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(1:10 p.m.)

CHAIR MARCOU: Good afternoon everybody.

(Chorus of good afternoon.)

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. One more time.

Good afternoon everybody.

(Chorus of good afternoon.)

CHAIR MARCOU: Great. We've had lunch, so some might be a little somnambulistic from that, but this is always time to have good energy.

So if you need to, walk around. The room will become a little warm because it's pretty full. So do feel free to walk around, get some air.

My name is Matthew Marcou. I am the Associate Director of the Public Space Regulation Division and the chair of the Public Space Committee of the District of Columbia.

The time is now 1:10 in the afternoon of Thursday, October 15th, 2018. We are in Room
200 of 1100 4th Street S.W., and I am calling the Public Space Committee roundtable to order.

The Public Space Committee is a committee established through an order of the mayor. Just so everybody knows, we're not the District of Columbia Department of Transportation's public space committee.

Though it might seem that way because there are two members from the District Department of Transportation and the staff is from the District Department of Transportation. But actually is an independent body of the Department of Transportation.

It is established through a mayor's order and has a history that goes back 80 years or more with a responsibility to hear applications for and to issue public space permits for the use of public space by a variety of entities. What brings us here today is small cell technology and its implementation in public space.

With me on the dais from my left, your
right is Mr. Wiley with the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs, Mr. Shaheen with the Office of Planning, Ms. Chamberlin with the District Department of Transportation.

And now starting from my right, your, still your, to my, to my right but still moving forward from your right to left is Ms. Hudson with the Office of the Secretary of State in the executive office of the Mayor.

We have all five members of the Public Space Committee present, so we certainly have a quorum to conduct business. We also are joined by Bernadette Edwards who the acting Public Space Committee secretary, executive secretary for today's meeting.

On the dais with us we also have Glenn Dubin with the District Department of Transportation and working in the audience to check you in were Kisha Allen who is the Public Space Committee technician and Catrina Felder who is the Public Space Committee coordinator, so we have, also on our side as well.
The purpose of today's meeting is to consider draft guidelines that have been developed by a variety of stakeholders regarding the implementation of small cell technology in the District of Columbia.

The reason this is so important is because small cell technology reflects the next, let's call it the next generation of utility infrastructure going into public space. And as a result the deployment of it will have an impact in the public space and it's a private use of public space, which therefore subjects it to requirements and responsibilities to obtain permits and to follow certain standards for the uses of public space in the District of Columbia.

And as we know the District of Columbia has limited public space. Apparently, they're not making more so we have all the public space that we have.

As a result, it has a lot of very complex and ever evolving uses, both as a roadway and a transit network, sidewalks, parking, street
lights, traffic signals, street trees and then
the public parking area in front of the
properties across the District of Columbia, which
give the District a very unique landscape and a
very unique streetscape.

I often use this example when I watch
HGTV, and I see a show like Curb Appeal, I
immediately know whether it's in the District of
Columbia or not. It doesn't matter, they don't
have to tell me, I just look at the streetscape
and I go, oh, that's totally a District of
Columbia streetscape.

And it doesn't matter what neighbor
it's in, it's going to share similar
characteristics, but it will have a unique flavor
for each of the individual neighbors across the
District of Columbia.

It's really amazing because even when
they film shows in Baltimore or Toronto, they
clearly are not the District of Columbia.
In addition, the District of Columbia
is uniquely situated as the nation's capital. It
is a very deliberately planned city. It is a
city that grew from two small port towns,
Georgetown and Alexandria, and now they went back
to Virginia, so let's not even talk about them
again.

And it grew and evolved from that, but
it evolved from that in a very contemplated,
purposeful way. And that means that any of the
uses of public space should be equally
contemplative and planned. They can't be ad hoc.
They can't be willy-nilly. But they also have to
be adaptable and they also have to recognize the
ever-present needs of public space.

So as a result, we have a situation
where -- everybody, raise your hand if you have a
cell phone. Really, like a little higher,
please. Yes. Look, the whole audience,
everybody has a cell phone.

Ten years ago, did you have a cell
phone? Probably only the people -- right. A few
people. Right. Mr. Viteri, I'm not surprised.
It's V-I-T-E-R-I, in case you need to spell it.
I'm not surprised that you're one of the first to have one, but I didn't. Right?

So ten years ago very few people had them. And now they are ubiquitous. And not only ubiquitous, but I actually have two. I have a work cell phone and I have a personal cell phone, a play cell phone if you will.

So all of this constant evolution in technology requires an infrastructure to support it. And that's why we're here because the infrastructure to support small cell, to support telecommunications, which is a vital utility is ever evolving and needs to adapt to the current needs of the users, which includes all of us.

