

## **Town of Waterford 5G Task Force Committee**

**Meeting: November 19, 2020**

**Hurst Visitor Center**

**9:00 AM**

**Minutes**

**Attendance: Dave Woodin, Dom Gabriel, Jeff Cleary, Dave Ball (phone), Paul Henry (phone), Mike O'Brien, Judy Houbre, Brian Gidley**

After introductions, the group reviewed the answers to five questions that Verizon responded to since the last meeting. Verizon indicated that colocation is possible by setting the bandwidths to be unique. Answers were also provided re: 50 ft pole maximum height, potential cell tower locations, and use of railroad property for cell towers.

It was the consensus of the group that a track change version of the Master License Agreement is still necessary. Dave Woodin has requested such from Don Boyajian. Maggie Hayes of Verizon also would like a copy.

The Syracuse Aesthetic & Design Standards document was reviewed along with a similar document from the Town of Niskayuna. The Niskayuna document was more of an introduction and their intent was to incorporate the requirements into the actual Town Code. The Syracuse document was more of a standalone document and therefore was more comprehensive. There were a few issues in the Syracuse version that needed clarification. After the meeting, Dave Woodin sent an email to the Syracuse City Engineer requesting more information. The City responded that they would answer the questions and that they have a new (November 2<sup>nd</sup>) version of the standards.

The questions posed to Syracuse were as follows:

Page 11 – Section 2.31 Is there a reason why the “City preferred small wireless facility equipment locations in order of preference: on-strand attached to a utility pole.....” is listed as the first preference rather than attached to an existing utility pole or any other type of pole? Also, if it is installed on-strand, do you still collect the annual re-occurring fee since it is not physically on the utility pole?

Page 13 – last paragraph What does “one small wireless facility will be allowed by the City per utility pole....” mean? We came up with two possible interpretations:

1. Collocation is not allowed and only one small wireless facilities per pole
2. Collation is allowed, but any provider cannot have more than one of their small wireless facilities on any given pole

Page 14 – What is the reason for “A small wireless facility may not be placed on a traffic signal pole which has a luminaire attached”?

Page 17 – How did you determine “15%” as in “At least 15% of the pole design structural capacity shall be reserved for future City installations”? We assume that future City installations could include a span wire to support overhead signs, hanging flower baskets or future street lighting.

Page 19 - We had various interpretations of what was meant by the following: “Small Cell Poles shall not be installed between the perpendicular extension of the primary facing wall plane of any single-or two family residence and the street”. Does this mean don’t put a pole up directly in front of a house, but keep it away, like near the boundary line?

Dom Gabriel asked that we request in our standards what the new poles will be mounted on, such as a concrete sub-base, etc. He also asked about maintenance responsibilities (Verizon will handle) and liability issues re: accidents.

The group discussed possible topics for the next meeting. How to roll out the program to the public will be a topic. The next meeting will be 2 to 3 weeks away; most likely on Thursday, December 10<sup>th</sup>.