name: LAURIZIO, Vin
Address: 439 GREENWICH ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 415 516 5271 Email: ~~vin@laurizio.com~~ LAURIZIO, VIN@GMAIL.COM
4. PRINTED Name: MUSTELLE, NOBIAK
Address: 439 GREENWICH ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 415 843 2650 Email: vin@mustelle.com
5. PRINTED Name: Tony Yu ~~WORKER DELI CONT~~
Address: #1 Telegraph Hill ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 415 610 0252 Email: _____
6. PRINTED Name: STEVE YU ~~WORKER DELI CONT~~
Address: #1 Telegraph Hill ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: Han WIP sign
Address: 1507 Stockton St. ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

2. PRINTED Name: Joson Pineda
Address: 558 A Union Street ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

3. PRINTED Name: Douglas Horn Bm #3450
Address: 278 27th Ave 600 Union St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

4. PRINTED Name: Felix Lew PATRICK
Address: 1534 30th Ave 1570 Stockton ZIP Code: 94133 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

5. PRINTED Name: Walter Ramos (W)
Address: 414 Columbus ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: Chris Nixon
Address: 43 Bannan ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: (714) 305-8915 Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we do not oppose installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: TONY LAM
Address: 1570 Stockton ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

2. PRINTED Name: Frank Duran
Address: 1865 Stockton ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

3. PRINTED Name: Tosha Luk *work*
Address: 1714 Stockton #200 ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

4. PRINTED Name: BARBARA WANG *work*
Address: 1714 Stockton St #200 ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

5. PRINTED Name: Ling Pak Lee
Address: 1580 Jackson Pl. ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: BO JUN CHEN
Address: 346 Vallejo ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: Kui Guts
Address: 539 Fillmore St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

2. PRINTED Name: FRANCISCO GARCIA
Address: 600 FILLBERT ZIP Code: _____
Phone: _____ Email: _____

3. PRINTED Name: Teresa Wang
Address: 2125 Mason St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

4. PRINTED Name: Vally J
Address: 475 Serrano St ZIP Code: 94118
Phone: _____ Email: _____

5. PRINTED Name: Jennifer Chaudhury
Address: 1055 Broadway ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: Leslie Ramirez
Address: 1055 Broadway ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1703 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: Cristina Piana
Address: 744 Union St. ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____
2. PRINTED Name: Hana Edieva
Address: 705 Union St. ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____
3. PRINTED Name: Ekatereha Alekseenko
Address: 1134 Montgomery ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 3476355283 Email: _____
4. PRINTED Name: Natasha Semiyachko
Address: 1134 Montgomery ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____
5. PRINTED Name: Josiah Villacorte
Address: 688 Lombard Street ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____
6. PRINTED Name: Jessie Milda Lewskis
Address: 792 Filbert St. ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: Mindy Chen
Address: 474 Filbert St SFCA ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

2. PRINTED Name: Vickie Chen
Address: 474 Filbert ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

3. PRINTED Name: FRANK LEE
Address: 474 Filbert ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

4. PRINTED Name: ALLEN LEE
Address: 557 A UNION ST ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

5. PRINTED Name: Randall Geto
Address: 533 Filbert St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: Mia Ling Geto
Address: 533 Filbert St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: Travis Pizini cc
Address: 142 Columbus St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 415 537 8148 Email: _____

2. PRINTED Name: Kelsey Brown
Address: 300 Columbus ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 831-537-8148 Email: _____

3. PRINTED Name: Paquel Pincol
Address: 300 Columbus ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 415-268-5003 Email: _____

4. PRINTED Name: ^{SENIOR} MARCEL EMPLOYEE OF RESTAURANT
Address: 1570 STOCKTON ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

5. PRINTED Name: ANTHONY BELCONA MARKER. VALST PAREJA
Address: 1570 STOCKTON ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: LEONARDO MARKER
Address: 1570 STOCKTON ZIP Code: 94133 VALST PAREJA
Phone: _____ Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we do not oppose installation of small macrocellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: Richard Keinker
 Address: 17 Rosale Pl. ZIP Code: 94133
 Phone: 415 571-1008 Email: _____
ROGUE NORTH BEACH BAY
2. PRINTED Name: B. Jordan
 Address: 673 Union St. ZIP Code: 94133
 Phone: 415-302-5377 Email: _____
3. PRINTED Name: Kelsey Federmeier
 Address: 579 Columbus ZIP Code: 94133
 Phone: 986-4038 Email: _____
MICHEL MENDO CIPRO
VALERIA ROSTAN (M)
4. PRINTED Name: ANDI
 Address: 561 COLUMBUS ZIP Code: 94133
 Phone: 415-362-2777 Email: _____
5. PRINTED Name: DAN
 Address: 543 COLUMBUS AVE. ZIP Code: 94133
 Phone: 399 077 Email: _____
L.A. BOUTHERN
6. PRINTED Name: US RESTAURANT
 Address: 515 COLUMBUS ZIP Code: 94133
 Phone: 397 6200 Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: Fernando Valle
Address: 517 Broadway St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 415 Email: valfer689@hotmail.com

2. PRINTED Name: Alex Avadaku
Address: 314 Columbus St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 650-307-6191 Email: _____

3. PRINTED Name: Mark Patterson
Address: 650 Filbert St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 415-720-1713 Email: uniquyvk@scribble.net

4. PRINTED Name: Chris Schrell
Address: 650 Filbert St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 415-720-1713 Email: N/A

5. PRINTED Name: Mason Wagon
Address: 650 Filbert ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 415 Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: Jigam Alabar
Address: 650 Filbert ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: DANIELLO BELLU
Address: 516 Columbus ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

2. PRINTED Name: ELIA GAMBACONI
Address: 516 GREEN ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 415 778 1806 Email: ITA.ELYA@GMAIL.COM

3. PRINTED Name: Filippa Gambacconi
Address: 516 GREEN ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

4. PRINTED Name: Mary Lee Sanders
Address: 1350 Gannett Ave ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 677-9888 Email: _____

5. PRINTED Name: ALESSANDRO S. VETASCO
Address: 625 Bush St. ZIP Code: 94108
Phone: _____ Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: Billie Grant
Address: 516 Grant ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 160 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: Carlos Rojas
Address: 401 Broadway ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 415 Email: _____

2. PRINTED Name: DIONISIO FERNANDO
Address: 470 BROADWAY ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

3. PRINTED Name: Rob Mardel
Address: 402 Broadway ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 415 933-1328 Email: [scribble]

4. PRINTED Name: Brandon Loberg
Address: 371 Columbus Ave. ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: (510) 277-2781 Email: _____

5. PRINTED Name: Dennis Zarabina
Address: 371 Columbus Ave. ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: (562) 862-0082 Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: Finnas Kurdi
Address: 550 Broadway st ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 415-327-1310 Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: GUIDO GHIGLIERI
Address: 52 GENE PLACE ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

2. PRINTED Name: Max Rohrer
Address: 62 Alta St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

3. PRINTED Name: Dom Cacciatore
Address: 570 Union St. ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

4. PRINTED Name: Nick Rosano
Address: 570 Union St. ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

5. PRINTED Name: ~~Harriet~~ Harriet Hamnath
Address: 546 COLUMBUS ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: A. Adams
Address: 546 Columbus ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: Lyman Wong
Address: 805 Broadway ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

2. PRINTED Name: LEAH LI
Address: 111 WASHINGTON ZIP Code: 94108
Phone: _____ Email: _____

3. PRINTED Name: Claire Borgeson
Address: 2296 15th St. #8 ZIP Code: 94114
Phone: _____ Email: _____

4. PRINTED Name: _____
Address: _____ ZIP Code: _____
Phone: _____ Email: _____

5. PRINTED Name: _____
Address: _____ ZIP Code: _____
Phone: _____ Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: _____
Address: _____ ZIP Code: _____
Phone: _____ Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we do not oppose installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 160 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: DELORE BLADE
Address: 622 Green St ZIP Code: _____
Phone: 415 2447061 Email: _____

2. PRINTED Name: John Farum
Address: 674 Green St ZIP Code: _____
Phone: 415 6652193 Email: _____

3. PRINTED Name: CHARIE LUND
Address: 418 Union St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: 415 5775765 Email: _____

4. PRINTED Name: HYUN YOO
Address: 809 MONTGOMERY ST ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: (415) 982-6663 Email: _____

5. PRINTED Name: Eun Hwan Yoo
Address: 809 Montgomery St ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: _____
Address: _____ ZIP Code: _____
Phone: _____ Email: _____

Yes, let's improve our wireless communications.

As merchants, employees and residents living and working in North Beach and Telegraph Hill, we support installation of small microcellular antennas at 1500 Grant, 501 Greenwich and 1763 Stockton. These sites will improve wireless communications for our friends and neighbors. We understand that these micro sites are approved by the Health Department, feeding the antennas with less than 15 watts of power (insignificant when compared to a 100-watt light bulb). Radio frequency exposure levels are less than from a cordless phone or wireless router for a home computer. The small antennas are generally hidden from the street, and appear similar to small roof vents from above.

Already supported by more than 150 residents and merchants in the North Beach area, this proposal for leading edge infrastructure will provide the quality wireless coverage that residents expect in our neighborhood.

