Planning Co	Planning Commission Public Comment Matrix: DETAILED COMMENTS				
Reference #	Name	Comment Type	Comment (with attachments or links)		
WCF-1	Jill F. Harris	Online Form	"DEAR FRIENDS, I don't mean legal permitting; I mean the knowledge-based permission of the citizens who will be exposed to 5G. 5G is being rolled out to serve the wireless technology companies and their financial gain, without considering the effects on human bodies. There is far too much scientifically proven information regarding 5G facts and extreme dangers to humans to try to attach, here.* Our human bodies are electrical systems. 5G is different from even 4G, and will be debilitatingly dangerous to our health,messing with our brains, organs, very cells, and the delicate electrical systems that are part of a healthy body. *Please, for your own sake, take the time to Google "The dangers of 5G on the human body" and read/listen to what doctors and scientists are frantically trying to get the word out about. Consider, and determine for yourself if you want to be exposed to 5G. THANK YOU. Jill F. Harris"		
WCF-2	Svetlana Skalican	Online Form	I think this is wonderful to see we are considering updated systems for Kitsap County. As a woman that feels safety is a big concern, having the ability to call a loved one at a moments notice, is super important. I also find it hard to use GPS in certain parts of Kitsap County. It feels awful driving somewhere I've never been to without any assistance from a map. I'm hoping that updating the infrastructure for our cell phones that we can get better coverage for those types of uses as well.		
WCF-3	Athena Doctor	Online Form	We live in an area of Kitsap County that we refer to as "the boonies" because we do not have access to cable, high speed internet, or many wireless companies. In fact, there is only one company that has any type of coverage available at our home and even that is spotty. There are several "dead zones" in the area, which renders quick contact for emergency help non-existent in many places. We would like to see a wireless tower (and cable services) in our area. Is there a proposal for this in the Carney/Wye Lake area??		

Planning Commission Public Comment Matrix: DETAILED COMMENTS				
Reference #	Name	Comment Type	Comment (with attachments or links)	
WCF-4	John Galt	Email	Do the county's Planning Commission, Commissioners, and county employees approving and implementing these technologies plan on accepting and maintaining liability for the damage that this technology will bring to the living condition?	
			Can you please provide documented health risk discussion from citizens and officials regarding these programs and it's (seemingly unobstructed) implementation?	
			Also, does the county really view Wikipedia as a source for factual, relevant information? Specifically, "click here" links emailed to subscribers?	
			Thanks for your response.	

Planning Co	Planning Commission Public Comment Matrix: DETAILED COMMENTS					
Reference #	Name	Comment Type	Comment (with attachments or links)			
WCF-5	Lelah Vaga	Email, letter, redline document	I understand that the public hearing has been postponed, but I did want to get you Verizon's comment letter and updated redline today. Both are attached. In general, we do find some sections of the proposed code to be in conflict with the most recent FCC order and that some provisions in the draft are not technically feasible for some kinds of wireless deployments. We very much appreciate the opportunity to provide input, and we appreciate all of the time and work that Kitsap County staff has been putting into this issue. We have often found that a stakeholder's meeting is a good way to work through the kinds of legal and technical concerns that we see in this draft code. In a stakeholder's meeting, staff would sit down with various members of the wireless industry, and representatives of the local utility to discuss the details of the code in a work session kind of format. It provides an opportunity to discuss the nuances in more detail and a forum for evaluating possible resolutions with the input of a wider group. It can also be a more efficient use of staff time than individual meetings. Verizon would like to encourage Kitsap County to hold a stakeholder's meeting to address the various industry concerns. We are also happy to help with the coordination of such a meeting if you feel it would useful. WCF_5_Attach_Vag a_Lelah_Verizon_Let WCF_5_Attach_Vag a_Lelah_Verizon_Spt			

Planning Co	Planning Commission Public Comment Matrix: DETAILED COMMENTS					
Reference #	Name	Comment Type	Comment (with attachments or links)			
WCF-6	Meridee Pabst	Email, letter, redline document	"On behalf of AT&T, we have attached a comment letter and redlined suggested changes to proposed new KCC Chapter 17.530. Please forward this letter and redline to the Planning Commissioners for their consideration prior to Tuesday night's hearing." WCF_6_Attach_Pabs t_Meridee_ATT_Lette WCF_6_Attach_Pabs t_Meridee_ATT_Lette			
WCF-7	Brian Moran	Online Form	This is a wrong-headed proposal with code language written to only address aesthetics, and does nothing to improve or promote access to the under served of Kitsap County, and would in effect discriminate against rural access.			
WCF-8	Marcia J. Stocking	Letter	Please add the letter sent on January 2, 2019 to the record. WCF_8_Attach_Stocking_Marcia_2019_0			
WCF-9	Linda Atkins	Online Form	On behalf of T-Mobile, there are numerous material concerns with the draft code proposed for this evening's public hearing. Detailed comments are being prepared and will be submitted prior to the close of the public comment period on February 26. We would ask the planning commission to not move the current draft forward until all public comments have been evaluated and addressed.			

