

**From:** [Andy Newkirk](#)  
**To:** [Andy Newkirk \(anewkirk@cityofgoleta.org\)](mailto:anewkirk@cityofgoleta.org)  
**Subject:** FW: Addendum Re suggested ham antenna language in the ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, May 13, 2019 12:54:00 PM

---

**From:** Denis Franklin, MD <[denisfranklin@uchicago.edu](mailto:denisfranklin@uchicago.edu)>  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 11, 2019 9:32 AM  
**To:** Kyle Richards <[krichards@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:krichards@cityofgoleta.org)>; Roger Aceves <[raceves@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:raceves@cityofgoleta.org)>; [ikyriaco@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:ikyriaco@cityofgoleta.org); Paula Perotte <[pperotte@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:pperotte@cityofgoleta.org)>; Stuart Kasdin <[skasdin@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:skasdin@cityofgoleta.org)>  
**Cc:** Anne Wells <[awells@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:awells@cityofgoleta.org)>  
**Subject:** Addendum Re suggested ham antenna language in the ordinance

Greetings:

Upon reflection, unless I am mistaken and there is a convention or term of art of which I am not aware, the proper grammar in American English is to exempt a person or an object FROM a requirement, not “for” it. (One is *removing* the requirement *from* the person, object or process.)

And the phrase should either be, “that do not exceed” or, “not exceeding”, but not “that do not exceeding”.

Therefore I suggest that the wording for 17.42.020 (A) be further changed to:

**Exempt.** The following types of telecommunications facilities are exempt ~~for~~ from requiring a zoning permit.”

1. Licensed amateur (ham) radio antennas not exceeding sixty feet in height.

Likewise, the following types of telecommunication facilities ~~that do~~ not exceeding the maximum height permitted by this Title are exempt ~~for~~ from requiring a zoning permit:

2. Hand-held, mobile, marine, and portable radio transmitters and/or receivers.

[ ... then continuing with the numbered list as before, adding Citizens Band radio as number 7 on the list. ]

By the way, in the first line of my previous Post Script, the word “preemption” should be plural: “preemptions”. Sorry for the oversight. Nowhere more than in the formulation of a law is the necessity for precise language more important.

However, I realize that this document is merely a draft, and that these errors would have been corrected in the final proofreading. Or, as we used to joke when I was a newspaper journalist, “preefrooding”.

Denis Franklin,MD