

**AT&T Sandco Cell Tower Class II
Neighborhood Compatibility Meeting
Animas Valley Grange
July 11, 2016**

--Meeting Summary--

Present:

Daniel Murray (County Planning Staff)
Ashley Austin (County Planning Staff)

Nicholas Constantine (TEP)
Richard Busch (TEP, Busch & Assoc)
Drew Thatcher (TEP, Lisa Thatcher, Inc.)

Surrounding Landowners (SLO) – see sign in sheet for list of 10 ppl

Meeting:

1. Introduction by Planning Staff Daniel Murray (DM)
2. Presentation by Applicant, Tower Engineering Professionals (TEP) and their team regarding wireless coverage needs, siting requirements, inherent visibility of a cell tower.
 - a. Increase network demand 150k%
 - b. 50% do not have home phone, expect quality coverage. Antennas do not work behind screens (natural or man-made).
 - c. Silo is not structurally sound
 - i. SLO: how to make structurally sound? Why is proposed location there?
3. SLO – why is there such a big height difference between current and proposed tower?
 - a. TEP- LPLUC requirement - need to accommodate 4 carriers. Site needs to be useful to lowest carrier. Tower needs to be designed to support goals of lowest carrier.
4. SLO- clarify that tower will be 60' higher than existing
 - a. TEP- Yes, need to be at least 10' higher than highest obstacle (silo in this case). Min elev would be 70' for the lowest carrier. ATT goal is to remove and replace existing tower (Lone Pine RV Park, 1 mi away). Also, replace the coverage from that tower.
5. SLO- Why not add height to existing pole?
 - a. TEP- (prop map) If moved to RV park pole, coverage would be lost down south. Goal is to obtain highest coverage which is why the proposed location is at Sandco.
6. SLO- Why not choose somewhere higher, out of sight?
 - a. TEP- 1 tall tower in a higher elevation does not have enough capacity as there are more and more users. Need more antennas closer to destination now to carry capacity.
7. SLO- Why not use existing structures such as telephone poles?
 - a. TEP- industry not there yet. This is starting in bigger cities. LPC is not dense enough.
8. SLO- Why not wait for the new technology (telephone poles) and protect views? Proposed location is right smack in the middle of the valley.
 - a. TEP- Level of demand justifies the new technology. Animas valley is not dense enough. Don't have demand on the network such as Denver.
9. SLO- What is the threshold to get new technology? Are we going to be leapfrogging technology? We can now use wireless network to make calls, etc.
 - a. TEP- when you use wifi, as soon as you step outside of your home, that call drops. Still need service from outside your home. Wifi helps take demand off the network but still need antennas for continuous coverage.

10. SLO- Will this work with Emergency services?
 - a. TEP- It's required to. Every carrier is required to handle emergency calls. Even phones without service. Police, rescue, etc. want to be at top of mountains. Need lower frequency to go farther. They don't have capacity issues; it's a coverage issue for them. Unlikely that police will want a spot on this particular tower.
11. SLO- what other locations were considered?
 - a. TEP- 4 corners materials across the street, and a location half mile north. Settled for shorter tower at this location.
12. SLO- if you want max coverage, then you should locate at Hermosa Mountain.
 - a. TEP- higher location will compete with existing poles. Don't want to overlap with existing sites. Missionary Ridge, etc.
 - b. SLO- how does it conflict with existing?
 - c. TEP- design is to reuse the frequencies from the site. If too high or too many poles in one area, a phone in the nearby area will see too many signals and will lose efficiency. It will go back and forth between the different signals and confuse the phone. Also, code requires locating in industrial zones as opposed to residential. Compatible with surrounding uses.
 - d. SLO- how was compatibility assessed?
 - e. TEP- LPLUC zoning
13. SLO- blinking light on top? Why can't you add 30' to existing pole instead of new?
 - a. TEP- no light. Existing structure not structurally capable of handling extra load. Can't reinforce something like that. Silo will stay and be used for Sandco business.
14. SLO- why can't height remain the same?
 - a. TEP- Elev trying to get the most coverage up north and toward town as possible
15. SLO- can you build at 110'? That's the min you need
 - a. TEP- 120' is target to meet coverage needs by ATT. Losing coverage up north if any lower.
16. SLO- Couldn't go to other location because it would be too high. Now you're saying need more height at proposed site
 - a. TEP- suggestion was to move further west. Not plausible because you would get more shadowing up north and we would lose industrial site. No industrial sites on west.
 - b. SLO- sounds like site is based on industrial use rather than best site. To county: do you need industrial site?
 - c. DM: yes, it lends itself to this use. Residential does not. LPC went through a process to determine what uses were appropriate in locations. This is the first time were applying these regulations. Better than no regs. May refine regulation in the future based on this application. Animas valley is scenic and unique. Only place with zoning. 95% county is unzoned. Zoned with intent to manage these uses. Not use by right, it still requires a Special Use Permit (CL II process). This is where it was contemplated for these uses to go. I will double check what other zones may allow this use (General Commercial I believe is the only other zone).
17. SLO- Are there other industrial sites besides gravel operations. Can you share other locations where this is allowable?
 - a. DM- Zoning map will dictate that.
18. SLO- conversation started as receiving a better signal, not about location. Be more transparent as to why this location was selected. It's because of zoning.
 - a. TEP- engineers use "search ring" based on coverage objectives. Target area turned over to people who understand land use. They look at and determine the zone districts that allow this use in the target area. Same principle used 6 years ago. If there's an existing use, clearly that will be a considered location. Decision for this spot was made 6 years ago.
19. SLO- Accept area as industrial but the only thing higher than 20' at this site is the Silo tower. Not close to dense area.
 - a. TEP- closest residence is radar house. 1,100' away. 1,400' 1,800'.