1. PRINTED Name: Julian Lopez
Address: 650 Filbert ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

2. PRINTED Name: Reginald J. Bell
Address: 650 Filbert ZIP Code: 94132
Phone: _____ Email: _____

3. PRINTED Name: Victor Amador
Address: 650 Filbert ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

4. PRINTED Name: Lena Lopez
Address: 650 Filbert ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

5. PRINTED Name: DANIEL LEVIN
Address: 1600 STOCKTON 7411 ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

6. PRINTED Name: Ramon Valera
Address: 1610 STOCKTON ZIP Code: 94133
Phone: _____ Email: _____

CHILL
EMPLOYEES
(Construction Crew)
↓

Google Map




1500 Grant Ave.

T-Mobile's Existing 3G Coverage (Drive Test)




1500 Grant Ave.

T-Mobile's Existing 3G Coverage



1500 Grant Ave.

T-Mobile's proposed 3G Coverage (SF43437-MEA CINIS)




1500 Grant Ave.

T-Mobile's Existing 3G Coverage (Drive Test)




1763 Stockton St.

T-Mobile's Existing 3G Coverage



1763 Stockton St.

T-Mobile's proposed 3G Coverage (SF23211B-Francisco Launderette)



1763 Stockton St.

Google Map




501 Greenwich St.

T-Mobile's Existing 3G Coverage (Drive Test)




501 Greenwich St.

T-Mobile's Existing 3G Coverage



501 Greenwich St.

T-Mobile's proposed 3G Coverage (SF13114B-501 Greenwich)



501 Greenwich St.

· · T · · Mobile · Engineering and Operations

SF23211 Alternative Site Analysis

Coverage Objective: Provide 3G in-building residential and commercial coverage in the northwestern portion of the Telegraph Hill area as more specifically defined below

Primary Candidate: Francisco Laundrette (1763-1767 Stockton St.)

The enclosed Alternative Site Analysis supplements our current record which identifies alternative locations that were considered by T-Mobile but ultimately found to be infeasible candidates for a variety of reasons.

T-Mobile has identified a significant gap in its 3G indoor residential and commercial coverage in the North Beach District of San Francisco bounded by Lombard St. to the north, Grant Ave. to the east, Powell St. to the west and Filbert St. to the south and seeks to install a new facility to fill the gap in coverage. The primary candidate for this search area is a mixed use commercial/residential building located at 1763-1767 Stockton St. (at the intersection of Greenwich St.). The "microcell" proposal at this location (one antenna hidden with a vent-like enclosure) constitutes the least intrusive means of filling the significant gap in 3G coverage because it minimizes visual impacts, meets the coverage objective, and is proposed on a mixed use building which is favored by the City of San Francisco over solely residential buildings which constitute the majority of the search area.

In addition to the proposed location, T-Mobile researched the following alternate locations within the search area. The below candidates were proven to be infeasible due to a number of factors ranging from land use incompatibility, potential visual impacts, inability to meet coverage objectives, and lack of landlord interest.

1. Tower Laundry
2. SFFD Station 28
3. Comjam Chinese Herb Co.
4. Lombard Heights Market
5. Saints Peter and Paul Church

Report prepared by Joe Camicia
Permit Me, Inc.,
Agent for T-Mobile West Corporation

T-Mobile West Corporation
SF23211 Alternative Site Analysis
North Beach/Telegraph Hill
San Francisco, CA 94133

Alternative 1 – Tower Laundry



Address: 1800 Stockton St.

APN: 0077/023A

Location: Northeast corner of Greenwich
St. and Stockton St.

Zoning District: RM-1 (Residential, Mixed
District)

Height/Bulk District: 40-X

Historic/Conservation District: None

Year Built: 1908

This building is located directly across the intersection from the primary candidate at 1763 Stockton St. While the building's location within the search area is acceptable, the building is adjacent to a number of taller buildings to the north and east, which would significantly limit the ability of a new antenna facility to meet the coverage objectives.

T-Mobile West Corporation
SF23211 Alternative Site Analysis
North Beach/Telegraph Hill
San Francisco, CA 94133

Alternative 2 – SFFD Station 28



Address: 1814 Stockton St.	Zoning District: RM-1 (Residential, Mixed District)
APN: 0077/024	Height/Bulk District: 40-X
Location: On Stockton St. just north of Greenwich St.	Historic/Conservation District: None
	Year Built: 1900

The SFFD station is located directly adjacent to Alternative 1, which is directly across the intersection from the primary candidate at 1763 Stockton St. The fire station is considered a public use and is, therefore, generally viewed as a preferred location to locate a wireless antenna facility. Unfortunately, the building is significantly shorter than surrounding buildings thus blocking the propagation of the RF signal. As a result, this building is not a viable candidate due to inability to achieve coverage objectives.

T-Mobile West Corporation
SF23211 Alternative Site Analysis
North Beach/Telegraph Hill
San Francisco, CA 94133

Alternative 3 – Comjam Chinese Herb Co.



Address: 591 Greenwich St.

APN: 0088/022

Location: Southeast corner of
Greenwich St. and Stockton St.

Zoning District: North Beach Neighborhood
Commercial District

Height/Bulk District: 40-X

Historic/Conservation District: None

Year Built: 1925

This building is located directly across the street from the primary candidate at 1763 Stockton St. and would provide approximately 85% of the coverage improvements offered by the primary candidate. While the building is similar to the primary candidate from a land use perspective, there is more existing rooftop equipment (existing antennas, vents, and a staircase penthouse) on the roof of 1763 Stockton, thus providing an appropriate backdrop for a new faux vent. The primary candidate allows for more coverage improvement with a lesser visual impact than this alternative.

T-Mobile West Corporation
SF23211 Alternative Site Analysis
North Beach/Telegraph Hill
San Francisco, CA 94133

Alternative 4 – Lombard Heights Market



Address: 1873 Stockton St.

APN: 0076/001

Location: Southwest corner of Lombard St.
and Stockton St.

Zoning District: RM-1 (Residential, Mixed
District)

Height/Bulk District: 40-X

Historic/Conservation District: None

Year Built: 1917

This building is located at the northern boundary of the search area at the intersection of Stockton St. and Lombard St. This building is a mixed commercial/residential building (like the primary candidate), but is zoned for residential use, whereas the primary candidate is zoned for neighborhood-serving commercial uses. As such, this candidate is considered a slightly less appropriate alternative than the primary candidate.

From a coverage standpoint, this building, being at the northern edge of the intended coverage area, is located in an area that currently has a higher degree of coverage than

T-Mobile West Corporation
SF23211 Alternative Site Analysis
North Beach/Telegraph Hill
San Francisco, CA 94133

elsewhere within the search area. Much greater coverage gains can be made by installing a new antenna facility at the primary candidate. Additionally, visual impacts will be minimized by locating a new faux vent on the primary candidate's rooftop because it will blend in with the existing rooftop facilities.


T-Mobile West Corporation
SF23211 Alternative Site Analysis
North Beach/Telegraph Hill
San Francisco, CA 94133

Alternative 5 – Saints Peter and Paul Church



Address: 650 Filbert St.	Zoning District: RM-1 (Residential, Mixed District)
APN: 0089/015	Height/Bulk District: 40-X
Location: On Filbert St. between Stockton St. and Powell St.	Historic/Conservation District: None
	Year Built: 1922

Saints Peter and Paul Church has a significant height advantage over surrounding buildings, so much so that the overall height renders the building infeasible from a technical standpoint due to potential interference with existing T-Mobile facilities. Additionally, the church is a San Francisco landmark and exterior alterations to such a historic structure (such as adding antennas) might result in adverse visual impacts.



Primary Candidate
1763-1767 Stockton St.

4

2

1

3

5

Photo

Photo of Site from Stockton St. and Greenwich St.



Photo of Site from Stockton St. just south of Greenwich St.



Photo Looking South at Stockton St. and Greenwich St.



Photo Looking East from Greenwich St. just West of Stockton St.



Photo Looking West from Greenwich St. just East of Stockton St.



View from 501 Greenwich Rooftop Looking West at Site



Close-up of Site from 501 Greenwich Rooftop



T-MOBILE WEST CORPORATION

T-Mobile®

a DELAWARE CORPORATION

1855 GATEWAY BLVD., 9TH FLOOR, CONCORD, CA 94520

SF23211B

FRANCISCO LAUNDERETTE

1763-1767 STOCKTON STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94133
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

MICHAEL WILK ARCHITECTURE 

833 Market Street, #805
San Francisco, CA 94103
T: 415-839-9594
F: 415-904-8388
www.wilkarch.com

T-Mobile
T-MOBILE WEST CORPORATION,
a DELAWARE CORPORATION
1855 GATEWAY BLVD., 9TH FLOOR
CONCORD, CA 94520

SF23211B
FRANCISCO
LAUNDERETTE
1763-1767 STOCKTON ST.
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94133



DRAWN BY: SH CHECKED BY: MW


NO	DATE	ISSUE
1	05/05/08	90% CONST.
2	05/20/08	100% CONST.
3	07/01/09	100% CONST. REV.
4	07/30/09	100% CONST. REV.
5	04/19/10	100% CONST. REV.

