
From: Andrea Merg <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 15, 2024 8:36 AM
To: planningweb <planningweb@cityofmerced.org>
Subject: Cell tower proposal at Olive and Parsons

Dear Planning Division,

I was notified that a cell tower is being proposed on church property at the corner of Olive and Parsons near Chenoweth Elementary School. I am writing this email to voice my concern about putting this directly in a residential neighborhood and *next to an elementary school*. We do not know the full effects of radiofrequency electromagnetic waves on human health. The results are inconclusive and require more time in order to understand their long-term effects. In the meantime, there have been several studies that have shown negative effects on human health. In fact, the World Health Organization (WHO) upgraded the classification of radio waves to "*possibly carcinogenic to humans*" in 2011 (see link and attachment). The fact that this is being proposed in the middle of a residential neighborhood and across the street from an elementary school is appalling!

These structures also lower property values. Would you or others that you know like to have a cell tower right behind their backyard? The answer for a vast majority of people is "no"! Please consider alternative locations that are not placed in residential neighborhoods and near schools, and that have good buffer space around the structure to minimize exposure to people in the surrounding area.

WHO link: https://www.iarc.who.int/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/pr208_E.pdf


Thank you,

Andrea Merg

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of City of Merced -- DO NOT CLICK on links or

From: [planningweb](#)
To: [Lee, Jessie](#)
Subject: FW: Site Plan Review #544
Date: Tuesday, April 16, 2024 2:02:31 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Thanks,



Kayla Abarca

Administrative Assistant II, Planning Department
City of Merced | 678 W. 18th Street | Merced, CA 95340
[\(209\) 385-6954](tel:(209)385-6954) Direct | [\(209\) 385-6858](tel:(209)385-6858) Dept Phone
abarca@cityofmerced.org | www.cityofmerced.org

From: Bryant Rodriguez <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2024 1:53 PM
To: planningweb <planningweb@cityofmerced.org>
Subject: Site Plan Review #544

Good Afternoon,

My Name is Bryant Rodriguez and I reside at [REDACTED]. I am attempting to make my opposition known to this proposal of a 55 ft cell tower. This would be basically in my backyard. I am opposed not only to the potential drop in my home's equity. I am wanting to bring up the potential health issues that could come up. Based on a review of studies published up until 2011, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) has classified RF radiation as "possibly carcinogenic to humans," This is not to mention the complete eye sore this will bring to my backyard that I will have to look at. I am in my backyard constantly whether gardening or playing with my children or just plain relaxing. I do not want to view this. I have spoken to multiple neighbors and they also do not want this. This was already attempted at the Calvary Chapel of Merced located at 1345 E Olive Ave, Merced, CA 95340. This was denied due to opposition and a compromise was that they would build a stealth tower at Rahilly park. Why is it that now they are attempting to put it at another church 1/4 of a mile down the road in another residential area where people do not want it?

Thank You,

Bryant Rodriguez

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of City of Merced -- **DO NOT CLICK** on links or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

From: [planningweb](#)
To: [Lee, Jessie](#)
Subject: FW: Site Plan Review #544
Date: Tuesday, April 16, 2024 1:36:59 PM

Thanks,

Kayla Abarca
Administrative Assistant II, Planning Department
City of Merced | 678 W. 18th Street | Merced, CA 95340
(209) 385-6954 Direct | (209) 385-6858 Dept Phone
abarca@cityofmerced.org | www.cityofmerced.org

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

From: Jason Verrinder <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 15, 2024 9:15 PM
To: [planningweb](#) <planningweb@cityofmerced.org>
Subject: RE: Site Plan Review #544

Hello,

As a property owner on [REDACTED] I was recently notified of the intention of attempting to put in a cellphone tower on Church of the Nazarene of Merced property adjacent to my backyard. I am opposed. As a good neighbor, I wanted to notify you that I've decided to hold private Hardcore music parties every Sunday for hardcore music lovers. It will be loud, very loud, but during appropriate daytime hours. This will be happening every Sunday into the foreseeable future.

Best wishes,
Jason Verrinder
Sent from my iPhone

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of City of Merced -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

I am a 20 year resident of [REDACTED], representing all the families in the area who will be directly affected by the construction of a cell phone tower on the property of Bear Creek Community Church, adjacent to the homes on my block.

I feel that the city of Merced, ATT, and the owners of the property on which Bear Creek Community Church is situated are all complicit in irresponsible behavior towards our community. It is well-documented and researched that cell phone towers emit dangerous radiation within their vicinity, causing a multitude of health issues. The wireless antennas on the tower emit radio frequency non-ionizing radiation. When these antennas are close to our homes and schools, the daily exposure to radio frequency radiation is increased, contributing to all sorts of maladies. To think that the city of Merced would put families and homeowners at risk is an outrage. Even more egregious is the fact that an elementary school is within very close range of the proposed cell tower. To put the 744 students and 80 staff members of Chenoweth School, directly across the street from the proposed construction site, which would then expose them to radiation on a daily basis, is truly a crime.

