


10/11 AT&T community meeting 7-8pm
655 North Delaware Street
400 North San Mateo Drive
201 North Amphlett Blvd
815 South B Street

Dr Martin Luther King Jr Center
725 Monte Diablo Ave, San Mateo, CA 94401

- Attendees list attached
- Introductions (City Department of Public Works and Abby from Modus representative of AT&T)
- 7-7:10 attendees looked around posters and visited different tables and there was informal dialogue regarding resident concerns addressed at each station.
- 7:10 started formal presentation of site SFOK2_025 (655 North Delaware Street) and residents/city/AT&T/commissioner gathered in a circle to hear answers from Abby.
- Resident concerns for SFOK2_025 (655 North Delaware Street) related to:
 - No sites proposed in San Mateo Park – a more affluent area in San Mateo. Abby explained that AT&T radio frequency engineer chooses sites based on where he sees a coverage gap on the SiNR map and this has nothing to do with socioeconomic standing.
 - EME concerns -> resident lives in condo adjacent to subject pole and has a baby and is concerned about EME. Raj from H&E addressed EME concerns and explained EME report.
 - Concern over 2 antennas on same block (1 existing and 1 proposed) and cumulative effects. Raj from H&E replied saying that this would still not exceed FCC limits and offered to run study for exact numbers.
 - Resident asked if the City limits the number of cell sites/block and the distance they have to be apart from each other. City replied that this is not stated in the ordinance, but public works reviews all applications including site locations.
 - Resident asked about the first page of the EME report and about the microwave rays. Raj answered and explained the microwave radiation in relation to the FCC limit.
 - Resident asked about future of the cell site and if more boxes will be added if the site is upgraded to 5g. Abby and Marc Grabisch (senior technical vendor manager for AT&T) replied that we are only proposing this current design and any upgrade will need to be permitted by the City in the future. Abby explained that PG&E CPUC GO95 has strict standards for amount of equipment allowed at site/height/clearances/quadrants that must be left clear for climbing and equipment space.
 - Resident replied asking if we could add 10x equipment in the future and Abby reiterated the strict guidelines we are held to, and that PG&E walks and approves the sites for use. 10x the equipment would not pass the structural report. We are only proposing current design and cannot predict what the future holds. Raj replied stating that the power usage and EME would not increase in future.
 - Residents asked for coverage maps to see the gaps that RF is trying to cover. Abby replied that we did not provide these to San Mateo yet since this was not required as part of the ordinance, but we can ask AT&T and RF for these to see if we can provide them to the City/residents.
 - Resident asked Raj about wattage of sites and Raj replied that sites are 1300 watts and that they could find this information in the EME reports. Two residents asked for copies of EME report.

- Resident asked if we could pursue steel light poles since this could elicit a much stealthier design. Abby said that AT&T would be happy to provide steel pole options if a master attachment agreement was in place with City of San Mateo. Unfortunately, there is no MAA and these sites have an immediate need, so we need to pursue PG&E poles wherever possible so that we can fill the coverage gaps in San Mateo ASAP.
- Resident asked how to determine if a site will be passed and if there is an appeal period. City answered that they have 60 days to process applications given new FCC standard. 60 days start after community outreach meeting is completed and application submitted. If they run out of time to review and the 60 days is approaching they have the right to deny based on opposition or an incomplete application with unanswered questions. There is a resident appeal period once the site has been approved.
- Resident asked if ordinance requires public hearings. Abby answered that all sites were noticed within a 500-foot radius from lat/long of pole. All residents and property owners were noticed. This is required per ordinance as are community meetings if requested. Residents/owners must receive the notices priority mail >10 days before meeting is held.
- Resident asked City how they would process future modifications. City replied that these would be processed through 6409.
- Resident asked again if site would exceed FCC standards and when FCC standards are dated. Raj replied that the FCC standard is from 1996 and that we are just proposing the existing design. We would need to add 60 more radios onto the pole to come close to exceeding the FCC limit. These sites use 2 radios.
- 7:55pm City asked to move onto the next site. We asked if any residents had any questions on other sites.
 - Resident said he lived close to SFOK2_031 (815 South B Street) and has terrible AT&T service and is a proponent of the proposed antenna site at SFOK2_031. He must go into his backyard to make any calls from his cell phone.
 - One resident expressed concern about antenna being level with second story of condominium complex across the street from the site and the health impacts from the site into the window. Raj replied again that this is far below the FCC limit.
 - Alex Smith voiced concern over SFOK2_028 as he is within 500 feet of the site.
 - Olga expressed concerns over lack of parking at Martin Luther King Jr Center.
 - Olga expressed concern over cumulative effects of EME from another T-Mobile cell site down N Delaware Street. The cell site is located ~350 feet away and therefore the site is not in violation of the ordinance.

Photograph of meeting:



Photograph of 3D model presented at meeting:

