

To: Distribution  
From: Bob Hunnicutt, Tower Coordinator, Columbia  
Telecommunications

A meeting of the Telecommunications Transmission Facility  
Coordinating Group (TTF CG) was held on September 19, 2001. The  
following people were in attendance:

MEMBERS

Jane Lawton OCA (240) 777-3724 (FAX) 777-3770  
Pat Hanehan MCPS (301) 279-3609 (FAX) 279-3737  
Michael Ma M-NCPPC (301) 495-4595 (FAX) 495-1306  
Willem Van Aller DIST  
Dave Niblock DPS (240) 777-6252 (FAX) 777-6241  
Rey Junquera DPWT (240) 777-6252 (FAX) 777-6109

STAFF

Robert Hunnicutt CTC (410) 964-5700 (FAX) 964-6478  
Julie Modlin CTC (410) 964-5700 (FAX) 964-6478  
Amy Rowan OCA (240) 777-3684 (FAX) 777-3770

OTHER ATTENDEES

Lee Jarmon Nextel (410) 953-7440 (FAX) 953-7406  
Bill O'Brien VoiceStream (443) 570-1032  
Jim Michal Jackson & Campbell (202) 457-1652 (FAX) 457-1678  
Tom King Darnestown Assoc.  
Janet Brown Jackson, Campbell (202) 457-4263 (FAX) 457-1678  
Steve Weber VoiceStream (571) 227-0235  
David Primcin Sprint PCS (301) 564-1827  
Darien Manley M-NCP Police (301) 929-2731  
Greg James LCC for XM Satellite (703) 873-2751  
Carolyn Mitchell Cingular Wireless (410) 712-7754  
Mark Nelligan Citizen (301) 948-0020  
Arsenio Ibay AT&T Wireless (301) 586-4057  
Brian Parsons SBA for Nextel (410) 953-7441  
Jaymie Hanna American Tower (410) 729-5821  
George Carras Bechtel (301) 961-4465  
Ed Donohue Cole, Raywid/AT&T (202) 659-9750  
J. Stanley Sprint PCS (201) 362-4304  
Kurt Bitting Sprint PCS (201) 684-4450

Action Item: Approval of August 15, 2001 Minutes: Willem Van  
Aller noted that on page 4, where the County's 800 MHz system  
was referenced, the conflict with XM Satellite was related to  
interference with the County's 2200 MHz microwave system, not  
the 800 MHz system. Mr. Van Aller moved the minutes be  
approved as amended. Dave Niblock seconded and the minutes  
were unanimously approved.

Discussion Item - Response to letter from Chairman Hussmann:  
Jane Lawton distributed copies of a draft reply from the TTF CG to  
the Planning Board for the TTF CG members' review and comment.  
Ms. Lawton explained that the issues were as follows:

1) Proving or disproving alternative technologies - Ms. Lawton

stated that she tried to communicate to the Board what the TTFCG could do in reviewing applications.

2) Signal strength issues - Ms. Lawton stated that the letter expresses the group's concern about trying to define the appropriate signal level for the carriers.

3) Providing confidential information - Ms. Lawton stated that the letter states that we are prohibited from making public information which is provided to the TTFCG as confidential.

Ms. Lawton added that, as a result of the meeting she had with Judy Daniels and the Planning Board, the TTFCG agreed it would better communicate what each TTFCG review entailed. She stated that this letter was a start to better advise the Board of what the TTFCG could and could not do as part of its review process. She also said that she apprised the Board that the MFP Committee was also interested in these issues as well.

