

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2023 7:27 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

We are in agreement with the proposed changes.

Bill Fritz

From: Brooks, Ann <Ann.Brooks@crowncastle.com>
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2023 3:35 PM
To: Bill Fritz
Cc: Cornwall, Amanda
Subject: RE: Cell Tower Regulation Review
Attachments: Crown Castle Albemarle County draft ordinance 12-05-23.pdf

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Good afternoon Bill, please see attached the response from Crown Castle. We are grateful for the opportunity to comment, and look forward to many years of collaboration with Albemarle County.

ANN BROOKS

M: (404) 944-7393 | O: (980) 938-7154

From: Bill Fritz <BFritz@albemarle.org>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 3:54 PM
Subject: Cell Tower Regulation Review

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

Thank you for your interest in the review of cell tower regulations in Albemarle County. A draft ordinance has been prepared and we are seeking your input on the proposed ordinance. We are asking for written comments by December 15th. The draft ordinance and a summary of the survey results may be found [HERE](#). That site also has a link that will allow you to provide comments.

William D. Fritz, AICP

Development Process Manager

[Albemarle County](#)

bfritz@albemarle.org

434-296-5823 ext. 3242

401 McIntire Road, North Wing, Charlottesville, VA 22902

This email may contain confidential or privileged material. Use or disclosure of it by anyone other than the recipient is unauthorized. If you are not an intended recipient, please delete this email.

Bill Fritz

From: Annissa Reed <AReed@ctia.org>
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2023 2:47 PM
To: Bill Fritz
Cc: Jeremy Crandall
Subject: CTIA Albemarle County Siting Letter
Attachments: CTIA Albemarle County Siting Letter - 15 December 2023.pdf

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Good afternoon,

On behalf of CTIA®, the trade association for the wireless communications industry, attached is a comment letter regarding Albemarle County's revised draft Ordinance related to cell towers and cell poles. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. Please reach out if you have any questions.

Thank you,



Annissa Reed

Director, State and Local Affairs

1400 16th Street, NW

Washington, DC 20036

202-736-3674 (office)

202-735-7244 (mobile)

areed@ctia.org

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2023 10:41 AM
To: Allison Wrael; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

December 15, 2023 William D. Fritz, AICP, Development Process Manager Albemarle County, Department of Planning and Zoning 401 McIntire Road, North Wing Charlottesville, VA 22902 Re: Proposed Changes to Cell Tower Regulations Dear Bill: On behalf of our client, SBA Communications Corporation, we want to thank you and Albemarle County for the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the Zoning Ordinance. SBA owns, operates, and maintains wireless telecommunications infrastructure throughout the United States, including seven (7) tower sites in unincorporated Albemarle County. Specifically, we are providing comments on those changes posted online and dated 11/13/23. We appreciate the efforts of staff in preparing this document, and in working toward improving the Cell Tower Regulations. We understand this is the County's first comprehensive review and update of this portion of the Zoning Ordinance in roughly 20 years. To be sure, the County has made revisions to the ordinance in response to court decisions, changes to the Federal and State law and regulatory changes as promulgated by the FCC. We want to urge the County to look carefully at the regulatory framework it has in place, to make sure it is in full compliance, as discussed below. Having reviewed the proposed changes, and incorporating the comments below, we believe there are many aspects of the proposed regulations that should be approved. As additional comment, we submit the following: 1. Height Increase to 30 Feet: One of the hallmarks of the County's regulatory environment for the past 20 years has been the limitation imposed on towers to be considered as Tier II (treetop) to be no more than ten (10) feet above the treeline, as measured by the "reference tree". Under the proposed amendment, this limit has been increased to thirty (30) feet. We support the proposed increase. Having said that, we believe the changes could be improved to avoid ambiguity and conflict with other provisions. For example, under the existing Development requirements/General Design the following appears: "Screening and siting to minimize visibility. The site shall provide adequate opportunities for screening and the facility shall be sited to minimize its visibility from adjacent parcels and streets, regardless of their distance from the facility. The facility also shall be sited to minimize its visibility from any entrance corridor overlay district, state scenic river, national park or national forest, regardless of whether the site is adjacent to the district, river, park or forest. If the facility would be located on lands subject to a conservation easement or an open space easement, or adjacent to a conservation easement or open space easement, the facility shall be sited so that it is not visible from any resources specifically identified for protection in the deed of easement". Without clarification, this text with inherent ambiguities, could negate any benefit of the proposed height increase. The text refers to "any entrance corridor" of which there are many, as well as scenic rivers, national parks or national forest. How is an applicant to know how to assess the "mitigation" necessary to allow a proposed facility to qualify for 'by-right' treatment under Tier II? There are a great number of properties under conservation

and/or open space easement; the regulations state that any facility located on any such property “shall not be visible from any resources specifically identified for protection”. Surely this is overly broad. 2. RFE Compliance: The proposed regulations continue the County’s longstanding policy of asserting a role in an area wholly reserved to the Federal Government; compliance radiofrequency emissions (RFE) and radiofrequency interference. The regulations require a signed statement from an engineer to demonstrate compliance with applicable RFE levels, despite the fact the FCC is the sole authority on these matters. The County should recognize the law of preemption and eliminate this requirement. 3. FCC Rules and Orders, including Section 6409 and Shot Clock Rules: Section 6409 of the Spectrum Act was issued in 2012. Further, the FCC adopted a Compound Expansion Order in 2020. We urge the County to adopt all applicable FCC regulations and commit to a rigorous review of its compliance. Section 6409 includes “shot clock rules” for the proper and timely review of all tower and antenna applications, sets forth what can and cannot be required of applicants. Of critical importance is the timing of such review and we ask the County to track and report its findings on the timing of all such applications. Section 6409 also contains parameters on fees, and we similarly ask for a report. Under the proposed regulations a “substantial change” is defined as A modification to an eligible support structure that meets one or more of the following criteria: Defeats concealment elements. The modification would defeat the concealment elements of the eligible support structure”. Above, we noted the County is proposing to increase the height of “treetop Towers” reviewed under Tier II from ten (10) to thirty (30) feet. This provision as drafted could negate the benefits of such an increase and potentially mean that no treetop towers would ever be able to extend their height or widen the antenna setoffs as permitted by the FCC regulations. The County has long interpreted its treetop tower design standards as the legal equivalent to “concealment elements” such as a treepole (monopine) or other concealment device. If the regulations are approved as drafted, this would codify this very questionable interpretation. We are not aware of any other jurisdiction in the state that uses such an interpretation. Again, we appreciate staff’s time and consideration. Sincerely, /s/ Edward L. Donohue Counsel, SBA Communications Corp.

(Optional) What is your name?

Edward L. Donohue

(Optional) What is your email address?

edonohue@dtm.law

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2023 10:39 AM
To: Allison Wrael; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

December 15, 2023 William D. Fritz, AICP, Development Process Manager Albemarle County, Department of Planning and Zoning 401 McIntire Road, North Wing Charlottesville, VA 22902 Re: Proposed Changes to Cell Tower Regulations Dear Bill: On behalf of our client, SBA Communications Corporation, we want to thank you and Albemarle County for the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the Zoning Ordinance. SBA owns, operates, and maintains wireless telecommunications infrastructure throughout the United States, including seven (7) tower sites in unincorporated Albemarle County. Specifically, we are providing comments on those changes posted online and dated 11/13/23. We appreciate the efforts of staff in preparing this document, and in working toward improving the Cell Tower Regulations. We understand this is the County's first comprehensive review and update of this portion of the Zoning Ordinance in roughly 20 years. To be sure, the County has made revisions to the ordinance in response to court decisions, changes to the Federal and State law and regulatory changes as promulgated by the FCC. We want to urge the County to look carefully at the regulatory framework it has in place, to make sure it is in full compliance, as discussed below. Having reviewed the proposed changes, and incorporating the comments below, we believe there are many aspects of the proposed regulations that should be approved. As additional comment, we submit the following: 1. Height Increase to 30 Feet: One of the hallmarks of the County's regulatory environment for the past 20 years has been the limitation imposed on towers to be considered as Tier II (treetop) to be no more than ten (10) feet above the treeline, as measured by the "reference tree". Under the proposed amendment, this limit has been increased to thirty (30) feet. We support the proposed increase. Having said that, we believe the changes could be improved to avoid ambiguity and conflict with other provisions. For example, under the existing Development requirements/General Design the following appears: "Screening and siting to minimize visibility. The site shall provide adequate opportunities for screening and the facility shall be sited to minimize its visibility from adjacent parcels and streets, regardless of their distance from the facility. The facility also shall be sited to minimize its visibility from any entrance corridor overlay district, state scenic river, national park or national forest, regardless of whether the site is adjacent to the district, river, park or forest. If the facility would be located on lands subject to a conservation easement or an open space easement, or adjacent to a conservation easement or open space easement, the facility shall be sited so that it is not visible from any resources specifically identified for protection in the deed of easement". Without clarification, this text with inherent ambiguities, could negate any benefit of the proposed height increase. The text refers to "any entrance corridor" of which there are many, as well as scenic rivers, national parks or national forest. How is an applicant to know how to assess the "mitigation" necessary to allow a proposed facility to qualify for 'by-right' treatment under Tier II? There are a great number of properties under conservation

and/or open space easement; the regulations state that any facility located on any such property “shall not be visible from any resources specifically identified for protection”. Surely this is overly broad. 2. RFE Compliance: The proposed regulations continue the County’s longstanding policy of asserting a role in an area wholly reserved to the Federal Government; compliance radiofrequency emissions (RFE) and radiofrequency interference. The regulations require a signed statement from an engineer to demonstrate compliance with applicable RFE levels, despite the fact the FCC is the sole authority on these matters. The County should recognize the law of preemption and eliminate this requirement. 3. FCC Rules and Orders, including Section 6409 and Shot Clock Rules: Section 6409 of the Spectrum Act was issued in 2012. Further, the FCC adopted a Compound Expansion Order in 2020. We urge the County to adopt all applicable FCC regulations and commit to a rigorous review of its compliance. Section 6409 includes “shot clock rules” for the proper and timely review of all tower and antenna applications, sets forth what can and cannot be required of applicants. Of critical importance is the timing of such review and we ask the County to track and report its findings on the timing of all such applications. Section 6409 also contains parameters on fees, and we similarly ask for a report. Under the proposed regulations a “substantial change” is defined as A modification to an eligible support structure that meets one or more of the following criteria: Defeats concealment elements. The modification would defeat the concealment elements of the eligible support structure”. Above, we noted the County is proposing to increase the height of “treetop Towers” reviewed under Tier II from ten (10) to thirty (30) feet. This provision as drafted could negate the benefits of such an increase and potentially mean that no treetop towers would ever be able to extend their height or widen the antenna setoffs as permitted by the FCC regulations. The County has long interpreted its treetop tower design standards as the legal equivalent to “concealment elements” such as a treepole (monopine) or other concealment device. If the regulations are approved as drafted, this would codify this very questionable interpretation. We are not aware of any other jurisdiction in the state that uses such an interpretation. Again, we appreciate staff’s time and consideration. Sincerely, /s/ Edward L. Donohue Counsel, SBA Communications Corp.

