

PLANNING COMMISSION
NOTICE OF DECISION

Date: June 27, 2012

File No.: USE2012 0008

Westtower Communications
19500 Cipole Road
Tualatin, OR 97062

Application For: A Conditional Use Permit for a new 69-foot cell phone tower on a steel platform with diesel generator, enclosed within a 27' x 27' compound, located on residential property adjacent to Glacier Highway

Legal Description: USS 2389 LT H FR

Property Address: 14080 Glacier Highway

Parcel Code No.: 4-B31-0-100-0021-1

Hearing Date: June 26, 2012

The Planning Commission, at its regular public meeting, adopted the analysis and findings listed in the attached memorandum dated June 21, 2012, and approved the Conditional Use Permit for a new 69-foot cell phone tower on a steel platform with diesel generator, enclosed within a 27' x 27' compound, located on residential property adjacent to Glacier Highway to be conducted as described in the project description and project drawings submitted with the application and with the following conditions:

1. Prior to the issuance of a Building permit, the applicant shall submit a letter to the Community Development Department from a radio frequency expert indicating the structures comply with electromagnetic radio emission levels set by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).
2. Prior to receiving a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant shall submit a letter to the Community Development Department from a radio frequency expert indicating the structures as constructed and at optimal emission levels comply with electromagnetic radio emission levels set by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).
3. Prior to issuance of a Building permit, the applicant shall submit to the Community Development Department's planning staff for approval, dark green or brown powder coat color samples to be used for the tower and all accessory structures.
4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a noise study to demonstrate that dBA levels will not exceed 65 dBA at the property line during the day or 55 dBA at night. If the noise study indicates that the generator is louder than 55 dBA at the nearest residential property line, the project shall be reviewed as a Utility through the Conditional Use permitting process.

Attachments: June 21, 2012 memorandum from Teri Camery, Community Development, to the CBJ Planning Commission regarding USE2012 0008.


This Notice of Decision does not authorize construction activity. Prior to starting any project, it is the applicant's responsibility to obtain the required building permits.

This Notice of Decision constitutes a final decision of the CBJ Planning Commission. Appeals must be brought to the CBJ Assembly in accordance with CBJ §01.50.030. Appeals must be filed by 4:30 P.M. on the day twenty days from the date the decision is filed with the City Clerk, pursuant to CBJ §01.50.030 (c). Any action by the applicant in reliance on the decision of the Planning Commission shall be at the risk that the decision may be reversed on appeal (CBJ §49.20.120).


Effective Date: The permit is effective upon approval by the Commission, June 26, 2012

Expiration Date: The permit will expire 18 months after the effective date, or December 26, 2013 if no Building Permit has been issued and substantial construction progress has not been made in accordance with the plans for which the development permit was authorized. Application for permit extension must be submitted thirty days prior to the expiration date.

Project Planner:


Teri Camery, Senior Planner
Community Development Department


Michael Satre, Chair
Planning Commission


Filed With City Clerk

6/29/12
Date

cc: Plan Review

NOTE: The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is a federal civil rights law that may affect this development project. ADA regulations have access requirements above and beyond CBJ-adopted regulations. Owners and designers are responsible for compliance with ADA. Contact an ADA - trained architect or other ADA trained personnel with questions about the ADA: Department of Justice (202) 272-5434, or fax (202) 272-5447, NW Disability Business Technical Center (800) 949-4232, or fax (360) 438-3208.

MEMORANDUM

CITY & BOROUGH OF JUNEAU

155 South Seward Street, Juneau, Alaska 99801

DATE: June 21, 2012

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Teri Camery, Senior Planner
Community Development Department

FILE NO.: USE2012 0008

PROPOSAL: A Conditional Use Permit for a new 69-foot cell phone tower on a steel platform with diesel generator, enclosed within a 27' x 27' compound, located on residential property adjacent to Glacier Highway

GENERAL INFORMATION

Applicant: Westtower Communications

Property Owner: Adam Zenger

Property Address: 14080 Glacier Highway

Legal Description: USS 2389 Lot H FR

Parcel Code Number: 4-B31-0-100-021-1

Site Size: 0.63

Zoning: D-3

Utilities: none

Access: Glacier Highway

Existing Land Use: vacant residential lot with previously approved 100-foot wooden monopole

Surrounding Land Use:

North	-	Rural Reserve; vacant CBJ property
South	-	Auke Rec Bypass Road
East	-	Glacier Highway; D-3 Residential
West	-	Rural Reserve; vacant CBJ property



CITY & BOROUGH OF JUNEAU
ALASKA'S CAPITAL CITY

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1	Vicinity Map
Attachment 2	Development Permit Application
Attachment 3	Conditional Use Application
Attachment 4	Site Plans
Attachment 5	Existing and Proposed Views
Attachment 6	Horan & Company Independent Impact Assessment
Attachment 7	Tower Map
Attachment 8	CBJ Assessors Office comment 6/19/12
Attachment 9	Sheufelt comment letter 6/18/12

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant requests a Conditional Use Permit for the development of a 69-foot tall cell phone tower monopole for Verizon Wireless, located on a leased vacant residential lot adjacent to the Auke Rec Bypass Road. The tower will be installed on a 12' x 8' steel platform with a diesel generator within a 27' x 27' chain-link fenced compound. Antennas will be mounted at 66 feet above ground level with an overall height of the towers and antennas at 69 feet above ground level.

The project site has an existing 100-foot wood monopole with equipment enclosure and transmission lines. This development was approved without additional conditions on March 14, 2007 as USE2007-0006. This tower is owned by ACS, and GCI has already co-located with an additional structure on the tower. Space is not available for a third carrier on the tower, and the applicant reports that regardless of space, the existing tower does not meet structural requirements for a third carrier. The new tower will be located approximately 60 feet from the existing tower.

ANALYSIS

Agency Review Comments –

Staff solicited comments from the Community Development Building Department, CBJ Streets Division, CBJ General Engineering, CBJ Assessor's Office, CBJ Fire Department, CBJ Lands and Resources, CBJ Parks and Recreation, CBJ Public Works, CBJ Police, and the State Department of Environmental Conservation. Staff did not request comments from the Juneau Airport Manager because the site is beyond the boundaries of the Federal Aviation Administration Juneau Airport Contour Map.

Comments Received:

Greg Browning, Juneau Police Department
No comment from Police.

Charlie Ford, Building Official, CBJ CDD Building Division
The Building Department has no issues with the proposed project.

Ed Foster, CBJ Streets Superintendent
Streets and Fleet Maintenance Division has no concerns or comments on this application.

Ron King, Chief Regulatory Surveyor
No concerns with use, complete grading and drainage plan, including access drive, required for building permit approval.

Dave Crabtree, CBJ Public Works Water Utility
The water utility has no concerns with this proposal.

Dan Jager, Fire Marshall
There do not appear to be any fire dept. issues with this project.

Brent Fischer, Director, CBJ Parks and Recreation
Parks and Recreation has no comments on this project.

John Sahnaw, Appraiser, CBJ Assessors Office
I have reviewed the Permit Application USE2012 0008 for the proposed tower. Thank you for including the detailed Impact Report by Mr. Horan. I concur with his analysis and conclusion. The Assessor's office has no issues with this proposal.

Project Site -

The project site is 0.63 acre vacant hillside residential lot with frontage on the Auke Rec Bypass Road. The proposed tower will be located near the southern boundary of the property near the top of a steep driveway, adjacent to cleared building pad for a future home. (Attachment 4, page A-1.) The tower will be located approximately 60 feet from the existing tower, and is outside of the 25-foot front yard setback required in the D-3 residential zoning district. The site has no other structures.

Project Design -

As noted in the Project Description, the tower with antennas will be 69 feet above ground level. The tower will be installed on a 12' x 8' steel platform with a diesel generator within a 27' x 27' chain-link fenced compound. Diesel generator specifications are included in Attachment 9. Noise will be addressed in the next section.

Traffic, Parking and Circulation -

The project site is vacant except for the existing tower and has adequate space for staging of construction materials at the top of the driveway, which is a significant distance from Glacier Highway. No additional impacts to traffic, parking, or circulation are expected.

Noise -

CBJ Code 49.16.330(g)(11) states under Conditional Use Permit review, "*Conditions may be imposed to discourage production of more than 65 dBa at the property line during the day or 55 dBa at night.*" Furthermore, the CDD Director has determined that if noise from a cell tower generator is louder than 55 dBa at the nearest residential property line, it will need to be reviewed separately as a form of 'Utility' through the Conditional Use permitting process.

To ensure that this standard has been met, staff recommends the following condition:

1) Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a noise study to demonstrate that dBa levels will not exceed 65 dBa at the property line during the day or 55 dBa at night. If the noise study indicates that the generator is louder than 55 dBa at the nearest residential property line, the project shall be reviewed as a Utility through the Conditional Use permitting process.

Public Health or Safety -

All telecommunication towers must be designed to meet specific wind and weight bearing loads, as specified in local building codes. This review will be done during the Building permitting process if this Conditional Use Permit is approved. With compliance to specific building codes, the tower will be properly installed.

