

# NEIGHBORHOOD INFORMATION MEETING

PROJECT: Southridge Golf Course Wireless Telecommunications Facility

DATE: February 10, 2015

APPLICANTS: Becky Siskowski (Centerline Solutions), David Born (Verizon), Kwasi Addo-Donkoh (Verizon), Chad Webber (Verizon), Jason Shelledy (Verizon), Debbie Effert (Verizon)

STAFF PRESENT: Rebecca Everette (Planning), Delynn Coldiron (Neighborhood Services), Clay Frickey (Planning), Bill Whirty (Parks)

## Summary of Presentation:

- Previous application in 2010 by AT&T at a similar location was met with lots of opposition
- This proposal calls for a similar monopine but lower in elevation and adjacent to existing maintenance building
  - This proposal is 58 feet lower in elevation than AT&T proposal
- Tower will be 55 feet tall
- Equipment building will be an extension of maintenance facility
- Arrays arranged to prevent antennas from sticking up at the top and blend in to pine
- Example of monopine on Vine and Shields
- Applicant will use camouflage to cover antennas and add needles to make them look like part of the branch
- Bark and colors will be similar to existing trees so they blend in
- Applicant picks locations based on access for maintenance trucks, power availability, ability to reach proper height to transmit signals, flat land
- Tried to accommodate at Transfort facility but couldn't find a suitable location
- Tried to locate at this Heart of the Rockies church but couldn't get the necessary height
- Antennas have to be 47 feet high to transmit properly
- Tried at respite care facility and didn't have enough room
- Looked at park across the street from the golf course and there were no vertical elements to hide the tree

## Questions, Comments & Responses:

**Question (Citizen):** I am confused, is the tower 55 feet or 85 feet?

**Response (Applicant):** The original proposal was 85 feet and we moved it to a different location on the golf course and decreased it to 55 feet.

**Question (Citizen):** How tall are the screen poles along the edge of the golf course?

**Response (Applicant):** 55 feet.

**Comment (Citizen):** So this would be the same height as the screen poles.

**Response (Applicant):** Parks and Recreation requires that the tower be no taller than the screen poles.

**Question (Citizen):** I have Verizon and I live on Cactus Court and I don't understand why we need this facility at all, can you explain?

**Response (Applicant):** To clarify, we have two kinds of cell phone towers: capacity sites and coverage sites. Capacity sites are used where they don't have adequate service or there are too many people on the network at one time. What happens in that scenario is there's not enough capacity to accommodate multiple users at one time. For radio frequency questions, I can refer to David or Kwasi?

**Response (Applicant):** To explain the purpose of this site it does both. There are some bad coverage areas around here where I wasn't able to use LTE as the signal is not strong enough. The primary driver is that as more people use data applications we look at the sites around it to see how they perform and the sites here are getting slow throughputs and you are not able to use new applications on your phone. People can call and send texts but that isn't the point of the site. It is mainly a capacity site. When we built a tower on Timberline and Harmony at the Hospital, we saw huge traffic from day one and there was pent up demand to the south. We want this site to improve coverage.

**Comment (Citizen):** This comment is related to the service issue. We have had problems the whole time I have lived here and we get dropped calls all the time at home. I am a physician and we miss calls all the time. One of my partners lives in the Miramont area and they have the same issue.

**Response (Applicant):** Historically, people didn't use cell phones at home so we built towers in business areas, industrial areas, and along roads. But the problem is now people use their cell phone at home, so we are seeing more traffic in residential areas and of course it's harder to build tower sites there. When you get a big residential area there isn't much choice.

**Question (Citizen):** Did you look at open space on the south side of Trilby along the Power Trail? Will there be other carriers on this tree?

**Response (Applicant):** We're not sure if it is City owned property. The trail easement is City property and I would have to look at Natural Areas to see what they allow regarding cell phone towers.

**Response (Applicant):** It will be built for future carriers. Another carrier could come along and put up an antenna.

**Response (City):** New wireless towers need to accommodate collocation, as we want to promote competition. We require additional review if they add an equipment shelter.

**Question (Citizen):** We have excellent coverage according to the coverage map from Verizon, what is the need for a new tower given the coverage map? The tower is 55 feet high and is the same height of those black poles on the driving range and if the array is at 47 feet and another array for another carrier would be lower still it could end up having visual impacts even lower. I have concerns about emissions in that neighborhood. These homes on Pheasant drive are only 300 feet from the tower site. I am concerned about the emissions.

