

TTFCG Meeting Minutes February 7, 2001

To: Distribution

From: Bob Hunnicutt, Tower Coordinator, Columbia Telecommunications

A meeting of the Telecommunications Transmission Facility Coordinating Group (TTFCG) was held on February 7, 2001. The following people were in attendance:

MEMBERS

Jane Lawton, Chairperson OCA (240) 777-3724 (FAX) 777-3770
Pat Hanehan MCPS (301) 279-3405 (FAX) 279-3737
Michael Ma M-NCPPC (301) 495-4595 (FAX) 495-1306
Dave Niblock DPS (240) 777-6252 (FAX) 777-6241
Eric Carzon OMB (240) 777-2763 (FAX) 777-2756

STAFF

Tim Krout CTC (410) 964-5700 (FAX) 964-6478
Robert Hunnicutt CTC (410) 964-5700 (FAX) 964-6478

OTHER ATTENDEES

Lee Jarmon Nextel (301) 625-4907 (FAX) 625-5502
Deane Mellander Voicestream (240) 264-8658 (FAX) 264-8610
Jim Michal Jackson & Campbell (202) 457-1652 (FAX) 457-1678
Charles Ryan LCC/XM Satellite (703) 873-2393 (FAX) 873-2686
Robin Allen CPM for Sprint (410) 266-2319
M.G. Diamond Verizon Wireless (301) 951-1564
Maureen Smith VoiceStream (240) 264-8611
Tony Goodman Fuzion Wireless (703) 830-7373
Richard Carr CWF for Fuzion (301) 571-4356
Don Collison PEPCO (202) 388-2775

Action Item - Approval of January 10, 2001 Minutes: Pat Hanehan moved the minutes be approved as written. Michael Ma seconded the motion and the minutes were unanimously approved.

Discussion Item - Butler School Monopole: Jane Lawton noted that Mr. Deppa from the Darnestown Civic Association, had requested copies of TTFCG minutes from September 1999 to date. She asked the Tower Coordinator to please provide Mr. Deppa with the copies requested.

Action Item: XM Satellite Radio application to attach an omni-directional whip antenna on a 12' extension on the top of an existing 160' monopole and a satellite dish antenna at the 50' level on the Bethesda Country Club monopole located at 7601 Bradley Boulevard in Bethesda (Application #200101-03).

Tim Krout summarized the application and noted that the Tower Coordinator did not recommend this application due to inconsistencies between what the applicant submitted to the TTFCG and what it proposed in its request for a Modification to Special Exception before the Board of Appeals. He noted that in the Board of Appeals request, the equipment was proposed to be located within the existing compound, but the TTFCG application showed the equipment located outside the existing compound. In

addition, the request to the Board of Appeals showed the monopole at the same height while the TTFCG application showed that antennas would be 14' above the monopole on a supporting pole.

In response, Mr. Ryan faulted the site acquisition team for providing preliminary documentation that showed the equipment outside the compound. He stated that he had since determined that the equipment would be going within the existing compound. He also noted that the confusion came during the negotiations for the land lease and it was simply an error. He added that Jim Michal was correct in stating at the last TTFCG meeting that the monopole belonged to Sprint.

Tim Krout noted that there was still a difference in the height between the two applications that needs to be addressed. Jim Michal stated that it was simply a supporting pole for the antennas and it did not actually increase the height of the monopole itself.

Mr. Hunnicutt stated that he believed the Board of Appeals may have thought that there would be no increase in height to the facility because of the way the matter was stated in the Modification request. He stated that AT&T came to the same conclusion as he had regarding the height of the antenna, and read the relevant section from an AT&T letter (copy attached). He distributed copies of the letter which he received in response to the TTFCG's questions from the last meeting regarding why, according to XM Satellite, AT&T had denied permission to XM to attach to the AT&T monopole at the same site. He reported that AT&T replied that the reason for not agreeing to the XM attachment was the issue of the additional height and not that it had a "metal-for-metal" policy. He stated that he believed that before the Tower Coordinator could make a recommendation to the TTFCG, it was necessary for XM to reconcile the differences between the TTFCG application and what the Board of Appeals recently approved, and provide an explanation to the Tower Coordinator.