(Optional) What is your name?

Edward

Bill Fritz

From: Karmen Rajamani <Karmen.Rajamani@wia.org>
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2023 9:23 AM
To: Bill Fritz
Subject: Albemarle County, VA - Cell Tower Code - Comment Letter
Attachments: Albemarle County VA_WIA Comment Ltr_12.14.2023.pdf

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Mr. Fritz – Thanks to you and Albemarle County, VA in seeking comments on recent proposed changes to the County's Cell Tower code and definitions. Please find attached WIA's (Wireless Infrastructure Association) comment letter. Please contact me with any questions. Thanks very much.

Best regards,

Karmen Rajamani

She/Her/Hers

Vice President, Government Affairs

Direct: 703.719.4521

Mobile: 215.868.3738

Email: karmen.rajamani@@wia.org



Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2023 1:02 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

While I think that Albemarle County cell phone service should be improved, the draft ordinance goes way to far in granting the cell phone/cell tower companies almost everything that they desire in the way of changes. We need to recognize that people live in and travel to Albemarle County because of its natural beauty. We need to make a strong effort to preserve the County's natural beauty so that people will want to live here and so that tourists will want to visit (and spend money here). The final ordinance should carefully take this into account and, as a result, should (for example) limit the height of the towers, place size restrictions on the antennas (and limit their projection), limit the diameter of the monopole towers, and limit the number of arrays attached to the towers. I am not arguing for no changes to the ordinance; I just think that the changes should be more modest, reasonable and preserve the beauty of our community. Some of this potentially can be accomplished by obscuring (e.g., through use of vegetation and appropriately positioning) the added height, additional towers and expanded antennas and arrays. However, as written, the draft ordinance goes way to far and needs to be cut back to a reasonable compromise. The cell phone/cell tower companies are not the only interested parties here and should not be given a blank check in terms of expansion of and additions to cell towers.

(Optional) What is your name?

Mike Schaengold

(Optional) What is your email address?

mikeschaengold@hotmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2023 12:35 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I have carefully reviewed the draft ordinance and related documents. While I think that cell phone service should be improved in Albemarle County, I believe that these proposed changes go way to far and fail to consider that people move to and visit the county because of its natural beauty. We need to ensure that the final ordinance takes this into account and does not discourage people from moving here or visiting here (as tourists) because of very unsightly cell towers.

(Optional) What is your name?

Mike Schaengold

(Optional) What is your email address?

mikeschaengold@hotmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Peggy Gilges <peggygilges@me.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2023 12:28 PM
To: Bill Fritz
Subject: Weighing in on cell tower infrastructure changes around Albemarle

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Hi Bill,

I regret I did not participate in the survey but I was reading Sean Tubbs' coverage last night and decided I better pipe up!

First, I hope it's clear that 750 some poll participants is not a large number of residents. I'm willing to bet that the people who did participate are almost all people who have poor coverage, so results will be skewed toward yes we need many more cell towers. The majority of residents like me have no problem with coverage. I know for a fact there are areas with spotty or low coverage to be improved, but the proposed changes keep referring to the poll results, and because they represent such a small percentage of county residents, I think changing policy drastically based on the poll is a problem.

I do not think the County should immediately go from careful siting and attention to aesthetics and impact on others to instantly adopting an "anything goes" policy.

I don't want to imagine how many towers will be bristling the tops of local mountains if someone is not considering additional cell infrastructure on a case by case basis. It's very disappointing that 50%+ of respondents to the poll believe that there should be no places worth sparing the visual blight of extremely high monopoles, etc. especially in forestal districts or on our mountains.

Another thing about the poll that was concerning to me were questions that asked whether the County Board or County staff should make calls on applications. Isn't the Planning Commission normally involved? Will they not be in the future? County staff are not elected officials, and I wonder if they alone should be making decisions. I think Planning Commissioners and Supervisors should still eyeball the proposals and be the final decision makers based on staff recommendations. There may be conflicts of interest when people who are contractors for the county and also for the industry are working on proposals. (I am thinking of Valerie Long as an example. I'm not sure if she is still working for the County.)

Thank you for your response to my inquiries.

Peggy Gilges

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2023 9:57 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I am disappointed that there seems to be zero interest in reigning in these cell companies to keep them from despoiling our rural landscape with their ugly, oversized towers.

(Optional) What is your name?

John Blackburn

(Optional) What is your email address?

blackburn630@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2023 8:18 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

While I understand the purported benefit of the 10' to 30' increase in height allowed above the tallest tree within 25', I don't think this should be by-right. There should be a review done prior to allowing the height increase, as not all circumstances are the same. Allowing this increase by-right unfairly favors the tower owner/operator over adjacent property owners. By requiring a review, and allowing community input in the review, hopefully the situations where a height increase would adversely impact the surrounding tax payers can be avoided.

(Optional) What is your name?

jeff woodbury

(Optional) What is your email address?

jtwodbury@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Kirk Bowers <engr1950@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2023 9:47 AM
To: Bill Fritz
Cc: Donna Shaunesey; John Cruickshank; barbara; sara@sustainablegems.com
Subject: Cell tower regulations review and comments
Attachments: Cell tower ordinance review comments 12.13.2023.pdf

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Good morning Mr Fritz,

On behalf of the Piedmont Group, Sierra Club, I am submitting our review comments on the Draft Cell Tower Ordinance.

My background includes design and construction of more than 200 cell tower sites in Virginia, including Albemarle County, as a Professional Engineer. My knowledge is considerable about cell tower siting, design and construction from my work as a Civil Engineer.

In general, additional items are needed to safeguard the health of the public from too many cell towers in Albemarle County. Please review and add our comments to the discussion.

We want to see all antennae and cell towers removed from Schools property. It is a hazard to the kids and staff health.

When will a public hearing be held for public comments?

If you have any questions, please let me know and I will be happy to answer them.

Please confirm receipt of this email.

Happy Holidays.

--

Kirk A Bowers, PE
Charlottesville, VA 22911

Tolerance, compromise, understanding, acceptance, patience - I want those all to be very sharp tools in my shed.

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 12, 2023 4:52 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

This is a terrible ordinance which will deface the landscape of the county in order to line line the pockets of corporations

(Optional) What is your name?

Al Mirme

(Optional) What is your email address?

alvinmirmelstein@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 12, 2023 9:12 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

The COVID years clearly illustrated that cell-tower based phone and internet services are absolutely critical infrastructure in Albemarle County. I spent many frustrating hours trying to get a reliable signal so my children could participate in their online-only classes and my wife, a teacher, could teach her classes effectively from home. Cell tower visibility is a small price to pay to keep us all connected. I strongly support any regulatory changes that will improve the speed and coverage of cell service in Albemarle County.

(Optional) What is your name?

Matt Shadel

(Optional) What is your email address?

matt@shadelfamily.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 12, 2023 6:31 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

The county is in desperate need of cell phone coverage that is dependable. This is not 20 years ago. Please bring the county to to date with the reality we live in today.

(Optional) What is your name?

Dianna Rankin

(Optional) What is your email address?

cbdrankin2@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Monday, December 11, 2023 5:19 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

It looks like you are prioritizing the cell phone companies desire to build larger, cheaper towers over the beauty of our rural area. Your revisions weaken our current ordinances almost across the board, especially in terms of visibility. Allowing towers 30' above the top of the trees is a major change. The cell companies always pick the largest tallest tree to measure against, so the tower will be more than 30' higher than the average tree and will more than likely not be covered over time through the growth of the trees. Therefore, it will be visible forever. You are also allowing the facilities and antenna to be more visible by grouping them together and allowing larger antenna and more arrays. I urge you to move in a different direction on these ordinances and prioritize making them much less visible. Albemarle should continue to be a leader in this area.

(Optional) What is your name?

Charles Seilheimer

(Optional) What is your email address?

charles@seilheimer.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Monday, December 11, 2023 5:10 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Visually appealing cell towers are tough to come by. If the height limit is to be raised to 30 feet, I'd suggest that the tower be made to look like a tree. There are some of these towers out there and they are not bad to look at.

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Monday, December 11, 2023 6:48 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Cell towers are destructive to my bees. Tha radio frequencies disrupt the bees internal GPS which causes disorientation causing them to become lost and unable to find the hive. They die.

(Optional) What is your name?

Mike Stevenson

(Optional) What is your email address?

mike@mediafarm.org

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 10, 2023 1:20 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I'm opposed to any changes that will allow corporations to build larger and/or more cell phone towers in this area. Most of us have Internet at home and we don't need to be using our phones on the road, especially in the rural areas where the towers would likely take away from the views. Thank you.

(Optional) What is your name?

Nickolas Simon

(Optional) What is your email address?

simonnickolasjay@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 9, 2023 11:42 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

It is clear from the responses to the survey in August that more and higher cell towers are in no way the majority opinion. Most of the answers hovered around 50% and were unclearly worded, I.E The pie charts asking about adequate coverage and intermittent coverage means there already IS coverage for over half of the respondents-just not 100% of the time which will never be possible due to the geography of the area. Also there is no direct question clarifying what better coverage would cost in terms of permanent destruction of view shed and lower property values. Sure people want better coverage but do they want a cell tower right next to their house? No! Plus there is a clear lack of understanding about what wifi, fiber optic and cell towers mean in terms of coverage.. Those of us who recently got fiber optic, use that for better cell coverage at home by using the wifi. I feel these questions to the public are already biased and hide the real intent of the county-which is doing whatever the cell companies want at the expense of the tax payers. No one moves out to the country expecting perfect cell coverage 100% of the time. It makes sense to put towers where no one lives and or can see them. But taking away the number limit of how many towers can go in one area and letting them go much taller puts the burden of the decreased property values and destroyed view shed on the people that already have to live near existing towers. With 5G being of concern to so many and without adequate new studies, you could be putting ALL of us at risk instead of being reasonable with heights, number of towers and locations. Once they are built-all of us have to suffer the consequences just for the desires of a few-less than 50% according to the survey. Please, please do not let the cell companies have free rein just for profit. This is where we live and raise our children and animals. The value of keeping Albemarle healthy, beautiful and historic has got to be worth more than corporate profit. YOU are the guardians of this area so please protect its residents, its character and its values of healthy quality of life for all.

(Optional) What is your name?

Laura Good

(Optional) What is your email address?

lauragood@twigs.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 5, 2023 8:25 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Make no changes to the ordinance.