Antenna arrays distribute radio waves that contain levels of radio frequency (RF) radiation. Radio Frequency Radiation emissions from these structures cannot exceed certain levels regulated by the Federal Communication Commission (FCC) to ensure compliance with National Environmental Protection Agency (NEPA). According to the 1996 Telecommunications Act, municipalities have zoning authority over towers but may not regulate the location of or deny a personal wireless facility based on environmental effects of radio frequency emissions to the extent that such facilities comply with the FCC regulations of emissions.¹ Though municipalities cannot modify FCC's emission levels they can require proof of compliance. Staff recommends two conditions of approval requiring that the applicant submit a letter from a radio frequency expert indicating compliance with FCC emission levels during pre- and post-construction, as follows:

¹ Section 704 (a)(7)(B)(iv) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 of the US Federal Communications Commission. For further details of this act click on the following internet link: <http://transition.fcc.gov/telecom.html>

- 1) Prior the issuance of a Building permit, the applicant shall submit a letter to the Community Development Department from a radio frequency expert indicating the structures comply with electromagnetic radio emission levels set by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).
- 2) Prior to receiving a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant shall submit a letter to the Community Development Department from a radio frequency expert indicating the structures as constructed and at optimal emission levels comply with electromagnetic radio emission levels set by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).

Habitat -

The project does not require fill in wetlands. No evidence indicates that the project will impact sensitive habitat, and no Land Use Code habitat regulations appear to be relevant to the proposed development.

Property Value or Neighborhood Harmony -

The applicant has provided a report prepared by Horan & Company, LLC *Perceived Impact of Installation of 90' Tall Communications Monopole at 14080 Glacier Highway on Neighboring Property Values Based on Interviews with Knowledgeable Market Observers, Juneau, Alaska* (Attachment 6). The report states that the tower will be visible from nearby properties and along the highway, but it would be similar to towers found in other residential settings in the Mendenhall Valley and Auke Bay. Horan & Company reviewed data from realtors, brokers, appraisers, and other market professionals and concluded that, "*As planned, it would not cause a serious view blight and would not provide noise, smell, or any other tactile interference to make it disharmonious with the neighborhood.*" The CBJ Assessor's Office reviewed the report and concurred with the analysis and conclusions (Attachment 8).

Staff notes that the Horan & Company report evaluates a 90-foot tower rather than the 69-foot tower proposed, and describes the existing wooden tower on the site as 75 feet when it is actually 100 feet. Putting these numbers together, the report appears to evaluate a greater impact than what is actually proposed, so the report's conclusion regarding minimal impacts from the development are still valid.

The Horan report states that the tower will be painted green or brown to blend in with surroundings, however the applicant has indicated that no color has been proposed. In recent tower reviews the Planning Commission has required either a dark green or brown powder coat for towers and accessory structures to minimize visual impacts. Therefore staff recommends the following condition:

- 1) Prior to issuance of a Building permit, the applicant shall submit to the Community Development Department's planning staff for approval, dark green or brown powder coat color samples to be used for the tower and all accessory structures.

Lastly, staff received one public comment in support of the project since it will improve reception in the area. (Attachment 9)

Conformity with Adopted Plans - The 2008 Comprehensive Plan designates the subject neighborhood as Rural Low Density Residential (RLDR), defined as rural residential land at densities of one to three dwelling units per acre, based on existing platting and capability of the land to accommodate on-site septic systems and wells or whether the land is served by municipal water and sewer service. Any commercial development should be of a scale consistent with a low-density residential neighborhood. Telecommunication towers are not listed under this definition or specifically identified in the Plan. However, telecommunication services are vital for Juneau as the Capital City and regional hub for Southeast Alaska.

On page 64, the Comprehensive Plan states “As Alaska’s Capital, it is vital for the CBJ to offer modern transport and communications systems and facilities to Alaskan residents who wish to participate in State legislative affairs.”

Telecommunication infrastructure is also a form of a communication utility. As stated in the Comprehensive Plan, “Together with the transportation network and private utility and communication systems, public services and facilities provide the community’s “urban glue” and require efficient and timely provision.”

With increasing demand for telecommunication technology usage throughout the nation, additional communication coverage will be needed in areas not served or underserved. Most telecommunication services in suburban or rural areas are distributed from towers because there are so few tall structures above the tree line. Taking this fact into consideration for the subject area, one can infer that neighborhoods near the Auke Rec Bypass Road are underserved by wireless telecommunication service by the lack of towers. Existing towers along this road can be seen in Attachment 7, Tower Location Map. Enabling towers to be built throughout the borough in ways that do not disrupt neighborhood harmony, property value, or the public’s health or safety meets the intent of the Comprehensive Plan. With the recommended conditions, the proposed tower will meet the intent of the Comprehensive Plan.

FINDINGS

CBJ §49.15.330 (e)(1), Review of Director's Determinations, states that the Planning Commission shall review the Director's report to consider:

1. Whether the application is complete;
2. Whether the proposed use is appropriate according to the Table of Permissible Uses;
and,
3. Whether the development as proposed will comply with the other requirements of this chapter.

The Commission shall adopt the Director's determination on the three items above unless it finds, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the Director's determination was in error, and states its reasoning for each finding with particularity.

CBJ §49.15.330 (f), Commission Determinations, states that even if the Commission adopts the Director's determination, it may nonetheless deny or condition the permit if it concludes, based upon its own independent review of the information submitted at the public hearing, that the development will more probably than not:

1. Materially endanger the public health or safety;
2. Substantially decrease the value of or be out of harmony with property in the neighboring area; or,
3. Not be in general conformity with the comprehensive plan, thoroughfare plan, or other officially adopted plans.

Per CBJ §49.15.330 (e) & (f), Review of Director's & Commission's Determinations, the Director makes the following findings on the proposed development:

1. Is the application for the requested conditional use permit complete?

Yes. We find the application contains the information necessary to conduct full review of the proposed operations. The application submittal by the applicant, including the appropriate fees, substantially conforms to the requirements of CBJ Chapter 49.15.

2. Is the proposed use appropriate according to the Table of Permissible Uses?

Yes. The requested permit is appropriate according to the Table of Permissible Uses. The permit is listed at CBJ §49.25.300, Section 18.300 for the D-3 zoning district.

3. Will the proposed development comply with the other requirements of this chapter?

Yes. The proposed development complies with the other requirements of this chapter. Public notice of this project was provided in the June 15, 2012 and June 25, 2012 issues of the Juneau Empire's "Your Municipality" section, and a Notice of Public Hearing was mailed to all property owners within 500 feet of the subject parcel. Moreover, a Public Notice Sign was posted on the subject parcel, visible from the public Right of Way (Glacier Highway).

4. Will the proposed development materially endanger the public health or safety?

No. Based on the preceding staff analysis, no evidence indicates that the proposed development will materially endanger public health or safety.

5. Will the proposed development substantially decrease the value of or be out of harmony with property in the neighboring area?

No. Based on the preceding staff analysis with the recommended conditions such as painting the tower, property value and neighborhood harmony will be preserved.

6. Will the proposed development be in general conformity with the land use plan, thoroughfare plan, or other officially adopted plans?

Yes. Based on staff's review and with the recommended conditions, staff finds that the intent of the 2008 Comprehensive Plan will be met.

Per CBJ §49.70.900 (b)(3), General Provisions, the Director makes the following Juneau Coastal Management Program consistency determination:

7. Will the proposed development comply with the Juneau Coastal Management Program?


Not applicable. The project does not affect any sensitive habitat and no policies in the Juneau Coastal Management Program apply.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and grant the requested Conditional Use permit. The permit would allow the development of a new 69-foot cell phone tower on a steel platform with diesel generator, enclosed within a 27' x 27' compound, located on residential property adjacent to Glacier Highway. The approval is subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Prior the issuance of a Building permit, the applicant shall submit a letter to the Community Development Department from a radio frequency expert indicating the structures comply with electromagnetic radio emission levels set by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).
- 2) Prior to receiving a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant shall submit a letter to the Community Development Department from a radio frequency expert indicating the structures as constructed and at optimal emission levels comply with electromagnetic radio emission levels set by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).
- 3) Prior to issuance of a Building permit, the applicant shall submit to the Community Development Department's planning staff for approval, dark green or brown powder coat color samples to be used for the tower and all accessory structures.
- 4) Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a noise study to demonstrate that dBa levels will not exceed 65 dBa at the property line during the day or 55 dBa at night. If the noise study indicates that the generator is louder than 55 dBa at the nearest residential property line, the project shall be reviewed as a Utility through the Conditional Use permitting process.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING



PROPOSAL: A Conditional Use Permit for a new 69-foot cell phone tower on private property adjacent to Glacier Highway.

FILE NO:	USE2012 0008	APPLICANT:	WESTOWER COMMUNICATIONS
TO:	Adjacent Property Owners	Property PCN:	4B3101000211
HEARING DATE:	June 26, 2012	Owner(s):	Adam and Michelle Zenger
HEARING TIME:	7:00 PM	Size:	27514 sqft
PLACE:	ASSEMBLY CHAMBERS Municipal Building 155 South Seward St Juneau, Alaska 99801	Zoned:	D3
		Site Address:	14080 GLACIER HWY
		Accessed via:	GLACIER HWY

PROPERTY OWNERS PLEASE NOTE:

You are invited to attend this Public Hearing and present oral testimony. The Planning Commission will also consider written testimony. You are encouraged to submit written material to the Community Development Department no later than 8:30 A.M. on the Wednesday preceding the Public Hearing. Materials received by this deadline are included in the information packet given to the Planning Commission a few days before the Public Hearing. Written material received after the deadline will be provided to the Planning Commission at the Public Hearing.

