

TOWN OF ACTON  
PLANNING BOARD

PUBLIC HEARING  
5 CRAIG ROAD - CELL TOWER APPLICATION

SEPTEMBER 17, 2013  
ACTON TOWN HALL  
ROOM 204  
472 MAIN STREET  
ACTON, MASSACHUSETTS  
9:00 p.m.

---- Reporter: Julie Thomson Riley, RDR, CRR ----

EPPLEY COURT REPORTING, LLC  
Post Office Box 382  
Hopedale, Massachusetts 01747  
(508) 478-9795 (508) 478-0595 (Fax)  
[www.eppleycourtreporting.com](http://www.eppleycourtreporting.com)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

APPEARANCES:

.  
Prince Lobel Tye, LLP  
by Brian S. Grossman, Esquire  
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 2200  
Boston, Massachusetts 02114  
(617) 456 8184  
bgrossman@PrinceLobel.com  
for the Applicant

Isotrope, LLC  
David Maxson, Chief Executive Officer  
505 Main Street  
Medfield, Massachusetts 02052  
(508) 359-8833  
David@isotrope.im

Acton Planning Board:

Jeff Clymer, Chairman  
Roland Bartl, Planning Director  
Derrick Chin  
Roland Bourdon  
Michael Dube  
Ray Yacouby  
Kim Gorman

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

I N D E X

Speaker:	Page
Michael Grossman, Esquire on behalf of the applicant	5
David Maxson, Chief Executive Officer Isotrope, LLC	23
Michael Maglothin, 288 School Street	35
Justin Weir, 305 School Street	39
Kathy Quinn, 299 School Street	44
David Clough, 14 Evergreen Road	71

## E X H I B I T S

2	No.		Page
3	1	SBA Towers II, LLC filing application dated June 28, 2013, consisting of 112 pages.	5
6	2	Packet of photographic simulations of a camouflage monopine tower, prepared by Caron & Associates Design.	5
9	3	Packet of photographic simulations of a monopole tower, prepared by Caron & Associates Design.	5
12	4	Memo from Mark Hald, to Roland Bartl, dated January 25, 2010, and attached e-mail, dated September 17, 2013 with updated comments, consisting of one double-sided page.	22
17	5	Planning Board Memorandum, dated August 22, 2013, consisting of four pages.	32
20	6	Report prepared by David Maxson, Isotrope, LLC, dated September 13, 2013, consisting of eight pages.	32

24

\*\*\*Exhibits were returned to Attorney Grossman.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Documents were premarked Exhibit Nos. 1 through 3 for identification.)

CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Okay. Whenever you're ready.

MR. GROSSMAN: Great. Thank you.

Good evening, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Planning Board. My name is Brian Grossman. I'm an attorney with Prince Lobel, and we represent the applicant, SBA Towers II, LLC, along with the applicant anchor tenant which is AT&T. So they are the wireless carrier that would be the anchor tenant for the proposed facility, and they are the ones who provided some of the technical data with regard to a significant gap in coverage that's sought to be covered.

As you may have noticed, in accordance with the Board's requirement in the zoning bylaw, we have a stenographer to be responsible for transcription of the hearing.

Along those lines, since we have the stenographer, it kind of makes sense to kind of number the exhibits. So I've asked her to number

1 the original application that we submitted on  
2 June 28th of 2013 as No. 1, and that would include  
3 all of the 15 tabs that were included in that.

4           While we were waiting for her to set up, I  
5 tried to make use of the time; so I distributed two  
6 different packets of photographic simulations to  
7 you. The first one has the proposed camouflage  
8 monopine. I've asked her to label that as  
9 Exhibit 2. And the second set I provided is for a  
10 standard monopole without camouflaging with a full  
11 platform, and I've asked her to number that as  
12 No. 3.

13           So far those are all the exhibits I've  
14 asked her to number. And, again, I know there are  
15 some staff reports and things, and as we discuss  
16 those, we'll number those accordingly.

17           The photographic simulations that are  
18 provided are based on a balloon test or actually it  
19 ended up being a crane test, given the winds they  
20 were expecting; and in order to make a useful visual  
21 test, we opted to go for a crane with a balloon at  
22 the top to help identify visibility. The crane was  
23 raised to the height of 110 feet. There's a little  
24 bit of a report that's in there regarding the visual

1 demonstration on how it was done. It was done to  
2 make sure that it was accurate. The photographic  
3 simulations have been done. The first set, as I've  
4 said, is the monopine as is best proposed, the  
5 camouflage monopine. The second, for comparative  
6 purposes, is what a standard monopole without any  
7 sort of camouflaging would look like.

8 SBA's applying for a special permit for a  
9 110-foot monopole camouflaged as a pine tree or  
10 commonly referred to as a monopine. The 110 feet is  
11 to the top of the faux branch. Under the bylaw the  
12 way the height is that's the appurtenance attached  
13 to the tower. And so despite the tower itself, the  
14 physical steel structure of the tower itself stops  
15 at 100 feet, the branches, to get to the proper  
16 tapering so that it looks correct in terms of what  
17 you would expect a pine tree to look like, it has  
18 that taper; it extends above the tower itself. So  
19 we've measured that to the top of those faux  
20 branches as 110 feet.

21 We mentioned the top of the actual tower  
22 is 100 feet. AT&T would install panel antennas, 12  
23 panel antennas with a center line of 100 feet that  
24 would extend up to 105 feet to the top of the

1 antennas and down 5 feet to 95 feet.

2 In the packet there is the FAA  
3 determination of the no hazard to air navigation,  
4 demonstrating that the facility, as proposed, would  
5 not require any marking or lighting under FAA  
6 standards.

7 As the Board may recall, the property was  
8 the subject of a prior application that was  
9 for -- also by SBA, but it was for a 170-foot tower.  
10 In working with AT&T and reviewing the prior  
11 proceedings, SBA would come in with a 110-foot tower  
12 instead to the top of the faux branches representing  
13 a 60-foot reduction from the prior proposal. We  
14 think that helps address a number of concerns that  
15 were raised previously, including visual impact, and  
16 also it helps with the design of the monopine itself  
17 to bring it more in line with the heights of some of  
18 the taller types of evergreen trees you would see in  
19 the area, to bring it closer to the average tree  
20 height in the area.

21 It is based off a monopole design, so it  
22 does comply with the prohibition on towers requiring  
23 guy wires or more than one leg to support it.

24 As I mentioned, SBA's anchor tenant would

1 be AT&T. The panel antennas installed in the tower  
2 will be connected by coaxial cable or cabling or  
3 other cabling that runs within the tower itself, out  
4 over the base, over to the equipment shelter. The  
5 equipment shelter's approximately 12 by 20 and  
6 approximately 10 feet high.

7 The shelter will have a light near the  
8 door for authorized personnel if they need to access  
9 the facility in low light conditions. The lighting  
10 will comply with the Town's zoning requirements with  
11 regard to lighting and not falling on other  
12 properties.

13 All of that is located within a 30 by 90  
14 fenced-in compound. The proposed fence is a  
15 chain-link fence, 6 feet high, and then topped with  
16 one foot of stranded barbed wire, a couple  
17 of -- three strands or so of barbed wire, extending  
18 the overall height to 7 feet, and that's to prohibit  
19 unauthorized access.

20 An additional carrier can be accommodated  
21 at the 85-foot level on the tower; and in addition,  
22 the compound itself in the case of an extension  
23 would be able to -- the tower would be able to  
24 accommodate an additional three carriers beyond AT&T

1 as well, and we have enough space for that.

2 The facility will be visited one to two  
3 times per month per carrier. That's typically what  
4 works in this type of communications facility. So  
5 once the construction is completed and done, some  
6 heavy trucking you might actually see at the  
7 property because of the use of the property, but the  
8 facility itself in terms of the traffic that's  
9 generated is very little, and one to two times per  
10 month. That's not even per week or per day.

11 The facility will comply with FCC  
12 regulations with regard to the exposure and  
13 emissions from RF. We've included the calculations  
14 for that, and I think Mr. Maxson has had a chance to  
15 review those and has commented on those in his  
16 report.

17 The facility also complies with the  
18 requirement that the tower be set back 350 feet from  
19 the nearest residential building. The design and  
20 the location of the tower and the compound will not  
21 interfere with the existing operations on the  
22 property, and we will address the planning staff on  
23 that more fully; but the planning staff noted that  
24 the current area being proposed for the location of

1 the facility is currently utilized by the property  
2 owner, and that's true. We've talked to the  
3 property owner and confirmed that this is really  
4 excess space for him. It will be able to be located  
5 there and not negatively impact operations on the  
6 property. It won't cause trucks to have to queue up  
7 on Craig Road; and as the owner pointed out to us,  
8 that the acquisition of 5 Craig Road occurred  
9 subsequent to their original operations on the  
10 property at 7, and so they conducted the same  
11 business at that 7 Craig Road, even without the  
12 added benefit of 5 Craig Road. So in terms of  
13 access, in terms of their daily operations, we won't  
14 have a negative impact. It won't cause additional  
15 traffic to back up onto Craig Road.

16 The proposed monopine it has been noted in  
17 the staff report, it's an interpretive issue, but as  
18 I understand it, Acton has consistently interpreted  
19 the CAM to require essentially something what we  
20 call a flagpole style monopole where the shaft of  
21 the antenna would be located internally. Because of  
22 the area and because of industry trends, SBA thinks  
23 the monopine design helps camouflage better than the  
24 flagpole or CAM, and it also accounts for a couple

1 of other intentions of the bylaw which is maximize  
2 co-location and try to ensure technical feasibility.

3 I think one of the themes that runs  
4 through the bylaw is if you're going to build a  
5 tower, you want to make sure that more than one  
6 carrier can utilize it; and in looking at current  
7 industry trends, something like a concealed antenna  
8 monopole where everything's internal is very  
9 difficult to project going forward for carrier  
10 usage.