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 5, 2023 4:43 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I am so surprised that in so many instances Albemarle proposes to increase visibility. This does not seem in keeping with Albemarle's general respect for scenic beauty and nature

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Monday, December 4, 2023 9:01 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

People have been zombified by their cell phones, and this is complete surrender. The worst part is that the most rural and forested areas may now be blighted by poles rising 30 feet above the tree line, with virtually unlimited electronic crowns. As usual, we will pay the price in loss of beauty and tranquility, due to the human faults of wanting too much, fear of being left out, and uncritical projection of follow-on effects.

(Optional) What is your name?

Mark Helprin

(Optional) What is your email address?

windrow@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 2, 2023 10:26 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

All of this expansion of cell towers and their strength does not even mention my primary concern: putting really powerful towers right at schools. We should not let them within 2000 feet of where we require young people to congregate.

(Optional) What is your name?

Hunter Lewis

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 2, 2023 2:47 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I am opposed to the increase in cell tower height. I live on Pea Ridge Road off of Garth and bought my property for the unobstructed views of the mountains. I am satisfied with the amount of cell signal I receive and do not wish to see any more cell towers erected in our area.

(Optional) What is your name?

Danielle Schott

(Optional) What is your email address?

dschott170@yahoo.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Friday, December 1, 2023 6:34 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Thank you for the survey on a very important issue. One note is that all the survey questions that ask whether something should be reviewed "only by County Staff or by the Board of Supervisors" didn't provide respondents with enough information to make an educated decision. It's bad survey design, unfortunately, and the results shouldn't be used to inform your plan. Unless most people taking the survey were insiders well versed in the difference between the two groups and the history of how they have approached cell tower review (in which case it's not representative of the county), they were probably guessing or basing responses on the word "only" being nearer to County Staff, which implies that the County Staff choice would involve less regulation. This is not a personally-motivated reaction based on the results--I truly have no idea which choice would actually speed things up or slow them down, which is more likely to approve or deny, etc.

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 30, 2023 1:52 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

A definition of "substantial change" might improve applications to avoid possible confusion of what that phrase means. Expanding design options to increase competition, service, and coverage area is much appreciated.

(Optional) What is your email address?

droadcap1@aol.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 30, 2023 12:52 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Tower height should not be increased beyond the 10 feet as urbanization occurs there is more opportunity to "hide" towers. the rural nature in agricultural and forested areas should be maintained as avoidance areas. With the broadband fiber project this should improve access and not necessate the visual aesthetic destruction of the viewshed. Increasing the number of arrays and standoff should help with capacity. Furthermore obstructionist neighbors that should allow for access to key locations should be more of a focus as they deny reasonable passage of fiber and power. ie in the growth area

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2023 12:25 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I am uncomfortable with cell towers as part of our rural skyline. The old ordinance was unpleasant to me but I appreciated the height limits and appearance requirements. Please do not remove these requirements from the tower permitting and review process. Cell towers negatively affect my real estate value so I am partial to less obtrusive tower designs.

(Optional) What is your name?

Reed Muehlman

(Optional) What is your email address?

reed@dialogueanddesign.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2023 12:25 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I am strongly in favor of all changes recommended by cell tower review. I hope these changes bring more wireless coverage to more county residents. I hope the Agricultural/forests Districts Advisory Committee is not too restrictive in approving new towers, which might reduce the effectiveness of the proposed changes to the ordinance.

(Optional) What is your name?

Tom Paoletti

(Optional) What is your email address?

atpjnk@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2023 10:14 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I do not think that reducing the requirements and public protections for cell towers is at all appropriate. Not only do the towers deteriorate the natural beauty of Albemarle County, the transmission power of electro- magnetic radiation will be increasing. The cellular corporations are in the process of introducing 5G transmission, and are in the process of designing 6G transmitters. At what point does electro-magnetic radiation become harmful to the public? I suggest caution at this point until some of the problems are addressed.

(Optional) What is your name?

michael upchurch

(Optional) What is your email address?

upchurchm@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 28, 2023 12:52 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I think most of the propose changes are reasonable, and while monopole type towers are explicitly specified in the ordinances, it's not clear that lattice type towers are in fact prohibited, and I think they should be. Perhaps the wording is sufficient to prohibit them. I skimmed the recommendations and may have missed this important point, that is, safety to the public when they spend large amounts of time near the tower's antennas should certainly be explicitly considered in the ordinances. The relatively high transmitter power of cell phone base stations installed where individuals could spend significant time exposed to both the far-field and possibly near-field power densities should require careful review during the licensing process. For example, the antennas on the walls of the county jail are one installation that I hope was carefully reviewed from a radiation density perspective. Thanks so much for allowing the public to provide input in this incredibly important topic.

(Optional) What is your name?

John Effland

(Optional) What is your email address?

johneffland@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 23, 2023 6:11 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Deleting the agricultural and forestal district from the Avoidance Area criteria is appropriate. In Development Requirements and Checklist, item 11, I would change the wording "dark brown natural or painted wood color" to read "dark color with a non-reflective finish". We do not need to think cell towers are trees. On Application Requirements and Checklist, what happened to #'s 10 and 11? Maybe #12 needs to be re-numbered. In #12 what is the interior of the site if the public can view it from all sides? The big issues are in the language regarding height above the adjacent reference tree and in skylighting. I don't know where the existing language originated, but it seems to me as a non-expert in communications, that 30 feet above the surrounding trees (and not just above the "reference" tree) is bound to improve transmission coverage.as compared to current ordinance language. With towers being above the ground, whether according to existing ordinance limits or the somewhat higher draft language, some skylighting occurs depending on where the observer stands. Allowing No skylighting effectively undermines all reasonable improvements in the proposed draft ordinance language. I think that with all due respect to NIMBY concerns, the community (local citizens and the public traveling through our community) should be provided reliable cell coverage along all major transportation routes not only for convenience but also for safety and security .

(Optional) What is your name?

Sanford Wilcox

(Optional) What is your email address?

sanfordp1973@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 22, 2023 9:14 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I am extremely disappointed. I find it unfathomable that the results of the survey supported the removal of ALL restrictions.

(Optional) What is your name?

David van Roijen

(Optional) What is your email address?

albemarle@splitcreek.me

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 22, 2023 4:35 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

The planned changes to remove restrictions to number and size of antennas is a good idea from my standpoint. Removing these restrictions will improve the coverage and capacity. Also, allowing the towers to be taller over the trees will improve coverage as well. Thanks.

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 22, 2023 2:56 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I'm very pleased that the proposed changes loosen the restrictions and open the door to more effective and more rapid tower construction to improve the generally sub-par level of wireless service in the county. I would encourage the county to go further to streamline this process as much as possible for the tower companies to ensure that we can have a modern, fast, effective cellular network, which is a necessity in today's world for business, personal and public safety reasons. Higher limits, more clustering, more arrays on a tower and removal of other unnecessary restrictions like standoff limits and antenna size restrictions are all great -- the companies need to have flexibility to build the most modern and effective technology. I would love to see the revisions go further, but I fully support these revisions.

(Optional) What is your name?

Dan Seideman

(Optional) What is your email address?

djseideman@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 4:15 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Interesting how all the changes "MAY" increase visibility. Of course larger, taller, more standoff will increase visibility. That ruins the skyline of the County. As frequencies go up with 5G then 6G then whatever G, the signals are more easily attenuated by objects. People, Trees, structures. Ultimately more sites will be needed due to the new technology. I think leaving the regulations alone and making it easier to erect just above tree line towers / poles is what the future needs. Not bigger, more antennas, or taller. That does not work for the higher frequencies and lower power output of the future. The newer antennas have some of the electronics built into them. Schools need to have RF setback zones around them to protect the people working in them every day from long term exposure to the ever increasing frequencies.

(Optional) What is your name?

ROBERT RIVES HUMPHRIS JR

(Optional) What is your email address?

robertrivesjr@aol.com

Bill Fritz

From: John Cruickshank <jcruickshank4@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 1:46 PM
To: Bill Fritz
Cc: John Cruickshank
Subject: Comments on proposed revisions to cell tower regulations

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Members of the Albemarle County Planning Commission,

I have lived in the Charlottesville area for 45 years and at my current address since 1988. I was employed by the Albemarle County Public Schools from 1981 to 2007 as a teacher and school principal. I have serious concerns about the proposed revisions to the Cell Tower Regulation.

- First and foremost, new cell towers should never be located near schools, daycare centers, and neighborhoods. Any existing towers in those areas should be removed.
- By-right height of treetop towers should remain at ten feet above the tallest tree within twenty-five feet.
- Agricultural/forestal districts and nature preserves should be classified as avoidance areas.
- There should be a limit of three providers on each tower.
- Current size restrictions of antennas should remain.
- Retain the current restrictions on the projection of antennas from the face of the tower.
- Current limits on the diameter of cell towers should remain in place.

Thank you for considering my thoughts on the proposed policy changes.

John A. Cruickshank

700 Spring Lake Dr.
Earlysville, VA 22936
434 973-0373

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 11:55 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Thanks for collecting our feedback, happy to participate. Hopefully the changes will help at least with cell service, especially in the portion of Albemarle county that is south of I-64. I've noticed development slowly moving south, like the Wegmans shopping center and new townhouses off of Route 20 and Avon Extended. There are also new developments planned in Scottsville. Good cell and internet coverage would be welcome.

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Monday, November 20, 2023 12:36 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

It is long overdue!

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Monday, November 20, 2023 9:27 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

"By-right height of administratively reviewed towers (called Tier II, aka treetop towers) has increased from 10 feet to 30 feet above the tallest tree within 25 feet of the tower. " This proposed change is so frustrating because we fought against the tower at 4605 Garth Road and when we were unable to fight it, we were told it would not exceed the tallest tree. Please do not increase this tower as our sacred view of the Blue Ridge will definitely be impacted and our property values will decrease. Please save the reason we live in Western Albemarle!!! Thank you for your consideration.

(Optional) What is your name?

Heather D'Arcy

(Optional) What is your email address?

hcdarcy@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 19, 2023 7:12 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I am in favor of any change that might lead to better cell service on Clark Road in White Hall. At present, it is very spotty.

(Optional) What is your name?

Natasha Jahrsdoerfer

(Optional) What is your email address?

islandia.farm.va@live.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 19, 2023 6:35 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Please adopt changes asap, so cell service improves and our county! 5G is a must!

(Optional) What is your name?

Allison Mitchell

(Optional) What is your email address?

mittchellmimi@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 18, 2023 8:45 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I support the changes as proposed, as of today, 2023=11-18

(Optional) What is your name?

Kenneth Webster

(Optional) What is your email address?

kwebconsult@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 18, 2023 2:39 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I am pleased with the suggestions. We definitely need more coverage for much of the southern and western parts of the county. It's very important for safety. Thank you.

(Optional) What is your name?