Jane Lawton expressed concern that XM had submitted the Modification request before going through TTFCG review.

Charles Ryan agreed to resolve any inconsistencies, and asked that the TTFCG application be tabled until the next meeting, at which time he would provide clarification on the application.

Motion: Pat Hanehan moved the application be tabled until XM Satellite reconciled the application information with information provided to the Board of Appeals. Dave Niblock seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Fuzion Wireless application to attach antennas at the 125' level on the roof of the Silver Spring Metro Center II building located at 1315 East-West Highway in Silver Spring (Application #200101-02).

Tim Krout summarized the application. Since this carrier was new to the TTFCG, Mr. Krout asked the Fuzion representative, Richard

Carr, to explain the nature of Fuzion services and the details of the antenna attachment.

Richard Carr stated he was an independent contractor representing Fuzion Wireless. He introduced Tony Goodman, an engineer for Fuzion, and noted Mr. Goodman was present to answer any technical questions from the group.

Mr. Carr displayed a sample antenna and stated that this siting would place twelve (12) antennas in a six-sector array to provide wireless broadband services for retail users and ISPs. He stated the advantage of the service provided customers with a way to avoid the local loop and thus get to market more quickly than they otherwise might. Mr. Carr explained that this location would be a hub site providing broadband services at speeds up to 45 Mbps, serving businesses within a 3-mile radius or up to approximately 90 buildings. He stated it appeared there would be just one hub site in Montgomery County.

Jane Lawton asked if this service was also to be for residential users. Mr. Carr stated it was primarily focused on businesses and there were no current plans for residential service, but the company may re-evaluate that market in the future. Ms. Lawton asked if the service proposed for the Silver Spring area would also serve customers in the Bethesda area. Mr. Carr stated if there were customers in Bethesda, it may require a second hub.

Eric Carzon asked if this service was similar to the airBand Communications service which the TTFCG had recently reviewed. Mr. Carr stated that it was similar to airBand, Verizon, Teligent, and Winstar. Ms. Lawton asked if there would be antennas at the customer sites. Mr. Carr displayed a paper representation of a customer antenna, adding that it was smaller than the hub antennas and there would be approximately one user antenna per site. Ms. Lawton stated that the present code required TTFCG applications for all customer antennas. She added that the TTFCG had also discussed this matter with airBand and that because the antennas were so small, if the TTFCG review of many similar, small antennas became too cumbersome, the TTFCG may reconsider its position on reviewing those types of antennas.

Mr. Krout asked if there was one antenna per building, or one antenna per subscriber. Mr. Goodman stated that there would be one user antenna per building and that multiple subscribers within the building would be wired into a bandwidth management device which could adequately handle in-building coverage.

Motion: Eric Carzon moved the application be recommended. Dave Niblock seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: AT&T Wireless application to construct a new 130' monopole on the S & W Farm located at 1506 Briggs Chaney Road in Silver Spring (Application #200010-07).

Tim Krout commented that AT&T had requested that this application be tabled until the March meeting. Michal Ma asked the reason for AT&T's request. Jane Lawton replied that AT&T was taking another review of alternatives discussed at the last TTFCG

meeting to see if they could somehow make one of those options meet AT&T's network needs. She commented that AT&T was interested in being community-friendly as it deployed its network to serve this area.

Tim Krout stated that this was the end of the agenda as it was distributed to members, but in discussions with Ms. Lawton prior to the meeting, she decided that there were other applications which were ready and could be reviewed by the TTFCG at today's meeting. Ms. Lawton explained that there were a number of applications that had been submitted within a few days after the deadline, but were complete by-right attachments, and, given that today's meeting had an unusually light agenda, she felt that these applications could be reviewed by the group during today's meeting.

Mr. Hunnicutt stated he would distribute copies of each application for the members to review as each item was introduced.

Action Item: VoiceStream Wireless application to attach antennas at the 143' level of an existing 140' PEPCO transmission line tower #163-N located at 1301 Ashton Road in Ashton (Application #200101-06).