Children are more vulnerable to this type of radiation as they absorb it deep into their brains and bodies. A child's developing brain and organ systems are more sensitive to environmental stressors.

Cell phone tower radiation exposures are continuous – day and night. How can the city even ponder putting such an environmental hazard so close to our homes and schools?

The proposed tower will undoubtedly decrease the property values of the homes in the vicinity, in addition to presenting a host of health issues to the residents, school children, and school staff.

Rethink this issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheryl Wight



Environmental Assessment Specialists, Inc.

Office [REDACTED]

www.easenv.com

April 12, 2024

City of Merced Planning and Permitting
678 West 18th Street
Merced, CA 95340
planningweb@cityofmerced.org

RE: Invitation to Comment - Cultural Resource Identification Study/Sacred Lands File Search for Proposed Wireless Communications Candidate: AT&T Mobility, LLC (Client) – CVL02828 @ 1717 E. Olive Avenue, Merced, Merced County, CA 95340

Environmental Assessment Specialists, Inc. (EAS) is under contract with Client to submit this proposed telecommunication site information to Native American tribal groups and other interested parties for review. This submittal is being requested for compliance with Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) to determine if the site will impact historic places and/or archaeologically sensitive sites. Below please find the proposed site description for the above-referenced telecommunications facility.

Site Location and Description

The lease area lies in S16 T7S R14E as shown on the USGS Merced, CA 7.5-minute quadrangle map. The Client proposes to install a new telecommunications facility at this location: new faux tree antenna structure and associated equipment within a new compound including utility trenching. Ground disturbance will be required.

Field assessment for both historic properties and archaeological sites *will be* conducted, and a determination *will be* made of the project's direct and indirect effects on eligible properties. Consulting parties are invited to provide information concerning historic or archaeological properties already listed in the National Register or that could be eligible for listing in the National Register.

If you have any questions regarding historical resources, please feel free to contact me via U.S. mail or email [REDACTED]. Thank you for your consideration.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Gavin Leaver'.

Gavin Leaver

Environmental Assessment Specialists, Inc.

Please mail your response to:

[REDACTED]

From: [planningweb](#)
To: [Lee, Jessie](#)
Subject: FW: Proposed Cell Tower at 1717 East Olive Avenue
Date: Thursday, April 18, 2024 4:36:09 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Thanks,



Kayla Abarca

Administrative Assistant II, Planning Department
City of Merced | 678 W. 18th Street | Merced, CA 95340
[\(209\) 385-6954](tel:(209)385-6954) Direct | [\(209\) 385-6858](tel:(209)385-6858) Dept Phone
abarca@cityofmerced.org | www.cityofmerced.org

From: Ronald Ringstrom <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2024 4:34 PM
To: planningweb <planningweb@cityofmerced.org>
Subject: Proposed Cell Tower at 1717 East Olive Avenue

We are unequivocally opposed to the construction of a 5G cellular phone tower on the property at 1717 East Olive Avenue. The entire area is residential, including our property at [REDACTED]. Cell towers have absolutely no place in a residential area.

The proposed site is approximately 0.4 miles (line-of-sight) from our house. There is already a cell tower next to the McKee Fire Station about 0.36 miles (line-of-sight) from our property. Putting two cell towers so close to each other makes zero sense, even if they are operated by two different companies.

It makes no difference that the tower will be camouflaged by a fake tree. It will still be an incredible eyesore that will diminish the property values of all of the residents in the area. AT&T will probably say that their proposed 5G system will not emit signals causing any significant harm to people in the area. That's sales talk. The high frequency radio waves emitted from this site may have very harmful effects to the children attending Chenoweth Elementary School, which is only about 100 feet from the site, as well as all of the residents in the area. We simply do not have enough long-term data available to be assured it will not cause harm. We do not endorse a project having the potential to cause physical harm to residents or to destroy the value of their properties.

We don't care that the church at that location wants to increase its revenue by allowing the proposed cell tower to be built on its property. Their interests are clearly contrary to the interests of residents in the area. We also don't care that AT&T is offering improved reception in the area. AT&T is a commercial enterprise solely motivated by profit. They don't care about the welfare of the people who live here. I certainly hope the City of Merced will not place the profit-motivated interests of a huge corporation ahead of the safety and welfare of its citizens.

By the way, it is far past time for the City of Merced to increase the notification area for proposed projects. The existing notification radius is far too small. We should have been notified because this monstrosity will affect us.

