

Update: Voicemail and emails received after 7/6/2020, 4:30 p.m.

Wednesday, 7/8/2020 (Voicemail)

“Hi, my name is Suzanne Taxin (left phone number). I’m asking, requesting, please there is going to be a meeting concerning the possible AT&T macro tower being constructed on an area in, and my sister lives in that area and these parents and their children really want to protect the woods there. So, I’m asking you to please don’t put the tower there. Please do not put the tower in the woods there. I think it is going to upset a lot of people and the children where the people walk in the woods and all that. So, please do not. I’m voting against it and asking you please to not put the tower there. Please do not. Save the woods. Save the kids. Save the beauty of the area. If you need to reach me, (left phone number). Thanks for all that you do. Thanks. Take care. Bye-bye.”

Monday, 7/6/2020

Good evening. I cannot figure out how to participate in the meeting, but I will continue trying.

I have a comments and a question regarding the AT &T Tower. I am one of the owners that Councilmember Sesma referred to as having a “view from our bedroom window”. I hope AT &T provides more info that it did previously. I also hope they address Councilmember Sayles concern about removing trees and can give an accurate count as to removal and a plan to replant.

Shortly after the last meeting on this topic, the Council either voted or a previous vote came to reality when construction started on one of several multi story commercial buildings in Downtown Crown. Councilmember Spiegel even posted on Facebook about it. I would like to know if AT &T has considered using the rooftop of one of these buildings?

The area is within the zone AT &T needed to serve. The zoning is mixed use. Trees have already been removed and replanted in this area, plus utilizing a rooftop doesn’t require tree removal.

Thank you for presenting my question.

Respectfully,
Stefanie Sanders Levy

Below are all of the emailed comments (61) received through 4:30 p.m. on Monday, 7/6/2020 in regard to the Proposed AT&T Cell Tower off of Great Seneca Highway. There were two emails in favor of the tower and they are shown in green text.

Sun. 7/5 & Mon. 7/6

To whom it may concern:

We live at 414 Upshire Circle and would live in close proximity to the proposed cell tower. We are writing to state we are strongly opposed to this location. Living in such close proximity and bombarded with electromagnetic radiation cannot be good for ones health long term. It makes more sense to place this tower in location farther away from residential homes or on commercial property. We are optimistic a better location will be found.

Thank you,

Florence and ERic Cho

Hello, Mayor Ashman and City Council Members.

My name is Jack Cline of 420 Upshire Circle. I live in the Washingtonian Woods neighborhood.

I asked to speak tonight to make three observations and one recommendation.

1. First, would the City of Gaithersburg confirm that they have reviewed the original land covenant, when the City acquired the parcel of land (we are discussing tonight) to ensure that all requirements and restrictions are being honored as you consider leasing the land to a telecommunication provider?
2. Second, it is troubling that the Council would consider a 155' cell tower between two neighborhoods that were purposely designed to have all utility lines underground and out of sight. This proposal violates your own 2003 Master Plan where the City seeks to "maintain a thriving 'urban forest' that provides ecological, economic, and aesthetic benefits." In Chapter 9, on Environmental issues related, the plan states "Forests and Landscapes Protection and Enhancement Strategies" states, "Require underground utilities, whenever possible, to reduce the negative effects of overhead lines on tree health and canopy coverage."
3. Third, did you notice that in every AT&T presentation they have not included a single photograph of the entire tower? Do you want to know why? Because it's a monstrosity! If the City Council and everyone on this call saw a picture of this tower they would be shocked. Instead, AT&T shows us all partial pictures and renderings. We know better. Make no mistake, this tower will change the skyline in Gaithersburg. If I were you, I'd insist on seeing what the final produce would look like. Would you ever buy something sight unseen? I don't know what kind of game AT&T is trying to play here. Also, I'll

note that this tower would exceed the City of Washington, D.C.'s height ordinance for any commercial building construction.

4. Finally, my recommendation is for the Council to create a Task Force to review this proposal, and other proposals that may be forthcoming, regarding this parcel of land. This Task Force would be made of community stakeholders and perhaps a seat designated for a representative of industry appointed by the Gaithersburg Chamber of Commerce. Following a period of no more than 36 months a report would be delivered to the Council with a recommendation.

That said, if a vote is taken this evening on the proposal, I urge you to vote no.

Jack Cline
420 Upshire Circle

For the Council's review, below, are two examples of what the proposed AT&T cell tower would look like.



As a environmentalist and frequent user of Muddy Branch stream valley park I deplore the city of Gaithersburg for choosing money over the environment. Once you destroy nature you can never get it back. It hurts everyone. Pick a commercial site for your tower.

Art Latterner

I would like to submit my staunch **opposition to the installation of a cell tower near the Washingtonian Woods Community**. My girlfriend and I are new homeowners in this community and a large part of our decision to move here was due to the oasis of nature. The proposed blight of a cell phone tower does not enhance the surrounding community at all.

AT&T has conveniently left out the tower's visibility from certain vantage points. Furthermore, even if it was completely obscured, that doesn't make it any less there. It still disturbs the natural habitat which is of consequence to the members of this community. There is a thriving ecosystem of birds, reptiles, rodents and other small mammals that would undoubtedly have their homes disrupted or destroyed by this installation, so too will ours.

We are current AT&T customers and are perfectly content with the level of service we have. In fact, if this passes, we are more inclined to change providers. The trade-off simply isn't worth it. So much of Montgomery County is being overbuilt already. Don't keep up with the Joneses. It's a race to the bottom. The enduring charm of this neighborhood is its serenity. Please deny this request from AT&T. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Anthony Mormile

921 Hillside Lake Terrace Unit 305

Gaithersburg MD

I strongly urge you to vote NO to the installation of the proposed AT&T Macro tower near the Woods residences. 4G/5G radiofrequency radiation (some in the microwave range) is known to be hazardous to humans, animals, plants and insects. Here is a brief overview of some of the hazards:

1. "5G Danger: 13 Reasons 5G Wireless Technology Will Be a Catastrophe for Humanity"

<https://www.globalresearch.ca/5g-danger-13-reasons-5g-wireless-technology-will-be-a-catastrophe-for-humanity/5680503>

2. "Putting the Earth Inside a High-Speed Computer" (5G Satellites)

<https://www.5gexposed.com/2020/06/04/putting-the-earth-inside-a-high-speed-computer-arthur-firstenburg/>

3. "5G Dangers, 5th Generation Wireless Technology Health and Environmental Impacts" (5G health risks)

https://www.globalresearch.ca/5g-dangers-5th-generation-wireless-technology-health-and-environmental-impacts/5663264?utm_campaign=magnet&utm_source=article_page&utm_medium=related_articles

If you read these brief descriptions, you will see by voting "yes" you will be consigning these residents and surrounding area to debilitating lifelong harm.

Janice Smith

Why must man continually destroy?

Bonita Tabakin

Dear City of Gaithersburg Council Members,

I am writing this email to voice my opposition to the proposed AT&T cell phone towers. AT&T is proposing to install a cell tower in a wooded area that contains many trails and bike paths that are used by Washingtonian Woods, Mission Hills, Lakelands and Kentlands homeowners. To disrupt this area for installing a cell phone tower appears to be a poorly thought out plan that will negatively impact home values, homeowner's quiet enjoyment of their communities and destroy a significant amount of valued forestry. There are commercial areas that are better suited to house the proposed AT&T cell tower and we hope that you investigate these areas further before approving the AT&T plan. If this cell phone tower is permitted to move forward, then additional cell phone towers will surely follow, and before you know it, much of the valued forestry in our area will be removed.

There is significant resident homeowner opposition to this plan and we would greatly appreciate your opposition as well.