So with that said, I'm going to turn to any other committee members if they are interested in making any comments before we begin today's meeting. Okay. I do want to reiterate, we are here to take in a lot of information and we are here to hear from all interested parties and stakeholders.

This is an open meeting and as a
result it is being transcribed by Neal R. Gross Company. If anybody is interested a transcription of this meeting afterward, they can contact the Neal R. Gross Company.

Also as a public meeting, people who are here are subject to being recorded, both audio recordings and visual recordings. So we just want to make sure that everybody is fully aware of that as you are here and as you both hear from others and present any information that you'd like.

And to that last point, the committee will be here to hear from everybody. If anybody is here who wants to speak and it turns out it's 7 o'clock at night, we will happily, gladly and be very interested to hear what you have to say.

Because ultimately, as I said at the beginning, we can't make the best decision unless we have the best information and that best information is going to come from you, the stakeholders who represent all parts of the District of Columbia.
So with that, why don't we start with our first presentation. This is a presentation from the District Department of Transportation, Kathryn Roos. And when you come to the front, please state your name, spell your last name for the record and present your information to the committee.

There's one thing I want to do before you start. When you do, the recording that's actually occurring through Neal R. Gross is occurring using the cell phone-ish looking thing. So that's the piece to talk into. Ms. Roos.

MS. ROOS: Good afternoon. My name is Kathryn Roos, R-O-O-S. I am the P3 manager at DDOT as well as the Street Light manager at DDOT. I have a PowerPoint presentation that I believe will be brought up now, that I would like to take you through the basics of the draft design guidelines for small cell installations within the District of Columbia. Next slide.

In today's presentation, I'd like to go over three basic things. I'd like to provide
you with the background of why we have created
design guidelines. I would like to go over
the purpose, as well as some general highlights
of the guidelines.

My hope is that you've had a chance to
review the guidelines in depth. I will not be
going page by page, line by line, et cetera, but
will be giving a highlight of the design
guidelines, and then I'm more than happy to
answer any questions that you might have.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you.

MS. ROOS: Thank you. Next slide.

CHAIR MARCOU: Just an aside for
everybody, the small cell guidelines, the
presentations that have already been made and the
presentations that we will be receiving that are
new here, will all be available at our website,
ddot.dc.gov.

MS. ROOS: Great. Thank you. So the
background of the design guidelines, this came
about as a new technology has been requested to
be integrated within the public right of way.
And as such, we felt that it was appropriate given the unique nature of D.C., to come up with some design guidelines to help the installation of this technology within our community that also respects the nature of the District and the public right of way.

You might be asking, what is small cell technology? There will be other presenters later today that will go much more in depth, but I just wanted to give a very basic overview of the technology to kind of give a basis for the design guidelines.

So as Mr. Marcou mentioned, there has been an increase of cell phone activity throughout the nation, and thus an increased need for more capacity on our networks, our cellular networks.

Small cell technology is one that is taking it from what is now typically on macro towers or rooftops, down to the ground level where the user is, in close proximity. This small cell technology includes antennas, as well
as related power equipment, radios and cabinets.

The small cell technology is being
installed in cities across the nation, as well as
countries around the world. So we are not unique
in this request for the installations. Next
slide.

The guidelines have been drafted with
an input from a variety of stakeholders that are
critical to the public space of the District of
Columbia.

This includes various divisions within
the Department of Transportation, the Office of
Planning, the Historic Preservation Office, the
staff from the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts, as
well as the staff from the National Capital
Planning Commission.

All of us have formed a working group
to start to put together these guidelines and
their input has very much been included in this.

They've also been informed by the
technology itself and from interactions and
information that we have received from small cell
providers themselves in accordance with what 
their needs are required.

    We, as part of the design guideline 
process, we did a best practices research review. 
So we looked at what are other cities doing? 
What are the cities that are ahead of us that 
have already started installing this, as well as 
what are cities around the world doing, 
particularly the capital cities of countries 
across the world?

    So all of this has been informed. You 
can see a few of the specific cities that we've 
researched that are included in here. But we 
really did do a best practices approach as to 
what could we learn from the installations that 
have already occurred.

    It should be noted that these 
guidelines are not all inclusive in the fact that 
they are supplemental to the guidelines and 
things that already exist, such as the design and 
engineering manual, all of the other District of 
Columbia codes, et cetera that are applicable.
So this is additional information on top of all of those guidelines that already exist that must be applied to. So this is an additional supplemental specific to small cell technology and by no means excludes other laws, codes, et cetera that must be abided by. Next slide.

So the purpose of this guideline is to set forth requirements and specifications for the placement and design of small cell infrastructure within the District's public right of way.