If you have questions, please contact Teri Camery by phone at (907) 586-0755 or via email at TERI_CAMERY@

Planning Commission Agendas, Staff Reports and Meeting Results can be viewed at www.juneau.org

ATTACHMENT 1

DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION

Project Number	CITY and BOROUGH of JUNEAU	Date Received: <u>5/24/12</u>
Project Name (City Staff to Assign Name)		

INFORMATION	Project Description This application is for the installation of telecommunications equipment installed on a 12'x8' steel platform with a diesel generator and permitting a 66' high monopole within a 27'x27' chain link fenced compound. <u>Antennas will be mounted at 66' AGL with overall height of towers and antennas at 69' AGL.</u>		
	PROPERTY LOCATION		
	Street Address 14080 Glacier Highway	City/Zip Juneau, AK 99801	<u>above</u>
	Legal Description(s) of Parcel(s) (Subdivision, Survey, Block, Tract, Lot) A Fraction of Lot H, US Survey 2389, State of Alaska		
	Assessor's Parcel Number(s) 4B3101000211		
	LANDOWNER/ LESSEE		
	Property Owner's Name Adam Zenger	Contact Person: (907)321-0698	Work Phone: (907)789-8192
	Mailing Address PO Box 32055, Juneau, AK 99803	Home Phone: (907)789-3506	Fax Number:
	E-mail Address adam.zenger@acsalaska.net,	Other Contact Phone Number(s):	
	LANDOWNER/ LESSEE CONSENT ****Required for Planning Permits, not needed on Building/ Engineering Permits****		
PROJECT / APPLICANT	I am (we are) the owner(s) or lessee(s) of the property subject to this application and I (we) consent as follows: A. This application for a land use or activity review for development on my (our) property is made with my complete understanding and permission. B. I (we) grant permission for officials and employees of the City and Borough of Juneau to inspect my property as needed for purposes of this application.		
	X <u>Adam Zenger</u> Landowner/Lessee Signature		<u>5/14/12</u> Date
	X <u>Michelle M. Zenger</u> Landowner/Lessee Signature		<u>5/14/12</u> Date
	NOTICE: The City and Borough of Juneau staff may need access to the subject property during regular business hours and will attempt to contact the landowner in addition to the formal consent given above. Further, members of the Planning Commission may visit the property before the scheduled public hearing date.		
	APPLICANT If the same as OWNER, write "SAME" and sign and date at X below		
	Applicant's Name Westover Communications	Contact Person: Alissa Haynes	Work Phone: 907-727-7907
	Mailing Address 19500 Cipole Road, Tualatin, OR 97062	Home Phone:	Fax Number:
	E-mail Address sitedeployment@gmail.com	Other Contact Phone Number(s): Sarah Grant 503-853-1065	
	X <u>Alissa Haynes</u> Applicant's Signature	<u>05/07/2012</u> Date of Application	
	<small>Digitally signed by Alissa Haynes DN: cn=Alissa Haynes, o=City and Borough of Juneau, email=sitedeployment@gmail.com, c=US Date: 2012.05.07 12:43:48 -0700</small>		

-----OFFICE USE ONLY BELOW THIS LINE-----					
STAFF APPROVALS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Permit Type	**SIGN	Date Received	Application Number(s)
		Building/Grading Permit			
		City/State Project Review and City Land Action			
		Inquiry Case (Fee In Lieu, Letter of ZC, Use Not Listed)			
		Mining Case (Small, Large, Rural, Extraction, Exploration)			
		Sign Approval (If more than one, fill in all applicable permit #'s)			
		Subdivision (Minor, Major, PUD, St. Vacation, St. Name Change)			
		Use Approval (Allowable, Conditional, Cottage Housing, Mobile Home Parks, Accessory Apartment)		<u>5/24/12</u>	<u>USE 12-0008</u>
		Variance Case (De Minimis and all other Variance case types)			
		Wetlands Permits			
		Zone Change Application			
		Other (Describe)			
	***Public Notice Sign Form filled out and in the file.				
	Comments:				Permit Intake Initials <u>ESF</u>

ALLOWABLE/CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION

Project Number	Project Name (15 characters)	Case Number <u>USE 12-0008</u>	Date Received <u>5/29/12</u>
----------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

TYPE OF ALLOWABLE OR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT REQUESTED

- ☐ Accessory Apartment*** (AAP)
 ☐ Driveway in Right-of-Way (ADW)
 ☒ Use Listed in §49.25.300 (USE)
 (Table of Permissible Uses)

Please list the Table of Permissible Uses Category: 49.25.210 (b, c) and 49.25.300 18.300 (3)

***An Accessory Apartment Application will also be required.

DESCRIBE THE PROJECT FOR WHICH AN ALLOWABLE OR CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL IS NEEDED.

This application is for the installation of telecommunications equipment installed on a 12'x8' steel platform with a diesel generator and permitting a 66' high monopole within a 27'x27' chain link fenced compound

IS THIS A MODIFICATION OF AN EXISTING APPROVAL?

☒ NO ☐ YES - Case # _____

CURRENT USE OF LAND OR BUILDING(S):

Property is currently used as telecommunications site for a wood monopole and future homesite.

PROPOSED USE OF LAND OR BUILDING(S):

Proposed use for telecommunications site in the South boundary of the property with 66' high monopole constructed within the 27'x27' area.

UTILITIES PROPOSED:

WATER: ☐ Public ☐ On Site

SEWER: ☐ Public ☐ On Site

SITE AND BUILDING SPECIFICS:

Total Area of Lot 27,514 square feet

Total Area of Existing Structure(s) 0 square feet

Total Area of Proposed Structure(s) 729 square feet

EXTERNAL LIGHTING:

Existing to remain ☐ No ☐ Yes - Provide fixture information, cutoff sheets, and location of lighting fixtures

Proposed ☐ No ☒ Yes - Provide fixture information, cutoff sheets, and location of lighting fixtures

PROJECT NARRATIVE AND SUBMITTAL CHECKLIST:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Site Plan | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Existing and proposed parking areas (including dimensions) and proposed traffic circulation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Floor Plan of proposed buildings | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Existing Physical Features of the site (drainage, habitat, hazard areas, etc.) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Elevation view of existing and proposed buildings | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Proposed Vegetative Cover | |

For more information regarding the permitting process and the submittals required for a complete application, please see the reverse side.

If you need any assistance filling out this form, please contact the Permit Center at 586-0770.

ALLOWABLE/CONDITIONAL USE FEES

	Fees	Check No.	Receipt	Date
Application Fees	\$ <u>500.00</u>			
Admin. of Guarantee	\$ _____			
Adjustment	\$ _____			
Pub. Not. Sign Fee	\$ <u>50.00</u>			
Pub. Not. Sign Deposit	\$ <u>100.00</u>			
Total Fee	\$ <u>650.00</u>	<u>21053D</u>	<u>EAW 153</u>	<u>5/30/12</u>

NOTE: MUST BE ACCOMPANIED BY DEVELOPMENT PERM

ATTACHMENT 3

ARCHITECTURAL
T-1 TITLE SHEET
A-1 OVERALL SITE PLAN
A-2 ENLARGED SITE PLAN & ANTENNA LAYOUTS
A-3 ELEVATIONS

APPLICANT:
VERIZON WIRELESS
15800 SE HASTCATE WAY
N/S 231
RENTON, WA 98058

APPLICANT AGENT:
WESTPAC COMMUNICATIONS
19800 CIRCLE ROAD
TOMLTON, TX 77062
CONTACT: DANNY GONZA
PHONE: (505) 853-1669
FAX: (505) 210-1001

ARCHITECT/ELECTRICAL ENGINEER:
KSO ARCHITECTS/ENGINEERS P.C.
4720 BOGHE STREET SW., SUITE 200
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55408
CONTACT: ERIC CAMP
PHONE: (612) 876-8851
FAX: (612) 872-8842
AK 122564 A-12886

PROJECT MANAGER:
VERIZON WIRELESS
15800 SE EASTGATE WAY
M/S 231
BEAVERTON, WA 98008
CONTACT: MICHAEL GALAGHER

PERMITTING CONSULTANT
WESINGER
12500 CIRCLE ROAD
DUMFRIES, OH 43012
CONTACT: SUEBETH BATTMAN
PHONE: (420) 281-0080

LEASING CONSULTANT:
WINTERBURN
19500 ORACLE ROAD
VILLAGES, OR 97132
CONTACT: SHERRI BATHMAN
PHONE: (503) 241-0083

INSTRUCTION MANAGER:
POWER
10 CIRCLE ROAD
ATW, OR 97052
KENSEE 32710

LECTURAL ENGINEER:
OS ENGINEERING, LLC
BOX 2152
WOOD, WA 98039
ACE FRANK LINDSEY
E: (206) 234-2336

CIVIL ENGINEER
4900 MICHELSON AVENUE S.E.
2600 N STREET SW., SUITE 200
FISHER, WA 98026
MOBILE: 800-646-7
E: (425) 870-8651
(425) 712-0846

SYOR:
WALATKA & ASSOCIATES
W 2934 AVE
MAGE, AK 99517
CT: FRED WALATKA
T: (907) 248-1066
F: walatka@aol.com



AK3-AUKE BAY ALT #3
14080 GLACIER HWY
JUNEAU, AK 99801
LAT: 58° 22' 44.02"N (NAD 83)-1A
LONG: 134° 42' 22.57"W (NAD 83)-1A
ELEV: 152.0' AMSL (NAVD-88)-1A

A PRISONER OF WAR U.S. SURVIVOR 0389 STATE OF ALASKA JANCAR RECORDING DISTRICT

THE ARCHITECT/ENGINEER SHALL MAKE EVERY EFFORT TO SET FORTH IN THE CONSTRUCTION AND CONTRACT DOCUMENTS THE COMPLETE SCOPE OF WORK. CONTRACTORS BEGINNING THE JOB ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING THAT THEIR OMISSIONS OR ERRORS IN THE DRAWINGS AND/OR SPECIFICATIONS SHALL NOT PRECLUDE ANY CONTRACTORS FROM COMPLETING THE PROJECT AND AMPOUNDS IN ADOLESCENCE WHY THE OWNER OF THESE DOCUMENTS THE OWNER SHALL BEAR THE RESPONSIBILITY OF NOTICE ON AMENDING THE AMBIGUITY/OMISSIONS OF ANY CONTRACTS, ERRORS OR OMISSIONS DUE TO THE NEGLIGENCE OF CONTRACTOR'S NEGLIGENCE. IN THE EVENT OF PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTOR SHALL BEAR THE MORE COSTLY OR EXTENSIVE WORK UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED.