11 As Mr. Maxson noted in his report and as  
12 I'll note here, right now one of the carrier trends  
13 for a number of carriers not just AT&T, although  
14 AT&T included, is the use of RRHs or remote radio  
15 heads. Those are located up near the antennas and  
16 directly behind the antenna, and they have a size  
17 and depth to them; and when you locate those in the  
18 same space or near the same space as the panel  
19 antennas, given their size, given their depth and  
20 the number of panel antennas that the carrier would  
21 utilize, the diameter of the CAM grows so wide that  
22 it's no longer really a tower. Its diameter is  
23 excessive, and you kind of lose the benefit of the  
24 CAM. With the concealment with the monopine, it

1 allows for carriers to have the full amount of  
2 flexibility to build out their networks. They're  
3 doing 3G upgrades. They're doing 4G upgrades. I'm  
4 already learning about some 5G upgrades and speeds.  
5 So it gives the carriers the flexibility they need  
6 to build out their networks and provide the broad  
7 base of services that their subscribers want and  
8 demand from them, while still trying to respect the  
9 requirements to conceal it in some way, to minimize  
10 overall visual impact, and while still allowing for  
11 co-location potential and opportunities and  
12 flexibility. And given the intentions there, we  
13 think this strikes the best balance in terms of  
14 meeting all of those requirements.

15 At Tab 7 of the original application,  
16 there is a report from the site acquisition  
17 specialist that goes through a number of the  
18 alternatives, all of the alternatives that SBA and  
19 AT&T evaluated, and rules out all of the other  
20 properties that were looked at and evaluated as  
21 potential candidates. So based on AT&T's network  
22 need, which is to provide coverage to a significant  
23 gap it had along Route 2 and the surrounding area,  
24 we've determined this is the only feasible

1 alternative in terms of siting possibilities that  
2 are, one, available, reasonable, constructible, and  
3 also meet the radio frequency needs of the carrier.

4 As referenced, the planning staff put in a  
5 couple of comments. I know there are some requests  
6 for planning changes or amendments or additions in  
7 there. We will have them made. We've seen them.  
8 We didn't have a chance to address them quick enough  
9 to turn around the plans for today, but we've seen  
10 the comments. We will turn those around. I didn't  
11 think any of us expected that this would be the one  
12 and only hearing on this. We assumed there would be  
13 questions and things we'd have to get back to the  
14 Board on, and so if we have those, if there are any  
15 other questions or additions or concerns that we  
16 need to address with regard to the planning, I'm  
17 happy to take those down as well, and we can make  
18 sure that we address all of those.

19 One other thing, on the planning staff  
20 report and on the photographic simulations, the  
21 planning staff had asked for pictures to be taken  
22 with a 50-millimeter lens or a lens with a  
23 50-millimeter focal point. Every one of the  
24 pictures that you have from the visual test has the

1 type of lens that was used. Some are 50. Some were  
2 65 or 80. That was because of the distance. Once  
3 you got fairly far away from the visual point  
4 itself, using a 50 was impractical, and using the 65  
5 or the 80 gives a clearer picture. It's still  
6 representative to the extent that it actually is  
7 different from a 50. And I'm not a photography  
8 expert. This comes from them. The 80 gives a  
9 clearer picture and gives him a better representation,  
10 and so we're actually showing maybe actually even  
11 more clear than what -- it is, in fact, more clear  
12 than what a 50-millimeter lens would show. So it's  
13 certainly consistent with what was asked for, and  
14 unfortunately we didn't see that until after the  
15 initial demonstration was done, and so we couldn't  
16 make that adjustment.

17 To address Mr. Maxson -- some of the  
18 issues in Mr. Maxson's report -- has the Board seen  
19 Mr. Maxson's report?

20 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: (Nods.)

21 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.

22 A couple highlights from it. I'm sure  
23 there are other issues to discuss. He also talks  
24 about the CAM versus the monopole versus other types

1 of designs, and some of what we've said is consistent  
2 with what he has said in terms of the carrier needs  
3 and trends. We may have disagreement over the  
4 ultimate result and how you get there, but I think  
5 in terms of what I've described in terms of carrier  
6 trends of going to the RRHs or a larger antenna that  
7 integrate those in and make a CAM less desirable, I  
8 think, are consistent with his comments and has been  
9 consistent with our experience.

10           There were a couple of questions raised by  
11 Mr. Maxson's report, and we're happy to address  
12 those. One had to do with the greater frequency  
13 coverage cost provided by AT&T. They are not marked  
14 as to what frequency band AT&T propagated them at.  
15 AT&T has three bands in this market, radio frequency  
16 bands in this market that it utilizes, which is the  
17 1950 megahertz band, the 700 megahertz band, and the  
18 850 megahertz band. The band in which it has the  
19 most spectrum -- I call that the workhorse of the  
20 network -- is the 1950 band; and so for that reason,  
21 it is also a limiting factor on our propagation  
22 given the characteristic of the band. That's what  
23 it has been propagated at. It will carry the LTE.  
24 It will carry the 3G, and the other bands supplement

1 that, but they don't -- they don't have the same  
2 band width. They don't have the same capacity. So  
3 what drives the network capacity, from my  
4 understanding, is the 1950 megahertz band.

5 And I should mention I do have the radio  
6 frequency engineer from AT&T with us. Amjad Md is  
7 the radio frequency engineer. So if you have  
8 questions for him, I'm certainly happy to direct  
9 those to him.

10 One of the questions raised is what is the  
11 gap you're trying to serve, and I've addressed it  
12 already; but just for clarity purposes, I'll revisit  
13 it. The gap is in-vehicle coverage on Route 2 and  
14 the surrounding area. The facility will provide and  
15 may assist in providing some improved coverage in  
16 buildings in the surrounding areas, but it's not  
17 being counted on as part of the design criteria.

18 There are some buildings and residences  
19 that are within and very near the building  
20 footprint. A lot of them are further away. In part  
21 that's why we think this site is preferable to other  
22 sites that were looked at that weren't available,  
23 and why we kind of picked this spot that is removed  
24 from some of the more populated areas including

1 where Hosmer and Route 2 come together -- or Hosmer  
2 crosses under -- and you have the neighbors to the  
3 north, neighbors to the south, and a little bit to  
4 the west. This pulls it away from there. So  
5 instead of no residences in the area -- I know there  
6 are -- but it minimizes the number of residences and  
7 proximity to the Town itself.

8           So it may assist in providing some of that  
9 coverage, but it's not being counted on, and it's  
10 outside -- as Mr. Maxson's report notes, it's  
11 outside the reliability threshold. So to the extent  
12 that it provides improved coverage is an added  
13 benefit, and it's great, but it's not being counted  
14 on as part of the driving force for this particular  
15 site in addressing this particular coverage gap.

16           There were two questions about coverage  
17 being provided as shown on the radio frequency  
18 propagation maps: one from Annursnac Hill, and the  
19 other having to do with Great Hill. We are  
20 confident that they are, in fact, shown accurately  
21 on the radio frequency propagation maps we have  
22 provided. I've spoken with the radio frequency  
23 engineer and the explanation is that on Annursnac  
24 Hill, which is to the northeast, across Route 2, to

1 the northeast in Concord; to the north, the  
2 elevation north of Annursnac Hill goes up. And so  
3 the network does not receive a lot of benefit from  
4 that site. Where they were having problems is  
5 actually this area here that hadn't had a solution  
6 designed for it. It was in flux and didn't have a  
7 facility to provide the necessary coverage. And so  
8 as part of their optimization process to try and at  
9 least Band-Aid a solution until a real solution  
10 could be developed, which is this site, they took  
11 the antenna that was the second that was pointed  
12 north into the hill and wasn't providing enough  
13 coverage, and they reoriented everything and so  
14 there's a section that points into this area that  
15 throws the coverage from there into this area and  
16 kind of ignores a little bit the area to the north  
17 of Annursnac Hill. It is not a perfect solution;  
18 it's far from a perfect solution. It was a  
19 Band-Aid. It doesn't address the fundamental  
20 problem. It was something to at least try and get  
21 some coverage in the area and address some of the  
22 dropped calls and capacity issues, but it was not a  
23 long-term -- is not a long-term solution. It  
24 doesn't work. It's not reliable from a network

1       standpoint.

2               As part of that, they've also reduced the  
3       down tilt, the options in terms of how the antennas  
4       are oriented, in terms of 360 degrees. They also  
5       have options vertically. They raised it up to help  
6       broadcast that coverage from Annursnac Hill into  
7       this area here; and so instead of focusing the  
8       coverage and kind of getting that umbrella that a  
9       lot of times you see around the site itself, they  
10      were bypassing that and broadcasting it out and  
11      given beam widths and everything else, the coverage  
12      wasn't being -- the robust coverage wasn't really  
13      being provided down in that area that you would  
14      expect.

15              That explanation also goes to a second  
16      question that Mr. Maxson had about why if you drew a  
17      circle around the area we've described as the center  
18      of the search area itself, why that coverage seemed  
19      to be better than the surrounding areas itself, and  
20      it is because of these Band-Aid solutions that AT&T  
21      has been trying to use, again, to at least try and  
22      resolve some level of coverage, even if not totally  
23      reliable, to at least provide something in the area  
24      to try and address concerns and issues that

1 subscribers are having on Route 2, which is a highly  
2 traveled road during the day.

3           The response for Great Hill is the same  
4 question. Again, to paraphrase Mr. Maxson, he  
5 wasn't seeing what he would expect to see in terms  
6 of coverage right around Great Hill. The answer is  
7 somewhat similar in that the coverage objective is  
8 really from the surrounding areas, not necessarily  
9 Great Hill. It's to the north or the east on  
10 Route 2 and the intersection there with the -- it's  
11 not the cloverleaf, but with the exit there. So,  
12 again, they optimized it and raised it up, so you're  
13 not getting that umbrella coverage focused down.  
14 You're shooting it out to try and throw the coverage  
15 where it's needed the most. And so, again, that's  
16 why you have the area -- the smaller area of  
17 increasing the strength of the tower, and you also  
18 have really the benefit of actually the stronger  
19 signal strength of coverage up near Route 2 and then  
20 with that intersection in that direction.

21           I'm happy to take any questions.

22           MR. BARTL: It's not a question. I just  
23 want to draw to your attention we just got that  
24 today from our colleague, IT, Information

1 Technology. This deals with Section 3.10.6.12(a) of  
2 the zoning bylaw which provides that the Planning  
3 Board may approve or require the installation of  
4 transmission devices owned, operated, or used by the  
5 Town of Acton. And so if you were to approve this  
6 or if whatever you end up doing if you approve this  
7 tower in some way or form, I would ask you to take  
8 this into consideration. It's a double-sided sheet  
9 of paper. It basically is the same letter that he  
10 submitted on January of 2010 for the previous tower  
11 application, and then there were a few modifications  
12 and an e-mail that he attached to it today. I'm  
13 going to give this to Mr. Grossman as well. I'm  
14 sorry. We just got it today.