Thank you,
Russ Dalin
135 Upshire Circle, Gaithersburg, MD
Washingtonian Woods

Sorry I did not get this to you earlier. I am sure you have had plenty of input from my neighbors regarding the AT&T cell tower request. We are all concerned about the detrimental site lines that would be established not only for our neighborhood but along Great Seneca Highway. I have three comments on the subject.

1. When the AT&T consultants performed their visibility study (balloon test) it was when all the trees were in full bloom. The study should be performed when the trees are not in full bloom.
2. The Mayor, Council and Citizens have traditionally been very protective of the Muddy Branch Watershed. I think we would like to see the results of an environmental impact before anything was decided.
3. Maybe I missed it but I have never seen exactly what the proposed tower looks like. We have been told how tall it could be but nothing about the number and size of the antennas that will be placed on it. Someone distributed an example of a/the tower in our neighborhood. It was a monstrosity. But I have not seen what is being proposed.

Ralph Lieberthal
915 Linslade St.
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

I am a resident in the Washington Woods neighborhood at 423 Upshire Circle .I am opposed to having this cell tower in the woods area in our neighborhood.

Robert Rosenberg
Marcia Rosenberg

Rob Rosenberg

I OPPOSE the proposed 155'-175' AT&T macrotower, 1500-sq. ft. industrial base station and service road in Washingtonian Woods. I live on Upshire Circle, this would DIRECTLY impact our household with children. Why does this tower have to be so close to MY house? I oppose this.

Regards,

Eric Cho

I would like to voice my objection to the proposed location of the AT&T cell tower off of great Seneca highway. This proposed location would destroy park land that my kids and many in our neighborhood hike, mountain bike, and play in very often. This proposed size tower is too large for its proposed location and would visible and an eye sore for our neighborhood.

Please listen to the Gaithersburg citizens and reject the AT&T proposal

Thank you
Manik Anand
301 midsummer drive
Gaithersburg MD

My name is Max Howell, and I live at 419 Danbridge Street in Lakelands.

This will be my 3rd opportunity to voice my vociferous opposition to AT&T's proposed construction of a 160 foot 5G cell tower on City property located in the Muddy Branch parklands, and directly in the middle of 2 high density RESIDENTIAL communities.

This is my 2nd time feeling bewildered and frustrated that this ridiculous proposal still is being given any serious consideration.

At the conclusion of the 1st meeting on this topic nearly 12 months ago, the City Council voted unanimously that the installation of a cell tower in this coveted and protected natural park was completely

inappropriate. For that reason, the Council directed the applicant to find an alternative and more suitable site.

Months later, the applicant came back to a 2nd meeting before the Council claiming that it had located an alternative site - one only a few hundred feet north of the originally proposed location, and in the same parkland. As I sat through applicant's 2nd presentation, I recalled early in my legal career an unnamed attorney engaging in a similar "redo" with a Federal Court Judge. That attorney had been given a 2nd opportunity to restate his argument after considering "more appropriate and controlling" legal authority. The Court considered his "redo" presentation disingenuous at best, and borderline contemptuous.

By any measure, applicant's second proposed site cannot be characterized as "an alternative location" to Muddy Branch Parklands within the meaning of the Council's directive. However, to the astonishment of everyone attending that 2nd meeting, the Council inexplicably reversed course, and decided to entertain further discussion of that "alternative location", following an awkwardly transparent prodding by the City Manager.

So, here we are again - a year later for a 3rd time, and nothing meaningful with respect to this cell tower issue has changed. Muddy Branch is still Muddy Branch, an unsightly 160 foot cell tower is still an unsightly 160 foot cell tower, in areas with weaker reception Wi-Fi calling is still readily available as the same or better Wi-Fi calling, and the idea of putting this commercial towering monstrosity right in our neighborhood is no less absurd than it was 12 months ago.

I ask that you discontinue any further consideration of this matter, and focus instead on imposing a conservation easement or other restrictive covenant on this land so that its cherished character can never be jeopardized again. All of you are aware of how valuable natural forestry like Muddy Branch is in our area, and how easily it can be transformed and forever lost. Recall what the developer of Lakelands had to go through in the 1990's just to build an entrance to our neighborhood, or how he had to address the problem of beavers continually chopping down the trees he had planted along the lake.

That AT&T desperately wants to monopolize 5G in our area under the illusory guise of a Federal first responder's contract, and that it has been shot down by all other owners of more appropriate surrounding commercial sites, should be of zero consequence to you. The nature and character of the parklands they now wish to invade, the voice of those citizens actually living in these communities who are most adversely affected by this proposal, and frankly your own basic common sense alone, should enable you to direct the applicant once again (and hopefully for a 3rd and final time), to "go find an alternative and more suitable location" for its 5G cell tower.

Thank you.

Maxwell A. Howell, Jr., Esq.

Dear Mr. Mayor, City Counsel Members, and City Manager,

I have been a resident of the Washingtonian Woods neighborhood for several years; my husband and I moved here because we envisioned this neighborhood as our forever home where we wanted to raise our family. We now have three boys, ages 6, 3, and 1.5, so we have a VERY long time until the thought of moving enters our brain again. We love this neighborhood not only for the community, but also because of the surrounding nature. Therefore, I am sending this email in opposition for the proposed site of the AT&T cell tower located in the woods between our neighborhood and the Lakeland's/Kentlands neighborhood.

Times today are weird and are unlike anything any of us could have ever imagined. I am a nurse and my husband is a Physician Assistant, both of us work in the hospital and both of us work very closely with COVID patients, so the reality of today hits hard. We don't have any outside help with the boys, we made the difficult decision to cut our nanny because she helped care for her elderly mother and we didn't want to pose any additional risk to them. As a result, we have to balance our schedules so that they are opposite and so that one of us is always home with the kids. Needless to say, we are stressed. We see our kids regressing because they don't have the social interactions they need and we aren't able to take them on our usual excursions. We also see the effects first hand that this pandemic causes on infected patients. But one thing that brings us peace is our nature walks in the woods of the proposed AT&T tower. Going on hikes, creek walks, nature scavenger hunts and playing various nature games I remember playing as a camp counselor has helped keep our family sane and at peace. We have spotted countless wildlife and wildlife tracks and it has helped my kids develop a love and respect for nature.

This area has become so built up over the years, these little sanctuaries in our own backyards are becoming so far and few between. The tower would clearly be visible (and heard) not only while on our walks, but also from our homes. Instead of looking outside and seeing trees and blue skies, we would see a massive tower. The amount of land that would need to be cleared for the tower, generators, and access road would destroy the homes of countless wildlife. There are other already built up areas in the surrounding vicinity that would be much more suitable for this tower and it wouldn't displace wildlife or destroy an area that has offered so much peace for people.

I hope you take this all into consideration when reviewing AT&T's proposal. Those woods are not the only answer to the problem, there are other more viable solutions.

Thank you for your time,
Erica Adler
Resident of the Washingtonian Woods neighborhood

Dear Mr. Mayor, City Council Members and City Manager,

I am a resident of Washingtonian Woods and I am sending this email in opposition to the proposed site for the ATT cell tower located in the woods between our neighborhood and the Lakelands/Kentlands.

The solution that ATT proposes isn't right sized for the problem of spotty reception and a handful of open tickets. My wife has ATT and I have Verizon, and true, her cell phone service is spotty compared to mine. However, how did Verizon solve the problem without installing a massive cell tower 300 ft. north of our neighborhood? I believe ATT could easily adopt a similar solution as Verizon; potentially installing several mini cell towers on telephone poles around the area like the other service providers have done. However, I believe ATT is building this simply to lease space to other cell providers and turn it into a profit center but dressing it up as a needed life safety issue.