ALASKA STATE CODE COMPLIANCE:
IBC-2006, INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE W/ LOCAL AMENDMENTS
NEC-2008, NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE

SITE NAME:
ARIZONA TRAP ALT 83

SITE ADDRESS:
T40RD GLACIER HWY
JULIAN, AZ 85021

LAND OWNER:
ARM ZENDER
507-780-3416

JURISDICTION:
CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU

TAX ID NO:
48310100211
701110

RECEIVED / SPN - 12/18/82 DS (1) DS

AREA CALCULATIONS:

```

SITE INFORMATION:      3.60
OCCUPANCY GROUP:      1
CONSTRUCTION TYPE:    3-4
WINDLOAD CLASSIFICATION: 130
EXPANSIVE ZONE:       YES
FLOODPLAIN:           100
SEISMIC ZONE:         YES

```

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

THIS PROPOSAL IS FOR THE INSTALLATION OF (1) OUTDOOR EQUIPMENT CABINET MOUNTED ON A NEW 12'-0" X 8'-0" STEEL PLATFORM, (2) DIESEL GENERATOR ON A CONCRETE GRASS BEAMS WITHIN A NEW 27'-0" X 27'-0" CHAIN LINK FENCED LEASE AREA. ALSO, THE INSTALLATION OF (3) ANTENNAS ON CLIMB RATED T-APOLIS AND (4) 8'-10" MICROWAVE ANTENNA MOUNTED ON A NEW 8'-0" HIGH MONOPOLE.

APPROVAL LIST		
APPROVAL	DATE	SIGNATURE
PROPERTY OWNER		
SITE ACQUISITION		
ZONING		
PROJECT MANAGER		
RE ENGINEER		
TRANSPORT		
CONST. MANAGER		

VERIZON WIRELESS

CELLULAR DESIGN ENGINEER'S APPROVAL			
PRINTED NAME	SIGNATURE	DATE	DAY


	ELEVATION NUMBER SHEET NUMBER		ELECTRIC WIRE, ELECTRICAL WIRING (TYPICAL USE)
	DETAIL NUMBER SHEET NUMBER		ELECTRICAL WIRING (CHANGED SPACING)
	SECTION NUMBER SHEET NUMBER		SHEET CHANGE
	PROPERTY LINE		STRUCTURAL STEEL
	ELECTRICAL SERVICE		ARCHITECTURAL STEEL
	FELLO SERVICES		REINFORCING BAR
	GROUNDING		GROUNDING STRIP
	CROSSING ATTACHMENT		

FROM JENSEN INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
DEPART JENSEN INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT ON SHELL STANDING IN
(SOUTH)
TURN LEFT (NORTH-WEST) ONTO YANUKUN DR
NEAR RIGHT (NORTH-WEST) ONTO SHELL STANDING IN
TURN LEFT (WEST) ONTO AK-7 (GLACIER HWY)
TURN LEFT TO STAY ON AK-7 (GLACIER HWY)
KEEP STRAIGHT ONTO AK-7 (GLACIER HWY)
TURN LEFT (WEST) ONTO AK-7 (GLACIER HWY)
ARRIVE LAKES GLACIER LK. JENSEN AK 50001


Not for disclosure outside VERIZON WIRELESS
without permission.

PLANS PREPARED FOR

PLANE SEIZED BY:



KDC
ARCHITECTS/ENGINEERS, P.C.
4720 200TH STREET SW, SUITE 200



CHIEFED BY: FBI

REVISIONS

DATE	DESCRIPTION	B
01/12 2012	ISSUED FOR 993 ZU REVIEW	AL
2/20 2013	ISSUED FOR ZUING	AL
5/7 2013	ISSUED FOR REVIEW ZUING	AL

PROJECT:
AK3
AUKE BAY ALT#3
14080 GLACIER HWY
JUNEAU AK 99801

T-1


ATTACHMENT 4

MICROWAVE / COAX SCHEDULE									
SECTOR	QUANTITY	C.L. HEIGHT	ANT. SIZE	AZIMUTH	DOWN TILT	NUMBER OF COAX RUNS	COAX SIZE	COAX LENGTH	TWA
MICROWAVE ALPHA	1 NEW	69'-0"	8'-0" x 8'-0"	72°	0°	1 NEW	5/8"	102'-0"	NO
MICROWAVE (T.B.D.)	1 NEW	36'-0"	8'-0" x 8'-0"	180°	0°	1 NEW	5/8"	84'-0"	NO
MICROWAVE (T.B.D.)	1 NEW	36'-0"	8'-0" x 8'-0"	180°	0°	1 NEW	5/8"	69'-0"	NO

ANTENNA / COAX SCHEDULE									
SECTOR	QUANTITY	TOP HEIGHT	ANT. SIZE	AZIMUTH	DOWN TILT	NUMBER OF COAX RUNS	COAX SIZE	COAX LENGTH	TWA
ALPHA	2 NEW	69'-0"	8'-0" x 8'-0"	72°	0°	2 NEW, 2 FUTURE	7/8"	102'-0"	NO
BETA	2 NEW	69'-0"	8'-0" x 8'-0"	140°	0°	2 NEW, 2 FUTURE	7/8"	102'-0"	NO
Gamma	2 NEW	69'-0"	8'-0" x 8'-0"	240°	0°	2 NEW, 2 FUTURE	7/8"	92'-0"	NO


KEYED NOTES

- 1 NEW VERIZON WIRELESS 86'-0" HIGH MONOPOLE
- 2 NEW VERIZON WIRELESS ANTENNAS (6 TOTAL, 2 PER SECTOR)
- 3 NEW VERIZON WIRELESS ICE BRIDGE
- 4 NEW VERIZON WIRELESS CLAMP RATED T-ANNS
- 5 NEW VERIZON WIRELESS 30KW GENERATOR W/210 GALLON DIESEL FUEL TANK
- 6 NEW VERIZON WIRELESS MICROWAVE ANTENNAS (4 TOTAL)
- 7 NEW VERIZON WIRELESS 27'-0"x27'-0" GRAVEL PAVED LEASE AREA
- 8 NEW VERIZON WIRELESS METER (BEYOND)
- 9 NEW VERIZON WIRELESS EMERGENCY DISCONNECT (BEYOND)
- 10 NEW 6'-0" HIGH CHAIN LINK FENCE W/BARBED WIRE ATOP W/ GREEN SCREENING SLATS
- 11 NEW 12'-0" WIDE CHAIN LINK GATE W/ GREEN SCREENING SLATS
- 12 NEW VERIZON WIRELESS GPS ANTENNA MOUNTED AT ICE BRIDGE
- 13 NEW VERIZON WIRELESS VELOCITY H-FRAME
- 14 NEW VERIZON WIRELESS COAX ROUTE
- 15 NEW VERIZON WIRELESS GROUND ACCESS EASEMENT
- 16 NEW VERIZON WIRELESS O.P. UTILITY LIGHT (2 TOTAL)
- 17 NEW VERIZON WIRELESS U.S. POWER & FIBER ROUTE (APPROX. 135'-0")
- 18 NEW VERIZON WIRELESS OUTDOOR EQUIPMENT CABINET ON 8'-0" x 12'-0" STEEL PLATFORM
- 19 NEW VERIZON WIRELESS 10' UTILITY EASEMENT
- 20 NEW VERIZON WIRELESS ECOLOGY BLOCK RETAINING WALL
- 21 10' SETBACK
- 22 20' SETBACK
- 23 FUTURE SECOND CARRIER ANTENNAS
- 24 ADD SCREENING FOR 8' TALL AFFORDABLE LANDSCAPING ALONG NORTHEAST EDGES OF LEASE AREA
- 25 NEW VERIZON WIRELESS FENCE POST MOUNTED TO ECOLOGY BLOCK



NEW MW LAYOUT PLAN @ 36' & 65'

SCALE FOR 24X36 3/16" = 1'-0" SCALE FOR 11X17 3/16" = 1'-0" NORTH



NEW ANTENNA LAYOUT PLAN @ 65'

SCALE FOR 24X36 3/16" = 1'-0" SCALE FOR 11X17 3/16" = 1'-0" NORTH


ENLARGED SITE PLAN

SCALE FOR 24X36 3/16" = 1'-0" SCALE FOR 11X17 3/16" = 1'-0" NORTH


PLANS PREPARED FOR:

verizon wireless

PLANS PREPARED BY:



KDC ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS, P.C.
4728 300TH STREET SW, SUITE 200
LYNNWOOD, WA 98037



CHECKED BY: EJC

DATE: 1/17/12

DESCRIPTION: 2012 BOX 2D REVIEW

BY: ATO

DATE: 2/20/12

DESCRIPTION: 2012 2D REVIEW

BY: ATO

DATE: 3/7/12

DESCRIPTION: 2012 2D REVIEW

BY: ATO

PROJECT:

AK3

AUKE BAY ALT#3

14080 GLACIER HWY


JUNEAU, AK, 99801

A-2

- KEYED NOTES**
- 1. PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS 66'-0" HIGH MONOPOLE
 - 2. PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS ANTENNAS (6 TOTAL, 2 PER SECTOR)
 - 3. PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS ICE BRIDGE
 - 4. PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS CLIMB RATED T-JOBS
 - 5. PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS 350W GENERATOR
 - 6. PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS MICROWAVE ANTENNA (3 TOTAL)
 - 7. PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS METER
 - 8. PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS EMERGENCY DISCONNECT
 - 9. PROPOSED 6'-0" HIGH CHAIN LINK FENCE W/SHEDDED WIRE AND 4' GREEN SCREENING SLATS
 - 10. PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS LANDSCAPE SCREENING 8' x 8' TALL ATROPALE
 - 11. PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS GPS ANTENNA MOUNTED AT ICE BRIDGE
 - 12. PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS UTILITY N-FRAME
 - 13. PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS COAX ROUTE
 - 14. PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS C.H. UTILITY LIGHT (3 TOTAL)
 - 15. PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS OUTDOOR EQUIPMENT CABINET ON 8'-0" x 12'-0" STEEL PLATFORM
 - 16. PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS ECOLOGY BLOCK RETAINING WALL
 - 17. FUTURE SECOND GENERATOR ANTENNAS

NOTES



UNCL. NOTE:
FENCE SHOWN AS DASHED LINE FOR CLARITY



2 **SOUTHEAST ELEVATION**
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0" (SEE 1/8" TYP. SCALE 1/8" = 1'-0")



1 **SOUTHWEST ELEVATION**
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0" (SEE 1/8" TYP. SCALE 1/8" = 1'-0")



DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY
5/17/13	ISSUED FOR PERMIT	AK3
2/6/12	REVISED TO REVISED	AK3
2/20/12	ISSUED FOR PERMIT	AK3
2/21/12	REVISED TO REVISED	AK3
2/21/12	REVISED TO REVISED	AK3
2/21/12	REVISED TO REVISED	AK3

PROJECT:
AK3
AUKE BAY ALT#3
14000 GLACIER HWY
JUNEAU, AK 99801

A-3

KDC

ARCHITECTS. ENGINEERS, P.C.

4720 200TH STREET SW SUITE 200

LYNNWOOD, WA 98036

PHONE: 425.670.8651


FAX: 425.712.0846

The Verizon Wireless logo, featuring the word "verizon" in a bold, sans-serif font with a checkmark-like shape above the 'v', followed by the word "wireless" in a smaller, lowercase sans-serif font.

EXISTING VIEW



PROPOSED VIEW




KDC


ARCHITECTS. ENGINEERS, P.C.
4720 200TH STREET SW SUITE 200
LYNNWOOD, WA 98036
PHONE: 425.670.8651
FAX: 425.712.0846

verizonwireless

EXISTING VIEW



PROPOSED VIEW



RECEIVED
FEB 14 2012
JUNEAU, ALASKA

**PERCEIVED IMPACT OF INSTALLATION OF
90' TALL COMMUNICATIONS MONOPOLE
AT 14080 GLACIER HIGHWAY
ON NEIGHBORING PROPERTY VALUES
BASED ON INTERVIEWS WITH KNOWLEDGEABLE
MARKET OBSERVERS, JUNEAU, ALASKA**



View of subject property looking in a westerly direction. Note 021812_0562 the other proposed 90' metal monopole to the right of the existing 75' wooden pole.

PREPARED FOR: Alissa Haynes, Project Manager
Westtower Communications
1301 Huffman Road, Suite 125
Anchorage, Alaska 99515

PREPARED BY: Charles E. Horan, MAI
HORAN & COMPANY, LLC
403 Lincoln Street, Suite 210
Sitka, Alaska 99346

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 7, 2012

REPORT DATE: February 29, 2012

OUR FILE: 12-020B

HORAN & COMPANY, LLC

403 Lincoln Street, Suite 210 Sitka, Alaska 99835

Telephone (907) 747-6666 FAX (907) 747-7417

Email commercial@horanappraisals.com

**CHARLES E. HORAN, MAI / WILLIAM G. FERGUSON, TIMOTHY W. RILEY, JOSHUA C. HORAN,
JAMES A. CORAK AND JACQUE WALTON**

REAL ESTATE APPRAISERS / CONSULTANTS

February 29, 2012

Alissa Haynes, Project Manager
Westtower Communications
1301 Huffman Road, Suite 125
Anchorage, Alaska 99515

VIA Email: sitedeployment@gmail.com

Ref: Perceived Impact of Installation of 90' Tall Communications Monopole at 14080 Glacier Highway on Neighboring Property Values Based on Interviews with Knowledgeable Market Observers, Juneau, Alaska; Our File no. 12-020B

Dear Ms. Haynes:

Westtower Communications is developing communication facilities that includes a 90' monopole at 14080 Glacier Hwy, a hillside residential lot. A conditional use permit is required to be obtained for this development. This facility will be adjacent to an existing 75' wooden pole used by another carrier. One of the requirements of the permit is to determine the impact of wireless telecommunication facilities on surrounding property values. I have completed a study to identify the valuation issues through discussions with planning staff, local knowledgeable people involved in this issue and local real estate appraisers, brokers and other market participants who would enable me to discern the market perception relative to this issue in the Juneau market.

I have viewed the subject site, interviewed the site developers and planner, and reviewed the project plans. The poll will be in an excavated area at the top of a steep driveway adjacent to a cleared building pad for a future home. It is also adjacent to the existing wooden pole. It appears it will have a similar profile as the existing pole - similar in height against the trees on the adjacent forested property. It will be visible from nearby properties and traffic along the highway. The subject is at the west end of a string of subdivided residential lots along the north side of the highway. There are waterfront lots to the south across the highway on Indian Cove and Auke Nu Cove. There are industrial uses in Auke Bay further to the east. The lands to the west and north of the subject are wooded and undeveloped lands owned by the City and Borough of Juneau.

To limit its contrast against the other trees and the neighboring view shed, the pole will be painted green or brown. In my opinion, this would be similar to monopoles found in other residential settings in the Mendenhall Valley or Auke Bay. As planned, it would not cause a serious view blight and would not provide noise, smell, or any other tactile interference to make it disharmonious with the neighborhood. Based on my interviews with four Realtors, seven appraisers, and my own experience in the market place, it does not appear that there would be any substantial or measurable decrease in value of neighborhood property due to the proposed development.

Alissa Haynes
February 29, 2012
Page 2


In addition to interviewing knowledgeable market observers, I have collected anecdotal information which substantiates this finding. The only additional research that might be done to further probe the issue would be to identify recent sales in residential areas where there are cell towers and do a one-on-one comparison to see how those sale prices compare to the sale values of other properties with a lesser presence of cell tower influence. In my opinion, it is highly probable that this additional analytical effort would not differ from the conclusions found from interviewing local, knowledgeable market observers.

Your attention is invited to the attached report which describes the subject property, outlines my methodology, discerns the opinions of knowledgeable market observers and identifies areas of other cell towers in residential settings that might have comparisons to the subject. Also, I have outlined what type of locational impacts may result in substantial decrease in property values. The report contains other background information relative to our conclusions, and summarizes Assumptions and Limiting Conditions, Definitions and Certification of this consultation.

If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to call.

Respectfully Submitted,

HORAN & COMPANY, LLC



Charles E. Horan, MAI
AA41

CEH:jy



-THIS IS NOT A SURVEY-

Property lines are approximate
Image date: June 2006

0 50 100 200 300 400 Feet



FIGURE 1 - SUBJECT PROPOSED POLE LOCATION

Source: City and Borough of Juneau Community Development

Pole Location by Horan & Company, LLC

12-020b / 14080 Glacier Highway, Juneau

Proposed Project

Westtower Communications is negotiating approximately a 40' by 40' lease area from the land owner Adam Zenger at 14080 Glacier Highway, Juneau, Alaska. The site is in the northerly fraction of Lot H, US Survey 2359. It is just over 0.6 acre in size having over 300' of frontage along Glacier Highway. The site rises up to 50' above the existing road grade in its westerly corner where there is an existing 75' tall wooden cell tower pole. The subject proposed 90' monopole will be adjacent to this existing pole on a high point in the corner of the site. The topography then slopes downward where there's a level house pad. These poles will be up against the fringe of trees on CBJ public land behind the subject site.

The subject is zoned D3(T)D5 a medium density residential zone. Residential uses are found across the street south and to the east. The public lands behind the subject are zoned Rural Reserve. More distant east is waterfront industrial area along the protected waters of Auke Bay.




FIGURE 2 - AUKE BAY VICINITY SITE LOCATION

Site noted by Horan & Company, LLC

The project is for a proposed installation of an outdoor equipment cabinet mounted on the steel platform and a diesel generator on a concrete grade beam within the leased area, which will be surrounded by a chain-link fence. There will be six antenna on a climb rated T arm and four microwave antenna mounted on the proposed 90' high steel monopole.

Views of the of the tower will be visible from most distant neighborhood perspectives. The pole will be above the highway and above and behind most of the nearby residential development with views to the east and south. The pole's elevation will be just above the existing wood pole and similar to the height of the trees behind them to the north and west.

It is assumed the structure will meet wind and weight bearing specifications as it goes through the local building code process. The antennas will distribute electromagnetic radio waves that contain some levels of radiation. These radio frequency levels must be in compliance with FCC emissions. There is a concern on the local level about the health hazards of cell tower emissions. There have been local concerns about these health risks and these risks are also expressed in national and international literature on the issues of cell towers and their possible bio-hazards. There are two sides to this debate. While a sincere concern for health risks have been raised at a number of public meetings for conditional use permits in conjunction with tall cellular phone tower development in Juneau, there is extensive public literature that indicates there is no convincing scientific evidence that weak radio frequency signals from base stations and wireless networks cause adverse health effects¹. New research and information may emerge over time and the arguments for and against the health concerns may change in the future. The only purpose of my study is to determine if there is a current negative market response to the presence of cell towers in the type of setting anticipated at the 14080 Glacier Highway, as of February 2012.




