

Location:	City street light pole in public right-of-way (sidewalk) adjacent to: 2003 Telegraph Avenue (At intersection of Telegraph Ave. and Thomas L. Berkeley Way)
Assessor's Parcel Numbers:	Adjacent to: 008-06450-005-00
Proposal:	To establish a new "small cell site" telecommunications facility, in order to enhance existing services, by attaching an antenna and equipment to a 26' City street light located in the sidewalk; the antenna would be attached to the top at up to 31' - 4" and equipment at approximately 9' to 15' - 1".
Applicant / Phone Number:	Ana Gomez/Black & Veatch & Extenet (for: T-Mobile) (913) 458-9148
Owner:	Extenet et al.
Case File Number:	PLN16419
Planning Permits Required:	Major Conditional Use Permit with additional findings for Monopole Telecommunications Facility adjacent Residential Zone; Regular Design Review with additional findings for Monopole Telecommunications Facility
General Plan:	Central Business District
Zoning:	Central Business District Pedestrian Retail Commercial Zone (CBD-P)
Environmental Determination:	Exempt, Section 15301 of the State CEQA Guidelines: Existing Facilities; Exempt, Section 15302: Replacement or Reconstruction; Exempt, Section 15303: New Construction of Small Structures; Section 15183: Projects Consistent with a Community Plan, General Plan or Zoning
Historic Status:	Non-historic property
City Council District:	2
Date Filed:	December 5, 2016
Action to be Taken:	Decision based on staff report
Finality of Decision:	Appealable to City Council within 10 days
For Further Information:	Contact case planner Marilu Garcia at (510) 238-5217 or mgarcia2@oaklandnet.com

SUMMARY



The applicant requests Planning Commission approval of a Major Conditional Use Permit and a Regular Design Review with additional findings to establish a Monopole Telecommunications Facility ("small cell site"). The purpose is to enhance existing wireless services. The project involves attaching an antenna and equipment to an existing City street light pole located within the sidewalk in the public right-of-way.

Staff recommends approval, subject to conditions, as described in this report.

BACKGROUND

For several years in the City of Oakland, telecommunications carriers have proposed facility installation within the public right-of-way, instead of private property. These facilities typically consist of antennas and associated equipment attached to utility poles or street light poles. Poles are often replaced with

CITY OF OAKLAND PLANNING COMMISSION



Case File: PLN16419

Applicant: Ana Gomez/Black & Veatch & Extenet (for: T-Mobile)

Address: City street light pole in sidewalk adjacent to: 2003 Telegraph Avenue

Zone: CBD-P

replicas for technical purposes. The main purpose is to enhance existing service, given increasing technological demands for bandwidth, through new technology and locational advantages. The City exercises zoning jurisdiction over such projects in response to a 2009 State Supreme Court case decision (*Sprint v. Palos Verdes Estates*). Pursuant to the Planning Code, utility or joint pole authority (JPA) sites are classified by staff as "Macro Facilities," and street light pole sites (lamps, not traffic signals) as "Monopole Facilities." For JPA poles, only Design Review approval may be required, as opposed to Design Review and a Conditional Use Permit, for example. For non-JPA pole sites, such as City light poles, projects also require review by the City's Public Works Agency (PWA) and Real Estate Division, and involve other considerations such as impacts to historical poles. The PWA may also review projects involving street lights. In either case, the practice has been to refer all such projects to the Planning Commission for decision when located in or near a residential zone.

Several projects for new DAS (distributed antenna services) facilities have come before the Planning Commission for a decision and have been installed throughout the Oakland Hills. Some applications have been denied due to view obstructions or proximity to residences. Improved practices for the processing of all types of sites incorporating Planning Commission direction have been developed as a result. Conditions of approval typically attach requirements such as painting and texturing of approved components to more closely match utility poles in appearance. Approvals do not apply to any replacement project should the poles be removed for any reason. As with sites located on private property, the Federal Government precludes cities from denying an application on the basis of emissions concerns if a satisfactory emissions report is submitted. More recent Federal changes have streamlined the process to service existing facilities.

Currently, telecommunications carriers are in the process of attempting to deploy "small cell sites." These projects also involve attachment of antennas and equipment at public right-of-way facilities such as poles or lights for further enhancement of services. However, components are now somewhat smaller in size than in the past. Also, sites tend to be located in flatland neighborhoods and Downtown where view obstructions are less likely to be an issue. Good design and placement is given full consideration nonetheless, especially with the greater presence of historic structures in Downtown. Additionally, given the sheer multitude of applications, and, out of consideration for Federal requirements for permit processing timelines, staff may develop alternatives to traditional staffing and aging.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS BACKGROUND

Limitations on Local Government Zoning Authority under the Telecommunications Act of 1996

Section 704 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) provides federal standards for the siting of "Personal Wireless Services Facilities." "Personal Wireless Services" include all commercial mobile services (including personal communications services (PCS), cellular radio mobile services, and paging); unlicensed wireless services; and common carrier wireless exchange access services. Under Section 704, local zoning authority over personal wireless services is preserved such that the FCC is prevented from preempting local land use decisions; however, local government zoning decisions are still restricted by several provisions of federal law. Specifically:

- Under Section 253 of the TCA, no state or local regulation or other legal requirement can prohibit or have the effect of prohibiting the ability of any entity to provide any interstate or intrastate telecommunications service.
- Further, Section 704 of the TCA imposes limitations on what local and state governments can do. Section 704 prohibits any state and local government action which unreasonably discriminates among personal wireless providers. Local governments must ensure that its wireless ordinance

does not contain requirements in the form of regulatory terms or fees which may have the “effect” of prohibiting the placement, construction, or modification of personal wireless services.

- Section 704 also preempts any local zoning regulation purporting to regulate the placement, construction and modification of personal wireless service facilities on the basis, either directly or indirectly, on the environmental effects of radio frequency emissions (RF) of such facilities, which otherwise comply with Federal Communication Commission (FCC) standards in this regard. (See 47 U.S.C. Section 332(c)(7)(B)(iv) (1996)). This means that local authorities may not regulate the siting or construction of personal wireless facilities based on RF standards that are more stringent than those promulgated by the FCC.
- Section 704 mandates that local governments act upon personal wireless service facility siting applications to place, construct, or modify a facility within a reasonable time (See 47 U.S.C.332(c)(7)(B)(ii) and FCC Shot Clock ruling setting forth “reasonable time” standards for applications deemed complete).
- Section 704 also mandates that the FCC provide technical support to local governments in order to encourage them to make property, rights-of-way, and easements under their jurisdiction available for the placement of new spectrum-based telecommunications services. This proceeding is currently at the comment stage.

For more information on the FCC’s jurisdiction in this area, consult the following:

Competition & Infrastructure Policy Division (CIPD) of the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, main division number: (202) 418-1310.

Main division website:

<https://www.fcc.gov/general/competition-infrastructure-policy-division-wireless-telecommunications-bureau>

Tower siting:

<https://www.fcc.gov/general/tower-and-antenna-siting>

SITE DESCRIPTION

The project site consists of an existing City street light pole located in the public right-of-way (sidewalk, towards the curb) that measures 26 feet in height. The “cobra head”-style lamp projects over Telegraph Avenue at a height of 31’-4”. The pole is semi-decorative or ornate. The light pole is placed on the northwest corner of Telegraph Avenue and Thomas L. Berkeley Way and is adjacent to a single story commercial structure. The sidewalk measures approximately ten feet in depth. The light pole is not situated directly in front of any windows and does not create a view obstruction. Properties across the streets (approximately 64 feet in distance) are used as a parking lot, a multi-story apartment structure with retail ground floor and offices. Utilities are undergrounded in the districts; poles along Thomas L. Berkeley Way contain a more ornate-style bulb. The district is not a historic Area of Importance.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposal is to establish a Monopole Telecommunications Facility (“small cell site”). The project involves attaching an antenna and equipment to a 26-foot tall light pole. The applicant intends to replace the metal street light pole to match the existing in order to accommodate new internal-located conduits. One antenna, measuring 23.5” and 7.9” in diameter, would be installed on top of the pole at heights of 26-feet to

31'-4". Various equipment would be installed on the light pole between 9-feet to approximately 15-feet in height.

GENERAL PLAN ANALYSIS

The site is located in a Central Business District area under the General Plan's Land Use and Transportation Element (LUTE). The intent of the area is: *"to encourage, support, and enhance the downtown are as a high density mixed use urban center of regional importance and a primary hub for business, communications, office, government, high technology, retail, entertainment, and transportation in Northern California."* Given mixed use activities and customers' increasing reliance upon cellular service for phone and internet, the proposal for a Monopole Telecommunications Facility that is not adjacent to a primary living space or historic structure conforms to this intent.

Staff therefore finds the proposal, as conditioned, to conform to the General Plan.

ZONING ANALYSIS

The site is located within the Central Business District Pedestrian Retail Commercial Zone (CBD-P). The intent of the CBD-P Zone is: *"to create, maintain, and enhance areas of the Central Business District for ground-level, pedestrian-oriented, active storefront uses. Upper story spaces are intended to be available for a wide range of office and residential activities."* Per OMC section 17.136.040 and 17.128.080, Monopole Telecommunications Facilities on City light poles require a Conditional Use Permit and a Regular Design Review with additional findings when located within 300 feet of the boundary of any residential zone. The Central Business District Residential Zone (CBD-R) is situated 117 feet southwest from the proposed monopole. New wireless telecommunications facilities may also be subject to a Site Alternatives Analysis, Site Design Alternatives Analysis, and a satisfactory radio-frequency (RF) emissions report. Staff analyzes the proposal in consideration of these requirements in the 'Key Issues and Impacts' section of this report. Additionally, attachment to City infrastructure requires review by the City's Real Estate Department, Public Works Agency's Electrical Division, and Information Technology Department. Given increase reliance upon cellular service for phone and Wi-Fi, the proposal for a Monopole Telecommunications Facility that is not adjacent to a primary living space or historic structure conforms to this intent.

Staff finds the proposal, as conditioned, to conform to the Planning Code.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines categorically exempts specific types of projects from environmental review. Section 15301 exempts projects involving 'Existing Facilities'; Section 15302 exempts projects involving 'Replacement or Reconstruction'; and, Section 15303 exempts projects involving 'Construction of Small Structures.' The proposal fits all of these descriptions. The project is also subject to Section 15183 for 'Projects consistent with a community plan, general plan or zoning.' The project is therefore exempt from further Environmental Review.

KEY ISSUES AND IMPACTS

The proposal to establish a Monopole Telecommunications Facility is subject to the following Planning Code development standards, which are followed by staff's analysis in relation to this application:

17.128.080 Monopole Telecommunications Facilities.

A. General Development Standards for Monopole Telecommunications Facilities.

1. Applicant and owner shall allow other future wireless communications companies including public and quasi-public agencies using similar technology to collocate antenna equipment and facilities on the monopole unless specific technical or other constraints, subject to independent verification, at the applicant's expense, at the discretion of the City of Oakland Zoning Manager, prohibit said collocation. Applicant and other wireless carriers shall provide a mechanism for the construction and maintenance of shared facilities and infrastructure and shall provide for equitable sharing of cost in accordance with industry standards. Construction of future facilities shall not interrupt or interfere with the continuous operation of applicant's facilities.

The proposal involves using a replacement of a City of Oakland metal street light pole for the wireless communication facility that would be available for future collocation purposes.

2. The equipment shelter or cabinet must be concealed from public view or made compatible with the architecture of the surrounding structures or placed underground. The shelter or cabinet must be regularly maintained.

Recommended conditions of approval require painting and texturing the antenna and equipment to match the appearance of the metal pole. There is no equipment shelter or cabinet proposed, however, minimal equipment would be closely mounted on the side of the metal pole.

3. When a monopole is in a Residential Zone or adjacent to a residential use, it must be set back from the nearest residential lot line a distance at least equal to its total height.

The existing City light pole is located across the street from residential uses and meets the distance requirement. The closest residential property lot line is situated sixty-five feet from the light pole. The proposed antenna would be placed on top of the light pole at a maximum height of 31'-4".

4. In all zones other than the D-CE-5, D-CE-6, IG, CIX-2, and IO Zones, the maximum height of Monopole Telecommunications Facilities and connecting appurtenances may be increased from the otherwise required maximum height to forty-five (45) feet upon the granting of a Conditional Use Permit (see Chapter 17.134 for the Conditional Use Permit Procedure).