- b. SLO- very visual. Area of proximity vs line of sight are very different things.
- 20. SLO- stealth? This proposal is not consistent with neighborhood. Is the Lone tree RV Park an option?
 - a. DM- Lone Pine RV park tower is a nonconforming use. Zoning precludes use in residential district such as that. Too close to residences.
- 21. TEP- presented balloon views to represent the height of the proposed tower. A lot of places you will be able to see it.
 - a. SLO- is the balloon width of the tower?
 - b. TEP- No, structure 18" wide, each bracket is 4 to 6' wide, antennas at end of bracket. Balloon is about 4' wide.
 - c. SLO- so 12' wide?
 - d. TEP- Yes, roughly.
- 22. SLO-only 2 arms?
 - a. TEP- no, 3 sectors (arms)
 - b. SLO- this shouldn't be located next to Missionary Ridge. You are Losing 180 degrees. All dollars and cents. Should be 4 sectors, not 3. Clearly you're admitting that the location isn't the best. Move north
 - c. DM- Limited areas to the north. Remember Residential Zoning
 - d. TEP- each sector is 120 degrees so total 360 degrees. Every site being reworked because they can't keep up with capacity. Most carriers now have 4 diff frequencies to get coverage. Need isn't phone call anymore. Data demand needs to be accommodated. That's what's driving this change. Not going to see 4 carriers because there are only 2 large carriers here.
- 23. SLO- Code requires 4 carriers so it needs to be higher than necessary.
- 24. SLO- ok when the existing site was built because it wasn't too high and fit with use. But this is double. Too high.
- 25. SLO- is it possible that structure could be built to accommodate 2 carriers instead of 4?
 - a. DM- intent is fewer towers overall however, may be conflicting with other goals and objectives such as lower tower heights. Possible code revision. Can't change the playing field in the middle of an application. Applicant would need to withdrawal, LPC would need to amend code, and then applicant would need to reapply. Or, applicant can't apply for variance, for which there could be support. There are options to consider...
- 26. SLO- Would ATT still be interested if a variance was granted for a lower height?
 - a. TEP- no, this is height ATT said they needed.
 - b. SLO- even though neighbors would be happier?
 - c. TEP- T mobile and sprint may locate here one day.
 - d. SLO- If ATT can't be happy at less than 120', why would anyone want to locate below them?
 - e. TEP- may need another tower. Other carriers won't be happy.
 - f. DM- There is a requirement that applicant must prove that they have exhausted all other existing locations. New carriers won't be able to just build a new tower because a lower location on this site isn't optimal.
 - g. TEP- Other carriers will settle for proposed tower. Rarely will you see 2 towers close to each other.
- 27. SLO- Proposed tower will be 12' wide by 45' high of antennas. Balloon is meaningless. (doesn't accurately represent the proposed tower)
 - a. TEP- balloon is to demonstrate height. Drive around town and look at other locations, it will be similar.
- 28. SLO- Would County consider a variance in other areas? Not a lot of industrial zones. Maybe Honeyville?
 - a. DM- may not require a variance. Commercial areas will allow this use.
 - b. SLO- If that's the case, there are better locations. Honeyville is less visually impactful. Would still get a lot of coverage.
 - c. DM- then public should provide direction for applicant to explore that option.