**Response (Applicant):** It's less a coverage site and more of a capacity site. The sites covering this area now are not performing well according to our data.

**Question (Citizen):** What makes us think this tower will improve coverage given the number of towers already in the area?

**Response (Applicant):** It will.

**Question (Citizen):** There are 24 sites within 4 miles. How many more towers do you need to get the capacity you need?

**Response (Applicant):** The number of cell towers depends on height and how many antennas we can put up. When I look at a site, if we were to go here we would need one definitely, because it is too short. The initial proposal was for 85 feet so I request that you take into consideration what everyone has to look at. The lower we go the less area we can cover so we have to use more sites to accommodate higher capacity.

**Question (Citizen):** You mentioned alternatives like the park but you didn't mention anything about the baseball diamonds and the fact they have huge towers right now. Why didn't you put a tower where all of the other towers further from houses at a higher elevation so it will improve coverage? You wouldn't need a tree there since you have half a dozen 50 foot towers to begin with. You could put a tree there since it is a park. My question is did you consider this?

**Response (Applicant):** I am not really sure. When we started this, the Heart of the Rockies church was the center of the search area. The Southridge site is further north but not much more than here. The original search range was around the Heart of the Rockies and we couldn't get an antenna there so I had to move the search a bit further north. The baseball fields are northwest of the Southridge site and we have sites next to it. As a result, that site wouldn't accomplish our goals well. The golf course was the only other non-residential area where I could put a tower.

**Question (Citizen):** Have you looked at collocating on the existing cell tower to the northeast?

**Response (Applicant):** Which one?

**Comment (Citizen):** The one next to the barn and silo is the existing AT&T tower. This is the tower that was initially proposed for this site and got turned down.

**Response (Applicant):** If it's close to Kechter road it would be too close to an existing site.

**Question (Citizen):** I will read from the Land Use Code, section 3.8.13(B)

*No wireless telecommunication facility or equipment owner or lessee or employee thereof shall act to exclude or attempt to exclude any other wireless telecommunication provider from using the same building, structure or location. Wireless telecommunication facility or equipment owners or lessees or employees thereof, and applicants for the approval of plans for the installation of such facilities or equipment, shall cooperate in good faith to achieve co-location of wireless telecommunication facilities and equipment. Any application for the approval of a plan for the installation of wireless telecommunication facilities or equipment shall include documentation of the applicant's good faith efforts toward such cooperation.*

Do you have documentation for us to see? Has collocation been adequately explored?

**Response (Applicant):** Yes, collocations have been considered and as he mentioned we explored the AT&T site nearby. Yes, they are always considered. We would prefer collocations because they are cheaper and easier. In this case, it wasn't appropriate.

**Comment (Citizen):** I have a quote here from the CFO from Verizon and he said wants to own his own towers, they want to get their own space without collocation so they don't have to jump through hoops. It is easier to own towers and you can sell these towers later. You sold 11,000 towers last week to American Tower for \$5 billion.

**Response (Applicant):** Chad is the construction manager for the site so he can speak to specific issues about the tower construction. I can't speak for Verizon. Becky is right. If there are collocation opportunities we pursue that first. I am not sure what you were trying to say, but collocation makes life easier.

**Question (Citizen):** How do we get documentation that you pursued collocation?

**Response (Applicant):** Collocation didn't work out for our objectives.

**Comment (Citizen):** The question is, it's required as part of the development review application so I would like to see documentation.

