

## MINUTES OF TTF CG MEETING

To: Distribution

From: Bob Hunnicutt, Tower Coordinator, Columbia Telecommunications

A meeting of the Telecommunications Transmission Facility Coordinating Group (TTF CG) was held on March 1, 2006. The following people were in attendance:

### MEMBERS

Pat Hanehan MCPS (301) 279-3609

Martin Rookard WSSC (301) 206-8979

David Niblock DPS (240) 777-6252

Jennifer Bryant OMB (240) 777-2761

Helen Xu DTS (240) 777-2804

Marjorie Williams DTS (240) 777-3762

### STAFF

Robert Hunnicutt CTC (410) 964-5700

David Doulong CTC (410) 964-5700

### OTHER ATTENDEES

Delisa Coleman Nextel

Mike Budde T-Mobile

Erin Galvin T-Mobile

Jasim Jafri T-Mobile

Vanessa Cooper T-Mobile

Michelle Rhodes WFI

Action Item - Meeting Minutes: Martin Rookard moved that the minutes be approved as written. David Niblock seconded the motion and the minutes were unanimously approved.

### Consent Agenda Items:

1. Nextel application to relocate twelve 48" panel antennas from the 125' level to the 200' level on a 480' guyed lattice tower located at 16700 Barnesville Road in Barnesville (Application #200512-03).
2. Nextel application to relocate twelve 48" panel antennas from the 106' level to the 130' level on a 150' monopole located at 16501 Shady Grove Road in Gaithersburg (Application #200512-04).
3. T-Mobile application to attach nine 54" panel antennas at the 132' level on an existing 140' water tank at 9500 MacArthur Boulevard in Bethesda (Application #200602-02).
4. T-Mobile application to attach nine 54" panel antennas at the 170' level on a 190' monopole on the Clement property located at 25217 Peach Tree Road in Clarksburg (Application #200602-03).
5. T-Mobile application to attach up to nine 54" panel antennas at the 136' level a 124' high PEPCO transmission line tower #674-E at 5200 Olney-Laytonsville Road in Olney (Application #200602-04).
6. T-Mobile application to attach nine 53" panel antennas at the 97' level on a 100' high Takoma Business Center office building located at 6930 Carroll Avenue in Takoma Park (Application #200602-06).
7. T-Mobile application to attach nine 54" panel antennas at the 152" level on a 275' lattice tower on the Carver property located at 2647 University Boulevard in Wheaton (Application #200602-07).
8. FiberTower application to attach two 3' microwave dish antennas at the 172' and 173' level atop the penthouse on a 165' high Rock Creek Terrace apartment building located at 12630 Veirs Mill Road in Silver

Spring (Application #200602-08).

9. FiberTower application to attach two 3' microwave dish antennas at the 120' level on a 180' tower on Fire Station #31 property located at 12100 Darnestown Road in Gaithersburg (Application #200602-09).

10. FiberTower application to attach one 13" microwave dish antenna at the 70' level and one 3' microwave dish antenna at the 165' level on a 185' monopole on the Gate of Heaven Cemetery property located at 13801 Georgia Avenue in Silver Spring (Application #200602-10).

11. FiberTower application to colocate on an existing tower on Sandy Spring VFD #40 property located at 16911 Georgia Avenue in Olney (Application #200602-13).

12. FiberTower application to attach one 13" microwave dish antenna at the 145' level on a 180' high monopole on Knights of Columbus property located at 17001 Overhill Road in Gaithersburg (Application #200602-14).

Motion: Bob Hunnicutt announced that the first item on the consent agenda was withdrawn by the applicant. Martin Rookard moved that the remaining consent agenda items be recommended. Pat Hanehan seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: FiberTower application to colocate on an existing 140' monopole on Gymkhana Club property located at 14100 River Road in Potomac (Application #200602-12).

Bob Hunnicutt explained that this item would have been on the consent agenda except that there were a number of different alternate locations for the equipment associated with this siting. He stated that one of the locations was outside the existing equipment area. Since this site was permitted by a Special Exception which limits the equipment area, any additional space used outside the equipment area will likely require a modification to the Special Exception. Consequently, the Tower Coordinator's recommendation was conditioned on FiberTower obtaining any modification to the Special Exception that may be required.

Motion: David Niblock moved that the application be recommended. Helen Xu seconded the motion and it was unanimously recommended.

Action Item: Nextel application to construct a new 100' monopole at the Storage USA property located at 19500 Frederick Road in Germantown, and attach 12) 48" antennas at the 100' level (Application #200511-02).

David Doulong noted that Nextel needs this site to add capacity to the area and that they had submitted RF contour maps showing the calculated coverage at 100 feet, 75 feet, and 50 feet. He said that the map showing antennas at 50 feet illustrated a significant difference in coverage from antennas at the 100 foot level. However, he noted that the map showing coverage with antennas at 75 feet showed little difference in coverage from antennas at 100 feet, and he believed that the height of the monopole could be lowered to 75 feet and still meet the coverage objective.

