

AS AMENDED
MINUTES OF TFCG MEETING

To: Distribution

From: Bob Hunnicutt, Tower Coordinator, Columbia Telecommunications

A meeting of the Transmission Facility Coordinating Group (TFCG) was held on January 3, 2007. The following people were in attendance:

MEMBERS

Jennifer Bryant OMB (240) 777-2761
Jane Lawton OCCS (240) 777-3724
Helen Xu DTS (240) 777-2804
Mary Pat Wilson MCPS (240) 314-4707
Carlton Gilbert MNCPPC (301) 495-5476
Martin Rookard WSSC (301) 206-8979
David Niblock DPS (240) 777-6252

STAFF

Bob Hunnicutt CTC (410) 964-5700
Carol Watson CTC (410) 964-5700
Donna Keating OCCS (240) 777-3668

OTHER ATTENDEES

Michele Rosenfeld Law Office of Michele Rosenfeld
Bill Tritsis River Falls Condo
Jack Andrews Sprint/Nextel
Jeff Ott Spring/Nextel
Katie Oppenheimer T-Mobile
Mike Budde T-Mobile
Adam Knubel Clearwire
Arun Sudama Sprint/Nextel
Gurindes Bir-Singh Sprint/Nextel
Andrea Trozin River Falls Condo
Prabhu Marragathanannan Cingular
Jim Michal, Esq. Jackson & Campbell

Discussion Item - Meeting Minutes: Bob Hunnicutt stated that he had two corrections to the minutes. On page four at the bottom of the page - Motion on Action Item #18, needed to be corrected to reflect that Helen Xu moved that the application be recommended and that Carlton Gilbert seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

The second correction was on page six, where the motion on Application 200608-02 needed to be changed to reflect that Martin Rookard, not Carlton Gilbert moved that the application be tabled.

Action Item - Meeting Minutes: David Niblock moved the minutes be approved as amended. Carlton Gilbert seconded the motion and the minutes were unanimously approved.

Consent Applications:

1. Clearwire application to install antennas at the 165' level on an existing monopole at Old Burtonsville VFD located at 15430 Old Columbia Pike, Burtonsville (Application #200611-07).

Motion: Carlton Gilbert moved that the consent agenda item be recommended. David Niblock seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Baltimore Gas & Electric Company application to install three omnidirectional antennas and two microwave dishes on an existing 250' lattice tower located on the Easterday property at 9265 Brown Station Road in Mount Airy (Application #200612-01).

Bob Hunnicutt summarized the application noting that there are no records available on the Special Exception that permitted this structure, which had been in place for many years. He said that given its age and the number of antennas already attached to the tower, he conditioned his recommendation for this application on the applicant's submission of a structural analysis that showed that the BG&E antennas could be safely attached. Mike Budde stated he had a structural analysis for the site, which he then submitted to Mr. Hunnicutt. Mr. Budde noted that although the structural analysis reported that the tower was overstressed, the structural engineer had stated that the additional antennas could be attached safely. Mr. Hunnicutt said that with submission of the structural analysis report, he now recommended the application. He noted however, that the structural analysis also reported that with this BG&E attachment the tower would be at its maximum capacity and that modifications would be necessary to support any additional antennas.

Jane Lawton asked where the equipment would be placed and how large was the parcel of land on which the tower was located. Mr. Hunnicutt replied that he did not have the site plan that showed the entire piece of property, but based upon his recollection from the site visits, it was a large parcel and the equipment would be placed at the base of the tower among the other equipment structures already on the site. He added that unlike many sites, this location does not have a clearly defined equipment area. He said that he did not have any documentation as to whether there was a specific ground space approved in this Special Exception, and said he presumed that the placement of the BG&E equipment would be acceptable because it was among those existing shelters already in place. Ms. Lawton commented that in the future the group would like to have a site map submitted with the application that shows the entire property parcel with the location of the structure noted.

Motion: David Niblock moved the application be recommended. Martin Rookard seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: T-Mobile application to install nine antennas at the 91' level on an existing 140' monopole on the Gymkhana Club property located at 14100 River Road in Potomac (Application 200612-02).