FIGURE 3 - SITE PERSPECTIVE

¹ See American Cancer Society web site under question *Do Cellular Phone Towers Cause Cancer?*
<http://www.cancer.org/Cancer/CancerCauses/OtherCarcinogens/AtHome/cellular-phone-towers>

Juneau Real Estate Market

A market is a place where buyers and sellers meet to determine a price. The market in Juneau is relatively well developed with most transactions being handled by Realtors. There is an active Multiple Listing Service (MLS) that gives reasonable exposure for the bulk of the sales. As an indicator of the volume and pricing trends in this market, Figure 4 from the Juneau Economic Development Association shows average selling price of a single-family residence through the first quarter of 2011. The market has remained strong throughout the year.


This trend covers a period when housing prices had run up, which generally follows the national trend, peaking in 2007 and then cooling in the following years based on the national recession and the uncertainty in the real estate market. The Juneau market, however, has remained strong over the past three years with a persistent employment and population base. Also, the capital creep ended or slowed significantly in 2009 along with the announcement that the Kensington Mine would come online. Indeed, production began in June 2010. Further, the influence of the state government in Juneau remained positive due to the strength of the treasury as a result of persistent high oil prices. In this environment, demand is good, sales brisk and the market would be characterized as in balance.

At the same time, the demand for cell phone usage has increased significantly. The increased demand has been filled mostly by AT&T and GCI within the Juneau area. They or their contractors have developed cell towers within the community in an attempt to get as complete coverage as possible. The Mendenhall Valley and related residential area has seen a development of several towers and some permitting of towers that have not been built. The subject tower is proposed by a contractor for Verizon, which would introduce a new cell carrier in the Juneau market.

Housing

Juneau Housing Sales and Prices

In the first half of 2011, home prices were up, and the average number of days on the market was down. The average price of a single-family residence was \$321,391—a three percent increase over the first half of 2009 and similar to 2007 (peak) prices. During the same period, the price of single-family homes nationally fell by 7 percent. Nationally homes are at their 2003 prices.



Source: Juneau and Southeast Economic Indicators 2011, Juneau Economic Development Council

FIG 4 - JUNEAU HOUSING STUDY

Value Impact and Harmony of Cell Tower Presence

This study specifically addresses the City and Borough of Juneau Code 49.15.330 (d)(5)(B) f, which require the Planning Director and Commission to answer the question “Will [the proposed development] substantially decrease the value of or be out of harmony with property in the neighborhood area?” The term “substantially decrease the value” would mean there would be a measurable negative influence. In the subject instance, this would come from the visual impact of the tower and the market’s perceived health and safety risks that would be substantial enough to be discernable through sales activity reflecting a measurable downward pricing trend discernable in the market. The term “be out of harmony” would be captured in these elements of market diminution due to the negative impact of sight, sound, smell or other perceived health or safety risks that were not present prior to the permitted use.

In the past, the appraiser has studied the Juneau market including specific sales research and interviews with knowledgeable market observers to discern what types of negative uses or situations may result in an impact on property values. Some of these impacts may be substantial or measurable to pricing in the market. Some impacts are more subtle and not considered to have a measurable impact on property values relative to comparable properties in areas without the particular disharmonious use. Some examples of situations that, in the extreme, may impact property values and on the other hand, if more subtle, probably would not impact property values include the following:

- a home in a slide area
- properties next to high voltage power lines, with view obstruction
- properties with significant view obstructions such as power poles, commercial and industrial or degraded uses within the view shed
- properties next to noxious odors or noises such as sewage treatment plants or airport noise
- properties within avalanche areas
- properties that have had oil spills or other bio-hazardous events that have been mitigated -- cleaned up or managed in place.

In order to determine the impact of these types of negative attributes, we have considered a variety of methods including matched-paired sales studies and interviews with local knowledgeable market observers. The in the subject instance matched-paired sales method would include identifying recent sales of properties near cell towers that are similarly situated to the proposed situation. These sales could then be contrasted with other neighborhood sales or sales as similar as can be found in all regards except for the influence of cell towers due to proximity or visual orientation. This would be a time consuming and costly study. Its ultimate reliability would depend upon the availability of observations or sales that would provide the needed contrast. In situations where cell towers are large, of noticeable contrasting colors, and provide extreme nearby view obstructions in a residential settings, it would be an easier hypothesis to test. In the subject’s case, where the cell tower would be viewed from a distance and in a mixed setting where there are already similar cell towers in a fractured landscape, it may be difficult to discern the subtle differences and would require a greater amount of market research with a questionable outcome depending on the quality of available data.

As an alternative, there is a more direct way to address the problem. We developed a second method, interviewing knowledgeable market observers.

Ultimately, real estate is local. Prices paid and the factors influencing those prices are based on local preferences and market knowledge. Trends observed in other areas may not be immediately applicable to the local market. Professionals who have observed their local market, especially Realtors and appraisers who are familiar with hundreds or thousands of transactions in the local market, would be the best to first discern what the expected impact of cellular phone towers would be on price or market value. The definition of market value is:

The most probable price that a property should bring in a competitive and open market under all conditions requisite to a fair sale, the buyer and seller each acting prudently and knowledgeably, and assuming the price is not affected by undue stimulus. Implicit in this definition is the consummation of a sale as of a specified date and the passing of title from seller to buyer under conditions whereby:

1. Buyer and seller are typically motivated;
2. Both parties are well informed or well advised, and acting in what they consider their best interests;
3. A reasonable time is allowed for exposure in the open market;
4. Payment is made in terms of cash in U.S. dollars or in terms of financial arrangements comparable thereto; and
5. The price represents the normal consideration for the property sold unaffected by special or creative financing or sales concessions granted by anyone associated with the sale.

(12 C.F.R. Part 34.42(g); 55 Federal Register 34696, August 24, 1990, as amended at 57 Federal Register 12202, April 9, 1992; 59 Federal Register 29499, June 7, 1994)

The Dictionary of Real Estate Appraisal, 5th Edition, Appraisal Institute, Pages 123

The critical element here is the knowledge of the buyers and sellers. In order to determine the buyer and seller knowledge base, we have interviewed appraisers, Realtors and others who are knowledgeable within the market place, having observed buyer and seller response to prices for various positive and negative aspects of residential real estate transactions in Juneau.

INTERVIEWS WITH MARKET PARTICIPANTS

Juneau Residential Real Estate Appraisers' Feedback

We've interviewed a significant number of brokers and residential real estate appraisers who work within the Juneau market and regularly communicate with buyers and sellers. Seven appraisers with over 100 years of experience and over 10,000 residential appraisals were asked if they had ever used a discount or adjustment for a property's locational influence relative to cell towers in the residential settings similar to the subject. The answer was no. Further inquiry was made as to what types of negative neighborhood influences might require consideration of market adjustments. Examples

included proximity to Lemon Creek Correctional Center, the garbage dump, substation noise, avalanche zone or slide areas, residential views over industrial parks or old mobile home parks. It is important to note that many of these negative influences are relative to comparables taken from other areas and are not necessarily negative for comparables from the similarly situated area.

Juneau Residential Realtors' Feedback

Similar to the question proposed to appraisers, Realtors were interviewed to ascertain if they had detected any influence of cell towers in their experience with buyers and sellers. Four Realtors interviewed represented involvement of approximately 1,400 transactions, with over 30 years experience within the Juneau market. Their responses were generally that there was no significant influence and, oftentimes, if cell towers were disguised, they were overlooked. There was an acknowledgment that if cell towers interfered significantly with the view shed, such as a large, direct, obstruction, which obstructed an otherwise scenic view, it may be an issue. However, there were no specific situations noted in this regard. One realtor commented that if there were a large tower developed immediately adjacent to the property it might have some influence, but it depended on the degree and how well screened the tower would be. In several cases, Realtors commented that they were never discussed or not known to have existed in areas where they were present. In some cases, cell tower installations were confused with electrical installations.

When asked if there were health concerns related to cell towers within the market that impacted value, the answer was no. One comment was that there may have been some health concerns with proximity to electrical substations, and they would expect that concerns of cell towers might be similar, however, there was no known adjustment for price based on these situations.

The Realtors were asked what kind of negative influences in the market they would consider substantial or measurable due to locational elements. Waste water treatment plant, a gas company, down wind from the dump and proximity to the jail and avalanche areas were all mentioned. Properties that had persistent noise or odor, significant view obstruction or known hazards such as avalanche may be considered significant within the market. When queried about less significant negative influences that may not be substantial, the indication was that if the degree of influences were moderate or subtle, they would not be significant market determinants.

Anecdotal Data

The presence of cell towers in many instances are unnoticed. There are comments from Realtors who sold houses adjacent to cell towers that they were not even aware the cell towers were there. One realtor handled two separate transactions within the last few years, literally across the street from the 100' tall cell tower at Valley Boulevard and Mendenhall Loop Road (8503 Valley Boulevard) and indicated the cell tower had no apparent influence on the transaction. A comment was made that the congested intersection and traffic along Mendenhall Loop Road would have more of an impact on price consideration.



A renter at 12280 Mendenhall Loop Road, Darrell West, indicated the nearby cell tower made no negative difference to him or his roommates. In fact they appreciated that they had very good reception for their 3G Android cell phones.

The former City and Borough of Juneau Assessor related an incident where as Assessor he had made a downward adjustment for a cell tower on North Douglas. Within a year of making a substantial downward adjustment, he reported the property sold for \$200,000 over the adjusted value. There seems to be an acknowledgment in the market that a large tower blocking a scenic view could have an influence on value but this would be a rare case.

