

To: Distribution

From: Bob Hunnicutt, Tower Coordinator, Columbia
Telecommunications

A meeting of the Telecommunications Transmission Facility
Coordinating Group (TTF CG) was held on August 15, 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
Eric Carzon OMB (240) 777-2763 (FAX) 777-2756
Dave Niblock DPS (240) 777-6252 (FAX) 777-6241

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
Deane Mellander VoiceStream (240) 264-8658 (FAX) 264-8610
Jim Michal Jackson & Campbell (202) 457-1652 (FAX) 457-1678
M.G. Diamond Verizon Wireless (301) 951-1564
Tom King Darnestown Assoc.
Janet Brown Jackson, Campbell (202) 457-4263 (FAX) 457-1678
Maureen Kane Smith VoiceStream
Karl Nelson VoiceStream (410) 332-8663 (FAX) 332-8184
Tim Boyce Sprint PCS (201) 684-4135
Abiy Zewde VoiceStream
Carol Watson VoiceStream
Patrick Sasu VoiceStream
Jonathan Small VoiceStream (443) 570-1005
David Primcin Sprint PCS (301) 564-1827
Darien Manley M-NCP Police (301) 929-2731
Greg James LCC for XM Satellite
Geraldine McCarthy LCC for XM Satellite

Discussion Item - Maryland Public Television Broadcast Tower: Jane
Lawton opened the meeting by advising the group that she had
received copies of correspondence between the State of Maryland and
the M-NCPPC regarding Maryland Public Television's (MPT) plan to erect
a 450' lattice tower along I-270 in the Clarksburg vicinity to
accommodate its digital TV antennas. She stated that this proposal was
first approved by the M-NCPPC, but after further review it was
determined that this was not a replacement tower, as originally
proposed, but a new tower to be erected in Montgomery County. It is a
replacement tower only in the sense that it is a new tower being
erected to replace a similar tower in Frederick County, which is going to
be dismantled. It was now her understanding that this proposal would
go through Mandatory Referral, that the State had been advised of this,
and that the M-NCPPC would like the TTF CG to review this application.

Pat Hanehan asked if there was a possibility for MPT to co-locate antennas on an existing structure. Ms. Lawton replied that it might be possibility. Willem Van Aller noted that the tower was to be erected on State property at the truck weigh station along I-270.

Action Item: Approval of July 11, 2001 Minutes: Pat Hanehan noted that the text in middle of the second paragraph on page 9 was confusing and appeared to be redundant with a similar statement made in a previous page. Bob Hunnicutt stated that the same comments were made twice regarding two different applications. Ms. Lawton suggested the language be amended to add the words "because it is on M-NCPPC property". Dave Niblock moved the minutes be approved as amended. Michael Ma seconded and the minutes were unanimously approved.

Consent Agenda Item: Michael Ma requested that item #4 be discussed. Eric Carzon requested that item #8 be discussed. Jane Lawton requested that item #13 be discussed.

XM Satellite Radio revised application to attach a panel antenna 6' above the Spectrasite monopole rather than placing a proposed whip antenna 13' above the monopole located at the Knights of Columbus at 17001 Overhill Road in Gaithersburg (Application #200003-15-revised).

XM Satellite Radio revised application to attach a panel antenna rather than a whip antenna on the roof of the Washingtonian building located at 9701 Fields Road in Gaithersburg (Application #200004-01-revised).

XM Satellite Radio revised application to attach a panel antenna rather than a whip antenna on the Airpark water tank located at 20511 Woodfield Drive in Gaithersburg (Application #200008-01-revised).

Nextel Communications application to attach antennas at the 122' level of an existing 130' PEPCO transmission tower #29-N located at 19500 Peach Tree Road in Poolesville (Application #200106-01).

Sprint PCS application to attach antennas at the 168' level of an existing 178' monopole on the Weitzer property located at 14705 Sugarland Road in Poolesville (Application #200107-01).

VoiceStream Wireless application to replace 6) 54" antennas with 6) 72" antennas at the same location on the penthouse at the 125' level of the Renaissance Plaza Apartments building located at 14000 Castle Boulevard in Silver Spring (Application #200107-05).

