

From: nava1uni@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Cindy Navarro](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I am writing to you today to urge you to please support Appeal File #C251098 - Conditional Use Authorization
Date: Tuesday, February 10, 2026 8:30:00 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Legislative Services,

Please grant the Appeal Conditional Use Authorization approval at 350 Amber Dr - File No. C251098

This MacroTower is only "necessary, desirable and compatible with the neighborhood" according to AT&T & their business goals. Neighbors and visitors disagree. Allowing this "exemption" sets a dangerous precedent for all neighborhoods.

AT&T stated in Dec '25 FCC filings: "AT&T will continue to require additional macro facilities to densify its wireless networks. And it will require additional macro facilities to meet public safety needs, as directed by The First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet)."

4 of 7 Planning Commissioners approved the project based on AT&T's false claim that this massive tower is essential for 911 service and First Responders' FirstNet access. According to Police and Fire, their First Responders are not required to use FirstNet and 911 calls go to the nearest carrier.

The proposed structure—a 10-story monopole with 700+ cubic ft of 12 bulky antennas—will extend 20 feet above the tree line, towering over George Christopher Playground & Glen Canyon, visible throughout the neighborhood. It does not comply with CEQA: it is not a "small addition to an existing structure" but a "new" massive structure. Planning Resolution 14182 gives preference to antennas placed "on publicly used structures," yet this is not "on" the Police Academy building but in a parking area behind it.

SF has only 4 wireless structures over 100 ft: 2 attached to commercial buildings downtown, 1 in Presidio Sports Basement lot, 1 at Balboa BART. Other "exemptions" cited by Planning & AT&T (80-93 feet) are near freeways or industrial areas. Two park structures not in residential neighborhoods (40-60 feet) are in Golden Gate Park soccer fields and Palace of Fine Arts with fewer antennas. NO free-standing towers of this size exist in residential neighborhoods next to parks. CUA Approval sets dangerous precedent.

Diamond Heights' "modernist" architecture is eligible for historic status, designed to blend with nature and preserve views. Families, naturalists and hikers want to enjoy trees and sky without a giant tower in the sky that's painted brown to "blend in."

Glen Canyon is a SF "significant natural area" with biodiversity-supporting birds nesting around the Police Academy. Bird-tower collisions are documented. The tower 20' above trees will interfere with bird navigation especially in fog and wind, causing bird deaths in this critical urban wildlife habitat.

The Fire Chief described the canyon as having "Wildfire Interface Area characteristics"—dry grass, windy canyon, red flag warnings. A telecom wildfire consultant identified this as a fire threat. Examples: AT&T is a named defendant in the 2025 Palisades Fire & partially responsible for Malibu Canyon Fire and other incidents. All met safety codes. Cell tower fires are electrical,

requiring power-down before applying water while fire spreads to homes, nursery schools & parks. AT&T states no evidence of fire danger & it will comply with codes.

The project sits 50 feet from SF landslide seismic hazard zone on 30-60 ft of infill. The tower's weight increases landslide risk in this high-soil-saturation area. El Niño rains & tree loss compound erosion and instability.

AT&T claims all locations were exhausted, which is false. There are no documented "coverage gaps" only "areas of relatively weak signal." Less intrusive alternatives exist; other carriers provide coverage without such towers.

AT&T wants market-share regardless of neighborhood concerns.

Massive profit-making towers do not belong on public property surrounded by dense housing and parks.

I urge you to grant the appeal of the Conditional Use Authorization.

Sincerely,

Cindy Navarro

142 Sears St San Francisco, CA 94112-4030

navaluni@comcast.net

From: poojasabh@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Pooja S](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I am writing to you today to urge you to please support Appeal File #C251098 - Conditional Use Authorization
Date: Monday, February 9, 2026 6:44:52 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Legislative Services,

Please grant the Appeal Conditional Use Authorization approval at 350 Amber Dr - File No. C251098

This MacroTower is only "necessary, desirable and compatible with the neighborhood" according to AT&T & their business goals. Neighbors and visitors disagree. Allowing this "exemption" sets a dangerous precedent for all neighborhoods.

AT&T stated in Dec '25 FCC filings: "AT&T will continue to require additional macro facilities to densify its wireless networks. And it will require additional macro facilities to meet public safety needs, as directed by The First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet)."

4 of 7 Planning Commissioners approved the project based on AT&T's false claim that this massive tower is essential for 911 service and First Responders' FirstNet access. According to Police and Fire, their First Responders are not required to use FirstNet and 911 calls go to the nearest carrier.

The proposed structure—a 10-story monopole with 700+ cubic ft of 12 bulky antennas—will extend 20 feet above the tree line, towering over George Christopher Playground & Glen Canyon, visible throughout the neighborhood. It does not comply with CEQA: it is not a "small addition to an existing structure" but a "new" massive structure. Planning Resolution 14182 gives preference to antennas placed "on publicly used structures," yet this is not "on" the Police Academy building but in a parking area behind it.

SF has only 4 wireless structures over 100 ft: 2 attached to commercial buildings downtown, 1 in Presidio Sports Basement lot, 1 at Balboa BART. Other "exemptions" cited by Planning & AT&T (80-93 feet) are near freeways or industrial areas. Two park structures not in residential neighborhoods (40-60 feet) are in Golden Gate Park soccer fields and Palace of Fine Arts with fewer antennas. NO free-standing towers of this size exist in residential neighborhoods next to parks. CUA Approval sets dangerous precedent.

Diamond Heights' "modernist" architecture is eligible for historic status, designed to blend with nature and preserve views. Families, naturalists and hikers want to enjoy trees and sky without a giant tower in the sky that's painted brown to "blend in."

Glen Canyon is a SF "significant natural area" with biodiversity-supporting birds nesting around the Police Academy. Bird-tower collisions are documented. The tower 20' above trees will interfere with bird navigation especially in fog and wind, causing bird deaths in this critical urban wildlife habitat.

The Fire Chief described the canyon as having "Wildfire Interface Area characteristics"—dry grass, windy canyon, red flag warnings. A telecom wildfire consultant identified this as a fire threat. Examples: AT&T is a named defendant in the 2025 Palisades Fire & partially responsible for Malibu Canyon Fire and other incidents. All met safety codes. Cell tower fires are electrical,

requiring power-down before applying water while fire spreads to homes, nursery schools & parks. AT&T states no evidence of fire danger & it will comply with codes.

The project sits 50 feet from SF landslide seismic hazard zone on 30-60 ft of infill. The tower's weight increases landslide risk in this high-soil-saturation area. El Niño rains & tree loss compound erosion and instability.

AT&T claims all locations were exhausted, which is false. There are no documented "coverage gaps" only "areas of relatively weak signal." Less intrusive alternatives exist; other carriers provide coverage without such towers.

AT&T wants market-share regardless of neighborhood concerns.

Massive profit-making towers do not belong on public property surrounded by dense housing and parks.

I urge you to grant the appeal of the Conditional Use Authorization.

Sincerely,

Pooja S

847 Duncan St San Francisco, CA 94131-1831

poojasabh@yahoo.com

From: sarah_aid@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Sarah Aird](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I am writing to you today to urge you to please support Appeal File #C251098 - Conditional Use Authorization
Date: Thursday, February 5, 2026 4:47:46 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Legislative Services,

Please grant the Appeal Conditional Use Authorization approval at 350 Amber Dr - File No. C251098

This MacroTower is only "necessary, desirable and compatible with the neighborhood" according to AT&T & their business goals. Neighbors and visitors disagree.

Allowing this "exemption" sets a dangerous precedent for all neighborhoods, including my neighborhood in the Tenderloin. AT&T stated in Dec '25 FCC filings: "AT&T will continue to require additional macro facilities to densify its wireless networks. And it will require additional macro facilities to meet public safety needs, as directed by The First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet)."

Four of 7 Planning Commissioners approved the project based on AT&T's false claim that this massive tower is essential for 911 service and First Responders' FirstNet access. According to Police and Fire, their First Responders are NOT required to use FirstNet and 911 calls actually go to the nearest carrier.