SHEET TITLE

TITLE SHEET

SHEET NUMBER

T-1



- DIRECTIONS FROM T-MOBILE OFFICE AT 1855 GATEWAY BOULEVARD, CONCORD CA:
1. START AT 1855 GATEWAY BLVD, CONCORD GOING TOWARD CLAYTON RD - GO < 0.1 MI
 2. TURN RIGHT ON CLAYTON RD - GO 0.3 MI
 3. TAKE RAMP ONTO CA-242 S - GO 0.9 MI
 4. TAKE RAMP ONTO I-680 S TOWARD OAKLAND/SAN JOSE - GO 3.6 MI
 5. TAKE THE OAKLAND/LAFAYETTE EXIT ONTO CA-24 W - GO 13.6 MI
 6. TAKE THE SAN FRANCISCO/HAYWARD EXIT ONTO I-580 W TOWARD SAN FRANCISCO - GO 1.5 MI
 7. TAKE THE SAN FRANCISCO LEFT EXIT ONTO I-80 W (PORTIONS TOLL) - GO 6.7 MI
 8. TAKE THE FREMONT ST EXIT TOWARD FOLSOM ST - GO 0.6 MI
 9. TURN LEFT ON FOLSOM ST - GO 0.3 MI
 10. TURN LEFT ON THE EMBARCADERO - GO 0.7 MI
 11. TURN LEFT ON BROADWAY ST - GO 0.5 MI
 12. BEAR RIGHT ON COLUMBUS AVE - GO 0.2 MI
 13. BEAR RIGHT ON STOCKTON ST - GO 0.2 MI
 14. ARRIVE AT 1767 STOCKTON ST, SAN FRANCISCO, ON THE LEFT

DRIVING DIRECTIONS

THE PROJECT INVOLVES THE INSTALLATION OF:
 -(1) PANEL ANTENNA CONCEALED WITHIN NEW FRP SIMULATED VENT AT (E) BUILDING ROOF.
 -(2) MICROCELL BTS CABINETS MOUNTED AT (E) BUILDING ROOF.
 -ANTENNA COAXIAL TRANSMISSION LINES FROM BTS TO ANTENNAS.
 -POWER AND TELEPHONE SERVICE TO BE PROVIDED FROM EXISTING BUILDING SOURCES.
 -NO BATTERIES TO BE INSTALLED

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

APPLICANT/LESSEE

T-MOBILE WEST CORPORATION
a DELAWARE CORPORATION
1855 GATEWAY BOULEVARD, 9TH FLOOR
CONCORD, CA 94520
LEASING MANAGER JIM JAGGERS
PERMIT ME, INC.
3850 23RD STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114
(916) 213-8407
ZONING MANAGER JOE CAMICIA
PERMIT ME, INC.
3850 23RD STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114
(408) 688-1067

CONSTRUCTION MANAGER

AL MASTROIANNI
1855 GATEWAY BOULEVARD, 9TH FLOOR
CONCORD, CA 94520
(925) 324-9829

PROPERTY INFORMATION

LANDLORD: A CALIFORNIA LLC
ADDRESS: 665 CHESTNUT ST. 3RD FL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94133
 CONTACT: PETER ISKANDER
PHONE: (415) 297-5185
 AREA OF CONSTRUCTION: 25.5± SQ. FT.
 OCCUPANCY TYPE: B/R-2
 CONSTRUCTION TYPE: TYPE V-A
 CURRENT ZONING: NORTH BEACH NCD
 LAT: 37.80231 ° N {NAD 83}
 LONG: 122.40954 ° W
 A.P.N.: 0089-001
 HANDICAP T-MOBILE FACILITY IS UNMANNED AND NOT REQUIREMENTS: FOR HUMAN HABITATION. DISABLED ACCESS NOT REQUIRED IN ACCORDANCE WITH CALIFORNIA STATE ADMINISTRATIVE CODE, TITLE 24, SECTION 1105B.3.4, EXCEPTION 1.

PROJECT SUMMARY

ALL WORK AND MATERIALS SHALL BE PERFORMED AND INSTALLED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CURRENT EDITIONS OF THE FOLLOWING CODES AS ADOPTED BY THE LOCAL GOVERNING AUTHORITIES. NOTHING IN THESE PLANS IS TO BE CONSTRUED TO PERMIT WORK NOT CONFORMING TO THE LATEST EDITIONS OF THE FOLLOWING CODES.

1. 2007 CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE
2. INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE
3. INTERNATIONAL CODE COUNCIL (ICC)
4. 2007 CALIFORNIA MECHANICAL CODE
5. ANSI/EIA-222-F
6. 2006 NFPA 101, LIFE SAFETY CODE
7. 2007 CALIFORNIA PLUMBING CODE
8. 2007 CALIFORNIA ELECTRICAL CODE
9. 2007 CALIFORNIA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE
10. CITY/COUNTY ORDINANCES
11. 2002 NFPA 72, NATIONAL FIRE ALARM CODE
12. NFPA 13, SPRINKLER CODE
13. 2007 CALIFORNIA ENERGY CODE, TITLE 24

CODE COMPLIANCE

ARCHITECT

MICHAEL WILK ARCHITECTURE
833 MARKET STREET, SUITE 805
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103
CONTACT: BRYNN MCMILLAN
CONTACT NUMBER: (415) 350-6346
FAX NUMBER: (415) 904-8388
EMAIL: bmcmillan@wilkarch.com

ELECTRICAL ENGINEER

RANDALL LAMB ASSOCIATES
208 UTAH STREET, 4TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108
CONTACT: RUDY ZEPEDA
CONTACT NUMBER: (415) 512-9771 x113
FAX NUMBER: (415) 512-8940

PROJECT TEAM

SHEET	DESCRIPTION	REV.
T1	TITLE SHEET	5
T2	GENERAL NOTES	5
T3	EMF REPORT / ANTENNA SPECIFICATIONS	5
T4	ACCESSORY USE LETTERS / FIRE DEPARTMENT CHECKLIST	5
A1	OVERALL SITE / ROOF PLAN	5
A2	ENLARGED EQUIPMENT AREA PLAN, ANTENNA LAYOUT	5
A3	ELEVATIONS	5
A4	DETAILS	5
A5	DETAILS	5
S1	STRUCTURAL NOTES, PART. ROOF PLAN, ANTENNA MOUNT SECTION	5
S2	SECTIONS	5
E1	SINGLE LINE DIAGRAM	5
E2	ELECTRICAL PLANS	5
E3	GROUNDING PLANS	5

SHEET INDEX

TITLE	SIGNATURE	DATE
LEASING		
ZONING		
CONSTRUCTION		
T-MOBILE PM		
RF ENGINEER		

SIGNATURE BLOCK

DO NOT SCALE DRAWINGS
 THESE DRAWINGS ARE FORMATTED TO BE FULL-SIZE AT 24"x36". CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL PLANS AND EXISTING DIMENSIONS AND CONDITIONS ON THE JOB SITE AND SHALL IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY THE ARCHITECT/ENGINEER IN WRITING OF ANY DISCREPANCIES BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH THE WORK OR MATERIAL ORDERS OR BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE SAME.

GENERAL CONTRACTOR NOTES

SUBMITTAL DOCUMENTS FOR DEFERRED SUBMITTAL ITEMS SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO THE ARCHITECT OR ENGINEER OF RECORD, WHO SHALL REVIEW THEM AND FORWARD THEM TO THE BUILDING OFFICIAL WITH A NOTATION INDICATING THAT THE DEFERRED SUBMITTAL DOCUMENTS HAVE BEEN REVIEWED AND THAT THEY HAVE BEEN FOUND TO BE IN GENERAL CONFORMANCE WITH THE DESIGN OF THE BUILDING. THE DEFERRED AND SUBMITTAL ITEMS SHALL NOT BE INSTALLED UNTIL THEIR DESIGN AND SUBMITTAL DOCUMENTS HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY THE BUILDING OFFICIAL.

- SOILS COMPLIANCE PRIOR TO FOUNDATION INSPECTION
- CONCRETE OVER 2500 PSI AT 28 DAYS
- CONCRETE PLACEMENT AT SLAB ON GRADE
- WRITTEN CERTIFICATION FOR PROPER PLACEMENT OF REINFORCEMENTS AT SLAB ON GRADE
- FOUNDATION EXCAVATION AND FILL INCLUDING UTILITY TRENCHES
- CERTIFICATION OF BUILDING PAD, FOUNDATION AND FILL BY THE GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEER OF THE RECORD
- VERIFICATIONS OF MILL REPORT
- IDENTIFICATION OF STEEL AND AT JOB SITE
- ADHESIVE BOLTS IN CONCRETE OR MASONRY
- ANCHOR BOLTS INSTALLATION AND PLACEMENT IN CONCRETE
- HIGH STRENGTH BOLTING
- EXPANSION ANCHOR INSTALLATION
- SPRAYED -ON- FIREPROOFING
- STRUCTURAL MASONRY
- PRESTRESSED CONCRETE
- ALL FIELD WELDING
- REINFORCING PLACEMENT
- DESIGNER SPECIFIED (SEE SHEET#___)
- OTHER_____

SPECIAL INSPECTION REQUIREMENTS

6

ANTENNA	AZIMUTH	ANTENNA MAKE/MODEL	COAXIAL CABLE LENGTH	CABLE SIZE	ELECTRICAL DOWNTILT	MECHANICAL DOWNTILT	ANTENNA RAD CENTER
PANEL	65°	APXV18-206513-C	60'-0"±	7/8"Ø	-	-	39'-10 1/4"± A.G.L.

NOTE: THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOVE MUST BE VERIFIED BY THE CONTRACTOR PRIOR TO ORDERING ANY EQUIPMENT.