This requirement does not apply. The subject property is not located in any of the described zoning districts. Nonetheless, the facility would not exceed the height of 31'-4".

5. In the D-CE-5, D-CE-6, CIX-2, and IO Zones, the maximum height of Monopole Telecommunications Facilities and connecting appurtenances may be increased from the otherwise required maximum height to eighty (80) feet upon the granting of a Conditional Use Permit (see Chapter 17.134 for the Conditional Use Permit Procedure).

This requirement does not apply. The subject property is not located in any of the described zoning districts. Nonetheless, the facility would not exceed the height of 31'-4".

6. In the IG Zone, the maximum height of Monopole Telecommunications Facilities and connecting appurtenances may reach a height of forty-five (45) feet. These facilities may reach a height of eighty (80) feet upon the granting of Regular Design Review approval (see Chapter 17.136 for the Design Review Procedure).

This requirement does not apply. The subject property is not located in the described zoning districts. Nonetheless, the facility would not exceed the height of 31'-4".

7. The applicant shall submit written documentation demonstrating that the emissions from the proposed project are within the limits set by the Federal Communications Commission.

This standard is met by the proposal; a satisfactory emissions report has been submitted and is attached to this report (Attachment F).

8. Antennas may not extend more than fifteen (15) feet above their supporting structure.

The proposed antenna would not be less than fifteen feet above the City light pole.

17.128.110 Site location preferences.

New wireless facilities shall generally be located on the following properties or facilities in order of preference:

- A. Co-located on an existing structure or facility with existing wireless antennas.**
- B. City-owned properties or other public or quasi-public facilities.**
- C. Existing commercial or industrial structures in Nonresidential Zones (excluding all HBX Zones and the D-CE-3 and D-CE-4 Zones).**
- D. Existing commercial or industrial structures in Residential Zones, HBX Zones, or the DCE-3 or D-CE-4 Zones.**
- E. Other Nonresidential uses in Residential Zones, HBX Zones, or the D-CE-3 or D-CE-4 Zones.**
- F. Residential uses in Nonresidential Zones (excluding all HBX Zones and the D-CE-3 and D-CE-4 Zones).**
- G. Residential uses in Residential Zones, HBX Zones, or the D-CE-3 or D-CE-4 Zones.**

Facilities locating on an A, B or C ranked preference do not require a site alternatives analysis. Facilities proposing to locate on a D through G ranked preference, inclusive, must submit a site alternatives analysis as part of the required application materials. A site alternatives analysis shall, at a minimum, consist of: a. The identification of all A, B and C ranked preference sites within one thousand (1,000) feet of the proposed location. If more than three (3) sites in each preference order exist, the three such closest to the proposed location shall be required. b. Written evidence indicating why each such identified alternative cannot be used. Such evidence shall be in sufficient detail that independent verification, at the applicant's expense, could be obtained if required by the City of Oakland Zoning Manager. Evidence should indicate if the reason an alternative was rejected was technical (e.g. incorrect height, interference from existing RF sources, inability to cover required area) or for other concerns (e.g. refusal to lease, inability to provide utilities).

A site alternatives analysis is not required because the proposal conforms to 'B' as it would be located on a public facility (City light pole). Nonetheless, the applicant has submitted an analysis which is attached to this report (Attachment E).

17.128.120 Site design preferences.

New wireless facilities shall generally be designed in the following order of preference:

- A. Building or structure mounted antennas completely concealed from view.**
- B. Building or structure mounted antennas set back from roof edge, not visible from public right-of way.**
- C. Building or structure mounted antennas below roof line (facade mount, pole mount) visible from public right-of-way, painted to match existing structure.**

D. Building or structure mounted antennas above roof line visible from public right-of-way.

E. Monopoles.

F. Towers.

Facilities designed to meet an A or B ranked preference do not require a site design alternatives analysis. Facilities designed to meet a C through F ranked preference, inclusive, must submit a site design alternatives analysis as part of the required application materials. A site design alternatives analysis shall, at a minimum, consist of: a. Written evidence indicating why each such higher preference design alternative cannot be used. Such evidence shall be in sufficient detail that independent verification could be obtained if required by the City of Oakland Zoning Manager. Evidence should indicate if the reason an alternative was rejected was technical (e.g. incorrect height, interference from existing RF sources, inability to cover required area) or for other concerns (e.g. inability to provide utilities, construction or structural impediments).

The proposal most closely conforms to 'E' (monopole) and the applicant has submitted a satisfactory site design alternatives analysis (Attachment E).

17.128.130 Radio frequency emissions standards.

The applicant for all wireless facilities, including requests for modifications to existing facilities, shall submit the following verifications:

- a. With the initial application, a RF emissions report, prepared by a licensed professional engineer or other expert, indicating that the proposed site will operate within the current acceptable thresholds as established by the Federal government or any such agency who may be subsequently authorized to establish such standards.**
- b. Prior to commencement of construction, a RF emissions report indicating the baseline RF emissions condition at the proposed site.**
- c. Prior to final building permit sign off, an RF emissions report indicating that the site is actually operating within the acceptable thresholds as established by the Federal government or any such agency who may be subsequently authorized to establish such standards.**

A satisfactory report is attached to this report (Attachment F).

Analysis

The proposed site design would not be situated on a historic pole or structure, would not create a view obstruction, would not be directly adjacent to a primary living space such as a living room or bedroom window. The antenna is intended to be placed at the corner of a wide intersection where no immediate structures to the east, southeast and southwest are located. The closest structure is a single story facility used for retail. The proposed antenna would have no projection over the sidewalk/street. The antenna would be placed on top of the existing metal light pole. Staff, therefore, finds the proposal to provide an essential service with a least-intrusive possible design. Draft conditions of approval stipulate that the components be painted and textured to match the metal pole in appearance for camouflaging.


Outreach

The applicant held a community meeting open to the public to introduce the technology in Downtown Oakland on February 24, 2017. The applicant also conducted additional outreach on April 10, 2017 in East Oakland.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval subject to recommended Conditions of Approval.

- RECOMMENDATIONS:**
1. Affirm staff's environmental determination.
 2. Approve the Conditional Use Permit and Major Design Review subject to the attached Findings and Conditions of Approval.

Prepared by:



MARILU GARCIA
Planner I

Approved by:



SCOTT MILLER
Zoning Manager

Approved for forwarding to the
City Planning Commission:



DARIN RANELLETTI, Interim Director
Planning and Building Department

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. Findings
- B. Conditions of Approval
- C. Plans
- D. Applicant's Photo-Simulations
- E. Site Alternatives Analysis/Site Design Alternatives Analysis dated October 28, 2016
- F. RF Emissions Report by Hammett & Edison, Inc. dated October 19, 2016
- G. Applicant's Proof of Public Notification Posting

ATTACHMENT A: FINDINGS

This proposal meets the required findings under General Use Permit Criteria (OMC Section 17.134.050); Conditional Use Permit Criteria for Monopole Facilities (OMC Section 17.128.080 (C)), Regular Design Review Criteria for Nonresidential Facilities (OMC Sec. 17.136.050(B)) and Telecommunications Regulations/Design Review Criteria for Monopole Telecommunications Facilities (OMC Sec. 17.128.080(B)), as set forth below. Required findings are shown in **bold type**; explanations as to why these findings can be made are in normal type.

SECTION 17.134.050 – GENERAL USE PERMIT CRITERIA:

A. That the location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed development will be compatible with and will not adversely affect the livability or appropriate development of abutting properties and the surrounding neighborhood, with consideration to be given to harmony in scale, bulk, coverage, and density; to the availability of civic facilities and utilities; to harmful effect, if any, upon desirable neighborhood character; to the generation of traffic and the capacity of surrounding streets; and to any other relevant impact of the development.

The proposal involves the placement of a Monopole Facility in close proximity to a residential zone but not immediately adjacent to a residential use. Specifically, it will provide for one new antenna to the upper portion of an existing City light pole located in the northwest corner of Telegraph Avenue and Thomas L. Berkeley Way. The antenna and equipment is to be camouflaged and match the metal pole. The project will be compatible with the neighborhood; it meets special findings and is intended to improve wireless services in the neighborhood.

B. That the location, design, and site planning of the proposed development will provide a convenient and functional living, working, shopping, or civic environment, and will be as attractive as the nature of the use and its location and setting warrant.

The intent is to place a monopole within 300 feet of residential zone, at a corner location and across from mixed uses to improve wireless services in the area. The inclusion of camouflaging paint will lessen the impacts of the proposed facility.

C. That the proposed development will enhance the successful operation of the surrounding area in its basic community functions, or will provide an essential service to the community or region.

The placement of the proposed monopole facility will provide wireless communication services in the neighborhood.

D. That the proposal conforms to all applicable design review criteria set forth in the design review procedure at Section 17.136.070.

The proposal conforms to Design Review findings which are included in that section of this attachment of Findings for Approval.

E. That the proposal conforms in all significant respects with the Oakland Comprehensive Plan and with any other applicable plan or development control map which has been adopted by the City Council.

The project is consistent with the following Objectives of the Oakland General Plan's Land Use & Transportation Element (adopted 1998):

Civic and Institutional Uses, Objective N2: Encourage adequate civic, institutional, and educational facilities located within Oakland, appropriately designed and sited to serve the community.

Infrastructure, Objective N12: Provide adequate infrastructure to meet the needs of Oakland's growing community.

The proposal to expand a wireless telecommunications facility will not create functional issues for the area and the project possesses a satisfactory emissions report.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CRITERIA FOR MONOPOLE FACILITIES (OMC SEC. 17.128.070(C))

1. The project must meet the special design review criteria listed in subsection B of this section.

The proposal conforms to Design Review findings which are included in that section of this attachment of Findings for Approval.

2. Monopoles should not be located any closer than one thousand five hundred (1,500) feet from existing monopoles unless technologically required or visually preferable.

The request is part of proposed small cell network. This network consists of a series of radio access nodes connected to small telecommunications antennas to distribute wireless communication signals. Monopoles within the network may be located within one thousand five hundred feet and the applicant has submitted documentation to demonstration that such arrangement is technologically required and/or visually preferable to a minimum distance separation. (Attachment E)

3. The proposed project must not disrupt the overall community character.

The Monopole Facility will not alter or disrupt the current overall character of the community as it will be attached to an existing City light pole. The antenna will be painted and texturized to match existing metal pole in appearance for camouflaging providing for a the least intrusive design, as required by conditions of approval.

4. If a major conditional use permit is required, the Planning Director or the Planning Commission may request independent expert review regarding site location, collocation and facility configuration. Any party may request that the Planning Commission consider making such request for independent expert review.

An independent expert review may be requested by the specified parties. No expert review has been requested as of now.

REGULAR DESIGN REVIEW CRITERIA FOR NON-RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES (OMC SEC. 17.136.050(B))

1. That the proposed design will create a building or set of buildings that are well related to the surrounding area in their setting, scale, bulk, height, materials, and textures:

The attachment of a small antenna and equipment to a non-historic City light pole, painted and texturized to match the pole in appearance for camouflaging, will be the least intrusive design. The antenna will be placed on top of the City light pole and away from the closest residences.

2. That the proposed design will protect, preserve, or enhance desirable neighborhood characteristics;

The proposal will not create a view obstruction, be directly adjacent to a primary living space such as a living room or bedroom window, or be located on an historic structure.

3. The project will provide a necessary function without negatively impacting surrounding opens pace and hillside residential properties.

The proposal will enhance essential services in an urbanized neighborhood.

4. That the proposed design will be sensitive to the topography and landscape.

The proposal will not be ground mounted.

5. That, if situated on a hill, the design and massing of the proposed building relates to the grade of the hill.

This finding is inapplicable because the site is level.

6. That the proposed design conforms in all significant respects with the Oakland General Plan and with any applicable design review guidelines or criteria, district plan, or development control map which have been adopted by the Planning Commission or City Council.

