

To: Distribution

From: Bob Hunnicutt, Tower Coordinator, Columbia Telecommunications

A meeting of the Telecommunications Transmission Facility Coordinating Group (TTF CG) was held on September 14, 2005. The following people were in attendance:

**MEMBERS**

Jane Lawton DTS (240) 777-3724  
Pat Hanehan MCPS (301) 279-3609  
David Niblock DTS (240) 777-6252  
Carlton Gilbert M-NCPPC (301) 495-4576  
Jennifer Bryant OMB (240) 777-2761  
Martin Rookard WSSC (301) 206-8979

**STAFF**

Margie Williams DTS (240) 777-3762  
Robert Hunnicutt CTC (410) 964-5700  
David Randolph CTC (410) 964-5700

**OTHER ATTENDEES**

Jill Goyette Cingular Wireless  
Chris Thompson Cingular Wireless  
Bill O'Brien MACTEC  
Tom Carroll T-Mobile  
Doug Brown T-Mobile  
Katie Oppenheimer T-Mobile  
Steve Weber T-Mobile/NBC  
Mike Budde T-Mobile/NBC  
Adam Knubel Verizon Wireless

**Action Item - Meeting Minutes:** Pat Hanehan requested that the minutes be amended at the middle of the third paragraph on page 5 to read "Mr. Hanehan replied that many of the structures sited on public school property had to go for mandatory referral before the Planning Board not modification before the Board of appeals as they now read. Dave Niblock moved that the minutes be adopted with the changes requested by Pat Hanehan. Pat Hanehan seconded the motion and the minutes were unanimously approved as amended.

**Consent Agenda Items:**

1. T-Mobile application to attach three 54" panel antennas at the 90' level of an existing 105' monopole located on the Petrucelli Property at 14120 Darnestown Road in Germantown (Application #200508-01).
2. T-Mobile application to attach nine 54" panel antennas at the 142' level of an existing 150' PEPCO transmission line tower #195-S at 4751 Sandy Spring Rd in Burtonsville (Application #200508-02).
3. Nextel application to attach 12 - 48" panel antennas to the walls of the penthouse at the 73' level on the roof of the 58' White Oak Center building located at 11120 New Hampshire Avenue in Silver Spring (Application #200508-03).
4. Nextel application to attach 12 - 48" panel antennas at the 120' level of an existing 190' monopole on the Clement property located at 25217 Peach Tree Road in Clarksburg (Application #200508-04).
5. Cingular Wireless application to attach nine 55" dual band antennas at the 145' level on a 132' PEPCO

transmission line tower #23-S located on Beallsville Road in Barnesville (Application #200508-08).

6. T-Mobile application to attach three 54" panel antennas at the 39' level inside the steeple of the First Alliance Church located at 14500 New Hampshire Avenue in Silver Spring (Application #200508-09).

7. T-Mobile application to attach nine 54" panel antennas at the 180' level of the 171' Promenade building located at 5225 Pooks Hill Road in Bethesda (Application #200508-06).

Jane Lawton requested that item six be reviewed by the Committee.

**Motion:** Pat Hanehan moved to recommend items 1 - 5 and item 7. Carlton Gilbert seconded the motion and it was approved with Pat Hanehan abstaining from item 6 (Cingular's application).

**Action Item:** T-Mobile application to attach three 54" panel antennas at the 39' level inside the steeple of the First Alliance Church located at 14500 New Hampshire Avenue in Silver Spring (Application #200508-09).

Bob Hunnicutt summarized the application. Jane Lawton asked the applicant for an explanation of how the antennas would be attached inside the steeple. Tom Carroll replied that the antennas would be placed inside the church steeple and the existing slotted ventilation panels would be removed and replaced with RF friendly material to permit the signals to radiate from the antennas. He stated the new panels would be painted to match the rest of the steeple. Ms. Lawton replied that she had no objections to the application and was only concerned about the appearance because of the low height of the building.

**Motion:** Martin Rookard moved that the application be recommended. Carlton Gilbert seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

**Action Item:** T-Mobile application to attach six 54" panel antennas at the 41' level on the rooftop of an existing 29'6" Loughlin building located at 4110 Aspen Hill Road in Rockville (Application #200508-10).

Bob Hunnicutt summarized the application. He noted that the siting was a typical rooftop site with antennas being attached to the wall of an equipment shelter to be constructed on the penthouse. He noted that this application required a Special Exception because the building height does not meet the 30' minimum height required by the zoning code. He asked Tom Carroll to comment on the height of the building.

Mr. Carroll explained that when the carrier conducted its initial site visit, one representative determined the building height by dropping a measuring tape over the side of the building. He said that T-Mobile tried to verify the official height from the County zoning records but found that the County does not maintain such files.

Dave Niblock commented that in this C-1 zone any elevation height would be based on the average elevation of the building taken from all four sides of the building. He said that to document the height of the building the applicant would have to provide a certification from an engineer which stated the average height of the building. He added that the issue regarding the height of the building was similar to the Semmes Building located at River Road and Falls Road.