Brian Ray

(Optional) What is your email address?

svmapping@earthlink.net

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 18, 2023 12:52 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Would like to be able to use a cell phone from home. When the power goes out we loose landline and internet . The high speed internet connection relies on a switch box connected to power. In these situations we have to drive 2 miles to make an emergency phone call. Would appreciate a cell phone tower nearby.

(Optional) What is your email address?

mdallasm44@aol.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 18, 2023 11:53 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

A significant part of the attraction to living in Albemarle County is the preservation of the rural nature outside the confines of Charlottesville. By increasing the height and density of cell phone towers, we risk destroying this (relatively) unique landscape of a rural environment close to an economically and intellectually vibrant city. In addition, spending a bit less time on one's cell phone and more time directly interacting with each other would produce immeasurable benefit to our current social fabric. 24/7/365 access to cellular service should not be the end-all goal of society, especially if it comes at the expense of a loss of environmental beauty.

(Optional) What is your name?

B. A. Pollok

(Optional) What is your email address?

rapidanbio@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 18, 2023 11:24 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

No issues.

(Optional) What is your name?

Adam Doyle

(Optional) What is your email address?

adamdoyle0369@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 18, 2023 9:08 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Thank you for including a detailed summary of the proposed changes as the chart really was of no use. I support all of the changes and the survey data does as well. Thanks for listening to the input from the citizens.

(Optional) What is your name?

Mark Cronin

(Optional) What is your email address?

mjcroni@yahoo.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 18, 2023 6:53 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

This is a good start. We need to let the cellular carriers do their job ,find the dead zones . Then Albemarle county needs to approve the towers. This does not need to be complicated. There are real safety issues involved here.

(Optional) What is your name?

William Martin

(Optional) What is your email address?

Scottmartin4445@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Friday, November 17, 2023 8:34 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Since I found the actual draft proposal to be somewhat opaque, I'm going to rely on the revision summary. These changes should lead to increased coverage in the county. However, I am curious if there are other potential changes to increase coverage that were not included and what was the rationale. This is the opportunity to fix the coverage problem once and for all.

(Optional) What is your name?

David Cox

(Optional) What is your email address?

drdbc54@aol.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Friday, November 17, 2023 3:13 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I think they are well needed. Cell service between Charlottesville and Scottsville is horrible. Coverage in Scottsville itself is also horrible.

(Optional) What is your name?

Melissa Moore

(Optional) What is your email address?

msm6e@yahoo.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Friday, November 17, 2023 2:48 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

More coverage for poorly served areas

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Friday, November 17, 2023 11:36 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

We've chosen convenience over aesthetics. It's a hard choice, but safety comes first.

(Optional) What is your name?

Ida Simmons

(Optional) What is your email address?

idasmtidafarm@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Friday, November 17, 2023 10:24 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I have reviewed the proposed changes and am pleased that they are responsive to the survey inputs.

(Optional) What is your name?

Michael Rosene

(Optional) What is your email address?

mrrosene@aol.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 16, 2023 8:51 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I have reviewed the regulation review and find it well thought out, consistent with the needs of the community, and acceptable in current form.

(Optional) What is your name?

John Post

(Optional) What is your email address?

john@johnpostmd.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 16, 2023 3:19 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I am highly discouraged by the latest draft changes, which mean the towers will be bigger, taller, more visible, and even more unsightly. The proposal is very shortsighted and sacrifices priceless natural beauty at the altar of selfish convenience. I urge you to put the brakes on this and not erect the most massive towers possible! Do our citizens realize that once these towers are up, they will be there as an eyesore "forever"? Is it not likely that technology will advance quickly, and, like so much in the digital realm, future towers will be more compact, less visible, and less massive?

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 16, 2023 10:42 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I believe that these changes are essential to building the cellular network in Albemarle County. Our current system is totally inadequate for the needs of our residents, businesses and public services.

(Optional) What is your name?

Karen S Johnson

(Optional) What is your email address?

johnsonkaren615@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 16, 2023 10:25 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

please no towers in rural or mountain area

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 16, 2023 8:56 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Approve all! The currently dangerous situation of poor unreliable cell service must be fixed. The changes support and improve the chances of better service and reliability. Thank you

(Optional) What is your name?

Richard Ward

(Optional) What is your email address?

sapward@yahoo.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 16, 2023 6:45 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

loosening the restrictions as shown will certainly help us residents that are surrounded by mountains

(Optional) What is your email address?

katprrrrs@aol.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 11:05 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

it seems as if you looked at the option that would increase visibility for each change and selected that one - the natural beauty this area enjoyed is rapidly diminishing

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 8:02 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Unfortunately, the cell tower regulation changes as proposed are necessary and well done. The safety of our rural communities and possibly first responders hinge on reliable communication. Thank you for your work.

(Optional) What is your name?

Gloria Newton

(Optional) What is your email address?

newtongr75@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 7:33 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

The proposed changes appear reasonable.

(Optional) What is your name?

Liz Rabin

(Optional) What is your email address?

lizrabin62@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 7:01 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I support all the proposed amendments. We need better cell coverage.

(Optional) What is your name?

Randy Fleitman

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 3:05 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Verizon Wireless supports all of the proposed changes to the telecom ordinance but requests that the County reconsider the height set in point #2. "By-right height of administratively reviewed towers (called Tier II, aka treetop towers) has increased from 10 feet to 30 feet above the tallest tree within 25 feet of the tower." Verizon's RF Engineers do not believe that a 20 ft increase in the height of all towers above the tallest tree will result in a meaningful improvement of cellular coverage. The topography and rural nature of the majority of the County would require a minimum tower height of 175' AGL for customers to see a significant improvement in coverage. Verizon requests that the County revise the ordinance to allow new and replacement 175' monopoles and self-support towers where setbacks will allow. Thank you,

(Optional) What is your name?

Steven Fanshaw

(Optional) What is your email address?

Steven.Fanshaw@verizonwireless.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 2:55 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

The changes go a long way to address concerns carriers have regarding placement of towers within the county. I think the county still needs to address setbacks and historic districts.

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 1:46 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I totally support changes proposed. I hope and pray that we in the County can get better cell service for everyday as well as emergency service. I live with 1 bar of service 8 miles from Barracks Road Shopping Center if I am lucky. Constant interrupted or dropped calls at home. Constantly despite using wifi to support. Wifi is terrible here as well; 20mg download. Network extenders eat up 10mg so no computer service if I use them. Please for Gods sake get this done. My property is available for site inspection as a cell tower site.

(Optional) What is your name?

Peter Daniel 3355 Free Union Road 22901

(Optional) What is your email address?

peter.v.daniel@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 12:41 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I've reviewed the proposed changes as summarized on this web site, and I'm in favor of all of the changes proposed. These modifications should enhance cell phone coverage, and therefore safety, of Albemarle citizens.

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 12:12 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Keeping in mind that we are a CELL PHONE society today, all persons should have access to GOOD cell phone service, no matter where they are in the county. There are still areas where there is POOR coverage. The Whitehall area is very bad. We have asked for towers to improve the coverage for years. I feel that the county has an obligation to see that all residents have the same coverage as the rest of the county. Thank you Bob Rash

(Optional) What is your name?

Robert G Rash

(Optional) What is your email address?

rashrobert44@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 11:38 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I am happy that the county is easing the regulations on cell phone towers so that we can have more towers and better coverage. Currently at and around my residence in Esmont we are in a dead zone with NO cell service. In the past ten years that we have lived here, I know of several cases where people have died because cell service was not available and authorities could not be reached to get aid. It is critical that this part of the county be better served w cell service. Our health and well being supersedes any supposed environmental or "beauty" issues. I hope this allows complete coverage in South Albemarle: Esmont, Keene, N&S Garden and esp including Walnut Creek park . (Where a mountain biker bled out after a crash and no cell service. There was also a death on Rt 20, but I believe that a cell tower was installed near that location to hopefully correct that issue.) Thank you for your attention to this and I hope we get actual cell service at my residence soon. I installed Starlink recently (on my home generator backup) to avoid power outage down times w Brightspeed WiFi and landline calling, but others in my neighborhood are not able to afford the large upfront cost. Any time power goes out here (quite often), Brightspeed WiFi and landline goes down until Century Link / Brightspeed drops a generator at the local switch station. Which means all of the local population is vulnerable to health crisis w NO communication after a weather event that causes a power loss.

(Optional) What is your name?

Berne K Stober

(Optional) What is your email address?

bernyks@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 10:23 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

We definitely need more coverage in Cismont area. I have constant problems with my cell and internet isn't much better.

(Optional) What is your name?

Linda Shifflett

(Optional) What is your email address?

Shifflett00@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 10:04 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Please. just allow cell providers to put up some towers already. As many have stated, we were 'promised' hi-speed internet years ago, but most still haven't gotten it. I pay for a phone landline in addition to slow internet, when the people down the street, who have a 5 bars, don't have that expense.

(Optional) What is your name?

Sean O

(Optional) What is your email address?

spomalley@embarqmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 9:24 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I think the draft ordinance is moving in the right direction. I think cell phone coverage is very poor, outside the urban ring. I have very little service in Crozet, where I live, and it causes issues when our power is out and I do not have Internet to supplement the service. I also noticed poor coverage while working for Albemarle Fire and Rescue. At times I can't not call a hospital to give report because due to a lack in cell phone coverage.

(Optional) What is your name?

Shane Corpolongo

(Optional) What is your email address?

scorpolongo@albemarle.org

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 9:05 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

The proposed changes in the draft ordinance for cell towers all look good. I agree with each one.

(Optional) What is your name?

Margaret Faison

(Optional) What is your email address?

zoef10@earthlink.net

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 8:33 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Agree with the proposed changes. These changes should allow for better rural signal coverage and increase the signal strengthen for individual users. If these changes are inacted will there be any feedback from the primary cellular providers (VzW, AT&T, TMO) on future plans to augment existing facilities?

(Optional) What is your name?

Mike Cardoso

(Optional) What is your email address?

mdcinva@msn.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 8:32 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

It is high time that Albemarle deals with the issue of poor cell service. No reason why I should get great service driving through the back woods of West Virginia and have near zero service being between C'ville and Richmond. Thank you for addressing this issue.

(Optional) What is your name?

Jamie Ballif

(Optional) What is your email address?

Jcballif44@aol.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 7:39 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I Support the proposed changes to the cell-tower regulations when the service area in question does not have sufficient cell-phone coverage, however, I would hope that there would be requirements that cell phone service providers be required to share tower space with other cell phone service providers and Albemarle County regulations would restrict new towers when there is adequate tower space to share.

(Optional) What is your name?

Presley Thach

(Optional) What is your email address?

presleythach@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 7:38 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

It seems that the ordinance completely deregulates cell phone towers. I don't see one single provision that takes into account aesthetics or preserving the natural landscapes of our rural areas - that is a big mistake.