Bob Hunnicutt summarized the application noting that his recommendation was conditioned on submission of a structural analysis showing that these antennas, the sixth set to attach to this monopole, could be supported by the structure. He added that because T-Mobile's equipment is shown on the plan where FiberTower opted to place its equipment, he also conditioned the recommendation on T-Mobile resolving any conflicts over equipment placement with FiberTower. Jane Lawton noted that Fiber Tower was not shown on the elevation drawing. She asked Mr. Hunnicutt if he had a copy of the Special Exception for this site, and noted that she recalled there had been resident opposition to this monopole when it was initially proposed.

Mr. Hunnicutt stated that since this was a collocation and the equipment would be within the existing compound, he did not think it necessary to bring a copy of the Special Exception to the meeting today. Ms. Lawton stated that at future meetings, she would like to have a copy available of the Special Exceptions for sites to be reviewed by the group.

Motion: Carlton Gilbert moved the application be recommended conditioned on submission of a structural analysis to Permitting Services with a copy to the Tower Coordinator that showed T-Mobile's antennas may be safely attached. Martin Rookard seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Invisible Tower/Cingular application to construct two 100' monopoles on River Falls Home Owners Association property located at MacArthur Boulevard and Stable Lane in Potomac (Application #200604-40).

Bob Hunnicutt stated that this application had been before the TFCG on two prior occasions. The first time was in the late spring of 2006 when Tim Dennis of Invisible Towers gave a slide show presentation to the group in advance of submission of an application. At that time, the plan was for a 140' monopole disguised as a tree and Mr. Dennis had advised the group that the River Falls community had requested that Invisible Tower place a monopole on their common property along MacArthur Boulevard for carriers to attach their antennas to improve service for the residents in that area.

Mr. Hunnicutt added that in his review of the initial application, he had advised Mr. Dennis he would not consider a speculative tower without a carrier designated as the technical basis for the facility. Mr. Hunnicutt stated that Cingular had been designated the carrier for the monopole and that the first application was based on Cingular's RF information and documentation of a need for the facility.

Mr. Hunnicutt added that at that time (spring 2006) Cingular was the only carrier who had shown a need for service improvements in this area on their annual plan submissions. Since then, however, with the updated filings received in August, two additional carriers had identified this area for service improvements as well. Mr. Hunnicutt presumed that was based on the fact that they were aware of this proposal and wanted to add it to their plan so they could collocate once the tower is constructed.

He said that just prior to the July meeting when the original application was scheduled for review by the TFCG, both he and Jane Lawton had been contacted by residents near the site and by representatives from community organizations who had advised them they had not been aware of the proposed monopole, objected to it, and wanted to obtain information about exactly what was proposed before the TFCG reviewed the application. Consequently, the item was pulled from the July agenda.

Mr. Hunnicutt explained that after the initial application had been filed, the applicant discovered the monopole would not meet setback requirements. Consequently, they had revised their plan from a single 140' monopole to two 100' monopoles. He said he had also received a letter from the River Falls Homeowners Association, representing 99 homes and upon whose property the monopole would be placed, advising him that they supported the project.

Mr. Hunnicutt said he has now been advised that Invisible Towers had attended community meetings to brief the residents on their latest design. The Presidents of the Civic Association of River Falls and the River Falls Condominium Association have since written to Ms. Lawton expressing their organization's opposition to the monopoles.

Mr. Hunnicutt noted that he had included four sets of documents in the member packets for this application. The first set was the initial application and Tower Coordinator recommendation that was distributed to the TFCG members for the July meeting. The second set included copies of letters from the residents as described above. The third set was the correspondence and attachments from Invisible Tower that describe the revisions proposed to the application. The final set of documents included the revised Tower Coordinator recommendation and copies of photos he had prepared to illustrate some of the points regarding the site.

Mr. Hunnicutt reviewed the photos, noting that the first one was an aerial view of the greater River Falls community comprised of approximately 514 homes represented by the Civic Association of River Falls. He noted that the white area on the photo was the location of the proposed monopoles. Mr. Hunnicutt noted he thought it important for the members to understand the different organizations that would be discussed at today's meeting. The circled area in the photo identified the 99 homes of the River Falls Homeowners Association which owned the land where the monopole would be constructed. That association included the 13 condominium units indicated in the area in the square box in the photo. He noted that additional photos showed a 270° panoramic view from the site looking toward the community, the site in winter with no leaves on the trees (when the monopole would be plainly visible), and the site when the trees were in full foliage (when the monopole may not be as visible).

