

**GLENDALE ORGANIZED AGAINST CELL TOWERS
COMMENTS ON PASADENA'S PROPOSED WIRELESS ORDINANCE, AND
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR GLENDALE'S WIRELESS ORDINANCE
DELIVERED JUNE 9, 2009 TO GLENDALE CITY COUNCIL**

Pasadena has conducted two readings of its new Wireless Telecommunications Facility Ordinance, and will likely approve it this June. Glendale Organized Against Cell Towers notes several problems with the proposed ordinance, and offers this critique for the benefit of Glendale citizens:

1. It appeared to Pasadena residents and to observers in Glendale that telecom representatives had privileged access to city staff. Pasadena's city attorney referred to such meetings during city council meetings. Residents' requests to meet with staff were not granted. Staff deflected residents' questions by referring them to the city attorney, whose office responded by saying that the attorney represented the city and could not communicate with them.

Glendale's published plan, which is to release a draft ordinance and ask for input from residents and industry at the same time, appears fair and balanced.

2. The Pasadena ordinance is far too confusing, and leaves important interpretations (including basic definitions!) and decisions to city staff. One resident called it "unintelligible." As our previous mayor John Drayman noted, staff should be receiving clear direction from the city, not left to their own discretion in applying various rules. **The Glendale ordinance should be comprehensive, easy to understand, and simple to interpret, for all parties.**

3. Pasadena gives away too much to applicants by streamlining applications for minor facility sites on city-owned property. There are approximately 189 city-owned sites mapped by Pasadena, many of them within residential neighborhoods, on which microsites could be installed with little or no public input or notification. Little is gained here if the sites end up on city-owned parcels right next to homes, with homeowners having no fair warning. **The Glendale ordinance should have uniform notification guidelines of at least 500 feet and generous public comment periods of at least 45 days for all applications.**

4. Pasadena will not require justification studies for all wireless installations, only for those on the public right-of-way, and monopoles on private property. It does not require justification studies for minor wireless facilities on private property, including city-owned property. A needs assessment is virtually the only way, under current federal and state law, that municipalities can control the proliferation of wireless sites. **The Glendale ordinance should have consistent, rigorous justification requirements for every application.**

5. Pasadena's proposed ordinance offers "co-location sites" on city-owned property and lengthy lease terms, leaving residents little opportunity to influence siting on city-owned property over the long term. No objections to a site could even come up for 20 years. **The Glendale ordinance should provide residents every possible opportunity over time to protect their neighborhoods and private property.**

GOACT urges Glendale to copy as much as possible from the County of San Diego's wireless ordinance, which was upheld by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. As Glendale's General Counsel for Public Works Christina Sansone has informed us, it was just favorably reviewed by the U.S. Solicitor General in response to a request from the Supreme Court.