The proposed structure—a 10-story monopole with 700+ cubic ft of 12 bulky antennas—will extend 20 feet above the tree line, towering over George Christopher Playground & Glen Canyon, visible throughout the neighborhood.

It does not comply with CEQA: it is not a "small addition to an existing structure" but a "new" massive structure. Planning Resolution 14182 gives preference to antennas placed "on publicly used structures," yet this is not "on" the Police Academy building but in a parking area behind it.

SF has only 4 wireless structures over 100 ft: 2 attached to commercial buildings downtown, 1 in Presidio Sports Basement lot, 1 at Balboa BART. Other "exemptions" cited by Planning & AT&T (80-93 feet) are near freeways or industrial areas. Two park structures not in residential neighborhoods (40-60 feet) are in Golden Gate Park soccer fields and Palace of Fine Arts with fewer antennas. NO free-standing towers of this size exist in residential neighborhoods next to parks. CUA Approval sets dangerous precedent.

Diamond Heights' "modernist" architecture is eligible for historic status, designed to blend with nature and preserve views. Families, naturalists and hikers want to enjoy trees and sky without a giant tower in the sky that's painted brown to "blend in."

Glen Canyon is a SF "significant natural area" with biodiversity-supporting birds nesting around the Police Academy. Bird-tower collisions are documented. The tower 20' above trees will interfere with bird navigation especially in fog and wind, causing bird deaths in this critical urban wildlife habitat.

The Fire Chief described the canyon as having "Wildfire Interface Area characteristics"—dry grass, windy canyon, red flag warnings. A telecom wildfire consultant identified this as a fire threat. Examples: AT&T is a named defendant in the 2025 Palisades Fire & is partially responsible for the Malibu Canyon Fire and other incidents. All met safety codes. Cell tower fires are electrical, requiring power-down before applying water while fire spreads to homes, nursery schools & parks. AT&T states no evidence of fire danger & it will comply with codes.

The project sits 50 feet from SF landslide seismic hazard zone on 30-60 ft of infill. The tower's weight increases landslide risk in this high-soil-saturation area. El Niño rains & tree loss compound erosion and instability.

AT&T claims all locations were exhausted, which is false. There are no documented "coverage gaps" only "areas of relatively weak signal." Less intrusive alternatives exist; other carriers provide coverage without such towers. AT&T wants market-share regardless of neighborhood concerns.

Massive profit-making towers do not belong on public property surrounded by dense housing and parks.

I urge you to please consider this request and grant the appeal of the Conditional Use Authorization.

Sincerely,
Sarah Aird
575 Ofarrell St Apt 99 San Francisco, CA 94102-1920
sarah_aird@igc.org

From: josieiselin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Josie Iselin](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I am writing to you today to urge you to please support Appeal File #C251098 - Conditional Use Authorization
Date: Sunday, February 8, 2026 8:53:44 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Legislative Services,

Please grant the Appeal Conditional Use Authorization approval at 350 Amber Dr - File No. C251098

This MacroTower is only "necessary, desirable and compatible with the neighborhood" according to AT&T & their business goals. Neighbors and visitors disagree. Allowing this "exemption" sets a dangerous precedent for all neighborhoods.

AT&T stated in Dec '25 FCC filings: "AT&T will continue to require additional macro facilities to densify its wireless networks. And it will require additional macro facilities to meet public safety needs, as directed by The First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet)."

4 of 7 Planning Commissioners approved the project based on AT&T's false claim that this massive tower is essential for 911 service and First Responders' FirstNet access. According to Police and Fire, their First Responders are not required to use FirstNet and 911 calls go to the nearest carrier.

The proposed structure—a 10-story monopole with 700+ cubic ft of 12 bulky antennas—will extend 20 feet above the tree line, towering over George Christopher Playground & Glen Canyon, visible throughout the neighborhood. It does not comply with CEQA: it is not a "small addition to an existing structure" but a "new" massive structure. Planning Resolution 14182 gives preference to antennas placed "on publicly used structures," yet this is not "on" the Police Academy building but in a parking area behind it.

SF has only 4 wireless structures over 100 ft: 2 attached to commercial buildings downtown, 1 in Presidio Sports Basement lot, 1 at Balboa BART. Other "exemptions" cited by Planning & AT&T (80-93 feet) are near freeways or industrial areas. Two park structures not in residential neighborhoods (40-60 feet) are in Golden Gate Park soccer fields and Palace of Fine Arts with fewer antennas. NO free-standing towers of this size exist in residential neighborhoods next to parks. CUA Approval sets dangerous precedent.

Diamond Heights' "modernist" architecture is eligible for historic status, designed to blend with nature and preserve views. Families, naturalists and hikers want to enjoy trees and sky without a giant tower in the sky that's painted brown to "blend in."

Glen Canyon is a SF "significant natural area" with biodiversity-supporting birds nesting around the Police Academy. Bird-tower collisions are documented. The tower 20' above trees will interfere with bird navigation especially in fog and wind, causing bird deaths in this critical urban wildlife habitat.

The Fire Chief described the canyon as having "Wildfire Interface Area characteristics"—dry grass, windy canyon, red flag warnings. A telecom wildfire consultant identified this as a fire threat. Examples: AT&T is a named defendant in the 2025 Palisades Fire & partially responsible for Malibu Canyon Fire and other incidents. All met safety codes. Cell tower fires are electrical,

requiring power-down before applying water while fire spreads to homes, nursery schools & parks. AT&T states no evidence of fire danger & it will comply with codes.

The project sits 50 feet from SF landslide seismic hazard zone on 30-60 ft of infill. The tower's weight increases landslide risk in this high-soil-saturation area. El Niño rains & tree loss compound erosion and instability.

AT&T claims all locations were exhausted, which is false. There are no documented "coverage gaps" only "areas of relatively weak signal." Less intrusive alternatives exist; other carriers provide coverage without such towers.

AT&T wants market-share regardless of neighborhood concerns.

Massive profit-making towers do not belong on public property surrounded by dense housing and parks.

I urge you to grant the appeal of the Conditional Use Authorization.

Sincerely,

Josie Iselin

622 29th St San Francisco, CA 94131-2206

josieiselin@lovingblind.com

From: yndigdigns@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [YNanea Digdigan](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I am writing to you today to urge you to please support Appeal File #C251098 - Conditional Use Authorization
Date: Sunday, February 8, 2026 3:57:10 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Legislative Services,

Please grant the Appeal Conditional Use Authorization approval at 350 Amber Dr - File No. C251098

This MacroTower is only "necessary, desirable and compatible with the neighborhood" according to AT&T & their business goals. Neighbors and visitors disagree. Allowing this "exemption" sets a dangerous precedent for all neighborhoods.

AT&T stated in Dec '25 FCC filings: "AT&T will continue to require additional macro facilities to densify its wireless networks. And it will require additional macro facilities to meet public safety needs, as directed by The First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet)."

4 of 7 Planning Commissioners approved the project based on AT&T's false claim that this massive tower is essential for 911 service and First Responders' FirstNet access. According to Police and Fire, their First Responders are not required to use FirstNet and 911 calls go to the nearest carrier.

The proposed structure—a 10-story monopole with 700+ cubic ft of 12 bulky antennas—will extend 20 feet above the tree line, towering over George Christopher Playground & Glen Canyon, visible throughout the neighborhood. It does not comply with CEQA: it is not a "small addition to an existing structure" but a "new" massive structure. Planning Resolution 14182 gives preference to antennas placed "on publicly used structures," yet this is not "on" the Police Academy building but in a parking area behind it.

SF has only 4 wireless structures over 100 ft: 2 attached to commercial buildings downtown, 1 in Presidio Sports Basement lot, 1 at Balboa BART. Other "exemptions" cited by Planning & AT&T (80-93 feet) are near freeways or industrial areas. Two park structures not in residential neighborhoods (40-60 feet) are in Golden Gate Park soccer fields and Palace of Fine Arts with fewer antennas. NO free-standing towers of this size exist in residential neighborhoods next to parks. CUA Approval sets dangerous precedent.