ANTENNA CONFIGURATION CHART

7

NO BATTERIES TO BE INSTALLED

BATTERY DATA CHART

8

	GROUT OR PLASTER		SPOT ELEVATION
	CONCRETE		REVISION
	EARTH		GRID REFERENCE
	PLYWOOD		DETAIL REFERENCE
	GRAVEL		ELEVATION REFERENCE
	WOOD CONTINUOUS		SECTION REFERENCE
	WOOD BLOCKING		
	STEEL		

SYMBOLS

9

1. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL CONTACT UTILITY LOCATING SERVICES PRIOR TO THE START OF CONSTRUCTION.
2. ALL EXISTING ACTIVE SEWER, WATER, GAS, ELECTRIC, AND OTHER UTILITIES WHERE ENCOUNTERED IN THE WORK, SHALL BE PROTECTED AT ALL TIMES, AND WHERE REQUIRED FOR THE PROPER EXECUTION OF THE WORK, SHALL BE RELOCATED AS DIRECTED BY CONTRACTOR. EXTREME CAUTION SHOULD BE USED BY THE CONTRACTOR WHEN EXCAVATING OR DRILLING PIERS AROUND OR NEAR UTILITIES. CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE SAFETY TRAINING FOR THE WORKING CREW. THIS WILL INCLUDE BUT NOT BE LIMITED TO A) FALL PROTECTION B) CONFINED SPACE C) ELECTRICAL SAFETY D) TRENCHING & EXCAVATION.
3. ALL SITE WORK SHALL BE AS INDICATED ON THE DRAWINGS AND PROJECT SPECIFICATIONS.
4. IF NECESSARY, RUBBISH, STUMPS, DEBRIS, STICKS, STONES AND OTHER REFUSE SHALL BE REMOVED FROM THE SITE AND DISPOSED OF LEGALLY.
5. ALL EXISTING INACTIVE SEWER, WATER, GAS, ELECTRIC AND OTHER UTILITIES, WHICH INTERFERE WITH THE EXECUTION OF THE WORK, SHALL BE REMOVED AND/OR CAPPED, PLUGGED OR OTHERWISE DISCONTINUED AT POINTS WHICH WILL NOT INTERFERE WITH THE EXECUTION OF THE WORK, SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF CONTRACTOR, OWNER AND/OR LOCAL UTILITIES.
6. CONTRACTOR SHALL MINIMIZE DISTURBANCE TO EXISTING SITE DURING CONSTRUCTION.
7. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE SITE SIGNAGE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION FOR SITE SIGNAGE.
8. THE SITE SHALL BE GRADED TO CAUSE SURFACE WATER TO FLOW AWAY FROM THE BTS EQUIPMENT AND TOWER AREAS.
9. NO FILL OR EMBANKMENT MATERIAL SHALL BE PLACED ON FROZEN GROUND. FROZEN MATERIALS, SNOW OR ICE SHALL NOT BE PLACED IN ANY FILL OR EMBANKMENT.
10. THE SUB GRADE SHALL BE COMPACTED AND BROUGHT TO A SMOOTH UNIFORM GRADE PRIOR TO FINISHED SURFACE APPLICATION.
11. THE AREAS OF THE OWNERS PROPERTY DISTURBED BY THE WORK AND NOT COVERED BY THE TOWER, EQUIPMENT OR DRIVEWAY, SHALL BE GRADED TO A UNIFORM SLOPE, AND STABILIZED TO PREVENT EROSION AS SPECIFIED IN THE PROJECT SPECIFICATIONS.
12. CONTRACTOR SHALL MINIMIZE DISTURBANCE TO EXISTING SITE DURING CONSTRUCTION. EROSION CONTROL MEASURES, IF REQUIRED DURING CONSTRUCTION, SHALL BE IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE LOCAL GUIDELINES FOR EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL.

SITE WORK GENERAL NOTES

3

1. ALL CONCRETE WORK SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ACI 301, ACI 318, ACI 336, ASTM A184, ASTM A185 AND THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION SPECIFICATION FOR CAST-IN-PLACE CONCRETE.
2. ALL CONCRETE SHALL HAVE A MINIMUM COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH OF 2500 PSI AT 28 DAYS, UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
3. REINFORCING STEEL SHALL CONFORM TO ASTM A 615, GRADE 60, DEFORMED UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE. WELDED WIRE FABRIC SHALL CONFORM TO ASTM A 185 WELDED STEEL WIRE FABRIC UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE. SPLICES SHALL BE CLASS "B" AND ALL HOOKS SHALL BE STANDARD, UNO.
4. THE FOLLOWING MINIMUM CONCRETE COVER SHALL BE PROVIDED FOR REINFORCING STEEL UNLESS SHOWN OTHERWISE ON DRAWINGS:
 - CONCRETE CAST AGAINST EARTH.....3 IN.
 - CONCRETE EXPOSED TO EARTH OR WEATHER:
 - #6 AND LARGER2 IN.
 - #5 AND SMALLER & WWF.....1 1/2 IN.
 - CONCRETE NOT EXPOSED TO EARTH OR WEATHER OR NOT CAST AGAINST THE GROUND:
 - SLAB AND WALL3/4 IN.
 - BEAMS AND COLUMNS.....1 1/2 IN.
5. A CHAMFER 3/4" SHALL BE PROVIDED AT ALL EXPOSED EDGES OF CONCRETE, UNO, IN ACCORDANCE WITH ACI 301 SECTION 4.2.4.
6. INSTALLATION OF CONCRETE EXPANSION/WEDGE ANCHOR, SHALL BE PER MANUFACTURER'S WRITTEN RECOMMENDED PROCEDURE. THE ANCHOR BOLT, DOWEL OR ROD SHALL CONFORM TO MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDATION FOR EMBEDMENT DEPTH OR AS SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS. NO REBAR SHALL BE CUT WITHOUT PRIOR ENGINEERING APPROVAL WHEN DRILLING HOLES IN CONCRETE. EXPANSION BOLTS SHALL BE PROVIDED BY HILTI INC. AND SHALL BE STAINLESS STEEL HILTI KWIK BOLT TZ OR APPROVED EQUAL, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED IN PLANS.

CONCRETE AND REINFORCING STEEL NOTES

4

1. ALL STEEL WORK SHALL BE PAINTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROJECT SPECIFICATIONS AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH ASTM A36 UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
2. ALL WELDING SHALL BE PERFORMED USING E70XX ELECTRODES AND WELDING SHALL CONFORM TO AISC. WHERE FILLET WELD SIZES ARE NOT SHOWN, PROVIDE THE MINIMUM SIZE PER TABLE J2.4 IN THE AISC "MANUAL OF STEEL CONSTRUCTION". PAINTED SURFACES SHALL BE TOUCHED UP.
3. BOLTED CONNECTIONS SHALL BE ASTM A325 BEARING TYPE (3/4"Ø) CONNECTIONS AND SHALL HAVE MINIMUM OF TWO BOLTS UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
4. NON-STRUCTURAL CONNECTIONS FOR STEEL GRATING MAY USE 5/8" DIA. ASTM A 307 BOLTS UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
5. INSTALLATION OF CONCRETE EXPANSION/WEDGE ANCHOR, SHALL BE PER MANUFACTURER'S WRITTEN RECOMMENDED PROCEDURE. THE ANCHOR BOLT, DOWEL OR ROD SHALL CONFORM TO MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDATION FOR EMBEDMENT DEPTH OR AS SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS. NO REBAR SHALL BE CUT WITHOUT PRIOR CONTRACTOR APPROVAL WHEN DRILLING HOLES IN CONCRETE. SPECIAL INSPECTIONS, REQUIRED BY GOVERNING CODES, SHALL BE PERFORMED IN ORDER TO MAINTAIN MANUFACTURER'S MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE LOADS.

STRUCTURAL STEEL NOTES

5

1. FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSTRUCTION DRAWING, THE FOLLOWING DEFINITIONS SHALL APPLY:
 - CONTRACTOR - GENERAL CONTRACTOR
 - SUBCONTRACTOR - SUBCONTRACTOR
 - OWNER - CARRIER
 - OEM - ORIGINAL EQUIPMENT MANUFACTURER
2. PRIOR TO THE SUBMISSION OF BIDS, THE BIDDING CONTRACTOR SHALL VISIT THE CELL SITE TO FAMILIARIZE WITH THE EXISTING CONDITIONS AND TO CONFIRM THAT THE WORK CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED AS SHOWN ON THE CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS. ANY DISCREPANCY FOUND SHALL BE BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF ARCHITECT/ENGINEER.
3. ALL MATERIALS FURNISHED AND INSTALLED SHALL BE IN STRICT ACCORDANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE CODES, REGULATIONS, AND ORDINANCES. CONTRACTOR SHALL ISSUE ALL APPROPRIATE NOTICES AND COMPLY WITH ALL LAWS, ORDINANCES, RULES, REGULATIONS, AND LAWFUL ORDERS OF ANY PUBLIC AUTHORITY REGARDING THE PERFORMANCE OF THE WORK.
4. ALL WORK CARRIED OUT SHALL COMPLY WITH ALL APPLICABLE MUNICIPAL AND UTILITY COMPANY SPECIFICATIONS AND LOCAL JURISDICTIONAL CODES, ORDINANCES AND APPLICABLE CODE AND REGULATIONS.
5. DRAWINGS PROVIDED HERE ARE NOT TO BE SCALED AND ARE INTENDED TO SHOW OUTLINE ONLY.
6. UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE, THE WORK SHALL INCLUDE FURNISHING MATERIALS, EQUIPMENT, APPURTENANCES, AND LABOR NECESSARY TO COMPLETE ALL INSTALLATIONS AS INDICATED ON THE DRAWINGS.
7. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL INSTALL ALL EQUIPMENT AND MATERIALS IN ACCORDANCE WITH MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDATIONS UNLESS SPECIFICALLY STATED OTHERWISE.
8. IF THE SPECIFIED EQUIPMENT CANNOT BE INSTALLED AS SHOWN ON THESE DRAWINGS, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROPOSE AN ALTERNATIVE INSTALLATION FOR APPROVAL BY THE ARCHITECT/ENGINEER.
9. CONTRACTOR SHALL DETERMINE ACTUAL ROUTING OF CONDUIT, POWER AND T1 CABLES, GROUNDING CABLES AS SHOWN ON THE POWER, GROUNDING AND TELCO PLAN DRAWING. CONTRACTOR SHALL UTILIZE EXISTING TRAYS AND/OR SHALL ADD NEW TRAYS AS NECESSARY. CONTRACTOR SHALL CONFIRM THE ACTUAL ROUTING WITH THE CONSTRUCTION MANAGER.
10. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROTECT EXISTING IMPROVEMENTS, PAVEMENTS, CURBS, LANDSCAPING AND STRUCTURES. ANY DAMAGED PART SHALL BE REPAIRED AT CONTRACTOR'S EXPENSE TO THE SATISFACTION OF OWNER.
11. CONTRACTOR SHALL LEGALLY AND PROPERLY DISPOSE OF ALL SCRAP MATERIALS SUCH AS COAXIAL CABLES AND OTHER ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE EXISTING FACILITY. ANTENNAS REMOVED SHALL BE RETURNED TO THE OWNER'S DESIGNATED LOCATION.
12. CONTRACTOR SHALL LEAVE PREMISES IN CLEAN CONDITION.
13. ALL CONCRETE REPAIR WORK SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH AMERICAN CONCRETE INSTITUTE (ACI) 301.
14. ANY NEW CONCRETE NEEDED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION SHALL HAVE 2500 PSI STRENGTH AT 28 DAYS. ALL CONCRETING WORK SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ACI 318 CODE REQUIREMENTS.
15. ALL STRUCTURAL STEEL WORK SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH AISC SPECIFICATIONS.
16. CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL EXISTING DIMENSIONS AND CONDITIONS PRIOR TO COMMENCING ANY WORK. ALL DIMENSIONS OF EXISTING CONSTRUCTION SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS MUST BE VERIFIED. CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY ARCHITECT OF ANY DISCREPANCIES PRIOR TO ORDERING MATERIAL OR PROCEEDING WITH CONSTRUCTION.
17. THE EXISTING CELL SITE IS IN FULL COMMERCIAL OPERATION. ANY CONSTRUCTION WORK BY CONTRACTOR SHALL NOT DISRUPT THE EXISTING NORMAL OPERATION. ANY WORK ON EXISTING EQUIPMENT MUST BE COORDINATED WITH CONTRACTOR. ALSO, WORK SHOULD BE SCHEDULED FOR AN APPROPRIATE MAINTENANCE WINDOW USUALLY IN LOW TRAFFIC PERIODS AFTER MIDNIGHT.
18. SINCE THE CELL SITE IS ACTIVE, ALL SAFETY PRECAUTIONS MUST BE TAKEN WHEN WORKING AROUND HIGH LEVELS OF ELECTROMAGNETIC RADIATION. EQUIPMENT SHOULD BE SHUTDOWN PRIOR TO PERFORMING ANY WORK THAT COULD EXPOSE THE WORKERS TO DANGER. PERSONAL RF EXPOSURE MONITORS ARE ADVISED TO BE WORN TO ALERT OF ANY DANGEROUS EXPOSURE LEVELS.
19. PROVIDE A PORTABLE FIRE EXTINGUISHER WITH A RATING OF NOT LESS THAN 2-A OR 2-A/10-BC WITHIN 75 FEET TRAVEL DISTANCE TO ALL PORTIONS OF THE WORK AREA DURING CONSTRUCTION.