The site is located in a Central Business District area under the General Plan's Land Use and Transportation Element (LUTE). The intent of the area is: *"to encourage, support, and enhance the downtown are as a high density mixed use urban center of regional importance and a primary hub for business, communications, office, government, high technology, retail, entertainment, and transportation in Northern California."* Given mixed use activities in the area and other customers increasing reliance upon cellular service for phone and internet, the proposal for a Monopole Telecommunications Facility that is not adjacent to a primary living space or historic structure conforms to this intent.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS REGULATIONS/DESIGN REVIEW CRITERIA FOR MONOPOLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES (OMC SEC. 17.128.080(B))

1. Collocation is to be encouraged when it will decrease visual impact and collocation is to be discouraged when it will increase negative visual impact.

The project does not involve collocation as it involves the establishment of a new telecommunications facility; however, the project should not preclude any future proposals for location at the site.

2. Monopoles should not be sited to create visual clutter or negatively affect specific views.

The Monopole Facility is sited at a corner location where it will not create clutter or negatively affect specific views. The closest structure is a single story commercial structure and the Monopole Facility is not adjacent to any windows.

3. Monopoles shall be screened from the public view wherever possible.

The Monopole Facility will be camouflaged and placed as an attachment to an existing light pole. The antenna and equipment will be texturized to match the pole in appearance. The antenna will be placed on top of the City light pole and away from the closest residences.

4. The equipment shelter or cabinet must be concealed from public view or made compatible with the architecture of the surrounding structures or placed underground. The shelter or cabinet must be regularly maintained.

Recommended conditions of approval require painting and texturing the antenna and equipment to match the appearance of the metal pole. There is no equipment shelter or cabinet proposed, however minimal equipment would be closely mounted on the side of the metal pole.

5. Site location and development shall preserve the preexisting character of the surrounding buildings and land uses and the zone district as much as possible. Wireless communication towers shall be integrated through location and design to blend in with the existing characteristics of the site to the extent practical. Existing on-site vegetation shall be preserved or improved, and disturbance of the existing topography shall be minimized, unless such disturbance would result in less visual impact of the site to the surrounding area.

The proposed Monopole Facility will be placed in an existing non-decorative City Light pole. This enables the preservation of character in the area and will not pose a negative visual impact as the proposal will be camouflaged to match the pole. There is no impact on existing vegetation or topography as this is an existing City light pole.

6. That all reasonable means of reducing public access to the antennas and equipment has been made, including, but not limited to, placement in or on buildings or structures, fencing, anti-climbing measures and anti-tampering devices.

The minimal clearance to the facility will be nine-feet.

Attachment B: Conditions of Approval

Approved Use

The project shall be constructed and operated in accordance with the authorized use as described in the approved application materials, **staff report** and the approved plans **dated September 12, 2016 and submitted November 20, 2016**, as amended by the following conditions of approval and mitigation measures, if applicable (“Conditions of Approval” or “Conditions”).

2. Effective Date, Expiration, Extensions and Extinguishment

This Approval shall become effective immediately, unless the Approval is appealable, in which case the Approval shall become effective in ten calendar days unless an appeal is filed. Unless a different termination date is prescribed, this Approval shall expire **two calendar years** from the Approval date, or from the date of the final decision in the event of an appeal, unless within such period all necessary permits for construction or alteration have been issued, or the authorized activities have commenced in the case of a permit not involving construction or alteration. Upon written request and payment of appropriate fees submitted no later than the expiration date of this Approval, the Director of City Planning or designee may grant a one-year extension of this date, with additional extensions subject to approval by the approving body. Expiration of any necessary building permit or other construction-related permit for this project may invalidate this Approval if said Approval has also expired. If litigation is filed challenging this Approval, or its implementation, then the time period stated above for obtaining necessary permits for construction or alteration and/or commencement of authorized activities is automatically extended for the duration of the litigation.

3. Compliance with Other Requirements

The project applicant shall comply with all other applicable federal, state, regional, and local laws/codes, requirements, regulations, and guidelines, including but not limited to those imposed by the City’s Bureau of Building, Fire Marshal, and Public Works Department. Compliance with other applicable requirements may require changes to the approved use and/or plans. These changes shall be processed in accordance with the procedures contained in Condition #4.

4. Minor and Major Changes

- a. Minor changes to the approved project, plans, Conditions, facilities, or use may be approved administratively by the Director of City Planning.
- b. Major changes to the approved project, plans, Conditions, facilities, or use shall be reviewed by the Director of City Planning to determine whether such changes require submittal and approval of a revision to the Approval by the original approving body or a new independent permit/approval. Major revisions shall be reviewed in accordance with the procedures required for the original permit/approval. A new independent permit/approval shall be reviewed in accordance with the procedures required for the new permit/approval.

5. Compliance with Conditions of Approval

- a. The project applicant and property owner, including successors, (collectively referred to hereafter as the “project applicant” or “applicant”) shall be responsible for compliance with all the Conditions of Approval and any recommendations contained in any submitted and approved technical report at his/her sole cost and expense, subject to review and approval by the City of Oakland.
- b. The City of Oakland reserves the right at any time during construction to require certification by a licensed professional at the project applicant’s expense that the as-built project

conforms to all applicable requirements, including but not limited to, approved maximum heights and minimum setbacks. Failure to construct the project in accordance with the Approval may result in remedial reconstruction, permit revocation, permit modification, stop work, permit suspension, or other corrective action.

- c. Violation of any term, Condition, or project description relating to the Approval is unlawful, prohibited, and a violation of the Oakland Municipal Code. The City of Oakland reserves the right to initiate civil and/or criminal enforcement and/or abatement proceedings, or after notice and public hearing, to revoke the Approval or alter these Conditions if it is found that there is violation of any of the Conditions or the provisions of the Planning Code or Municipal Code, or the project operates as or causes a public nuisance. This provision is not intended to, nor does it, limit in any manner whatsoever the ability of the City to take appropriate enforcement actions. The project applicant shall be responsible for paying fees in accordance with the City's Master Fee Schedule for inspections conducted by the City or a City-designated third-party to investigate alleged violations of the Approval or Conditions.

6. Signed Copy of the Approval/Conditions

A copy of the Approval letter and Conditions shall be signed by the project applicant, attached to each set of permit plans submitted to the appropriate City agency for the project, and made available for review at the project job site at all times.

7. Blight/Nuisances

The project site shall be kept in a blight/nuisance-free condition. Any existing blight or nuisance shall be abated within 60 days of approval, unless an earlier date is specified elsewhere.

8. Indemnification

- a. To the maximum extent permitted by law, the project applicant shall defend (with counsel acceptable to the City), indemnify, and hold harmless the City of Oakland, the Oakland City Council, the Oakland Redevelopment Successor Agency, the Oakland City Planning Commission, and their respective agents, officers, employees, and volunteers (hereafter collectively called "City") from any liability, damages, claim, judgment, loss (direct or indirect), action, causes of action, or proceeding (including legal costs, attorneys' fees, expert witness or consultant fees, City Attorney or staff time, expenses or costs) (collectively called "Action") against the City to attack, set aside, void or annul this Approval or implementation of this Approval. The City may elect, in its sole discretion, to participate in the defense of said Action and the project applicant shall reimburse the City for its reasonable legal costs and attorneys' fees.
- b. Within ten (10) calendar days of the filing of any Action as specified in subsection (a) above, the project applicant shall execute a Joint Defense Letter of Agreement with the City, acceptable to the Office of the City Attorney, which memorializes the above obligations. These obligations and the Joint Defense Letter of Agreement shall survive termination, extinguishment, or invalidation of the Approval. Failure to timely execute the Letter of Agreement does not relieve the project applicant of any of the obligations contained in this Condition or other requirements or Conditions of Approval that may be imposed by the City.

9. Severability

The Approval would not have been granted but for the applicability and validity of each and every one of the specified Conditions, and if one or more of such Conditions is found to be invalid by a

court of competent jurisdiction this Approval would not have been granted without requiring other valid Conditions consistent with achieving the same purpose and intent of such Approval.

10. Job Site Plans

Ongoing throughout demolition, grading, and/or construction

At least one (1) copy of the stamped approved plans, along with the Approval Letter and Conditions of Approval, shall be available for review at the job site at all times.

11. Special Inspector/Inspections, Independent Technical Review, Project Coordination and Monitoring

The project applicant may be required to cover the full costs of independent third-party technical review and City monitoring and inspection, including without limitation, special inspector(s)/inspection(s) during times of extensive or specialized plan-check review or construction, and inspections of potential violations of the Conditions of Approval. The project applicant shall establish a deposit with the Bureau of Building, if directed by the Building Official, Director of City Planning, or designee, prior to the issuance of a construction-related permit and on an ongoing as-needed basis.

12. Public Improvements

The project applicant shall obtain all necessary permits/approvals, such as encroachment permits, obstruction permits, curb/gutter/sidewalk permits, and public improvement ("p-job") permits from the City for work in the public right-of-way, including but not limited to, streets, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, utilities, and fire hydrants. Prior to any work in the public right-of-way, the applicant shall submit plans for review and approval by the Bureau of Planning, the Bureau of Building, and other City departments as required. Public improvements shall be designed and installed to the satisfaction of the City.

13. Construction Days/Hours

Requirement: The project applicant shall comply with the following restrictions concerning construction days and hours:

- a. Construction activities are limited to between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, except that pier drilling and/or other extreme noise generating activities greater than 90 dBA shall be limited to between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m.
- b. Construction activities are limited to between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturday. In residential zones and within 300 feet of a residential zone, construction activities are allowed from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. only within the interior of the building with the doors and windows closed. No pier drilling or other extreme noise generating activities greater than 90 dBA are allowed on Saturday.
- c. No construction is allowed on Sunday or federal holidays.

Construction activities include, but are not limited to, truck idling, moving equipment (including trucks, elevators, etc.) or materials, deliveries, and construction meetings held on-site in a non-enclosed area.

Any construction activity proposed outside of the above days and hours for special activities (such as concrete pouring which may require more continuous amounts of time) shall be evaluated on a case-by-case basis by the City, with criteria including the urgency/emergency nature of the work, the proximity of residential or other sensitive uses, and a consideration of nearby residents'/occupants' preferences. The project applicant shall notify property owners and occupants located within 300 feet at least 14 calendar days prior to construction activity proposed outside of

the above days/hours. When submitting a request to the City to allow construction activity outside of the above days/hours, the project applicant shall submit information concerning the type and duration of proposed construction activity and the draft public notice for City review and approval prior to distribution of the public notice.

When Required: During construction

Initial Approval: N/A

Monitoring/Inspection: Bureau of Building

PROJECT-SPECIFIC CONDITIONS

14. Emissions Report

Requirement: A RF emissions report shall be submitted to the Planning Bureau indicating that the site is actually operating within the acceptable thresholds as established by the Federal government or any such agency who may be subsequently authorized to establish such standards.

Requirement: Prior to a final inspection

When Required: Prior to final building permit inspection sign-off

Initial Approval: N/A

Monitoring/Inspection: N/A

15. Camouflage

Requirement: The antenna shall be painted, texturized, and maintained matte silver, and the equipment and any other accessory items including cables matte brown, to better camouflage the facility to the City light pole.

When Required: Prior to a final inspection

Initial Approval: N/A

Monitoring/Inspection: Bureau of Building

16. Operational

Requirement: Noise levels from the activity, property, or any mechanical equipment on site shall comply with the performance standards of Section 17.120 of the Oakland Planning Code and Section 8.18 of the Oakland Municipal Code. If noise levels exceed these standards, the activity causing the noise shall be abated until appropriate noise reduction measures have been installed and compliance verified by the Planning and Zoning Division and Building Services.

When Required: Ongoing

Initial Approval: N/A

Monitoring/Inspection: Bureau of Building

17. Possible District Undergrounding PG&E Pole

Requirement: Should the City light pole be permanently removed for purposes of district undergrounding or otherwise, the telecommunications facility can only be re-established by applying for and receiving approval of a new application to the Oakland Planning Bureau as required by the regulations.

When Required: Ongoing

Initial Approval: N/A

Monitoring/Inspection: N/A

18. Graffiti Control Requirement:

- a. During construction and operation of the project, the project applicant shall incorporate best management practices reasonably related to the control of graffiti and/or the mitigation of the impacts of graffiti. Such best management practices may include, without limitation:
- b. The project applicant shall remove graffiti by appropriate means within seventy-two (72) hours. Appropriate means include the following:
 - i. Removal through scrubbing, washing, sanding, and/or scraping (or similar method) without damaging the surface and without discharging wash water or cleaning detergents into the City storm drain system.
 - ii. For galvanized poles, covering with new paint to match the color of the surrounding surface.
 - iii. Replace pole numbers.