29. SLO- not a lot of support from neighbors at the proposed Sandco location.
30. SLO- gravel pit made special concession on hours in respect of neighbors.
31. SLO-48 acres on 4 corners material will see downzone soon.
32. SLO- We knew there was a gravel pit when we bought our property but no one said there would be a tower. Offended that applicant assumes that buyer knew this site was "industrial" so can do whatever they want. Buyers beware. Don't want to see tower when golfing. Golf course is not a "buffer zone". Paint to surrounding colors? Are you going to paint a new color every season?
33. SLO- radio frequencies and health?
 - a. TEP- health physicist, specialize in non-ionizing radiation which this is and industrial exposures. Low energy radiation on EM spectrum (red). Close to microwaves and infrared. Cannot damage DNA. Human, cellular, or animal. Higher frequency less able to radiate into body. Long term exposure studies done that heat tissue. Calc exposure rate at nearest home is 0.002 to 0.004 about 1400 times less than the public limit. Not significant RF exposure. 3 carriers would double exposure, still ridiculously low. US standard same as those used in 60 countries. No convincing evidence that RF exposure below guideline times cause health effects in humans (at cell phone level). Overall cancer incidence has decline. Proposed site is significantly less than FCC public exposure limits.
34. SLO- FEMA ok with floodway?
 - a. TEP- yes, very strict.
 - b. DM- building code compliance will cause equipment shelter to be elevated.
35. SLO- light?
 - a. TEP- if a tower is less than 200', a light is not required. If there was an airport, yes.
36. DM- Provided some background on public notice: 1000' only captured 8 residents. TEP agreed to 2000' for 108 residents. 2 articles in paper. Info page on website. What can we do to help engage?
 - a. SLO- Consider more demographics than proximity in feet (dist boundary). Contact property managements, chamber of commerce, Home owners associations.
 - b. SLO- timing is difficult. Many home owners gone on vacation, etc.
 - c. SLO- consider any proposals by what is the impacted area. Line of sight of 120' tower affects more than people 500' away. Contact everyone who is affected by line of sight of 120' tower. Everyone that is impacted rather than just 2000' SLO.
37. SLO- what's next step?
 - a. DM- A hearing before the PC and then BoCC. People who received notice will continue to, tell others to get on notification list.
38. SLO- When does planner recommend approval?
 - a. DM- The first hearing, which will be the PC.
39. SLO- How much better will the service be? Not so much concern with the visual.
 - a. DM- Up to TEP to demonstrate that through a propagation study.
40. DM- We were expecting more people.
 - a. SLO- Awkward timing may escalate via word of mouth. Not a large volume of people are aware currently.
 - b. SLO- Effects more than just Animas Valley residents. Durango known for scenic views and outdoor activities. Community as a whole will be impacted. Once broader community becomes aware, more comment.
 - c. DM- subject to FCC timeline. Fed gov has dictated how to process these applications. Normally responses come in too late.
41. SLO- Nothing similar to compare to in area. Has a lot of impact. Needs to be considered and not fast-tracked.
 - a. DM- it is not being fast-tracked, it just has a track as dictated by the FCC.
42. SLO- consider a commercial location. There are more opportunities. Look at other locations.

- a. DM- We simply evaluate the proposal for compliance, we don't necessarily dictate what they propose. Make it clear to the applicant in writing what other proposals you'd like to see.
 - b. TEP- biggest limiting factor is locations that allows use
 - c. DM- there was a separate review on impacts to historical locations which happened well before this review.
43. SLO- will this impact the ability of the gravel site to create there road every winter? Gravel Co builds a road across the animas river and installs culverts. Will the tower/equip flood?
- a. DM- don't believe there would be any issues. Can build in a floodway, just needs to be up to code
 - b. TEP- Will be built to standards and floodway considered.
44. SLO- timing, dates?
- a. DM- a few more weeks for review. Earliest to PC is sept. BoCC Oct. Don't wait to inform the Board of comments/concerns. Tell the applicant to make a change well in advance. Applicant wants to put forth something that will likely be approved.