June 2, 2021

MINUTES OF TFCG MEETING

To: Distribution

From: TFCG Staff (CTC Technology & Energy)

A meeting of the Transmission Facility Coordinating Group (TFCG) was held on June 2, 2021. The following people were in attendance:

MEMBERS
Marjorie Williams (via video) TFCG Chair
Patricia Wolford (via video) DPS
Boyd Lawrence (via video) MCPS
Thomas Williamson (via video) DGS
Daryl Braithwaite (via video) Takoma Park
Martin Rookard (via video) WSSC
Michelle Grace (via video) M-NCP PC
Benjamin Berbert (via video) M-NCP PC

STAFF
Shawn Thompson (via video) CTC
Julie Elias (via video) CTC
Heather Elliot (via video) DTS
Zeena Oduro (via video) DTS

OTHER ATTENDEES
Javad Shayan (via video) DPS
Brian Kim (via video) DPS
Debbie Spielberg (via video) Office of the County Executive

Action Item: Meeting Minutes May 11th.

Motion: Michelle Grace moved that the May minutes be approved as written. Boyd Lawrence seconded the motion, and the motion was otherwise unanimously approved.

Action Item: Consent Agenda
Minutes of TFCG Meeting
Held June 2, 2021
Page 2 of 4

Consent Agenda

1. Application Number: 2021021397 Type: Minor Modification Received (date): 2/24/2021
   Revised: 3/15/2021
   Revised: 3/25/2021
   Revised: 4/19/2021
   Revised: 5/25/2021

   Applicant: Centerline Communications on behalf of T-Mobile
   Site Name/Location: Benmar Property/ 23000 Whites Ferry Rd, Dickerson
   Zoning Standard: AR
   Property Owner: Montgomery Mule LLC
   Description: T-Mobile will be installing (3) APXVAAL24_43 antennas, remove and replace three existing TMAs with (3) new 1A-KRY 112 489/2 TMAs, install (3) new RRU4449 B71 RRU's and install (1) 6 x 12 hybrid cable
   Tower Coordinator Recommendation: Recommended. Recommendation is subject to compliance with all applicable laws.

2. Application Number: 2021041413 Type: Minor Modification Received (date): 4/5/2021
   Revised: 4/22/2021
   Revised: 4/29/2021

   Applicant: Centerline Communication on behalf of T-Mobile
   Site Name/Location: Cedar Heights Water Tank/24213 Ridge Rd, Damascus
   Zoning Standard: RE-2C
   Property Owner: WSSC
   Description: Remove and replace three existing antennas with three new antennas, remove and replace three existing RRUs with three new RRUs, remove and replace three existing TMAs with three new TMAs, install three 6 x 12 hybrid lines
   Tower Coordinator Recommendation: Recommended on the condition the existing lease is amended to authorize the proposed modification.

Both applications were moved to the regular agenda.

Application Number: 2021021397:
Shawn Thompson summarized the scope of work and explained that the application meets the requirements of a minor modification by the County’s definition as well as the definition of a limited use. He also explained that the application additionally qualified as an “Eligible Facility Request” as defined by the FCC.

Shawn Thompson noted that the TFCG had received comments outlining concerns from residents of the County about this application last month. While many of the issues raised by residents were framed as errors or omissions, he noted that many of these same issues are brought up every month ahead of the scheduled TFCG meeting and are either not County requirements or outside the purview of the TFCG. The resident had concerns about the ownership of the structure and the
antenna inventory. After reaching out to the applicant to clarify, the applicant requested a temporary stay for the shot clock while they digest the comments and provide answers. The application was removed from last months agenda. After reviewing the materials and reaching out to the tower owner, the applicant revised their construction drawings and EME report to show the MCRCS antennas and they transposed the structure and landowner. CTC reviewed the revisions and find no unmet requirement of the County, and as such, recommended this application to the TFCG.

