











CN4554 - ALTERNATIVES MATRIX

Alternative #	Address	Site Photo	Rad Center Modeled	Height Necessary to Fulfill Minimum RF Objectives for Search Ring	Azimuths Modeled (Sector 1, 2, 3)	Type of Antenna Modeled/Frequency	Type of Proposal	Zone District	Zone District Height Limit	Meets Ordinance Standards (Y/N/?), Reasoning	Leasing Consideration	Zoning Consideration	RF Considerations
1- Proposed Project	1035 San Pablo Avenue		43'	43'			Roof mounted	SPC, San Pablo Com.	38'	YES. The facility will be located on an existing structure in compliance with Section 20.20.100.E.3 of the Wireless Code. In addition, the building currently hosts an existing wireless facility and qualifies as a collocation under Section 20.20.100.E.2.a. Antennas and radio equipment on the facility will be camouflaged and screened from view in compliance with Section 20.20.100.E.1.j. Finally, the Proposed Facility is located in the San Pablo Commercial District, which is a permitted location for wireless facilities and meets required setbacks from adjacent residential zone according to Section 20.20.100.D.2.c.	YES. Willing landlord	As designed the Proposed Facility will have no aesthetic impacts on the surrounding neighborhood as shown in the photosimulation provided with the application submittal.	Proposed facility will meet the majority of RF coverage objectives of the search ring, providing good in-building coverage throughout the center of the ring and good in-transit coverage on the northeast and northwest portions of the ring.
2- Albany Fire Dept.	1000 San Pablo Avenue		Not modeled	Undetermined	N/A	N/A	Tower replacement	PF, Public Facility	40'	YES. A proposed replacement tower at this location would meet the zoning code with respect to collocation on PF zoned property.	NO. The Albany Fire Department declined to lease the facility to AT&T for a WCF. The unavailability of this location was confirmed by Albany Planning and Building Manager Jeff Bond in November 2009, and September 2010	A proposed replacement tower at this location would meet the zoning code with respect to collocation on PF zoned property, however, a replacement tower would need to be larger and more obtrusive than that which currently exists at the site, thus exacerbating visual impacts.	Due to the fact that the LL is unwilling to lease to AT&T and it does not meet zoning requirements, no modeling was performed on this site.
3-Apt. Building	850 Stannage Avenue		35' & 90'	90'	20, 260, 140	Powerwave 4ft/850 MHz	Roof mounted/tower	SC, Solano Com.	35'	NO. Project would not meet zoning code requirements/preferences for a collocated facility when existing collocation potential exists. There are no existing WCFs on the building.	NO. LL was not approached due to the fact that the building is a residential use and would not meet RF or Zoning objectives.	The existing structure is residential although it is located in a commercial zone district. In order to achieve satisfactory coverage objectives an approximately 90'-tall structure would be required. This would consist of a monopole or other support tower which would be highly intrusive and inconsistent with the character of the neighborhood.	A facility at this location would most likely consist of a facade mounted facility with a rad center of 33'. Propagation at this rad center would not achieve coverage objectives of the search ring, as it would have poor coverage in the southern portion of the ring. In order to achieve satisfactory coverage of the ring, a 90'-tall structure would be required.
4-Villa del Mar Realty	979 San Pablo Avenue		25' & 50'	50'	70, 345, 165	Powerwave 4ft/850 MHz	Roofmounted	SPC, San Pablo Com.	38'	NO. There are no existing WCFs at the site so it would not satisfy the Wireless Code's collocation preference.	YES. LL is willing to lease to AT&T.	A project at this location would consist of a roof-mounted structure, which would obtain a maximum height of roughly 38' (approximately 10'-13' above existing rooftop). The most likely solution would involve a structure 5-7 feet a the rooftop in order to maintain architectural integrity of the building. However, such a proposal would be considered more intrusive than the proposed facility as it would involve an increase in height of the building and modification of existing building architecture.	A facility at this location would most likely consist of a rooftop facility with a rad center of 25'-30' involving some type of rooftop extension (e.g., penthouse structure). Such a facility would provide satisfactory coverage throughout a majority of the search ring with the exception of the far western edge of the ring. A taller facility, up to 50 feet would satisfy all coverage objectives.
5- Evergreen Building	1231 Solano Avenue		25' & 70'	50'	20, 260, 140	Powerwave 4ft/850 MHz	Roof mounted	SC, Solano Com.	35'	NO. There are no existing WCFs at the site so it would not satisfy the Wireless Code's collocation preference.	NO. LL was not approached due to the fact that the building is too low to meet RF objectives and would not satisfy the City's requirements for collocation.	A project at this location would consist of a roof-mounted structure, which would obtain a maximum height of roughly 35' (approximately 10' above existing rooftop). The most likely solution would involve a structure 5-7 feet a the rooftop in order to maintain architectural integrity of the building. However, such a proposal would be considered more intrusive than the proposed facility as it would involve an increase in height of the building and modification of existing building architecture.	A facility at this location would most likely consist of a rooftop facility with a rad center of 25'-30' involving some type of rooftop extension (e.g., penthouse structure). Such a facility would provide satisfactory coverage in the northern portion of the search ring but would not achieve in-building coverage in a majority of the southern portion of the ring. A facility approximately 70 feet in height would be needed to provide adequate coverage to the search ring, similar to the proposed project.