Jane Lawton asked if the façade of the screening around the equipment cabinets would be brick faced. Mr. Carroll explained that brick would not be possible because that would block the RF signals, but noted that the screening would be designed to be compatible with the rest of the building exterior. He asked the Group to consider conditioning approval of the application on the determination that the building met the 30' requirement. **Motion:** Carlton Gilbert moved that the application be recommended conditioned on either the applicant obtaining approval for a Special Exception for this attachment or a determination that the building meets the minimum height requirements. Dave Niblock seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

**Action Item:** T-Mobile application to construct a new 120' monopole and attach three 54" flush mount antennas at the top of the monopole. The monopole will be built on Oakview Recreation Association property located at 1101 Corliss Street in Silver Spring (Application #200508-11).

Bob Hunnicutt summarized the application. He noted that the location of the monopole on the property did not meet existing setback requirements. He also explained that the site backed up to forested land with trees

ranging from 60' to 80' in height between the site and the beltway. He noted that the objective for these antennas would be to provide coverage along the beltway and to offload traffic from the existing cell site to the east at the Chateau Apartment Building. He stated that east of this site was Board of Education property where construction had begun for a new school. Mr. Hunnicutt said that to the southeast of the site there were a number of residential dwellings from which residents would be able to see the monopole. He stated that they had asked the carrier to provide RF contour maps for antennas at the 75' elevation, a height which would meet the setback requirements. He stated that based on the review of those maps it appeared that the coverage objective could not be obtained because of the tall trees adjacent to the property that would diminish the signal levels toward the beltway. Mr. Hunnicutt said they also asked for RF maps showing antennas at the 95' elevation, and asked Dave Randolph to explain his findings based on review of those maps.

Dave Randolph stated that it appeared that with antennas at the 95' level, coverage along the beltway could still provide satisfactory in vehicle service. He noted that although the lower elevation may work for this carrier, he would be concerned that subsequent carriers wishing to co-locate on this facility may not be able to meet their coverage objective because of the tall trees adjacent to the site.

Mr. Hunnicutt reminded the group that the RF contour maps were theoretical computer models and due to the extent of tall trees between the site and the beltway and the terrain variances around the site, these models did not appear to be as reliable as other site models. He said the initial set of RF maps provided had raised engineering questions and the Tower Coordinator had requested a second set of maps be provided to verify the results. The Tower Coordinator had agreed with Mr. Randolph that the height of the trees adjacent to the property might result in the site not being as attractive for co-location for future carriers.

Mr. Carroll added that although the trees may only be 80' tall at this time, some appeared to be taller than that and the trees would grow over time making the site less attractive for antennas at elevations closer to the height of the trees.

Mr. Hunnicutt said their recommendation was conditioned on the approval of a Special Exception as well as a variance for the setback issues. Mr. Carroll stated that the Board of Appeals, as part of the Special Exception review process, has the authority to waive the setback requirements and that the site would not require a variance. He noted that a variance entailed more stringent requirements for approval by the Board, and that in this case only a waiver was required.

Pat Hanehan asked about the difference between this application and the one reviewed last month for the WIN Radio Tower replacement in the Potomac area. Mr. Hunnicutt referred the group to the minutes from the last meeting and recalled that there were a number of extenuating circumstances on that site that differentiated that case from this one. He said this was a new monopole to be constructed at a site where no other structure existed. In the WIN case, the applicant proposed to replace an existing tower at a location on the property in an area that did not meet setback requirements. He also recalled that the applicant had not made the Board of Appeals aware of that fact when they had sought Board of Appeals approval for that tower replacement.

Jane Lawton added that in the WIN case the attorney representing WIN had argued a number of other points, one of which was that there were other locations on the property where they could place the new tower to meet setback requirements, but the attorney argued that to do so would require further review and approval by the Revenue Authority which would take longer than the Special Exception process. Consequently, he opted to pursue Special Exception for that reason. Based on all of those points, the TFCG concluded that they could not recommend that application.

Mr. Hunnicutt commented that this site is for a new structure and the applicant believed there is no other location on the property where they can place the monopole to meet setback requirements. Mr. Carroll added that they could not move the site along the property line because the terrain fell away rather significantly near the property line. Mr. Hunnicutt added that they could not move the monopole farther away from the property line because it would then not meet the requirements for the minimum distance of a new monopole from the nearest dwelling. He added that if you move farther away from the property line you would also encroach upon the area for the community pool which was on the property.

Mr. Hanehan added that he had checked with staff at the public schools property division and they had no objections to the monopole site; in fact, they prefer the present location which places it farther away from the

school and the recreation association parking lot.

Mr. Hunnicutt stated that the current design was for a uni-pole, which minimizes the visual impact of a facility. However, since it backed up to the adjacent wooded area with very tall trees the carrier could consider making the design of this facility a tree pole which may better minimize the visual impact if there were concerns about the unipole design. He said a tree pole design could work whether the ultimate design was 120' or 95' structure.