The residents submitted concerns again this month claiming that the original issues raised had not been addressed and raised several new issues that are beyond the purview of the TFCG. Shawn Thompson reviewed the original items raised and the Tower Coordinator’s response to the questions item by item. A question concerning the Special Exception for this site was raised. Shawn Thompson explained that CTC reviewed the Special Exception as part of their review and found there were no terms or conditions related to the proposed minor modification at hand. Debbie Spielberg asked if the Special Exception needed an administration review by the Hearing Examiner. Patricia Wolford explained that a number of years ago, the Hearing Examiner directed the TFCG to not send applicants to them unless the tower would be increasing in height, or the compound was increasing in size. As long as the application was to swap things out or add something in the existing compound, they don’t want to see it, unless the special exception calls out a specific number of antenna or equipment inventory. She explained that Zoning would not sign off on the permit until they receive notice from the BOA, but if the applicant is doing a minor modification that is not outside of the scope of the special exception, no further action or referral was needed.

A question concerning structural analysis was raised, and Shawn Thompson reminded the committee that the TFCG does not review applications for structural integrity, and that if a structural analysis would be required by the County, it would need to be submitted with their permit applications to DPS. If an applicant submits a structural analysis with their application, the Tower Coordinator will review it, but it is not a required document for the TFCG. The question of the antenna inventory was raised, and Shawn Thompson explained that the applicant provided a set of construction drawings stamped by a professional engineer, and the tower coordinator does not construct an independent inventory of current antennas to compare submitted drawings against.

A question was raised concerning providing a computational simulation for Maximum Effective Radiated Power (max ERP). Shawn Thompson explained that there is no County requirement to provide a computational simulation of the max ERP, and that the tower coordinator verified the max ERP listed on the application appears correct.

Debbie Spielberg asked about a question raised by residents concerning registration with the FAA. Shawn Thompson explained that the question of if the structure must be registered with the FCC is asked in the application, but that a structure needing registration would be limited to when a tower is being built when that analysis is requested by the FCC. Shawn Thompson noted that the FCC structure registration number question appeared to be missing from the application form, and that he would look into when that happened and reinstating that field in the application.

The resident also raised a question concerning the height of the tower as measured to be the height of the support structure, not support structure and antennas, and that to do so was somehow
deficient. Shawn Thompson cautioned the committee against conflating the height of the structure and the length of the antennas. The application asks for both the height of the support structure and the length of the antennas as separate data points, and he fails to see why we would want to be less detailed in our information gathering. When looking at the construction drawings submitted, the information is consistent with the application form, and there are no inaccuracies across documents. Looking at past applications, the TFCG has looked at the height in this way. If the County would like to change this, they would need to write this new definition into their rules.

Shawn Thompson summed up the explanation that what the committee had before them was a complete minor modification limited use application, and that the Tower Coordinator stands by their recommendation. Margie Williams asked if there were any further questions.

Michelle Grace asked about the review process for the committee. She noted this application had been on the consent agenda and was moved to the regular agenda against the normal protocol to answer questions raised by the public, not committee members. Debbie Spielberg said that if this was not the normal procedure, there needed to be a process where comments from the public are addressed, an opportunity for public participation. Michelle Grace lauded the members of the public for being engaged and submitting their questions. She noted that many of the questions received was because they don’t understand the telecommunications, so they are asking questions which is good. She posed to the committee why the committee was changing their internal process, interfering in a carrier’s right to swap out their own antennas that are allowed under the zoning code. She noted that the committee members understand the regulations to review these swap outs, where someone from the public might not.

Motion made by Patricia Wolford to recommend the application. Boyd Lawrence seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed.

**Application Number: 2021041413:**
Shawn Thompson summarized the application. Debbie Spielberg inquired as to WSSC’s internal review process, and if WSSC does their own structural analysis. Martin Rookard explained that WSSC has a telecom and cellular leasing engineer who reviews all of these applications to make sure everything is safe prior to entering into any kind of lease agreement with the carrier.

Motion made by Michelle Grace to recommend the application. Patricia Wolford seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned.

The next TFCG meeting is scheduled for July 7, 2021, at 2 p.m.