There's a similar tower on Norbeck Rd as you're heading from Gude towards Georgia Ave, but there are no homes within 300' of that facility, in fact, not even 1000'. If you happen to be driving

by there, take a look and that's what Gaithersburg will be getting. It's an unsightly tower and the base is messy. If you want to see what ATT is proposing, look no further than this tower. There is also an existing cell tower roughly 1500 ft from their proposed site at the Itzaak Walton League of America Park off Muddy Branch. I didn't see any mention of the existing tower in any of the documentation and was curious why the current tower isn't in consideration for ATT.

The proposed tower will also be high enough that in Summer and Winter, we will see the tower when driving into our neighborhood on Midsummer Drive. It will also be a scar on the landscape and exist as a prominent backdrop to our community pool.

I find it sad if we as residents and council members allow the destruction of this natural wildlife habitat and trees in lieu of an ugly 175' tower that will be surrounded by a large fence which will house a 1500 sq ft. raised concrete base, diesel generators and hundreds if not thousands of gallons of Diesel fuel. Furthermore, hundreds of specimen sized trees will be cleared, thereby further exposing the tower to our ground level view from the adjacent neighborhoods and Great Seneca Highway. Service and fuel trucks will be in and out on a routine basis and the generators will be run weekly to exercise them which is SOP for diesel generators. They're also very loud and dirty. This will disturb the peace whenever they are run as the proposed site is in close proximity to homes.

Where elevation above ground level is an ally for better cell coverage, ATT is proposing the tower on the lowest lying piece of ground in the area. I drove with an altimeter from the AstraZeneca building down Great Seneca and right onto Muddy Branch, and the proposed site is at about 360' whereas the top of the AstraZeneca garage is at about 460' and the top of the Hopkins property sits at about 410'. So it's not really about elevation, I believe it's about the path of least resistance and since Hopkins and AstraZeneca have turned ATT down, they have now targeted a piece of City owned property banking on the City just approving it with little push back.

We as citizens of Gaithersburg are banking on the Mayor, City Council and City Manager to take a stand and see that this is not a right sized solution for the problem they're intending to solve, nor an appropriate solution considering the proximity to homes in the Lakelands / Kentlands and Washingtonian Woods. We look to you to fall on the right side of this vote and preserve our precious wildlife, trees and natural habitat and keep the peace of the woods and neighborhoods so we, our children and families can continue to enjoy the space as we have for years past.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Stephanie Baer

Members of the City of Gaithersburg City Council, City officials and City staff,

I would like to register my **opposition to the installation of a cell tower** in the parkland behind the homes in the 400 block of Upshire Circle.

I have reviewed the most recent proposal from AT&T that was presented on February 3rd of this year and find that **AT&T omitted some specific 'views'** of the balloon that was floated in October of 2019. My husband and I spent about two hours driving in the adjacent neighborhoods, along with our own neighborhood of Washingtonian Woods and took some of the same photos that were included in the AT&T presentation. However, **I have additional photos and videos** from a 'gap' in what was presented. I have attached the AT&T presentation from the Feb 3rd council meeting for your ease of reference. If you look at Page 8 of the attached PDF, you will see a gap between #16, #25 & #26. The photos for the map area of Washingtonian Woods where the City of Gaithersburg Washingtonian Woods Park and the Washingtonian Woods Pool/Clubhouse are located have not been included. These are the recreational areas of our neighborhood that are enjoyed by neighborhood residents along with city residents.

I have attached two photos that I took; view from the sidewalk by the pool and from the corner of Upshire & Midsummer Drive looking towards the park. I also have videos, but those were too large to attach to an email. I walked from Upshire & Midsummer Drive, past Midsummer Circle to the city park shooting video the entire way and the balloon was visible for the entirety of that distance. The tower will be even more visible during the late fall and winter months when there are no leaves on the trees.

I would be happy to provide the videos on a USB drive, should you like to view them. I hope this additional information is helpful.

Please deny this repeated request from AT&T. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Regards,
Karen Klemow
451 Upshire Circle
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

We raised two boys in the wonderful woods between Washingtonian Woods and what is now the Lakeland's. We spent many hours there building forts, skipping stones, wading upstream like great explorers, sitting quietly and watching nature do its wondrous things, such as a northern water snake eating a frog (it took a long time). Those grand trees and that uninterrupted riparian area have always been an oasis for families and kids in the crowded suburban landscape of Gaithersburg. And it has allowed a rich wildness to flourish and support pileated woodpeckers, fox, bard owls, snapping turtles, trout and many other species. To destroy this tiny wild place so some people can have four bars of signal everywhere in their homes would be a travesty. Technology may soon obviate the need for this proposed AT&T cell tower, but it won't be able to replace what will be lost if it is built. It won't be able to bring back the wonder, the opportunity, the great trees, the thriving nature or the quietude this cherished place currently holds for all the residents of Gaithersburg. Please vote to OPPOSE the proposed 155'-175' AT&T macrotower, 1,500-sq. ft. industrial base station and service road in the Muddy Branch watershed off of Great Seneca Highway. Thank you for considering my family's request.

Sincerely,
Craig W. Culp
5 Flameleaf Ct.
Gaithersburg, MD

I would like advise you that I am opposed to building the AT &T cell phone tower on the beautiful parkland adjacent to Lakelands. At the time of the founding of Lakelands, this land was marketed as future parkland with hiking paths. One of many amenities being offered to attract home buyers to the new planned community in Gaithersburg By extension, one can make the case that this wooded parcel was funded by the community with revenue included in the purchase price of their new homes closed on in the years from 1999 to approximately 2005. It would be to the detriment of these very homeowners if the city were to sell this parcel of land to AT &T for the sole purpose of building this ugly cell phone tower thereby defacing the community parkland.

Please vote against this Cell Tower proposal.

Sincerely,

Ned McGowan

We live in Upshire Cir where our house backs up against the beautiful stream and woods that AT&T proposes its 27-Acre Macro Cell Tower compound. We oppose this proposal as there are other 'sensible' locations that would not destroy the natural habitat of our woods.

Thank you,
Loren Atkinson

Good evening, Mr. Mayor and Councilmembers. My name is Lisa Cline. I live at 420 Upshire Circle, 500 feet from AT&T's proposed macro cell tower and 100 feet from the access road. First, thank you for including the public in this conversation. I know you didn't have to. I hope our input can help you avoid immutable environmental damage and a deliberate downgrade to the quality of life of families who live nearby.

I see seven distinct issues with A&T's latest proposal, which is incomplete in its lack of disclosures. They are:

1. Another simulation is need when the leaves are off the trees to show what the tower will look like.
2. None of the photos on pages 27-38 illustrate the top of the tower. Nor the middle. And the Morris Park tower is irrelevant. It looks nothing like the proposed Suffield tower.
3. Where's the NEPA report? The link in the proposal doesn't work.

4. **There's no mention of Limits of Disturbance.** This is the square footage contiguous to the project for bringing in, storing and operating the construction equipment. Please ask AT&T how much additional demolition this will require.
5. AT&T's coverage map on their website indicates gaps in the Kentlands, NOT where I live. This is curious to me because there is an AT&T macrotower (No.: 10004887) at 12100 Darnestown Rd. and it's closer to the Kentlands than the Suffield tower. How could the Suffield tower solve a problem that a closer tower cannot?
6. Next, The National Fire Protection Association creates codes for safe operation of generators. In [NFPA 110](#), they state:
 - a. "A generator must be located in an area not subject to flooding," such as streambeds.
 - b. "Diesel generators must have inspections and periodic maintenance." These include daily tank level checks, weekly battery checks, monthly generator start-ups, and semi-annual load testing. That's a lot of truck traffic in and out of the woods.
 - c. NFPA also states, "The area must be free of combustible material." Yet AT&T proposes a wooden stockade fence surrounding the complex. The site is in the middle of the forest. NFPA would deem this a fire hazard.
 - d. NFPA further states that "fuel spills and leaks pose risk of explosion." And "smoking in the vicinity can be fatal." Is this not a huge red flag?