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 6:25 AM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

The proposed changes in the draft ordinances appear to essentially move any regulation over the visual and aesthetic impact. This would have a significant impact on the topography of the county. The net effect would be quite negative. If we wish to evolve to the landscape of Northern Virginia, the value proposition of county places on natural beauty will be reduced. If there are going to be towers of the size and density, they need to be built in a way that they are camouflaged to look like trees. I do appreciate the fact that my comments will likely be ignored and industry/ development interests appear to be paramount.

(Optional) What is your name?

Paul Lyons

(Optional) What is your email address?

pdjlyons@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 11:51 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

You are just dragging this whole thing out. Since the vast majority of residents use cellphones just put the towers where the benefit is greatest. The people who are against this have nothing better to do. And they organize and send their silly pictures through their cellphones. Either build the towers or ban them completely. This half-assed approach benefits no one.... You are wasting a large amount of taxpayer money with the current process.

(Optional) What is your name?

Edward Strauss

(Optional) What is your email address?

es8m@virginia.edu

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 10:30 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

We need better cell phone service ion Campbell road in Keswick Va

(Optional) What is your name?

Beverly Birckhead

(Optional) What is your email address?

thngswedo60@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 9:37 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Taller poles with limited requirements needed for approval? What a terror to our visual beauty around Cville. Should keep regulations in place with minimal change over a 20 year plan. That way, as technology improves, so will thoughtfulness on how and where towers are erected and obscured.

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 8:30 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

The revisions described all seem to go in the right direction making the towers more useful and easier to apply for. From a safety standpoint, it is essential that we have effective tower coverage for all of Albemarle, and we do not have that today. Nothin mars my view of our countryside worse than a broken car, and nothing is a more welcome sight than a cell tower when I am in trouble.

(Optional) What is your name?

Bucky Walsh

(Optional) What is your email address?

buckywalsh@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 7:19 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I agree with the changes. Whatever it takes to have cell service in southern Albemarle.

(Optional) What is your name?

Travis

(Optional) What is your email address?

seilertravis90@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 7:00 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

It appears much of the reasoning for the original ordinance was for aesthetics. Now, according to the survey, the main concern is connectivity. The new ordinance reflects that concern. Hopefully we will see improved performance from our cell phones especially given the spotty coverage we have with Brightspeed.

(Optional) What is your name?

No Answer

(Optional) What is your email address?

cat3d97@yahoo.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 6:35 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

The proposed changes are acceptable for now. I must note that I have experienced cell provider issues during the last year in which data services that once worked for decades became saturated and failed, supposedly because of the number of users. I am not sure that the issue is with tower saturation, as Verizon and T-Mobile have suggested or the way they manage capacity and data. We must try to ensure that consistency of service and session duration isn't sacrificed in the rush to add users. Otherwise, could end up with forests of towers that still don't meet the needs of education and business.

(Optional) What is your name?

Robert Campbell

(Optional) What is your email address?

bocam48@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 6:22 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Agree as drafted.

(Optional) What is your name?

Harry Franze

(Optional) What is your email address?

22911@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 5:43 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

"Agricultural/Forestral Districts will not be classified as an avoidance area. Avoidance areas are areas where administrative approval of towers is not permitted." I am adamantly opposed to this change. I don't really like some of the others, particularly any change in allowable height, but this one is very bad. it is of no comfort that towers would still need to be approved. These areas should remain avoidance areas.

(Optional) What is your name?

Richard Stovall

(Optional) What is your email address?

richado@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 5:36 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I have no objections to any of the proposed expansion of cell towers regardless of appearance or placement. I reside in the Southernmost portion of Albemarle County (Howardsville) and cell service is spotty at best. I do have Fiber internet provided by Brightspeed (formerly Centurylink) and I can use my cell phone via WiFi although I do have a landline as well. When the electricity goes out (not too often) I have no way to communicate and must go about a mile or so from my home to get cell service. I really enjoy where I live and having reliable cell service when power outages occur would make it almost like heaven! I do realize the wheels of progress grind forward at a glacial pace but hopefully things will be expedited to provide essential communication in the near future in my part of the county.

(Optional) What is your name?

Michael J. McCloskey

(Optional) What is your email address?

mickiemac70@centurylink.net

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 5:35 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

It seems like we're giving carte blanche to the corporations providing cell service, and I'm not sure why. Can we not require them to secure special use permits and regulate on a case-by-case basis? The whole premise of our zoning structure is to protect scenic views in Albemarle, and this proposed policy blows that out of the water. Other communities have required telecoms to "disguise" their towers -- to make them look like trees. Maybe this policy allows such tall structures and so many attachments that that would be impossible, but I do not favor improving cell service for all while ruining certain scenic views for the residents of this area.

(Optional) What is your name?

Sandy Schott

(Optional) What is your email address?

hauschott@aol.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 5:28 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Cellphones have become a necessity and better coverage makes sense for safety and utility. The size changes will not affect the overall aesthetics of a tower.

(Optional) What is your name?

Kim Kepchar

(Optional) What is your email address?

kimkepchar@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 5:08 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Concur with proposed changes.

(Optional) What is your name?

Roger Shropshire

(Optional) What is your email address?

No Answer

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 4:53 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

It sounds like the proposed changes are designed to expand and improve coverage. This is wonderful because I don't even have good audio cell phone service at my rural Albemarle County residence.

(Optional) What is your name?

Monica Cortada

(Optional) What is your email address?

monica.cortada@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 4:46 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

It appears they are more liberal in code with appropriate admin review so they can't be put in place just anywhere. I am positive about these

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 4:45 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

This is WONDERFUL! I am reading this and it seems to say we can get more cell service to rural areas which is really good news as so many don't have land lines anymore!!! thank you!

(Optional) What is your name?

Mark Lepsch

(Optional) What is your email address?

Lepsch@virginia.edu

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 4:36 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I uniformly approve of all the changes made to the draft ordinance. Thank you for paying attention to the survey results. I very much hope that the changes will allow for better cell phone coverage in currently underserved areas.

(Optional) What is your name?

J H Verkerke

(Optional) What is your email address?

ripv@virginia.edu

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 4:32 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I'm comfortable with the additional visibility being proposed and service is improved along entrance corridors.

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 4:31 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Please allow towers that will allow Albemarle to thrive. This is a 20+ (life of the tower) decision. We must get this right. We have to allow for the long range future, not just the now or short term future.

(Optional) What is your name?

Greg McFadyen

(Optional) What is your email address?

mcfadyen.greg@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 4:30 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

I'd like people who live in rural areas to be able to install personal cell towers.

(Optional) What is your name?

Mark Sackson

(Optional) What is your email address?

msackson@me.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 4:30 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Looks good, the County needs better cell phone coverage in rural areas and these revisions should encourage that.

(Optional) What is your name?

Tony Townsend

(Optional) What is your email address?

mrwadt@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 4:29 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Bleeping thank you!! If this helps me have service, you have improved my whole family's safety!!

(Optional) What is your name?

Kim

(Optional) What is your email address?

kianfi13@gmail.com

Bill Fritz

From: freeunionroad <freeunionroad@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 4:29 PM
To: Bill Fritz
Subject: Re: Cell Tower Regulation Review

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Thanks, very good work so far -- sounds promising.

Charles H. Foster, Jr.
2559 Palmer Drive, Keswick VA 22947
cell: 434-987-8001
freeunionroad@gmail.com

On Tue, Nov 14, 2023 at 4:25 PM Bill Fritz <BFRITZ@albemarle.org> wrote:

Thank you for your interest in the review of cell tower regulations in Albemarle County. A draft ordinance has been prepared and we are seeking your input on the proposed ordinance. We are asking for written comments by December 15th. The draft ordinance and a summary of the survey results may be found [HERE](#). That site also has a link that will allow you to provide comments.

William D. Fritz, AICP

Development Process Manager

[Albemarle County](#)

bfritz@albemarle.org

434-296-5823 ext. 3242

401 McIntire Road, North Wing, Charlottesville, VA 22902

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 4:02 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Sounds like it was written by Verizon. Too extreme. The cost of expanding wireless is not worth the cost of the loss of the things important to us (views etc) here in Albemarle County. You shouldn't be including people who don't live here (but work here) in this decision making. They don't have to stare at a tower when they go home. Greene County put up a tower on the border of Albemarle and Greene it's very noticeable (leaves or not) and really spoils the view of otherwise unspoiled vistas. Everyone complains about it. Be careful what you wish for. Quit using non representative samples to make policy. It wasn't a random survey. Responses could mostly be from people who drive through rural Albemarle and want cell phone service. Your action items to this survey are out of proportion to the responses you got. You are elected officials ..be stronger. People respond to strength, not catering to every whim. You're coming closer to making this place like every other. A number of people responded how broadband is more important. You're trying to solve broadband a bit but once again, be stronger. Focus on companies that want to make the place better like Firefly, not those that are awful like Brightspeed.. focus on improving cell service where towers already exist, don't go wild on adding new, taller, visible towers. Focus on improving electric outages and fiber and you'd find many cell phone complaints going away. Focus on a representative sample of 100,000 people in the county..not a non random sample of people who were somehow made aware of the survey. Above all, take things slow. Once these towers are up that's it.

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 3:38 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

"Should new tower projects within the mountain protection areas be reviewed only by County Staff or by Board of Supervisors?" Survey results 22.3% say never and 28.2% say board of supervisors. Over 50% want mountain areas protected. NO towers in maintain areas

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 3:29 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

They look reasonable.

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 3:28 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

overall i approve of the changes. we need better access in real areas.

(Optional) What is your name?

bradford bennett

(Optional) What is your email address?

bennett@westeastsomatics.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 3:23 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

Changes in the county limits on the tower's height above the nearest tree contiguous tree and the number of arrays attached to a tower are overdue.

(Optional) What is your name?

Richard Randolph

(Optional) What is your email address?

rickrandolph@icloud.com

Bill Fritz

From: Engage Albemarle <notifications@engagementhq.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 3:22 PM
To: Allison Wrabel; Bill Fritz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Draft Ordinance Feedback

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Draft Ordinance Feedback with the responses below.

What feedback or comments do you have on the proposed changes in the draft ordinance?

All the results are in favor of the cell tower owners so it seems to me the questioners to the public was a waste of time!

(Optional) What is your name?

Bruce Butala

(Optional) What is your email address?

bruce@butalabis.com



December 15, 2023

VIA EMAIL

Mr. Bill Fritz
Albemarle County, VA
Development Process Manager

Re: Albemarle County, VA Cell Tower Regulations

Dear Mr. Fritz:

The Wireless Infrastructure Association (WIA) represents the companies that build, develop, own, maintain, operate and innovate the nation's wireless infrastructure. WIA member companies include infrastructure providers, wireless carriers, and professional services firms that collectively own and operate more than 135,000 telecommunications facilities around the globe. We congratulate Albemarle County, VA ("County") on proposing updates to your cell tower and personal wireless facility code. After reviewing the proposed changes, we agree that the County has made improvements adding transparency to tower and wireless facility siting and modification but we urge you to continue your work to bring the code into compliance with current FCC guidelines and orders.