When Required: Ongoing

Initial Approval: N/A

Monitoring/Inspection: Bureau of Building

NW-CA-SANFRNMC-07134A

ADJACENT TO (IN PROW)
2003 TELEGRAPH AVE
OAKLAND, CA 94612



CODE COMPLIANCE

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 (AS APPLICABLE). NOTHING IN THESE PLANS IS TO BE CONSTRUCTED TO PERMIT WORK NOT CONFORMING TO THESE CODES.

- 1: IBC - 2012
- 2: CALIFORNIA BUILDING STANDARDS CODE - 2013
- 3: CALIFORNIA GENERAL ORDER 95
- 4: CALIFORNIA MECHANICAL CODE 2013
- 5: CALIFORNIA PLUMBING CODE 2013
- 6: CALIFORNIA ELECTRICAL CODE 2013
- 7: CITY AND/OR COUNTY ORDINANCES
- 8: 2012 INTERNATIONAL FIRE CODE
- 9: BUILDING OFFICIALS AND CODE ADMINISTRATORS (BOCA)
*EFFECTIVE UNTIL JANUARY 1ST, 2017

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

THESE DRAWINGS DEPICT THE INSTALLATION OF A WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS NODE IN THE PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY. HARDWARE AND ANCILLARY EQUIPMENT TO BE INSTALLED AS DESCRIBED HEREIN.

GENERAL PROJECT NOTES

1. PRIOR TO SUBMITTING A BID, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL FAMILIARIZE HIMSELF/HERSELF WITH THE SCOPE OF WORK AND ALL CONDITIONS AFFECTING THE NEW PROJECT.
2. CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL FIELD CONDITIONS AND DIMENSIONS OF THE JOB SITE AND CONFIRM THAT WORK AS INDICATED ON THESE CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED AS SHOWN PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF ANY WORK.
3. ALL FIELD MODIFICATIONS BEFORE, DURING OR AFTER CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE APPROVED IN WRITING BY AN EXTENET SYSTEMS REPRESENTATIVE.
4. INSTALL ALL EQUIPMENT AND MATERIALS PER THE MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDATIONS, UNLESS INDICATED OTHERWISE.
5. NOTIFY EXTENET SYSTEMS, IN WRITING, OF ANY MAJOR DISCREPANCIES REGARDING THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS, EXISTING CONDITIONS, AND DESIGN INTENT. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING CLARIFICATIONS FROM AN EXTENET SYSTEMS REPRESENTATIVE, AND ADJUSTING THE BID ACCORDINGLY.
6. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE SOLELY RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL CONSTRUCTION MEANS, METHODS, TECHNIQUES, SEQUENCES AND PROCEDURES OF THE WORK UNDER THE CONTRACT.
7. CONTRACTOR SHALL PROTECT ALL EXISTING IMPROVEMENTS AND FINISHES THAT ARE TO REMAIN. CONTRACTOR SHALL REPAIR ANY DAMAGE THAT MAY OCCUR DURING THE CONSTRUCTION TO THE SATISFACTION OF AN EXTENET SYSTEMS REPRESENTATIVE.
8. CONTRACTOR PLANS TO ILLUSTRATE THE AS-BUILT CONDITION OF THE SITE. FOLLOWING THE FINAL INSPECTION BY EXTENET, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE EXTENET SYSTEMS WITH ONE COPY OF ALL RED-LINED DRAWINGS.
9. VERIFY ALL FINAL EQUIPMENT WITH AN EXTENET SYSTEMS REPRESENTATIVE. ALL EQUIPMENT LAYOUT, SPECS, PERFORMANCE INSTALLATION AND THEIR FINAL LOCATION ARE TO BE APPROVED BY EXTENET SYSTEMS. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR COORDINATING HIS/HER WORK WITH THE WORK AND CLEARANCES REQUIRED BY OTHERS RELATED TO SAID INSTALLATIONS.



INTERNAL REVIEW	
CONSTRUCTION SIGNATURE	DATE
RF SIGNATURE	DATE
REAL ESTATE SIGNATURE	DATE

BLACK & VEATCH CORPORATION
2999 OAK ROAD
SUITE 490
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94597

THESE DRAWINGS ARE COPYRIGHTED AND ARE THE PROPERTY OF BLACK & VEATCH; PRODUCED SOLELY FOR THE USE OF OUR CLIENT. ANY REPRODUCTION OR USE OF THE INFORMATION CONTAINED WITHIN SAID DRAWINGS IS PROHIBITED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT BY BLACK & VEATCH.

PROJECT NO.	DRAWN BY	CHECKED BY
192417.XXXX	JAT	LW

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
B	11/21/16	ISSUED FOR REVIEW
A	11/17/16	ISSUED FOR REVIEW

PRELIMINARY

IT IS A VIOLATION OF LAW FOR ANY PERSON, UNLESS THEY ARE ACTING UNDER THE DIRECTION OF A LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER, TO ALTER THIS DOCUMENT.

EXTENET SYSTEMS (CA) LLC
2000 CROW CANYON PLACE
SUITE 210
SAN RAMON, CA 94583

SITE ADDRESS
ADJACENT TO (IN PROW)
2003 TELEGRAPH AVE
OAKLAND, CA 94612

SHEET TITLE
TITLE SHEET

SHEET NUMBER
T-1

SHEET INDEX

SHEET NO:	SHEET TITLE
T-1	TITLE SHEET
GN-1	GENERAL NOTES AND LEGEND
C-1	OVERALL SITE PLAN
C-2	UTILITY POLE ELEVATIONS AND RISER DETAILS
C-3	EQUIPMENT DETAILS
C-4	EQUIPMENT DETAILS
C-5	CONCEPTUAL WIRING DIAGRAMS

PROJECT INFORMATION

POLE OWNER	APPLICANT
OWNER: CITY OF OAKLAND ADDRESS: 7101 EDGEWATER DRIVE OAKLAND, CA 94621 PHONE: -	COMPANY: EXTENET SYSTEMS CALIFORNIA, LLC. CONTACT: MATTHEW YERGOVICH ADDRESS: 2000 CROW CANYON PLACE, SUITE 210 SAN RAMON, CA 94583 PHONE: (415) 596-3474 E-MAIL: MYERGOVICH@EXTENETSYSTEMS.COM

AGENT	ENGINEER	PROJECT DATA
COMPANY: BLACK & VEATCH CONTACT: ANA GOMEZ ADDRESS: 2999 OAK ROAD, SUITE 490 WALNUT CREEK, CA 94597 PHONE: (913) 458-9148 E-MAIL: GOMEZABARCAA@BV.COM	COMPANY: BLACK & VEATCH ENGINEER: AARON EVANS PHONE: (952) 896-0751 E-MAIL: EVANSRA@BV.COM	LATITUDE: 37.809678 LONGITUDE: -122.269688 POLE #: A2678 ELEVATION: XXXX' AMSL ZONING JURISDICTION: CITY OF OAKLAND ZONING DISTRICT: CBD-P NEAREST A.P.N.: 008-064500500 OCCUPANCY: U, UNMANNED CONSTRUCTION TYPE: ATTACHMENTS TO A METAL/STREET LIGHT POLE TITLE 24 REQUIREMENTS: FACILITY IS UNMANNED AND NOT FOR HUMAN HABITATION. THIS PROJECT IS EXEMPT.

IF USING 11"X17" PLOT, DRAWINGS WILL BE HALF SCALE

SUBCONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL PLANS & EXISTING DIMENSIONS & CONDITIONS ON THE JOB SITE & SHALL IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY THE ENGINEER IN WRITING OF ANY DISCREPANCIES BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH THE WORK OR BE RESPONSIBLE FOR SAME

UNDERGROUND SERVICE ALERT
UTILITIES PROTECTION CENTER, INC.
811
48 HOURS BEFORE YOU DIG

GENERAL NOTES

- THESE NOTES SHALL BE CONSIDERED A PART OF THE WRITTEN SPECIFICATIONS, CONTRACT AND CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS.
- THE WORK SHALL INCLUDE FURNISHING MATERIALS, EQUIPMENT, APPURTENANCES, AND LABOR NECESSARY TO COMPLETE ALL INSTALLATIONS AS INDICATED ON THESE PLANS AND IN THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS.
- PRIOR TO THE SUBMISSION OF BIDS, THE CONTRACTOR(S) SHALL VISIT THE JOB SITE(S) AND BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL CONTRACT DOCUMENTS, FIELD CONDITIONS AND DIMENSIONS, AND CONFIRM THAT THE WORK MAY BE ACCOMPLISHED PER THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS. ANY DISCREPANCIES ARE TO BE BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION ENGINEER AND ARCHITECT/ENGINEER PRIOR TO BID SUBMITTAL.
- THE CONTRACTOR SHALL RECEIVE WRITTEN AUTHORIZATION TO PROCEED ON ANY WORK NOT CLEARLY DEFINED OR IDENTIFIED IN THE CONTRACT AND CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS BEFORE STARTING ANY WORK.
- ALL WORK PERFORMED AND MATERIALS INSTALLED SHALL BE IN STRICT ACCORDANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE CODES, REGULATIONS, AND ORDINANCES, INCLUDING APPLICABLE MUNICIPAL AND UTILITY COMPANY SPECIFICATIONS.
- THE CONTRACTOR SHALL INSTALL ALL EQUIPMENT AND MATERIALS IN ACCORDANCE WITH MANUFACTURER RECOMMENDATIONS. IF THESE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE IN CONFLICT WITH THE CONTRACT AND CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS AND/OR APPLICABLE CODES OR REGULATIONS, REVIEW AND RESOLVE THE CONFLICT WITH DIRECTION FROM THE IMPLEMENTATION ENGINEER AND ARCHITECT/ENGINEER PRIOR TO PROCEEDING.
- THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE SOLELY RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL CONSTRUCTION MEANS, METHODS, TECHNIQUES, SEQUENCES, AND PROCEDURES AND FOR COORDINATION OF ALL PORTIONS OF THE WORK UNDER THE CONTRACT INCLUDING CONTACT AND COORDINATION WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION ENGINEER AND WITH THE AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE OF ANY OUTSIDE POLE OR PROPERTY OWNER.
- THE CONTRACTOR SHALL MAKE NECESSARY PROVISIONS TO PROTECT EXISTING IMPROVEMENTS, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO PAVING, CURBS, VEGETATION, GALVANIZED SURFACE OR OTHER EXISTING ELEMENTS AND UPON COMPLETION OF THE WORK, REPAIR ANY DAMAGE THAT OCCURRED DURING CONSTRUCTION TO THE SATISFACTION OF EXTENET.
- CONTRACTOR IS TO KEEP THE GENERAL AREA CLEAN, HAZARD FREE, AND DISPOSE OF ALL DIRT, DEBRIS, RUBBISH, AND REMOVE EQUIPMENT NOT SPECIFIED AS REMAINING ON THE PROPERTY. LEAVE PREMISES IN CLEAN CONDITION DAILY.
- PLANS ARE INTENDED TO BE DIAGRAMMATIC ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE SCALED UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED. RELY ONLY ON ANNOTATED DIMENSIONS AND REQUEST INFORMATION IF ADDITIONAL DIMENSIONS ARE REQUIRED.
- THE EXISTENCE AND LOCATION OF UTILITIES AND OTHER AGENCY'S FACILITIES WERE OBTAINED BY A SEARCH OF AVAILABLE RECORDS. OTHER FACILITIES MAY EXIST. CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY LOCATIONS PRIOR TO START OF CONSTRUCTION AND USE EXTREME CARE AND PROTECTIVE MEASURES TO PREVENT DAMAGE TO THESE FACILITIES. CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PROTECTION OF UTILITIES OR OTHER AGENCY'S FACILITIES WITHIN THE LIMITS OF THE WORK. WHETHER THEY ARE IDENTIFIED IN THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS OR NOT.
- THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY UNDERGROUND SERVICE ALERT (800) 227-2600, AT LEAST TWO WORKING DAYS PRIOR TO THE START OF ANY EXCAVATION.

DEFINITIONS

- "TYPICAL" OR "TYP" MEANS THAT THIS ITEM IS SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME ACROSS SIMILAR CONDITIONS. "TYP." SHALL BE UNDERSTOOD TO MEAN "TYPICAL WHERE OCCURS" AND SHALL NOT BE CONSIDERED AS WITHOUT EXCEPTION OR CONSIDERATION OF SPECIFIC CONDITIONS.
- "SIMILAR" MEANS COMPARABLE TO CHARACTERISTICS FOR THE CONDITION NOTED. VERIFY DIMENSIONS AND ORIENTATION ON PLAN.
- "AS REQUIRED" MEANS AS REQUIRED BY REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS, BY REFERENCED STANDARDS, BY EXISTING CONDITIONS, BY GENERALLY ACCEPTED CONSTRUCTION PRACTICE, OR BY THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS.
- "ALIGN" MEANS ACCURATELY LOCATE FINISH FACES OF MATERIALS IN THE SAME PLANE.
- THE TERM "VERIFY" OR "V.I.F." SHALL BE UNDERSTOOD TO MEAN "VERIFY IN FIELD WITH ENGINEER" AND REQUIRES THAT THE CONTRACTOR CONFIRM INTENTION REGARDING NOTED CONDITION AND PROCEED ONLY AFTER RECEIVING DIRECTION.
- WHERE THE WORDS "OR EQUAL" OR WORDS OF SIMILAR INTENT FOLLOW A MATERIAL SPECIFICATION, THEY SHALL BE UNDERSTOOD TO REQUIRE SIGNED APPROVAL OF ANY DEVIATION TO SAID SPECIFICATION PRIOR TO CONTRACTOR'S ORDERING OR INSTALLATION OF SUCH PROPOSED EQUAL PRODUCT.
- FURNISH : SUPPLY ONLY, OTHERS TO INSTALL. INSTALL: INSTALL ITEMS FURNISHED BY OTHERS. PROVIDE: FURNISH AND INSTALL.

FIELD WELDING NOTES:

- WELDING TO BE PERFORMED BY AWS CERTIFIED WELDER FOR THE TYPE OF AND POSITION INDICATED. ALL WORK MUST BE IN CONFORMANCE WITH LATEST EDITION OF AWS D1.1.
- GRIND SURFACES TO BE WELDED WITH A SILICON CARBIDE WHEEL PRIOR TO WELDING TO REMOVE ALL GALVANIZING WHICH MAY OTHERWISE BE CONSUMED IN THE WELD METAL. APPLY ANTI-SPATTER COMPOUND AFTER GRINDING.
- WELDING TECHNIQUE MUST MINIMIZE TEMPERATURE RISE ON THE INSIDE SURFACE OF THE POLE AND ALSO VOLATIZE ANY REMAINING ZINC WITHIN THE BASE METAL WITH MINIMUM SPATTER. USE AN E70 (LOW HYDROGEN) ELECTRODE. USE LARGEST DIAMETER ELECTRODE COMPATIBLE WITH WELDING POSITION AND MATERIAL THICKNESS. STRICTLY FOLLOW ALL MANUFACTURER'S INSTRUCTIONS FOR STORAGE AND USE OF ELECTRODES. AVOID REMOVING ELECTRODES FROM MANUFACTURER'S PACKAGING UNTIL READY FOR IMMEDIATE USE.
- WELDING MAY PRODUCE TOXIC FUMES. REFER TO ANSI STANDARD Z49.1 "SAFETY IN WELDING AND CUTTING" FOR PROPER PRECAUTIONS.
- UPON COMPLETION OF WELDING, APPLY GALV-A-STICK ZINC COATING TO ALL UNPROTECTED SURFACES. APPLY A SECOND LAYER OF COLD GALVANIZING SPRAY COMPOUND CONTAINING A MINIMUM ZINC CONTENT OF 95%. IF NECESSARY, APPLY A FINAL COAT OF COMPATIBLE PAINT TO MATCH SURROUNDING SURFACES.

ANTENNA MOUNTING

- DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF ANTENNA SUPPORTS SHALL CONFORM TO CURRENT ANSI/TIA-222 OR APPLICABLE LOCAL CODES.
- ALL STEEL MATERIALS SHALL BE GALVANIZED AFTER FABRICATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH ASTM A123 "ZINC (HOT-DIP GALVANIZED) COATINGS ON IRON AND STEEL PRODUCTS", UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
- ALL BOLTS, ANCHORS AND MISCELLANEOUS HARDWARE SHALL BE GALVANIZED IN ACCORDANCE WITH ASTM A153 "ZINC-COATING (HOT-DIP) ON IRON AND STEEL HARDWARE", UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
- DAMAGED GALVANIZED SURFACES SHALL BE REPAIRED BY COLD GALVANIZING IN ACCORDANCE WITH ASTM A780.
- ALL ANTENNA MOUNTS SHALL BE INSTALLED WITH LOCK NUTS, DOUBLE NUTS AND SHALL BE TORQUED TO MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDATIONS.
- CONTRACTOR SHALL INSTALL ANTENNA PER MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDATION FOR INSTALLATION AND GROUNDING.
- PRIOR TO SETTING ANTENNA AZIMUTHS AND DOWNTILTS, ANTENNA CONTRACTOR SHALL CHECK THE ANTENNA MOUNT FOR TIGHTNESS AND ENSURE THAT THEY ARE PLUMB. ANTENNA AZIMUTHS SHALL BE SET FROM TRUE NORTH AND BE ORIENTED WITHIN +/- 5% AS DEFINED BY THE RFDS. ANTENNA DOWNTILTS SHALL BE WITHIN +/- 0.5% AS DEFINED BY THE RFDS.

TORQUE REQUIREMENTS

- ALL RF CONNECTIONS SHALL BE TIGHTENED BY A TORQUE WRENCH.
- ALL RF CONNECTIONS, GROUNDING HARDWARE AND ANTENNA HARDWARE SHALL HAVE A TORQUE MARK INSTALLED IN A CONTINUOUS STRAIGHT LINE FROM BOTH SIDES OF THE CONNECTION.
 - RF CONNECTION BOTH SIDES OF THE CONNECTOR.
 - GROUNDING AND ANTENNA HARDWARE ON THE NUT SIDE STARTING FROM THE THREADS TO THE SOLID SURFACE. EXAMPLE OF SOLID SURFACE: GROUND BAR, ANTENNA BRACKET METAL.
- ALL 8M ANTENNA HARDWARE SHALL BE TIGHTENED TO 9 LB-FT (12 NM).
- ALL 12M ANTENNA HARDWARE SHALL BE TIGHTENED TO 43 LB-FT (58 NM).
- ALL GROUNDING HARDWARE SHALL BE TIGHTENED UNTIL THE LOCK WASHER COLLAPSES AND THE GROUNDING HARDWARE IS NO LONGER LOOSE.
- ALL DIN TYPE CONNECTIONS SHALL BE TIGHTENED TO 18-22 LB-FT (24.4 - 29.8 NM).
- ALL N TYPE CONNECTIONS SHALL BE TIGHTENED TO 15-20 LB-IN (1.7 - 2.3 NM).


ROW UTILITY POLE CONSTRUCTION NOTES

- NO BOLT THREADS TO PROTRUDE MORE THAN 1-1/2" [.038M].
- FILL ALL HOLES LEFT IN POLE FROM REARRANGEMENT OF CLIMBERS.
- ALL CLIMB STEPS NEXT TO CONDUIT SHALL HAVE EXTENDED STEPS.
- CABLE NOT TO IMPEDE 15" [.381M] CLEAR SPACE OFF POLE FACE (12:00).
- 90 SHORT SWEEPS UNDER ANTENNA ARM. ALL CABLES MUST ONLY TRANSITION ON THE INSIDE OR BOTTOM OF ARMS (NO CABLE ON TOP OF ARMS).
- USE 90 CONNECTOR AT CABLE CONNECTION TO ANTENNAS.
- USE 1/2" [.013M] CABLE ON ANTENNAS UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED.
- FILL VOID AROUND CABLES AT CONDUIT OPENING WITH FOAM SEALANT TO PREVENT WATER INTRUSION.

NODE SITE POWER SHUT DOWN PROCEDURES

- FOR NON EMERGENCY/SCHEDULED POWER SHUT DOWN
 - CALL EXTENET SYSTEMS NOC (NETWORK OPERATIONS CENTER) (866)892-5327
 - 24 HOURS PRIOR TO SCHEDULED POWER SHUT OFF
 - PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION
 - NOC SITE NUMBER IDENTIFIED ON SITE NUMBERING STICKER
 - YOUR NAME AND REASON FOR POWER SHUTOFF
 - PROVIDE DURATION OF OUTAGE
 - UNLOCK DISCONNECT BOX, FLIP BOTH BREAKERS TO THE OFF POSITION
 - POWER SHUT OFF VERIFICATION WITH APPROVED PG&E PROCEDURES
 - NOTIFY EXTENET NOC UPON COMPLETION OF WORK
 - REINSTALL LOCK ON DISCONNECT BOX
- EMERGENCY POWER SHUT OFF
 - CALL EXTENET SYSTEMS NOC (NETWORK OPERATIONS CENTER) (866)892-5327
 - PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION
 - NOC SITE NUMBER IDENTIFIED ON SITE NUMBERING STICKER
 - YOUR NAME AND REASON FOR POWER SHUTOFF
 - PROVIDE DURATION OF OUTAGE
 - UNLOCK DISCONNECT BOX, FLIP BOTH BREAKERS TO THE OFF POSITION
 - POWER SHUT OFF VERIFICATION WITH APPROVED PG&E PROCEDURES
 - NOTIFY EXTENET NOC UPON COMPLETION OF WORK
 - REINSTALL LOCK ON DISCONNECT BOX

LEGEND



INTERNAL REVIEW	
CONSTRUCTION SIGNATURE	DATE
RF SIGNATURE	DATE
REAL ESTATE SIGNATURE	DATE



THESE DRAWINGS ARE COPYRIGHTED AND ARE THE PROPERTY OF BLACK & VEATCH; PRODUCED SOLELY FOR THE USE OF OUR CLIENT. ANY REPRODUCTION OR USE OF THE INFORMATION CONTAINED WITHIN SAID DRAWINGS IS PROHIBITED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT BY BLACK & VEATCH.

PROJECT NO.	DRAWN BY	CHECKED BY
192417.XXXX	JAT	LW

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
B	11/21/16	ISSUED FOR REVIEW
A	11/17/16	ISSUED FOR REVIEW

PRELIMINARY


IT IS A VIOLATION OF LAW FOR ANY PERSON, UNLESS THEY ARE ACTING UNDER THE DIRECTION OF A LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER, TO ALTER THIS DOCUMENT.

EXTENET SYSTEMS (CA) LLC
2000 CROW CANYON PLACE
SUITE 210
SAN RAMON, CA 94583

SITE ADDRESS
ADJACENT TO (IN PROW)
2003 TELEGRAPH AVE
OAKLAND, CA 94612

SHEET TITLE
GENERAL NOTES
AND LEGEND




SHEET NUMBER
GN-1



SITE PLAN MAP

NO SCALE A

THIS DRAWING IS NOT A SITE SURVEY
 THE PURPOSE OF THIS DRAWING IS TO SHOW HOW THE DEVELOPED SITE RELATES TO THE PARENT PARCEL AND ADJACENT PROPERTIES. R.O.W. MEASUREMENTS ARE APPROXIMATIONS.



INTERNAL REVIEW	
CONSTRUCTION SIGNATURE	DATE
RF SIGNATURE	DATE
REAL ESTATE SIGNATURE	DATE

BLACK & VEATCH

BLACK & VEATCH CORPORATION
 2999 OAK ROAD
 SUITE 490
 WALNUT CREEK, CA 94597

THESE DRAWINGS ARE COPYRIGHTED AND ARE THE PROPERTY OF BLACK & VEATCH; PRODUCED SOLELY FOR THE USE OF OUR CLIENT. ANY REPRODUCTION OR USE OF THE INFORMATION CONTAINED WITHIN SAID DRAWINGS IS PROHIBITED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT BY BLACK & VEATCH.

PROJECT NO.	DRAWN BY	CHECKED BY
192417.XXXX	JAT	LW

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
B	11/21/16	ISSUED FOR REVIEW
A	11/17/16	ISSUED FOR REVIEW

PRELIMINARY

IT IS A VIOLATION OF LAW FOR ANY PERSON, UNLESS THEY ARE ACTING UNDER THE DIRECTION OF A LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER, TO ALTER THIS DOCUMENT.