*NFPA is a nonprofit established in 1896 to eliminate death, injury, and property loss due to fire and electrical hazards.

7. Finally, I recently drove I-95 up to New England. This 8-lane interstate is peppered with macro towers. I counted them in New Jersey alone. I stopped at 27. They are everywhere. Why? Because that's where they belong. Even the [FCC's environmental rules](#) take exception to towers located in wilderness and wildlife areas as they involve deforestation and "significant changes" in wetlands areas.

This is not about cell service. This is about whether a wooded wonderland for kids, hikers, and animals is appropriate for an industrial compound of this magnitude.

AT&T clearly likes the woods as much as we do. But they want to profit off a vertical radiofrequency strip mall and play landlord to three co-locating telecom carriers. Please tell them the woods are not for sale. It is not a dumping ground. It is in the best interest of the citizens, and each of your environmental scorecards to deny this application once and for all.

P.S. Dozens of cities and towns have refused wireless transmission towers (WTFs) as a matter of public health and safety. Here are just a few:

- Trenton, NJ: Assemblyman Holley calls for [commission to study 5g safety](#)
- Gov. of Alabama: calls for safety study
- Gov. of Connecticut: calls for safety study

- Passed: New Hampshire Bill 522: An act establishing a commission to study the environmental and health effects of evolving 5G technology. July 2019
- Passed: Vermont H.513, Sec. 24: The Commission on Public Health shall submit a report on the possible health consequences from exposure to the radio frequency fields produced by wireless technologies, including cellular telephones and FCC-regulated transmitters. June 2019
- Passed: Louisiana HR145: The Louisiana House of Representatives voted to request the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality and the Department of Health conduct a study on the effects of 5G technology, not just on the environment, but also public health. May 2019
- Passed: Oregon SB 283: Ordered the Oregon Health Authority to “review peer-reviewed, independently funded scientific studies of health effects of exposure to microwave radiation, particularly exposure that results from the use of wireless network technologies in schools or similar environments.” August 2019
- Farragut, TN: resolved to halt the deployment of the 5G wireless facilities within the rights-of-way of our local communities belonging to the public until such time as the only agency with the authority to do so, the FCC, reevaluates by an independent study the adequacy of its radio frequency emissions standards.
- Carmel, Indiana: **Resolution CC-10-21-19-03** requests the State Legislature to Take Action to Protect Indiana’s Residents and Guests From any Harmful Effects of 5G Technology; Sponsor(s): Councilor(s) Green and Carter — ADOPTED.
- State of Louisiana: First state to call for study <https://trackbill.com/bill/louisiana-house-resolution-145-environment-requests-the-department-of-environmental-quality-in-conjunction-with-the-louisiana-department-of-health-to-study-the-effects-of-evolving-5g-technology/1748701/>
- Carlsbad, CA: issues cease and desist
- Encinitas, CA: 5G ban from residential areas and school, parks and fire hazard areas, along with 26 other ordinance amendments.
- Elk Grove, CA: Decision to keep cell antennas away from our Elk Grove homes.
- Fairfax, CA: city requires insurance and ADA coverage
- Los Altos, CA: Rejects 13 applications with a strong city ordinance.
- Marin County, CA: Residential and mixed-use sites and areas within 1,500 feet of schools and daycare centers are least-preferred locations and 1000 ft in between antenna.
- Mill Valley, CA: city indemnification with PROW 1500ft apart

- Mission Viejo, CA: applicant moves small cell installation to another location
- Moorpark, CA: tower application moved from an elementary school
- Newport Beach, CA: requires 3rd party re-insurance requirement in the application
- Nevada City, CA: Mayor advocates for RF safety
- Oak Park, CA: requires 1,000 ft set back from schools
- Ojai, Malibu, and Beverly Hills, CA: Ordinance looks into the health of their residents
- Orcutt, CA: forced Verizon to withdraw its appeal for an 80-foot cell tower
- San Anselmo, CA: Town is entitled to employ independent consultant at applicant's expense to evaluate exceptions
- Santa Barbara, CA: 90-day pause on a 20-year Verizon Wireless licensing agreement
- San Clemente, CA: 500-ft setback from residential and schools.
- Simi Valley, CA: Cease and Desist, Writ of Mandamus " suing the city council members for a breach of oath of office
- South Lake Tahoe, CA: Cease and Desist
- Sonoma, CA: ADA lawsuits
- Thousand Oaks, CA: 12 ADA requests, A Cease and Desist, Suing the city/Telecom, logged two applications without NEPA reviews with the FCC.
- Ross, California, CA: prohibits facilities in residential and downtown zoning district. Public right-of-way facilities subject to separate design criteria.
- San Rafael, CA: 500-foot setback from residential districts
- Walnut Creek, CA: 1,500 ft setback from residential areas
- Westlake Village, CA: Amended ordinance to include insurance on the WTFs and Pumpkin clause

(when the 9th District Circuit rules in favor of the League of Cities all WTFs have to stop functioning)

- Western Springs, IL: Incomplete Applications Rejected

Lisa Cline

Fri. 7/3 & Sat. 7/4

Hello,

I am a local resident and recently learned that there are discussions about installing AT&T towers in the woods near Muddy Branch and Great Seneca. I am writing to implore you to find a different area for these towers. These hiking trails and direct access to creeks and nature were among the reasons we moved to the neighborhood. My two young boys enjoy exploring this area with our family and the trails and water have brought us many happy moments. It would be tragic if these opportunities were taken away from us and other families for a cell tower. Please prioritize the environment and preserving this natural habitat and find another suitable location for the towers.

Best,
Kathryn Weiland
2 Peach Leaf Ct, North Potomac, MD 20878

Mr. Ashman and the Gaithersburg City Council,

Are you quite sure you are willing to use the people of Lakelands and Washingtonian Woods as test subjects for a radiation experiment when there are so many who are screaming NO.

From the INTERNATIONAL APPEAL Stop 5G on Earth and in Space

“There are **296,340 signatories** from 218 nations and territories
as of July 3rd, 2020

To the UN, WHO, EU, Council of Europe
and governments of all nations

***We the undersigned scientists, doctors, environmental organizations and citizens from
(__) countries, urgently call for a halt to the deployment of the 5G (fifth generation)
wireless network, including 5G from space satellites. 5G will massively increase exposure***

to radio frequency (RF) radiation on top of the 2G, 3G and 4G networks for telecommunications already in place. RF radiation has been proven harmful for humans and the environment. The deployment of 5G constitutes an experiment on humanity and the environment that is defined as a crime under international law.”

(<https://www.5gspaceappeal.org/>)

In February 2019, Senator Richard Blumenthal asked representatives from the wireless companies if there is research that indicates that 5G is safe. They said there is NONE. Let me restate that...according to the wireless companies there is NO research that indicates that 5G is safe.

(<https://mdsafetech.org/2019/02/13/no-research-on-5g-safety-senator-blumenthal-question-answered/>)

From the Environmental Health Trust:

“Last week EHT submitted extensive testimony to the FCC documenting the scientific evidence that 5G will impact human health and the environment.

EHT put the science on the official record.

In [Docket 19-226](#), the FCC proposed new allowable limits to the amount of electromagnetic radiation exposure to be absorbed by humans and the atmosphere from the use of frequencies as high as 3 THz and as low as 3 kHz.

The FCC asked what the public thinks. So we told them.

“We recommend a halt to the roll-out of the fifth generation, 5G, for telecommunication and a halt to the expansion of wireless networks until hazards for human health and the environment of these new frequencies and the densification of networks have been fully investigated by scientists independent from industry.

“5G paired with densification of 4G or other antennas will substantially increase environmental exposure to radiofrequency electromagnetic fields. We also recommend federally developed safety limits based on empirical scientific studies that have thoroughly investigated long-term effects to humans, animals, insects, trees, and the environment.