Discussion Item - Maryland Public Television (MPT) Digital Broadcast Tower: Ms. Lawton updated the TTFCG members of a MPT meeting she attended with State agencies, Carl Morgan of Nancy Dacek's office, and Bob Hunnicutt and Lee Afflerbach of CTC. She stated the meeting was held at MPT, and the State real estate office, the Natural Resources Police, the Fire and Rescue agencies, the State Police, and the MPT outside Counsel were present to explain the need for a new tower in Montgomery County. Ms. Lawton noted that the proposed new tower is to be erected in an agricultural preserve area at the State's truck weigh station on I-270, close to the Frederick County border. She noted that this tower must go through Mandatory Referral, and that the Park and Planning Commission wanted it to go through the TTFCG process as well. She stated that she had explained the TTFCG process and that Judy Daniels explained the Park and Planning Commission's Mandatory Referral process. She noted that it was a good meeting which facilitated a great start of the exchange of information. She said the State explained the value of the tower for State antennas. She explained to MPT what would be reviewed by the TTFCG during the evaluation of MPT's proposal for this new tower. She commented that she believed the TTFCG would need to see MPT's engineering study, among other items to be requested. Willem Van Aller noted that MPT should provide the TTFCG with the broadcast equivalent of RF propagation maps for review. Bob Hunnicutt noted he had spoken with the State, who had already obtained the MPT maps and would be providing them to the TTFCG. Mr. Van Aller noted that at a meeting he had with the State, they discussed whether MPT could use the 250' tower at the MCCF, but the State advised him that it would not work due to the County's height limitation imposed by the Council for that facility. Ms. Lawton added that when the MCCF tower was proposed and constructed, the County had no knowledge of MPT's intent to build a much taller tower in the same vicinity. Mr. Van Aller stated he understood that the first criteria the State uses in selecting a site for its antennas is based not the RF issues, but simply on where State land is available. Ms. Lawton stated there had been some articles in the up-county press about this tower, but so far she has not received any citizen calls regarding it.

Dave Niblock asked if the State had been lobbied to place the

tower in Montgomery County. Ms. Lawton stated that the State elected representatives had not taken a position on the tower but were also asking for more information.

Pat Hanehan asked if the State tower needs could be met using the new tower at the MCCF facility. Mr. Van Aller replied it probably could not be done at this point. Mr. Van Aller added that further construction at that site would be difficult because of the issues related to the Seneca Creek aquifer. Ms. Lawton stated that the State is cooperating with the TTF CG and that additional information would be forthcoming.

Consent Agenda Item: Bob Hunnicutt stated there were a number of items on the regular agenda that could be moved to the consent agenda. He would like to have items 1-13 considered for the consent agenda, unless any member wished to discuss one of these items. Jane Lawton stated she would like to review item #3, 11, 12, and 13.

Motion: Dave Niblock moved that the following consent agenda items be approved. Michael Ma seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

1. Cingular Wireless application to install 12 antennas at the 130' level of an existing 137' PEPCO transmission tower #660-N located at 11200 Deborah Drive in Rockville (Application #200108-01).

2. VoiceStream Wireless application to replace 6) 54" antennas with 6) 72" antennas at the same elevation level of 200' on an existing 220' lattice tower on the Izaak Walton property located at 18301 Waring Station Road in Germantown (Application #200108-02).

4. Cingular Wireless application to attach 12 antennas to the walls of the elevator shelter at the 134' level of an existing 12 story building located at 8830 Piney Branch Road in Silver Spring (Application #200108-04).

5. XM Satellite Radio application to install one directional antenna at the top and a satellite dish at the base of the 200' Colesville water tank located at 2201 Industrial Parkway in Silver Spring (Application #200108-06).

6. Sprint PCS application to attach 9 antennas to a 5' extension pole at the 150' level on an existing PEPCO transmission pole #85-R located in the 22400 block of Georgia Avenue in Brookeville (Application #200108-07).

7. Sprint PCS application to attach 9 antennas at the 125' level of an existing 130' PEPCO transmission pole #629-S located at Travilah Road and Dufief Mill Road in Gaithersburg (Application #200108-08).

8. Sprint PCS application to attach 9 antennas at the 141.5' level of an existing PEPCO transmission pole #163-S located at Route 108 east of Ashland Drive in Ashton (Application #200108-09).

9. Sprint PCS application to attach 9 antennas at the 155' level of an existing PEPCO transmission pole #681-W located at 1800

Wickham Road in Brookeville (Application #200108-10).

10. Sprint PCS application to attach 9 antennas at the 140' level of an existing PEPCO transmission pole #148-S located at 19800 New Hampshire Avenue in Brinklow (Application #200108-11).

Action Item: Nextel Communications application to attach 12 antennas to the penthouse walls at the 98' level of the existing 90' Holy Cross Hospital building located at 1500 Forest Glen Road in Silver Spring (Application #200108-03).

