



Correspondence is available for review
in the Office of the City Clerk or on the
City's Official Website at
[http://www.cityofsacramento.org/webtech/streaming
_video/live_council_meetings.htm](http://www.cityofsacramento.org/webtech/streaming_video/live_council_meetings.htm)

Correspondence

Meeting of November 4, 2010

a. Correspondence

1. None at this time

b. eComment

1. See attached.

City of Sacramento

City Council (Closed Session Starts at 5:30 P.M.)

Thursday, November 04, 2010

Top Discussion Item

Agenda Item	Position %
<p>5. Estimated Time: 30 minutes T-Mobile Riverside Boulevard Monopine (P07-153) (Noticed on 10-4-10)</p> <p>Total Number of Comments: 3</p>	 <p> ■ Support 33% ■ Oppose 0% ■ None 66% </p>

Public Comments Summary

Opinion	Agenda Item	Support	Oppose	None	Total
	4. Estimated Time: 30 minutes Appeal: AT & T Odd Fellows Cemetery Monopine (Noticed on 10-4-10)	1	1	0	2
	5. Estimated Time: 30 minutes T-Mobile Riverside Boulevard Monopine (P07-153) (Noticed on 10-4-10)	1	0	2	3
	8. Estimated Time: 30 minutes Supplemental Agreement: Reintroduction of Vehicular Traffic on K Street	1	0	0	1
Total					6

Public Comments Details

Agenda Item		Support	Oppose	None	Total
4. Estimated Time: 30 minutes Appeal: AT & T Odd Fellows Cemetery Monopine (Noticed on 10-4-10)		1	1	0	2
Steve Belzer steve@belzercarrlaw.com 4531 Capri Way District 4 Sacramento CA	Regarding items 4 and 5 - I support the application for a cell site at Odd Fellows and oppose the one at the Balshor site. These should be co-located on the monopine in the cemetery.				Support 11/4/2010 
Nancy Yilk optimumhealthonline@comcast.net 3220 Riverside Blvd District 4 Sacramento ca	I am a local business owner in the Land Park area for the last 16 years. I oppose to the increasing of the tower in height to accomdate more than one cell tower. I get that we will indeed see the increase of cell towers to met the needs of data and cell service, however keeping in light the risk of having abnormal sized towers is not in the interest of residents or land use. This site may met ATT's needs but does not TMobiles and unfairly rewards one site to the other at 2616 Riverside.				Oppose 11/4/2010 

Agenda Item		Support	Oppose	None	Total
5. Estimated Time: 30 minutes T-Mobile Riverside Boulevard Monopine (P07-153) (Noticed on 10-4-10)		1	0	2	3
Sandy Patterson District 4 Sacramento CA	I would like to voice my support of the proposed T-Mobile Cellular Tower at the Balshor Florist location at 2661 Riverside Blvd. I have read all the information contained in the agenda packet and do not think the tower would detract from the environment in any way. It blends in quite nicely and would provide the much-needed reception in that area. If we can support our local businesses without it being detrimental, then by all means we should. Thank you for your consideration.				Support 11/1/2010 
Nancy Yilk optimumhealthonline@comcast.net 3220 Riverside Blvd District 4 Sacramento ca	I am in favor of the construction of TMOilbes site here it meets their coverage better, in is a small less offensive monopole, the process or application and the Balshors handling with the neighborhood has been an example to model on how we as a community should act with each other in assess objection and develope cooperation. This site should be approved and the permit at Oddfellows should be reduced in height. As a local business owner I have heard of no objections to the Balshor site.				None 11/4/2010 
Steve Belzer steve@belzercarrlaw.com 4531 Capri Way District 4 Sacramento CA	Oppose the monopine at the Balsor site. See my comment to item 4. There should be co-location at the Odd Fellows site.				None 11/4/2010 

Agenda Item		Support	Oppose	None	Total
8. Estimated Time: 30 minutes Supplemental Agreement: Reintroduction of Vehicular Traffic on K Street		1	0	0	1
Reed Geisreiter	As owner of 916 K Street, we are completely in support of the cars on K Street project.				Support

reed.geisreiter@gmail.co
m
916 K Street District 1
Sacramento CA

10/29/2010