“Federal safety limits should be based on adequate data from animal and human research, not based on assumptions.”

Donna Baron

I am living in High Gable Drive building 311, and I am for installation of this Cell Tower because we have a very poor coverage in our community and we never could use our phones in our building or even in our big garden yard in front of our building , We need this Cell Tower to be installed and that is why I am for it Thanks

Manoochehr Roosta

Thur. 7/2

I am extremely concerned about AT&T's decision to place a Cell Tower opposite the entrance to Lakelands Ridge. We are a community of people who have invested everything we have into our condos and single family homes.

At this time of the economic turndown and the serious Covid19 pandemic we do not need anything to happen that will cause the values of our homes to decrease. Placing such a huge cell tower so close to a residential community certainly takes away from the way in which the original plan for this development had been made.

There are many areas along Great Seneca Highway where AT&T could place their tower which would not impact any residential areas.

I believe no person on the City or County Councils, would want this eyesore opposite his/her home. Please think of that when you vote to allow AT&T to move ahead to impact our development so negatively.

I have always had confidence that the Gaithersburg Mayor and Council members would put the best interests of their constituents first. Please vote against the placement of this tower.

Sincerely yours,
Elayne Kabakoff, President of Lakelands Ridge HOA

311 High Gables Drive #404 Gaithersburg, MD 20878

I was given your information as a point of contact regarding concerns with the proposed cell tower & associated structure (off Great Seneca Highway).

I am writing to contest having the cell tower built within 1000-ft of my building. I live in condominium #1 of the Lakelands Ridge community (201 High Gables Dr) and I purchased a unit on the side of the building facing where the proposed cell tower will be built. One of the main reasons I purchased this unit was the scenic view I have from being on a higher-level floor.



The construction of this cell tower will hinder me by making it more difficult to sell my unit since buyers will not want to purchase a unit near a large cell tower and have the scenic view obstructed. In addition the construction of this cell tower will undo one of the main reasons I chose to purchase my unit. I do not want to have to endure a view with a large cell tower while living here.

Please document my written comments above on the proposed project. I would like confirmation that my concerns will be heard and acknowledged.

Thank you,
Nora Elbeheiry

We live at 229 Midsummer Circle in Gaithersburg MD
and would like to vote against a new AT&T Cell Phone tower.

Thanks,

Donna Pence

The development that I live in is directly opposite from the proposed cell tower to be built on Great Seneca Highway near Muddy Branch Road. Can you imagine what it would be like for me to look out of my window each day to see an ugly, very tall structure? Aside from the fact that such a tower will be a dangerous health hazard, it will be most unsightly and excessively high.

If this tower must be built, I would appreciate it if the city could find a more appropriate place.

Beverly S. Brown
311 High Gables Drive, Apt.405
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

In regards to the AT&T cell phone tower meeting on Monday, July 6, 2020 - we vote NO!!!

Thank you,
Paul A. Bugenske
Ingrid K. Bugenske
423 Danbridge St
Gaithersburg

Wed. 7/1

Dear Mr. Mayor, City Counsel Members and City Manager,

I have been a resident of Washingtonian Woods for the past 7 years and I am sending this email in opposition to the proposed site for the ATT cell tower locted in the woods between our neighborhood and the Lakelands/Kentlands. I do not want to see a beautiful piece of nature steps from our home that

my family enjoys, destroyed and replaced with pollutants, ugliness, and the potential health risks a cell tower close to your home can bring. Covid is taking away so much from us right now, we don't need this taken too.

The solution that ATT proposes isn't right sized for the problem of spotty reception and a handful of open tickets. How did Verizon solve the problem without installing a massive cell tower 300 ft. north of our neighborhood? I believe ATT could easily adopt a similar solution as Verizon; potentially installing several mini cell towers on telephone poles around the area like the other service providers have done. However, I believe ATT is building this simply to lease space to other cell providers and turn it into a profit center but dressing it up as a needed life safety issue.

There's a similar tower on Norbeck Rd as you're heading from Gude towards Georgia Ave, but there are no homes within 300' of that facility, in fact, not even 1000'. If you happen to be driving by there, take a look and that's what Gaithersburg will be getting. It's an unsightly tower and the base is messy. If you want to see what ATT is proposing, look no further than this tower. There is also an existing cell tower roughly 1500 ft from their proposed site at the Itzaak Walton League of America Park off Muddy Branch. I didn't see any mention of the existing tower in any of the documentation and curious why the current tower isn't in consideration for ATT.

The proposed tower will also be high enough that in Summer and Winter, we will see the tower when driving into our neighborhood on Midsummer Drive. It will also be a scar on the landscape and exist as a prominent backdrop to our community pool.

I find it sad if we as residents and council members allow the destruction of this natural wildlife habitat and trees in lieu of an ugly 175' tower that will be surrounded by a large fence which will house a 1500 sq ft. raised concrete base, diesel generators and hundreds if not thousands of gallons of Diesel fuel. Again, this is a beautiful area that my children can walk to in minutes from our home and spend hours playing. Especially now where it is so hard with Covid quarantine to find things to enjoy, they have to social distance, it is beyond cruel to take this away from children!

Furthermore, hundreds of specimen sized trees will be cleared, thereby further exposing the tower to our ground level view from the adjacent neighborhoods and Great Seneca Highway. Service and fuel trucks will be in and out on a routine basis and the generators will be run weekly to exercise them which is SOP for diesel generators. They're also very loud and dirty. This will disturb the peace every they are run as the proposed site is in close proximity to homes. You are replacing clean air from trees with pollution! I am not living in an urban area and I don't want it to feel like one!

Where elevation above ground level is an ally for better cell coverage, ATT is proposing the tower on the lowest lying piece of ground in the area. I drove with an altimeter from the Astra Zeneca building down Great Seneca and right onto Muddy Branch, and the proposed site is at about 360' whereas the top of the AZ garage is at about 460' and the top of the Hopkins property sits at about 410'. So it's not really about elevation, I believe it's about the path of least resistance and since Hopkins and AZ have turned ATT down, they have now targeted a piece of City owned property banking on the City just approving it with little push back.

We as citizens of Gaithersburg are banking on the Mayor, City Counsel and City Manager to take a stand and see that this is not a right sized solution for the problem they're intending to solve, nor an

appropriate solution considering the proximity to homes in the Lakelands / Kentlands and Washingtonian Woods. We look to you to fall on the right side of this vote and preserve our precious wildlife, trees and natural habitat and keep the peace of the woods and neighborhoods so we, our children and families can continue to enjoy the space as we have for years past.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Michelle Monti

As a Gaithersburg resident I would like to say NO to this or any other Tower

Carlos Blum
457 Upshire Circle
Gaithersburg, MD

Tue. 6/30

It is not valid for one to assume that this cell phone tower will not be visible in the wintertime just because the red balloon was not visible during the test while the trees were full of leaves. The under story of this forest is very open and relatively clear of underbrush. In many areas your unobstructed view within the forest is 300 to 400 feet in the summertime.

We live in the Lakelands. Our houses have views toward the forest. In summer, our views in the easterly direction are limited to less than 100 feet due to the heavy leaf cover. The same view in the winter time, one can see the southbound traffic on Great Seneca highway near High Gables drive approximately 800' away. Therefore, the red balloon test did not take into consideration the views for the other half of the year.

We would like to restate our request of February 3, 2020, that another balloon test be held after the leaves are down, but before further consideration be given to this project or before a decision is made. We believe there is a high probability that this massive, ugly cell tower will be visible to the community for the 6 winter months.

Please do not vote "yes" to building the tower until a further balloon test is conducted.