EXTENET SYSTEMS (CA) LLC
 2000 CROW CANYON PLACE
 SUITE 210
 SAN RAMON, CA 94583

SITE ADDRESS
 ADJACENT TO (IN PROW)
 203 TELEGRAPH AVE
 OAKLAND, CA 94612

SHEET TITLE
 OVERALL SITE PLAN

SHEET NUMBER
C-1

OVERALL SITE PLAN




SHROUD / ANTENNA ELEVATION VIEW

NO SCALE

1

F1-4868-FSS FUSION SPlice ENCLOSURE

WIDTH: 2 1/8" (W)
 LENGTH: 6 3/4" (L)
 HEIGHT: 4 3/4" (H)




FIBER SPlice BOX

NO SCALE

6

NOTE
 ANTENNA NOT SHOWN FOR CLARITY




CLAMP-ON BRACKET

NO SCALE

2

NOTE
 IF EXISTING POLE HAS A LIGHT ARM, SHROUD HALVES MUST BE FIELD CUT.




SHROUD ASSEMBLY

NO SCALE

4

COMMSCOPE 3X-V65S-GC3-3XR

RADOME COLOR: LIGHT GREY
 RADOME MATERIAL: FIBERGLASS, UV RESISTANT
 DIAMETER: 7.9" (200mm)
 HEIGHT: 23.5" (596mm)
 TOTAL WEIGHT (WITHOUT BRACKETS): 7.2 Kg (15.9 LB)
 CONNECTOR INTERFACE: 4.1-9.5 DIN FEMALE
 RF CONNECTOR LOCATION: BOTTOM
 RF CONNECTOR QUANTITY: 6



ANTENNA SPECIFICATION

NO SCALE


7

ITEM #	PART #	DESCRIPTION	QTY.	UNIT WT. (LBS)
CLAMP-ON BRACKET PARTS / HARDWARE				
1	WA-943	3/8" x 13 7/8" O.D. A36, TOP CAP WLDMNT	1	13.7
2	WA-1049	3/8" x 1'-1 7/8" O.D. A36, TOP MOUNT WLDMNT	1	15.9
3	PL-1655	1/4" x 1 5/8" x 2 1/8" A36, PLATE	3	0.2
4	40027	1/2" x 1.032" O.D. x .121" FLAT WASHER, S.S.	4	0.02
5	43020	1/2" LOCK WASHER, S.S.	7	0.01
6	44005	1/2" FLAT WASHER, NYLON	3	0.01
7	52005	1/2" JAM NUT, S.S.	5	0.04
8	71012F	1/2" x 1 3/4" S.S. FULLY THD'D BOLT	3	0.1
9	71052F	1/2" x 3" FULLY THD'D BOLT, S.S.	2	0.2
10	71051F	1/2" x 3 1/2" FULLY THD'D BOLT, S.S.	2	0.24
11	71053F	1/2" x 4" FULLY THD'D BOLT, S.S.	2	0.3
12	80333	1/2" x 6" S.S. THREADED ROD	1	0.3
SHROUD ASSEMBLY & COVER PLATE PARTS / HARDWARE				
13	WA-1048	14 1/4" O.D. x 1/8" w x 3'-5 1/2" FIBERGLASS, SHROUD ASSEMBLY	1	23.8
14	404-15	14GA. x 14 1/4" TD x 4 1/4" BD x 23 1/16" TL A569 WELD	1	10.3
15	404-16	14GA. x 14 1/4" TD x 4 1/4" BD x 23 1/16" TL A569 WELD	1	10.3
16	209-4	11GA. x 1 1/2" x 2 15/16" A36, FORMED PLATE	4	0.1
17	55500	1/4-20-STYLE SPEED NUT	8	0.02
18	70399	1/4" x 3/4" SS, CNTR SUNK SCKET HD SCREW	8	0.01
19	55510	3/8-16 SPEED NUT	3	0.04
20	70428	3/8" x 1 1/4" COUNTERSUNK SCKT HD SCREW, S.S.	6	0.01
TOTAL GALV. WT.			75	

EQUIPMENT TABLE

NO SCALE

3




SHROUD ASSEMBLY (AS ASSEMBLED)

NO SCALE

5

COMMSCOPE CBC 1923-4310/ E11F13P20



DIPLEXER SPECIFICATION

NO SCALE

8



INTERNAL REVIEW
 CONSTRUCTION SIGNATURE DATE
 RF SIGNATURE DATE
 REAL ESTATE SIGNATURE DATE



BLACK & VEATCH CORPORATION
 2999 OAK ROAD
 SUITE 490
 WALNUT CREEK, CA 94597

THESE DRAWINGS ARE COPYRIGHTED AND ARE THE PROPERTY OF BLACK & VEATCH; PRODUCED SOLELY FOR THE USE OF OUR CLIENT. ANY REPRODUCTION OR USE OF THE INFORMATION CONTAINED WITHIN SAID DRAWINGS IS PROHIBITED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT BY BLACK & VEATCH.

PROJECT NO.	DRAWN BY	CHECKED BY
192417.XXXX	JAT	LW

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
B	11/21/16	ISSUED FOR REVIEW
A	11/17/16	ISSUED FOR REVIEW

PRELIMINARY

IT IS A VIOLATION OF LAW FOR ANY PERSON, UNLESS THEY ARE ACTING UNDER THE DIRECTION OF A LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER, TO ALTER THIS DOCUMENT.

EXTENET SYSTEMS (CA) LLC
 2000 CROW CANYON PLACE
 SUITE 210
 SAN RAMON, CA 94583





SITE ADDRESS
 ADJACENT TO (IN PROW)
 2003 TELEGRAPH AVE
 OAKLAND, CA 94612

SHEET TITLE
 EQUIPMENT DETAILS

SHEET NUMBER
C-3

ERICSSON RADIO 2203

LENGTH: 7.8" (200MM)
 WIDTH: 7.8" (200MM)
 DEPTH: 3.93" (100MM)
 TOTAL WEIGHT (WITHOUT BRACKETS): <4.5 Kg



NOTE: SPECIFIC EME PLACARD WILL BE PLACED AFTER EME REPORT



INTERNAL REVIEW	
CONSTRUCTION SIGNATURE	DATE
RF SIGNATURE	DATE
REAL ESTATE SIGNATURE	DATE



BLACK & VEATCH

BLACK & VEATCH CORPORATION
 2999 OAK ROAD
 SUITE 490
 WALNUT CREEK, CA 94597

THESE DRAWINGS ARE COPYRIGHTED AND ARE THE PROPERTY OF BLACK & VEATCH. PRODUCED SOLELY FOR THE USE OF OUR CLIENT. ANY REPRODUCTION OR USE OF THE INFORMATION CONTAINED WITHIN SAID DRAWINGS IS PROHIBITED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT BY BLACK & VEATCH.

PROJECT NO.	DRAWN BY	CHECKED BY
192417.XXXX	JAT	LW

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
B	11/21/16	ISSUED FOR REVIEW
A	11/17/16	ISSUED FOR REVIEW

PRELIMINARY

IT IS A VIOLATION OF LAW FOR ANY PERSON, UNLESS THEY ARE ACTING UNDER THE DIRECTION OF A LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER, TO ALTER THIS DOCUMENT.

EXTENET SYSTEMS (CA) LLC
 2000 CROW CANYON PLACE
 SUITE 210
 SAN RAMON, CA 94583

SITE ADDRESS
 ADJACENT TO (IN PROW)
 2003 TELEGRAPH AVE
 OAKLAND, CA 94612

SHEET TITLE
 EQUIPMENT DETAILS

SHEET NUMBER

C-4

RADIO SPECIFICATION DETAIL

NO SCALE

1

VERTICAL ACCESS PORT DETAIL


NO SCALE

2

RF SIGNAGE DETAIL



NO SCALE

3



LEGEND

1. COPPER TINNED GROUND BAR HOLE CENTERS TO MATCH NEMA DOUBLE LUG CONFIGURATION
2. INSULATORS
3. 5/8" LOCKWASHERS
4. WALL MOUNTING BRACKETS
5. 5/8"-11 X 1" H.H.C.S. BOLTS



GROUND BAR

NO SCALE

4




ANTENNA CABLE GROUND KIT

NO SCALE

5

MURRAY LW002GRU SPECIFICATION

DIMENSIONS
 LOAD CENTER DEPTH: 3.625"
 LOAD CENTER WIDTH: 5.2"
 LOAD CENTER HEIGHT: 8.125"
 WEIGHT: 4.55 LB
 LOAD CENTER TYPE: MAIN LUG
 MAX AMPERAGE: 60
 MOUNTING TYPE: PLUG IN
 NUMBER OF PHASES: 1
 NUMBER OF SPACES: 2
 VOLTAGE (VOLTS): 120/240
 INDOOR/OUTDOOR: OUTDOOR
 ELECTRICAL PRODUCT TYPE: LOAD CENTER



BREAKER BOX SPECIFICATION

NO SCALE

6

RADIO POLE MOUNTING DETAILS

NO SCALE

7

EQUIPMENT PLACEMENT DETAIL

NO SCALE

8

INTERNAL REVIEW	
CONSTRUCTION SIGNATURE	DATE
RF SIGNATURE	DATE
REAL ESTATE SIGNATURE	DATE



BLACK & VEATCH

BLACK & VEATCH CORPORATION
2999 OAK ROAD
SUITE 490
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94597

THESE DRAWINGS ARE COPYRIGHTED AND ARE THE PROPERTY OF BLACK & VEATCH; PRODUCED SOLELY FOR THE USE OF OUR CLIENT. ANY REPRODUCTION OR USE OF THE INFORMATION CONTAINED WITHIN SAID DRAWINGS IS PROHIBITED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT BY BLACK & VEATCH.

PROJECT NO.	DRAWN BY	CHECKED BY
192417.XXXX	JAT	LW

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
B	11/21/16	ISSUED FOR REVIEW
A	11/17/16	ISSUED FOR REVIEW

PRELIMINARY


IT IS A VIOLATION OF LAW FOR ANY PERSON, UNLESS THEY ARE ACTING UNDER THE DIRECTION OF A LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER, TO ALTER THIS DOCUMENT.

EXTENET SYSTEMS (CA) LLC
2000 CROW CANYON PLACE
SUITE 210
SAN RAMON, CA 94583

SITE ADDRESS
ADJACENT TO (IN PROW)
2003 TELEGRAPH AVE
OAKLAND, CA 94612


SHEET TITLE
CONCEPTUAL
WIRING DIAGRAMS

SHEET NUMBER
C-5



CONCEPTUAL WIRING SCHEMATIC

NO SCALE 1



CONCEPTUAL FIBER / COAX SCHEMATIC

NO SCALE 2


NOT USED

NO SCALE 3

TYPICAL STEEL STREET LIGHT SITE TEMPLATE


NO SCALE 4

Attachment D





Existing



Proposed



Existing



proposed antenna

Proposed



EXTENET OAKLAND NODE 07134A ALTERNATIVE SITE ANALYSIS


ATTACHMENT E

MAP OF ALTERNATIVE POLES EVALUATED FOR NODE 07134A



- The above maps depict ExteNet's proposed Node 07134A in relation to other poles in the area that were evaluated as possibly being viable alternative candidates.
- The following is an analysis of each of those 7 alternative locations.

PROPAGATION MAP OF NODE 07134A



This propagation map depicts the ExteNet proposed Node 07134A in relation to surrounding proposed ExteNet small cell nodes.

07134A - PROPOSED LOCATION



- The location for ExteNet's proposed Node 07134A is a metal light pole located adjacent to 2003 Telegraph Avenue (37.809678, - 122.269688).
- ExteNet's objective is to provide T-Mobile 4G wireless coverage and capacity to the Oakland area.
- ExteNet evaluated this site and nearby alternatives to verify that the selected site is the least intrusive means to close T-Mobile's significant service coverage gap.

ALTERNATIVE NODE 07134B




- Node 07134B is a metal light pole located at 2016 Telegraph Avenue (37.809678, - 122.269448).
- This is pole is not a viable alternative because it has an existing traffic signal light.
- This pole is not a viable alternative candidate because this pole is located too far from the primary Node 07130A.