Thank you for your attention to this email message.

Ron and Claudia Ringstrom

From: [planningweb](#)
To: [Espinosa, Kim](#); [Lee, Jessie](#)
Subject: FW: Site Plan Review #544
Date: Monday, April 22, 2024 11:56:58 AM

From: Amy de Ayora <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2024 10:29 AM
To: planningweb <planningweb@cityofmerced.org>
Subject: Site Plan Review #544

To whom it may concern:

Merced City Site Plan Review Committee,

We live with our four children at [REDACTED], which is located directly behind the Church of the Nazarene (Bear Creek Community Church). We strongly object to this project for the following reasons:

1. The findings in Section 20.58.070 of the Zoning Code cannot be made. Specifically, subsection (C) requires a showing that “the location for the wireless communication facility minimizes the visibility of the facility from residentially zoned property.” This huge tower will absolutely be visible from our home as well as from the homes of our neighbors; in fact, it will shade our yard, block our views and ruin our property values. Additionally, the City must find that “all reasonable opportunities to locate the facility or to co-locate the facility on an existing structure have been exhausted by the applicant and are not feasible,” and that “sites near the project area, which are poorly suited for other forms of development, are unavailable for use by the wireless communication facility.” (Subsections E and F) Where is the evidence that this analysis occurred? It has not been provided to us. The City cannot act without thoroughly and fairly considering this information.
2. The public notice does not specify which CEQA exemption is being relied upon, so it is impossible to determine if the exemption actually applies to this project. In addition, a categorical exemption will not apply when there are “unusual circumstances” creating the reasonable possibility of significant environmental effects. The construction and operation of a cell phone tower within feet of our home is reasonably possible to have significant aesthetic and public safety (fire) impacts, among others.
We urge you to deny this site plan review. This is simply the wrong location for this project.

Jason and Amy Verrinder

Sent from [Outlook](#)

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of City of Merced -- **DO NOT CLICK** on links or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

From: [planningweb](#)
To: [Lee, Jessie](#)
Subject: FW: Very important - CASE #544
Date: Thursday, April 25, 2024 11:26:11 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

From: Nicole de Ayora <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2024 11:05 AM
To: planningweb <planningweb@cityofmerced.org>
Subject: Very important - CASE #544

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to express concern over the proposed cell tower installation at the Bear Creek Community Church. This location is one block away from Chenoweth Elementary School and several family residences.

It is disappointing and alarming that a cell tower would be even considered for a residential neighborhood. Both anecdotal reports and epidemiology studies have found headaches, skin rashes, sleep disturbances, depression, concentration problems, dizziness, memory changes and increased risk of cancer, tremors and other neurophysiological effects in populations near base stations.

Given these highly publicized concerns around health issues associated with cell towers, the 20 to 40 percent reduction in home and land neurophysiological effects in populations near base stations. Given these highly publicized concerns around health issues associated with cell towers, the 20 to 40 percent reduction in home and land values, the environmental and visual impact, it is unconscionable that it be placed here.

Please conduct some additional research and find a more appropriate location.

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of City of Merced -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

From: [planningweb](#)
To: [Lee, Jessie](#)
Subject: FW: Site Plan Review Item #544
Date: Wednesday, April 24, 2024 1:02:49 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

From: Erin Dietzen <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, April 24, 2024 12:00 PM
To: planningweb <planningweb@cityofmerced.org>
Subject: Re: Site Plan Review Item #544

Re: Site Plan Review Item #544

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to express concern over the proposed cell tower installation at the Bear Creek Community Church. This location is one block away from Chenoweth Elementary School and several family residences. It is disappointing and alarming that a cell tower would be even considered for a residential neighborhood. Both anecdotal reports and epidemiology studies have found headaches, skin rashes, sleep disturbances, depression, concentration problems, dizziness, memory changes and increased risk of cancer, tremors and other neurophysiological effects in populations near base stations. Given these highly publicized concerns around health issues associated with cell towers, the 20 to 40 percent reduction in home and land values, the environmental and visual impact, it is unconscionable that it be placed here.

Please conduct additional research and find a more appropriate location.

Sincerely,
Erin Dietzen

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of City of Merced -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

From: [planningweb](#)
To: [Lee, Jessie](#)
Subject: FW: Site Plan Review #544 - Public Comments
Date: Thursday, April 25, 2024 9:25:54 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Thanks,



Kayla Abarca

Administrative Assistant II, Planning Department
City of Merced | 678 W. 18th Street | Merced, CA 95340
[\(209\) 385-6954](tel:(209)385-6954) Direct | [\(209\) 385-6858](tel:(209)385-6858) Dept Phone
abarca@cityofmerced.org | www.cityofmerced.org

From: Kathy Saetern <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2024 9:21 AM
To: planningweb <planningweb@cityofmerced.org>
Subject: Site Plan Review #544 - Public Comments

In regards to Site Plan Review #544, I am in opposition.