Diamond Heights' "modernist" architecture is eligible for historic status, designed to blend with nature and preserve views. Families, naturalists and hikers want to enjoy trees and sky without a giant tower in the sky that's painted brown to "blend in."

Glen Canyon is a SF "significant natural area" with biodiversity-supporting birds nesting around the Police Academy. Bird-tower collisions are documented. The tower 20' above trees will interfere with bird navigation especially in fog and wind, causing bird deaths in this critical urban wildlife habitat.

The Fire Chief described the canyon as having "Wildfire Interface Area characteristics"—dry grass, windy canyon, red flag warnings. A telecom wildfire consultant identified this as a fire threat. Examples: AT&T is a named defendant in the 2025 Palisades Fire & partially responsible for Malibu Canyon Fire and other incidents. All met safety codes. Cell tower fires are electrical,

requiring power-down before applying water while fire spreads to homes, nursery schools & parks. AT&T states no evidence of fire danger & it will comply with codes.

The project sits 50 feet from SF landslide seismic hazard zone on 30-60 ft of infill. The tower's weight increases landslide risk in this high-soil-saturation area. El Niño rains & tree loss compound erosion and instability.

AT&T claims all locations were exhausted, which is false. There are no documented "coverage gaps" only "areas of relatively weak signal." Less intrusive alternatives exist; other carriers provide coverage without such towers.

AT&T wants market-share regardless of neighborhood concerns.

Massive profit-making towers do not belong on public property surrounded by dense housing and parks.

I urge you to grant the appeal of the Conditional Use Authorization.

Sincerely,

YNanea Digdigan

700 San Bruno Ave San Francisco, CA 94107-2662

yndigdign@yahoo.com

From: kathi.schaff@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Katherine Schaff](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I am writing to you today to urge you to please support Appeal File #C251098 - Conditional Use Authorization
Date: Sunday, February 8, 2026 10:26:28 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Legislative Services,

Please grant the Appeal Conditional Use Authorization approval at 350 Amber Dr - File No. C251098

I am a 20-year resident of the Mission and also a public health researcher and organizer. I'm concerned about the health impacts of this decision.

This MacroTower is only "necessary, desirable and compatible with the neighborhood" according to AT&T & their business goals. Neighbors and visitors disagree. Allowing this "exemption" sets a dangerous precedent for all neighborhoods.

AT&T stated in Dec '25 FCC filings: "AT&T will continue to require additional macro facilities to densify its wireless networks. And it will require additional macro facilities to meet public safety needs, as directed by The First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet)."

4 of 7 Planning Commissioners approved the project based on AT&T's false claim that this massive tower is essential for 911 service and First Responders' FirstNet access. According to Police and Fire, their First Responders are not required to use FirstNet and 911 calls go to the nearest carrier.

The proposed structure—a 10-story monopole with 700+ cubic ft of 12 bulky antennas—will extend 20 feet above the tree line, towering over George Christopher Playground & Glen Canyon, visible throughout the neighborhood. It does not comply with CEQA: it is not a "small addition to an existing structure" but a "new" massive structure. Planning Resolution 14182 gives preference to antennas placed "on publicly used structures," yet this is not "on" the Police Academy building but in a parking area behind it.

SF has only 4 wireless structures over 100 ft: 2 attached to commercial buildings downtown, 1 in Presidio Sports Basement lot, 1 at Balboa BART. Other "exemptions" cited by Planning & AT&T (80-93 feet) are near freeways or industrial areas. Two park structures not in residential neighborhoods (40-60 feet) are in Golden Gate Park soccer fields and Palace of Fine Arts with fewer antennas. NO free-standing towers of this size exist in residential neighborhoods next to parks. CUA Approval sets dangerous precedent.

Diamond Heights' "modernist" architecture is eligible for historic status, designed to blend with nature and preserve views. Families, naturalists and hikers want to enjoy trees and sky without a giant tower in the sky that's painted brown to "blend in."

Glen Canyon is a SF "significant natural area" with biodiversity-supporting birds nesting around the Police Academy. Bird-tower collisions are documented. The tower 20' above trees will interfere with bird navigation especially in fog and wind, causing bird deaths in this critical urban wildlife habitat.

The Fire Chief described the canyon as having "Wildfire Interface Area characteristics"—dry grass, windy canyon, red flag warnings. A telecom wildfire consultant identified this as a fire threat. Examples: AT&T is a named defendant in the 2025 Palisades Fire & partially responsible for Malibu Canyon Fire and other incidents. All met safety codes. Cell tower fires are electrical,

requiring power-down before applying water while fire spreads to homes, nursery schools & parks. AT&T states no evidence of fire danger & it will comply with codes.

The project sits 50 feet from SF landslide seismic hazard zone on 30-60 ft of infill. The tower's weight increases landslide risk in this high-soil-saturation area. El Niño rains & tree loss compound erosion and instability.

AT&T claims all locations were exhausted, which is false. There are no documented "coverage gaps" only "areas of relatively weak signal." Less intrusive alternatives exist; other carriers provide coverage without such towers.

AT&T wants market-share regardless of neighborhood concerns.

Massive profit-making towers do not belong on public property surrounded by dense housing and parks.

I urge you to grant the appeal of the Conditional Use Authorization.

Sincerely,
Katherine Schaff
2866 24th St San Francisco, CA 94110-4233
kathi.schaff@gmail.com

From: stephpappaspi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Stephanie Pappas](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I am writing to you today to urge you to please support Appeal File #C251098 - Conditional Use Authorization
Date: Sunday, February 8, 2026 9:08:35 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Legislative Services,

Hello, while this is a form letter I have read and agree with all of it. SAVE our beautiful Diamond Heights neighborhood and this historic beautiful open space next to nature. do not destroy generations of love and commitment here.

Please grant this Appeal Conditional Use Authorization approval at 350 Amber Dr - File No. C251098
This MacroTower is only "necessary, desirable and compatible with the neighborhood" according to AT&T & their business goals. Neighbors and visitors disagree. Allowing this "exemption" sets a dangerous precedent for all neighborhoods.

AT&T stated in Dec '25 FCC filings: "AT&T will continue to require additional macro facilities to densify its wireless networks. And it will require additional macro facilities to meet public safety needs, as directed by The First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet)."

4 of 7 Planning Commissioners approved the project based on AT&T's false claim that this massive tower is essential for 911 service and First Responders' FirstNet access. According to Police and Fire, their First Responders are not required to use FirstNet and 911 calls go to the nearest carrier.

The proposed structure—a 10-story monopole with 700+ cubic ft of 12 bulky antennas—will extend 20 feet above the tree line, towering over George Christopher Playground & Glen Canyon, visible throughout the neighborhood.

It does NOT comply with CEQA: it is NOT a "small addition to an existing structure" but a "new" MASSIVE structure. Planning Resolution 14182 gives preference to antennas placed "on publicly used structures," yet this is not "on" the Police Academy building but in a parking area behind it.

SF has only 4 wireless structures over 100 ft: 2 attached to commercial buildings downtown, 1 in Presidio Sports Basement lot, 1 at Balboa BART. Other "exemptions" cited by Planning & AT&T (80-93 feet) are near freeways or industrial areas. Two park structures not in residential neighborhoods (40-60 feet) are in Golden Gate Park soccer fields and Palace of Fine Arts with fewer antennas. NO free-standing towers of this size exist in residential neighborhoods next to parks. CUA Approval sets dangerous precedent.

Diamond Heights' "modernist" architecture is eligible for historic status, designed to blend with nature and preserve views. Families, naturalists and hikers want to enjoy trees and sky without a giant tower in the sky that's painted brown to "blend in."

Glen Canyon is a SF "significant natural area" with biodiversity-supporting birds nesting around the Police Academy. Bird-tower collisions are documented. The tower 20' above trees will interfere with bird navigation especially in fog and wind, causing bird deaths in this critical urban wildlife habitat.