Jane Lawton summarized the application and asked what the consequences of placing these facilities on the hospital would be. Brian Parsons of Nextel replied that they were working on a lease agreement and had preliminary comments from Holy Cross Hospital. He stated that Nextel had submitted letters to Holy Cross which document that Nextel's equipment sited at two other hospitals did not interfere with those hospitals' equipment.

Jane Lawton asked if there was a heliport landing on the roof. Lt. Manley from the Park Police stated that any helicopters that deliver patients to the hospital land on Park property adjacent to the hospital, not on the building itself.

Dave Niblock commented that the application stated that the desired area of coverage was Bethesda, yet the hospital is in the Silver Spring area. Jane Lawton stated that we should make a correction that the service area to be covered would be Silver Spring and that correction should be noted on the record of action form.

Motion: Michael Ma moved the application be recommended with the comments as noted on the action form. Rey Junquera seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to attach 9 antennas at the 140' level of an existing 150' monopole on the Pyle property located at 211 Ednor Road in Silver Spring (Application #200108-13).

Julie Modlin summarized the application. Jane Lawton asked how many other carriers were already attached to this facility. Bob Hunnicutt noted this was the first set of antennas to co-locate on this AT&T monopole which had recently been constructed. Michael Ma asked if the equipment was to be located within the existing compound or if there would be an additional lease signed with the property owner. The Sprint representative stated that the equipment would be located in the existing compound.

Motion: Willem Van Aller moved the application be recommended. Dave Niblock seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to attach 9 antennas at the 90' level of an existing 140' monopole at the Gymkhana Club located at 14100 River Road in Rockville (Application #200108-14).

Julie Modlin summarized the application. Jane Lawton recalled that this had been a controversial site and asked if the equipment was

to be located within the existing shelter and if the tower was to be altered. Ms. Modlin stated that the equipment would be in the existing shelter area. Mr. Hunnicutt said that with the last attachment to the site, AT&T had considered raising the height of the tower but that has not been pursued and these antennas are going at a lower elevation.

Motion: Rey Junquera moved the application be recommended. Michael Ma seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to attach 9 antennas at the 170' level of an existing 180' lattice tower at the BSA Troop 52 property located at 16100 Darnestown Road in Dawsonville (Application #200108-15).

Julie Modlin summarized the application. Jane Lawton asked if there were any structural concerns at this location. Bob Hunnicutt replied that the Tower Coordinator did not have concerns with this attachment.

Motion: Dave Niblock moved the application be recommended. Willem Van Aller seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: AT&T Wireless application to construct a new 134' monopole on the Barnhart property located at Hawkins Creamery Road and Laytonsville Road in Gaithersburg (Application #200105-01).

Bob Hunnicutt stated that the recommendation for this application was written to provide more information for the Park and Planning Commission, as requested. He asked the members to take a moment to review the extensive comments before Julie Modlin summarized the application.

Rey Junquera asked if the FAA issues had been resolved. Bob Hunnicutt explained that they had, despite the somewhat confusing way in which the recommendation text explained it. Mr. Hunnicutt apologized for the confusion, noting that the paragraph was out of order.

Ms. Modlin summarized the application, and noted that this site was linked to another AT&T site, the Stanley property, which will be coming before the TTFCG for review in the near future. She stated that in reviewing this application, the Tower Coordinator looked at a number of different RF propagation maps, including ones using existing PEPCO facilities, and RF analysis for the proposed monopole at the lower elevation. She noted that the alternatives did not provide the desired coverage in the service area and would complicate signal handoffs from the existing antennas to the south and to the proposed site at the Stanley property. Ed Donohue mentioned that the Stanley site application had been postponed for review by the Park and Planning Commission until November. He also noted that the Park and Planning Commission hearing on this application was scheduled for October 11, 2001.

Jane Lawton asked if drive tests had been conducted. Bob

Hunnicuttt replied they had not been done for this site.

Dave Niblock asked for clarification that the FAA did approve the monopole at the 134' height. Julie Modlin stated that it had and that RF maps for that lower elevation had been submitted and reviewed. In response to questions, Ms. Modlin stated that the Tower Coordinator does not generate the RF maps but requests that the carriers generate the RF models and provide the results to the Tower Coordinator for review.