6- Albany Theater	1115 Solano Avenue		45' & 90'	45'	20, 260, 140	Powerwave 4ft/850 MHz	Roof mounted	SPC, San Pablo Com./Com. Node Overlay	38'	NO. There are no existing WCFs at the site so it would not satisfy the Wireless Code's collocation preference.	NO. The leasing manager for the Albany Theatre (run by Landmark Theaters), Jennifer Palm, 512-474-0046, verbally stated on January 13, 2011 that the landlord has no interest in leasing space to AT&T nor will they in the foreseeable future. This was again confirmed in a string of emails and letters sent to Landmark Theaters in May through June 2011.	It was determined that this building has likely historical significance and probable historical status. According to its website, the building that the Albany Theatre occupies was built in the 1920s, originally as a meeting hall and then a dance hall with live music. In 1935, the building was converted to the new home of the Albany Theatre. Potential historical significance would require extensive analysis by environmental consultants to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act and the National Environmental Policy Act. The site is disfavored due to cost and time delays to determine historical significance as well as the possible impacts on a historical structure which could result from locating a WCF at this location.	Facility design at this location is difficult to determine due to the architectural and historical significance of the building. Propagation maps prepared by AT&T indicate that a facility at this location could provide good in-building coverage in the northern half of the search ring but not in the southern half of the ring. Any facility at this location would likely be in the 30'-35' foot range, however, and would not provide coverage similar to the proposed project. A structure of approximately 70 feet or more would be necessary to provide coverage characteristics similar to the proposed project.
7-UC Property	1051 Monroe Street		45' & 90'	90'	70, 345, 165	Powerwave 4ft/850 MHz	Tree pole	R-2, Res. Multi-fam.	28'	NO. The property is owned by the State of California and thus is not subject to the City's Zoning Code. However, a proposal at this location would be inconsistent with the City's code given it's proximity to Ocean View School and the fact that it is zoned residential and would not be allowed with such a zoning designation.	The University of California was unresponsive when contacted by AT&T Mobility about leasing of this portion of the 75 acre raw land site.	A facility at this location would be a new build and would require a tower type structure. RF propagation indicates we would likely need 90 feet to cover the objective due to existing tree clutter. A proposal at this location would involve some type of tree pole. This proposal would be far more aesthetically obtrusive than the proposed project which is integrated into building architecture.	RF propagation maps indicate that a 90'-tall structure would have coverage characteristics similar to that of the proposed facility. A majority of the search ring would have good in-building coverage except for the northeast quadrant.
8- Town Centre Structure	940 San Pablo Ave		35' & 50'	50'	70, 345, 165	Powerwave 4ft/850 MHz	Faux monument sign	SPC, San Pablo Com.	38'	YES. A proposed facility at this location would meet zoning code requirements for collocation. However, a facility at this location would require extension of the monument sign to a height that would exceed zoning code requirements. A variance would be required and the resulting impacts are considered to be more significant than the proposed facility.	NO. Planning and Building Manager Jeff Bond has confirmed that the Town Centre has no interest in leasing any space to wireless carriers at this location (email dated 5/19/2011)	AT&T investigated the property located at 924 San Pablo Avenue. Although formerly a Cingular facility, T-Mobile currently owns and operates the wireless facility at this site. The existing sign structure housing T-Mobile's antennas would not accommodate another carrier unless the height of the structure were increased another 10-15 feet. This would not only create an additional visual impact, but would require a height variance because it would exceed the maximum height of 30 feet for free-standing signs. As such this site is disfavored due to aesthetic impacts and inconsistency with the zoning code height limits.	RF propagation maps indicate that a 50'-tall structure would meet a majority, but not all, of the coverage objectives for the search ring similar to the proposed location. Propagation at 35' also indicates that coverage objectives could be met similar to the proposed location, however, antennas would have to be placed at a height approximately 10 feet lower than this rad center due to the fact that an existing carrier retains the top position.
9-USDA Building	800 Buchanan Street		35' & 65' & 100'	100'	70, 345, 165	Powerwave 4ft/850 MHz	Roof mounted/tower	PF, Public Facility	40'	NO. The property is owned by the Federal Government and thus is not subject to the City's Zoning Code. However, a proposal at this location would be inconsistent with the City's code given that it would exceed height limits of the zone district.	NO. AT&T has contacted the USDA representatives and to date they have not been able to formally decline or accept potential lease negotiations	A roof mounted facility could most likely be developed at this location, however, at the height that could be obtained on the roof a large portion of the southern part of the ring would remain with unsatisfactory coverage. Thus a tower would have to be proposed to gain the additional height. Such a facility would be much more intrusive than the proposed facility which is integrated into the existing building.	A facility at this location would most likely involve a rooftop structure which could potentially achieve a height close to 65'. Propagation maps show that this height would not meet the coverage objectives of the search ring primarily because the candidate is located outside the ring and would be shooting into the designated area. In-building coverage would be good on the western half of the search ring but less than satisfactory throughout the remainder of the ring.
10- CMX District	No Specific address		50' & 150'	150'	70, 345, 165	Powerwave 4ft/850 MHz	Light standard in park/monopole?	CMX, Com. Mixed Use	45'	NO. A facility in the CMX zone district would not meet the requirements of the zoning code because it would exceed the height limits of the zone district in an effort to meet the coverage objectives. The facility would also be a new build, which is not favored by the zoning code.	N/A	A facility in this area would have to be extremely tall to even remotely meet the coverage objectives of the search ring. This would create a significant visual impact and be far more intrusive than the proposed facility which is integrated into the existing building.	RF coverage, even with a 150'-tall tower would not even meet half of the RF coverage objective for the search. The CMX zone district is located to far from the intended target area.