GENERAL NOTES

1

ALL WORK AND MATERIALS SHALL BE PERFORMED AND INSTALLED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CURRENT EDITIONS OF THE FOLLOWING CODES AS ADOPTED BY THE LOCAL GOVERNING AUTHORITIES. NOTHING IN THESE PLANS IS TO BE CONSTRUCTED TO PERMIT WORK NOT CONFORMING TO THESE CODES.

- 2007 BUILDING STANDARDS ADMINISTRATIVE CODE, PART 1, TITLE 24 C.C.R.
- 2007 CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE(CBC), PART 2, TITLE 24, C.C.R. (2006 INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE AND 2007 CALIFORNIA AMENDMENTS)
- 2007 CALIFORNIA ELECTRICAL CODE (CEC), PART 3, TITLE 24 C.C.R. (2005 NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE AND 2007 CALIFORNIA AMENDMENTS)
- 2007 CALIFORNIA MECHANICAL CODE (CMC), PART 4, TITLE 24 C.C.R. (2006 UNIFORM MECHANICAL CODE AND 2007 CALIFORNIA AMENDMENTS)
- 2007 CALIFORNIA PLUMBING CODE (CPC), PART 5, TITLE 24 C.C.R. (2006 UNIFORM PLUMBING CODE AND 2007 CALIFORNIA AMENDMENTS)
- 2007 CALIFORNIA FIRE CODE, PART 9, TITLE 24 C.C.R. (2006 INTERNATIONAL FIRE CODE AND 2007 CALIFORNIA AMENDMENTS)
- 2007 CALIFORNIA REFERENCED STANDARDS, PART 12, TITLE 24 C.C.R.
- TITLE 19 C.C.R., PUBLIC SAFETY, STATE FIRE MARSHALL REGULATIONS

APPLICABLE CODES

2

MICHAEL WILK ARCHITECTURE



833 Market Street, #805
San Francisco, CA 94103
T: 415-839-9594
F: 415-904-8388
www.wilkarch.com

T-Mobile

T-MOBILE WEST CORPORATION,
a DELAWARE CORPORATION
1855 GATEWAY BLVD., 9TH FLOOR
CONCORD, CA 94520

SF23211B
FRANCISCO
LAUNDERETTE
1763-1767 STOCKTON ST.
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94133



DRAWN BY: SH CHECKED BY: MW

NO	DATE	ISSUE
1	05/05/08	90% CONST.
2	05/20/08	100% CONST.
3	07/01/09	100% CONST. REV.
4	07/30/09	100% CONST. REV.
5	04/19/10	100% CONST. REV.

SHEET TITLE

GENERAL NOTES

SHEET NUMBER

T-2

shall be printed on the sign) for immediate shut-down of the site 24hr/7days a week.
* The sign shall also state whether or not the back-up battery power to the antennas is also shut-down.
* The signage shall be permanently mounted next to the main electrical shut-off, in the FCC room within close proximity to the Fire Alarm Panel, at the battery cabinet and at the equipment room.

- NO -> 11. Is a new HVAC system being installed? NO
Yes
* What is the volume of refrigerant used by the cooling unit(s)?
* What is the type of refrigerant per 2007 CMC?
* Assure compliance with 2007 CFC Section 606. N/A

- N/A -> 12. Plans state sequence of operations for any new detection, dampers, or fans.
13. Plans shall clearly show locations of batteries and battery cabinets.
14. Plans shall state whether the building is fully sprinklered or not.
15. In fully sprinklered buildings, equipment rooms shall be provided with sprinklers in accordance with NFPA 13.
16. Provide a table on a drawing sheet showing the manufacturer, model, type, amount (gallons or pounds) of electrolyte, flooded lead acid, Ni-Cd, VRLA or Li-ion. Please show detailed compliance with 2007 CFC Section 608 on the drawing sheets. When compliance with Section 608 of the 2007 California Fire Code is required, the following additional information shall be provided:
* Rooftop battery rooms exceeding the above requirements shall be separated from the building and any openings as specified by the 2007 CBC and CMC. - SEE SHEET T-4
* Plans state that a separate fire department permit will be obtained from SFFD Headquarters at 698 2nd St.

VOLUME OF ELECTROLYTE < 50 GALLONS
Prepared by: MICHAEL WILK, ARCHITECT
(Please include professional title and stamp)
Firm Name: MICHAEL WILK ARCHITECTURE
Address: 833 MARKET STREET, SUITE 803, SF CA 94103
Phone Number: (415) 839-9594
Fax Number: (415) 904-8388



2.06 Permit Application Checklist for Cellular Antennas Sites and all Equipment Serving the Cellular Antenna Site

This checklist shall be printed on a drawing sheet and submitted as part of the plans submitted with any building permit application creating or modifying cellular antenna sites regardless of RF emission quantities. This checklist is designed to assist designers, installers, plan reviewers, and field inspectors. This checklist shall be prepared by the design professional and shall be stamped and wet-signed.

This document is not all-inclusive of all requirements for cellular antenna sites and it is the responsibility of the designer to research the applicable codes. Documents referenced for this bulletin are as follows:

- FCC OET Bulletin 56 - Questions and Answers about Biological Effects and Potential Hazards of Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields (August 1999)
FCC OET Bulletin 65 - Evaluating Compliance with FCC Guidelines for Human Exposure to Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields (Ed. 97-01: August 1997)
FCC - A Local Government Official's Guide to Transmitting Antenna RF Emission Safety: Rules, Procedures, and Practical Guidance (June 2, 2000)
2007 California Building Code (2001 CBC)
2007 California Fire Code (2001 CFC)
2007 California Mechanical Code (2001 CMC)
2007 San Francisco Fire Code (2001 SFFC)
2002 NFPA 13 Automatic Sprinkler Systems
2002 NFPA 72 National Fire Alarm Code

- 1. Description of scope of work (both on the application and plans) shall match the actual work being done.
2. Plans shall include plan views and elevations showing all equipment locations and cable runs.
3. Submit on a drawing sheet the San Francisco Health Department Cellular Antenna Site (WTS) Checklist/Proposal/Engineer's RF Report. The FCC requires carriers to inform and prevent occupational exposure (i.e. building maintenance workers, fire fighters, etc.) The RF report shall not specify locking the roof access door to keep the general public off of the roof per 2001 SFFC 1207.7.1. The RF report shall be wet stamped and signed by an engineer.
4. Drawings shall reflect the striped/exclusion areas per the above RF Report with a minimum radius being 1 foot.
5. Notice to Workers warning signage as applicable per the above RF Report: - SEE RF WARNING SIGNAGE DETAIL