The Fire Chief described the canyon as having "Wildfire Interface Area characteristics"—dry grass, windy canyon, red flag warnings. A telecom wildfire consultant identified this as a fire threat. Examples: AT&T is a named defendant in the 2025 Palisades Fire & partially responsible for Malibu Canyon Fire and other incidents. All met safety codes. Cell tower fires are electrical, requiring power-down before applying water while fire spreads to homes, nursery schools & parks. AT&T states no evidence of fire danger & it will comply with codes.

The project sits 50 feet from SF landslide seismic hazard zone on 30-60 ft of infill. The tower's weight increases

landslide risk in this high-soil-saturation area. El Niño rains & tree loss compound erosion and instability.

AT&T claims all locations were exhausted, which is false. There are no documented "coverage gaps" only "areas of relatively weak signal." Less intrusive alternatives exist; other carriers provide coverage without such towers. AT&T wants market-share regardless of neighborhood concerns.

Massive profit-making towers do not belong on public property surrounded by dense housing and parks. THAT is FOR SURE!

I urge you to grant the appeal of the Conditional Use Authorization.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Pappas

5235 Diamond Heights Blvd Apt 204 San Francisco, CA 94131-2144

stephpappaspi@gmail.com

From: gmaann@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Robert Gee](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I am writing to you today to urge you to please support Appeal File #C251098 - Conditional Use Authorization
Date: Sunday, February 8, 2026 7:26:04 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Legislative Services,

Please grant the Appeal Conditional Use Authorization approval at 350 Amber Dr - File No. C251098

This MacroTower is only "necessary, desirable and compatible with the neighborhood" according to AT&T & their business goals. Neighbors and visitors disagree. Allowing this "exemption" sets a dangerous precedent for all neighborhoods.

AT&T stated in Dec '25 FCC filings: "AT&T will continue to require additional macro facilities to densify its wireless networks. And it will require additional macro facilities to meet public safety needs, as directed by The First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet)."

4 of 7 Planning Commissioners approved the project based on AT&T's false claim that this massive tower is essential for 911 service and First Responders' FirstNet access. According to Police and Fire, their First Responders are not required to use FirstNet and 911 calls go to the nearest carrier.

The proposed structure—a 10-story monopole with 700+ cubic ft of 12 bulky antennas—will extend 20 feet above the tree line, towering over George Christopher Playground & Glen Canyon, visible throughout the neighborhood. It does not comply with CEQA: it is not a "small addition to an existing structure" but a "new" massive structure. Planning Resolution 14182 gives preference to antennas placed "on publicly used structures," yet this is not "on" the Police Academy building but in a parking area behind it.

SF has only 4 wireless structures over 100 ft: 2 attached to commercial buildings downtown, 1 in Presidio Sports Basement lot, 1 at Balboa BART. Other "exemptions" cited by Planning & AT&T (80-93 feet) are near freeways or industrial areas. Two park structures not in residential neighborhoods (40-60 feet) are in Golden Gate Park soccer fields and Palace of Fine Arts with fewer antennas. NO free-standing towers of this size exist in residential neighborhoods next to parks. CUA Approval sets dangerous precedent.

Diamond Heights' "modernist" architecture is eligible for historic status, designed to blend with nature and preserve views. Families, naturalists and hikers want to enjoy trees and sky without a giant tower in the sky that's painted brown to "blend in."

Glen Canyon is a SF "significant natural area" with biodiversity-supporting birds nesting around the Police Academy. Bird-tower collisions are documented. The tower 20' above trees will interfere with bird navigation especially in fog and wind, causing bird deaths in this critical urban wildlife habitat.

The Fire Chief described the canyon as having "Wildfire Interface Area characteristics"—dry grass, windy canyon, red flag warnings. A telecom wildfire consultant identified this as a fire threat. Examples: AT&T is a named defendant in the 2025 Palisades Fire & partially responsible for Malibu Canyon Fire and other incidents. All met safety codes. Cell tower fires are electrical,

requiring power-down before applying water while fire spreads to homes, nursery schools & parks. AT&T states no evidence of fire danger & it will comply with codes.

The project sits 50 feet from SF landslide seismic hazard zone on 30-60 ft of infill. The tower's weight increases landslide risk in this high-soil-saturation area. El Niño rains & tree loss compound erosion and instability.

AT&T claims all locations were exhausted, which is false. There are no documented "coverage gaps" only "areas of relatively weak signal." Less intrusive alternatives exist; other carriers provide coverage without such towers.

AT&T wants market-share regardless of neighborhood concerns.

Massive profit-making towers do not belong on public property surrounded by dense housing and parks.

I urge you to grant the appeal of the Conditional Use Authorization.

Sincerely,

Robert Gee

9 Bella Vista Way San Francisco, CA 94127-1807

gmaann@aol.com

From: bertatiny@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Berta Jimenez](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I am writing to you today to urge you to please support Appeal File #C251098 - Conditional Use Authorization
Date: Sunday, February 8, 2026 12:00:50 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Legislative Services,

Please grant the Appeal Conditional Use Authorization approval at 350 Amber Dr - File No. C251098

This MacroTower is only "necessary, desirable and compatible with the neighborhood" according to AT&T & their business goals. Neighbors and visitors disagree. Allowing this "exemption" sets a dangerous precedent for all neighborhoods.

AT&T stated in Dec '25 FCC filings: "AT&T will continue to require additional macro facilities to densify its wireless networks. And it will require additional macro facilities to meet public safety needs, as directed by The First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet)."

4 of 7 Planning Commissioners approved the project based on AT&T's false claim that this massive tower is essential for 911 service and First Responders' FirstNet access. According to Police and Fire, their First Responders are not required to use FirstNet and 911 calls go to the nearest carrier.

The proposed structure—a 10-story monopole with 700+ cubic ft of 12 bulky antennas—will extend 20 feet above the tree line, towering over George Christopher Playground & Glen Canyon, visible throughout the neighborhood. It does not comply with CEQA: it is not a "small addition to an existing structure" but a "new" massive structure. Planning Resolution 14182 gives preference to antennas placed "on publicly used structures," yet this is not "on" the Police Academy building but in a parking area behind it.

SF has only 4 wireless structures over 100 ft: 2 attached to commercial buildings downtown, 1 in Presidio Sports Basement lot, 1 at Balboa BART. Other "exemptions" cited by Planning & AT&T (80-93 feet) are near freeways or industrial areas. Two park structures not in residential neighborhoods (40-60 feet) are in Golden Gate Park soccer fields and Palace of Fine Arts with fewer antennas. NO free-standing towers of this size exist in residential neighborhoods next to parks. CUA Approval sets dangerous precedent.

Diamond Heights' "modernist" architecture is eligible for historic status, designed to blend with nature and preserve views. Families, naturalists and hikers want to enjoy trees and sky without a giant tower in the sky that's painted brown to "blend in."

Glen Canyon is a SF "significant natural area" with biodiversity-supporting birds nesting around the Police Academy. Bird-tower collisions are documented. The tower 20' above trees will interfere with bird navigation especially in fog and wind, causing bird deaths in this critical urban wildlife habitat.

The Fire Chief described the canyon as having "Wildfire Interface Area characteristics"—dry grass, windy canyon, red flag warnings. A telecom wildfire consultant identified this as a fire threat. Examples: AT&T is a named defendant in the 2025 Palisades Fire & partially responsible for Malibu Canyon Fire and other incidents. All met safety codes. Cell tower fires are electrical,

requiring power-down before applying water while fire spreads to homes, nursery schools & parks. AT&T states no evidence of fire danger & it will comply with codes.

The project sits 50 feet from SF landslide seismic hazard zone on 30-60 ft of infill. The tower's weight increases landslide risk in this high-soil-saturation area. El Niño rains & tree loss compound erosion and instability.

AT&T claims all locations were exhausted, which is false. There are no documented "coverage gaps" only "areas of relatively weak signal." Less intrusive alternatives exist; other carriers provide coverage without such towers.

AT&T wants market-share regardless of neighborhood concerns.

Massive profit-making towers do not belong on public property surrounded by dense housing and parks.

I urge you to grant the appeal of the Conditional Use Authorization.