It is admirable that the County has undertaken comprehensive work in reviewing its code, definitions, completing a wireless facility survey and communicating regularly with the public. Why not complete this work and bring the County's code into compliance with current FCC guidelines and orders? These rules have proven to be effective in balancing local control with guidance that effectively allows wireless facility siting and modifications that help reduce proliferation of wireless facilities.

To be specific, we urge the County to:

1. Adopt FCC Section 6409 of the Spectrum Act issued in 2012 and

1. Section 6409(a) provides straightforward rules that allow for clear application processing timelines, equipment dimensions and modification parameters that have worked effectively nationwide for over a decade. Some key provisions the County could codify are:
 - a. 150-Day Shot Clock from application submission to application determination for new tower siting
 - b. 60-Day Shot Clock from application submission to application determination for tower modifications

- c. Colocations may increase tower height due to antenna separation no more than 20 feet as measured from the top of an existing antenna to the bottom of the new proposed antenna.
- 2. Adopt FCC Small Cell Order issued in 2018.
 - a. Establish \$270 right of way access for per small cell location
 - b. 90-Day Shot Clock from application submission to application determination for new small cell
 - c. 60-Day Shot Clock from application submission to application determination for small cell modification

All these guidelines have proven effective in the long term nationwide resulting in predictable permitting processes, reasonable fees, necessary and appropriate wireless facilities, faster wireless infrastructure deployment, and reliable wireless connectivity. We respectfully urge you to include these parameters in your code revisions.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Karmen Rajamani
VP, Government Affairs
Wireless Infrastructure Association
2111 Wilson Blvd., Suite 210
Arlington, VA 22201
703-719-4521
Karmen.Rajamani@wia.org

Bill Fritz, Albemarle County Development Process Manager
County of Albemarle
401 McIntire Road
Charlottesville, VA 22902

SUBJ: Albemarle County Draft Cell Tower and Cell Pole (Personal Wireless Facility)
Regulations review comments

Dear Bill,

The Piedmont Group, Sierra Club has reviewed the Draft Cell Tower and Cell Pole (Personal Wireless Facility) Regulations for Albemarle County. Our comments are listed below:

General comments

- First and foremost, cell towers should never be located near schools, daycare centers, and densely populated neighborhoods.
- By-right height of treetop towers should remain at ten feet above the tallest tree within twenty-five feet.
- Forestal planning districts should be classified as avoidance areas.
- There should be a limit of three providers on each tower.
- Retain the current restrictions on the projection of antennas from the face of the tower.
- Current limits on the diameter of cell towers should remain in place.

Specific code sections comments

Sec. 5.1.40 Personal wireless service facilities; collocation, replacement, and removal of transmission equipment

Application Requirements

1. *Section 4(g) Setbacks, parking, fencing, and landscaping.*

Add setbacks listed below:

- a. A 1500-foot setback between cell towers
 - b. A 500-foot minimum setback between antennas and homes
2. *Section 7. Additions of antennas.*

Justify adding antennas or constructing new cell towers by:

- a. Requiring proof of a significant gap in service coverage for any antenna, proven by 'in-kind' testing (such as drive-by tests and dropped calls) certified by an RF engineer.
- b. Clarify that an applicant's claim that it needs the proposed tower for "future capacity" is not sufficient to establish that it suffers from a significant gap in coverage.
3. Require the least intrusive methods to fill any coverage gap for antennas. Maintain requirement for the least intrusive methods to fill the gap for cell towers. A justification study which includes the rationale for selecting the proposed use; if applicable, a detailed explanation of the coverage gap that the proposed use would serve; and how the proposed use is the least intrusive means for the applicant to provide wireless service.
4. Insure against reductions in property values of properties situated near wireless facilities. Require assessment study of properties with half mile of the proposed cell tower site to determine impacts to neighborhood property values.
5. Require that the submittal of key items by the applicant is done so under oath and penalty of perjury.
6. Require General Liability Insurance: Pollution Exclusion Clause – In order to protect the county from liability from harm to humans or the environment, localities have a legitimate right to require proper health protective insurance on their master license or emergency ordinance. Without proper insurance that does not have a pollution exclusion a locality can be sued for damages by individuals.
7. FCC Clause: Add a clause voiding the agreement or requiring agreement modification in the event of a regulatory change.
8. Proof of NEPA Review: Require information by cell tower company showing this installation has received any required review (e.g., environmental assessment and review) by the FCC pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), or is exempt from such requirements. If exempt, please state what the basis is for the exemption and provide proof, including supporting documents that establish that this installation meets such exemption.

Development Requirements

9. **Revise Section 10. *Height of monopole.*** The top of the monopole, measured in elevation above mean sea level, shall not be more than **ten** feet above...
10. Include specific information on fall-zone requirements so that wireless facilities are maintained at a sufficient distance from structures and the general public.
11. Setback From Roads or Property Lines: All new towers shall be constructed with a setback from the tower's base of at least 1.5 times the tower height to a public or private road and at least 2.5 times the tower height to the nearest property line.

12. Setbacks from Schools and Hospitals: 1500-foot setback from schools and hospitals.
Discontinue allowing antennae on county and school properties.

Applicability of other Development Requirements in this Chapter

13. Add section for Annual Recertification:

Each year, commencing on the first anniversary of the issuance of the permit, the Permittee shall submit to the County an affidavit which shall list all active cell wireless installations it owns within the County by location, certifying that (1) each active cell installation is covered by liability insurance in the amount of at least \$2,000,000 per installation, naming the County as additional insured; and (2) each active installation has been inspected for safety and found to be in sound working condition and in compliance with all federal safety regulations concerning RF exposure limits.

14. Radiofrequency Testing and Monitoring

Require all applicants to submit to the County an RF Compliance Report signed by a registered Professional Engineer, together with a completed form RF Data Request Sheet that provides technical information sufficient for power density verification. The RF Compliance Report should provide power density calculations in microwatts per centimeter squared ($\mu\text{W}/\text{cm}^2$) as well as percent of FCC standard; and power density calculations should be provided in tabular form showing power density at 10' increments out to a distance of 1000 feet at ground level (6') and to second-story building levels. The RF reposts shall be submitted to the County every 3 years.

- a. The County shall have the right to employ a qualified RF engineer to conduct an annual random and unannounced test of the Permittee's cell wireless installations located within the County to certify their compliance with all FCC radio-frequency emission limits as they pertain to exposure to the general public.
- b. Excessive RF radiation— No wireless telecommunications facility shall at any time be permitted to emit illegally excessive RF radiation as defined in Section 18.23.020, or to produce power densities that exceed the legally permissible limits for electric and magnetic field strength and power density for transmitters, as codified within 47 CFR 1.1310(e)(1), Table 1, Sections (i) and (ii), as made applicable pursuant to 47 CFR 1.1310(e)(3)
- c. The County may cause such random testing to be conducted as often as the County may deem appropriate. However, the County may not require the owner and/or operator to pay for more than one test per facility per calendar year unless such testing reveals that one or more of the owner and/or operator's facilities are exceeding the limits codified within [47 CFR 1.1310\(e\)\(1\)](#) et seq., in which case the

County shall be permitted to demand that the facility be brought into compliance with such limits, and to conduct additional tests to determine if, and when, the owner and/or operator thereafter brings the respective facility and/or facilities into compliance.

- d. In the event that such independent tests reveal that any cell installation or installations owned or operated by Permittee or its Lessees, singularly or in the aggregate, is emitting RF radiation in excess of FCC exposure guidelines as they pertain to the general public, the County shall notify the Permittee and all residents living within 1500 feet of the small cell installation(s) of the violation, and the Permittee shall have forty-eight (48) hours to bring the small cell installation(s) into compliance. Failure to bring the small cell installation(s) into compliance shall result in monetary penalties or revocation of site permit.
15. Prohibit cell telecommunication facilities in residential zones and multi-family zoning districts.

Please contact Kirk Bowers or John Cruickshank with any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Kirk A. Bowers". The signature is written in dark ink on a light background.

Kirk A. Bowers, PE
Albemarle County, VA 22911

December 15, 2023

Planning Commission
Albemarle County
401 McIntire Road
Charlottesville, VA 22902

Dear Esteemed Members of the Planning Commission,

Thank you for continuing to keep Crown Castle Inc. ("Crown Castle") apprised as the County reviews its Personal Wireless Service Facilities zoning ordinance for prospective revisions. We commend the County for its efforts to provide the people, businesses, and government of the County with better access to connectivity. If the events of the Covid-19 pandemic the last few years say anything, it's that connectivity is more important than ever. People and businesses rely on a strong wireless connection for so many facets of their daily lives, from basic phones calls and telehealth appointments to emergency situations where every minute counts.

Section 6409 Background

Crown Castle is the nation's leading provider of shared wireless infrastructure. Crown Castle owns and manages approximately 40,000 macrocell communications facilities in the United States and approximately 80,000 route miles of fiber optic cable supporting small cell and fiber solutions. This diverse, shared infrastructure allows Crown Castle to partner with wireless carriers to deliver critical broadband services throughout the United States.

Crown Castle also provides professional zoning and permitting services for our wireless customers. This broad range of expertise, both as a communications facility owner and manager, and as a service provider working for wireless carrier providers, gives Crown a unique perspective when reviewing public policy that affects wireless deployment.

We have been following the County's work sessions and the consultant's presentations. We agree with the consultant's recommendation that establishing a collocation friendly ordinance is the best means to achieve the County's objective of improved wireless connectivity. While there are times when new infrastructure is required to meet connectivity needs, Crown Castle believes that shared wireless infrastructure is good policy for the County and our wireless industry partners. By adopting policies that encourage collocation, the County can maximize the use of existing infrastructure and reduce the need for new infrastructure. To that end, Crown Castle provides the following comments on the November 13, 2023, draft ordinance and application process.

Eligible Facilities Requests under Section 6409.

Crown Castle supports the County's incorporation of the federal law commonly known as Section 6409. In 2012, Congress passed Section 6409 of the Spectrum Act and the President signed it into law. The Federal Communications Commission then promulgated regulations implementing the law, which have been upheld by the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals. The statute¹, regulations², FCC Orders³ and court decision⁴ establish a clear, national policy in favor of collocation on existing wireless infrastructure. We strongly encourage the County to continue to harmonize its ordinance with Section 6409 to reduce ambiguity and conflict with these federal standards.

Section 6409 states "a State or local government may not deny, and shall approve, any eligible facilities request ("EFR") for a modification of an existing wireless tower or base station that does not substantially change the physical dimensions of such tower or base station."⁵ The FCC's related regulations and orders provide guidance to interpret and implement Section 6409. Given their importance to telecommunications infrastructure, Crown Castle has prepared several summaries of the highlights of this important federal law. We are attaching them in the hope that they will facilitate the County's efforts to encourage collocation.