David Niblock asked if lowering the height would still permit colocation. Bob Hunnicutt stated that it would depend on the coverage objectives of future colocators. Pat Hanehan asked if any other carriers were interested in placing antennas in this area, based on the annual plans. Mr. Hunnicutt said that most of the other carriers already had antennas in that area. Mike Budde stated that he could assure the TTFCG that T-Mobile would be interested in attaching their antennas once this monopole was constructed and that they would prefer to be as high as possible at the 90 foot level. Mr. Hanehan noted that setback issues had been of particular concern to residents, and asked if this monopole met setback requirements. Mr. Hunnicutt explained that application did meet the commercial zone setback requirement of one-half foot for every one foot of structure height. He also noted that since this was a by-right placement, the requirement for maintaining a distance of 300 feet from the nearest dwelling did not apply.

Motion: Pat Hanehan moved that the application be recommended as proposed at 100 feet. David Niblock seconded the motion and it was unanimously recommended.

Discussion Item - Letter from Ed Donohue: Margie Williams distributed copies of a letter transmitted via e-mail just prior to the start of today's meeting in which Mr. Donohue raised concern about the timeliness of processing applications. She asked the group what an appropriate response might be to the items raised in

the letter. David Niblock stated that, based on his experience working in the Department of Permitting Services for the County, he knew that there were always people that would complain about how long it may take to process a permit. He thought this was a similar situation and that the process seemed to be working fine.

Ms. Williams suggested that the group ask the Tower Coordinator to review the letter and prepare statistics that show the TTFCG's record for application processing times. She stated that she understood it was currently only about 30 days from start to finish. Jennifer Bryant asked if there was a specified time for completing review of an application. Bob Hunnicutt stated that there was a goal of completing an application within 60 days. Martin Rookard stated that it appears as though the Tower Coordinator is well within the limits of that goal.

Mike Budde stated that the reason for the letter was not the fact that, over time, the average may be low, but that during the first three months of 2006, a T-Mobile application had taken longer than that and had missed making today's agenda. Ms. Williams stated that just because an application was submitted by the deadline does not guarantee that it will be on the next agenda. She added that if the Tower Coordinator needed additional information to complete his review he should request it (and the carrier should provide it) so that the TTFCG can conduct a thorough review of all aspects of each application.

Mr. Hunnicutt said that he would provide statistics showing the past and recent experience in application process time, and noted that this matter had come up once before at the time the filing deadlines were first established. He said he would review the files and the minutes from those meetings and report his findings to the group when he reports on the processing statistics. He added that if there were any changes to the process that the group felt necessary, he would be happy to make them.

Pat Hanehan stated that if the Tower Coordinator typically requested RF maps at elevations lower than those proposed by the carrier, perhaps it could be made a requirement of the submission. Mr. Hunnicutt stated that was often the case with new towers to document that the structure height proposed was the height required to meet coverage objectives. He reminded the group that there have been cases when carriers have lowered the height of new structures, thereby minimizing the impact in the community. Mr. Budde suggested that if it would help, the carriers could submit RF at the desired level and at four 20-foot increments from the ground up.

Helen Xu noted that the Tower Coordinator and the TTFCG did have the authority to ask for additional information they believed necessary to complete the review process. She said that if obtaining the additional information delayed review of the application, it was just part of the process. Ms. Xu said that perhaps additional tower staff may be required. Mr. Hunnicutt said that could be accomplished, but it would likely result in increased costs to the County. Mr. Niblock stated that the Department of Permitting Services is experiencing the same problem, and as a result, the fees for permit applications that require site plan review have been increased by 25 percent to cover the increased costs. He suggested that perhaps the fees for tower review should be increased as well.

Mr. Hanehan noted that since it was important for the group to consider colocation, height may be a consideration. Ms. Williams noted that there had been many questions raised by the community regarding some of the new structures on school properties, and asked if the complaints had been regarding the structure height. Mr. Hanehan stated that, generally, residents object to a monopole on school property regardless of the height. He said that the specific complaints he recalled had to do with meeting setback requirements, and that he could not recall the height of a structure as having ever been an issue.

Ms. Williams asked the Tower Coordinator to review Mr. Donohue's letter and provide statistics on application processing time and any additional comments that he thought would be helpful to the group in preparing a reply to Mr. Donohue's letter. Mr. Hunnicutt agreed to provide that information. Martin Rookard stated that he did not believe a response was necessary. Mr. Hunnicutt said that he would make any modifications that the group thought warranted. He said it would be simple to insert additional requirements in the instructions for the applications.

Discussion Item - Next Meeting: The next meeting of the TTFCG is scheduled for Wednesday, April 5, 2006 at 2 p.m. in the second floor conference room #225 of the COB.