I am in opposition to the building of the 55-ft monopine tower and 8x8 walk-in closet shelter due to fire hazards, declining property value, and possible future health concerns. While there's no strong evidence that they cause any noticeable health effects NOW, I am making note that they are still relatively new. Without strong evidence leaning towards either side that they may or may not cause health concerns, I'd make the smart choice to not risk my life or my family and friends for future research.

Thank you,
Kathy Cravalho

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of City of Merced -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

From: [planningweb](#)
To: [Lee, Jessie](#)
Subject: FW: ATT&T tower Site application #544
Date: Thursday, April 25, 2024 8:05:48 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

From: Joe Brucia <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2024 7:42 AM
To: planningweb <planningweb@cityofmerced.org>
Subject: ATT&T tower Site application #544

My comment.....

I am Joe Brucia and live a few block north from the proposed cell phone tower. I have lived in Merced for over 40 years. I find it hard to believe that the Church of the Nazarine would consider putting a "tree" tower in what amounts to be the backyards of Vickie Court homes. Obviously, there is no "love thy neighbor.".

Historically, the residents of Vickie Court bought the homes knowing that beyond their fences there would never be the equivalent of a 4 story building that they would see every day from their kitchen windows.

There are options within the neighborhood for the ATT&T tree tower. May I suggest Rahilly Park. The tower would blend with the existing trees. Just across the street of the proposed tower is the vacant land between Chenoweth School and Black Rascal Creek. I believe owned by the Merced City School District. Lots of vacant land in this area that will probably never be developed. A third alternative is the City firehouse area at Davenport Park. Lots of open space. In closing, I would hope the City has not told ATT&T "Not in our open space, try some one's..... backyard."

Respectfully submitted,
Joe Brucia

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of City of Merced -- DO NOT CLICK on links or



MERCED IRRIGATION DISTRICT

April 8, 2024

Kayla Abarca, Administrative Assistant II
City of Merced, Planning Division
678 West 18th Street
Merced, CA 95340

Re: **Site Plan Review #544**

Ms. Abarca,

The Merced Irrigation District (MID) has reviewed the above referenced Site Plan and offers the following comment:

1. MID operates and maintains the Bradley B Lateral Pipeline lying adjacent to the southernly line of the subject property within a 24-foot-wide fee strip as described in the deed recorded in Vol. 2838 of Deeds, at Page 55, Merced County Records.

MID respectfully requests that the City require, as conditions of approval, the following:

1. The property owner shall execute an Encroachment Agreement with MID for any proposed improvements lying within the MID fee strip and pay all associated MID fees.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above referenced application. If you have any questions, please contact me at 354-2882.

Sincerely,

Mike Morris

Mike Morris PLS
Survey Project Manager

From: [Randy Fontes](#)
To: [planningweb](#)
Subject: Site Plan Review #544
Date: Monday, April 22, 2024 1:12:04 PM

I am opposed to the AT&T tower proposed for this site. The entire surrounding area is predominately residential. A 55ft. cell tower would be unsightly in our neighborhood. As I live directly across the street, it would be in plain view from all my front windows.

I also would question what effect it may have on our property values.

Randal & Dabby Fontes

[REDACTED]

Merced, CA 95340

[REDACTED]

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of City of Merced -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

From: [planningweb](#)
To: [Espinosa, Kim](#); [Lee, Jessie](#)
Subject: FW: Site Plan Review Item #544
Date: Monday, April 22, 2024 8:01:12 AM

From: Salazar, Regina <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, April 19, 2024 4:53 PM
To: planningweb <planningweb@cityofmerced.org>
Subject: Site Plan Review Item #544

This email is regarding the cell tower being placed next door to Chenoweth school. As a parent and long time employee of the school district I strongly oppose this happening. The childrens health and well being is of the utmost importance and I strongly believe this will compromise both of those for all the scholars at the school.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Gina Salazar

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system administrator. Please note any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Merced City Elementary School District. Finally, the recipient should check this email and any attachments for the presence of viruses. The District accepts no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this email.