With this in mind, Crown Castle offers the following comments and recommendations regarding several important provisions of the County's draft ordinance.

Chapter 18, Article I, Sec. 3 – Definitions

Wireless Facility "Tiers": The County's definition and designation of wireless facilities among various "Tiers" creates unnecessary distinctions and levels of review which we believe will lead to inefficient review processes and lack of clarity to applicants as to the appropriate standards. We strongly encourage the County to adopt a streamlined process for EFRs. Failing to do so will create ambiguity and tension between the County's standards and federal law which established clear parameters for what the County may consider when reviewing an EFR.

¹ 47 U.S.C. § 1455.

² 47 CFR § 1.6000, et seq.

³ Acceleration of Broadband Deployment by Improving Wireless Facility Siting Policies, 80 Fed. Reg. 1238-01 (Jan. 8, 2015) (the "2014 Infrastructure Order"); Accelerating Wireless and Wireline Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment, 85 Fed. Reg. 45126 (July 27, 2020) (the "5G Upgrade Order"); and Accelerating Wireless and Wireline Deployment by Streamlining Local Approval of Wireless Infrastructure Modifications, WT Docket # 19-250, RM-11849; FCC 20-153 (Nov. 3, 2020).

⁴ Montgomery County Maryland v. FCC, 811 F.3d 121 (4th Cir. 2015).

⁵ 47 U.S.C. §1455(a)(1).

For example, many of the application requirements for the different Tiers are not applicable to EFRs and are preempted by federal law.

Concealment Elements as Applied to Non-Stealth Facilities: Crown Castle encourages the County to revise its definitions of “Concealment Element” and “Defeats Concealment Elements”, and to align them with the federal government’s definition. The County’s defines a “concealment element”, in pertinent part, as any condition of approval imposed on the personal wireless service facility as a concealment technique. To the contrary, the FCC specifically defined what amounts to a concealment element.

To qualify as an EFR, a proposed modification cannot “defeat the concealment elements of the eligible support structure.”⁶ In 2020, the FCC, in the 5G Upgrade Order, provided important clarity regarding what constitutes a “concealment element”. In that Order, the FCC specifically defined “concealment elements” as “elements of a stealth-designed facility intended to make the facility look like something other than a wireless tower or base station.”⁷ A “stealth-designed facility” is defined as “facilities designed to look like some feature other than a wireless tower or base station.”⁸ The FCC is clear that “concealment elements are those elements of a wireless facility installed for the purpose of rendering the ‘appearance of the wireless facility as something fundamentally different than a wireless facility,’ and that concealment elements are ‘confined to those used in stealth facilities.’”⁹

The County’s draft ordinance inaccurately classifies conditions such as flush mounting, antenna size, screening by trees, and increasing the height of a tower above the tallest tree within twenty-five feet (i.e. “Treetop Facility”) as concealment elements. This provision would directly conflict with Section 6409 and would be preempted.¹⁰ The FCC expressly stated that elements such as placement behind a tree line or fence are not concealment elements.¹¹ This will lead to delay and unnecessary use of County time and resources as County staff tries to determine the correct standard and reconcile these conflicting provisions. We believe the goal should be the efficient use of existing infrastructure by harmonizing the County ordinance with Section 6409.

Small Cell Facility Criteria: While the County’s definition of a “Small Cell Facility” is consistent with federal law, the County’s definition of “Small Cell Facility Criteria” is not. In its definition, the County excludes nodes located in

⁶ 47 C.F.R. 1.6100(b)(7)(v).

⁷ 5G Upgrade Order at para. 34.

⁸ Infrastructure Order at para. 200, cited by 5G Upgrade Order at para. 34.

⁹ 5G Upgrade Order at para. 34.

¹⁰ See *Montgomery County Maryland v. FCC*, 811 F.3d 121, 128-129 (4th Cir. 2015).

¹¹ 5G Upgrade Order at para. 40.

historical districts, as well as nodes located inside the jurisdictional boundaries of a locality having expended a total amount equal to or greater than 35 percent of its general fund operating revenue, as shown in the most recent comprehensive annual financial report, on undergrounding projects since 1980. As provided in the Code of Federal Regulations¹², the FCC defines a small cell as a small wireless facility (i) mounted on structures 50 feet or less in height including their antennas, or (ii) mounted on structures no more than 10 percent taller than other adjacent structures, or (iii) do not extend existing structures on which they are located to a height of more than 50 feet or by more than 10 percent, whichever is greater. The federal definition notably does not make the same exclusions that the County is attempting to make, as such, the County's definition will be preempted.

Crown Castle encourages the County to revise its definition of "Small Cell Facility Criteria" to be in alignment with federal law, by removing these exclusions, and treating those facilities as small cells subject to the same protections¹³ afforded under federal law.

Chapter 18, Article II, Sec. 5.1.40 - Application Requirements

Crown Castle recommends this section be revised to comply with the federal framework for wireless applications. The County's use of "Tiers," and the related application requirements and levels of review, conflicts with Section 6409 and the FCC's regulations. Section 6409 only allows the County to determine if an application qualifies as an EFR. If the application qualifies, the County must approve it.¹⁴ Furthermore, when an applicant asserts in writing that a request for a modification is covered by Section 6409, a local government may only require the applicant to provide reasonable application materials necessary to demonstrate the application is in fact a Section 6409-covered project.¹⁵ Several of the application requirements for Tier I, II and III facilities, to the extent the County would apply them to EFR applications, would be contrary to federal law and would be inconsistent with the limited scope of review for an EFR application.

Chapter 18, Article II, Sec. 5.1.40 - Development Requirements

Development Standards for New Facilities: The requirement that "all new wireless" projects not covered by Section 6409 "must conform" to the County's Development Standards will make new site development extremely challenging. While strict compliance with any one of the proposed standards could be challenging, requiring strict

¹² 47 CFR § 1.6002(l).

¹³ 47 U.S.C. § 253(a).

¹⁴ 47 CFR § 1.6100(c).

¹⁵ 47 CFR § 1.6100(c)(1).

compliance with all standards including, concealment, zone height limits, and setbacks could be nearly impossible. Collectively, these standards will make new site development very difficult, if not impossible in some cases. The cumulative effect of these requirements on new wireless facilities risks creating a “material inhibition” of wireless service in violation of the applicable provisions of the Telecommunications Act and the relevant FCC rules and orders.

Crown Castle recommends that the County provide guidance to staff and applicants, and also offer flexibility to depart from the guidelines when necessary. It is important to empower staff to make informed, common-sense decisions and to balance these guidelines with the connectivity needs of the wireless network in the County.

Section 10 – Height of Monopole: The County’s proposed design standards also address specific height allowances certain Tier II structures. These design standards incorporate the same standards proposed by the County for “Treetop Facilities” and Crown Castle expresses the same concerns about the validity of these standards under federal law. Specifically, it will present significant difficulty to determine and demonstrate compliance with the requirement that the top of the monopole be no more than thirty feet taller than the tallest tree within 25 feet. Of course, trees change. Furthermore, the tallest tree one day could be considerably different due to development in the area. Such development may be completely beyond Crown Castle’s control, and this would create an unnecessary hardship, particularly on existing infrastructure. The FCC addressed the example of using the tree line as a concealment element specifically, stating in pertinent part, “a requirement that the facility remain hidden behind a tree line is not a feature of a stealth-designed facility; rather it is an aesthetic condition that falls under section 1.6100(b)(7)(vi).¹⁶ Then elaborating further, “like any other condition under section 1.6100(b)(7)(vi), such an aesthetics-related condition still cannot be used to prevent modifications specifically allowed under section 1.6100(b)(7)(i)-(iv).¹⁷ Crown Castle recommends removing the entirety of the revised “height” section for existing towers as it may directly conflict with Section 6409. Section 6409 also allows for towers, other than those located in the public right of way, to be extended by 10% or by the height of one additional antenna array with separation from the nearest existing antenna not to exceed twenty feet, whichever is greater.¹⁸ Therefore, height extensions within the EFR guidelines under Section 6409 are permissible, regardless of the height restrictions imposed on any Tier.

¹⁶ 5G Upgrade Order at para. 40

¹⁷ 5G Upgrade Order at para. 42

¹⁸ 47 C.F.R. §1.60001(b)(7)(i)

Crown Castle appreciates the County's efforts. An initiative like the one that the County is undertaking takes significant time and resources. But it is also important. We commend the County for its efforts to facilitate wireless connectivity to meet the needs of the citizens of Albemarle County and hope that you will receive our recommendations in the spirit of making that connectivity a reality. We would welcome the opportunity to further discuss these issues with the County and we look forward to partnering with you in this work. Should you have any questions or would like further information you may reach me at Amanda.Cornwall@crowncastle.com.

Sincerely,

Amanda Cornwall

Amanda Cornwall
Attorney

cc: Ann Brooks, External Affairs Manager, Crown Castle



December 15, 2023

The Honorable Corey Clayborne, Chair
Albemarle County Planning Commission
401 McIntire Road
Charlottesville, VA 22902

The Honorable Frederick Missel, Vice-Chair
Albemarle County Planning Commission
401 McIntire Road
Charlottesville, VA 22902

RE: Comments on Revised Draft Ordinance and Definitions related to cell towers and cell poles (personal wireless facilities) in Albemarle County

Dear Chair Clayborne, Vice-Chair Missel, and Members of the Planning Commission:

CTIA®, the trade association for the wireless communications industry, respectfully submits these comments on draft changes to Albemarle County’s Cell Tower Ordinance (PWSF) and Ordinance Definitions. We appreciate the County’s efforts to modernize its cell tower regulations to help enhance wireless connectivity for Albemarle County’s residents, schools, and businesses. As consumers increasingly rely on wireless services for text, voice, and broadband communications, including internet access, our members rely on reasonable and predictable policies that help facilitate the deployment and enhancement of wireless networks.

It is critical to keep in mind that the public’s growing demand for wireless services requires wireless carriers to continuously upgrade and expand their networks. CTIA members are investing tens of billions of dollars - \$39 billion in 2022 alone - in their networks nationwide to provide that connectivity.¹ This investment also fuels economic growth in Virginia, where the wireless industry supports 103,000 jobs and generates \$10.6 billion in annual GDP growth.² We are eager to continue working with state and local officials to build networks that deliver the benefits of 5G and broadband services.

CTIA strongly supports various provisions that update the County’s existing zoning requirements for wireless facilities as well as align those requirements with state and federal law. However, CTIA is concerned other provisions would impose unintentional barriers or otherwise cause delays in deployment. We look forward to working with the Planning Commission on these concerns and how they can be modified to advance high-quality wireless service in Albemarle County.