ALTERNATIVE NODE 07134C



- Node 07134C is a metal light pole located at 1951 Telegraph Avenue,(37.809458, - 122.269745).
- This is pole is not a viable alternative because it has an existing traffic signal light.
- This pole is not a viable alternative candidate because this pole is located too far from the primary Node 07132B.
- This pole is not a viable alternative because the signal will be blocked by a tall building.

ALTERNATIVE NODE 07134D



- Node 07134D is a metal light pole located at 725 Market Street (37.809435, - 122.269432)
- This is pole is not a viable alternative because it has an existing traffic signal light.
- This pole is not a viable alternative candidate because this pole is located too far from the primary Node 07130A.
- This pole is not a viable alternative because the signal will be blocked by a tall building.

ALTERNATIVE NODE 07134E



- Node 07134E is a metal light pole located at 2003 Telegraph Avenue (37.809689, -122.269755)
- This is pole is not a viable alternative because it has an existing traffic signal light.
- This pole is not a viable alternative candidate because this pole is located too close to primary Node 07130A.

ALTERNATIVE NODE 07134F



- Node 07134F is a metal light pole located at 501 Thomas L. Berkley Way (37.809545, - 122.269839)
- This pole is not a viable alternative candidate because this pole is located too far from the primary Node 07132B.
- This pole is not a viable alternative because the signal will be blocked by a tall building.
- This pole is not a viable alternative because it is a decorative metal light pole.

ALTERNATIVE NODE 07134G



- Node 07134G is a metal light pole at located 2015 Telegraph Avenue (37.809993, - 122.269622)
- This pole is not a viable alternative candidate because this pole is located too close to primary Node 07132B.


ALTERNATIVE NODE 07134H

- Node 07134H is a metal light pole at located 2003 Telegraph Avenue (37.809715, - 122.269911)
- This pole is not a viable alternative because it is a decorative metal light pole.



ALTERNATIVE SITE ANALYSIS CONCLUSION

Based on ExteNet's analysis of alternative sites, the currently proposed Node 07134A is the least intrusive location from which to fill the surrounding significant wireless coverage gaps.



SM
extenet
SYSTEMS

Thank You!



November 30, 2016

City Planner
Planning Department
City of Oakland
250 Frank Ogawa Plaza, 2nd Floor
Oakland, CA 94612

Re: Proposed ExteNet Small Cell Node Installation
Applicant: ExteNet Systems (California) LLC
Nearest Site Address: Public Right of Way near 2003 Telegraph Avenue
Site ID: NW-CA-SANFRANMC Node 07134A
Latitude/Longitude: 37.809678, -122.269688

Dear City Planner,

On behalf of ExteNet Systems (California) LLC, this letter and attached materials are to apply for a design review permit to install a small cell node in the public right-of-way near 2003 Telegraph Avenue ("Node 07134A").¹ The following is an explanation of the existing site, a project description of the designed facility, the project purpose and justifications in support of this proposal.

A. Project Description.

The proposed location for our facility currently consists of an approximate 26 foot tall metal pole in the public right-of-way on the west of Telegraph Avenue just northwest of the intersection with 20th Street, at about 2003 Telegraph Avenue.

ExteNet proposes to swap the existing metal street light pole for a new like-for-like pole measuring 26 feet above ground and to affix one canister antenna within an antenna shroud on top of a 7 inch pole extension at the pole. The antenna, measuring 23.5 inches long and 7.9 inches in diameter, will be placed on top of the pole, within the antenna shroud, at 29 feet 1 inch. The top of the antenna shroud will be at 31 feet 4 inches. Two proposed diplexers measuring 6.4 inches long, 4.6 inches wide and 1.8 inches deep will be placed inside the antenna shroud on top of the pole. Two MRRUs measuring 7.9 inches tall, 7.9 inches wide and 3.9 inches deep will be placed on the pole at 12 feet 4 inches and 15 feet 1 inch. A proposed fiber splice box measuring 6 ¾ inches tall, 4 ¾ inches wide and 2 1/8 inches deep will be placed on the pole at 3 feet 4 inches. All equipment will be painted to match the pole. Our proposal is depicted in the attached design drawings and photographic simulations.

This is an unmanned facility that will operate at all times (24 hours per day, seven days per week) and will be serviced about once per year. Our proposal will greatly benefit the area by improving wireless telecommunications service as detailed below.

B. Project Purpose.

¹ ExteNet expressly reserves all rights concerning the city's jurisdiction to assert zoning regulation over the placement of wireless facilities in the public rights-of-way.

The purpose of this project is to provide T-Mobile third and fourth generation (3G and 4G) wireless voice and data coverage to the surrounding area where there is currently a significant gap in service coverage. These wireless services include mobile telephone, wireless broadband, emergency 911, data transfers, electronic mail, Internet, web browsing, wireless applications, wireless mapping and video streaming. The proposed node is part of a larger small cell providing coverage to areas of Oakland that are otherwise very difficult or impossible to cover using traditional macro wireless telecommunications facilities due to the local topography and mature vegetation. The attached radio frequency propagation maps depict T-Mobile's larger small cell project. Further radio frequency details are set forth in the attached Radio Frequency Statement, including propagation maps depicting existing and proposed coverage in the vicinity of Node 07134A.

A small cell network consists of a series of radio access nodes connected to small telecommunications antennas, typically mounted on existing poles within the public rights-of-way, to distribute wireless telecommunications signals. Small cell networks provide telecommunications transmission infrastructure for use by wireless services providers. These facilities allow service providers such as T-Mobile to establish or expand their network coverage and capacity. The nodes are linked by fiber optic cable that carry the signal stemming from a central equipment hub to a node antenna. Although the signal propagated from a node antenna spans over a shorter range than a conventional tower system, small cell can be an effective tool to close service coverage gaps.

C. Project Justification, Alternative Site and Design Analysis.

Node 07134A is an integral part of the overall small cell project, and it is located in a difficult coverage area near Broadway. The coverage area consists of a primarily commercial neighborhood off of Telegraph Avenue, 20th Street, San Pablo Avenue, Broadway, and surrounding areas. Node 07134A will cover transient traffic along the roadways and provide in-building service to the surrounding residences as depicted in the propagation maps, which are exhibits to the attached Radio Frequency Statement.

Based on ExteNet's analysis of alternative sites the currently proposed Node 07134A is the least intrusive means to close T-Mobile's significant service coverage gap in the area. Node 07134A best uses existing utility infrastructure, adding small equipment without disturbing the character of the neighborhoods served. Deploying a small cell node at an existing pole location minimizes any visual impact by utilizing an inconspicuous spot. By installing antennas and equipment at this existing pole location, T-Mobile does not need to propose any new infrastructure in this coverage area.

The small cell node RF emissions are also much lower than the typical macro site, they are appropriate for the area, and they are fully compliant with the FCC's requirements for limiting human exposure to radio frequency energy. The attached radio frequency engineering analysis provided by Hammett & Edison, Inc., Consulting Engineers, confirms that the proposed equipment will operate well within (and actually far below) all applicable FCC public exposure limits. The facility will also comply with California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) General Order 170 (CEQA review) that governs utility use in the public right-of-way.

This proposed redesign is a viable design developed according to our discussions with the Planning Department. As discussed with City Planning, Node 07134A is the least intrusive option. Also the proposed location is a good coverage option because it sits at a spot from which point T-Mobile can adequately propagate its wireless signal.

ExteNet considered alternative sites on other poles in this area but none of these sites is as desirable from construction, coverage or aesthetics perspectives. The proposed location is approximately equidistant from other small cell nodes that ExteNet plans to place in surrounding hard-to-reach areas, so that service coverage can be evenly distributed. The proposed facility is not in the path of any protected view sheds. The other poles in the area are more conspicuous than the proposed pole. In addition to the pole proposed to host Node 07134A, ExteNet considered alternative sites set forth in the attached Alternative Site Analysis.


Alternative designs were considered including placing equipment inside of a ground-mounted cabinet. However, the pole-mounted equipment would better suit the area because it would blend in with the pole. We also evaluated whether equipment could be undergrounded but unfortunately this is not possible because there is insufficient right-of-way space for the necessary equipment access and the equipment would be compromised from saturation by rainwater. The antennas cannot be undergrounded because they rely on a line-of-site in order to properly transmit a signal.

Drawings, propagation maps, photographic simulations, and a radio-frequency engineering analysis are included with this packet.

As this application seeks authority to install a wireless telecommunication facility, the FCC's Shot Clock Order² requires the city to issue its final decision on ExteNet's application within 150 days. We respectfully request expedited review and approval of this application. Feel free to contact me if you have any questions. Thank you.

Thank you.

Best Regards,
EXTENET SYSTEMS



Matthew S. Yergovich

² See Petition for Declaratory Ruling to Clarify Provisions of Section 332(c)(7)(B), WT Docket No. 08-165, Declaratory Ruling, 24 F.C.C.R. 13994 (2009).

**ExteNet Systems CA, LLC • Proposed DAS Node (Site No. 07134A)
2003 Telegraph Avenue • Oakland, California**

Statement of Hammett & Edison, Inc., Consulting Engineers

The firm of Hammett & Edison, Inc., Consulting Engineers, has been retained on behalf of ExteNet Systems CA, LLC, a wireless telecommunications facilities provider, to evaluate the addition of Node No. 07134A to be added to the ExteNet distributed antenna system (“DAS”) in Oakland, California, for compliance with appropriate guidelines limiting human exposure to radio frequency (“RF”) electromagnetic fields.

Executive Summary

ExteNet proposes to install a directional panel antenna on a light pole sited in the public right-of-way at 2003 Telegraph Avenue in Oakland. The proposed operation will comply with the FCC guidelines limiting public exposure to RF energy.

Prevailing Exposure Standards

The U.S. Congress requires that the Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) evaluate its actions for possible significant impact on the environment. A summary of the FCC’s exposure limits is shown in Figure 1. These limits apply for continuous exposures and are intended to provide a prudent margin of safety for all persons, regardless of age, gender, size, or health. The most restrictive FCC limit for exposures of unlimited duration to radio frequency energy for several personal wireless services are as follows:

Wireless Service	Frequency Band	Occupational Limit	Public Limit
Microwave (Point-to-Point)	5,000–80,000 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

General Facility Requirements

Wireless nodes typically consist of two distinct parts: the electronic transceivers (also called “radios” or “channels”) that are connected to a central “hub” (which in turn are connected to the traditional wired telephone lines), and the passive antenna(s) that send the wireless signals created by the radios out to be received by individual subscriber units. The radios are often located on the same pole as the antennas and are connected to the antennas by coaxial cables. Because of the short wavelength of the frequencies assigned by the FCC for wireless services, the antennas require line-of-sight paths for their signals to propagate well and so are installed at some height above ground. The antennas are designed

**ExteNet Systems CA, LLC • Proposed DAS Node (Site No. 07134A)
2003 Telegraph Avenue • Oakland, California**

to concentrate their energy toward the horizon, with very little energy wasted toward the sky or the ground. This means that it is generally not possible for exposure conditions to approach the maximum permissible exposure limits without being physically very near the antennas.

Computer Modeling Method

The FCC provides direction for determining compliance in its Office of Engineering and Technology Bulletin No. 65, "Evaluating Compliance with FCC-Specified Guidelines for Human Exposure to Radio Frequency Radiation," dated August 1997. Figure 2 attached describes the calculation methodologies, reflecting the facts that a directional antenna's radiation pattern is not fully formed at locations very close by (the "near-field" effect) and that at greater distances the power level from an energy source decreases with the square of the distance from it (the "inverse square law"). The conservative nature of this method for evaluating exposure conditions has been verified by numerous field tests.

Site and Facility Description

Based upon information provided by ExteNet, including drawings by Black & Veatch Corporation, dated November 21, 2016, it is proposed to install one CommScope Model 3X-V65S-GC3-3XR, 2-foot tall, tri-directional cylindrical antenna, with two directions activated, on a light pole sited in the public right-of-way in front of the building located at 2003 Telegraph Avenue in Oakland. The antenna would employ no downtilt, would be mounted at an effective height of about 30 feet above ground, and its principal directions would be oriented toward 130°T and 250°T. T-Mobile proposes to operate from this facility with a maximum effective radiated power in any direction of 122 watts, representing simultaneous operation at 61 watts for AWS and 61 watts for PCS service. There are reported no other wireless telecommunications base stations at this site or nearby.