There was no anecdotal data related to the Mendenhall Valley or similar residential areas that would indicate well-situated, disguised cell towers would have a negative impact on surrounding property values.

Price Comparison

The scope of this study did not include an analysis of pricing of properties directly in the influence of cell towers that would be comparable to the subject situation. The appraiser has reviewed various cell tower locations in the area as indicated on the adjacent map Figure 5. The most competitive towers would be those located at 12260 and 12364 Mendenhall Loop Road, at the Valley Chapel at 9741 Mendenhall Loop Road, 8503 Valley Boulevard, and 8748 Trinity Drive. The adjacent Figure 5 indicates the potential similar study areas that would likely mimic the impact, if any, in the proposed area.

Further study could be done to suggest a radius of influence for these towers and identify sales, which have occurred since their installation. The compared sales analysis would attempt to identify properties similarly situated of similar characteristics in similar market conditions (time) and determine if there were significant price differences between the sales explainable by the influence of the cell tower. It is not certain how many sales and paired similar properties would fulfill this criteria. Based on the research done so far and the interviews with knowledgeable market observers, it does not appear likely that the most competitive similarly situated cell towers would produce a negative influence on market values discernable by this paired sales technique. However, we stand ready to pursue this type of study if so desired.

Conclusion

Based on a review of the competing potential similar study areas-neighborhoods, lack of documented discounts or negative market reactions towards the presence of cell towers in these residential settings based on interviews with local knowledgeable market observers, it is my conclusion there would be no substantial decrease of value due to the presence of the proposed cell tower to the surrounding neighboring properties. It is further my opinion that if a more in-depth study was completed through market price comparisons, it is highly probable it would not change this conclusion.

HORAN & COMPANY, LLC


ADDENDA

HORAN & COMPANY, LLC

CERTIFICATION OF CONSULTATION

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief:

- The statements of fact contained in this report are true and correct.
- The reported analyses, opinions, and conclusions are limited only by the reported assumptions and limiting conditions and are my personal, impartial, and unbiased professional analyses, opinions, conclusions and recommendations.
- I have no present or prospective interest in the property that is the subject of this report and no personal interest with respect to the parties involved.
- I have no bias with respect to the property that is the subject of this report or to the parties involved with this assignment.
- My engagement in this assignment was not contingent upon developing or reporting predetermined results.
- My compensation for completing this assignment is not contingent upon the development or reporting of a predetermined value or direction in value that favors the cause of the client, the amount of the value opinion, the attainment of a stipulated result, or the occurrence of a subsequent event directly related to the intended use of this appraisal.
- The reported analyses, opinions, and conclusions were developed, and this report has been prepared, in conformity with the requirements of the Code of Professional Ethics & Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice of the Appraisal Institute, which include the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.
- The use of this report is subject to the requirements of the Appraisal Institute relating to the review by its duly authorized representatives.
- I have made a personal inspection of the property that is the subject of this report on February 7, 2012.
- No one provided significant real property appraisal or appraisal consulting assistance to the person signing this certification.
- As of the date of this report, I, Charles Horan, MAI, have completed the continuing education program of the Appraisal Institute.



Charles E. Horan, MAI, AA41

February 29, 2012

Report Date

HORAN & COMPANY, LLC

ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITING CONDITIONS

This appraisal report and valuation contained herein are expressly subject to the following assumptions and/or conditions:

1. It is assumed that the data, maps and descriptive data furnished by the client or his representative are accurate and correct. Photos, sketches, maps, and drawings in this appraisal report are for visualizing the property only and are not to be relied upon for any other use. They may not be to scale.
2. The valuation is based on information and data from sources believed reliable, correct and accurately reported. No responsibility is assumed for false data provided by others.
3. No responsibility is assumed for building permits, zone changes, engineering or any other services or duty connected with legally utilizing the subject property.
4. This appraisal was made on the premise that there are no encumbrances prohibiting utilization of the property under the appraiser's estimate of the highest and best use.
5. It is assumed that the title to the property is marketable. No investigation to this fact has been made by the appraiser.
6. No responsibility is assumed for matters of law or legal interpretation.
7. It is assumed that no conditions existed that were undiscoverable through normal diligent investigation which would affect the use and value of the property. No engineering report was made by or provided to the appraiser.
8. Unless otherwise stated in this report, the existence of hazardous material, which may or may not be present on the property, was not observed by the appraiser. The appraiser has no knowledge of the existence of such materials on or in the property. The appraiser, however, is not qualified to detect such substances. The presence of substances such as asbestos, urea-formaldehyde foam insulation, or other potentially hazardous materials may affect the value of the property. The value estimate is predicated on the assumption that there is no such material on or in the property that would cause a loss in value. No responsibility is assumed for any such conditions, or for any expertise or engineering knowledge required to discover them. The client is urged to retain an expert in this field, if desired.
9. The value estimate is made subject to the purpose, date and definition of value.
10. The appraisal is to be considered in its entirety, the use of only a portion thereof will render the appraisal invalid.

HORAN & COMPANY, LLC

11. Any distribution of the valuation in the report between land, improvements, and personal property applies only under the existing program of utilization. The separate valuations for land, building, and chattel must not be used in conjunction with any other appraisal and is invalid if so used.
12. The signatory of this appraisal report is a member of the Appraisal Institute. The bylaws and regulations of the Institute require each member and candidate to control the use and distribution of each appraisal report signed by such member or candidate. Therefore, except as hereinafter provided, the party for whom this appraisal report was prepared may distribute copies of this appraisal report in its entirety to such third parties as selected by the party for whom this appraisal report was prepared; however, selected portions of this appraisal report shall not be given to third parties without the prior written consent of the signatory of this appraisal report. Further, neither all nor any part of this appraisal report shall be disseminated to the general public by the use of advertising media, public relations media, news media, sales media or other media for public communication without the prior written consent of signatory of this appraisal report.
13. The appraiser shall not be required to give testimony or appear in court by reason of this appraisal with reference to the property described herein unless prior arrangements have been made.

HORAN & COMPANY, LLC

QUALIFICATIONS OF CHARLES E. HORAN, MAI

Professional Designation

MAI, Member Appraisal Institute, No. 6534

State Certification

State of Alaska General Appraiser Certification, No. AA41

Bachelor of Science Degree

University of San Francisco, B.S., 1973, Major: Business Administration

Employment History

August 2004 Owner, HORAN & COMPANY, LLC

03/87-07/04 Partner, HORAN, CORAK AND COMPANY

1980-02/87 Partner, The PD Appraisal Group, managing partner since November 1984
(formerly POMTIER, DUVERNAY & HORAN)

1976-80 Partner/Appraiser, POMTIER, DUVERNAY & COMPANY, INC., Juneau and Sitka, Alaska

1975-76 Real Estate Appraiser, H. Pomtier & Associates, Ketchikan, AK

1973-75 Jr. Appraiser, Ketchikan Gateway Borough, Ketchikan, AK

Lectures and Educational Presentations

1998, "Easement Valuation Seminar," Alaska Chapter Appraisal Institute, Anchorage, AK

1998, "Easement Valuation Seminar," Seal Trust, Juneau, Alaska

1997, "Sitka Housing Market," Sitka Chamber of Commerce

1997, developed and taught commercial real estate investment seminar for Shee Atika, Inc.

1994, developed and taught seminar "Introduction to Real Estate Appraising," University of Alaska/S.E., Sitka Campus

1985, Speaker at Sitka Chamber of Commerce, "What is an Appraisal? How to Read the Appraisal"

1984, Southeast Alaska Realtor's Mini Convention, Juneau, Alaska

Day 1: Introduction of Appraising, Cost and Market Data Approaches

Day 2: Income Approach, Types of Appraisals, AIREA Accredited Course

1983, "The State of Southeast Alaska's Real Estate Market"

1982, "What is an Appraisal?"

Types of Property Appraised

Commercial - Retail shops, enclosed mall, shopping centers, medical buildings, restaurants, service stations, office buildings, auto body shops, schools, remote retail stores, liquor stores, supermarkets, funeral home, mobile home parks, camper courts. Appraised various businesses with real estate for value as a going concern with or without fixtures such as hotels, motels, bowling alleys, marinas, restaurants, lounges.

Industrial - Warehouse, mini-warehouse, hangars, docks barge loading facilities, industrial acreage, industrial sites, bulk plant sites, and fish processing facility. Appraised tank farms, bulk terminal sites, and a variety of waterfront port sites.

Special Land - Partial Interest and Leasehold Valuation - Remote acreage, tidelands with estimates of annual market rent. Large acreage land exchanges for federal, state, municipal governments and Alaska Native Corporations; retail lot valuations and absorption studies of large subdivisions; gravel and rock royalty value estimates; easements, partial interests, conservation easements; title limitations, permit fee evaluations. Appraised various properties under lease to determine leasehold and leased fee interests. Value easements and complex partial interests.

Special Projects - Special consultation for Federal land exchanges. Developed Land Evaluation Module (LEM) to describe and evaluate 290,000 acres of remote lands. Renovation feasibilities, residential lot absorption studies commercial and office building absorption studies. Contract review appraiser for private individuals, municipalities and lenders. Restaurant feasibility studies, Housing demand studies and overall market projections. Estimated impact of nuisances on property values. Historic appreciation / market change studies. Historic barren material royalty valuations, subsurface mineral and timber valuation in conjunction with resource experts. Mass appraisal valuations for Municipality of Skagway, City of Craig, Ketchikan Gateway Borough and other Alaska communities. Developed electronic/digital assessment record system for municipalities. Developed extensive state-wide market data record system which identified sales in all geographic areas.