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of City of Merced -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

From: [planningweb](#)
To: [Lee, Jessie](#)
Subject: FW: Site Plan review #544
Date: Thursday, April 25, 2024 8:06:40 AM
Attachments: [~WRD0000.jpg](#)
[image001.png](#)

Thanks,



Kayla Abarca

Administrative Assistant II, Planning Department
City of Merced | 678 W. 18th Street | Merced, CA 95340
[\(209\) 385-6954](tel:(209)385-6954) Direct | [\(209\) 385-6858](tel:(209)385-6858) Dept Phone
abarca@cityofmerced.org | www.cityofmerced.org

From: Sandra Lupercio <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, April 24, 2024 8:44 PM
To: planningweb <planningweb@cityofmerced.org>
Subject: Site Plan review #544

Hello, my husband Jorge and I own our home at [REDACTED].. We are opposed to the At&t tower being built in the field right across the street from our house. That would literally take our view of the sky away as that would be what we would see right when we walk out our front door. Also, we have a special needs son that has **epilepsy** and **seizures**, so the radiation no matter to what degree would not be good for his health. Not to mention the hundreds of school kids that play daily right across the street about 250 ft away from the proposed tower. My last concern would be all of our property value. I am a Realtor and the cell tower would lower the value of all of our homes approximately 20%, I don't know about you, but when your home is your retirement or what you would leave to your kids, possibly losing \$100,000 would be detrimental. We DO NOT want this tower being built here, there are so many other options close by that are not that close to homes. ex.Yosemite Ave and Parsons, Yosemite and Gardner, McKee and Olive, Lake and Yosemite. Thank you for your time and consideration.

--

Thank You



Sandra Lupercio

REALTOR® | [REDACTED]

C: [REDACTED]
E: [REDACTED]
W: [REDACTED]

From: [planningweb](#)
To: [Lee, Jessie](#)
Subject: FW: ATT tower at Parsons and Teak
Date: Thursday, April 25, 2024 8:05:29 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Thanks,



Kayla Abarca

Administrative Assistant II, Planning Department
City of Merced | 678 W. 18th Street | Merced, CA 95340
[\(209\) 385-6954](tel:(209)385-6954) Direct | [\(209\) 385-6858](tel:(209)385-6858) Dept Phone
abarca@cityofmerced.org | www.cityofmerced.org

From: Vince Remillard [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2024 7:51 AM
To: planningweb <planningweb@cityofmerced.org>
Subject: ATT tower at Parsons and Teak

To whom it may concern,

I received notice that there may be a new cell tower going in at the empty lot at Teak and Parsons in Merced. I live in this area, and I am very against it. I have already gone through cancer treatment and do not want to take a chance that I may have to do it again. The studies are inconclusive at this time as to the health effects of cell towers around humans but seem to be pointing to higher risks of cancers in those areas. There is also an elementary school in the area and the children should not be exposed to those possible dangers. Please do not allow this to go forward.

Vince Remillard
[REDACTED]

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of City of Merced -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

From: [planningweb](#)
To: [Lee, Jessie](#)
Subject: FW: Conditional Use Permit #1277 (Formerly Plan Review Permit #544)
Date: Tuesday, June 25, 2024 10:30:04 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

From: Jason Verrinder [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 24, 2024 3:38 PM
To: planningweb <planningweb@cityofmerced.org>
Subject: Conditional Use Permit #1277 (Formerly Plan Review Permit #544)

To whom it may concern,

I am the homeowner at [REDACTED]. I am against the proposed cell tower at the Church of the Nazarene. I would like to request the environmental checklist and/or other documentation supporting the Notice of Intent (NOI) to adopt a CEQA Categorical Exemption for Conditional Use Permit #1277. The material is difficult to locate on the City's website. The permit is for the installation of a cellular transmission tower. I understand that a public hearing related to said permit will be on July 3, 2024, the final day of the public review period. I plan to attend this hearing and have the following questions which I hope to have answered and included in the record:

- What other viable sites or alternatives were considered for tower placement?
- What made the current location the preferred alternative?
- Why is a public hearing being held on the final day of the public review period, before a national holiday?
- Can the public review period be extended? If not, why not?
- Per the request above, is supporting documentation available for the CEQA CE related to conditional use permit #1277?
- Is the City planning to circulate an environmental document if public opposition warrants further input consistent with CCR §15102 and §15202?

- Can the conditional use permit be withdrawn after the close of the public review period if project scope, public concern, or other issues arise?

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of City of Merced -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

From: [Vince Remillard](#)
To: [planningweb](#)
Cc: [Lynn Stapp](#)
Subject: Conditional Use Permit #1277
Date: Monday, July 1, 2024 3:40:35 PM

I live in the area that the proposed ATT cell tower is being considered. According to the staff report made available to the public on June 28th regarding the Conditional use Permit #1277, of other sites investigated, three of those sites are owned by the city of Merced. Rahilly Park, Rascal Strip Park, and city water tank on McKee Rd. The reason given for not choosing one of those sites was that the city did not want to lease to ATT.