- 6. Provide a quantitative three-dimensional perimeter of the RF levels if the antennas appear to encroach on any means of exiting.
7. Camouflaged antennas shall have 4inch x 4inch signage permanently mounted to the exterior of the RF screen as provided below. These antennas shall also have the striped exclusion area to the fullest extent of the antenna location with a minimum radius of 1 foot. The signage shall be clearly labeled and visible from any direction of approach even if access is achieved from the building face (i.e. ladders, cherry picker, etc.); The sign shall be weatherproof with contrasting background color and shall be recognizable from at least fifteen (15) feet from the sign. The sign shall contain the yellow triangle around the antenna symbol (see ANSI C95.2-1999); and Location and signage detail shall be included on a drawing sheet.
8. Plans shall show whether a new electrical service is installed for the cell site. In general, buildings should only have one electrical service. However, with the prior approval of the San Francisco Fire Department and the Electrical Inspection Division, buildings may have one additional service to serve rooftop antenna equipment, provided a permanent placard is provided at the location of each service disconnect stating the location of the other and identifying the equipment served by each service.
9. Provide route of all cables from their origin to the equipment (plan, elevation and section views). Cables/wiring shall not be allowed in exit enclosures or in front of dry standpipes (2007 CBC 1020.1.1)
10. EITHER:
Provide a manual battery disconnect.
* Instructional signage shall be provided on the Procedure To Disconnect or Do-Energize Radio Frequency (RF) Signal for the above manual disconnect for the batteries.
* Signage shall be permanently mounted next to the battery's electrical panel and clearly labeled in a phenolic label with a white background and black lettering. The title block shall be a red background and 1" high white lettering. - SEE SITE SIGNAGE DETAIL
* The actual breaker(s) shall be a phenolic label (red background and white lettering) with lettering not less than 1/8" high.
* The signage shall also be like posted in the FCC Room within proximity of the Fire Alarm Panel and building's main electrical room; within proximity of the main shutoff.
* A copy of the signage shall be included on a drawing sheet.
* Provide SFFD approved key lock box for equipment/electrical room for battery/equipment shutdown.
* The permanently mounted label above the lock box shall read "SFFD BATTERY DISCONNECT ACCESS KEY" and shall be a phenolic label with a red background and white lettering.
* Location and label of the key lock box shall be included on a drawing sheet.
OR:
Provide 24 hour/7 days a week telephone service center shut-down:
* Provide instructional signage for emergency shutdown of the cell site including telephone number and cell site identification number.
* The sign shall state that there is no manual shut down for the cell site and to call the contact number (the number shall be printed on the sign) with the site identification number (the number



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1660 Mission Street, Suite 500 San Francisco, California 94103 www.sfgov.org/planning

May 15, 2006

Brian Pudlik,
Parsons
Representing Omnipoint T-Mobile
185 Berry Street, Suite 4300
San Francisco, CA 94107

Re: T-Mobile
Accessory Use Determination for Microcell Facilities

Mr. Pudlik,

This determination is in response to your request for certain types of wireless telecommunication facilities qualification as accessory uses under the Planning Code.

After reviewing previous determinations, the Planning Code (Sections 204 and 703.2(b)(1)(C) for Accessory Uses, General and Accessory Uses in Neighborhood Commercial Districts, respectively) and the information submitted with your letter, I have determined that the proposed antenna installations would fall within the scope of accessory uses as authorized in previous letters of determinations for other wireless service providers.

This authorization shall be limited to the following:

- 1. The installation of up to one panel antennae, with overall dimensions of no more than 30 inches high, 6.8 inches wide and 3.5 inches deep (mounted on the roof within a false vent, limited to extend up to five feet above the existing roof-line and set back at least five feet from the any edge of the building, these maximum dimensions are to be reduced whenever possible) or up to two omni antennas no more than 24 inches in length and 1.5 inches in diameter (façade mounted and painted to match);
2. The installation of two Erickson equipment cabinets with exterior dimensions of 17" x 30" x 11" and screened from view or within an existing structure;
3. Individual emission calculations for each site shall be provided to the Department of Public Health for their review;
4. The installation of the panel antennas, coax cables and their related equipment cabinets are not to exceed the existing height of the structure to which they are to be attached, painted to match the color of the existing building, concealed, screened and/or otherwise designed to blend with existing architectural features, limiting them from public view; and

May 15, 2006

Letter of Determination
T-Mobile Accessory Use Determination

Page 2 of 2

- 5. Any proposed installation must comply with the design review of the Planning Department.

In order to facilitate the review of these "microcell" antennas by the Planning Department and other City agencies, each application shall be accompanied by the Wireless Telecommunications Services (W.T.S.) Facilities Siting Guidelines Application Checklist for Accessory Use Applications.

If for any reason the Zoning Administrator finds that this determination is no longer applicable or an individual site merits review and authorization from the Planning Commission, the Zoning Administrator may initiate the conditional use application process.

If anyone believes this determination represents an error in the interpretation of the Planning Code or an abuse of discretion by the Zoning Administrator, this determination may be appealed to the Board of Appeals within fifteen (15) days from the date of this letter. For information on the appeals process, please contact the Board of Appeals, located at 1660 Mission Street, or call (415) 575-6880.

Sincerely,

[Signature of Lawrence B. Badiner]

Lawrence B. Badiner
Zoning Administrator

MICHAEL WILK ARCHITECTURE



833 Market Street, #805
San Francisco, CA 94103
T: 415-839-9594
F: 415-904-8388
www.wilkarch.com

T-Mobile

T-MOBILE WEST CORPORATION,
DELAWARE CORPORATION
1855 GATEWAY BLVD., 9TH FLOOR
CONCORD, CA 94520

SF23211B
FRANCISCO
LAUNDERETTE
1763-1767 STOCKTON ST.
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94133



DRAWN BY: SH CHECKED BY: MW


Table with columns: NO, DATE, ISSUE. Rows show construction progress: 1 05/05/08 90% CONST., 2 05/20/08 100% CONST., 3 07/01/09 100% CONST. REV., 4 07/30/09 100% CONST. REV., 5 04/19/10 100% CONST. REV.

SHEET TITLE
ACCESSORY USE LETTERS /
FIRE DEPARTMENT
CHECKLIST

SHEET NUMBER
T-4




GREENWICH STREET



PROPOSED T-MOBILE TELCO CONDUIT ROUTE IN TRENCH, STUB-UP AT BUILDING & PENETRATE WALL TO FOLLOW PROPOSED POWER CONDUIT ROUTE

(E) DISTRIBUTION PANEL "1763" AT BASEMENT LEVEL/ PROPOSED T-MOBILE POWER P.O.C./ EMERGENCY SHUT-DOWN SIGNAGE LOCATION



65° AZIMUTH

(E) AT&T SB16937 TELCO VAULT/ PROPOSED T-MOBILE TELCO P.O.C.

(E) CONCRETE WALK

25'

4
A-5
PROPOSED T-MOBILE COAX ROUTE VIA CABLE TRAY ON SLEEPERS

2
A-5
PROPOSED T-MOBILE POWER/TELCO CONDUITS AT BASEMENT LEVEL. MOUNT TO (E) CEILING. FOLLOW (E) ROUTE

1
A-2
PROPOSED T-MOBILE PROJECT LOCATION AT BUILDING ROOF

(E) BUILDING

PROPERTY LINE/
(E) BUILDING LINE BELOW

(E) CINGULAR CABLE TRAY

(E) CINGULAR EQUIPMENT CABINETS

(E) PENTHOUSE/ ROOF ACCESS/ PROPOSED RF WARNING SIGNAGE/ EMERGENCY SHUT-DOWN SIGNAGE LOCATION

(E) DUCT

(E) LIGHT WELL

1
A-4

2
A-4

(E) ROOF VENT, TYP.

(E) ROOF

PROPERTY LINE/
(E) BUILDING LINE BELOW

(E) SKYLIGHT

PROPERTY LINE

(E) TELCO BACKBOARD AT GROUND LEVEL/ PROPOSED T-MOBILE NIU LOCATION

PROPOSED T-MOBILE POWER/TELCO CONDUITS ROUTE UP VIA (E) LIGHTWELL. FOLLOW (E) ROUTE

2
A-5

(E) BUILDING

(E) CONCRETE WALK



STOCKTON STREET

MICHAEL WILK ARCHITECTURE



833 Market Street, #805
San Francisco, CA 94103
T: 415-839-9594
F: 415-904-8388
www.wilkarch.com

T-Mobile

T-MOBILE WEST CORPORATION,
a DELAWARE CORPORATION
1855 GATEWAY BLVD., 9TH FLOOR
CONCORD, CA 94520

SF23211B
FRANCISCO
LAUNDERETTE
1763-1767 STOCKTON ST.
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94133



DRAWN BY: SH CHECKED BY: MW



NO	DATE	ISSUE
1	05/05/08	90% CONST.
2	05/20/08	100% CONST.
3	07/01/09	100% CONST. REV.
4	07/30/09	100% CONST. REV.
5	04/19/10	100% CONST. REV.

SHEET TITLE
**OVERALL
SITE / ROOF
PLAN**

SHEET NUMBER
A-1

OVERALL SITE / ROOF PLAN

SCALE:
1/4"=1'-0"



1

T-Mobile

T-MOBILE WEST CORPORATION,
a DELAWARE CORPORATION
1855 GATEWAY BLVD., 9TH FLOOR
CONCORD, CA 94520

SF23211B
FRANCISCO LAUNDERETTE
1763-1767 STOCKTON ST.
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94133



DRAWN BY: SH CHECKED BY: MW


NO	DATE	ISSUE
1	05/05/08	90% CONST.
2	05/20/08	100% CONST.
3	07/01/09	100% CONST. REV.
4	07/30/09	100% CONST. REV.
5	04/19/10	100% CONST. REV.