VoiceStream Wireless application to attach antennas at the 38' level of the existing WSSC Cedar Heights water tank located at 24213 Ridge Road in Damascus (Application #200107-09).

VoiceStream Wireless application to attach antennas at the 75' level of an existing 160' monopole on MDOT property located at I-495 & Connecticut Avenue in Kensington (Application #200107-10).

Motion: Michael Ma moved the remaining items on the consent agenda be recommended. Eric Carzon seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved. (insert XM conditions here: 800 MHz

conflict/FCC commercial license)

Regular Agenda Items:

Action Item: XM Satellite Radio revised application to attach 2 panel antennas rather than 3 panel antennas at the 140' level of the Sherwood High School monopole located at 300 Olney-Sandy Spring Road in Sandy Spring (Application #20010101-revised).

Michael Ma stated he wanted to clarify whether the satellite dish was still going to be attached to this structure. Julie Modlin replied that there would still be a satellite dish and that this application was simply to attach 2 antennas instead of 3 antennas. Eric Carzon asked if the XM Satellite representative could give a general explanation of the changes that XM was proposing for the several applications on today's agenda.

Greg James, representing XM Satellite, stated that they now have two satellites launched and were obtaining better coverage in the County than expected. He stated that some of the existing sites would interfere with one another because of overlapping coverage. He noted that XM had re-examined the types of antennas it was using at the county locations and that the orientation of antennas had been re-evaluated. For example, in some cases, omni-directional antennas were being replaced with panel antennas to better focus and direct transmission, or the number of panels was being reduced. In response to questions, Mr. James explained that some panels were being re-oriented to limit the focus of the transmissions to particular areas, or the number of panels were being reduced in response to the improved coverage provided by the satellites. He stated that the mounting poles were 22"-42" long and the antennas were approximately 6" wide and 2'-4' long. He stated that for the Sherwood High School site, the equipment ground space would not change and since those antennas had not been installed, they were simply reducing the number of antennas to be installed. Mr. Van Aller asked how many repeater sites there would be in the county. Mr. James replied he was not sure but thought it would be approximately 10 locations, but that he would verify the number and get back to Mr. Van Aller. Mr. Van Aller stated that was enough sites to warrant his continued interest in addressing any conflicts that may arise between the XM Satellite service and the County's 800 MHz public safety system.

Julie Modlin noted that the Tower Coordinator's recommendation for this application was conditioned on resolution of any conflict with the County's 800 MHz system, as was recommended the first time this siting was reviewed. She noted the recommendation was also conditioned on XM obtaining a commercial license from the FCC to provide commercial service.

Motion: Willem Van Aller moved the application be recommended conditioned on XM resolving any conflicts with the County's 800 MHz system and obtaining a commercial license from the FCC. Michael Ma seconded the motion and it was approved with Pat Hanehan abstaining.

Action Item: VoiceStream Wireless application to replace 6) 54" antennas with 6) 72" antennas at the same location on the penthouse at the 68' level of the Sunrise Apartments building located at 19310 Club House Road in Gaithersburg (Application #200107-06).

Eric Carzon stated that from his review of the drawings, it appeared that the antennas would be considerably higher than a typical rooftop installation. Julie Modlin noted that these antennas were replacements for the existing antennas on the same extension poles. Michael Ma asked if there was a code limitation for the height of antennas above the roof. Bob Hunnicutt stated that there were currently no height limits in the code and the TTF CG had identified that as an area for possible legislative changes to specify height limits. Dave Niblock stated that in the definition for antennas, there was a 15' limit on the length of a whip antenna.

Motion: Pat Hanehan 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 108' level of an existing 130' tree monopole at the Avenel Golf Course located at 10010 Oaklyn Drive in Potomac (Application #200107-08).

Jane Lawton asked how many carriers were approved to attach to this monopole. Bob Hunnicutt stated that VoiceStream was the sixth carrier to attach to this facility, that the applicant had provided a structural analysis that verified antennas could be safely attached, and that there was space within the existing compound for the carrier's equipment. Maureen Kane Smith commented that in accordance with the structural analysis, VoiceStream were using somewhat smaller cables than usual and confirmed that the equipment would be in the camouflaged equipment compound.