Sincerely,

Berta Jimenez

8 Moffitt St San Francisco, CA 94131-2615

bertatiny@gmail.com

From: bertatiny@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Berta Jimenez](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I am writing to you today to urge you to please support Appeal File #C251098 - Conditional Use Authorization
Date: Sunday, February 8, 2026 12:00:45 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Legislative Services,

Please grant the Appeal Conditional Use Authorization approval at 350 Amber Dr - File No. C251098

This MacroTower is only "necessary, desirable and compatible with the neighborhood" according to AT&T & their business goals. Neighbors and visitors disagree. Allowing this "exemption" sets a dangerous precedent for all neighborhoods.

AT&T stated in Dec '25 FCC filings: "AT&T will continue to require additional macro facilities to densify its wireless networks. And it will require additional macro facilities to meet public safety needs, as directed by The First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet)."

4 of 7 Planning Commissioners approved the project based on AT&T's false claim that this massive tower is essential for 911 service and First Responders' FirstNet access. According to Police and Fire, their First Responders are not required to use FirstNet and 911 calls go to the nearest carrier.

The proposed structure—a 10-story monopole with 700+ cubic ft of 12 bulky antennas—will extend 20 feet above the tree line, towering over George Christopher Playground & Glen Canyon, visible throughout the neighborhood. It does not comply with CEQA: it is not a "small addition to an existing structure" but a "new" massive structure. Planning Resolution 14182 gives preference to antennas placed "on publicly used structures," yet this is not "on" the Police Academy building but in a parking area behind it.

SF has only 4 wireless structures over 100 ft: 2 attached to commercial buildings downtown, 1 in Presidio Sports Basement lot, 1 at Balboa BART. Other "exemptions" cited by Planning & AT&T (80-93 feet) are near freeways or industrial areas. Two park structures not in residential neighborhoods (40-60 feet) are in Golden Gate Park soccer fields and Palace of Fine Arts with fewer antennas. NO free-standing towers of this size exist in residential neighborhoods next to parks. CUA Approval sets dangerous precedent.

Diamond Heights' "modernist" architecture is eligible for historic status, designed to blend with nature and preserve views. Families, naturalists and hikers want to enjoy trees and sky without a giant tower in the sky that's painted brown to "blend in."

Glen Canyon is a SF "significant natural area" with biodiversity-supporting birds nesting around the Police Academy. Bird-tower collisions are documented. The tower 20' above trees will interfere with bird navigation especially in fog and wind, causing bird deaths in this critical urban wildlife habitat.

The Fire Chief described the canyon as having "Wildfire Interface Area characteristics"—dry grass, windy canyon, red flag warnings. A telecom wildfire consultant identified this as a fire threat. Examples: AT&T is a named defendant in the 2025 Palisades Fire & partially responsible for Malibu Canyon Fire and other incidents. All met safety codes. Cell tower fires are electrical,

requiring power-down before applying water while fire spreads to homes, nursery schools & parks. AT&T states no evidence of fire danger & it will comply with codes.

The project sits 50 feet from SF landslide seismic hazard zone on 30-60 ft of infill. The tower's weight increases landslide risk in this high-soil-saturation area. El Niño rains & tree loss compound erosion and instability.

AT&T claims all locations were exhausted, which is false. There are no documented "coverage gaps" only "areas of relatively weak signal." Less intrusive alternatives exist; other carriers provide coverage without such towers.

AT&T wants market-share regardless of neighborhood concerns.

Massive profit-making towers do not belong on public property surrounded by dense housing and parks.

I urge you to grant the appeal of the Conditional Use Authorization.

Sincerely,

Berta Jimenez

8 Moffitt St San Francisco, CA 94131-2615

bertatiny@gmail.com

From: marycfitz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Mary Fitzpatrick](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I am writing to you today to urge you to please support Appeal File #C251098 - Conditional Use Authorization
Date: Friday, February 6, 2026 8:09:28 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Legislative Services,

Hello

I know you will realize that this messages matches or close to matches messages from other concerned citizens. It is the easiest and quickest way for me to let you know that I join all of them in opposing this.

Please grant the Appeal Conditional Use Authorization approval at 350 Amber Dr - File No. C251098

This MacroTower is only "necessary, desirable and compatible with the neighborhood" according to AT&T & their business goals. Neighbors and visitors disagree. Allowing this "exemption" sets a dangerous precedent for all neighborhoods.

AT&T stated in Dec '25 FCC filings: "AT&T will continue to require additional macro facilities to densify its wireless networks. And it will require additional macro facilities to meet public safety needs, as directed by The First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet)."

4 of 7 Planning Commissioners approved the project based on AT&T's false claim that this massive tower is essential for 911 service and First Responders' FirstNet access. According to Police and Fire, their First Responders are not required to use FirstNet and 911 calls go to the nearest carrier.

The proposed structure—a 10-story monopole with 700+ cubic ft of 12 bulky antennas—will extend 20 feet above the tree line, towering over George Christopher Playground & Glen Canyon, visible throughout the neighborhood. It does not comply with CEQA: it is not a "small addition to an existing structure" but a "new" massive structure. Planning Resolution 14182 gives preference to antennas placed "on publicly used structures," yet this is not "on" the Police Academy building but in a parking area behind it.

SF has only 4 wireless structures over 100 ft: 2 attached to commercial buildings downtown, 1 in Presidio Sports Basement lot, 1 at Balboa BART. Other "exemptions" cited by Planning & AT&T (80-93 feet) are near freeways or industrial areas. Two park structures not in residential neighborhoods (40-60 feet) are in Golden Gate Park soccer fields and Palace of Fine Arts with fewer antennas. NO free-standing towers of this size exist in residential neighborhoods next to parks. CUA Approval sets dangerous precedent.

Diamond Heights' "modernist" architecture is eligible for historic status, designed to blend with nature and preserve views. Families, naturalists and hikers want to enjoy trees and sky without a giant tower in the sky that's painted brown to "blend in."

Glen Canyon is a SF "significant natural area" with biodiversity-supporting birds nesting around the Police Academy. Bird-tower collisions are documented. The tower 20' above trees will interfere with bird navigation especially in fog and wind, causing bird deaths in this critical urban wildlife habitat.

The Fire Chief described the canyon as having "Wildfire Interface Area characteristics"—dry grass, windy canyon, red flag warnings. A telecom wildfire consultant identified this as a fire threat. Examples: AT&T is a named defendant in the 2025 Palisades Fire & partially responsible for Malibu Canyon Fire and other incidents. All met safety codes. Cell tower fires are electrical,

requiring power-down before applying water while fire spreads to homes, nursery schools & parks. AT&T states no evidence of fire danger & it will comply with codes.

The project sits 50 feet from SF landslide seismic hazard zone on 30-60 ft of infill. The tower's weight increases landslide risk in this high-soil-saturation area. El Niño rains & tree loss compound erosion and instability.

AT&T claims all locations were exhausted, which is false. There are no documented "coverage gaps" only "areas of relatively weak signal." Less intrusive alternatives exist; other carriers provide coverage without such towers.

AT&T wants market-share regardless of neighborhood concerns.

Massive profit-making towers do not belong on public property surrounded by dense housing and parks.

I urge you to grant the appeal of the Conditional Use Authorization.

Sincerely,
Mary Fitzpatrick
444 Myra Way San Francisco, CA 94127-1659
marycfitz@comcast.net

From: ratnesh_saxena@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Ratnesh S](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I am writing to you today to urge you to please support Appeal File #C251098 - Conditional Use Authorization
Date: Monday, February 9, 2026 6:50:44 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Legislative Services,

Please grant the Appeal Conditional Use Authorization approval at 350 Amber Dr - File No. C251098

This MacroTower is only "necessary, desirable and compatible with the neighborhood" according to AT&T & their business goals. Neighbors and visitors disagree. Allowing this "exemption" sets a dangerous precedent for all neighborhoods.

AT&T stated in Dec '25 FCC filings: "AT&T will continue to require additional macro facilities to densify its wireless networks. And it will require additional macro facilities to meet public safety needs, as directed by The First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet)."