**Comment (Citizen):** I have a question in regard to whether or not the company has considered the impacts on property values. I would like to hear your comments. I have some information as well I would like to present. I have this written down as well to pass out. I live in Southridge and I have been a realtor for 15 years. I specialize in golf course properties. I guarantee we will all have our property values impacted. The first reason they are impacted is because most people consider monopines unsightly. Second, there is a perception that monopines and cell towers bring about ill-health and sickness. My personal experience in showing properties is that often times you drive up to a property next to a cell tower or a busy street and that person will actually say don't take me out of the car and I don't want to look at this property. There are websites about this. In giving advice to buyers for properties, many say that the rise of wireless technology is linked to declining values. Whether you agree with this or not, the advice is often to pretend you do and offer a lower price when buying a home near a cell tower. Property values will not exceed what the appraiser says. I can guarantee you this because appraisers belong to associations that follow rules and regulations and one of them is the Appraisers Institute. The Appraisers Institute has 25,000 members, they have a journal and in the summer of 2005, they published a report that claims cell towers result in housing prices to go down 10-19% or more depending on their proximity. There are people's homes within 300 feet of this tower and they stand to lose a lot of money. A \$500,000 property can lose 10-20% of its value, which means a loss of \$50,000-\$100,000. That is a lot of money for someone to bear to absorb this small amount of money the city can make from leasing space to a cell phone company. I am not going to tell you what side I'm on, I'm just presenting information. They will see the tower from the neighborhood and it will affect not only them. The appraisers go to other surrounding properties and it turns into a domino effect of falling property values. The City of Fort Collins has stated anyone who lives within 800 feet of developments should be notified. If you count the number of houses within 800 feet of the proposed tower, it's 62 homes. Due to the size of the pine, it's going to be impacting homes much farther away than that. In

addition, there is a figure of 1,500 feet that experts say where radio frequency waves have negative health impacts but I realize that can't be taken into consideration. The perception of how this impacts health will impact property values. If you look at the number of houses within 1,500 feet of the tower, it's more than 62 houses. If you look on Zillow and you total up the value of the 62 houses within 800 feet of this tower, the value is over \$32 million. If you look at 10-20% devaluation, you look at a reduction of as much as \$6 million in reduced taxable income for the City. The people who know they are being impacted should get an appraisal and request devaluation on your house if this happens. Some may find their houses won't be worth what they paid for. Those people may have to get a foreclosure or walk away. Hopefully that won't be the case. If you go to court as a group and sue the City for loss in valuation on the property you can win. All you have to show is the reduced value is due to the perception that there are health risks associated with the property. We understand most cities will not get \$15,000-\$20,000 on rent for a similar structure. It seems to us that since these properties are in a low-density zone district, they should prohibit cell towers in those districts. That is spirit of the law. By considering putting a tower in the RL zone district is not in the spirit of the law. Everyone here will suffer due to a \$15,000-\$20,000 lease. That is just not right.

**Question (Citizen):** In looking at the map, if you would hold this up, Verizon has more towers in a 4-mile radius than any other company, yes or no?

**Response (Applicant):** I don't know.

**Question (Citizen):** It's yes, I am wondering why we need another tower when most of the people in the area have Verizon and they have 5 bars of service. It looks like between the Harmony location and the other south location you have this area covered. But if you have the best coverage and your sales people pitch having the best coverage, why are you trying to put a cell tower below house line and close to people's back yards? I lost both of my parents due to cancer. My opinion is smoking got em. Right now, you have more cell towers than anyone else in this proximity. Is there anyone that is not happy with Verizon? Why is it that this area needs more attention than 5 miles to the east?

**Response (Applicant):** What dictates this is we're looking at stats on the sites around our towers and coverage in the area. We know what kind of service people are getting and it is not up to the standard of what we're trying to provide. We want to provide better service and people want it. We can see what level of service people are getting and what we promise as a company and that will dictate everything. It's not a coverage problem but a capacity problem so it is important to note that this is a coverage map and not a capacity map.

**Question (Citizen):** Would you clarify will the golf course receive the lease money or will it go to the City?

**Response (City):** If we get that far, the money goes to Southridge.

**Question (Citizen):** Have you considered collocating the towers over on Trilby next to the railroad tracks? Those are already ugly, so can you put the towers there without much of a negative impact.

**Response (Applicant):** I will have to follow up on that with you. Poudre River Power Authority won't let us go on their towers. There are some antennas on Poudre River Power Authority towers around town.

They won't let us do that anymore. When we put antennas on towers and have to work on them, it creates disruption.

**Response (City):** Also, you can't collocate on light poles in the City because Poudre River Power Authority uses fiberglass light poles. These poles aren't sturdy enough to handle a heavy load and so this isn't feasible city wide.

**Comment (Citizen):** Who is the recipient of the lease, you said the golf course, correct? If the golf course is running short on funding, I would address the issue directly and increase green fees. Increase the green fees by \$1 and you can get \$300 in a day on a busy day and you could recoup money easily. We could save our value on our homes that way without the depreciation associated with a cell tower being so close to our homes. If you're a physician I would make sure I have a land line in my house and I am respectful to your situation. Also, fluorescent lights kill cell phone service.