Mark Nelligan, an Etchison community resident, stated that he had spoken with a number of pilots from the nearby airport that expressed a desire to have a light placed on this monopole. He asked if a light was presently proposed for this structure. Willem Van Aller stated it probably was not proposed, because if a structure is under 200' it is not required to have a light. Ed Donohue stated that the carrier would light the monopole if the County wanted it, but neither the FAA nor the Maryland AA require one. Rey Junquera stated he did not think we should endorse the lights because they are objectionable to residents.

Jane Lawton asked why the monopole could not be located nearer to the wooded area of the property to better conceal the structure from the community. Ed Donohue stated in order to do that, they would have to cut down trees in the area. Ms. Lawton stated she thought it would be appropriate for the monopole to be farther into the woods and that it should also utilize a tree monopole design.

Mr. Nelligan asked why AT&T could not use the PEPCO facilities approximately one mile away. Julie Modlin replied that the PEPCO facilities were one of the alternate sites investigated by the Tower Coordinator, and one for which they had requested additional RF propagation maps.

Mr. Nelligan stated that area residents presently have satisfactory service with Verizon Wireless and Cingular, and although he did not know where their antennas were, he was sure there were other existing structures which could be used in lieu of this new monopole. He added that he was not comfortable with the fact that the TTF CG relies on the carrier's RF propagation maps and does not conduct an independent RF analysis as part of our review. He commented that he was not convinced that this site was necessary.

Bob Hunnicutt explained that Ed Donohue had offered to meet separately with Mr. Nelligan and other area residents to privately review AT&T system design and the RF propagation maps they had submitted to the County as confidential information. In response to a question of whether the Tower Coordinator considered the coverage by other carriers in the area, Mr. Hunnicutt replied that coverage by other carriers is not part of the application review process for an application. He noted that only the coverage needs of the applicant are considered.

Jim Michal commented that the carriers do not construct new towers if there are other existing structures nearby to which they can attach their antennas because of the excessive cost and

burden on the carrier to go through the process of siting a new facility in the community. He added that each carrier has a different business plan and different coverage requirements.

Julie Modlin stated that the Tower Coordinator could review other information we may have regarding other carriers' service in the area. Jane Lawton stated she was not satisfied with the engineering review on this application.

Tom King asked the Tower Coordinator if they conducted a site visit to look for alternative existing structures. Bob Hunnicutt explained that they conduct a site visit, they drive the surrounding area, and, in addition to a database search, perform a visual survey of the general vicinity to look for alternate existing structures. He added that the survey includes looking for existing structures like silos, power company utility poles or transmission lines, church steeples, and other tall buildings that may be present. Julie Modlin added that, in this case, there were no other tall structures nearby except the PEPCO transmission lines, which we investigated and found them not to meet coverage requirements.

Mr. Nelligan stated he was still skeptical because the industry provides the RF maps. Ms. Lawton stated that while his belief that the monopole is unnecessary may be genuine, County law does not prohibit the Special Exception process for siting facilities in this zone.

The Tower Coordinators were asked if they could generate independent RF propagation maps. Ms. Modlin explained that they could if they had the software and had all of the detailed information regarding the carriers' networks, such as the engineering details of the transmitters, antennas, phones, etc. She said that there were a number of different RF software packages on the market ranging in price from \$3,000 to \$20,000 and she noted that the carriers use a variety of software to generate their RF propagation maps.

Bob Hunnicutt added that in analyzing a carrier's RF maps, if there are aspects that seem out of the ordinary to the Tower Coordinators, they question the RF results, and in some cases, ask for additional information or additional RF maps. He stated that they look for consistency in the maps, and in some cases, they even compare them for accuracy to maps that have been provided for related sites that have been previously reviewed for other applications. He noted that if there are questions about the powering, the elevation, or other such factors used in the modeling process, the Tower Coordinator asks the carrier for clarification. He noted that if the group wanted the Tower Coordinator to generate RF maps, the additional cost to the County was not just related to the cost of the software but to the additional time it takes to load the programs, run the models, and perform the analysis. Michael Ma stated it might not be necessary to do that for each application, but only for applications to construct a new facility.

Mr. Nelligan asked if it mattered how high the structure was, because he knew there were some very tall structures in

Damascus that could perhaps cover this area. Julie Modlin explained that height was an issue, and that generally, if antennas are at a higher elevation they can cover a larger area, but a limiting factor was the low power of the handset, which could not be too far away from the receiving antenna or the system would not work properly. The AT&T engineer agreed with Ms. Modlin.