4 of 7 Planning Commissioners approved the project based on AT&T's false claim that this massive tower is essential for 911 service and First Responders' FirstNet access. According to Police and Fire, their First Responders are not required to use FirstNet and 911 calls go to the nearest carrier.

The proposed structure—a 10-story monopole with 700+ cubic ft of 12 bulky antennas—will extend 20 feet above the tree line, towering over George Christopher Playground & Glen Canyon, visible throughout the neighborhood. It does not comply with CEQA: it is not a "small addition to an existing structure" but a "new" massive structure. Planning Resolution 14182 gives preference to antennas placed "on publicly used structures," yet this is not "on" the Police Academy building but in a parking area behind it.

SF has only 4 wireless structures over 100 ft: 2 attached to commercial buildings downtown, 1 in Presidio Sports Basement lot, 1 at Balboa BART. Other "exemptions" cited by Planning & AT&T (80-93 feet) are near freeways or industrial areas. Two park structures not in residential neighborhoods (40-60 feet) are in Golden Gate Park soccer fields and Palace of Fine Arts with fewer antennas. NO free-standing towers of this size exist in residential neighborhoods next to parks. CUA Approval sets dangerous precedent.

Diamond Heights' "modernist" architecture is eligible for historic status, designed to blend with nature and preserve views. Families, naturalists and hikers want to enjoy trees and sky without a giant tower in the sky that's painted brown to "blend in."

Glen Canyon is a SF "significant natural area" with biodiversity-supporting birds nesting around the Police Academy. Bird-tower collisions are documented. The tower 20' above trees will interfere with bird navigation especially in fog and wind, causing bird deaths in this critical urban wildlife habitat.

The Fire Chief described the canyon as having "Wildfire Interface Area characteristics"—dry grass, windy canyon, red flag warnings. A telecom wildfire consultant identified this as a fire threat. Examples: AT&T is a named defendant in the 2025 Palisades Fire & partially responsible for Malibu Canyon Fire and other incidents. All met safety codes. Cell tower fires are electrical,

requiring power-down before applying water while fire spreads to homes, nursery schools & parks. AT&T states no evidence of fire danger & it will comply with codes.

The project sits 50 feet from SF landslide seismic hazard zone on 30-60 ft of infill. The tower's weight increases landslide risk in this high-soil-saturation area. El Niño rains & tree loss compound erosion and instability.

AT&T claims all locations were exhausted, which is false. There are no documented "coverage gaps" only "areas of relatively weak signal." Less intrusive alternatives exist; other carriers provide coverage without such towers.

AT&T wants market-share regardless of neighborhood concerns.

Massive profit-making towers do not belong on public property surrounded by dense housing and parks.

I urge you to grant the appeal of the Conditional Use Authorization.

Sincerely,
Ratnesh S

847 Duncan St San Francisco, CA 94131-1831

ratnesh_saxena@yahoo.com

From: gardenforbees@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Maggie Hoppe](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I am writing to you today to urge you to please support Appeal File #C251098 - Conditional Use Authorization
Date: Tuesday, February 10, 2026 12:00:48 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Legislative Services,

Please grant the Appeal Conditional Use Authorization approval at 350 Amber Dr - File No. C251098

This MacroTower is only "necessary, desirable and compatible with the neighborhood" according to AT&T & their business goals. Neighbors and visitors disagree. Allowing this "exemption" sets a dangerous precedent for all neighborhoods.

AT&T stated in Dec '25 FCC filings: "AT&T will continue to require additional macro facilities to densify its wireless networks. And it will require additional macro facilities to meet public safety needs, as directed by The First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet)."

4 of 7 Planning Commissioners approved the project based on AT&T's false claim that this massive tower is essential for 911 service and First Responders' FirstNet access. According to Police and Fire, their First Responders are not required to use FirstNet and 911 calls go to the nearest carrier.

The proposed structure—a 10-story monopole with 700+ cubic ft of 12 bulky antennas—will extend 20 feet above the tree line, towering over George Christopher Playground & Glen Canyon, visible throughout the neighborhood. It does not comply with CEQA: it is not a "small addition to an existing structure" but a "new" massive structure. Planning Resolution 14182 gives preference to antennas placed "on publicly used structures," yet this is not "on" the Police Academy building but in a parking area behind it.

SF has only 4 wireless structures over 100 ft: 2 attached to commercial buildings downtown, 1 in Presidio Sports Basement lot, 1 at Balboa BART. Other "exemptions" cited by Planning & AT&T (80-93 feet) are near freeways or industrial areas. Two park structures not in residential neighborhoods (40-60 feet) are in Golden Gate Park soccer fields and Palace of Fine Arts with fewer antennas. NO free-standing towers of this size exist in residential neighborhoods next to parks. CUA Approval sets dangerous precedent.

Diamond Heights' "modernist" architecture is eligible for historic status, designed to blend with nature and preserve views. Families, naturalists and hikers want to enjoy trees and sky without a giant tower in the sky that's painted brown to "blend in."

Glen Canyon is a SF "significant natural area" with biodiversity-supporting birds nesting around the Police Academy. Bird-tower collisions are documented. The tower 20' above trees will interfere with bird navigation especially in fog and wind, causing bird deaths in this critical urban wildlife habitat.

The Fire Chief described the canyon as having "Wildfire Interface Area characteristics"—dry grass, windy canyon, red flag warnings. A telecom wildfire consultant identified this as a fire threat. Examples: AT&T is a named defendant in the 2025 Palisades Fire & partially responsible for Malibu Canyon Fire and other incidents. All met safety codes. Cell tower fires are electrical,

requiring power-down before applying water while fire spreads to homes, nursery schools & parks. AT&T states no evidence of fire danger & it will comply with codes.

The project sits 50 feet from SF landslide seismic hazard zone on 30-60 ft of infill. The tower's weight increases landslide risk in this high-soil-saturation area. El Niño rains & tree loss compound erosion and instability.

AT&T claims all locations were exhausted, which is false. There are no documented "coverage gaps" only "areas of relatively weak signal." Less intrusive alternatives exist; other carriers provide coverage without such towers.

AT&T wants market-share regardless of neighborhood concerns.

Massive profit-making towers do not belong on public property surrounded by dense housing and parks.

I urge you to grant the appeal of the Conditional Use Authorization.

Sincerely,

Maggie Hoppe

PO Box 31162 San Francisco, CA 94131-0162

gardenforbees@gmail.com

From: Agenthandy@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Erin Denny](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I am writing to you today to urge you to please support Appeal File #C251098 - Conditional Use Authorization
Date: Monday, February 9, 2026 8:02:01 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Legislative Services,

As a member of the Crag's Court Community Garden for 20 plus years, I say wholeheartedly, let's keep this wild open space as it is. Do not let a corporation like AT&T get a sweetheart deal from us in San Francisco while they hurt our communities by partnering with ICE. Lead us!

Please grant the Appeal Conditional Use Authorization approval at 350 Amber Dr - File No. C251098
This MacroTower is only "necessary, desirable and compatible with the neighborhood" according to AT&T & their business goals. Neighbors and visitors disagree. Allowing this "exemption" sets a dangerous precedent for all neighborhoods.

AT&T stated in Dec '25 FCC filings: "AT&T will continue to require additional macro facilities to densify its wireless networks. And it will require additional macro facilities to meet public safety needs, as directed by The First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet)."

4 of 7 Planning Commissioners approved the project based on AT&T's false claim that this massive tower is essential for 911 service and First Responders' FirstNet access. According to Police and Fire, their First Responders are not required to use FirstNet and 911 calls go to the nearest carrier.

The proposed structure—a 10-story monopole with 700+ cubic ft of 12 bulky antennas—will extend 20 feet above the tree line, towering over George Christopher Playground & Glen Canyon, visible throughout the neighborhood. It does not comply with CEQA: it is not a "small addition to an existing structure" but a "new" massive structure. Planning Resolution 14182 gives preference to antennas placed "on publicly used structures," yet this is not "on" the Police Academy building but in a parking area behind it.