**Response (City):** This proposal was initiated by Verizon, not Parks. It was not initiated out of a need to generate revenue. It's all about process. It comes down to Verizon and they approached us with an application. If we get into a lease, it's not about money. This land is available for a cell tower site here. The process is they go to the Planning & Zoning Board, they have a public hearing, and that is why I am here. After this meeting, we will talk to staff and we go from there. We think about greens fees all the time. There is a plethora of opportunities to raise funds but this is about this process and giving Verizon their due. We don't have a dog in the hunt other than land that is zoned to allow cell phone towers and that is why we go through the process.

**Comment (Citizen):** I have been fighting the wireless industry for 6 years. In May 2011, it was classified as a Class 2 carcinogen. They can make wireless a Class 1 carcinogen that is the same as benzene and asbestos. I just wanted to make sure everyone was aware of that.

**Comment (Citizen):** As far as alternative locations are concerned, I would like to know what other locations you have considered. It seems like this is one of the worst places for a cell tower. This is one of the last places in southeast Fort Collins with views to the mountains. It's real estate and you are impacting countless homes here and the backlash you will get will be enormous. If I drop Verizon will this help with capacity?

**Response (Applicant):** As far as for location we had looked at many places including this church, the Transfort facility and the church across the street. The church across the street was going through additions but it didn't work out. I looked at Respite Care, Southridge, and the park across the street as well. I looked at 5-6 different places. As I said, in looking at the feasibility, we have to look at access, power, height, space, blockages and if there is anything that will block the antennas. Southridge site was the best one out of all of them given these factors.

**Question (Citizen):** Was proximity to houses considered?

**Response (Applicant):** Anywhere I go to propose a cell tower, we have houses. We have to comply with city ordinances and we have to accommodate Verizon so there are lots of things to consider. I am not blindly putting my finger on the map and picking locations. This was the least obtrusive place on the golf course. This isn't in the middle of the course or on a ridge like the AT&T proposal. This isn't next to

a fairway or greens. It had to be in a spot that is visually acceptable and that is hidden. It's in a hole in the maintenance facility and it is made to look like an extension of the maintenance facility which isn't pretty. When you say you are looking at a monopine, the facility will blend in and the pine will blend in. The closest house is 400 feet away and you can still see it and I passed out photo sims so you can see what it looks like once built. The drawings are a rendering of what the pine could look like. It depends on the manufacturer we end up using but we can make the tower look like whatever we want. It will look like a pine that grew there but you won't see antennas. You won't see the facility associated with the tower either.

**Comment (Citizen):** This is a follow up on the power poles near the railroad track. That entire area is natural with no houses or big trees. Just put the tower near the poles and you can get much higher and it won't radiate radio frequencies into neighborhoods. Another point is the primary reason for this is capacity. You mentioned people are using their cell phones more at home. I have T-Mobile and they give you a router so you can use broadband for data so you don't use radio frequency signals from your cell phone. This way you can get better wireless service in your house and you don't need mobile service. Is Verizon looking at something similar? Also, it looks like the pictures that show the pine were taken with a wide angle lens. It won't look like that in real life. The pole looks far away and they didn't make the representation of the pole truthful.

**Question (Citizen):** I was curious is this about making money? I am in business so I understand the need to make money. Has Verizon given consideration to pay homeowners the percentage of their home values that they lose because of this cell tower? Because if we will be impacted, why shouldn't we get paid just like the City and just like Verizon?

**Response (Applicant):** I have an e-mail from Don Tiller, who is a resident of the neighborhood. I think the property value is an issue and subjective. According to Don, he works from home and gets no service. He has to leave his home to get service. Now that he has experienced issues with cell phone coverage at home, he will make sure he has coverage before he moves in to another home. I get what you are saying about property values and I sympathize, but a lot of people work from home and need improved service. Also, there are safety issues when you don't have good cell phone coverage. For example, when Don's neighbor accidentally cut his service line, he had to drive away from his house to make an emergency call. I am just reading this e-mail.