Screening and Visibility Requirements

The section on “Screening and siting to minimize visibility” in the draft Ordinance emphasizes minimizing visibility from adjacent parcels, streets and designated areas that would introduce significant challenges and possibly cause conflict with the subsequent “Height of monopole” section.

¹ <https://www.ctia.org/the-wireless-industry/wireless-industry>

² https://www.ctia.org/4g-assets/WirelessImpact_VA.pdf



We strongly support the shift from a ten-foot to thirty-foot height limit, which will provide greater ability for wireless carriers to expand coverage. However, the subjective nature of what constitutes “screening” taken together with the increased height limit may still result in the denial of facilities if it is perceived that a new deployment conflicts with this section’s intent to effectively conceal a structure.

Furthermore, an overly broad interpretation of this provision could restrict the placement of towers, potentially violating Sections 253 and 332 of the federal Communications Act. *Accelerating Wireless Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment*, 33 FCC Rcd 9088, 9102, *aff’d in part sub nom. City of Portland v. U.S.*, 969 F.3d 1020 (9th Cir. 2020) (“State/Local Siting Order”). This prohibits state and local regulations that have the effect of prohibiting or significantly impairing the provision of personal wireless services.

Finally, the inclusion of a screening requirement raises practical challenges, as some structures may be incapable of supporting screening. For example, screening has the potential to increase the wind load on buildings, which may impact structural integrity. We recommend revising the language to differentiate between screening and alternative concealment methods, providing flexibility for carriers to meet these requirements.

Radio Frequency (RF) Compliance Requirements

This new section in the draft Ordinance on “RF Compliance” requires applications for new towers and collocations, modifications or upgrades to provide a signed statement from an RF engineer stating that the radiofrequency emissions comply with Federal Communications Commission (FCC) standards. This requirement is unnecessary, duplicative and conflicts with the FCC’s authority to regulate RF emissions.

In Section 332(c)(7) of the Communications Act, Congress granted the FCC exclusive authority to regulate RF emissions and to impose RF-related siting conditions. The County’s mandate of an RF engineer statement constitutes an impermissible compliance requirement imposed by a local government. Furthermore, the requirement also does not define “competent RF engineer,” creating ambiguity and potentially leading to inconsistent application processes that will inhibit deployment and conflict with the FCC’s regulatory regime. Given the clear regulations established by the FCC in this regard, we request the removal of this unnecessary requirement, which would make the application process more burdensome. By removing this requirement, the approval process can be streamlined and conflicts with federal law can be avoided.

CTIA appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft Ordinance and Definitions, and the County’s recognition of the benefits of wireless connectivity. We strongly support a number of new provisions and look forward to working with the County to discuss these concerns to achieve the purpose and intent of these policies and benefit the County’s efforts to improve connectivity.

Sincerely,

Annissa Reed

Director, State and Local Affairs

Cc: William D. Fritz, AICP, Development Process Manager, Albemarle County

MEMORANDUM

TO: Albemarle County
Attention: Bill Fritz

FROM: Valerie Long and Lori Schweller

DATE: December 14, 2023

RE: Proposed Amendments to Wireless Telecommunications Ordinance, dated
November 13, 2023 (the "Ordinance")

The proposed Ordinance amendment would meaningfully increase the wireless industry's ability to provide good service in the County and should reduce County officials' meeting time spent on wireless facility applications.

We strongly support the following proposed revisions:

- The standard for a Tier II treetop tower is 30' above the reference tree, not 10';
- The definition of Tier I Personal Wireless Service Facility (PWSF) includes the administrative extension of an existing Tier II site to 30' above the reference tree;
- The definition of "concealment elements of the eligible support structure" provides that only an extension of an existing treetop tower more than 30' above the tallest tree within 25' would be a substantial change as to height;
- The amendment eliminates limitations on the number of antennas on a support structure, the size of antennas, antenna standoff, pole diameter, and number of Tier III facilities within a certain radius; and
- The amendment removes Agricultural-Forestal districts as an "Avoidance Area," which means that a treetop tower in such district will be classified as Tier II, not Tier III, thus avoiding the special use permit process for Tier II sites in Agricultural Forestal districts.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the draft Ordinance and make the following additional comments and recommendations:

1. **Minimizing Visibility.** Sec. 5.1.40(b)(6) requires every wireless facility to be "sited to minimize its visibility from adjacent parcels and streets." In fact, staff analysis of wireless facilities entails evaluating visibility from *all* streets from which the facilities are visible, not just adjacent streets. Historically, **this visibility analysis has been the core of the County's evaluation of every wireless facility.** It is unclear how staff will evaluate facilities that are 30' above the reference tree. The discretion established by (b)(6) for how visible a facility may be could undermine the new height limit unless this subsection is modified with a phrase such "subject to the allowable height provisions." In the alternative, this section could be revised to be specific about desired methods for minimizing visibility. For example, it could require facilities to be located within areas with enough trees so that the ground equipment and bottom portion of the support structure would be screened by the trees.

2. **Conservation Easements.** Section 5.1.40(b)(6) should be modified to delete the last sentence regarding conservation easements. The County should let the easement holders administer their own conservation easements, just as it allows property owners in common schemes of development to administer their own deed restrictions and declarations of covenants, conditions, and restrictions. If a facility is proposed on property under conservation easement, the County could require the applicant to provide a confirmation letter from the easement holder (grantee) that the facility is allowed under the terms of the easement (though, unless the easement holder is the County, that is a private contractual matter, which the County generally refrains from including in a land use matter). The County should not restrict the use of parcels that are adjacent to properties under conservation easement but are themselves *not* under conservation easement, especially with such ambiguous language as “the facility shall be sited so that it is not visible *from any resources specifically identified for protection* in the deed of easement” (emphasis added). Typically, conservation easements in the county cite a wide variety of conservation values to justify acceptance of the easement, including open spaces and viewsheds benefitting the traveling public, forests, streams, wildlife, and other natural resources. The language of this section could be read broadly to prevent *any* visibility of a wireless facility *anywhere* on the eased property. If read narrowly to apply only to specific structures called out by name, then so few conservation easements would be affected that the provision would be meaningless. Regardless of the near impossibility of administering this provision, it gives outsized power to neighbors, whose property is subject to conservation easement and may have already received generous tax benefits, to oppose a facility on the property of a neighbor who has not encumbered his property and received such benefits.
3. **Open Space Plan Resources.** Section 5.1.40(b)(7) should be deleted: “The facility shall not adversely impact resources identified in the natural resources chapter of the county’s comprehensive plan and the parks and green systems chapters in any county master plan.” This provision is overly inclusive and subjective. Further, the Avoidance Area concept was developed to control placement of facilities.
4. **Avoidance Areas.** According to CityScape’s June 13, 2023 Planning Commission Work Session Memo, **over 48%** of the County’s land area is within an Avoidance Area. Unsurprisingly, the Memo reports that over 46% of the existing 140 wireless facilities are in at least one Avoidance Area. Though two categories were eliminated from the definition of Avoidance Area (Agricultural-Forestral districts and sites with three or more facilities within 200’ radius), continuing to designate historic districts and scenic highways or byways as Avoidance Areas will continue to lengthen unnecessarily the review and approval process time for staff and applicants. Avoidance Areas are unnecessary if the County reviews every site in the same way for visual impact. The effect of having Avoidance Areas is to require a legislative approval process for sites that would otherwise be Tier II administrative sites. (We note also that Architectural Review Board review of wireless facilities on Entrance Corridors is redundant to staff’s visibility evaluation and not a good use of ARB meeting time.)
5. **Horizontal Separation of Multiple Facilities.** Section 5.1.40(b)(8) should be deleted; this section prohibits a Tier II facility from being located so that it and three or more existing or approved facilities would be within a radius of 200 feet. This situation was eliminated as an Avoidance Area, so it would be consistent to eliminate this subsection as well. This provision is counterproductive to the County’s desire for well-sited facilities. If a site has good tree coverage and/or screening topography, it is likely good for multiple

sites, thus preventing sites with greater visibility. There are many examples of such groups of three or more Tier II sites with excellent screening and visibility, including (a) the nearly invisible cluster of four wireless providers' sites on Newtown Heights on the mountain slope to the right of westbound I-64 traffic across from the VDOT Memorial (site nos. A34, A35, A36, and A37 in the Inventory); (b) the three PWSFs on Wild Turkey Lane off U.S. 250W (A44, A45, A46); and (c) three carriers' facilities on Dry Bridge Road (A62, A63, A64) off I-64W near Ivy. These are just a few of many examples of groups of three or more facilities notable for being very well-screened.

6. **Color of the Monopole.** To make it easier for new applicants to comply with Section 5.1.40(b)(11), we suggest that this section state that the County maintains a list of approved paint colors but that it will review and approve other colors proposed by the applicant. Since the County has approved so many sites, it is more efficient for the County to maintain an approved list rather than require applicants to figure out how to satisfy the requirement.
7. **Placement of Cables, Wiring, and Similar Attachments.** Rather than requiring all cables and wires to be placed within metal support structures, Section 5.1.40(b)(12) should allow them to be run along the inside of the structure if they don't all fit inside. With the amount of equipment on monopoles today, it may be more attractive to have a narrower pole than a pole with a diameter wide enough to fit all cables and wires.
8. **Grounding Rod.** Section 5.1.40(b)(1)(e) limits the height of lightning rods to two feet. This section should clarify that the lightning rod is not counted in the height of the monopole (which is why it is separately regulated). Because their diameters are so small and they are so high above the ground, lightning rods are minimally visible. Regulating dimensions of lightning rods seems unnecessary, but, if needed, we suggest allowing up to 4' tall, which is routinely used for facilities in other jurisdictions.
9. **Tree Surveys:** Section 5.1.40(a)(4)(f) requires a tree survey with the caliper and species of all trees with dripline within 50' of the facility. The height must be provided for the reference tree and all trees relied on for screening. For some sites, particularly taller sites, an expensive tree survey may be unnecessary. We suggest adding a provision that, if the agent determines that the survey is not needed for evaluation of the site, the agent may waive the provision. A tree conservation plan is already required under Section 5.1.40(b)(3) for all sites in order to identify trees that need to be protected and those that need to be removed for construction.
10. **Submittal Dates/Time for Action:** Section 5.1.40(e)(3) should be revised to be consistent with state and federal statutes and regulations. For all facilities, the date of actual submission, not the date of acceptance, should be the commencement date for measuring approval times. If the application is found to be incomplete, the date of completeness may be the start date. The timeline for deeming an application complete is 10 days for all applications per Va. Code Sec. 15.2-2316.4:1.C(1). Pursuant to Va. Code Sec. 15.2-2316.4:1, approval times for new facilities must be 150 days after complete submission is received, and, for collocations, 90 days after complete submission is received. For eligible facilities requests and small cells, they must be acted on within 60 days, or they are deemed approved.