SF has only 4 wireless structures over 100 ft: 2 attached to commercial buildings downtown, 1 in Presidio Sports Basement lot, 1 at Balboa BART. Other "exemptions" cited by Planning & AT&T (80-93 feet) are near freeways or industrial areas. Two park structures not in residential neighborhoods (40-60 feet) are in Golden Gate Park soccer fields and Palace of Fine Arts with fewer antennas. NO free-standing towers of this size exist in residential neighborhoods next to parks. CUA Approval sets dangerous precedent.

Diamond Heights' "modernist" architecture is eligible for historic status, designed to blend with nature and preserve views. Families, naturalists and hikers want to enjoy trees and sky without a giant tower in the sky that's painted brown to "blend in."

Glen Canyon is a SF "significant natural area" with biodiversity-supporting birds nesting around the Police Academy. Bird-tower collisions are documented. The tower 20' above trees will interfere with bird navigation especially in fog and wind, causing bird deaths in this critical urban wildlife habitat.

The Fire Chief described the canyon as having "Wildfire Interface Area characteristics"—dry grass, windy canyon, red flag warnings. A telecom wildfire consultant identified this as a fire threat. Examples: AT&T is a named defendant in the 2025 Palisades Fire & partially responsible for Malibu Canyon Fire and other incidents. All met safety codes. Cell tower fires are electrical,

requiring power-down before applying water while fire spreads to homes, nursery schools & parks. AT&T states no evidence of fire danger & it will comply with codes.

The project sits 50 feet from SF landslide seismic hazard zone on 30-60 ft of infill. The tower's weight increases landslide risk in this high-soil-saturation area. El Niño rains & tree loss compound erosion and instability.

AT&T claims all locations were exhausted, which is false. There are no documented "coverage gaps" only "areas of relatively weak signal." Less intrusive alternatives exist; other carriers provide coverage without such towers.

AT&T wants market-share regardless of neighborhood concerns.

Massive profit-making towers do not belong on public property surrounded by dense housing and parks.

I urge you to grant the appeal of the Conditional Use Authorization.

Sincerely,
Erin Denny
269 Madison St San Francisco, CA 94134-1347
Agenthandy@gmail.com

From: [Candace Low](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Appeal #251094 and #251098; Hearing 2/10/26 (Ecologist Expert Opinion)
Date: Monday, February 9, 2026 4:51:51 PM
Attachments: [Candace Low resume - ecologist \(2025\).pdf](#)
[Expert opinion Ecologist Candace Low PhD.pdf](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,
I humbly write to you in support of the appeal of AT&T Tower in Diamond Heights.
Please see my attached letter.
Regards,
Candace Low

Candace Low

Ecologist

Contact

1866 44th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

(415) 373-8106
candacelow13@gmail.com
www.linkedin.com/in/clowsf

Key Skills

- Ecological study design
- Data analyses
- Project management
- Team lead
- Monitoring and report writing
- Grant writing
- Stakeholder outreach

Activities and Interests

- Ashtanga yoga, surfing
- Art and photography
- Baking and cooking
- Road trips, camping
- Insects, wildlife
- Evolutionary game theory
- Economics
- Social justice
- Environmental justice

SUMMARY

A versatile field biologist with 25 years of experience doing field work, gathering ecological data sets, especially those from non-experimental, uncontrolled, observational studies. Enjoys also working with messy data that requires statistical manipulation to draw out patterns. Successful with report writing, attention to detail, and has acumen for legislation and research. Excellent communication skills and scientific report writing, as well as public and stakeholder outreach and engagement.

PhD in Ecology, with advanced technical training in statistical and theoretical modeling, and experimental design methods. Lead author of 11 peer-reviewed scientific articles in ecology, reporting on analyses of time series, behavioral data, field studies, survivorship, and molecular genetics. Spearheaded 10 collaborative research projects and won 15+ competitive grants with awards totaling \$300K. Taught ecology, conservation biology, restoration biology, and statistics to hundreds of students over the last 10 years.

PROJECTS

Contractor • Santa Clara Valley Water District • Santa Clara, California (Mar 2020 – Dec 2020)

Conducted survivorship analyses, estimated sample size requirements; generated descriptive statistics with supporting graphical figures for final reports – using hand recorded field data. Made recommendations for study design and types of metrics to use for future restoration work of *Ceanothus* habitat in Santa Clara Valley.

Education

PhD, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology

UC Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, California

MA, Conservation Biology

San Francisco State University
San Francisco, California

BA, Integrative Biology

University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, California

Service

California Native Plant Society, Yerba Buena Chapter

Board member/Education chair
<https://cnps-yerbabuena.org/>

Reimagining San Francisco

California Academy of Sciences
Steering committee member
<https://reimaginingsf.org/>

Entrepreneurship

Started an eco-conscious dog treat company that is certified as a [California Green Business](#)



Contractor • The Nature Conservancy • San Francisco, California (2014 – 2017)

Worked on the BirdReturns Project which aimed to increase wetland habitat for migratory birds and waterfowl in the California Central Valley during the drought and recovery years 2014-2017. Advised on sampling design, field protocol, metrics, processed data from visual point samples, generated figures, and conducted hypothesis tests. Wrote and published reports. Publications: [Reynolds et al. 2017](#) and [Golet et al. 2017](#)

Research associate • Dept of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology • Cornell University • Ithaca, NY (2009 – 2013)

1) Analyzed 10 years of field data of insect populations in a deciduous forest. Publication: [Low et al. 2013](#)
2) Studied nutrient cycling using field data of stable isotopes of vegetation, and measurements of temperature, moisture, and nitrogen-to-carbon ratios. Publication: [Low and Sparks 2016](#)

Research associate • US Dept of Agriculture • Beltsville, MD (Jan 2008 - Aug 2009)

Studied the community ecology of host-parasitoid interactions. Publication: [Low et al. 2012](#)

PhD candidate • University of California, Santa Barbara Santa Barbara, California (2002 – Dec 2007)

Studied the growth rates of insects on plants, behavioral characteristics, and host-parasitoid interactions. Publications: [Low et al. 2008](#) [Low 2008](#)

COMPANY

Small business owner • Frankie & Brody's Love Bites, San Francisco, CA (Established 2023)

<https://frankie-brody-love-bite.square.site/>

Candace Low, Ph.D.
1866 44th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122
candacelow13@gmail.com
Ph. 415-335-1448

February 9, 2026

Board of Supervisors
City of San Francisco
Jocelyn.Wong@sfgov.org
bos@sfgov.org

Re: Appeal #251094 and #251098; Hearing 2/10/26

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am an evolutionary biologist and ecologist. I received my bachelor's degree in Integrative Biology, and earned my master's degree in Conservation Biology at SF State, and then a PhD in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology at UC Santa Barbara. I pioneered a research program as a PI with a prestigious NSF Postdoctoral Fellowship in Biology (to study theoretical ecology at Cornell University). In 2013 I returned to my home in SF to teach Conservation Biology, Data Science, Evolution, and Ecology at San Francisco State University and to serve my community. I have served as the Education Chair of the Yerba Buena Chapter of the California Native Plants Society and as a volunteer with Reimagine San Francisco.

I began my career as a master's student in 1998 working on monitoring native plants and insect communities that were part of SFRP's Significant Natural Areas Project, to which I contributed to one of the first reports. Later, to complete my master's degree, I published two years of field study on the role of migratory birds, native plants, and insect communities in the Carman Valley watershed of the Sierra Nevada – which was later restored to its original function as a healthy riparian ecosystem (after being previously destroyed by human action).

I would like to comment on specific responses submitted from both the Planning Department and AT&T which lack basic understanding of the important natural resources and habitats in Glen Canyon Park. The response from the Planning Department and from AT&T to the appeal filed by the Diamond Heights Community

Association re: possible impacts of the 104 foot MACRO antenna tower topped with 12 antennas 20 feet above the tree line of Glen Canyon Park and Christopher Playground does not meet a basic biology test.