**Comment (Citizen):** I wanted to address the question of the perception of health risks. I have done a lot of research. I am an AuD (Doctor of Audiology), I worked in a research hospital for ten years, and one thing I participated in was reviewing research. I have done an extensive review of articles on health risks associated with cell phone towers. I wanted to talk to you about the research on exposure to radio frequency emission. In 1996, the FCC adopted standards developed by the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers, and that is where they came up with radio frequency emissions limits. Those emissions were related to heat, not cancer or other potential effects of radio frequency emissions. There was no one with a medical background that helped with the establishment of exposure limits. These emission standards have not been reviewed or changed since 1996. Some of those documents used to develop these standards are 30 years old. Some of these studies I am going to share with you

regarding radio frequency emissions have good research and design. Each one of these studies from radio frequency emissions were in places that had levels of radio frequency below international or national standard levels. It is also important to understand where standards came from. In the early 1990s, there weren't near the amount of cell phone towers that we have now. There are more than 150,000 cell towers in the US currently. Based on these studies, the World Health Organization is trying to reclassify radio frequencies as being carcinogenic. Some of these studies have shown an increase in incidence of cancer for those living within 1,600 feet of cell towers. People living within 1,600 feet of these sites have shown an increase in cancers, insomnia, infertility, ADD, genetic issues, and more. One of the main studies that has been cited repeatedly was done in Belo Horizonte, Brazil. It was released out of the city's health department. It was a 10-year study on the impacts of exposure to radio frequencies. That is something we don't have going on this country because we don't have longitudinal data. With a 10-year-long study, it has a lot of impact. They were looking at these people that live within close distances to towers and their findings were that there was an increased risk of cancer and that there were over 7,000 reported incidences of cancer in those areas. Shortly after the data was published, the city prosecutor sued the cell phone companies and requested that the towers be removed. That was in 2011. Let me say there were several other studies with similar findings. One study in Israel compared people who live within close proximity to cell phone towers to all other medical records and they found there was a 4-times greater risk of cancer at a 95% confidence level. There are several other studies on the topic and they are on the web. There are also some bad studies. We need more research and studies done on this topic here. It appears there is a risk with living close to cell phone towers and people perceive this health risk. That perception means a lot. I may put together a PowerPoint online for these articles but the bottom line is there is perception of health risks associated with radio frequency emissions and data to support it. If these towers affect property values you need to know why.

**Response (City):** Please send your comments to us and anything we receive will be included in the record.

**Question (Citizen):** You have answered several questions from participants in the meeting but you didn't answer the questions about home values. There's all kinds of studies that involve mitigation and there is evidence of mitigation helping with maintaining property values. How much of an impact, real or perceived, is justified in comparison for a marginal gain in speed for a few people so they can stream data, some of it illegally. How much mitigation is being done for impacts to property values and residences and city through tax revenue?

**Response (Applicant):** Verizon has not done any studies on property values. I am sure you can find something online if you look. I have handed out links and made copies that contain websites and articles that outline how cell phone towers impact property values. Verizon has not done any studies.

**Question (Citizen):** It seems like it is possible to know the answer to that question that would be better than an estimate. The City is building towers all the time. Is it possible to collect properties before and after on Vine and Shields, for example, and see if there was an impact on property values from that monopine?



**Response (Applicant):** Appraisers would have to do that for each property surrounding the tower and appraise it before and after.

**Question (Citizen):** Does the county do that with the assessor? It seems like it would be possible to see actual impact on values in that area.

**Response (City):** The City hasn't done studies on that either. We will take that into consideration.

**Question (Citizen):** I would just like to add that for both the Parks department and the City that the zoning at Southridge is RL and cell towers are prohibited in the RL.

**Response (City):** Just to clarify, Southridge Golf Course is in the Public Open Lands zone district, not in the RL.

**Comment (Citizen):** Just to respond, it is disallowed in the RL due to property values and nuisance and those kinds of those things. Nothing around us is industrial or mixed-use. We are high end residential. They are allowed in commercial districts and Public Open Lands. Public Open Lands has been interpreted incorrectly to include golf courses inside a neighborhood. When I think of Public Open Lands, I don't think of open space with ugly towers with houses nearby. You think of parks without houses nearby. That's what I think of when I think of Public Open Lands, not the little area inside RL, which excludes it. The City should look at it, address this issue, and make some changes where zoning is. We should classify some Public Open Lands as ok for cell towers, and some not.