15 MR. GROSSMAN: That's okay.

16 (Document was marked Exhibit No. 4 for  
17 identification.)

18 MR. BARTL: And just as a way of -- I  
19 think one of the issues is -- I mean I think most of  
20 what they would be looking at would be some kind of  
21 whips at the top of the tower, which you probably  
22 couldn't see from a distance anyways. And then he's  
23 talking about having a connection to the -- I forget  
24 what he's saying, some network. Oh, fiber optic

1 cable. It was either the fiber optic cable, and I  
2 think now he says if it's not that, then we would  
3 want to see some kind of dish antenna on there, and  
4 I said, well, you know, depending on where the  
5 Planning Board goes, the Planning Board agrees to  
6 the camouflage idea of a pine tree-like looking  
7 thing, then the dish would be okay. If the Planning  
8 Board were to go with a true CAM tower, then the  
9 dish would probably work; so that's ...

10 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: So I don't know if you  
11 want to hear from Mr. Maxson before we  
12 start -- what? Why don't we do that if that's okay  
13 with you.

14 MR. MAXSON: Thank you.

15 Good evening. My name is David Maxson  
16 with Isotrope, and as Mr. Bartl said, we're  
17 consulting to the Board on this matter.

18 Through the Chair would it be okay if I  
19 just asked how many board members have been on the  
20 Board or any board that has dealt with a wireless  
21 facility application before.

22 (Board members raise hands.)

23 MR. MAXSON: Great. Excellent. Thank  
24 you. It tells me how much repeating or information

1       you already know.

2                       So you're generally probably quite  
3       familiar with the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and  
4       the fact that your zoning bylaw was constructed and  
5       adjusted recently to help address that need to  
6       comply not only with state law the way you usually  
7       do but with this federal law that prohibits the  
8       prohibition of the provision of personal wireless  
9       services or an effective prohibition of those  
10      services by the way facilities are approved or not  
11      approved.

12                      You have evidence before you in the form  
13      of coverage maps from AT&T. I have some questions  
14      about them. I think the answers that have been  
15      given to me are reasonable on the face, although if  
16      this proceeding is continued, I would like to have  
17      the opportunity to do my own coverage analysis just  
18      to compare with the applicant. And to do that, I  
19      would need to have the usual information that radio  
20      engineers use to set up their computer models and  
21      just do a second opinion, give you a double check on  
22      the results; but I think the answers they've given  
23      me will probably lead me in that direction.

24                      I was using a lower frequency, the

1 cellular width band at 850 megahertz because in the  
2 past that's typically what I've seen from AT&T as  
3 their baseline.

4 And I would say that you could approach  
5 the design question in two ways. Do you design a  
6 system so that your weakest signal covers  
7 everything, or do you design a system so that your  
8 most effective signal -- let's say 700 megahertz  
9 which gets through vegetation much better than the  
10 high 1900 megahertz does -- do you design the system  
11 so the 700 megahertz gets out as far as it can and  
12 then work your way back to what the high frequencies  
13 do?

14 And obviously if you're designing a  
15 network, you want to make it go the other way and  
16 use the most pessimistic analysis you can, and  
17 that's what you have before you today.

18 So what you'll have to do is review that  
19 evidence, and, you know, make a decision as to  
20 whether you feel there's a need for service, a gap  
21 in service. As I said, I think, in general, the  
22 signal levels that we're looking at are probably  
23 reasonably well represented, and I might quibble as  
24 to how far in or out this area of less reliable

1 service is. I think that's based on the map.

2 In addition to the radio analysis, we  
3 also, of course, look at the whole question of the  
4 zoning regulations and the different kinds of  
5 facilities that are possible and whether there are  
6 alternative locations.

7 I certainly have a feeling of, as they  
8 say, déjà vu all over again because this site was,  
9 of course, proposed with SBA and other wireless  
10 companies several years ago. So to the extent that  
11 AT&T says that they picked this site, keep in mind  
12 that SBA had already picked this site, and so it was  
13 a very likely opportunity for AT&T to join SBA in  
14 reapplying to use this site.

15 If there are concerns about this location  
16 because of neighborhood compatibility, visual  
17 impact, whatever the issues might be from the zoning  
18 perspective, you have the opportunity to pursue  
19 alternatives. The applicant has given some  
20 commentary on the alternatives that they've looked  
21 at.

22 I rely on local knowledge. If there are  
23 other locations that the Board would like to  
24 consider from a coverage standpoint and from an

1 availability standpoint, the applicant, I'm sure,  
2 would be inclined to respond to those questions, and  
3 I could certainly do the same as a second opinion.

4 The one, I think, most obvious opportunity  
5 is to move over to being closer to Route 2, which  
6 apparently is the primary objective of this facility  
7 and to use developed property that is -- I think  
8 it's OP, Office Park District, by Hosmer Street,  
9 that area. I forget what the district is called,  
10 Roland.

11 MR. BARTL: Yes, I think it's called  
12 Office Park between Hosmer and Piper Road, that  
13 stretch, where the auto auction is.

14 MR. MAXSON: Yes. Yes. And is there also  
15 a motel?

16 MR. BARTL: Yes, there is a motel on the  
17 corner right there.

18 MR. MAXSON: So there's some relatively  
19 large parcels that are already heavily developed,  
20 and they're very close to Route 2 and a little bit  
21 farther away from that open space of the fields  
22 along Route 2 there that might be worth considering  
23 if the applicant -- depending on what the applicant  
24 says about their attempts to consider that area.

1           Now, as I said, keep in mind that SBA  
2           already had an opportunity at this Craig Road  
3           location, so it made it something a bit easy -- an  
4           easy task to bring it forward as a proposal because  
5           an awful lot of the initial legwork of making the  
6           deal with the landowner and doing the site design  
7           and that sort of thing had already been done.

8           In terms of tower height, this is a real  
9           conundrum. Mr. Grossman was, I think, on the mark  
10          in talking about the fact that the concealed antenna  
11          monopole, "CAM", is something that's becoming more  
12          and more challenging for wireless companies to use  
13          because of the fact that they're putting so much  
14          more equipment on cell towers today than they used  
15          to with all the new radio frequency bands, which  
16          means more antennas or fatter, taller antennas.  
17          These radio heads are also pretty chunky, and you  
18          have to have a pretty fat tower to hide the radio  
19          heads inside the cowling as well.

20          So you're presented with a different  
21          camouflage alternative which some people love  
22          monopines, and other people hate them. This one is  
23          clearly visible without much screening because it's  
24          right close to the open land. But you have some

1 visual simulations that -- I always sing the praises  
2 of this particular company, Caron Design Associates  
3 because I have seen them at work, and they are  
4 probably the most thorough in making sure that they  
5 get their simulations to the correct proportions and  
6 heights and that sort of thing; so I expect that  
7 those will be a pretty accurate simulation.

8           As far as the focal length is concerned, I  
9 think -- I appreciate that being pointed out. I'm  
10 not concerned about those shots that are at 65 or  
11 80 millimeters. As a general rule of thumb in the  
12 literature that says if you have a typical 50 or  
13 55-millimeter camera lens, that kind of captures a  
14 field of view that's typical when you're not  
15 focusing on something. It kind of -- it is accepted  
16 as relating to what sort of your normal field of  
17 view is, but something up to as much as an  
18 80-millimeter telephoto lens is still able to convey  
19 the sense that you're looking directly at something  
20 in the distance, and you're focusing on it. It's  
21 more like a slightly telephoto effect. So the fact  
22 that they did the 80 millimeter or the 65 millimeter  
23 at distances that were farther away from the tower  
24 does not detract from the quality of the results.

1 In fact, it may make them a little bit more  
2 realistic when you're trying to translate perception  
3 in the field to a flat piece of paper.

4 You have in the bylaw all these height  
5 requirements, and I think you might agree with me  
6 that it does seem rather impractical to require a  
7 pole that is being designed to 100 feet or  
8 thereabouts to be able to go to 175. That's a tall  
9 order, so to speak; so I think the Board can weigh  
10 in how much future additional height if it were  
11 willing to approve this tower at this height, if  
12 any, it might want to allow for other carriers to  
13 co-locate on it.

14 As I said in my report, with a tower at  
15 this height, it might be useful for three carriers.  
16 As you start going lower, the antennas get down  
17 close to the tree line, at which point the coverage  
18 in the direction away from Route 2 starts to get  
19 significantly compromised by the lower antenna  
20 height.

21 I ended my report with a series of  
22 pull-outs with some suggestions in them, and I don't  
23 know that I need to review those, but at least point  
24 them out that they're kind of a summary of some of

1 the details.

2           Again, I think I'll stop there, and I'd  
3 certainly be happy to be involved in discussion or  
4 answer questions.

5           CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Roland.

6           MR. BARTL: Mr. Chairman, given the 9:45  
7 timing we have, and in fairness to the folks that  
8 have been sitting there for a while now, being  
9 prepared in case the meeting goes faster, which it  
10 didn't, would it be okay to maybe take on -- take up  
11 the Avalon Bay matter. I think it's a short, brief  
12 discussion and decision, in my estimation, probably  
13 not more than five minutes, to give us directions on  
14 how to go further, and then go back to this hearing?  
15 I don't know. It's just a suggestion.

16           CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Yeah, I mean I think if  
17 it's -- you know, I certainly think that that  
18 probably makes sense, given that we'll probably be  
19 extending this anyway --

20           MR. BARTL: Right.

21           CHAIRMAN CLIMER: -- so we can probably at  
22 least focus on what we need for next time.

23           MR. BARTL: Get them on their way home.

24           CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Okay. All right. So

1 we'll temporarily move on to then the Avalon Bay  
2 decision --

3 MR. BARTL: Right.

4 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: -- and we'll come back  
5 to this in about five or ten minutes.

6 (There was a short break taken.)

7 (Documents were marked Exhibit Nos. 5  
8 through 6 for identification.)

9 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: So it seems like with  
10 respect to -- I mean we're going to have to extend  
11 the -- schedule to next month a hearing extension of  
12 this. Should we just focus on what we think we need  
13 for that meeting, so that we can --

14 MR. BARTL: Right. You might want to see  
15 if there are any abutters --

16 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Yes.

17 MR. BARTL: -- and then focus on what we  
18 need.

19 I have a quick question. With respect to  
20 an extension and continuation, I just wanted to  
21 clarify one point, and both Mr. Grossman and Dave  
22 Maxson might be able to help with that. I do not  
23 recall, but -- it has been a couple of years  
24 ago -- a lot of discussion about federal rules about

1 the time it takes to go through the hearing.

2 Can you refresh this for me and for the  
3 Board. I think in the end coming up with agreements  
4 of extensions and working together we override that,  
5 but it's probably still good to know that as a  
6 background.

7 Thank you.

8 MR. MAXSON: Thank you. Is this on?  
9 Okay.

10 And I'm not an attorney. I play one  
11 on -- no. The decision of the FCC that we're  
12 talking about is that for this project, which is a  
13 new tower, it's 150 days from the date of the  
14 application that is the presumption that that's  
15 enough time to arrive at a decision; but it is a  
16 presumption that is rebuttable if push comes to  
17 shove.

18 MR. BARTL: Which is shorter than the  
19 statutory time frames that the Mass. General Law  
20 provides for public hearings and processes under  
21 zoning.

22 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: (Nods.)

23 MR. CHIN: I have some questions for Dave.

24 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Do we want -- just

1 procedurally, I mean, I wonder -- and, you know,  
2 Roland's comment maybe we should focus on deciding  
3 what we need next time. So maybe we let a few -- we  
4 take a few comments --

5 MR. YACOUBY: I think we want to hear from  
6 the abutting people first --

7 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Yes, I agree.

8 MR. YACOUBY: -- in fairness to them and  
9 then decide what we do next.

10 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Okay. No. No. I think  
11 that's right. So maybe we can open it up to the  
12 abutters, and then we can save our questions for  
13 later.

14 So why don't we open it up to the public  
15 comments, so that we can hear what other people are  
16 thinking, so that we can be sure that we ask for the  
17 appropriate follow-ups for our extension but feel  
18 free -- oh, go ahead.

19 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't want to take any  
20 more time other than to say just so that the Board  
21 can keep track and Roland and Kim can keep track, I  
22 had asked the stenographer to mark as Exhibit 5 the  
23 Planning Staff Report and as Exhibit 6 Mr. Maxson's  
24 report.

1 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Okay.

2 MR. GROSSMAN: Just so you know.

3 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Great. Thank you.

4 So we'll open it to the abutters, and any  
5 public comments that people would like to make now.

6 Please just identify yourself and go right  
7 ahead.

8 MR. MAGLOTHIN: Good evening. Michael  
9 Maglothin, 288 School Street.

10 Just something I wanted to encourage to  
11 back up Mr. Maxson, and I'd like to see the Town  
12 issue a third-party technical study. I would like  
13 to see it be equally extensive to verify capability  
14 needs exist. Basically to the propagation path loss  
15 analysis that we not take SBA Tower's conclusions as  
16 irrefutable and to please insist on more signal  
17 strength quality on-site survey analysis and not  
18 just predictive modeling, but actually getting out  
19 and verifying that there's a quality and signal need  
20 out there, especially on Route 2.

21 In the previous submission application a  
22 couple years ago, there was a technical analysis  
23 that was conducted by BSEC Planning Corp. It found  
24 that there were more capable sites that were not

1 necessarily looked at.

2 And the last thing it's more of a question  
3 if we could verify who the proper property owner is.  
4 There's some confusion on that, and if we can get a  
5 point of contact for that company or person.

6 MR. BARTL: The property owner's John  
7 Palmer, Palmer Moving and Storage. I believe he's  
8 also on site at the property running his business.

9 MR. MAGLOTHIN: Is he present?

10 MR. BARTL: I haven't seen him here  
11 tonight, no.

12 MR. MAGLOTHIN: Okay. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Yep.

14 Can I -- I mean, we'll still let other  
15 people speak, but, Dave, you obviously understood  
16 that more than maybe we did on what the request was.  
17 Are those all items that would typically be items  
18 that you could follow up on or do you think we  
19 should follow up on?

20 MR. MAXSON: Yeah, I think the resident  
21 was speaking in that classic language of trust and  
22 verify, and it does relate to some of my comments  
23 which were if the Board is so inclined to request,  
24 on my behalf, the technical information that I would

1 need, to do my own propagation modeling to compare  
2 it to the applicant's results.

3 The second part of that is the field  
4 measurements, and I would ask the applicant if -- or  
5 AT&T, the co-applicant, if -- where did they  
6 go -- if there is a drive test of a recent vintage  
7 that was conducted of the existing coverage in this  
8 territory, that it might be shared.

9 MR. BARTL: I have a question on that. To  
10 what extent is the drive test and field coverage  
11 measurements valid in light of the Court's decision  
12 where it came out, like, in Sudbury where somebody  
13 went and said, well, I have a signal strength and  
14 whatnot. I mean is that different from anybody  
15 going around with a phone and saying well -- looking  
16 at what their signal strength is, and then retrying  
17 to refute the model that way. I'm just trying to  
18 figure out what the use of it is as opposed to the  
19 model.

20 MR. MAXSON: Right. It's my understanding  
21 that if you're just at a couple of places, and you  
22 sort of anecdotally say well, I've got coverage here  
23 what's the problem, that that's not particularly  
24 scientific or engineering-oriented; whereas, what

1 the drive test systems do is they collect numerous  
2 data points, hundreds of data points, during the  
3 drive test, so that you have something that has some  
4 statistical bearing and is done in a process that's  
5 repeatable. So if someone were to repeat the test,  
6 they could come up with similar results.

7 MR. BARTL: Okay.

8 MR. BOURDON: I have a question, and I  
9 don't know if this was brought up last time when we  
10 did the last tower, and it was discovered then that  
11 it was only for data. So the question is to the  
12 applicant is this voice and data or just data?

13 MR. MAXSON: The applicant can answer it.  
14 I'm not recalling what it says in the application  
15 but.

16 MR. GROSSMAN: It's both voice and data.

17 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Okay.

18 MR. BOURDON: Thank you.

19 MR. MAXSON: And I would just color that  
20 by saying that the primary objective that has been  
21 stated by the applicant is service to mobile  
22 traffic, so since texting and driving is not  
23 condoned in the Commonwealth, and it's really hard  
24 to surf the web while you're driving, it strikes me

1 that a major emphasis is to enable voice  
2 communication and what little data communication  
3 that goes on inside a vehicle, perhaps with  
4 passengers and that sort of thing as well.

5 MR. GROSSMAN: One additional quick point  
6 on the data.

7 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Yep.

8 MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly absent passengers  
9 who would be using it, don't forget there are a  
10 number of mobile apps. that allow drivers to  
11 navigate, and to do this it requires the use of the  
12 system. They may be legally using data at the same  
13 time, so, you know, it's an important objective.

14 MR. WEIR: Hi. My name is Justin Weir. I  
15 live at 305 School Street, and I will say that I  
16 mainly used AT&T's data for like two years on  
17 Route 2 to stream music with no problem at all. I  
18 experienced no coverage drops at all.

19 And if you look at their coverage map on  
20 the website, which I am right now, that's exactly  
21 what their website says. It says their coverage is  
22 good all on Route 2. So I also want to ask why  
23 according to the application that was denied a few  
24 years ago after T-Mobile dropped out. It was

1 Clearwire and T-Mobile for those of you who don't  
2 remember. And T-Mobile dropped out after it was  
3 shown that they didn't have a coverage gap, and, you  
4 know, I would -- since that process dragged on for  
5 months, I would think that the tower company would  
6 have contacted, you know, AT&T, Verizon, Sprint to  
7 try to get them on the application, and none of them  
8 joined. So I'm wondering why didn't AT&T join in  
9 that application and maybe -- has something changed  
10 in the last few years in their coverage. Is it  
11 suddenly now there's a gap that wasn't there before?  
12 And my last question is that if the tower goes up,  
13 would the drop in the property values of the  
14 surrounding houses be reflected in our tax  
15 valuation? Does anyone know?

16 No?

17 MR. BARTL: I don't know.

18 MR. BOURDON: I think that one you need to  
19 talk to the Assessors Office.

20 MR. MAXSON: Can I speak to that?

21 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Yes, I'm sorry.

22 MR. MAXSON: See if I can do justice to  
23 some of these questions. First of all, I think one  
24 thing that needs to be understood is the way these

1 wireless companies develop their sites.

2 At the time that T-Mobile and Clearwire  
3 were applying with SBA for the tower, T-Mobile and  
4 Clearwire were actively building their networks, and  
5 they had funded what are called search rings and  
6 decided that this year we're going to build cell  
7 sites at these locations, in these parts of the  
8 Commonwealth, and so the funding was available.

9 Now, I understand that it may be the  
10 perception of some that T-Mobile may have dropped  
11 out because there was no -- reportedly no gap in  
12 service. My recollection is more that T-Mobile,  
13 like many wireless companies, has ebbs and flows in  
14 their site development, and I actually recently  
15 experienced one when I was working with a church  
16 that was putting a T-Mobile facility in a steeple,  
17 and it got all the way through zoning permits and  
18 everything else, and then the planned merger with  
19 AT&T that never happened came along. They pulled  
20 the plug on all their unfinished projects. So what  
21 you'll see is that different companies are  
22 developing their networks at different times and  
23 what I'm seeing right now is that AT&T, according to  
24 press reports, is developing something on the order

1 of 10,000 new cell sites across the country now, and  
2 it's because they're trying to improve the quality  
3 of their service so they can expand their LTE  
4 network, their fourth generation technology, and  
5 provide better service to their customer base.

6 So I think that's probably a good  
7 understanding of the reason why this thing went away  
8 and now it's come back.

9 As for the question of whether AT&T, you  
10 know, the website may say coverage is good, and the  
11 gentleman's experience says coverage seems to be  
12 pretty good what's the problem? I think that kind  
13 of anecdotal evidence, while it's not strong in  
14 court, is certainly like the canary in the coal mine  
15 that says this is worth a little closer look to make  
16 sure we're not missing something or the applicant  
17 isn't missing something.

18 So another reason to ask the applicant if  
19 they had drive test data and if the Board is so  
20 inclined to collect its own at some additional  
21 expense to the applicant, we can do that as well  
22 with professional and commercial equipment.