HORAN & COMPANY, LLC

Expert Witness Experience and Testimony

2009 Expert at mediation - Talbot's Inc vs State of Alaska, et al. IKE-07-168CI

2008 Albright vs Albright, IKE-07-265CI, settled

2006 State of Alaska vs Homestead Alaska, et al, 1JU-06-572, settled

2006 State of Alaska vs Heaton, et al, 1JU-06-570CI, settled

2006 State of Alaska vs Jean Gain Estate, 1JU-06-571, settled

2004 Assessment Appeal, Board of Equalization, Franklin Dock vs City and Borough of Juneau

2000 Alaska Pulp Corporation vs National Surety - Deposition

U.S. Senate, Natural Resources Committee

U.S. House of Representatives, Resource Committee

Superior Court, State of Alaska, Trial Court and Bankruptcy Courts

Board of Equalization Hearings testified on behalf of these municipalities: Ketchikan Gateway Borough, City of Skagway, City of Pelican, City and Borough of Haines, Alaska

Witness at binding arbitration hearings, appointed Master for property partitionment by superior state court, selected expert as final appraiser in multi parties suit with settlements of real estate land value issues

Partial List of Clients

Federal Agencies

Bureau of Indian Affairs
Bureau of Land Mngmnt
Coast Guard
Dept. Of Agriculture
Dept. Of Interior
Dept. Of Transportation
Federal Deposit Ins Corp
Federal Highway Admin.
Fish & Wildlife Service
Forest Service
General Service Agency
National Park Service
USDA Rural Develop.
Veterans Administration

Lending Institutions

Alaska Growth Capital
Alaska Pacific Bank
Alaska Ind. Dev. Auth.
ALPS FCU
First Bank
First National Bank AK
Key Bank
Met Life Capital Corp.
National Bank of AK
Rainier National Bank
SeaFirst Bank
True North Credit Union
Wells Fargo
Wells Fargo RETECHS

ANCSA Corporations

Cape Fox, Inc.
Doyon Corporation
Eyak Corporation
Goldbelt
Haida Corporation
Huna Totem
Kake Tribal Corporation
Klawock-Heenya Corp.
Klukwan, Inc.
Kootznoowoo, Inc.
Sealaska Corporation
Shaan Seet, Inc.
Shee Atika Corporation
TDX Corporation
The Tatitlek Corporation
Yak-Tat Kwan

Companies

AK Electric Light & Power
AK Lumber & Pulp Co.
AK Power & Telephone
Allen Marine
Arrowhead Transfer
AT&T Alcom
Coeur Alaska
Delta Western
Gulf Oil of Canada
Hames Corporation
HDR Alaska, Inc.
Holland America
Home Depot
Kennecott Greens Creek
Kennedy & Associates
Madsen Construction, Inc.
Service Transfer
Standard Oil of CA
The Conservation Fund
Union Oil
Ward Cove Packing
White Pass & Yukon RR
Yutana Barge Lines

Municipalities

City & Borough of Haines
City & Borough of Juneau
City & Borough of Sitka
City of Akutan
City of Coffman Cove
City of Craig
City of Hoonah
City of Ketchikan
City of Klawock
City of Pelican
City of Petersburg
City of Thorne Bay
City of Wrangell
Ketchikan Gateway Borg.
Municipality of Skagway

Other Organizations

Baranof Island Housing
Authority (BIHA)
Central Council for Tlingit
& Haida Indian Tribes
of Alaska (CCTHITA)
Diocese of Juneau
Elks Lodge
Hoonah Indian Assoc.
LDS Church
Moose Lodge
SE AK Land Trust (SEAL)
SE AK Reg Health
Consortium (SEARHC)
Sitka Tribe of Alaska
The Nature Conservancy

State of Alaska Agencies

Alaska State Building
Authority (formerly
ASHA)
Attorney General
Dept. of Fish & Game
Dept. of Natural Service,
Div. of Lands
Dept. of Public Safety
Dept. of Transportation &
Public Facilities
(DOT&PF)
Mental Health Land Trust
Superior Court
University of Alaska

HORAN & COMPANY, LLC

Education

Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice -
2011 Update, Juneau, AK; June 2011
Current Issues & Regulatory Updates Affecting
Appraisers #10066; William King & Associates, Inc.,
Juneau, AK; June 2011
Loss Prevention Program for Real Estate Appraisers;
LIA Administrators & Insurance Services; Juneau,
AK; June 2011
Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land
Acquisitions (UASFLA), Rockville, MD, Oct 2010
Business Practices and Ethics, Seattle, WA, Apr 2010
Fall Real Estate Conference, Seattle, WA, Dec 2009
7-hour National USPAP Update Course, Seattle, WA,
May 2009
Fall Real Estate Conference, Seattle, WA, Nov 2008
Attacking and Defending an Appraisal in Litigation,
Kent, WA, Sep 2008
Sustainable Mixed-Use N.I.M., Seattle, WA, Feb 2008
Appraising 2-4 Unit Properties, Bellevue, WA, Sep
2007
Business Practices and Ethics, Seattle, WA, Jun 2007
7-hour National USPAP Update Course, Seattle, WA,
Jun 2007
Residential Market Analysis and Highest and Best Use,
Seattle, WA, Apr 2007
Basic Appraisal Procedures, Seattle, WA, Feb 2007
USPAP Update Course, Anchorage, AK, Feb 2005
Rates & Ratios: Making Sense of GIMs, OARs, and
DCF, Anchorage, AK, Feb 2005
Best Practices for Residential Appraisal Report
Writing, Juneau, AK, Apr 2005
Scope of Work - Expanding Your Range of Services,
Anchorage, AK May 2003
Litigation Appraising - Specialized Topics and
Applications, Dublin, CA, Oct 2002
UASFLA: Practical Applications for Fee Appraisers,
Jim Eaton, Washington, D.C., May 2002
USPAP, Part A, Burr Ridge, IL, Jun 2001
Partial Interest Valuation - Undivided, Anchorage, AK,
May 2001
Partial Interest Valuation - Divided, Anchorage, AK,
May 2001
Easement Valuation, San Diego, CA, Dec 1997
USPAP, Seattle, WA, Apr 1997
The Appraiser as Expert Witness, Anchorage, AK, May
1995

Appraisal Practices for Litigation, Anchorage, AK, May
1995
Forestry Appraisal Practices, Atterbury Consultants,
Beaverton, OR, Apr 1995
Advanced Sales Comparison & Cost Approaches, Univ.
of Colorado, Boulder, CO, Jun 1993
Computer Assisted Investment Analysis, University of
Maryland, MD, Jul 1991
USPAP, Anchorage, AK, Apr 1991
General State Certification Review Seminar,
Anchorage, AK, Apr 1991
State Certification Review Seminar, Dean Potter,
Anchorage, AK, Apr 1991
Highest and Best Use and Market Analysis, Baltimore,
MA, Mar 1991
Financial Institution Reform, Recovery & Enforcement
Act of 1989, Doreen Fair Westfall, Appraisal
Analyst, OTS, Juneau, AK, Jul 1990
Real Estate Appraisal Reform, Gregory Hoefer, MAI,
OTS, Juneau, AK, Jul 1990
Standards of Professional Practice, Anchorage, AK, Oct
1987
Federal Home Loan Bank Board Memorandum R41C
Seminar, Catherine Gearhearth, MAI, FHLBB
District Appraiser, Juneau, AK, Mar 1987
Market Analysis, Boulder, CO, Jun 1986
Federal Home Loan Bank Board Regulation 41b,
Instructor Bob Foreman, MAI, Seattle, WA, Sep 1985
Litigation Valuation, Chapel Hill, North CA, Aug 1984
Standards of Professional Practices, Bloomington, IN,
Jan 1982
Course 2B, Valuation Analysis & Report Writing,
Stanford, CA, Aug 1980
Course 6, Introduction to Real Estate Investment
Analysis, Aug 1980
Course 1B, Capitalization Techniques, San Francisco,
CA, Aug 1976
Course 2A, Case Studies in Real Estate Valuation, Aug
1976
Course 1A, Real Estate Principles and Valuation, San
Francisco, CA, Aug 1974

Rev 06/11

Teri Camery

From: John Sahnaw
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2012 10:48 AM
To: Teri Camery
Cc: Robin Potter
Subject: RE: USE2012 0008 Glacier Hwy cell tower impact assessment

Terri,

I have reviewed the Permit Application USE2012 0008 for the proposed tower. Thank you for including the detailed Impact Report by Mr. Horan. I concur with his analysis and conclusion.

The Assessor's office has no issues with this proposal.

John Sahnaw
Appraiser III
City and Borough of Juneau
Finance/Assessors Division
Phone: 907-586-0331

From: Teri Camery
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2012 10:04 AM
To: John Sahnaw
Subject: USE2012 0008 Glacier Hwy cell tower impact assessment

This completes the information for this review. Please let me know if you need anything else for your comments.

Cheers,
Teri

Teri Camery, Senior Planner
City and Borough of Juneau
Community Development Department
155 S. Seward
Juneau, AK 99801
(907) 586-0755 phone; (907) 586-3365 fax



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Teri Camery

From: Janice Sheufelt [sheufelt@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2012 7:59 PM
To: Teri Camery
Subject: Cell tower

Hi,
I encourage the planing commission to approve the permit for the cell phone tower at 14080 Glacier Hwy. The cell reception is extremely weak at our home, and I assume that this tower would be very helpful.

Thanks,
Janice Sheufelt
14321 Glacier Hwy
723-5637

Sent from my iPad