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

Action Item: Cingular Wireless application to attach antennas at the 150' level of an existing 225' lattice tower on Izaak Walton League property located at 18301 Waring Station Road in Germantown (Application #200107-03).

Julie Modlin summarized the application and noted that the recommendation was conditioned on any necessary modifications to the Special Exception for the additional ground space. She also noted that there was an external generator proposed for this site, which was something the TTF CG did not usually see. She added that the generator would be tested once a week for approximately one-half hour, but did not believe noise from the generator tests would be an issue as this was also a firing range site, and the area was heavily wooded.

Motion: Eric Carzon moved the application be recommended conditioned on obtaining any necessary modifications to the Special Exception. Pat Hanehan seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: VoiceStream wireless application to attach 6 antennas at the 135' level of an existing 150' monopole at the Tri-State Quarry located at 8200 Seven Locks Road in Bethesda (Application #200107-07).

Julie Modlin summarized the application and noted that the Special

Exception had been conditioned on Nextel notifying the Board of Appeals of each additional carrier attaching to this facility. Consequently, the Tower Coordinator's recommendation was conditioned on obtaining any necessary modifications to the Special Exception. She added that the recommendation was also conditioned on VoiceStream providing a structural analysis to the Department of Permitting Services that verifies attachment may be safely accomplished and providing a copy to the TTFCG prior to construction because the original structural analysis for the monopole stated it could only support 2 triangular antenna arrays. Jane Lawton asked if Dave Niblock would check that had been done prior to issuing a building permit. Dave Niblock agreed to do so.

Jane Lawton asked if the equipment was going within the existing equipment compound. Julie Modlin noted that it was within the compound. Jane Lawton noted that it appeared as though this was a location for the carrier to provide landscaping around the base of the monopole. Deane Mellander stated that landscaping would be difficult since the site was at a rock quarry.

Motion: Dave Niblock moved the application be recommended conditioned on compliance with the Special Exception terms and providing the Department of Permitting Services with a structural analysis which verifies that attachment may be safely accommodated and providing a copy to the TTFCG prior to construction. Eric Carzon seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: VoiceStream Wireless application to pole mount antennas on the penthouse roof at the 46' level of an existing 25' building located at 14301 Layhill Road in Silver Spring (Application #200105-06).

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to flush mount antennas on the penthouse walls at the 30' level of an existing 25' building located at 14301 Layhill Road in Silver Spring (Application #200107-04).

Julie Modlin explained that she would present both the VoiceStream and Sprint PCS applications together as they were both proposals to attach to the same building. She noted that these attachments were Special Exceptions because the building height was less than the 30' required by the code. Dave Niblock confirmed that the building was too short to be a by-right attachment.

Michael Ma asked if there were any taller buildings in the vicinity that could be used for co-location. Bob Hunnicutt stated that there were no taller buildings, although he had asked both carriers to consider use of the Argyle Country Club monopole located relatively close to this location. He added that RF analysis submitted by the carriers demonstrated that coverage from the Argyle Country Club would not meet their service requirements. Michael Ma asked about the height of the buildings in the shopping center across the street from this site. Bob Hunnicutt distributed photos showing that the buildings in the shopping center were even shorter than the proposed attachment site.

Jane Lawton noted that this would be an excellent location for the VoiceStream antennas to be enclosed within a flagpole, and asked when

the Special Exception hearing for this application was scheduled. Deane Mellander stated that VoiceStream had not filed for Special Exception yet.

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 antennas at the top of a new 150' monopole to be constructed and owned by WSSC at the Potomac Water Filtration Plant property located at 12200 River Road in Potomac (Application #200107-02).

Julie Modlin summarized the application and noted that the top of the WSSC building was full and could not accommodate additional antennas. She explained that the Tower Coordinator had asked Sprint to provide RF analysis for use of the Gymkhana Club monopole. The RF analysis demonstrated that the Gymkhana Club was too far from the proposed location to provide the desired coverage, and the carrier was already considering attachment to that monopole as a means to provide coverage in that vicinity. She noted that this was a difficult siting area as there were few tall structures in the general vicinity, which was surrounded by many residential properties.