SHEET TITLE

ELEVATIONS

SHEET NUMBER

A-3





EAST ELEVATION

SCALE: 3/16"=1'-0"  1




NORTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 3/16"=1'-0"  2



- NOTE:
- CONTRACTOR TO X-RAY PRIOR TO DRILLING OR CORING TO LOCATE (E) RE-BAR. DO NOT CUT RE-BAR.
 - ALL PENETRATIONS SHALL CONFORM TO TITLE 24, CALIF. BLDG. CODE, SECTION 714.
 - PENETRATIONS THRU WALLS SHALL COMPLY WITH T24, CBC SECTION 709.6.
 - PENETRATIONS THRU FLOORS/CEILING SHALL COMPLY WITH T24, CBC SECTION 710.3.
- F RATING - PENETRATIONS 4" OR LESS
T RATING - PENETRATIONS LARGER THAN 4", PENETRATIONS CORRIDOR CLGS. WHICH ARE NOT RATED, BELOW ANY CLG.

- CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY WITH THE CARRIER THE CORRECT CONTACT PHONE NUMBER PRIOR TO SIGN FABRICATION AND INSTALLATION.
- SIGN SHALL COMPLY WITH ANSI C95.2 COLOR, SYMBOL, AND CONTENT CONVENTIONS.
- CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY WITH THE CARRIER THE CORRECT CONTACT PHONE NUMBER PRIOR TO SIGN FABRICATION AND INSTALLATION.




ERICSSON RBS 2308 / 2109 DIMENSIONS		
DIMENSION	BASIC RBS 2308	BASIC RBS 2308 MAX. DIMENSIONS
HEIGHT	24.02"	29.21"
WIDTH	17.05"	17.05"
DEPTH	8.66"	10.63"

ERICSSON RBS 2308 / 2109 WEIGHT	
CABINET	90.39 LBS.

ERICSSON RBS 2308 / 2109 MINIMUM CLEARANCES		
DIRECTION	MINIMUM CLEARANCE	
CABINET WALL	0"	
CABINET LEFT SIDE	9.84"	
CABINET RIGHT SIDE	9.84"	
ABOVE CABINET	11.81"	
BELOW CABINET	19.7"	
IN FRONT OF CABINET	19.69"	


ERICSSON RBS 2308 / 2109 TEMPERATURE REQUIREMENTS W/ AC POWER		
RBS 2308 VARIANT	TEMPERATURE RANGE	RELATIVE HUMIDITY
WITHOUT OPTIONAL FAN	-33°C TO +45°C	15-100%
WITH OPTIONAL FAN	-33°C TO +55°C	15-100%

ERICSSON RBS 2308 / 2109 TEMPERATURE REQUIREMENTS W/ DC POWER		
RBS 2308 VARIANT	TEMPERATURE RANGE	RELATIVE HUMIDITY
START-UP	0°C TO +45°C	15-100%
OPERATIONAL WITHOUT OPTIONAL FAN	-15°C TO +45°C	15-100%
OPERATIONAL WITH OPTIONAL FAN	-15°C TO +55°C	15-100%



RF WARNING SIGNAGE

SCALE: N.T.S. 1



- NOTES:
- THIS SIGNAGE SHALL BE PERMANENTLY MOUNTED NEXT TO THE MAIN ELECTRICAL SHUT-OFF, IN THE FCC ROOM WITHIN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO THE FIRE ALARM PANEL, AT THE CABINET AND AT THE EQUIPMENT ROOM.
 - CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY WITH THE CARRIER THE CORRECT CONTACT PHONE NUMBER PRIOR TO SIGN FABRICATION AND INSTALLATION.



DRAWN BY: SH CHECKED BY: MW


NO	DATE	ISSUE
1	05/05/08	90% CONST.
2	05/20/08	100% CONST.
3	07/01/09	100% CONST. REV.
4	07/30/09	100% CONST. REV.
5	04/19/10	100% CONST. REV.

SHEET TITLE

DETAILS



SHEET NUMBER

A-4



NOTE:

ALL ROOF PENETRATION FLASHINGS/ CLOSURES BY EXISTING BUILDING ROOFING COMPANY. COORDINATE WITH BUILDING OWNER.



ERICSSON LMU DIMENSIONS	
DIMENSION	MAIN BOX
HEIGHT	12.637"
WIDTH	10.236"
DEPTH	3.81"
ERICSSON LMU WEIGHT	
MAIN BOX	11.023 LBS.

FLASHING AT SLEEPER

SCALE:
N.T.S.

5

CONDUIT ON SLEEPERS




SCALE:
N.T.S.

3

LMU MAIN BOX, AC/DC ADAPTER

SCALE:
N.T.S.

1



NOTE FOR EXTERIOR APPLICATION: PRE-DRILL HOLES INTO (E) WALL AND SEAL BETWEEN BOLT AND EXTERIOR FACE OF BUILDING W/ A ONE COMPONENT POLYURETHANE BASE ELASTOMERIC SEALANT.

CONDUIT STUB-UP AT BUILDING

SCALE:
N.T.S.

6

CABLE TRAY ON SLEEPERS

SCALE:
N.T.S.

4

CONDUIT WALL / CEILING MOUNT

SCALE:
N.T.S.

2

MICHAEL WILK ARCHITECTURE



833 Market Street, #805
San Francisco, CA 94103
T: 415-839-9594
F: 415-904-8388
www.wilkarch.com

T-Mobile

T-MOBILE WEST CORPORATION,
a DELAWARE CORPORATION
1855 GATEWAY BLVD., 9TH FLOOR
CONCORD, CA 94520

SF23211B
FRANCISCO
LAUNDERETTE
1763-1767 STOCKTON ST.
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94133



DRAWN BY: SH CHECKED BY: MW


NO	DATE	ISSUE
1	05/05/08	90% CONST.
2	05/20/08	100% CONST.
3	07/01/09	100% CONST. REV.
4	07/30/09	100% CONST. REV.
5	04/19/10	100% CONST. REV.

SHEET TITLE

DETAILS

SHEET NUMBER


A-5



PARTIAL ROOF PLAN AT ANTENNA

SCALE:	
N.T.S.	

2



SECTION AT ANTENNA MOUNT

SCALE:	
N.T.S.	

3

STRUCTURAL STEEL

1. ALL STRUCTURAL AND MISCELLANEOUS STEEL SHALL CONFORM TO ASTM A-36 AND SHALL BE FABRICATED AND ERECTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH A.I.S.C. SPECIFICATIONS FOR THE DESIGN, FABRICATION AND ERECTION OF STRUCTURAL STEEL FOR BUILDINGS, LATEST EDITION.
2. BOLTS SHALL CONFORM TO ASTM A307, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
3. PIPE STEEL SHALL CONFORM TO ASTM A-53, GRADE B.
4. TUBE STEEL SHALL CONFORM TO ASTM A-500, GRADE B.
5. ALL STEEL PERMANENTLY EXPOSED TO WEATHER, (INCLUDING NUTS, BOLTS WASHERS) SHALL BE HOT-DIP GALVANIZED.

FRAMING LUMBER

1. STRUCTURAL FRAMING LUMBER SHALL BE DOUGLAS FIR-LARCH NO. 1 AND SHALL BE GRADE MARKED PER WWP A SPECIFICATIONS. FRAMING LUMBER MAY HAVE MAXIMUM MOISTURE CONTENT OF 19% AT TIME OF INSTALLATION.
2. WOOD STRUCTURAL PANELING SHALL BE P.T. PLYWOOD (P.W.) AND SHALL BE APA RATED AND SHALL CONFORM TO U.S. PRODUCT STANDARD PS-1, LATEST EDITION AND UBC STANDARD 23-2.
3. HARDWARE SHOWN AS "SIMPSON" OR "SIMP." IS SIMPSON COMPANY WITH MAXIMUM NAILING UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
4. ALL NAILS SHALL BE FULL HEAD, COMMON WIRE NAILS, WITH DIAMETER AND LENGTH AS SPECIFIED ON UBC TABLE 23-III-C-2 U.O.N. NAILS EXPOSED TO WEATHER SHALL BE HOT DIP GALVANIZED.
5. MINIMUM NAILING SHALL CONFORM TO UBC TABLE NO. 23-II-B-1 U.O.N.
6. NO STRUCTURAL MEMBER SHALL BE CUT OR NOTCHED UNLESS SPECIFICALLY SHOWN, NOTED, OR APPROVED.
7. PROVIDE CUT WASHERS UNDER HEADS AND NUTS OF ALL BOLTS AND LAG SCREWS BEARING ON WOOD, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
8. SIZE OF BOLT HOLES IN WOOD SHALL BE THE NOMINAL DIAMETER OF THE BOLT PLUS 1/16" UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
9. PRESSURE TREATED WOOD SHALL COMPLY WITH THE APPLICABLE REQUIREMENTS OF AWPA STANDARDS C2 LUMBER AND C9 PLYWOOD. MARK EACH TREATED ITEM WITH THE QUALITY MARK REQUIREMENTS OF AN INSPECTION AGENCY APPROVED BY ALSA'S BOARD OF REVIEW. PRESSURE TREAT ABOVE GROUND ITEMS WITH WATER-BORNE PRESERVATIVES TO A MINIMUM RETENTION OF 0.25 PCF. AFTER TREATMENT, KILN-DRY LUMBER TO A MAXIMUM MOISTURE CONTENT OF 19 PERCENT, PLYWOOD TO 15 PERCENT. TREAT SITE SAWN CUTS WITH 2 COATS OF BRUSH APPLIED PRESERVATIVE TREATMENT. ALLOW TO CURE PRIOR TO ERECTING.
10. HOT-DIP GALVANIZED FASTENERS MEETING ASTM A153 AND CONNECTORS MEETING ASTM A653 CLASS G185 SHALL BE USED WHERE IN CONTACT WITH PRESSURE TREATED WOOD. STAINLESS STEEL TYPE 304 AND 316 CAN BE USED AS AN ALTERNATE.