**Comment (Citizen):** To come back to one of the earlier statements about location you said you selected this site so it would be out of the way and wouldn't be hit by golf balls. I don't know who you talked to, but golf balls hammer that maintenance building. Guys who park their cars on the other side look like they have hail damage. The tower could sustain a great deal of damage in that location. Also, your measurement to the nearest backyard is not accurate, it is 100 yards from the closest house to the back of that maintenance building, or 303 feet.

**Comment (Citizen):** I need to speak for a couple of neighbors. I don't have coverage at my home. I get the capacity issue. The analogy for me is, we have a road here, why should we have to build a bigger one? If more cars are going to be on it, we need a wider road. I appreciate people who brought materials to present to the group. I looked at all of the concerns on radio frequency emissions and property concerns before the meeting. I saw both sides of the issue and I encourage everyone to see both sides. You should read about both sides and see what you think of them and if they are credible and if references back them up. I have read things that say property values are not affected and I have seen the other way. It is perception. I am guessing that when you build a tower, are those houses within a certain distance of the tower really devalued by 20%? I bet they are the same value as before the tower was put in. It seems very easy to check so I would find it hard to believe that every time one of those towers goes up that people lose millions of dollars. It's a perception issue, but that doesn't mean the next person buying your home isn't going to pay what you're asking for it.

**Question (Citizen):** I have a two-part question. 1, you said looked at places for locating this tower, do you have a document showing the characteristics you are looking for? Many people have brought up other sites, will you look at those or blow us off?

**Response (Applicant):** I have heard of one new site from this meeting...

**Comment (Citizen):** I have heard of three potential sites tonight: the Power Trail, the baseball fields and the other side of railroad tracks and that could cover it.

**Response (Applicant):** I do not have documents. I have notes in my head but I can make up a document for you. As for other locations, we have existing sites that may be too close. The ballpark is too close to existing sites. I will look at open space lands and confer with city.

**Question (Citizen):** I want a clear answer on the need for the tower. You stated earlier that you proposed an 85 foot tower, now it's 55 foot because you are limited. What guarantees do you have that the arrays will get the capacity you want with a lower tower?

**Response (Applicant):** What we do is we have a tool where we put all of the information on all of the tower sites around our target area. We see where the antennas in the area are and their height and so we can do a predictive model of where we need coverage. We can do the same thing with other locations and play with heights and see how coverage does with different parameters. It's a tradeoff and we will see if these things are worth it. I hear a lot of concern about if Verizon needs this site, well we wouldn't build it if we didn't need it. We are seeing issues and we wouldn't build something that wouldn't solve a problem. There is a lot of analysis that goes into this, these sites aren't cheap and we don't just throw them around and build them in the first place we can. We decided we need this and it's worth it. It's not based purely on coverage and where we would like it. We are looking at traffic and usage in this area and it's high.

**Comment (Citizen):** Jerry over there, my wife has Verizon and has no problems. I am interested in the alternative sites that have been proposed, for example the railroad tracks. I just don't want it in my view, that's why I bought my house and you are putting it right into my view. That document for alternative sites would be great.

**Comment (City):** My name is Mary and I am with Fort Collins Police Department. The question of need has come up so I wanted to address that from our perspective. Police and Fire have specific needs for cell phone coverage. All of our paramedics have laptops and we have coverage issues in this part of town. We asked Verizon for this to get better coverage here. We have used AT&T before and they don't have the same coverage as Verizon. Verizon is the largest carrier. Please take this into consideration as we need cell phone coverage to provide service.

**Question (Citizen):** Since you already have towers in the area, is there anything you can do with existing towers in the area other than build an additional tower? Is there any assurance that you won't sell this tower like the others?

**Response (Applicant):** That is called optimization but when we have problems in an area, first of all we do what we can to sites to improve coverage. Sometimes it isn't about increasing signal, it is taking away signal from other sites. So if you can rein in the signals from other sites you can improve the overall signal strength. It is incumbent upon use to work with existing structures to get the most out of them. So I think we have done as much as what we can with existing structures. As for the second question, we all heard that Verizon sold a lot of towers to American Tower and for me personally, that

means more work because now we have to work with American Tower instead of doing everything internally. If we do sell the tower, we still have our site there. It's like leasing instead of owning a car. Now we are just tenants if we sell the tower.

**Response (City):** I would add that if another provider chose to make changes or if anything changes from the initial approval this would need to come back through the review process. If more equipment shelters were added, it would require more review.