Jane Lawton asked for verification that the WSSC roof was full. Bob Hunnicutt stated he had a copy of a letter from WSSC that confirmed that there was no space on the roof to accommodate additional antennas and there was no space within the building to accommodate additional equipment.

Jim Michal displayed an aerial photograph of the site showing the location of the monopole. Jane Lawton stated she was familiar with the area and believed this would be a good location for a tree monopole. Mr. Van Aller stated that given the heavily wooded nature of the area, he did not believe the monopole would be obtrusive. The Tower Coordinator agreed and stated that is why it had not recommended that the carrier consider a tree monopole. Pat Hanehan noted that if there were concerns about the monopole being obtrusive, that issue could be discussed at the Mandatory Referral hearing.

Michael Ma asked who would own the monopole. Bob Hunnicutt explained that WSSC would own the monopole, and once erected, it would be able to accommodate additional carriers in this hard-to-site area. Jim Michal noted that Sprint would pay for the monopole but WSSC would own it.

Motion: Eric Carzon moved the application be recommended and suggested that Sprint consider use of a tree monopole. Dave Niblock seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: VoiceStream Wireless application to construct a new 150' monopole on the Hungerford property located at 14615 Clopper Road in Boyds (Application #200105-09).

Julie Modlin summarized the application and noted that the Tower Coordinator suggested the applicant consider a tree monopole to better conceal the antennas from the recreational area at the adjacent Black

Hill Regional Park. Karl Nelson of VoiceStream stated that because the monopole, as viewed from the roadway, would extend so far above the surrounding trees, a tree monopole would appear more objectionable than the typical monopole design. He added that the property was too narrow to meet setback requirements no matter where they placed the monopole on the property, and explained they had selected a site at the corner of the property because it provided the owner maximum use of the property, and that the monopole would be constructed to accommodate additional carriers.

Michael Ma asked if the monopole could be placed on the other side of the road. Mr. Nelson explained that there was a large agricultural piece of property there and the monopole would be even more objectionable from that location. He added that there would be very few residences that would be able to view the monopole because of the location they had selected in the corner of the property. He added that the code provides for a monopole but there was no requirement for a tree monopole to be erected at this site. Bob Hunnicutt noted that a tree monopole was, in fact, a monopole disguised to look like a tree to minimize any negative impact on the community. He stated that the Tower Coordinator recommended a tree monopole in order to conceal the top of the structure from the recreational area at the park. Mr. Nelson stated that, based on the balloon test, only the very top of the monopole would be observed from the recreational area. Ms. Lawton commented that the photograph that Mr. Nelson displayed only showed one view of the balloon test and that it may be more noticeable from other viewpoints. Eric Carzon stated that he was also concerned about the view from the park. Mr. Nelson stated that to disguise the monopole would be an unnecessary expense for the company because the balloon test demonstrated that it would not be noticeable from the recreational area and would look more objectionable than a regular monopole as viewed from the road.

Michael Ma asked that carriers notify the M-NCPPC staff of scheduled balloon tests. Jane Lawton suggested that the group could recommend the application but express their concern about the view from the recreational area. Mr. Van Aller stated they could recommend the application but condition it on the carrier making an attempt to have the monopole blend in with the surrounding area.

Tom King asked who observes a balloon test when it is conducted. Mr. Nelson stated that VoiceStream had not advised anyone of the balloon test, as it had been done to determine if the site was acceptable to VoiceStream. Ms. Lawton stated that, in most cases, when a balloon test is performed the carrier invites nearby residents to observe the test, and that the TTF CG applauds this extra effort by the carrier. She added that VoiceStream could have done this for this application.

Michal Ma stated that when the referral on the Special Exception for this application is received, it would be referred to the M-NCPPC for comments regarding whether or not it would be objectionable to them.

Ms. Lawton commented that although it was near the park, the industrial site was an appropriate location and that VoiceStream's site selection indicated they were sensitive to the view from the residential areas. Mr. Van Aller suggested that community outreach should be

done by VoiceStream prior to the M-NCPPC hearing. Deane Mellander stated that VoiceStream had not yet filed for Special Exception because it wanted to have the TTFCG recommendation first.