NAILING SCHEDULE

2X JOIST, RAFTER, OR LEDGER TO SIDE OR F.O. STUDS	
2X4, 2X6, 2X8	3-16d F.N.
2X10, 2X12	4-16d F.N.
2X14, 2X16	5-16d F.N.
JOIST OR RAFTER TO SUPPORT, EACH SIDE	2-10d T.N. OR
NOTE 1	
CEILING OR FLOOR JOIST LAP OVER PARTITION	3-16d F.N.
CEILING JOIST TO PARALLEL RAFTER	3-16d F.N.
BLOCKING BETWEEN JOISTS OR RAFTERS	
BLOCK TO JOIST, EA. END, EA. SIDE	2-10d T.N.,
3-16d E.N. OR NOTE 1	
BLOCK TO SUPPORT, IF ANY, EA. SIDE	2-10d T.N., OR
NOTE 1	
BLOCKING BETWEEN STUDS, EA. END	2-10d T.N.,
3-16d E.N. OR NOTE 1	
SOLE PLATE TO JOIST OR BLKG THRU SHEATHING	16d @ 16" O.C.
TOP PLATE TO STUD	2-16d E.N.
STUD TO 2 X SILL PLATE	4-8d T.N.,
2-16d E.N. OR NOTE 1	
MULTIPLE STUDS, EACH LAYER, STAGGERED	16d @ 24" O.C.
DOUBLE TOP PLATE LAPS AT CORNERS	3-16d
DOUBLE TOP PLATE AT LAPS (4'-0" MIN. LAP)	16d @ 4" O.C.
STAGGERED	
DOUBLE TOP PLATE NAILING NOT AT LAPS	16d @ 16" O.C.
CONTINUOUS HEADER, 2-2X PIECES FULL LENGTH	16d @ 16" O.C.
EA. EDGE	
BUILT-UP BEAMS	NOT PERMITTED
CONTINUOUS HEADER TO STUD EA. END	4-8d T.N., OR
NOTE 2	
P.W. SHEATHING TO SUPPORT - MIN. NAILING	
AT SUPPORTED PANEL EDGES	10d @ 6" O.C.
AT INTERMEDIATE SUPPORTS	10d @ 12" O.C.
AT UNSUPPORTED T&G EDGES	16GA. X 1"
STAPLES @ 3" O.C.	

- NOTES:
1. SIMP. A34 CLIP OR EQ. W/3-8d NAILS TO EA. MEMBER MAY BE SUBSTITUTED.
 2. CRIPPLE STUDS OR STUDS MUST BE USED UNDER HEADER.
 3. F.N. = FACE NAIL, T.N. = TOE NAIL, E.N. = END NAIL

GENERAL NOTES

1. ALL CONSTRUCTION AND WORKMANSHIP SHALL CONFORM TO THE DRAWINGS AND 2007 CBC SPECIFICATIONS.
2. THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS AND CONDITIONS AT THE JOB SITE, AND SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR COORDINATING THE WORK OF ALL TRADES AND CONDITIONS OF ALL WORK AND MATERIALS INCLUDING THOSE FURNISHED BY SUB-CONTRACTORS. ANY DISCREPANCIES SHALL BE CALLED TO THE ATTENTION OF THE STRUCTURAL ENGINEER IMMEDIATELY AND BE RESOLVED BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH THE WORK.
3. STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS SHALL WORK IN CONJUNCTION WITH ARCHITECTURAL MECHANICAL, AND ELECTRICAL DRAWINGS.
4. DESIGN, MATERIALS, EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS OTHER THAN THOSE DESCRIBED OR INDICATED ON THE DRAWINGS MAY BE CONSIDERED FOR USE PROVIDED PRIOR APPROVAL IS OBTAINED FROM THE ARCHITECT.
5. ALL CONDITIONS SHOWN OR NOTED AS EXISTING ARE BASED ON BEST INFORMATION AVAILABLE AT THE TIME OF PREPARATION OF THESE DRAWINGS. NO WARRANTY IS IMPLIED TO THEIR ACCURACY. CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY ALL CONDITIONS. SHOULD CONDITIONS BECOME APPRENT WHICH DIFFER FROM THE CONDITIONS SHOWN, THEY SHALL BE BROUGHT TO THE IMMEDIATE ATTENTION OF ARCHITECT. STRUCTURAL ENGINEER WILL THEN PREPARE ADDITIONAL DRAWINGS AS MAY BE NEEDED TO ACCOMMODATE THE CONDITIONS AS BROUGHT TO THEIR ATTENTION.
6. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT MUST BE FIRMLY ATTACHED TO THE STRUCTURE. ISOLATORS, FASTENERS AND ANY OTHER ELEMENT PROVIDING STABILITY FOR MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT SHALL BE CAPABLE OF TRANSMITTING CODE REQUIRED LOADS, BUT IN NO EVENT LESS THAN A SHEAR LOAD EQUIVALENT TO 0.45 TIMES THE OPERATING WEIGHT OF EQUIPMENT.
7. DESIGN, MATERIALS, EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS OTHER THAN THOSE DESCRIBED OR INDICATED ON THE DRAWINGS MAY BE CONSIDERED FOR USE PROVIDED PRIOR APPROVAL IS OBTAINED FROM THE ARCHITECT.
8. DESIGN DATA:
 - DESIGN CODE: 2007 CBC
 - SEISMIC IMPORTANCE FACTOR $I_p = 1.0$
 - OCCUPANCY CATEGORY = II
 - MAPPED SPECTRAL RESPONSE:
 - ACCELERATIONS $S_s = 1.5$ $S_1 = 0.611$
 - SITE CLASS = D
 - SPECTRAL RESPONSE COEFFICIENTS $S_{ms} = 1.000$ $S_{m1} = 0.611$
 - SITE COEFFICIENT $F_a = 1.0$
 - SITE COEFFICIENT $F_v = 1.5$
 - WIND SPEED = 85 M.P.H.
 - WIND EXPOSURE = C
9. WATERPROOFING SEE ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS.

WELDING

1. THE QUALITY OF MATERIALS AND THE FABRICATION OF ALL WELDED CONNECTIONS SHALL BE IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WELDING SOCIETY'S STRUCTURAL WELDING CODE, AWS D1.1 LATEST EDITION.
2. SPECIAL INSPECTION OF WELDING PER SECTION 1704.3.1 IS REQUIRED. A QUALIFIED AND CERTIFIED INSPECTOR SHALL BE PRESENT DURING SHOP AND FIELD WELDING OPERATIONS UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED AND SHALL INSPECT ALL THE WORK AS REQUIRED BY AWS D1.1, SECTION 6.
3. SPECIAL INSPECTION NEED NOT BE CONTINUOUS FOR THE FOLLOWING ITEMS, PROVIDED THE MATERIAL, QUALIFICATIONS OF WELDING PROCEDURES AND WELDERS ARE VERIFIED PRIOR TO THE START OF WORK; PERIODIC INSPECTIONS MAY BE MADE OF WORK IN PROGRESS AND A VISUAL INSPECTION OF ALL WELDS IS STILL REQUIRED.
 1. SINGLE-PASS FILLET WELDS NOT EXCEEDING 5/16 INCH.
4. INSPECTORS SHALL POSSESS AND BE FAMILIAR WITH THE APPROVED WELDING PROCEDURE SPECIFICATIONS (WPS).
5. ALL WELDING SHALL BE DONE BY CERTIFIED WELDERS USING PRE-QUALIFIED WELDING PROCEDURES.
6. THE INSPECTOR SHALL CONFIRM THE QUALIFICATION OF WELDERS, THE USE OF AWS QUALIFIED PROCEDURES, THE MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDED USE OF AUTOMATIC EQUIPMENT AND THE PROPER USE OF PREHEAT, IF REQUIRED.

MICHAEL WILK ARCHITECTURE



833 Market Street, #805
San Francisco, CA 94103
T: 415-839-9594
F: 415-904-8388
www.wilkarch.com

T-Mobile

T-MOBILE WEST CORPORATION,
a DELAWARE CORPORATION
1855 GATEWAY BLVD., 9TH FLOOR
CONCORD, CA 94520

SF23211B
FRANCISCO
LAUNDERETTE
1763-1767 STOCKTON ST.
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94133



DRAWN BY: SH CHECKED BY: MW

NO	DATE	ISSUE
1	05/05/08	90% CONST.
2	05/20/08	100% CONST.
3	07/01/09	100% CONST. REV.
4	07/30/09	100% CONST. REV.
5	04/19/10	100% CONST. REV.

SHEET TITLE
**STRUCT. NOTES, PART.
ROOF PLAN, SECTION
AT ANTENNA MOUNT**





SHEET NUMBER

S-1

STRUCTURAL NOTES

SCALE:	
N.T.S.	


1



SECTION AT FRP SHROUD

SCALE: N.T.S.


3



SECTION AT ANTENNA MOUNT

SCALE: N.T.S.


1



PLAN AT ANTENNA MOUNT

SCALE: N.T.S.

4



SECTION AT FRP SHROUD

SCALE: N.T.S.

2

MICROCELL BTS CABINET MOUNT

SCALE: N.T.S.

5

MICHAEL WILK ARCHITECTURE

833 Market Street, #805
San Francisco, CA 94103
T: 415-839-9594
F: 415-904-8388
www.wilkarch.com

T-Mobile

T-MOBILE WEST CORPORATION,
a DELAWARE CORPORATION
1855 GATEWAY BLVD., 9TH FLOOR
CONCORD, CA 94520

SF23211B
FRANCISCO
LAUNDERETTE

1763-1767 STOCKTON ST.
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94133



DRAWN BY: SH CHECKED BY: MW

NO	DATE	ISSUE
1	05/05/08	90% CONST.
2	05/20/08	100% CONST.
3	07/01/09	100% CONST. REV.
4	07/30/09	100% CONST. REV.
5	04/19/10	100% CONST. REV.

SHEET TITLE

SECTIONS

SHEET NUMBER

S-2