He summarized the application and noted there were several problems regarding compliance with zoning standards. He noted that with regard to setback, if the height of the monopole is determined based solely on the monopole structure itself, it appeared to meet setback by a couple of feet from each side lot lines. However, he noted that this monopole is designed with pole extensions on top of the monopole which place the antennas at the 112' level at the top of the monopole. If the County and/or Board of Appeals determined that the extension should be included in the height, then this structure does not meet setback requirements. He said he could not find anything in the County Code that addresses extensions above a support structure, and he believed this was the first application where pole mounted antennas above a structure raised questions about whether the structure would meet setback requirements. He said he believed this issue appeared to be a loophole in the regulations that allow the monopole height (100') to be the sole basis upon which to determine compliance with setback, even though the overall structure would exceed that height.

He said that with regard to the structure meeting the required 300' distance from a dwelling, based on the plans submitted with the revised application, there was a statement that there were no dwellings within 300' and a circle with a 300' radius was drawn around each of the proposed monopoles. However, the plans did not show exactly how far the nearest dwelling was from the monopole. He said he had asked the applicant to provide a revised set of drawings that showed the nearest dwelling and the exact measurement to the dwelling. He stated the applicant first submitted a revised drawing that showed the nearest dwelling in the Homeowners Association to be over 400' from the site, but Mr. Hunnicutt did not believe that was the nearest dwelling. Mr. Hunnicutt said the applicant agreed to order a survey to document the distance to the nearest dwelling, but as of today's meeting it had not been provided. He said that because of his uncertainty as to whether the site meets this requirement he had obtained copies of the record plats from the County, and based upon his review of those documents, it appeared as though the monopoles did meet the 300' setback. He noted, however, that only a survey could clarify this issue.

Tim Dennis of Invisible Tower stated the survey had been completed and then provided Mr. Hunnicutt with a document that showed the nearest dwelling was approximately 325' from the monopoles, thus meeting the 300' requirement in the Code.

Mr. Hunnicutt noted that the structure was not designed to accommodate three carriers as required by Code. He stated that the revised application was for two 100' monopoles, each of which could accommodate antennas from two carriers. He stated that the applicant had reported they proposed to meet the requirement for attachment by three carriers by constructing two monopoles. Mr. Hunnicutt said this was contrary to the County's intent of having a single structure accommodate at least two additional collocators in lieu of multiple towers at a site. Consequently, he did not recommend the application.

Mr. Hunnicutt added that he considered the second monopole at this site speculative and only considered one monopole for attachment of Cingular's antennas. He stated that although the applicant had submitted letters of intent from additional carriers to attach to these facilities, the County requires that each carrier submit an application for placing antennas in the community and he would not consider an application for a second monopole until the first one had been approved, constructed, and additional antennas had been collocated on the facility to the point that it could no longer accommodate additional antennas.

Mr. Hunnicutt explained that at the time of the initial application, Cingular's coverage requirements were submitted as the basis for the technical rationale for this monopole. He stated that Cingular had submitted RF maps illustrating existing coverage with and without the calculated coverage for the proposed site. Based on his review of those RF maps it appeared that Cingular needed to improve service in this area to meet its desired signal levels, and that antennas at the 135' level may meet that requirement. He said that Invisible Tower and Cingular had argued that antennas at an elevation less than 135' would be unacceptable as it would have a significant negative impact on meeting Cingular's coverage objective. Mr. Hunnicutt said that based on the Tower Coordinator's review of maps showing Cingular's calculated coverage lower than 135', they concurred.

He stated that in the revised application, Invisible Tower asserts that because the majority of the residents east of the site on higher ground already had acceptable cell phone coverage, Cingular's antennas now proposed at the 110' elevation would suffice to meet the target coverage objective of providing service to just the 99 homes in the River Falls Homeowners Association. Mr. Hunnicutt asked for (and received) a statement from Cingular's engineer attesting to the assertion that although the 110' elevation was not what they desired, it would be acceptable to provide service to some of the residents near the site. He asked Carol Watson to summarize the review of the RF maps submitted by the applicant.