Eric Carzon suggested that someone should contact any known parties that use the park to determine the monopole's impact on the community. Michal Ma stated that would be done through the Special Exception review.

Motion: Eric Carzon moved the application be recommended with emphasis on the carrier taking measures to have the monopole blend in with its environment, and that the group suggested that comments from park users be obtained regarding the impact of the monopole in the community. Willem Van Aller seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Discussion Item - AT&T Request: Bob Hunnicutt explained that Ed Donohue had requested that the carriers be allowed to give a presentation of their applications prior to TTFCG discussion on the application. He also requested that the carriers be provided with a copy of the Tower Coordinator's recommendations prior to each meeting.

Regarding a carrier presentation, Mr. Hunnicutt stated that anytime a carrier wished to make a comment on their application they were always permitted to do so by the Chair and he did not believe that, as a routine practice, it was necessary to have a presentation from the carrier. Jane Lawton agreed and added that it would only extend the time required for each meeting and she did not believe it was necessary. She stated that evidently Mr. Donohue wanted to see a more formal review process by the TTFCG, but that she believed the existing informal process was working well and there was no need to make it a more structured process. Mr. Hunnicutt added that Mr. Donohue referred to "administrative law principles" in suggesting they change the nature of the TTFCG review. Mr. Hunnicutt stated that the TTFCG was not a Board of Appeals or a Planning Commission and did not believe that administrative law principles were applicable to the group's review process. Mr. Van Aller and Ms. Lawton concurred. Pat Hanehan asked if any other carriers had any comment on this matter. No one had any comments. Ms. Lawton stated that the group would continue to conduct its review in the present manner. Mr. Hunnicutt stated he would provide a copy of the Tower Coordinator's recommendations prior to each meeting, and noted they could be sent out with the agenda. Ms. Lawton stated that would be fine for now, but as soon as the County was able to add the recommendations and agenda to the TTFCG Website, she would prefer that method to be used to make those documents available for review by the carriers and other interested parties. She asked the Tower Coordinator to coordinate this effort with the appropriate County agency.

Discussion Item - Carriers' Microcell Presentation: Jane Lawton noted that in the previous meeting minutes, there was discussion regarding the carriers' giving a presentation to the TTFCG on the issues raised in the M-NCPPC letter to the TTFCG, and wanted to make it clear that at the subsequent presentation there was no TTFCG business discussed and there was no discussion of any specific application. She noted it was simply a briefing provided by the industry on the use of microcells.

She added that the carriers still offered to give the presentation a second time to any interest parties but she was waiting for a reply from Mr. King, Mr. Knopf and Mr. Klauber as to whether they would all be able to attend the presentation. Mr. King stated he had received a message from Bob Hunnicutt that the presentation would be given at the September TTFCG meeting. Ms. Lawton stated that if all of the interested parties could not attend in September, it would be scheduled for some other time.

Jim Michal asked if the TTFCG planned to respond to the letter from the M-NCPPC. Ms. Lawton stated that a response would be prepared but it would not be based solely on the industry meeting. She stated she was aware that the Council was looking into these issues, as were several community groups. Mr. Michal stated he wanted to reiterate that he believed the letter from the M-NCPPC asked the TTFCG to go beyond what it was authorized to do. Pat Hanehan asked for the M-NCPPC's opinion about the letter. Mr. Ma replied that the M-NCPPC needed direction on these issues from the TTFCG and it did not believe that direction was currently being provided. Mr. Michal asked when the industry might expect a response to the M-NCPPC letter. Ms. Lawton stated that when she drafted a response to the letter, she would provide copies only to the TTFCG members for their comments, prior to issuing a copy of the letter for public distribution.

Mr. Michal commented that he believed Mr. Klauber's recommendation that future carriers wishing to attach to an existing monopoly be required to obtain a modification to the Special Exception was inappropriate. Bob Hunnicutt noted that the code called for new monopolies to be constructed to accommodate three carriers.

The next meeting of the TTFCG is scheduled for Wednesday, September 19, 2001 at 2:00 p.m. in the Consumer Affairs Conference Room #225 of the COB.