23 And then the last question contains a very  
24 strong presumption that there would be a drop in

1 property values, and that's certainly a fair  
2 question. The way that has been addressed in other  
3 application proceedings is with what I would call  
4 dueling appraisal reports. That just as an  
5 anecdotal evidence from a telephone user that they  
6 have good service what is the applicant complaining  
7 about, so it is, likewise, that if someone just  
8 comes in and says, I'm a -- you know, I have some  
9 experience in real estate, I think property values  
10 are going to drop 10 percent, that that's generally  
11 not a strong enough source of evidence; that the  
12 evidence really would be in the form of a  
13 professional report from a certified appraiser or  
14 someone with the skills and experience in evaluating  
15 the impact of wireless facilities on residential  
16 values and to put that into the record.

17 As you know, the Federal Telecom Act  
18 requires any decision that is contrary to an  
19 application, a denial, to be supported by  
20 substantial evidence of a written record. So if you  
21 had evidence on a record that was credible that said  
22 that property values in this area are likely to  
23 decline by "X" percent, that would be something you  
24 could weigh the evidence and make a decision on.

1           Thanks.

2           MS. QUINN: Good evening. I'm Kathy Quinn.  
3 I live at 299 School Street.

4           I have a couple of points. I don't  
5 understand what an LTE network is and how that is  
6 different from voice or data, but I would ask if  
7 this is the kind of idea of supporting every  
8 incremental change in technology that comes along is  
9 that above the scope of what you need for compliance  
10 with what the Town needs to comply with?

11           The previous applicant on the tower was  
12 T-Mobile. They had no network. If you looked to  
13 see where their coverage was in the United States,  
14 there wasn't any, so, of course, there was a gap;  
15 but I think they were found to be also locating  
16 themselves at the top of that church steeple, at the  
17 top of the hill without notifying the Board the last  
18 time the application came before the Board, which  
19 was interesting.

20           I also went to the website and looked at  
21 AT&T's reported coverage of data. I'm sorry I don't  
22 have, like, bigger slides or anything, but this is  
23 best coverage for data along Route 2 and the fields  
24 where nobody lives, and this is the best coverage

1 for voice that -- I mean there's very little  
2 alteration. This is what they tell the public is  
3 that they have excellent coverage in this area.

4 I also kind of wondered if they had done  
5 everything they could to collate -- co -- excuse me.  
6 Co --

7 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Co-locate.

8 MS. QUINN: Co-locate because there are 29  
9 other towers in a 4-mile radius, and there are also  
10 127 antennas -- antennas are just identified as  
11 anything under 100 feet, but that seems like a lot  
12 of metal; and I wanted to know if they had looked to  
13 see if their gap could be addressed using that kind  
14 of technology or co-location or any of these  
15 repeater things that they talk about? Because I  
16 feel like this is a very convenient application, but  
17 it doesn't necessarily -- I think the person whose  
18 property it is is offering their space, and I  
19 understand the monetary desire to want to rent their  
20 land for that, but I'm not sure that it actually  
21 achieves the goals that are stated where is the best  
22 place to achieve those goals, and that's all that  
23 really matters, not their profitability.

24 So if there is, indeed, a need, I would

1     like other options seriously looked into. The state  
2     land right along Route 2 has a tree border, isn't  
3     within 350 feet of a home. So something like a  
4     monopine would blend more easily, and it's an  
5     elevation of over 40 feet higher than the property  
6     we're talking about; so the pole might only need to  
7     be 60 feet, and it would totally blend into the tree  
8     line and achieve the same objective.

9             So I wish that that would also be looked  
10     into, co-location, other locations, instead of just  
11     saying, well this is an easy do. Because it's a  
12     beautiful vista. I've lived there all my life, and  
13     I think we can do better.

14            CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Mr. Grossman, one  
15     question for you. You had referenced before the  
16     site location. Is that a document that we should  
17     have that addresses considering other sites in that  
18     area, or is that -- was there a document submitted  
19     that addressed that because I don't think it's in  
20     our package.

21            MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. There was a  
22     site -- there's an affidavit of a site acquisition  
23     specialist which was signed by Steve McGovern. It  
24     should have been -- it's eight pages, and it should

1 have been at Tab 7. So if you have the full and  
2 complete packet that looks like this (indicating).

3 MR. BARTL: You don't have it in front of  
4 you.

5 MR. YACOUBY: That's --

6 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: I understand.

7 MR. BARTL: It's in the big package.

8 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: All right. All right.  
9 My apologies.

10 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.

11 MR. BARTL: That's fine. That's fine.

12 MR. YACOUBY: It's referenced in here.

13 MR. BARTL: I just -- you know, it's  
14 always like what are we copying? You know, we have  
15 DocuShare now, so we try to not print everything  
16 too.

17 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: No, that's perfectly  
18 fine. I forgot this was the document that we  
19 already had. So thank you.

20 MR. GROSSMAN: Sure.

21 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Any more comments from  
22 the public because what we'd like to do I think at  
23 this point is decide what we need for our next  
24 meeting so that we can address some of the concerns

1 raised, some of the concerns that the Planning Board  
2 has, and I think if there were any other comments,  
3 we'd be happy to take them, but are you saying you  
4 want to go back to the --

5 MS. QUINN: Yeah, I'm sorry. I printed it  
6 off DocuShare. I looked at the sites that they  
7 looked at, and none of the ones I suggested were in  
8 there.

9 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Okay.

10 MS. QUINN: There's the ones that I  
11 suggested last time that other people in the  
12 community have suggested as more appropriate --

13 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Okay.

14 MS. QUINN: -- that have not been looked  
15 at or ...

16 Like the State property, the State didn't  
17 respond, and so they felt like they had done their  
18 due diligence. I think they should look for a  
19 response from the State. That's all.

20 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Okay. Thank you.

21 If -- oh, Dave.

22 MR. MAXSON: I do have some comments to  
23 the last resident's --

24 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Sure.

1 MR. MAXSON: -- remarks and questions.

2 I think just real quick for those who may  
3 have their heads spinning, and I don't blame anyone  
4 who does, with this LTE thing, it's called a Long  
5 Term Evolution. It's sort of a brand name for the  
6 technology that's providing the wireless carriers  
7 with the ability to deliver services that when you  
8 have a good connection with your wireless device  
9 that you can get data speeds that really rival what  
10 you can get on your cable or Fios Internet  
11 connection at home.

12 I just did a speed test in my office the  
13 other day on my smartphone, and I had, for those of  
14 you who like the numbers, 42 megabits per second,  
15 which is faster than I can get at home on my cable  
16 TV connection, Internet connection. You have to be  
17 in the right place and have a good signal and all  
18 that sort of stuff, and there has to be not a lot of  
19 other traffic on the network. There's all kinds of  
20 variables, but. So that's what the carriers are  
21 attempting to do with their LTE technology.

22 As far as voice service is concerned, the  
23 LTE technology doesn't do voice yet; so, in fact,  
24 it's data service, and that was actually one of the

1 issues with the Clearwire application because they  
2 were at the time a data-only company and were not  
3 offering voice services that were connected to the  
4 public's switched telephone network.

5 In this case, LTE voice services are  
6 close. The major wireless carriers are looking at  
7 starting to launch some next year. Starting to  
8 offer telephones that can use the technology next  
9 year.

10 Your existing telephone won't do voice on  
11 the LTE network, so it will take time for this all  
12 to phase in which gets us to the prescient question  
13 which is is this need to put in an LTE facility to  
14 provide service from Route 2 something that the Town  
15 needs to comply with as the resident is saying?  
16 And, you know, I think that's a fair question.

17 The Telecom Act talks about provision of  
18 service and the effective prohibition of the  
19 provision of service, and if the applicant is  
20 providing 3G services today, third generation  
21 technology services or three and a half G technology  
22 services that are working, if that's a true  
23 statement, in the target area, what is the Town's  
24 obligation to enable the applicant to put in new

1 facilities in order to beef up their ability to  
2 provide LTE fourth generation technology data  
3 services and a future voice service on that platform  
4 when the voice service becomes available?

5 So in terms of slicing the Telecom Act  
6 very thin and looking at this with a really hard,  
7 narrow view, there's a question as to where that  
8 line is drawn. From the other perspective, from a  
9 sort of general planning perspective where you're  
10 trying to make services available to the community,  
11 at this point there are as many cell phone numbers  
12 assigned in the United States as there are people in  
13 the United States. So cell phone use is completely  
14 ubiquitous, and it's a fact of life, and that sort  
15 of underscores the benefits and the importance of  
16 providing the services and providing better quality  
17 and competitive services over time.

18 So there's the broad and the narrow, and  
19 the Board may want to weigh those things against the  
20 impacts of the proposed facility to make a  
21 determination as to whether this facility should be  
22 approved.

23 I also think it's a great point that if  
24 there's State property, the State has become more

1       educated, more sophisticated about making its  
2       property available for wireless facilities than it  
3       ever used to be; and depending on the nature of this  
4       State-owned property, whether there is access to it,  
5       whether it's something that would require a curb cut  
6       on Route 2, which is probably not going to be a  
7       desirable thing, whether it has some kind of  
8       conservation restrictions on it. I mean there are a  
9       lot of questions, but at the same time if it's an  
10      opportunity that the Board might see that might  
11      significantly reduce the potential impact of a new  
12      tower in the area, it's certainly worth pursuing  
13      with a little more diligence.

14                 And, you know, I think that addresses the  
15      comments that I had some answers to.

16                 Thank you.

17                 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Thank you.

18                 MR. BOURDON: Give us some direction of  
19      what we'd like to --

20                 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Yeah. No, I agree. I  
21      think --

22                 MR. BARTL: You need to speak into the  
23      microphone.

24                 MR. BOURDON: Oh, I just commented that we

1 should give Dave Maxson some direction in which we  
2 want him to head to give us some --

3 MR. BARTL: And the applicant.

4 MR. BOURDON: And the applicant to get us  
5 information back before our next meeting.

6 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Because I think we have  
7 to ask the applicant to provide the data that Dave  
8 needs; is that correct?

9 MR. BARTL: Unless you want Dave to  
10 generate some more data which he offered he could do  
11 which is sort of like --

12 MR. BOURDON: We should ask the applicant.

13 MR. BARTL: -- if you feel like we could  
14 do that or not, that's up to you.

15 MR. YACOUBY: I think we would like some  
16 third-party other piece of data on the coverage  
17 issue.

18 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Okay. And then maybe  
19 we'll let Dave speak to that because I think we want  
20 to make sure that we're giving the right direction.