Why would the city decline a lease that would bring needed funds back to the city? If the city does not deem the cell tower as wanted or needed, how does the city planning Commission justify recommending a cell tower on a similar independent party site that the city itself refuses?

Maybe the Merced fire station 55 at 3520 Parsons Ave. would be a better choice farther away from an elementary school. If not, then why not???

Vince Remillard



[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of City of Merced -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

From: [Sherri Morris](#)
To: [planningweb](#)
Subject: CUP#1277
Date: Monday, July 1, 2024 12:49:02 PM

>

> I am opposed to CUP #1277 of a Monopone cell tower initiated by AT&T at the Church of the Nazarene at 1717 E. Olive Ave.

>

> This location is at the back of my residential property line. If I look out my windows the tower will be in view. The design of a monopine tower isnt appealing. There are no other trees in the area that it will blend in with.

>

> I don't feel the Church of the Nazarene or Merced planning commission has properly notified all residents in the surrounding area regarding the proposed tower site.

> I have not received any notifications regarding the CUP or previous hearing. I was informed by neighbors on multiple days after a previous hearing.

>

> Don B. Chenoweth school is across the street from the proposed location. Have "All" the parents of attending students been notified so they may be given an opportunity to voice their opinions?

>

> The cell tower will impose a negative effect on residents heath based on numerous studies of these towers located close to residential areas.

> It will also negatively effect homes values due to the proximity to the tower for health and esthetic reasons.

> I am opposed to having the tower erected close to my residential area.

>

>

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of City of Merced -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

From: [Andrew Lesa](#)
To: [Bennyhoff, Jeff](#)
Cc: [MILESI, BRYANT A](#); [OLSON, NELS L](#); [Ashley Smith](#); [MCCLOSKEY, DANIEL](#); [Carl Jones](#); [Quintero, Frank](#); [Lee, Jessie](#); [McBride, Scott](#)
Subject: Re: AT&T Cell Tower Placement (CPU1277) : Resident Communication
Date: Tuesday, July 2, 2024 1:59:25 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-ugydd1uu](#)

Good Afternoon Mr. Bennyhoff:

AT&T forwarded your communication requesting additional information regarding the AT&T proposed cell facility at 1717 E Olive Ave (CUP#1277). My office, under the lead of Carl Jones (copied), has been working on this project in an effort to address a lack of coverage in the City of Merced.

AT&T's goal is to fill a significant gap in coverage and improve cell service to this area of the City of Merced. My office, on behalf of AT&T, evaluated many properties to find the least intrusive means to fill the significant gap in coverage. Those alternative sites were detailed in the "Alternative Sites Analysis" provided to the Planning Department with our formal CUP application submittal.

I can confirm the City did NOT direct my office or AT&T to propose a new cell facility at the current location. This location was determined after substantial research. As you know, cell facilities must meet strict placement and design guidelines outlined in City Ordinances as well as meet the coverage objective of AT&T. Additionally, the site must have a willing landlord, adequate space for construction and access, a clean title, and pose no negative environmental impacts. It was only after proper due diligence that the proposed site location was identified as the best and least intrusive means to fill this significant gap in coverage.

Carl Jones will be attending and representing AT&T during tomorrow evening's meeting. Please let me know if you have any additional questions we can help address.

Thank you.

Andrew Lesa, Vice President - Operations
Epic Wireless Group LLC
605 Coolidge Drive, Suite 100, Folsom, CA 95630
530.368.2357
andrew.lesa@epicwireless.net



From: Bennyhoff, Jeff <BennyhoffJ@cityofmerced.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 2, 2024 11:26 AM
To: MILES, BRYANT A <bm3620@att.com>
Cc: McBride, Scott <McBrideS@cityofmerced.org>; Quintero, Frank <QUINTEROF@cityofmerced.org>; Lee, Jessie <leej@cityofmerced.org>
Subject: AT&T Cell Tower Placement (CPU1277) : Resident Communication

Bryant,

We had several resident complains last night at our Council Meetings about AT&T plans for construction of a cell tower in the community located at 1717 E Olive Ave (CUP#1277). The resident's stated AT&T was told by the City to place the tower at this location. We don't believe this is an accurate statement and we want to make sure residents have clear communication over how the location of this tower is decided. We would like to find out additional information before July 3rd planning commission as this item is on the agenda. Please let me know if you can get us additional information or have a conversation over this item. I have attached the AT&T Alternative Site Analysis document for reference from this agenda item. As I do not directly deal with cell towers within the I.T. Department, I am cc'ing the City Manager, Deputy City Manager, and Jessie Lee, who is bringing this item before the planning commission.