Planning Co	Planning Commission Public Comment Matrix: DETAILED COMMENTS					
Reference #	Name	Comment Type	Comment (with attachments or links)			
WCF-010	Marcus	Online	https://www.healthnutnews.com/prominent-biochemistry-professor-warns-5g-is-the-stupidest-idea-in-			
Through	Collier	Form	the-history-of-the-world/			
WCF-017			Should the county decide to install these technologies, there will liability against the county and its boards that allow this.			
			https://www.radiationhealthrisks.com/5g-cell-towers-dangerous/			
			https://thefreethoughtproject.com/cell-phone-5g-cancer-concerns/			
			The details, expert testimonies, and supporting documents contained herein should be sufficient for the county to cease this projects forward movement until such that adequate time has been employed to understand the dangers.			
			https://www.activistpost.com/2019/01/congressional-house-committee-investigates-fcc-for-collusion-in-re-5g-small-cell-tower-legislation-which-eliminated-local-control-over-installation.html			
			Please review the video from UN Secretary-General on the subject; as well, please note the 20 footnotes by various professionals and others that were sourced for this piece.			
			https://www.collective-evolution.com/2019/01/06/un-staff-member-whistleblower-5g-is-a-global-health-catastrophe/?fbclid=IwAR2LtZIXdO3Vt2rHyjx0iMqPVVePxZix7dILOwvB89r0JAQPb0PfGpNWScc			
			https://youtu.be/j-UEuOYOED4 WCF_11-16_Attach_ Collier_Marcus_Scier			

Planning Co	Planning Commission Public Comment Matrix: DETAILED COMMENTS					
Reference #	Name	Comment Type	Comment (with attachments or links)			
WCF - 018	Linda W. Atkins	Email	These comments on the proposed wireless ordinance update are submitted on behalf of T-Mobile. WCF_18_Attach_Atk ins_Linda_TMobile_2			
WCF - 019	Doug Rauch	Email	Bellevue is reviewing the use of small cell equipment on light poles instead of towers. It takes more but they are not as intrusive. See picture in attachment. FCC is still working on amount county/city can charge. WCF_19_Attach_Ra uch_Doug_2019_020			



WCF - 020

Dear Commissioner Gelder,

I'm contacting you regarding wireless technology in Kitsap County. As you already know, wireless technology has become ingrained into the lifestyles of most consumers. The new generation has largely grown up with wireless technology. On AT&T's network, we've seen a 360,000% growth in data use since 2007. Residents, and businesses, have an insatiable demand for wireless, and cell phones are critical in emergencies when consumers rely on their devices most. Over 80% of 911 calls now originate from wireless phones making wireless communications a public safety necessity. To satisfy growing demand, AT&T continuously upgrades the network, including deploying new technologies such as Small Cells, to add capacity, and to move the network toward 5G services, and beyond.

Over the past few month, the Kitsap County Planning Commission has been discussing a new overall Wireless Communications Facility Code. We support the County's efforts to update the code. AT&T, and other industry representatives, have been participating in the Planning Commission meetings and code discussions. We have submitted comments and expressed concerns over a number of the requirements. We want to alert you about proposed code language that would negatively impact our ability to provide Kitsap County residents with reliable wireless coverage and capacity, which they have come to depend on.

We have three main concerns with the proposed code:

- It is inconsistent with federal law. For example, the County is adding a test to prove a "significant gap" that is now superseded by an FCC order. Other Washington jurisdictions are updating their codes to remove this outdated test.
- Makes substantial departures from existing County policy without explanation. For instance, the
 County's current practice, and how it treats other land use approvals, is to approve new facilities
 conditioned on submittal of an application for building or construction permit within four years.
 Requiring that construction be completed within one year, as the proposed new code would, is
 unreasonable. Wireless approvals should be issued with the same duration as other land use
 approvals.
- Sets unnecessarily difficult and unreasonable standards. For example, the proposed code extends what are clearly small wireless facility design standards to all wireless facilities. These standards are far too restrictive for small wireless standards and completely impossible for macro facilities.