1. *The statements below from the Planning Department's response to the CEQA appeal assumes that animals do not move in this wild urban canyon.*

"The plan (the Recreation and Park's 2006 Significant Resource Area Management Plan- SRAMP) included a detailed assessment of Glen Canyon Park, including sensitive species that are found within the natural area boundary. However, in the assessment, the natural area boundary is not coterminous with the boundaries of the park, but rather is approximately 200 feet away from the project site. The portion of the natural area that is closest to the project site is also designated as Management Area 3, which is the least sensitive type of habitat, found to be covered with urban forest and invasive grasslands. Therefore, the assessment of biological resources by the Recreation and Parks Department found that while the interior portions of the adjacent park (which is not part of the project site) supports sensitive species, the natural area boundary is not near the project site, and could not be reasonably affected by construction or operation of the proposed project. Therefore, the project would not result in any significant impacts related to biological resources."

2. *The Recreation and Parks Departments did not assess this project or issue an independent assessment. The Planning Department staff used the 2006 SRAMP assessment and deduced significant impacts related to biological resources.* The Planning Department asserted,

"Because the proposed project is not located directly adjacent to a natural area, that the nearest natural area is of the least sensitive status and that the project site **would be entirely fenced in**, the project would not result in any significant impacts related to biological resources."

The "project is located" as described in AT&T application "amid" the trees on the border of Christopher Playground and Glen Canyon. This urban forest is a "natural area" and a "biological resource" for canyon wildlife including migratory birds and raptors. And, they fly more than 200 feet.

3. *AT&T's response (which mirrored the Planning Department's almost exactly) cites that the*

"San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department published a Significant [Natural Resource Area Management Plan in 2006](#). The plan included a detailed assessment of Glen Canyon Park, including [sensitive species](#) that are found with the natural area boundary. However, in the assessment, the natural area boundary is not coterminous with the boundaries of the park, but rather is approximately 200 feet away from the

project site. The portion of the natural area that is closest to the project site is also designated as Management Area 3, which is the least sensitive type of habitat, found to be covered with urban forest and invasive grasslands. Therefore, the assessment of biological resources by the Recreation and Parks Department found that while the interior portions of the adjacent park (which is not part of the project site) supports sensitive species, the natural area boundary is not near the project site, and could not be reasonably affected by construction or operation of the proposed project. Therefore, the project would not result in any significant impacts related to biological resources."

Again, this implies that Recreation and Parks did an assessment specific to the project, but they did not.

4. Further, a thorough environmental review is not concerned with only sensitive species but ALL species that form the intact ecosystem and functioning habitat.

The mention of MA-3 describes it as urban forest and grasslands. The reference report also highlights that MA-3 Management actions within areas designated as MA-3 include activities to promote the health and diversity of urban forests and the wildlife habitat they provide; but AT&T failed to acknowledge that section.

AT&T also included the following assertion regarding MA-3 from the Rec and Park 2006 report MA-3 – least sensitive to human-generated disturbance and can include a buffer zone for MA-1 and MA-2 from surrounding developed recreational and other land uses. MA-3 areas may feature a predominance of non-native vegetation, an absence of sensitive species, and can support a complement of native plants and wildlife habitat, etc. According to Figure 6.3-5 of the SNRAM Plan, the Policy Academy site is adjacent to an MA-3 area of Glen Canyon Park, an area designated as least sensitive to *human-generated* disturbance, and not an environmental resource of critical concern. The Project site is approximately 150 feet away from this MA-3 area of Glen Canyon Park.

As basic ecology tells us, habitat fragmentation is a severe threat to intact ecosystems that are more than the individual species. Where there is fragmentation, the persistence and health of ecological community like Glen Canyon Park, requires a wide buffer zone – and 150 feet makes no difference in a wild canyon. Ecological communities need healthy buffer zones that protect them from e.g., pathogens, pollution, noise, chemical agents, temperature-humidity increases, electromagnetic radiation – in order to thrive. These impacts of artificial human-introduced harms are well-documented BOTH above and below ground.

5. However, AT&T cites in their response to the CUA appeal, which I believe is ill-informed because no ecologist would agree that 150-feet would be sufficient when abutted immediately next to the boundary of the ecosystem:

"According to Figure 6.3-5 of the SNRAM Plan, the Police Academy site is adjacent to an MA-3 area of Glen Canyon Park, an area designated as least sensitive to human-generated disturbance. **An MA-3 area is not an environmental resource of critical concern.** The Project site is approximately 150 feet away from this MA-3 area of Glen Canyon Park. The Project will not interfere with any of the Glen Canyon Park site improvements, vegetation management, or wildlife recommendations in the SNRAM Plan. Neither will the Project impact the utilization of the Glen Canyon Park for recreation purposes.

6. *The report documents the urban forest which surrounds the Police Academy and describes migratory birds: - Migratory means they fly (beyond 150-200 feet) and nest in the urban forest.*

"Areas designated MA-3 within Glen Canyon Park include areas **covered with urban forest.** Site-Specific Conditions and Recommendations 6.3 Glen Canyon Park and O'Shaughnessy Hollow include: high levels of recreational trail use; outstanding views; interpretive signs and ample opportunity for educational use; one of two last free-flowing creeks in the City; some of the City's largest and most impressive and accessible rock outcrops; excellent forage and nesting habitat for a variety of resident and migratory bird species; extensive grasslands providing habitat for butterflies and other insects; dense willow thickets offering protection for resident and migratory birds; red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*) and great horned owl (*Bubo virginianus*) nesting sites and foraging areas; suitable habitat for special-status species of butterflies; important habitat for native plants; populations of sensitive plant and animal species; and extensive urban forest."

7. *AT&T failed to read further where the recommendations specifically cite the importance of protecting the forest canopy and the birds that nest there stating:*

"Tree removal shall not be conducted within 500 feet of the location of an existing red-tailed hawk or great horned owl nest while the nest is in use, approximately January 1-June 15 (MA-3a)"

8. *Lastly, the final report also includes: The that the Golden Gate Audubon Society (now Golden Gate Bird Alliance) Species of Local Concern (SLC) are found in MA-3 along with MA-1&2.*

AT&T did not read the 2006 report thoroughly. While MA-3 is not the highest Significant Natural Resource Management Area, it is a SNRMA and the entire canyon is not. Clearly, the urban forest is an important resource in and of itself and for wildlife.

In my scientific opinion the statements of both the Planning Department and AT&T are not credible. Their responses point to the importance of approving the exemption appeal and requiring a full Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

There is no mention of a bird strike analysis. Bird collisions with antennas are well documented in the scientifically documented world wide. The proposed electrified antenna tower structure will not only be a 104-foot physical obstacle in the flight path of migrating birds, 20 feet above the urban forest, birds, bats, and insects navigate using magnetoreception and Earth's magnetic fields which are disrupted by the electromagnetic radio frequencies from the antenna. This is especially significant at night, and will be likely in Glen Canyon because of its fog and windy conditions. Glen Canyon, according to the 2006 report, hosts ground-nesting birds, owls, and 250+ insect species and they do not stay in one place.

Lastly, there is no mention of protecting the forest with a surrounding buffer zone to protect the forest and riparian area with root systems that forest the ecosystem of Glen Canyon Park – which can be damaged during drilling, grating and construction and substrate vibrations of the heavy monopole. Plant root systems and insects, like planthoppers, communicate through vibrations and a network for fungal associations that the entire forest would die without. Glen Canyon is a rare natural area that represents our geologic and ecological history that deserves special consideration.

Given that there is a 2018 City-Wide resolution to preserve and protect biodiversity, the plan to build this macro-tower will be counter to these goals. There are MANY reasons to support both the CEQA exemption appeal and require a full EIR and for the CUA approval of this massive structure on the border of two parks that our city prioritizes as open space. We need to maintain their connectivity without a dangerous structure that could destroy sensitive and much needed habitat for both humans and wildlife. We need less fragmentation, not more. I hope you will carefully consider my expert opinion. Let's take the time to make the right decision together.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Candace Low". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "C" and a long, sweeping tail.

Candace Low PhD