Tom Carroll stated that T-Mobile would consider a tree design if requested through the Special Exception process but he argued that the unipole design might still be less intrusive, especially if the top portion of the monopole was painted a sky color.

**Motion:** Pat Hanehan moved the application be recommended with the conditions stated in the Tower Coordinator's recommendation. Dave Niblock seconded the motion and it was approved with Carlton Gilbert abstaining.

Mr. Hunnicutt noted that this month he had been advised by several carriers that they planned to change certain aspects of applications that had already been approved by the TTF CG but had not yet been implemented. Since the changes were minor in nature, he opted to include these on the agenda as discussion items summarized as follows.

Discussion Item – Cingular Wireless Application #200502-09 – Design Change: Mr. Hunnicutt explained that this Cingular application to change out AT&T Wireless antennas at a PEPCO transmission line tower had been approved several months ago but the change-out had never been made and now the carrier wanted to use different antennas than those that were reviewed by the TTF CG when it recommended that application. Matt Wolf added that the antenna differences were very minor in nature and included antennas that were a couple of inches larger than those originally proposed by the applicant and of a type that provided some expanded bandwidth capabilities than the antennas proposed with the initial TTF CG application.

**Discussion Item – Verizon Wireless Application #200505-01 – Design Change:** Mr. Hunnicutt reminded the group that this application had been approved conditioned on the carrier modifying the Special Exception to expand the equipment area permitted by Special Exception. He stated that the carrier had decided not to pursue to modification and instead had made arrangements to place their equipment shelter within the existing equipment compound. He added that it did not appear that the size of the existing equipment compound was not an issue with the application that was recommended by the TTF CG.

Discussion Item - Cingular Wireless Application #200506-01 – Design Change: Mr. Hunnicutt stated that this application was recently approved to attach antennas to an existing PEPCO transmission line tower. In this case, however, the carrier had determined that would not be possible and instead proposed to install a Fort Worth power mount within the transmission line tower and attach antennas at a slightly higher elevation. He stated that the carrier now proposes to attach nine antennas instead of the six antennas that were originally proposed in the application recommended by the TTF CG.

**Discussion Item - Nextel Application #200410-02 –** Mr. Hunnicutt advised the group that this item had been tabled at the November 2004 meeting and had been resubmitted with a design change to address the group's comments at that time. However, since then, Nextel has been notified that the structural analysis for that design failed, so they asked that the item be removed from the agenda while they decide what to do.

Discussion Item - Pending Zoning Text Amendment: Jane Lawton distributed copies of the zoning text amendments submitted by Ms. Praisner that were designed to add language that would bring greater uniformity in the code with respect to telecommunications facilities and that would address issues raised with the last zoning text amendment regarding broadcast towers and amateur radio antenna facilities. She added that there had been considerable community comment on a set of four very tall amateur radio antennas in the Poolesville area that had resulted in the introduction of some legislation at the state level concerning amateur radio tower facilities. She said that there had been some concessions at the state legislature to address some of the local concerns and that the legislation introduced by Ms. Praisner was a further attempt to address community interest in Montgomery County regarding the height of amateur radio facilities. She noted that the hearing on this legislation was set for Tuesday, September 20, 2005.

**Discussion Item - Pending Federal Legislation:** Mr. Hunnicutt stated that he had been working with Margie Williams to obtain copies of legislation that had been submitted in Congress that might limit local zoning authority for placement of telecommunications facilities, but so far neither he nor Ms. Williams had been able to obtain that information or verify it had been submitted. He said he had checked with Senator McCain's office staff, who he understood was one of the representatives that introduced the legislation. He said Senator McCain's legislative assistant had referred him to a bill which he had reviewed briefly but which did not appear to contain any language that would impact local zoning authority over siting telecommunications facilities. Ms. Lawton asked the carrier representatives if they knew of any such legislation and as a group they replied that they did not.

**Discussion Item - Annual Plan Status Update:** Mr. Hunnicutt noted that not all the carriers had submitted their annual plans yet.

**Discussion Item – Modifications to the Wheaton High School Light Pole Replacement:** Pat Hanehan said he wanted to advise the group that plans to replace a light pole at the Wheaton High School had been modified somewhat because the carrier had not made the replacement by the time the school year started and the school requested that the existing lights not be removed during the current athletic season. Instead, they opted to have the carrier construct the replacement light pole approximately 12 feet from the existing lights and after the current athletic season the stadium lights would be relocated to the new structure. Once vacated, the existing light pole would be removed. Ms. Lawton stated that she did not see any problem with that change and the group agreed they did not have any objection to that modification. Mr. Hanehan stated that the public schools had advised the Park and Planning Commission regarding this change as well.

**Discussion Item - Next Meeting:** The next meeting of the TTFCG is scheduled for Wednesday, October 12, 2005 at 2 p.m. in the second floor conference room #225 of the COB.