Ms. Watson stated that based on her site visit, there did not appear to be any existing structures to which Cingular could attach antennas to meet its service objective for this site. She stated that contrary to Invisible Tower's statement, based on her review of Cingular's RF maps, it appears that Cingular does show a need to improve service to the River Falls residents. Nevertheless, she agreed that based on her review of the RF maps antennas at the 110' would likely be able to provide an adequate level of service to the homes in the immediate vicinity of the monopole.

Ms. Watson added that the President of the River Falls Condominium Association had asked if adequate service would be provided in the heavily wooded Association area between the monopole and the homes. Ms.

Watson explained that since the antennas would be somewhat above the tops of the trees, she thought they would probably provide an acceptable signal level to residents in the immediate vicinity of the monopole. She added however, that if the antennas were below the treetops there would be approximately 600' of heavily wooded area through which signals would have to pass to reach the homes, and noted this may result in a significantly diminished signal level for those residents. She said that only drive tests could better document the expected coverage with antennas at either the 110' level or below the treetops. She said that based upon her comparison of the RF maps showing calculated coverage at 100' and 110', she did not discern any significant difference between antennas at those two heights. Consequently, she believed that antennas at the 100' level may provide the desired level of service, but noted again that drive test results would better document the actual signal levels.

Jane Lawton asked how many trees would have to be removed from the site. Mr. Dennis replied that a forestry study had not yet been done, but that they would minimize the number of trees removed. Ms. Lawton asked Mr. Dennis if he had anything to add to Mr. Hunnicutt's summary of the application.

Mr. Dennis stated that Mr. Hunnicutt had accurately outlined the challenges faced by their proposal to address the resident's concerns at this site. He said he recognized there were different opinions among the community members as to whether they wanted the monopole. He said he met with the community organizations to inform them of the revised plan and to solicit their input about the monopoles. He noted that his statement about the majority of the greater River Falls area residents having adequate coverage was not based on Cingular's RF calculations but was based upon hearing from many of the residents at the community meetings who stated that they already had adequate coverage and did not need service improvements in their area. He added that some of the homes to the east of the site were likely attaining their service from Cingular's antennas at the Avenel site to the east of the River Falls area. He stated that the 99 residents of the River Falls Homeowners Association, however, did not have sufficient coverage based upon their request for service improvement. He explained that was why they had contacted Invisible Tower to construct a monopole on their property.

Mr. Dennis stated that they had worked hard in their design to meet the Zoning Code requirements and to minimize the impact of the facility, including the removal of trees; however, some trees would have to be removed. He stated that the equipment compound would be approximately the same size for the two shorter monopoles as had been proposed for the taller monopole originally proposed. He said they had come up with a design to disguise the monopole as a tree which he thought would fit in with the heavily wooded surroundings and have minimal impact on the community.

Mr. Dennis noted that although some of the residents in the area do not want the monopole, there is a portion of the community where service is not very good and that the site is designed not only just to service the residents of the River Falls Homeowners Association, but also the roadway along MacArthur Boulevard and the park areas surrounding the site. He added that it was important for the antennas to be above the level of the treetops to attain the desired signal strength.

Mr. Dennis said that initially they thought a 140' structure would meet setback requirements because the River Falls Homeowner Association owned two parcels of land. However, they found that because the parcels were not contiguous since they are separated by Stable Lane, the setback requirements had to be measured from the lot lines for only one parcel. He said that a third carrier could not be accommodated on a monopole that meets setback requirements as that would place a third set of antennas below the treetop level. He said he was unaware that the TFCG required each carrier to submit an application for construction of or attachment to the structure. He noted that the site had initially been designed to serve up to four carriers which he had thought would meet the requirement to accommodate at least three carriers, but the setback issues had required a reduced height. He added that the tree pole would be a quality structure with life-like branches and simulated bark on the monopole to minimize the visual impact.

Mr. Dennis said he believed the current design for two towers was reasonable. He stated that Invisible Tower is a small company and would not consider such a venture if it were not needed. Mr. Dennis noted that they first began working only with Cingular, but since that time they have solicited interest from other carriers who are ready to attach to the monopole. Mr. Dennis noted that Cingular and T-Mobile have already signed agreements to do so, and that an agreement with Verizon was pending construction of the facility, per Verizon's internal policy. Mr. Dennis said that the facility was designed to fit on the available lot in the community and they had

taken great efforts to screen and disguise it to have a minimal visual impact. Mr. Dennis added that Invisible Tower was not interested in building a monopole for just two carriers.