Study Results

For a person anywhere at ground, the maximum RF exposure level due to the proposed T-Mobile operation is calculated to be 0.00098 mW/cm², which is 0.098% of the applicable public exposure limit. The maximum calculated level at the second-floor elevation of any nearby building is 0.46% of the public exposure limit. It should be noted that these results include several "worst-case" assumptions and therefore are expected to overstate actual power density levels from the proposed operation.

Recommended Mitigation Measures

Due to its mounting location and height, the ExteNet 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, it is recommended



**ExteNet Systems CA, LLC • Proposed DAS Node (Site No. 07134A)
2003 Telegraph Avenue • Oakland, California**


that appropriate RF safety training be provided to all authorized personnel who have access to the antenna, including employees and contractors of the utility companies. No access within 1 foot directly in front of the antenna itself, such as might occur during certain activities, should be allowed while the base station is in operation, unless other measures can be demonstrated to ensure that occupational protection requirements are met. Posting explanatory signs* on the pole at or below 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.

Conclusion

Based on the information and analysis above, it is the undersigned's professional opinion that operation of the node proposed by ExteNet Systems CA, LLC, at 2003 Telegraph Avenue in Oakland, California, will comply with the prevailing standards for limiting public exposure to radio frequency energy and, therefore, will not for this reason cause a significant impact on the environment. The highest calculated level in publicly accessible areas is much 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. Training personnel and posting signs is recommended to establish compliance with occupational exposure limitations.

Authorship

The undersigned author of this statement is a qualified Professional Engineer, holding California Registration No. E-18063, which expires on June 30, 2017. 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.



Rajat Mathur, P.E.
707/996-5200

December 8, 2016


* 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, and guidance from the landlord, local zoning or health authority, or appropriate professionals may be required.

FCC Radio Frequency Protection Guide

The U.S. Congress required (1996 Telecom Act) the Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) to adopt a nationwide human exposure standard to ensure that its licensees do not, cumulatively, have a significant impact on the environment. The FCC adopted the limits from Report No. 86, “Biological Effects and Exposure Criteria for Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields,” published in 1986 by the Congressionally chartered National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (“NCRP”). Separate limits apply for occupational and public exposure conditions, with the latter limits generally five times more restrictive. The more recent standard, developed by the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers and approved as American National Standard ANSI/IEEE C95.1-2006, “Safety Levels with Respect to Human Exposure to Radio Frequency Electromagnetic Fields, 3 kHz to 300 GHz,” includes similar limits. These limits apply for continuous exposures from all sources and are intended to provide a prudent margin of safety for all persons, regardless of age, gender, size, or health.

As shown in the table and chart below, separate limits apply for occupational and public exposure conditions, with the latter limits (in *italics* and/or dashed) up to five times more restrictive:

Frequency Applicable Range (MHz)	Electromagnetic Fields (<i>f</i> is frequency of emission in MHz)					
	Electric Field Strength (V/m)		Magnetic Field Strength (A/m)		Equivalent Far-Field Power Density (mW/cm ²)	
0.3 – 1.34	614	<i>614</i>	1.63	<i>1.63</i>	100	<i>100</i>
1.34 – 3.0	614	<i>823.8/f</i>	1.63	<i>2.19/f</i>	100	<i>180/f²</i>
3.0 – 30	1842/ <i>f</i>	<i>823.8/f</i>	4.89/ <i>f</i>	<i>2.19/f</i>	900/ <i>f²</i>	<i>180/f²</i>
30 – 300	61.4	<i>27.5</i>	0.163	<i>0.0729</i>	1.0	<i>0.2</i>
300 – 1,500	3.54√ <i>f</i>	<i>1.59√f</i>	√ <i>f</i> /106	<i>√f/238</i>	<i>f/300</i>	<i>f/1500</i>
1,500 – 100,000	137	<i>61.4</i>	0.364	<i>0.163</i>	5.0	<i>1.0</i>



Higher levels are allowed for short periods of time, such that total exposure levels averaged over six or thirty minutes, for occupational or public settings, respectively, do not exceed the limits, and higher levels also are allowed for exposures to small areas, such that the spatially averaged levels do not exceed the limits. However, neither of these allowances is incorporated in the conservative calculation formulas in the FCC Office of Engineering and Technology Bulletin No. 65 (August 1997) for projecting field levels. Hammett & Edison has built those formulas into a proprietary program that calculates, at each location on an arbitrary rectangular grid, the total expected power density from any number of individual radio sources. The program allows for the description of buildings and uneven terrain, if required to obtain more accurate projections.



RFR.CALC™ Calculation Methodology

Assessment by Calculation of Compliance with FCC Exposure Guidelines

The U.S. Congress required (1996 Telecom Act) the Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) to adopt a nationwide human exposure standard to ensure that its licensees do not, cumulatively, have a significant impact on the environment. The maximum permissible exposure limits adopted by the FCC (see Figure 1) apply for continuous exposures from all sources and are intended to provide a prudent margin of safety for all persons, regardless of age, gender, size, or health. Higher levels are allowed for short periods of time, such that total exposure levels averaged over six or thirty minutes, for occupational or public settings, respectively, do not exceed the limits.

Near Field.

Prediction methods have been developed for the near field zone of panel (directional) and whip (omnidirectional) antennas, typical at wireless telecommunications base stations, as well as dish (aperture) antennas, typically used for microwave links. The antenna patterns are not fully formed in the near field at these antennas, and the FCC Office of Engineering and Technology Bulletin No. 65 (August 1997) gives suitable formulas for calculating power density within such zones.

For a panel or whip antenna, power density $S = \frac{180}{\theta_{BW}} \times \frac{0.1 \times P_{net}}{\pi \times D \times h}$, in mW/cm²,

and for an aperture antenna, maximum power density $S_{max} = \frac{0.1 \times 16 \times \eta \times P_{net}}{\pi \times h^2}$, in mW/cm²,

where θ_{BW} = half-power beamwidth of the antenna, in degrees, and

P_{net} = net power input to the antenna, in watts,

D = distance from antenna, in meters,

h = aperture height of the antenna, in meters, and

η = aperture efficiency (unitless, typically 0.5-0.8).

The factor of 0.1 in the numerators converts to the desired units of power density.

Far Field.

OET-65 gives this formula for calculating power density in the far field of an individual RF source:

power density $S = \frac{2.56 \times 1.64 \times 100 \times RFF^2 \times ERP}{4 \times \pi \times D^2}$, in mW/cm²,

where ERP = total ERP (all polarizations), in kilowatts,

RFF = relative field factor at the direction to the actual point of calculation, and

D = distance from the center of radiation to the point of calculation, in meters.

The factor of 2.56 accounts for the increase in power density due to ground reflection, assuming a reflection coefficient of 1.6 (1.6 x 1.6 = 2.56). The factor of 1.64 is the gain of a half-wave dipole relative to an isotropic radiator. The factor of 100 in the numerator converts to the desired units of power density. This formula has been built into a proprietary program that calculates, at each location on an arbitrary rectangular grid, the total expected power density from any number of individual radiation sources. The program also allows for the description of uneven terrain in the vicinity, to obtain more accurate projections.





CITY OF OAKLAND

BUREAU OF PLANNING

250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Suite 2114, Oakland, CA 94612-2031

Phone: 510-238-3911 Fax: 510-238-4730

PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC NOTICE

Location:	City street light pole in sidewalk adjacent to: 2003 Telegraph Avenue (At intersection of Telegraph Ave. and Thomas L. Berkeley Way.)
Assessor's Parcel Number(s):	Adjacent to: 008-06450-005-00
Proposal:	To establish a new "small cell site" telecommunications facility, in order to enhance existing services, by attaching an antenna and equipment to a 26' City street light located in the sidewalk; the antenna would be attached to the top at up to 31'-4" and equipment at approximately 9' to 15'-1".
Applicant / Phone Number:	Ana Gomez/Black & Veatch & Extenet (for: T-Mobile) (913) 458-9148
Owner:	City of Oakland
Case File Number:	PLN16419
Planning Permits Required:	Major Conditional Use Permit with additional findings for Monopole Telecommunications Facility adjacent to Residential Zone; Regular Design Review with additional findings for Monopole Telecommunications Facility
General Plan:	Central Business District
Zoning:	Central Business District Pedestrian Retail Commercial Zone
Environmental Determination:	Exempt, Section 15301 of the State CEQA Guidelines: Existing Facilities; Exempt, Section 15302: Replacement or Reconstruction; Exempt, Section 15303: New Construction of Small Structures; Section 15183: Projects Consistent with a Community Plan, General Plan or Zoning
Historic Status:	Non historic property
City Council District:	1
Date Filed:	December 5, 2016
Action to be Taken:	Decision based on staff report
Finality of Decision:	Appealable to City Council
For Further Information:	Contact case planner Marilu Garcia at (510) 238-5217 or by email at mgarcia2@oaklandnet.com .

Your comments and questions, if any, should be directed to the Bureau of Planning, 250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, 2nd Floor, Oakland, California 94612-2031 at or prior to the public hearing to be held on **June 7, 2017**, at Oakland City Hall, Council Chambers, 1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Oakland, California 94612. The public hearing will start at 6:00 p.m.

If you challenge the Planning Commission decision on appeal and/or in court, you will be limited to issues raised at the public hearing or in correspondence delivered to the Bureau of Planning, at or prior to, the public hearing on this case. If you wish to be notified of the decision of any of these cases, please provide the case planner with a regular mail or email address.

Please note that the description of the application found above is preliminary in nature and that the project and/or such description may change prior to a decision being made. Such appeals must be filed within ten (10) calendar days of the date of decision by the Planning Commission and by 4:00p.m. An appeal shall be on a form provided by the Bureau of Planning, and submitted to the Bureau of Planning, 250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Suite 2114, to the attention of the Case Planner. The appeal shall state specifically wherein it is claimed there was error or abuse of discretion by the City of Oakland or wherein the decision is not supported by substantial evidence and must include payment in accordance with the City of Oakland Master Fee Schedule. Failure to file a timely appeal will preclude you from challenging the City's decision in court. The appeal itself must raise every issue that is contested along with all the arguments and evidence previously entered into the record prior to or at the public hearing mentioned above. Failure to do so will preclude you from raising such issues during the appeal hearing and/or in court.

POSTING DATE: **May 20, 2017**

IT IS UNLAWFUL TO ALTER OR REMOVE THIS NOTICE WHEN POSTED ON SITE

ATTACHMENT G



OAKLAND ATHLETICS
ROOTED IN OAKLAND



Thomas L Berkley WAY
500

What Moves You
hightown.net 877-863-8812

HIGHTOWN STATION



PUBLIC NOTICE
CITY OF OAKLAND



May 23, 2017

City Planner
Planning Department
City of Oakland
250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, 2nd Floor
Oakland, CA 94612

Re: Public Outreach Summary

Applicant: ExteNet Systems (California) LLC
Nearest Site Address: Public Right of Way near 2003 Telegraph Avenue.
Site ID: NW-CA-SANFRNMC-TMO Node 07134A
Latitude/Longitude: 37.809678, -122.269688
Planning Application: PLN16419

Dear City Planner,

This week we notified the following groups by sending them the attached project flier:

- Village Bottoms Community Development Corporation
- San Pablo Corridor Coalition

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions. Thank you.

Best Regards,

Ana Gomez/BV for ExteNet

Ana Gomez
ExteNet Permitting Contractor



ExteNet is improving wireless service in Oakland!

January 4, 2017

ExteNet Systems is a neutral host telecommunications infrastructure provider that is working to improve wireless service in Oakland.

We will soon be proposing to install fiberoptic cables and state-of-the-art small cell wireless facilities at existing telephone pole and light pole locations in the Oakland public right-of-way.

Telecommunications carriers transmit their signal through ExteNet's facilities to improve wireless voice, data, and public safety connectivity.

Although experiences with wireless services vary based on specific location and usage times, the wireless service proposed by this infrastructure will help meet existing, fluctuating and future demands.

Please see attached examples of actual ExteNet facilities like the ones we will be proposing in Oakland.

Want to learn more?

Please visit <http://www.extenetsystems.com/> or email myergovich@extenetsystems.com.