Planning Co	Planning Commission Public Comment Matrix: DETAILED COMMENTS				
Reference #	Name	Comment	Comment (with attachments or links)		
Therefered in	Hame	Type Comment (with	Comment (with actaemicites of mixes)		
			We would like to discuss language that is workable and allows industry to build wireless facilities that will serve the community's communications needs. I would be honored to share an update on AT&T's plans for Kitsap County. Would it be possible to schedule a meeting to discuss our concerns? Please let me know. Thank you for your attention to this matter.		
			Sincerely,		
			Carol Tagayun"		

Reference #	Name	Comment Type	Comment (with attachments or links)
WCF - 21	Lelah Vaga	Email	Here is the proposed equipment concealment language that we discussed on Friday. Related equipment. The visual effect of the small wireless facility on all aspects of the appearance of the pole shall be minimized to the greatest extent possible. 1. Antennas and the associated equipment enclosures shall be sited and installed in a manner which minimizes the visual impact on the streetscape either by fully concealing the antennas and associated equipment fully within the pole or shroud, or through a concealment method which provides a similar reduction in visual impact. This requirement shall be applied in a manner which does not dictate the
			technology employed by the service provider nor unreasonably impair the technological performance of the equipment chosen by the service provider. 2. Antennas and antenna elements unable to be enclosed within the facility or within a canister on the facility are allowed if the antennas match the support structure color, finish, and conceal cabling and wiring connections, to the greatestextent possible.
			 Each antenna may not exceed 3 cubic feet in volume. All related equipment shall be placed in an equipment enclosure not exceed 28 cubic feet is mounted within six (6) inches from the surface of the pole, unless a further distance is technically required, and is confirmed in writing by the pole owner. The equipment enclosure shall match the support structure's color and finish to the greatest extent possible and shall be the minimum size needed to enclose the required equipment.

Planning Co	Planning Commission Public Comment Matrix: DETAILED COMMENTS						
Reference #	Name	Comment Type	Comment (with attachments or links)				
WCF-22	Alan	Verbal	Representing Verizon Wireless				
	Bar	Testimony	Greatly appreciates technical nature of the code and opportunity to work with the County				
			Grew up in this area, doesn't want to see the proliferation of unsightly installations but wireless sites are needed to keep up with current technology				
			A large demand for wireless technology is already here, demand will only increase				
			Kids are using these devices to learn outside of school. Children are writing code and using drones which depend on wireless technology				
			Written statements were provided				
			Question and answer with planning commission:				
			 Do agreements allow for collocations on small wireless facilities? Not really. 				
			 Kitsap County code requirements to shroud interferes with the technology. Stealth technology applications to small wireless facility antenna is limited. No paint, but a dyed film cover can work. 				
			 What are the industry standards for tree trimming? Typically trees and other obstructions are considered when locating a facility such that tree trimming or removal is not required. When necessary this would default to right-of-way trimming maintenance and utility pole maintenance Can a small wireless facility locate on a private structure? Yes. Utility poles in the right-of-way are 				
			preferable				
			o Batching. How many applications are likely to be batched in a permit? Verizon would identify a				
			polygon to serve, such as an area in Silverdale, for which approximately 12-16 applications would				
			be batched in a permit.				

Planning Co	Planning Commission Public Comment Matrix: DETAILED COMMENTS					
Reference #	Name	Comment Type	Comment (with attachments or links)			
WCF-23	Carol	Verbal	Representing AT&T			
	Tagayun	Testimony	 Greatly appreciates opportunity to work with the County and the ability to have a stakeholder meeting prior to adoption of the code. 300,000% growth on existing data net with the release of iphone. 			
			Significant gap test applies to coverage not capacity. An area with coverage from a provider can still be an underserved area because the capacity within that coverage is insufficient.			
			 Now is the time to build. We need to deploy facilities now to expand 4G and prepare for 5G. Suggest adopting design standards that account for future technology similar to other jurisdictions. The related equipment and shrouding requirements don't allow for flexibility between carriers. Batching permit example in Seattle, 13 applications batched in a permit. 			
WCF-24	Tamara Smilovich	Verbal Testimony	 Heard from people that work for the companies on the east side of the water, providing a voice for the residents on Kitsap Peninsula. Real estate agent. People are moving to Kitsap County: to get away from the towers on every corner. Due to visual impacts and cancer caused by EMF radiation. for the natural beauty. 			
WCF-25	David Sisteen	Verbal Testimony	 Significant safety concerns. Read the articles, research the health risks associated with EMF radiation. Asking the County to hold off, don't adopt code yet, look at the studies first. 			