Ms. Lawton commented that she had been to the site and was astounded that this location had been selected because it is at the entrance to a large residential area and that there would be many trees that would have to be removed for the roadway to access the equipment area and to make room for a monopole and the large equipment area. She said she thought this application was clearly a commercial use of residential land just as if the monopole were proposed to be placed on one of the housing lots, and that she did not believe it was an appropriate setting for a monopole. She added that since the Homeowners Association owned the land where the monopole would be placed, they had a vested interest in the monopole because they would receive revenue from the siting. She asked Mr. Dennis if they had considered placing the monopole on federal park land across MacArthur Boulevard from the site since the federal government has a stated policy to entertain telecommunications sitings on park land.

Jim Michal replied that placing a facility on park land was very difficult and took a very long time. He noted that the monopole in the Great Falls Park had taken three years to complete. Mr. Dennis said they had not approached the Park Service, and added that they had already spent nearly three years working on this proposal. Mr. Hunnicutt reminded Mr. Dennis that Invisible Tower had indeed discussed the proposal with the Park Service and had submitted letters from the Park Service as part of their application. Mr. Dennis replied that they had advised the Park Service of their balloon test as part of their SHPO requirements and that the management for the Maryland Park Service had determined that the monopole as originally proposed would not have any impact on the park land. He said that the managers of the Virginia Park Service thought that the 140' tree monopole may have some impact from their perspective; however, he thought that they would agree that the current proposal of 100' monopoles would be acceptable and would not have any impact on the views from the park area.

Ms. Lawton recognized Bill Tritsis from the River Falls Condominium Association (RFCA) and asked him if he would like to speak to the group. Mr. Tritsis explained that he was the President of the RFCA and that he and the 13 residents in the condos have adequate cell phone coverage. He said they are the residents closest to the site and would be the most impacted if the site were permitted to be constructed.

He added that the condo owners were also dues-paying members of the River Falls Homeowners Association and that the condo owners were never told of the lease that the RFHOA signed with Invisible Tower until after it was signed. He noted that §59-G-2.58 of the County's Zoning Code requires that the applicant have a valid lease to use the land for their monopole. He said since the RFHOA covenants require that 67% of the homeowners agree to the use of the land for this purpose, and that the RFHOA had not acquired approval from 67% of the homeowners, the lease was not valid. He submitted a copy of a letter he had sent to the RFHOA that pointed out this fact, and also submitted a newsletter from the RFHOA which showed that 67% of the homeowners did not agree to placing a monopole on this property.

Mr. Tritsis also noted that a monopole was incompatible with the land use in this area and that the base of the monopole and the equipment area would be seen from the road entering the community -- especially when there are no leaves on the trees. He said that the homeowners objected to the loss of open space owned by the community, and noted that this property was used as a play area for their children and for walking in the common area. He also noted that the Potomac Master Plan required added scrutiny for a project like this because the State of Maryland has designated this section of MacArthur Boulevard as a scenic by-way. He said that the park land area must also be protected, and asked that the TFCG not approve this application. He said he would provide a written copy of his statements to the group at the end of the meeting (copy attached).

Ms. Lawton recognized Michele Rosenfeld who also wished to speak to the group. Ms. Rosenfeld stated that she represented Michael Day, the resident at 10909 MacArthur Boulevard -the property immediately adjacent to the proposed monopole site. She stated that she agreed with Mr. Tritsis who articulated a number of the reasons to deny this application. She said that based on statements from area residents, there does not appear to be a great need for coverage in the area and that there is no significant gap in coverage. She noted that although there may be some spots where calls may be dropped, the federal regulations do not require carriers to provide 100% coverage and acknowledged there can be spots where signals are below the desired coverage level.

Ms. Rosenfeld added that Invisible Towers did not have proper authority to pursue the lease since they did not have approval from 67% of the residents, as Mr. Tritsis had noted. She noted that because the facility did not meet the County Code requirement for accommodating three carriers, she believe it failed to meet the zoning standard. She added that she thought constructing two monopoles instead of a single monopole would increase the visual impact of the facility in the community and that the equipment area would be quite large and plainly visible to the residents.