Mr. Krout stated that this was a standard PEPCO attachment with a wooden platform at the base of the PEPCO tower.

Motion: Dave Niblock moved the application be recommended. Eric Carzon seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to attach antennas at the 60' level of an existing PEPCO transmission line tower #736473-0926 located on Dosh Road in Gaithersburg (Application #200102-02).

Tim Krout summarized the application and noted that this facility had not yet been installed.

Michal Ma asked if the Tower Coordinator had found cases where a carrier had completed antenna attachment before obtaining TTFCG review. Mr. Hunnicutt replied that there were two cases, both involving Sprint, where, during his site visit, he found the installation had been fully completed prior to review by the TTFCG. He noted that the TTFCG had reviewed the matter fully with Mr. Michal, Sprint's representative, and that Mr. Michal had informed the TTFCG that the matter had been thoroughly discussed with Sprint which assured the group there would be no further cases where Sprint would complete its installation prior to TTFCG review.

Jim Michal stated that the past cases where Sprint had installed its facilities without having obtained TTFCG approval was due to the fact that PEPCO could only complete antenna attachments during scheduled power outages. Mr. Michal noted that Don Collison was present at the meeting and Mr. Collison nodded that that was the case.

Mr. Hunnicutt stated that those circumstances had been explained to the TTFCG previously and that the group understood the process. He noted, however, that the problem with those prior Sprint attachments was that not only were the antennas

attached to the transmission line towers, but the complete installation of the ground facilities had also been completed, and those facilities were not installed by PEPCO, but by the carrier.

Mr. Ma asked if the platforms under the PEPCO transmission line towers were landscaped in any way. Mr. Hunnicutt replied there was no requirement for landscaping or fencing around the facilities within PEPCO's right-of-way. Mr. Michal added that fencing would only be required for security purposes and it was at the discretion of PEPCO and the carrier whether landscaping or fencing was appropriate. Dave Niblock confirmed that PEPCO had the authority to require landscaping within its right-of-way.

Mr. Michal stated that it was unreasonable to expect a carrier to wait for TTFCG review when the carrier had no control over when the antennas were to be attached, and that in cases when attachment could be done sooner than expected by the carrier, it was appropriate for the carrier to proceed with the attachment.

Ms. Lawton noted that when the carrier informs PEPCO that it wishes to attach to its transmission line facilities it should also submit an application to the TTFCG and thus obtain TTFCG review prior to PEPCO or the carrier taking action to install its facilities. She added that PEPCO's schedule for attaching the antennas should not be an excuse to preclude TTFCG review or compliance with the County code and that Sprint must comply with the local regulations in this regard.

Dave Niblock stated he believed that this attachment was within the City limits of Gaithersburg.

Motion: Eric Carzon moved that the application be recommended conditioned on the verification that the siting was in the County. If the siting was within the City of Gaithersburg, the applicant had to follow the applicable City of Gaithersburg regulations. Pat Hanehan seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Jane Lawton asked the Tower Coordinator to contact the Gaithersburg City Manager to verify whether this location is within the City limits of Gaithersburg or not.

Action Item: Nextel Communications application to attach antennas at the 105' level of an existing PEPCO transmission line tower #100-S located at Goshen Road & Rothbury Drive in Gaithersburg (Application #200101-08).

Tim Krout summarized the application.

Motion: Dave Niblock moved the application be recommended. Eric Carzon seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: VoiceStream Wireless application to attach antennas at the 127' level of an existing 135' PEPCO transmission line tower #111- S located at 7600 Hadley Farms Drive in Gaithersburg (200101-07).

Tim Krout summarized the application. In response to a question, Dave Niblock stated that this site was not within the Gaithersburg City limits.

Eric Carzon asked if the revenue from these attachments would impact PEPCO customer rates. Don Collison replied that all revenue derived from telecommunications attachments to PEPCO facilities were returned to the PEPCO operating funds and, in effect, returned to PEPCO customers.

Motion: Eric Carzon moved the application be recommended. Pat Hanehan seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to place antennas at the 52' level in the steeple of the Hughes United Methodist church located at 10700 Georgia Avenue in Wheaton (Application #200102-03).

Tim Krout summarized the application. Eric Carzon asked if the power equipment would be located within the building. Mr. Hunnicutt explained the carrier would build a platform within the steeple which would house all of the transmission equipment as well as the power equipment.

Jane Lawton asked if any of the carriers had considered using the church at Bradley & Wisconsin, as it appeared to be in the process of erecting a new steeple. M.G. Diamond stated that the old steeple was simply being cleaned and there was no reconstruction.

Mr. Michal commented that he thought the carriers should be commended for their use of stealth applications such as this church attachment and the AT&T flagpole siting he had recently discovered at the St. John's School in Washington, DC. He encouraged group members to visit that facility to see an example of what could be done by the carriers to conceal antennas.

Motion: Dave Niblock moved the application be recommended. Eric Carzon seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Discussion Item - Relocation of PEPCO pole attachments: Mr. Hunnicutt stated he had received requests from carriers to relocate antennas from the PEPCO pole as recommended by the TTFCG to another PEPCO pole.

The first request was for the County's 800 MHz repeater station on Sangamore Road (Application #200009-10). He stated he had been advised that the County and PEPCO desired to relocate to the pole immediately adjacent to the pole originally proposed to simplify pole replacement. Don Collison stated the initial pole had numerous PEPCO facilities attached to it and that the new pole was simply a guy pole and would be easier to replace and attach antennas and equipment. Mr. Hunnicutt stated the County notified him they met with the residents around this location and that the proposal for the new pole was presented to them and they agreed that this was a better siting.

The Tower Coordinator stated that he recommended this revision.

Motion: Pat Hanehan recommended the proposed revision for the Sangamore Road siting. Dave Niblock seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Mr. Hunnicutt stated that the second change was for the AT&T microcell attachment to a PEPCO wooden pole on River Road near

the intersection of Bradley Boulevard (Application #200004-04). He stated that in response to complaints from residents at the original site, PEPCO and AT&T had agreed to relocate this microcell to a pole near the entrance to Congressional County Club, approximately four-tenths of a mile away. The Tower Coordinator recommended this revision.

Motion: Eric Carzon recommended the proposed revision for the River Road siting. Pat Hanehan Dave Niblock seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved with Pat Hanehan abstaining.

Mr. Hunnicutt stated he had also received notice from the County that the 800 MHz repeater station on Riverwood Drive (Application #200012-06) was being withdrawn because of the property owner's objection to replacement of the PEPCO pole at that site. He stated that the County was searching for a new location, so the group could expect another TTF CG application in order to meet the County's coverage needs in that vicinity.

Discussion Item - FCC Antenna Structure Registration: Mr. Hunnicutt distributed copies of press releases from the FCC to acknowledge that the FCC considered antenna registration a serious matter and that it had imposed fines on a number of carriers for failing to comply with the registration process. This reinforced the TTF CG policy of requiring applicants to provide ASR numbers where applicable.

Discussion Item - Text Amendment Update: Jim Michal asked for an update on the text amendments being reviewed by the Park and Planning Commission. Michal Ma stated that there was a work session scheduled for the end of the month and they expected the changes in final form by the end of March. Jane Lawton asked if there were any issues for the TTF CG to consider. Mr. Ma replied there were none at this point.

Discussion Item - Annual Site Plan Update: Mr. Hunnicutt reported that Verizon Wireless, AT&T Wireless, and Sprint PCS were overdue in providing information required for the annual plan submission.

M.G. Diamond asked if it was only necessary to submit an update to what had been submitted last year. Mr. Hunnicutt replied that the submission requirements were in the Executive Regulation and, basically, it is to provide what sites are existing, and what is proposed or planned for the next 12 months. He added that not all sites previously submitted are actually activated, so merely adding newly proposed sites did not provide enough information. He also noted that just a carrier site number and location on the map is not sufficient. They are to provide addresses, latitude and longitude, and identify the type of structure, also.

The next meeting of the TTF CG is scheduled for Wednesday, March 7, 2001 at 2:00 p.m. in the Consumer Affairs Conference Room #225 of the COB.