21 MR. MAXSON: Yes, the first thing is that  
22 when radio engineers do coverage modeling, they have  
23 certain inputs that they need. They need to know  
24 the locations of the facilities, the antenna heights,

1 the type of antennas, the direction that the  
2 antennas are pointed. There's a number of variables  
3 that we need to know that I can communicate with the  
4 applicant and ask them for so that I can set up my  
5 model to review and compare with the applicant's  
6 coverage model and produce some coverage maps. So  
7 that would be information that assuming the  
8 applicant's agreeable, and we do have a nod of the  
9 head from counsel for the applicant, that we can do  
10 that.

11 The other one is the question of a drive  
12 test, which is a real physical evaluation of the  
13 performance when you compare it to the coverage maps  
14 and see if they are in relative agreements.

15 One of the difficulties here is if we did  
16 a drive test, we could drive test the AT&T LTE  
17 network if it is up and running on Annursnac Hill  
18 and on Great Hill and so forth, but we can only test  
19 that for data quality because it doesn't support  
20 voice services yet; and/or we can test the 3G  
21 network for data or for voice quality.

22 And then the question is if you get that  
23 information, how will that inform the discussion?  
24 The basic information in terms of signal strength we

1 can gather and use that to compare against the  
2 computer models, but as far as call testing is  
3 concerned, I -- I think they're attempting to build  
4 a network for voice that we can't test yet because  
5 it has not been released to the general public, and  
6 that would be a hard thing to evaluate.

7 MR. BARTL: You mentioned that right now  
8 it's not available, the new system is not available  
9 for voice, but it will be available for voice? Is  
10 that a fact of certainty?

11 MR. MAXSON: Yes.

12 MR. BARTL: Okay. So it really doesn't  
13 make -- in my mind, it really doesn't make sense to  
14 slice it down that way, because -- well, it may only  
15 be data right now if we were to say, well, this is  
16 just like Clearwire was, and we had to say no to  
17 Clearwire because they didn't qualify because they  
18 didn't even provide voice service at all.

19 AT&T provides voice service using  
20 different technology, but they will get there with  
21 the new one.

22 I'm not sure we would want to splice it  
23 down that way. I mean that's something that you  
24 guys would have to decide, but, you know, that maybe

1 the need for this tower if it, indeed, exists, it's  
2 not for voice as much as it is for data; but it  
3 looks like the voice service will be improved as  
4 well in the end.

5 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: So if we looked at  
6 current voice service, would we likely get a  
7 different answer than we might if the technology was  
8 currently out there, I mean, where you could test  
9 the LTE network? I mean, would you get a different  
10 answer?

11 MR. MAXSON: You know, I don't know. To  
12 the extent that they're doing voice on, let's say, a  
13 cellular band, the 850 megahertz spectrum, that will  
14 have slightly better coverage in foliage than the  
15 1950 spectrum, which currently is being used for  
16 both voice and data at this point.

17 The big question that has come up in a lot  
18 of meetings, a lot of hearings is the applicant says  
19 according to their website they've got pretty good  
20 service on Route 2, and, you know, that raises the  
21 question, and how do you test it? Well, since the  
22 anecdotal approach of somebody driving down the road  
23 saying, gee, I can stream Pandora just fine on  
24 Route 2, no problem. What's the issue? Or I can

1 maintain a call on Route 2 in my car, what's the  
2 issue? We can do that more scientifically with test  
3 equipment and collect some data and at least have it  
4 that says, yeah, you know what, this is  
5 corroborating or it's not corroborating what the  
6 advertising maps say.

7 MR. YACOUBY: Thank you. They're  
8 advertising maps.

9 MR. MAXSON: Right.

10 MR. BOURDON: We need to have one then for  
11 voice and one for data then.

12 MR. MAXSON: Well, you know, we could do  
13 one on the 3G network. That's where the voice is  
14 and do a separate one and test LTE, and what that  
15 will test is probably the best way to do that is  
16 just to do a speed test, which the systems do; and  
17 in doing a speed test, you can determine whether  
18 it's delivering really good speed, really bad speed,  
19 or typical intermediate speed levels. That's again  
20 assuming that there is LTE available on the Great  
21 Hill and the Annursnac Hill facilities. Have they  
22 been turned on?

23 MR. MD: I have to check that.

24 MR. MAXSON: The applicant needs to verify

1       whether or not the LTE has been turned on in those  
2       locations.

3               So that's what we can do. We can collect  
4       the data and see if there are any other set of data  
5       points to look at in your evaluation.

6               CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Okay. Do you want to  
7       comment on that?

8               MR. GROSSMAN: Just briefly on the  
9       observations. One of the things that were talked  
10      about the proposed facility covers voice and data,  
11      and the issue of well, what do you do with the data  
12      part if you lost out on the voice part? Do you  
13      carve that off? Do you splice it in that manner?  
14      It's actually already been -- it's been addressed.  
15      When these types of services are what we call  
16      commingled, so you have the voice and the data being  
17      provided by the same facility, the data is not split  
18      off, and you're not looking at well, do we just  
19      allow them to provide the voice that's covered by  
20      Personal Wireless Service Facilities definition.  
21      It's covered by the 1996 Telecommunications Act, but  
22      the data part over here we don't need to do.

23              You can do that with and did do that with  
24      Clearwire, where Clearwire was strictly data

1 broadband. It fell under a different definition, a  
2 different classification. Where you have what they  
3 call commingled services like the AT&T site will  
4 provide, then you don't split them. You take them  
5 together, and they both have the protection under  
6 the Federal Telecommunications Act because of that  
7 voice component.

8           Secondly, we're talking about how to  
9 address it, and I think in terms of the starting  
10 point, you know, having the data -- the call  
11 data -- the information concerning the surrounding  
12 facilities that Mr. Maxson needs from AT&T to look  
13 at his modeling and then fine tune it, certainly we  
14 can provide. We've done that in the past. Dave and  
15 I -- Mr. Maxson and I can communicate. We can get  
16 him that data.

17           From there I think maybe we can make a  
18 decision on -- once Dave's had a chance to run his  
19 tests, run his propagations -- of whether or not  
20 maybe something like a drive test or something is  
21 really necessary.

22           On the question of, well, your advertising  
23 maps show one thing, what about the propagation  
24 maps? Why do they look different? To address that,

1 the propagation maps were referenced. The propagation  
2 maps used by the radio frequency engineers have a  
3 level of detail, a level of granularity and a level  
4 of fine tuning that the advertising maps do not.  
5 They are formatted differently for the web to load  
6 faster. They don't have the same level of  
7 granularity details so they can smooth out. So  
8 instead of getting the sharp contrasts, you tend to  
9 see on the radio frequency propagation maps, which  
10 are what is utilized by the radio frequency  
11 engineers or one of the tools utilized by radio  
12 frequency engineers versus what's shown on the  
13 website, and so it would not --

14 MR. BARTL: When a used car dealer tries  
15 to sell you a car, the car always sounds better than  
16 it really is too.

17 (Laughter.)

18 MR. GROSSMAN: So it's not to say that the  
19 propagation maps are wholly inaccurate; they're not.  
20 For what they are used for, they're an appropriate  
21 representation, but they are not to the level of  
22 detail required for a network design, and that's why  
23 the radio frequency engineers use the programs they  
24 use.

1           MR. YACOUBY:  So where are we?  It's been  
2   an hour.

3           CHAIRMAN CLIMER:  Yeah.  So, I mean, you  
4   know, to ask you, Dave, so based on everything we've  
5   said, I mean what would your recommendation be to  
6   us, given that we are looking to have independent  
7   cooperation of the information that's been provided.

8           MR. MAXSON:  Well, I think given the time,  
9   if the applicant is prompt in providing the setting  
10  information I need to run my computer models, and we  
11  can run those computer models, that's certainly a  
12  good first pass, as Mr. Grossman suggests, and  
13  perhaps the Board could then delegate to Mr. Bartl  
14  whether or not to then proceed with a drive test  
15  based on what our opinions are on our results of our  
16  computer models, and that way we can hold off on a  
17  firm decision on whether to do the extra work or  
18  not.

19          MR. DUBE:  Thank you, Dave.  That sounds  
20  reasonable.

21          CHAIRMAN CLIMER:  Yeah, that sounds -- I  
22  mean do we -- we have enough time to do all that.  I  
23  mean we have 150 days from --

24          MR. BARTL:  Well, you have in the end

1       whatever time you and the applicant Mr. Grossman  
2       will agree on to work out. We have an extension and  
3       continuation agreement ready to be signed. You're  
4       going to have to -- I think it's -- you know, you're  
5       going to have to work your way towards a date  
6       somehow. It's ready there to be put in.

7               I'm not sure on what basis I would make  
8       that decision, but I'll try.

9               MR. MAXSON: Probably largely on my  
10       recommendation whether or not I think it's  
11       necessary. I can give you a rationalization for why  
12       or why not.

13              MR. BARTL: Right. Okay.

14              MR. MAXSON: And you can either agree to  
15       or not.

16              MR. BARTL: Now, that would involve  
17       probably additional costs that are not currently  
18       being covered under the deposit that we have from  
19       you right now, from the applicant, I assume, or is  
20       that -- we'd have to work on that part too, I  
21       suppose.

22              MR. MAXSON: Right. Right.

23              MR. BARTL: So that might all take a  
24       little time to work through, I suppose. But



1 side trip. I know the hour is late. We've talked  
2 about radio frequency coverage and radio frequency  
3 engineering and these matters. The Board might want  
4 to discuss a little bit about the different designs  
5 of tower --

6 MR. BARTL: Yeah, I was going to say that.

7 MR. MAXSON: -- now in order to raise  
8 questions in case you want the applicant to come  
9 back with simulations of alternative designs and  
10 that sort of thing.

11 MR. CHIN: Your report did not go into  
12 much detail about possibly having two shorter  
13 towers.

14 MR. MAXSON: Yes. One thing we lacked in  
15 the evidence so far is why this height is reportedly  
16 required by the applicant to achieve its objectives,  
17 and it's possible that something that's 20, 30 feet  
18 shorter, that looks more like a tree and less like a  
19 phallus would, you know, be something that would  
20 satisfy the applicant and the community; and if so,  
21 the need for co-location perhaps in the future might  
22 speak to having a second tower on the site rather  
23 than having this tower be extendable.

24 MR. CHIN: Well, that is one ugly looking

1     thing from Route 2.  It is like 55 feet more than  
2     the average height of all the other trees, and it  
3     just looks awful.  And I'm just thinking is it  
4     possible to have the same effect with two shorter  
5     towers?