Ms. Rosenfeld said she agreed with the Tower Coordinator's Recommendation, and that she thought the facility is inappropriate given the residential land use of the area. She noted that the proposal does not meet the recommendations in the County's Master Plan, citing that the State of Maryland designated MacArthur Boulevard as a scenic by-way which must be protected and that the view around the site must also be protected. She stated that the loss of trees would significantly impact the area. She said she had spoken with Terry Maxwell at the State of Maryland who advised her that the State was in the process of completing a tower management plan to protect scenic by-ways in the State of Maryland. She said that she believed construction of a monopole in advance of that plan would be inappropriate.

She noted that the Master Plan did have design guidelines but given the short notice of review of this application today, she had not had time to obtain copies of the design plans. She said she would obtain these copies if she would be permitted to submit them as part of her statement. She commented that the proposal impacts major transportation areas and park land as well as the properties around the site and asked that the TFCG not recommend the application.

Martin Rookard asked if the TFCG needed to consider that the lease between the Homeowner's Association and Invisible Towers may not be legally binding. Ms. Lawton stated that she did not believe we need consider those kinds of issues, but should consider comments from community organizations and issues such as the visibility of this site, land use, and the removal of trees. Mr. Rookard said he thought that since the Homeowners Association that represents the residents was in favor of the site and it was their land, that should be the main consideration for the group. Ms. Lawton replied that she thought that the group should consider the input from all of the residents who would be impacted by this facility, not just those who would benefit from having the monopole placed on their land and who would obtain revenue from that business venture.

Jim Michal stated that he thought it was the responsibility of the TFCG to look at whether there was a technical need for service improvements to the area and whether there are existing structures to which antennas could be attached to meet those needs. He added that he thought the other issues such as land use, zoning, and the legal issues, are for other County bodies to address, not the TFCG.

Ms. Lawton disagreed with Mr. Michal, stating that the TFCG could consider whatever they thought appropriate in their review of this application, even though they may not have authority to issue a final determination on those issues.

Mr. Michal commented that the applicant would not be constructing this facility if there was not a technical need for it. He suggested that the application be tabled until the applicant could attain additional documentation from other carriers that expressed a need to better service this area.

Ms. Lawton stated that she opposed the application because she did not believe that this was a good site for a monopole based on her site visit, especially with the loss of trees to accommodate the access road and equipment area.

Carlton Gilbert noted that he would abstain from voting on this application because it would require a Special Exception and would be referred to the Park and Planning Commission for review.

Ms. Lawton said she believed the M-NCPPC should closely scrutinize the issue of the height of extension to the monopole in considering whether the structure truly meets setback requirements. David Niblock stated that the Code did not have any requirement limiting extensions on structures, but noted that they were typically only seen on rooftop placements.

Ms. Lawton said that she agreed with the Tower Coordinator that the second tower in the proposal was speculative and should not be considered. She added that in her opinion the original proposal for a single

monopole was also a speculative venture. She noted that once the facility was constructed she thought the site (presently a wooded lot) would be significantly impacted because even though it would be screened by a wooden fence, the monopole, the top of the equipment buildings, the ice bridge, and the cables would all be plainly visible to the community.

Mary Pat Wilson stated that she thought the group should consider the application as it was submitted for two 100' monopoles, not just a single monopole as the Tower Coordinator characterized his review of the application. Mr. Hunnicutt replied that he would not recommend an application for two monopoles at this site.

Mr. Rookard asked if Mr. Hunnicutt would have recommended a single taller monopole. Mr. Hunnicutt stated he would not have recommended it since it would not meet setback requirements.

Ms. Lawton reminded the group that they had reviewed and recommended applications for monopoles in residential areas in the past, but in this case the site was at the gateway to the community and plainly visible from the residents as well as those using MacArthur Boulevard.

Mr. Rookard noted that the RFHOA had stated they needed the service. Ms. Lawton noted that the RFHOA also has a vested interest in this project and should not be the only position considered. She added that the RFHOA has no greater weight regarding impact of the facility than does the Condo Association or the greater Civic Association.

Mr. Gilbert said he thought it was appropriate to address the issue of whether the monopole was considered 100' or 110' tall because of the extension to the monopole. Ms. Lawton encouraged the Department of Permitting Services to consider this extension in their review of any construction permit that may be submitted for this site.

Motion: Mr. Niblock moved to table the application to permit the applicant time to revisit their proposal and change it to one monopole at 100' to accommodate three carriers. There was no second on the motion and the motion failed.