Sincerely,

Ned McGowan

June 25, 2020

Dear Gaithersburg City Council Members,

My name is Fawn Baranko. I live at 449 Upshire Circle in Washingtonian Woods.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback regarding the proposed installation of an AT&T cell tower and associated structure off Great Seneca Highway. I previously viewed the presentation and listened to comments from the video of the meeting held February 3, 2020, regarding this issue. I continue to be opposed to using the woods off Great Seneca Highway to install a cell tower. My reasons include:

1. **This cell tower would benefit very few people at the aesthetic expense of very many.** At the February meeting, no meeting attendees expressed a need for expanded AT&T services, despite several speakers being AT&T customers. Only AT&T expressed a need to add and improve coverage. I do not want public lands that are currently enjoyed by the public to benefit commercial enterprises.
2. I disagree with AT&T's assertion that the cell tower could be installed without visual impact to the surrounding community. **The tower will be very visible to any traveling along the Great Seneca corridor, and from my and other surrounding neighborhoods,** as evidenced by AT&T's own previously conducted balloon survey and viewing other cell phone towers located in wooded areas. Currently, the trees provide a visually pleasant green space free of the visual blight of development. While the woods have mature trees that help conceal homes and business in the summer, visibility markedly increases once the leaves fall. Currently, I see homes in the Lakelands from my back view that are not visible in the summer.
3. In the 10 years I have lived here, I have witnessed open space in this small area of Gaithersburg disappear at an astonishing rate. **With recent restrictions related to Covid-19, more people than ever enjoy the trails of that wooded area, free of business interests, as a welcome reprieve from social distancing and quarantine.** As an avid biker and hiker, I can also attest to the unpleasant aspect of suddenly encountering a large manmade humming structure in the middle of peaceful woods as there is at Schaffer's Farm. It disrupts the natural beauty.
4. AT&T's preference for a cell tower allows them to profit from renting tower cellular space to other companies. However, **other technology exists that improves cell phone reception, including in-home cell boosters that companies can provide their customers, and use of Distributed Antenna Systems (DAS).** DAS are small low-power units roughly the size of a microwave oven that can be mounted on existing telephone poles and buildings. Searching for the article "AT&T's new antenna system will boost cellular coverage at Walt Disney World" describes how the company successfully used this technology to solve the same issues they noted during the meeting, without installing a large cell tower.

I hope AT&T's request for this tower will not become a situation in which they get what they want if they only ask enough times, or because they shift the tower location within the same small space. Please do not approve their request for a cell tower. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Fawn Baranko

Sun. 6/28 & Mon. 6/29

Dear Mayor and City Council,

First, I hope you and your families are well and want to thank you for your continued service during this pandemic.

I'm writing to express my concern about erecting the AT&T cell tower behind our back yard without conducting a red balloon test in the winter. I find it difficult to believe that it will not be visible during the late Fall to early Spring timeframe. However, if that is the case, as demonstrated by another balloon test, I would be less concerned about the visual impact...though I would still be concerned about the impact on the environment and the potential impact it may have on human health (e.g. increased risk of cancer).

I do not think it's prudent to approve AT&T's request at this time, nor would such an approval show that residents' voices were heard during the previous two City Council meetings on this topic. To keep this email short, I will not restate the reasons for my (and others') views, as they were articulated well during these meetings.

I kindly request that no decision is made prior to such a balloon test. Thank you for your consideration.

Regards, Jarrod Borkat

To Gaithersburg Major and City Council,

I am writing in opposition to the proposed AT&T Cell Tower off Great Seneca Hwy.

The tower is going to be placed right in front of the Lakelands Ridge apartments. In October of last year AT&T placed a red balloon to mark the location and height of the tower. It is visible from our property. The tower will be visible above the tree canopy, and entirely during winter.

Myself and several neighbors oppose the installation of the AT&T cell tower. Our concerns are:

1. A cell tower in such proximity to our property and blatantly visible from our front window will have a negative impact in the value of our property
2. The location of the tower is very near (if not entirely inside) the Muddy Branch park, which is a fragile environment that needs to be protected.

3. The presence of a cell tower that rises above the three canopies will ruin the harmonious landscape of Great Seneca, which in turn will have an impact on quality of life and the overall quality of the neighborhood

4. We strongly believe that allowing AT&T to install a cell tower now sets the wrong precedent. Today is a tower, tomorrow there will be more towers. Why is Gaithersburg ceding a piece of park land to the telecommunications industry? Everybody knows that the telecommunication giants are not concerned about the environment and the quality of life in the neighborhood. If Gaithersburg allows AT&T to install a tower today, who is going to prevent that the competitors (T-Mobile, Verizon, etc.) will not get theirs too? The 5G technology is coming. Is Gaithersburg going to cede the Muddy Branch park to telephone giants to install antennas while running the environment?

5. One thing is when you buy your home knowing that you have a huge antenna in your front window, an entirely different situation is when you buy your home and then the City allows the telecommunications industry to put a cell tower in front of your property. When we bought our property, we were following the normal criteria that guide buyers (schools, safety, environment, etc.) We believe that the environment (both natural and social) deteriorates when the City allows installation of industrial equipment and constructions that do not belong to residential areas.

Thank you for your attention.

Sergio Torres
201 High Gables Dr
APT 201
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

1. It appears that the EXISTING cell tower on Great Seneca Hwy and High Gables Dr. isn't enough of an eyesore for AT&T since it is somewhat shorter than the proposed 175' 4 level Christmas Tree design AT&T is proposing to locate nearby.

2. Even if the tower itself is in the State or County right of way it appears that the supporting structures would be located on Gaithersburg Parkland.

3. These types of industrial facilities should be located on industrial sites and pay fair share real estate taxes levied for heavy industry.

Using Parkland as a means of reducing costs for AT&T and those that rent tower space from AT&T by avoiding legitimate taxes and structural constraints of an industrial facility increase their Corporate profit margins while decreasing the property values of residential structures in the area.

4. The "fair value" of a utility in a public right of way is not the TRUE VALUE or COST to the neighborhood. Thus, on behalf of local residents, the City Council should consider adequate compensation to all property owners within the line of sight of this monstrous tower.

5. Further, the loss of access to Public Parkland by the citizens whose tax dollars enable G'burg to possess such parkland due to fences and high voltage equipment to be located on this parkland should also be fully compensated.

6. Property taxes (which already consider proximity to parks as value added to our property assessments) should be reduced along with the assessed value of the residences in line of sight proximity to these facilities.

7. Overall, it may be a better idea for AT&T to locate this and any other CELL TOWER in a commercial or industrial setting better suited for such purposes.

8. It is not clear that approval of the AT&T tower would preclude another Cell Tower from being erected a few hundred feet away. There should be a ceiling on the number of towers and more importantly the total transmitted power output from these towers. An exclusion zone should be defined t5hat limits how many total transmitters should be allowed in a given area. NOTE several new Cell facilities have been installed on telephone poles along Muddy Branch withing the past two years.

Sincerely,

/S/

Steven Raphael

Here are my written comments to object to the "Proposed Cell Tower & Associated Structure Off Great Seneca Highway". The project will cause numerous negative impacts to the surroundings and residents.

-The proposed structures are excessivley higher then any surrounding sturctures and environment and also too close to residential homes, such as my home (Lakelands Ridge Condos); thus, they are too intrusive and permanently damage not only the esthatics of the living environment but also reduce property value.

-In addition, the proposed structures negatively impact and interfere with the nautural environment (inlcude interfering wildlifes) in this neighborhood.

-Any defects or damages that may occur to these proposed structures pose additional, unnecessary risk to all the residents nearby as well as to drivers along the Great Seneca Highway.

I strongly object to the propsed project on the cell tower and associated structures off Great Seneca Highway. Other better suitable site and technology should be considered and used.