6             MR. MAXSON:  The same coverage?

7             MR. CHIN:  Yes.

8             MR. MAXSON:  Well, that's what we need to  
9     do.  We don't have any analysis on the record at  
10    lower heights and nothing explained to us why they  
11    need the 100 feet that they're looking for.

12            MR. BARTL:  That is somewhat an issue  
13    because --

14            MR. MAXSON:  Right.  We can do that as  
15    well.

16            MR. BARTL:  I agree.  I mean my reaction  
17    to that fake pine tree was the same that you were  
18    just expressing.  Pine trees don't grow -- solitary  
19    pine trees don't grow in that fashion.  You know,  
20    the pine tree that's depicted here that I see across  
21    the country -- I just did a road trip across the  
22    country, and I saw various versions of it, and every  
23    time I could pick it out from a distance, and it was  
24    ugly, but that's -- it's a personal taste.

1                   MR. BOURDON:  There's one further up  
2  Route 2 and you see that that's fake.

3                   MR. BARTL:  It's a personal taste.  Some  
4  people may prefer that over seeing the real thing  
5  for what it is.  So I'm just expressing my own  
6  personal views.

7                   But if that thing weren't to stick up as  
8  high, it would come down in height to just maybe a  
9  little bit more above the tree height and  
10  surroundings, maybe it would be a different story,  
11  you know.  Maybe it might be -- and then maybe you  
12  don't need to conceal it any more either, and we  
13  could just do your regular CAM.  I don't know.  So I  
14  think, you know, we're playing around with those  
15  scenarios.

16                   I have a question.  If this were to be a  
17  CAM, like not a camouflage monopole but a concealed  
18  monopole, antenna monopole, how fat would that have  
19  to be at the let's say at the 100 feet height -- and  
20  I don't need the answer right now -- in order to  
21  accommodate AT&T's need?  And that can be -- that  
22  question can be answered just so we get a sense, you  
23  know, is it going to be 6 feet fat or, you know,  
24  maybe that can be simulated in a picture and see

1     what it would look like as opposed to the two  
2     simulation types we have right now.

3             MR. MAXSON: I think that's a good  
4     question, and I would love to see along with the  
5     number maybe just a physical plan layout of the  
6     equipment showing why that number is necessary --

7             MR. BARTL: Right.

8             MR. MAXSON: -- for the mounting  
9     brackets --

10            MR. BARTL: Right. Right.

11            MR. MAXSON: -- antenna, the radio head  
12     shape, and that sort of thing. Sure. That's a good  
13     idea.

14            CHAIRMAN CLIMER: You know, one of the  
15     other things we talked about were other locations  
16     that were possible, and I know there were some -- you,  
17     know, you made some comments and some of the  
18     comments came from, you know, potentially using  
19     State land. Does the process to look at that come  
20     from your modeling to see where the optimal spots  
21     are, and then you look at the properties there or  
22     does it make more sense for us as a Planning Board  
23     to look at the areas and say, hey, you missed this  
24     property; you missed this property. You should look

1 at this. What is the typical process of looking at  
2 other sites that, you know, might be better fits?

3 MR. MAXSON: In a word, yes, on both of  
4 those. You know, we can look at as we're looking at  
5 opportunities on the aerial photography and, you  
6 know, with an overlay of the parcel there and that  
7 sort of thing we can say, okay, this looks like a  
8 parcel that is remote enough from residences. It's  
9 got trees around it. Is it available? And how does  
10 it look for coverage? And we can say that looks  
11 like it might be pretty good. That will do  
12 90 percent of what they're looking for, you know, at  
13 a certain height. Is it available? Is it something  
14 that could be done, and then that's great.

15 The other side, as I said, I do rely on  
16 local knowledge because people know nooks and  
17 crannies, and they know of places that might not  
18 immediately come to mind when we're looking at a  
19 map. So suggestions from the Board or from the  
20 public are always helpful as well.

21 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Okay. So you're saying  
22 we probably should do both. You should be looking  
23 at that when you're doing your work, and we should  
24 be, you know, taking comments that were made on

1 particular sites and think of any other sites that  
2 may be appropriate?

3 MR. MAXSON: Right. And by having  
4 accurate computer modeling in their existing  
5 facilities, it will be easier for me to quickly vet  
6 a particular proposal location as to whether it's  
7 worth pursuing further.

8 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: And, Roland, this might  
9 be a question for you, but I notice the comments  
10 that on some of the adjoining -- either the WR Grace  
11 sites or the sites adjoining WR Grace that this was  
12 dismissed because of the contamination issues. Are  
13 those issues exactly the same as they were two or  
14 three years ago when, you know, those same  
15 properties were ruled out for the same reasons or,  
16 you know, is that just an easy, you know, a cop out  
17 that says, hey, this is contaminated? We don't have  
18 to look at this. Because, I mean, there are -- we  
19 are looking at things that we can do on those lands,  
20 right, as a Town?

21 MR. BARTL: Yes. There's clearly -- we  
22 are not looking, but, you know, there is clearly the  
23 idea that at some point, these brownfields can be  
24 ready for redevelopment of some sort, and the

1 discussions generally are about not -- maybe not for  
2 residential purposes, but even that seems to be  
3 moving in different directions sometimes, but I  
4 think that's a choice -- that was raised as an issue  
5 at the time, and, I think, you know, I would think  
6 fairly. So if I were in their shoes, I wouldn't  
7 want to necessarily take on the risks and  
8 liabilities that come with the contaminated site and  
9 me having to do some pretty deep boring to hold  
10 the -- digging to hold that tower in place, you  
11 know. So I can see the hesitation.

12 But that said, on the property that Grace  
13 owns -- it's 130 or 150 acres -- there are pristine  
14 pockets on that site that have never been touched  
15 and have not been contaminated either because the  
16 water didn't move in the direction. It takes -- it  
17 would take some work research to find those spots.

18 Then, of course, you're getting close to  
19 other neighbors that live down there --

20 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Uh-huh.

21 MR. BARTL: -- who then are going to come  
22 to the Planning Board and say why not over there on  
23 Craig Road? So you're going to have to weigh all of  
24 this stuff.

1                   CHAIRMAN CLIMER:   Okay.   Fair enough.

2                   Do we need to get any more guidance -- I  
3 know there's a couple of people -- there's a couple  
4 of comments that we wanted Dave, and I think there's  
5 another comment as well, so.

6                   MR. CLOUGH:   Yeah.   Dave Clough,  
7 14 Evergreen Road.

8                   In terms of guidance, one thing I look at  
9 is I see this as a chicken and egg problem. Do you  
10 have the capacity to serve the need or is the need  
11 not there because there's no capacity? So, for  
12 instance, I -- you know, it's pretty clear that  
13 Verizon dominates Acton. I did have AT&T at one  
14 time, and I don't because you couldn't get coverage.  
15 So the question is, you know, if you had the  
16 coverage, would it come?

17                   We know that more data's coming and  
18 everything else. So the question is what is the  
19 margin that you need? It's kind of like at home you  
20 hear that your cable is faster than the neighbor's.  
21 As soon as everybody gets home, it's slow, right?  
22 So you can't get Internet. So at what point do  
23 you -- so when you do the data in terms of what we  
24 have for capacity and what we have for coverage, at

1     what point does it get to a point where Pandora no  
2     longer works?  It might work today, but is there a  
3     5 percent margin, and if we had 10 percent more  
4     people, it no longer works.  You know what I'm  
5     saying?  So I don't think you can say it works now,  
6     so it's fine.  The question is how much margin is  
7     there until it doesn't work; and I'm not sure if you  
8     can get that kind of data, but to me that's as  
9     important as anything else.

10             You can say, yes, it's just barely making  
11     it, and it works fine, but, you know, 5 percent more  
12     people and maybe all of a sudden, it's gone.  I  
13     think that's an important piece that at least if I  
14     was in your shoes, I'd want to know.

15             MR. YACOUBY:  I think it's also a moving  
16     target because the technology too.  This is -- their  
17     thinking is what's happening with mobile utilization  
18     in the country period, and the whole thing with data  
19     is that voice is close to merging.  I mean,  
20     it's -- it's a conundrum.  It's a good point.

21             But I think you're right.  Because I  
22     guarantee you from an infrastructure standpoint, I  
23     think we would be remiss and incompetent and almost  
24     an egregious level as a community not to try to

1 anticipate that because land mines are going away,  
2 and what's happening over a time now people are  
3 saying that's my lifeline. So it better work. So  
4 the point you're making with the data and voice  
5 converging, there are all sorts of issues. I'm not  
6 sure. You know, I think we can get a certain amount  
7 of data, but there's going to have to be some  
8 judgement calls that get made, and it's not just  
9 AT&T. You've got different carriers that want to  
10 compete.

11 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: I guess when there's  
12 traffic on Route 2 though, hopefully it won't be  
13 doubling the traffic on Route 2.

14 MR. YACOUBY: But you look at they're  
15 talking about smart cars. They're talking  
16 about -- I mean this issue of people in the car  
17 utilizing the network is going to increase  
18 exponentially.

19 MR. CLOUGH: So I guess my question is if  
20 you're going to get guidance, can margin be  
21 determined? And maybe he needs to answer that.

22 Thanks.

23 MR. MAXSON: That's a difficult one to  
24 answer without being inside a network watching it

1 work. I just did an evaluation of a resort on Cape  
2 Cod, a high end resort that wants to provide the  
3 absolute best WiFi coverage it can to its customers,  
4 and if you've gone to a hotel over the years, and  
5 you've tried to use WiFi, you know that it's spotty  
6 and catch as catch can.

7 So the same way that we look at peak  
8 utilization which is where it comes in is that  
9 everybody wants to be using the service at a  
10 particular time of day. In a hospitality  
11 environment, it's 10:00 at night, and it's videos.  
12 On a highway environment like two -- Route 2, you're  
13 going to see the peaks, of course, during rush hour.

14 And really the best way to evaluate from  
15 the outside looking in is to look at the signal  
16 strength. We can do speed tests if they have the  
17 LTE network up, do data speed tests and see how  
18 that's working. That will give us an idea of what  
19 the coverage is like because the farther you are  
20 from the cell site, the slower your data service is  
21 going to be, all other things being equal, and so we  
22 can get a sense for whether or not the benchmarks  
23 are in the territory of the performance that  
24 wireless companies are designing their networks for

1 today, and that would be -- from the outside, that  
2 would be the data point that we would use.

