



## DEPARTMENT OF TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

Sonny Segal  
Chief Information Officer

### MINUTES OF TFCG MEETING

To: Distribution

From: Bob Hunnicutt, Tower Coordinator, Columbia Telecommunications Corporation

A meeting of the Transmission Facility Coordinating Group (TFCG) was held on October 3, 2012. The following people were in attendance:

#### MEMBERS

Marjorie Williams		DTS
Dave Niblock	(via phone)	DPS
Bernie Fitzgerald	(via phone)	DGS
Joan Cole	(via phone)	DTS
Martin Rookard	(via phone)	WSSC
Janice Turpin		MCPS

#### STAFF

Bob Hunnicutt	CTC
Marty Liebman	CTC

#### OTHER ATTENDEES

Tom Godwin	(via phone)	Powder River Development for AT&T
Steve Kinley	(via phone)	ACO Property Advisors for ATT

#### **Action Item - Meeting Minutes**

Marjorie Williams noted that Bernie Fitzgerald attended the September meeting but the minutes do not list his name as an attendant and asked that the minutes be corrected to reflect that he was there.

**Motion:** Joan Cole moved the minutes be approved as corrected. Dave Niblock seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

#### **Action Item: Consent Agenda**

1. AT&T application to attach twelve 55"-high panel antennas at the 110' level on a 140'-high monopole on Public Storage Pickup and Delivery LP property at 12355 Prosperity Drive in Silver Spring (Application #201210-02). *Co-location*

2. AT&T Application to attach a 4'-wide microwave dish antenna at the 150' level on a 140'-high monopole on the Nash property at 4301 Brookeville Road in Brookeville (Application #201209-03). *Minor Modification*

3. AT&T application to attach a 4'-wide microwave dish antenna at the 160' level on a 226'-high lattice tower (Application #201209-04). *Minor Modification*

Bob Hunnicutt explained that the applicant for applications 201209-03 and 04 requested that those applications be considered at today's meeting, despite the fact that they were not submitted by the previous month's deadline, because circumstances beyond his control prevented him from getting notice that the applications were incomplete—and, consequently, his response to complete the applications in time to be added to the agenda was delayed. Mr. Hunnicutt explained that they were not completed until last Friday when copies of the Tower Coordinator's recommendation and the applications were provided to the members for consideration. He recommended that, as a one-time courtesy due only due to the unusual circumstances, they be considered as part of the Consent Agenda. Martin Rookard objected to adding items for consideration at the last minute and would have preferred to have had an updated agenda prior to the meeting.

**Motion:** Janice Turpin moved that the Consent Agenda, including the two additional applications, be recommended. Martin Rookard seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

**Action Item:** T-Mobile application to add one 1'-wide dish antenna at the 125' level atop a WSSC water tank on WSSC property at 8505 Aqueduct Road in Potomac (Application #201210-04). *Minor Modification. Conditioned on providing, at time of permitting, written approval from WSSC that they have approved the addition of this dish antenna.*

**Motion:** Martin Rookard moved that the application be recommended as conditioned by the Tower Coordinator. Joan Cole seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

**Action Item:** AT&T application to construct a 150'-high monopole and install six 55"-high panel antennas, three at the 125' level and three at the 115' level, on Bagherian property located at 5600 Sundown Road in Gaithersburg (Application #201210-03). *New Monopole by Special Exception. Conditioned on approval by the Board of Appeals of a special exception or a modification to the existing special exception, approval of a reduction in the setback requirements, and notifying the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) that the property owner has changed.*

Mr. Hunnicutt explained that AT&T proposed to replace an existing monopole (designed to support nine antennas in three bays within its flag pole disguise) with a new one designed to accommodate 12 antennas in four bays. He noted the new design, also to be disguised as a flag pole, will be as high as the present one and will also be larger for structural reasons to support more and larger antennas. The wider monopole may potentially result in a more visually intrusive structure on the property. He added that the location for the new monopole will be closer to the rear property line and will no longer meet setback. Consequently, the applicant will request a reduction in the setback requirement at the time they file for the special exception. He

also explained that though there are other towers on the adjacent property, they are part of a highly secure FEMA facility and not available for private use, ruling them out as an alternative to the new monopole. In response to questions about the appearance of the monopole on the property, Mr. Hunnicutt referenced the photos on page one and two of the Tower Coordinator's Recommendation, noting that the location is far from the roadway and appears to have minimal intrusion because of the distance it is from other properties. Between that and the federal tower structures on the adjacent property, it may not be perceived to have a significant impact in that rural environment. The property and most of the surrounding property is farmland or wooded areas which may also screen views of the monopole.

Bernie Fitzgerald questioned the need for a flag pole disguise in a rural setting. He noted that because it looks out of place, he thought a typical monopole design may be better because it could support more antennas for future carriers or additional antennas for the existing carriers on the monopole. He asked why that design was constructed.

Mr. Hunnicutt reviewed the case file for the review of the existing monopole and noted that the application for it was filed with the flag pole disguise and the same concern had been raised by the TFCG when it was reviewed in 2002. He said he did not see a reason for the design in the record. He said he presumed it was at the request of the property owner since the application was filed with that design from the beginning. He asked if other members had the same opinion as Mr. Fitzgerald and if there was a consensus among the members in adding something to their recommendation to reflect those interests.

The members did not express a consensus. Marjorie Williams, noting that the property owner has changed since the existing monopole was constructed, remarked that she thought the interests of the property owner in regard to the disguise should be considered, and that it would be up to the Board of Appeals (as it was when the TFCG reviewed the original application for the monopole) to address those issues. She asked Mr. Hunnicutt to reflect the members' discussion in the minutes of today's meeting, which the Hearing Examiner would consider in review of the case.

**Motion:** Bernie Fitzgerald moved that the application be recommended as conditioned by the Tower Coordinator. Janice Turpin seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

The next meeting of the TFCG will be held on November 7<sup>th</sup> in Room #225 of the COB.