Best regards,

Angela Ng

201 High Gables Dr., #310

Gaithersburg, MD 20878

I live in the Lakelands Ridge neighborhood directly across from the proposed site for antennae cell tower. I AM NOT IN FAVOR of this location for a variety of reasons including the safety of our community. The proposed 155

to 175 ft. cell tower is too tall for this residential neighborhood and will be an eyesore. Also, diesel generators will create noise pollution. Move it to an area where there are no risks to the community.

Thank you,
Jody Rosenblum
201 High Gables Drive
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

Fri. 6/26 & Sat. 6/27

I vote "NO" to the AT&T cell phone tower in Gaithersburg Maryland.

Andre Mclemore

I am writing to express my concern over the issues presented by the proposed location for new AT&T cell towers. As a new resident of the Washingtonian Woods community, I am upset to read the trails and woods my partner and I have come to love are now threatened by such an ugly and unnecessary addition to our neighborhood. While the cause for the towers is valid, it should fall to the responsibility of the company that created the issue. Additionally - it does not seem that such a large tower is needed to solve the problem. I would rather have poor cell service forever than have the beautiful trails, parks, and ecosystem that lives in our backyard ruined or removed. Not to mention our home values which will also decrease. Please, please consider the quality of life of the city residents like me who are greatly affected by this action, and do not allow the project to continue here.

Thank you for listening,

Michelle Palombi

I have been a resident of Washingtonian Woods for the past 16 years and I am sending this email in opposition to the proposed site for the ATT cell tower locted in the woods between our neighborhood and the Lakelands/Kentlands.

The solution that ATT proposes isn't right sized for the problem of spotty reception and a handful of open tickets. My wife has ATT and I have Verizon, and true, her cell phone service is spotty compared to mine. However, how did Verizon solve the problem without installing a massive cell tower 300 ft. north of our neighborhood? I believe ATT could easily adopt a similar solution as Verizon; potentially installing several mini cell towers on telephone poles around the area like the other service providers have

done. However, I believe ATT is building this simply to lease space to other cell providers and turn it into a profit center but dressing it up as a needed life safety issue.

There's a similar tower on Norbeck Rd as you're heading from Gude towards Georgia Ave, but there are no homes within 300' of that facility, in fact, not even 1000'. If you happen to be driving by there, take a look and that's what Gaithersburg will be getting. It's an unsightly tower and the base is messy. If you want to see what ATT is proposing, look no further than this tower. There is also an existing cell tower roughly 1500 ft from their proposed site at the Itzaak Walton League of America Park off Muddy Branch. I didn't see any mention of the existing tower in any of the documentation and curious why the current tower isn't in consideration for ATT.

The proposed tower will also be high enough that in Summer and Winter, we will see the tower when driving into our neighborhood on Midsummer Drive. It will also be a scar on the landscape and exist as a prominent backdrop to our community pool.

I find it sad if we as residents and council members allow the destruction of this natural wildlife habitat and trees in lieu of an ugly 175' tower that will be surrounded by a large fence which will house a 1500 sq ft. raised concrete base, diesel generators and hundreds if not thousands of gallons of Diesel fuel. Furthermore, hundreds of specimen sized trees will be cleared, thereby further exposing the tower to our ground level view from the adjacent neighborhoods and Great Seneca Highway. Service and fuel trucks will be in and out on a routine basis and the generators will be run weekly to exercise them which is SOP for diesel generators. They're also very loud and dirty. This will disturb the peace every they are run as the proposed site is in close proximity to homes.

Where elevation above ground level is an ally for better cell coverage, ATT is proposing the tower on the lowest lying piece of ground in the area. I drove with an altimeter from the Astra Zeneca building down Great Seneca and right onto Muddy Branch, and the proposed site is at about 360' whereas the top of the AZ garage is at about 460' and the top of the Hopkins property sits at about 410'. So it's not really about elevation, I believe it's about the path of least resistance and since Hopkins and AZ have turned ATT down, they have now targeted a piece of City owned property banking on the City just approving it with little push back.

We as citizens of Gaithersburg are banking on the Mayor, City Counsel and City Manager to take a stand and see that this is not a right sized solution for the problem they're intending to solve, nor an appropriate solution considering the proximity to homes in the Lakelands / Kentlands and Washingtonian Woods. We look to you to fall on the right side of this vote and preserve our precious wildlife, trees and natural habitat and keep the peace of the woods and neighborhoods so we, our children and families can continue to enjoy the space as we have for years past.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best Regards,
Anton Vanas
410 Midsummer Drive
Gaithersburg MD 20878

As a resident of Washingtonian Woods I am writing to tell you we are NOT in favor of the AT&T cell tower being placed next to our neighborhood and property!!! Please do not pass this!!!

Sincerely,
Shannon & Bill Chen

Thur. 6/25

My wife and I are voting NO to the proposed macro tower at Great Seneca Highway. There are other more suitable nearby locations than right at our backyard.

Best regards,

Ruly and Arlette Arifin
435 Upshire Circle
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

Mayor & Council,
The proposed 155 to 175 ft. cell tower is too tall for this residential neighborhood and will be an eyesore. Also, diesel generators will create noise pollution.

Suzanne Leonard
945 Hillside Lake Ter.
20878

We are City of Gaithersburg residents living in the Washingtonian Woods development and are writing to let you know of our opposition to the proposal to build a cell tower in the woods along Great Seneca Highway which is directly adjacent to our neighborhood. This is very close to the beautiful trails that come from the other side of Great Seneca Highway. As of late, many more people have been exploring the nature around us and gaining an appreciation for its beauty and importance to the wildlife which it supports. Adding a cell tower with two diesel generators in this pristine area would be very detrimental to this beautiful environment, including the birds and mammals that have lived there for thousands of years. All of us want to have good cell service but not at the expense of further diminishing our surrounding environment. Please consider other more suitable and less intrusive locations.

Thank You,
Robert & Jennifer Wolf
463 Upshire Circle
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

Wed. 6/24

Hello,

I am writing to oppose the development of a cell tower behind Washingtonian Woods park. I am a resident and frequently enjoy the use of the trails and green space. The development would also detrimentally affect the myriad wildlife (band eagles, box turtles, fox, deer etc all known to nest and feed in these woods).

Stephanie Joseph

We have been residents of Washingtonian Woods since November 1989. We have enjoyed our beautiful neighborhood including all the bridges and trails in the back of our neighborhood. We understand that you want to put in cell towers in our neighborhood which would completely destroy our neighborhood for many reasons. We understand the park in our neighborhood is owned by the City of Gaithersburg, however, our families have enjoyed miles of hiking trails, as well as kid-made bike tracks, handmade bridges and a sandy 'shore' the kids call The Beach for 30 years.

We believe there are locales better suited for a structure of this size in nearby commercial areas and near the ICC entrance. Please consider this option so that you do not destroy our neighborhood and especially home values. It took many years for these homes to increase in value due to the negative connotation of living in "Gaithersburg" attending "North Potomac schools".

Sincerely,
Nancy R Gelber

Tue. 6/23

Good afternoon,

We understand ATT has a proposal for a new cell tower off Great Seneca Highway that the City Council is considering at the July 6 meeting. It is imperative that you approve this new cell tower as our coverage by ATT is spotty; inconsistent and has been unacceptable during the Covid remote work required situation. Prior proposals have been opposed by neighbors but it is critical that we get this needed infrastructure improvement for those of us who use ATT & live in the Lakelands. We have to have reliable cell service to work from home! We have had inadequate coverage for years and ATT must be allowed to get this fixed.

Please record our strong support for this new proposal. We have lived in the Lakelands since 2001. Thank you for your consideration.