3 MS. QUINN: I appreciated the -- I'm  
4 sorry. Kathy Quinn, 299 School Street.

5 I appreciated the introduction to LTE. So  
6 what I think I understand is it doesn't exist yet.  
7 That would explain the gap. It's not on the other  
8 locations, the 29 existing towers or one hundred  
9 and -- I don't know -- 127 other antennas and that  
10 also might be a reason for the gap; so I'm wondering  
11 if we could explore if those other resources that  
12 are already in existence had this technology, would  
13 then this project not be necessary? That would take  
14 care of the gap because you'd want to use existing  
15 structures first.

16 And how do you test that? And then at the  
17 same time is Acton responsible for the profitability  
18 of AT&T, for providing this great new service that  
19 may or may not come to be? And in which case if I  
20 decide to come up with a technology tomorrow or ten  
21 other people do does then Acton have to support me  
22 as well because you supported them on something that  
23 they said was coming? It's just something to think  
24 about, but I don't know how you can measure.

1           Obviously the 3G and whatever the existing  
2           technology is excellent. So we're talking about a  
3           gap in LTE, which doesn't exist yet because it's not  
4           on anything else. I'd like to see it on everything  
5           else before you put up something new for it. We're  
6           talking oranges now. We're not talking apples any  
7           more. You know what I'm saying?

8           CHAIRMAN CLIMER: I think we talked about  
9           that because you can't test something that's not  
10          there, and I think that we're going to test as much  
11          as we can to get a sense of what we can at this  
12          point. So I don't know. Dave, if you want to talk  
13          further.

14          MR. BARTL: Mr. Chairman, can I  
15          see -- somehow this picture slipped from me earlier,  
16          and before it does that again, I don't think we  
17          talked about alternative locations as much maybe as  
18          we could have, you know, relying on local knowledge.

19                 I believe that, you know, this is  
20          the -- this is what happens. I hit the wrong button  
21          again maybe. I don't know. So -- I'm sorry.  
22          Just -- okay. So anyways, I thought this was the  
23          pointer. I'm not going to blow it up as much any  
24          more, but you have the existing site or the proposed

1 site down here on Craig Road, and I believe --

2 (Picture on screen changes.)

3 MR. BARTL: Forget it.

4 All of those parcels along Route 2 which  
5 you saw over the top of the picture, they're all  
6 State-owned, and there's the lower -- I mean, you  
7 know the terrain. There's the lower field where the  
8 School Street crossing is, and then it kind of  
9 starts rising up towards where the woods are. And  
10 then there's quite a distance through the woods to  
11 Hosmer Street. You know, quite frankly, a location  
12 in that area at the edge of the woods, a little bit  
13 into the woods, I'm not sure if that from a coverage  
14 or a modeling perspective would work, but it would  
15 be out of the fields. It would remove a lot of the  
16 aesthetic objections we're dealing with. I think it  
17 would be worth checking into.

18 And, you know, I too have heard that the  
19 State's gotten a little more savvy about how to deal  
20 with these properties for wireless services; so it  
21 might be a little bit of a headache to try to deal  
22 with them, but I would urge you guys, Brian, to  
23 figure that out and talk to someone at the State,  
24 try to get an answer from the State. I think that's

1 a fair -- you know, that's a fair comment that was  
2 made is, like, you know, you tried; you didn't get  
3 an answer, and so your job is done. I think you  
4 need to do more than try once. I just feel that.

5 And if there is no answer, let us know who  
6 you tried to contact, and maybe we can help out a  
7 little bit too from the Town's perspective, try to  
8 facilitate that communication.

9 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Roland, did we talk  
10 about a transfer station last time?

11 MR. BARTL: Right. And back in -- back  
12 two years ago, two and a half years ago, we weren't  
13 sure -- there was -- the response we got is there  
14 isn't really any room in the area where the DPW  
15 maneuvers its equipment and all of that stuff. The  
16 only place would be right at or on the landfill, and  
17 there we were proposing and considering --

18 MR. YACOUBY: The solar farm.

19 MR. BARTL: -- the solar farm, which now  
20 is being installed. So could we go back and take  
21 another look and see if we can't squeeze it  
22 somewhere? Maybe. And that would be a question we  
23 would have to bring to the Town Manager to actually  
24 go and see if there is a place where it could fit.

1 Last time we looked at it, it didn't seem like it  
2 would work.

3 MR. BOURDON: When you drive to the  
4 transfer station, the road kind of comes in off of  
5 Route 2 and then turns to the left and then turns to  
6 the right. Well, as it turns to the right, right  
7 down there, it seems like that would be a logical  
8 place for a site. I don't know.

9 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Yeah, but then you're  
10 going down an incline, so you're --

11 MR. BOURDON: Or right near there. But  
12 then, again, you're going to be abutting people on  
13 the other side too, so --

14 MR. BARTL: Well, the more you go in, the  
15 more you start getting reactions from folks that  
16 live down on Minot Avenue and Forest Road.

17 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: It might be worth asking  
18 the Town Manager just to make sure.

19 MR. BARTL: It might be worth checking on  
20 that again, and going down the line and seeing if  
21 there isn't an area that could be identified; and  
22 again, I think if you guys want access to sort of go  
23 in and evaluate the suitability of the property and  
24 see what could work, I'm sure that could be worked

1 out with the Town. So, yeah, I mean I would urge  
2 you to look at those two if -- because, you know,  
3 the Town -- the Town dump or the transfer station is  
4 a little further west from the area I pointed out,  
5 but, you know, I would urge you to take a really  
6 serious look at those two areas. If they can work  
7 from a coverage overall perspective, I think that  
8 would be very helpful.

9 MR. MAXSON: Mr. Chairman, just one  
10 comment that I do like to make at some point in the  
11 hearing process too, and that is -- it will help the  
12 Board and help residents and that is I spoke about  
13 the fact that the courts look at substantial  
14 evidence in the written record. If there are  
15 residents who have documents in their possession  
16 that they're talking about, it's a very good idea to  
17 submit those to the record, so that they'll be in  
18 the data, in the paperwork online, and that if a  
19 judge is ever looking over the Board's shoulder, the  
20 judge will see that same documentation that was  
21 being talked about in the transcript.

22 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Thank you.

23 So, Roland, we need to -- we need to  
24 extend the public hearing for this. Something we

1 need to sign.

2 MR. BARTL: Right there.

3 So the suggestion is to go to about a  
4 month?

5 That would take us to October 15th. There  
6 is a public hearing scheduled at 7:45 -- no, an  
7 appointment scheduled at 7:45, and two tentative  
8 special permit hearings on sign special permit  
9 applications, which typically -- typically don't  
10 take that long, but, you know, we haven't scheduled  
11 them at this point.

12 But you mentioned one of them would  
13 actually slip to November 5th, so you don't really  
14 have all of the information yet. So, yeah. There  
15 would be time on October 15th. The only timed  
16 appointment is 7:45 --

17 MR. CLOUGH: Roland, talk into the  
18 microphone.

19 MR. BARTL: I'm sorry. The only time of  
20 the appointment on October 15th is 7:45. So  
21 October 15th would be wide open except for, I  
22 assume, a 15-minute spot. This is -- this is Half  
23 Moon Hill coming in and inquiring of the possibility  
24 of amending the permit for what they want to do a

1 community pool or something like that.

2 MS. GORMAN: Community pool.

3 MR. BARTL: Not really doing a permit  
4 application, just sort of bantering about. I can't  
5 imagine that going very long so.

6 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: So should we say 8:30  
7 or?

8 MR. BARTL: I think it will be -- we could  
9 ask Dana Snyder-Grant to come in at like 7:40, and  
10 then there's, you know, a little bit of flexibility  
11 and start the hearing at 8:00.

12 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Okay. That's okay.

13 MR. BARTL: And maybe that's okay. Get it  
14 all done.

15 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Is that okay with  
16 the --

17 MR. GROSSMAN: That's fine.

18 Before we end, I want to correct one  
19 thing, but if we need to continue discussing  
20 administrative matters, let's do that, but I just  
21 want to make sure I correct one thing before we go  
22 on. So it's up to you.

23 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Go right ahead.

24 MR. GROSSMAN: I just wanted to make one

1 point that I guess Ms. Quinn made that 3G was fine,  
2 and this facility is not for 3G, and it's solely for  
3 LTE. I don't want the record to be unclear about  
4 that. We've been fairly clear about that.

5 The facility is being built to provide 3G  
6 and 4G service. It is being built to provide and  
7 address a 3G and also an LTE issue. So there is a  
8 gap, 3G for voice. There's a gap for data. It's  
9 also carried on 3G, and there's an issue, and the  
10 facility will work with the rest of the LTE network.  
11 So it's being built to address a significant gap in  
12 all of those things.

13 CHAIRMAN CLIMER: Thank you.

14 MR. BARTL: I'm trying to figure out -- I  
15 have a date of the hearing continuation, but I  
16 don't -- I'm having a hard time coming up with a  
17 date for the extension -- oh, here we are. Decision  
18 deadline. Right now we have a decision due date of  
19 November 18th. Do you want to just extend that by a  
20 month too? Is that okay?

21 MR. GROSSMAN: That's November 18th? We  
22 have a hearing on October 15th. Can we take it up  
23 then?

24 MR. BARTL: Excuse me.

MR. GROSSMAN: I would prefer to take it up on October 15th when we know where we are with regard to the -- it's still 30 days from October 15th.

MR. BARTL: So. Right. Okay. All right. That's fair. I think that's fair. So let's just do the continuation and keep the date where it is. I'm okay with that, and we can discuss it on October 15th. Fine.

MR. GROSSMAN: If your decision date were, like, October 16th, I think that maybe we would want to address it, but since we have such a great deal of time after October 15th.

MR. BARTL: Yeah, okay. That's okay.

MR. BOURDON: So we need a motion to continue the public hearing to October 15th at 8:00 p.m. in this room.

MR. BARTL: That's correct.

MR. DUBE: So moved.

MR. YACOUBY: I'll second your motion.

CHAIRMAN CLIMER: All in favor?

Opposed?

Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you.

(Hearing concluded at 11:09 p.m.)

## C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Julie Thomson Riley, Registered Diplomate Reporter and Certified Realtime Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes on Tuesday, September 17, 2013, to the best of my knowledge, skill, and ability.

Julie Thomson Riley, RDR, CRR