Planning commission Item : <https://cityofmerced.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=6735179&GUID=04E57C71-88F4-4E14-83BD-1AF782EAEF48&Options=&Search=>



Jeff Bennyhoff

Director of Information Technology

City of Merced | 678 W. 18th Street | Merced, CA 95340
209-385-6829 | www.cityofmerced.org

Bryant Milesi

AT&T Director - External Affairs

1215 K Street, Suite 1800 Sacramento, CA 95814

m 916.947.9046 | bm3620@att.com

City of Merced records, including emails, are subject to the California Public Records Act. Unless exemptions apply, this email, any attachments and any replies are subject to disclosure on request, and neither the sender nor any recipients should have any expectation of privacy regarding the contents of such communications. The City of Merced shall not be responsible for any claims, losses or damages resulting from the use of digital data that may be contained in this email.

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of City of Merced -- **DO NOT CLICK** on links or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

From: [Jason Verrinder](#)
To: [planningweb](#)
Cc: [Lee, Jessie](#); [McBride, Scott](#); [Quintero, Frank](#); [Smith, Shane](#)
Subject: Conditional Use Permit #1277
Date: Monday, September 16, 2024 4:48:47 PM

To Whom it May Concern,

I, Jason Verrinder, resident at [REDACTED] am writing in regards to Conditional Use Permit #1277. At the July 3rd, 2024 Planning Commission meeting the Staff Report provided no reason for saying "no" to potential sites at Rahilly Park and Black Rascal Strip Park. At that meeting, I was told they did not even know why "no" was the answer. Since then, the applicant requested more time to research potential sites owned by the city and an updated staff report has been posted on the city's website and scheduled to be discussed on September 18th, 2024. The staff report includes no new potential sites owned by the city that were reviewed/taken into consideration, and no additional insight was provided for why the city continues to say "no" for the Rahilly Park and Black Rascal Strip Park sites. So my question remains the same. Why does the city say "no?" The public deserves more insight and analysis before a decision is made on our behalf on what is in the city's best interests regarding Conditional Use Permit #1277.

Sincerely,

Jason Verrinder
[REDACTED]

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of City of Merced -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

124

STOP THE TOWER!

We, the undersigned residents of the City of Merced, strongly and adamantly oppose the construction of a cell phone tower on the premises of the lot owned by the Church of the Nazarene on Parsons Ave.

Kathy Cravalho 3151 Vickie Ct.
Merced, CA 95340

Sherri Surgens 3131 Vickie Ct.
Merced, CA, 95340

Amy Verrinder 3121 Vickie Ct.

Jason Verrinder 3121 Vickie Ct.

Dabby E. Randal Fontes 3130 Vickie Ct.

Noe Tibervio 1740 Kimberly Ave Merced

Lynn Stapp 1874 Kimberly Ave Merced

Erica Cervantes 1912 Kimberly Ave Merced

Mark Emerson 1968 Kimberly Ave Merced 95340

Scott Meneely 2032 Kimberly Ave Merced

Yolanda M. Chavez 2044 Kimberly Ave Merced, CA

Brenna K. Gutfentelder 2058 Kimberly Ave Merced, CA

Paula Akers 2090 Kimberly Ave - Merced, CA

Mark Akers

Rick Freet 2110 Kimberly Ave Merced, Ca.

Jesse Allen 2165 Kimberly Ave Merced, CA

Mark Moreno 3168 Kirk Dr. Merced CA. 95340

Tyron Richardson

Diana S. Hozler

3168 Nottingham Ave 95390

Raquel Garcia

3162 Nottingham Ave Merced

Mary Jane

3148 Nottingham Ave. Merced

Leon Gough

3140 Nottingham Ave

Frank Butler

3132 Nottingham Ave

Johnny Fox

3125 Nottingham Ave

MICHAEL HADLEY

1504 Tipperary Ave

Alisa Phillips

1509 Tipperary Ave

Deena Heater

1501 Tipperary Ave

Robert Linn

3172 Dublin Ave

Laurene Ginn

3210 Dublin Ave

Will Lopez

3226 Dublin Ave

Maryette

3221 Dublin Ave

Sylvia Schenck

1610 Everett Court

Davin Martin

3191 Dublin Ave

David Mann

3131 McKee Rd

Musty Moen

3131 McKee Rd.

5001 POST

3171 VICKI BLVD.

Lola O'Brien 3171 Vickie Ct. Merced Ca 95340

Michael O'Brien 3171 Vickie Ct. Merced Ca 95340

Jorge Lupercio 3180 Vickie Ct.

Sandra Lupercio 3180 Vickie Ct.

Stefanie El Hareb 1872 El Portal Dr. Merced, CA.