Rob & Connie Ingalls
613 Bright Meadow Drive
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

Hello,

I am a resident of Washingtonian Woods, and I recently learned of AT&T's proposal to install a tower in the woods behind our neighborhood. While I have AT&T, and my service is terrible, it seems there are many alternative locations for the tower away from housing available and other options less intrusive than a giant tower designed for AT&T to increase its profits by leasing.

Please vote no to this proposal.

Yours,
Debra D'Agostino

To whom it may concern,

The City of Gaithersburg's logo reflects the importance of the environment on our past, present and future. Smart growth, and the fostering of a natural environment that is protected, respected and enhanced makes up one of our city's tenets. The new cell tower plan located in the woods between the Lakelands and Washingtonian Woods violates this city priority. It will require the removal of hundreds of trees, disturbs a beautiful natural area that community members use for exercise, adventure and play, as well as creates a perception that our environment is not as important to the city as cell phone coverage.

From what I understand, the AstraZeneca parking structure directly contributed to the loss of cell phone coverage. Why can't a mini tower be installed on this garage that caused the problem, as well as another garage (possibly the JDA parking garage)? Mini towers could help improve coverage and won't disturb natural habitats like the current plan.

Smart growth is incredibly important. The decimation of 1500 square feet of natural forest and creek space is not smart. It deters from what the City of Gaithersburg emphasizes as priorities. More research needs to be done by AT&T to determine a way for smaller towers to be installed (maybe in other commercial areas or over by the ICC) to boost coverage and to leave the natural space unharmed.

Thanks,

Stephanie Epstein

Please vote "NO" to adding the AT&T cell tower to the woods area behind the Washingtonian Woods neighborhood.

There are hiking trails, animal habitats, mature trees, creeks and handmade bridges in this beautiful natural habitat of our city.

There are better areas for a cell tower of this size near the ICC where you would not be disrupting this oasis of wildlife!

Thank you,

Stephanie Kauffman

Resident of Washingtonian Woods

Please stop the proposed AT&T 155'-175' micro towers and four (4) diesel generators in the woods and trails off Great Seneca Hwy.

We need to be conserving the trees, nature, and wild animals...not destroying their habitat!

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ximena Velasquez

Hello City Council Members,

I'm writing to request the relocation of the proposed AT&T cellular towers off of Great Seneca Highway. The location selected will not only destroy the home values of the nearby neighborhoods but destroy the lands that many of the city residents enjoy.

As a resident of a nearby neighborhood, the placement will force us to leave the city due to the councils greedy need for AT&T money.

There are multiple other locations the towers can be located, Astra Zenaca's campus is the most logical. This would avoid the disruption of wildlife, the lands that the city residents enjoy and frequent as well as alleviate the consequences many homeowners will have to face with lower home values.

I'd strongly suggest the relocation as the election for new officials is in 2021, next year. If you enjoy your office, listen to your constituents, otherwise, be prepared for massive backlash during your reelection campaign.

Thank you,

Stephanie Baer

I am writing to you as a life long, native Gaithersburg resident. I am not opposed to development and improved cell phone service, but I am opposed to the AT&T tower being placed in the woods between our neighborhoods. It is an oasis to wild life (owls, heron, beaver, woodpeckers, deer and more) dirt trails, mature trees, Muddy Branch, and place for children to play. I am appalled that we would consider placing a tower, diesel fuel tanks, buzzing generator and access road on this parcel of natural earth.

We must look to Astra Zeneca who caused this cellular break up with their parking garage to fix the problem they created, or find an alternate location that does not destroy more of our precious land. Must we continue to poison our own habitat? Our planet is out of balance. Have we not learned better? Can we not do better?

Sincerely,

Tami Mensh
102 Midsummer Drive, Gaithersburg

Please vote against the proposed cell tower. Destroying a wooded area adjacent to my neighborhood to fix a problem created by the Astra Zeneca parking garage is not a good solution.

Thank you.

Elizabeth Franzino

I strongly oppose the proposed installation of att cell towers in the woods near the muddy branch trail. We all are the stewards of our parklands and ecosystem. The animals, waterways and woods are all essential in the environment and Gaithersburg's commitments. Also what is the impact on the creek whose water flows directly to the Potomac river? What about the Muddy Branch Trail? Please review and find another alternative that is less impactful.

Anna Hogenkamp
6 Flameleaf Ct

Sat. 6/20 – Mon. 6/22

Hello,

I have just learned about the tower proposed in the woods off Great Seneca Highway. I understand that a good portion of the woods will need to be cleared for the cell tower. Our area is already overdeveloped with little woods around. I strongly oppose this project. Please have AT&T locate a better place for this structure - such as near commercial areas near the ICC entrance.

Thank you
Naomi

I live at 102 Midsummer Drive in Washingtonian Woods. I have lived in the development since 2001. I just got word of the proposed 150' tower that is proposed in our neighborhood. I am appalled and

disgusted that this is being considered. How can a beautiful piece of park/wildlife be destroyed because ATT lost signal in an area due to development in an area away from our neighborhood?

I can't imagine you would allow for destruction of all of those trees to put up a huge tower with diesel generators and tank trucks driving in to the site. This was not in any master plan and would have affected our decision to move here if it was. I plead with you to not allow this site in to our neighborhood.

There are much better commercial locations this can go instead of in to the middle of our neighborhood and I implore you to consider alternative sites.

Regards,

Brandt Mensh

Hello,

I am 22 years old and since I could walk I have been exploring those woods. I hope that I never come upon a fenced-off cell tower in the peaceful forest I grew up in.

Save the Woods!

-Adrian Culp

Dear Mayor Ashman and Gaithersburg City Council,

I urge you to REJECT the AT&T proposed macro cell tower between the Washingtonian Woods and Lakelands neighborhoods. My family and I have enjoyed the woods, the trails and creek for years - and even more since the pandemic. We are so lucky to have such pristine beauty in our backyards - and if I didn't live here, I would still come to hike the beautiful area!

Please have the tower placed in nearby commercial areas or near the ICC entrance.

Thank you for your consideration,

Gail Isaacson
Washingtonian Woods Resident

We were just made aware of the pending decision to install ATT tower in our neighborhood, Washingtonian Woods. We strongly oppose this action, especially given that there are alternative locations in the county that will be less disruptive. This action will negatively impact the

nature/ecosystem of our area, activity/outdoor resources for our families and children, increase unknown dangers of exposure to signal radiation, and negatively impact property values.

During the past few months, during stay-at-home orders, many families and children in our neighborhood have discovered or rediscovered the woods. This has created a critical outlet for physical and mental health for us and our neighbors and it is an area that will continue to be used even after stay-at-home orders cease.

Please vote NO against this action and seek an alternative location that will not impact the quality of life for our neighborhood or other residential areas.

Sincerely,
Shay & Colin Thomson
129 Upshire Circle
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

Hi. I am a resident of Washingtonian Woods and my teenager has been spending his days through the woods you want to destroy. We need to keep that land for the kids, as well as protect those who live near the proposed area for the tower. Choosing a place for the tower right inside a neighborhood is a poor choice for it.

Rachel Miller

I oppose this ! . Build your tower elsewhere , not in our back yards .

David Sarano
403 Midsummer Drive
Gaithersburg, Md 20878

I oppose this cell tower. It is not needed at the proposed location and cell tower service there is already good.

The tower will have 4 tiers that AT&T will lease to other carriers. It will include a 2500-sq.-ft. cement pad with four diesel generators. It will emit a great deal of radiation.

This will be bad for the environment. Hundreds of mature trees will be cleared for the ground facility and the access road.

Cell reception along this corridor is fine but further east is spotty. There are locales better suited for a structure of this size in nearby commercial areas and ICC entrance.

Molly Hauck

3900 Decatur Ave.
Kensington, MD 20895

Thur. 6/18

Please, I do not want any more cell towers in Gaithersburg MD.

lynn azar
310 high gables drive
gaithersburg md 20878