Motion: Helen Xu noted that there was evidence of a need for service -- otherwise the other carriers mentioned by the applicant would not seek to collocate on this structure. She commented that because there were so many issues of concern with this application, such as the height of the structure, number of poles, community opposition, and lease issues, she did not believe that the group had a basis to recommend the application and moved that the application not be recommended. There was no second to her motion and the motion failed.

Motion: Martin Rookard recommended approval of the application. There was no second to the motion and the motion failed.

Motion: Mary Pat Wilson stated that she agreed with Helen Xu's comments and moved to not recommend the application to construct two monopoles as proposed by the application. Helen Xu seconded the motion. Three members (Jane Lawton, Helen Xu, and Mary Pat Wilson) voted in favor of the motion to not recommend the application, two (Martin Rookard and Dave Niblock) voted against the motion, and one (Carlton Gilbert) abstained. The motion to not recommend the application was passed.

Discussion Item: T-Mobile application to replace an existing 35' Verizon utility pole #M16431 with a 70' Verizon utility pole and attach antennas at the 75' level of the pole located at Galway Drive in Silver Spring (Application #200608-22).

Bob Hunnicutt reminded the group that at the last meeting they had tabled an application by T-Mobile to attach antennas at the 70' level on a replacement pole to be installed by Verizon. He stated that the group voted to table the application pending research by the Tower Coordinator as to the group's action on similar applications in the past and to afford T-Mobile an opportunity to brief the staff of the nearby school on their proposal.

Mr. Hunnicutt said that, based upon his survey, he found that there were 11 applications in the past for pole-related antenna attachments. Three of those applications had been withdrawn due to resident objection and had been replaced with applications for two alternate sites. He said that Montgomery County had withdrawn

two applications in the Potomac area in lieu of a third site on Sangamore Drive, where they replaced a 45' wooden pole with a 70' wooden pole to attach 800 MHz public safety radio antennas at the top of the pole to enhance coverage along the Potomac River.

Mr. Hunnicutt reported that two applications had been recommended by the TFCG to either attach or change antennas atop an existing wooden pole. T-Mobile had submitted five applications to replace existing wooden poles ranging from 42' to 62' with 70' wooden poles:

- 1) one application was for a pole within an existing electric utility transmission line right-of-way and the replacement pole was approximately the same height as the other existing poles;
- 2) one replacement pole application had been approved on Fairland Road prior to the discovery that they would need a franchise agreement with the County to site at the location;
- 3) one application was recommended but was in the State of Maryland right-of-way;
- 4) one application on Bonifant Road was still pending; and
- 5) the fifth application with T-Mobile was the one presently being discussed.

He also noted that the Crown Castle application recommended by the TFCG a year or so ago also considered replacement of several poles (some for structural reasons), and recalled that some replacements would result in a slightly taller pole.

Jane Lawton asked Mr. Hunnicutt if he had any photos of the County's pole replacement on Sangamore Drive. He replied that he did not but he did have a photo of the antenna attachment at River Road, which he distributed to the TFCG members for their review.

Mary Pat Wilson stated that T-Mobile had met with the Principal of Galway Elementary School who stated that they did not object to the site other than they would like to be apprised of the work to replace the monopole and what impact it may have on the school.

Ms. Lawton asked if the Public Schools staff would notify the surrounding community. Ms. Wilson stated that if the application moves forward, the School would notify the PTA, but not adjacent property owners.

Carol Watson and Bob Hunnicutt noted that based on their review of the RF maps submitted for this application, it was their recommendation that antennas at the 60' level would meet the coverage requirements.

Mike Budde stated that he had no objection to keeping the school apprised of any activities to replace the pole and, upon checking with T-Mobile RF engineers, he agreed that the antennas at the 60' level would work.

Motion: Martin Rookard moved that the application be recommended conditioned on attachment of antennas at the 60' level. Mary Pat Wilson amended the motion to include a condition that T-Mobile coordinate with the Public Schools to advise them of the activities and timing related to the replacement of the existing pole and that the replacement and that the attachment would not negatively impact school operations and safety. Carlton Gilbert seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Discussion Item - Next Meeting: The next meeting of the TFCG is scheduled for Wednesday, February 7, 2007 at 2 p.m. in the second floor conference room #225 of the COB.