In response to Mr. Nelligan's request, Jane Lawton suggested that the meeting be closed to the public, except for Mr. Nelligan, so that AT&T could provide a more detailed explanation of its network and service in this area.

Discussion Item - Special Emergency Cellular Number for Park Police: Lt. Manley of the Park Police explained that over the past two years he had been working to develop an emergency call system similar to the #77 number used to directly connect with the Maryland State Police. He stated that in Prince George's and Montgomery County the Park Police have 50,000 acres of parkland used by approximately one million patrons each year. He noted there are over 100 miles of trails from which people may call for assistance at any location along the trail or within park property. He explained that when calls go into a 911 or #77 call center, and those police are dispatched to the park, they often do not know where within the park the person needing assistance might be found. The Park Police, who are very familiar with the location of facilities, trails, and the general landmarks in the parks, could be much more responsive to calls for emergency assistance. Consequently, if such a number were available for the Park Police, citizens would receive the response they need. Lt. Manley stated that Verizon and Nextel had agreed to initiate such a service but could only do so if all of the cellular carriers agreed to participate. He commented that he was hoping to address all of the carriers at today's meeting since the TTFCG meeting was a central gathering point. In closing, he noted that cell phones are becoming more important in the park areas because pay phones are being removed and are no longer as prevalent as they used to be because of the proliferation of cell phones.

Ed Donohue stated this was the first he had heard of this effort and would pass this information along to the representatives he deals with at AT&T. Jane Lawton commented that she believed this was a very positive project and that the TTFCG would be glad to assist Lt. Manley. She suggested that he provide his business card to the representatives at today's meeting. Michael Ma commented that perhaps the Planning Commission could make it a requirement for carriers who wish to site their facilities on park property to participate in the project.

Lt. Manley also stated that he was the communications officer for the Park Police and was also interested in asking the carriers to assist them by permitting attachment of Park Police antennas on their towers or monopoles where additional radio coverage was presently lacking. He stated that since he has recently obtained a copy of TTFCG database, he would be able to identify any specific locations he believed might be suitable for additional antennas. He noted that the Park Police used small whip antennas and a very small metal equipment box the size of a typical stereo receiver. Jim Michal added that, like AT&T, he would be happy to make this

issue known to the carriers that he represents, and asked Lt. Manley for a list of sites that he might be able to present to management.

Jane Lawton asked Lt. Manley to let Mr. Van Aller know of additional sites, as he was responsible for the County's tower facilities.

Discussion Item - FEMA application: Jim Michal asked that the Tower Coordinator schedule the Sprint application to attach to the FEMA tower on the next TTFCG agenda. He noted that the Tower Coordinator had asked him for information regarding other existing antennas and communications facilities on the tower but FEMA had declined to provide that information. He stated he did not believe that should be a reason to hold up the Sprint application.

The meeting was closed to discuss AT&T's confidential design materials for the Barnhart property application.

Action Item: AT&T Wireless application to construct a new 140' monopole on the Mullinix farm property located at 11604 Piedmont Road in Clarksburg (Application #200105-02).

Bob Hunnicutt summarized the application and the alternatives that the Tower Coordinator had suggested in discussions with AT&T. He noted alternatives included the Cedar Heights water tank, use of a single repeater, if necessary, to fill in any gaps to the south of the service area, and use of a stealth siting on the steeple of the church adjacent to the proposed site. Mr. Hunnicutt stated they had questioned some of the RF maps provided because they appeared to incorrectly show the coverage from the Brink Road water tank to the south. After these options had been pursued and analyzed, it was concluded that none of them would provide coverage sufficient to meet the carrier's needs in the service area.

Michael Ma asked if the monopole could be reduced in height. Mr. Ibay, explained that at 150' there were gaps in service coverage to the north along Route 27.

Motion: Willem Van Aller moved the application be recommended. Rey Junquera seconded the motion, and it was approved with Pat Hanehan abstaining.

A special TTFCG meeting to only discuss the AT&T/Barnhart property application is scheduled for October 3, 2001 at 2:00 p.m. in the Consumer Affairs Conference Room #225 of the COB.

The next meeting of the TTFCG is scheduled for Wednesday, October 10, 2001 at 2:00 p.m. in the 6th floor conference room of the COB.