Sonia Alvarez 1918 El Portal Merced Ca 95340

ROBIN DUNN 1942 EL PORTAL MERCED CA

Sam Costa 2014 EL Portal Dr. 95340

Chris Lee 2014 EL Portal Dr. 95340

3380 Capitol Ct Merced CA 95340

WILLIAM MARQUELIN 2194 EL PORTAL DR. MERCED, CA 95340

BRANDY RUSCHE 2097 EL PORTAL DR. MERCED 95340

Bella Lin 1997 El Portal Dr. Merced 95340.

Shirley Garcia 1959 El Portal Dr.

Michelle Faye 1933 El Portal Dr. 95340

Chris Stoen 1915 EL PORTAL DR. MERCED 95340

1895 El Portal Dr.

Claudia Ringstrom 1855 El Portal Dr.

Ana Maria Sifuentes 3059 N Parsons Merced 95340

Ann + Paul deAyora 2.0 95 Karen CT.
Merced CA 95340

Terri Persner 1995 Kimberly Ave 95340

LaQuivia Richardson 1741 Kimberly Ave 95340

Sheryl Wight 3170 Vickie Ct. 95340

Michelle + Joe Ortiz 1722 Teak Ave

Ancelia Carlos 3205 N. Parsons Ave

LESTER ACOSTA 3233 N. PARSONS AVE

Michael Thao 1614 Evette CT Merced

Valery Krieg 3299 Shannon Ct.

[Signature] 3204 Shannon Ave.

Wang Lise 3200 Shannon Ave

Maria Soloria 3205 Shannon Ave

Jack W. Lee 3214 SHANNON AVE

Yovana Santana 3259 Shannon Ave

Ramona Salis 3258 Nottingham

Venja Gamino 1742 Teak ave.

[Signature] 1700 Teak Ave

RICK DENNIS 1928 TEAK AVE

Ray Bernard 3207 Madison Ave

Jeff Leming 3293 Madison Ave.

Jingjing Shapley 3303 Madroan Ave. [REDACTED]

Karla Shugfeld / Marco A Rodriguez 1947 Bryor Court [REDACTED]

Bettie L Ward 1960 Bryor Ct. [REDACTED]

Sandra Renda 3258 Madroan Avenue

LARRY FISTER 1961 SAGE CT. MCD

Lura ARTHINGTON 3235 THORN AVE, MERCED, CA 95340 [REDACTED]

Torge L. Paris 3259 Thorn Ave Merced Ca. 95340

Jane Eastman 3222 Thorn Ave Merced CA 95340.

KOB MACHA 3209 ALDER AVE. CA 95340

Kurt Peterson 3235 Alder Ave Merced CA 95340

Crystal Garilazo 3245 Alder Ave Merced CA 95340

HORACIO Garilazo 3245 Alder Ave Merced 95340

Paul Munkatz 3259 Alder Ave Merced 95340

~~Barbara [REDACTED] 3271 ALDER AVE [REDACTED] CA 95340~~

Jill Knox 3283 Alder [REDACTED]

Kinda Alexander 3276 Alder Ave, Merced CA 95 [REDACTED]

Juan Gonzalez 3264 Alder ^{ave} Merced CA 95340

Maria Gonzalez 3264 Alder Ave Merced CA 95340

Jenni Antardona 3252 Alder Ave Merced CA 95340

Jami Gibson 3228 Alder Ave merced

Magdalena Castillo 3214 Alder Ave Merced. CA

Ed Russell-Cruz 2068 Teak Ave. Merced, CA

John Muel 2046 Teak Ave Merced

Laurie O'Brien 3285 Shannon court merced

Eric Gill 3285 Shannon court merced

Jonathan Boyajian 1922 El Portal Dr Merced

Michael Katell 1831 El Portal Dr.

Manselaw Hockless 1701 Elayne drive

Lorenzo Ortiz 3095. Beverly court. merced.

Tamara Miller

~~3055 Beverly Ct Merced~~

J. S. Baker

3050 Beverly Ct Merced

Victor Zaragoza

3061 Marie Court

Mary Shilock

1636 E Olive

Brad Cathey

1636 E Olive

Margarita Andrade 1614 E Olive Ave

Gino Rizzonelli 3133 N. Parsons Ave

Michael Thao 1614 Elvette Ct

Saula BERNES 3117 N. PARSONS

~~George Melly~~

Karen Greene 1225 El Portal Drive

Henry Pera 1213 EL Portal Pm

Carina Veliz 1204 EL Portal. Dr

Robin S. m. n. n. 1232 EL Portal Dr.

Jack Mobley

1284 EL Portal Dr

Brenda Morgan 1342 El Portal Dr

Bryant Rodriguez

1718 Teak Ave

Gary Hodnett

3141 Vickie + Merced

Jlías Benomar

3121 Vickie + merced

Blank lined area for writing.

RECEIVED
DATE
(Date)