It's intended to fit both the functional needs of the carriers themselves and the technology, while also protecting the character and function of the capital city's public space.

We have some very specific goals given the very unique nature of the District, including avoiding impact on vistas and views such as within the L'Enfant plan, minimizing the impact on the character of designated historic districts and landmarks.
As well as protecting access and
circulation to public space and minimizing the
visual and physical clutter in what is a very
precious asset that the District oversees. Next
slide.

CHAIR MARCOU: Can we stop you there
one second? Because I always get an opportunity
to say this, and this is the perfect opportunity
to say it. This is the most valuable asset owned
by the citizens of the District of Columbia.

The right of way is more valuable than
every other collectively owned asset combined.
If you take everything else the citizens own as a
collective group through the government, when you
put it on a balance scale, bam, it is nothing
compared to the right of way.

The right of way is more valuable,
literally valuable as an asset than any other
asset they own. Okay.

MS. ROOS: So what does the guidelines
access? Generally here's a list of the basic
things that it addresses. The appearance, so
what color does this equipment need to be? How big can it be? What is the overall height? Where can you place the equipment and the antennas? Where can new poles be installed within the public right of way?

It also addresses location. Are there specific requirements regarding historic areas, which there are. And the difference between existing infrastructure versus new infrastructure.

So what I mean by that is attaching to existing street lights, versus installing new poles with this infrastructure attached to it. It also talks about the placement within the streetscape, so where do you need to be in relation to things like trees? Making sure that we maintain handicap access, et cetera. Those are just some broad overviews.

Another very important thing that I think you'll hear a lot of comments on today, is the frequency. How far apart from each other can these installations occur? And that's something
that we've looked at very carefully and have thoughtfully put into the design guidelines.

Next slide please.

This chart here -- and I apologize for the small font, but hopefully you can see it better in the design guidelines in front of you. But this addresses the permissible types of installations, as well as the locations.

So you can see in the second column going from top to bottom, you have -- starting with asset that are owned by the District and DDOT, specifically our street light. This includes five A poles, which are typically found in alleys.

It includes exiting wood poles, as well as existing pendant poles that have cobra head attachments. Here's one clarification that I would like to make for those that aren't as familiar as I am, being the street light manager, with our assets.

A pendant pole is literally just the pole type and what it looks like. It is a very
simple six fluted pole that tapers towards the
top. Attached to the pendant pole are two
different types of fixture, one of which is
called the cobra head that has a very simple arm
on which a cobra head fixture is attached.

The second type of fixture that is
attached to a pendant pole is what we call the
tear drop. This includes a much more articulated
and designed arm, as well as an articulated
fixture and a finial on top of the pendant pole
itself. This at this moment has been excluded
from the design guidelines given its articulated
and very specifically designed nature.

Continuing down the second column, you
will see that we have new standalone poles. This
will be for areas in which there is no street
light pole that they're able to attach to given
the restrictions of the design guidelines or
there are no poles to which they can attach in
general. So this allows the carriers to install
new poles within the right of way.

The third and last one that you will
find, category, is poles that are owned by third-parties. So these are your typical utility poles that you see quite often in neighborhoods that are typically wood poles. So that it the last type of pole type.

You can also see that this chart addresses how cabinetry can be attached or placed that is needed for this equipment and it also gives specific areas such as the monumental core, which in this document, we have defined the monumental core as the L'Enfant plan.

Everything within the Shipstead-Luce Act, that boundary, there's a map that I'll show you later that has this very specifically articulated, as well as Old Georgetown.

We also have some areas that are specific to historic districts and how you can attach in those areas as well. Next slide, please.

Here are some illustration to show you what currently the design guidelines contemplate in terms of attachments to DDOT owned street
lights.

The first pole that you will see is the DDOT 5A pole. It is a simple round pole and attached to the top, you will see two different types of antennas. The first one is about a two-foot tall antenna that you can see is attached to the top.

The second is what I will refer to as a collar antenna, which is below the fixture of the arm. So that is two different types of radios and/or antennas that are attached. You will notice that this picture does not look at the cabinetry because the design guidelines currently state that all power equipment and related cabinetry needs to be put in vaults.

That is why this is not currently pictured within these images. The second one that you see is the DDOT pendant pole that I had mentioned previously, and this is with the cobra head arm and attachment. Again, you'll see about, I think it's actually a two-foot, six-inch antenna on top, along with the radio collar
antenna below the arm. Next slide, please.

So these are what we have proposed for permissible installation types of new poles. One of the considerations was we have multiple carriers here and they're all going to be installing new poles of some type. How do we keep that consistent to the public realm and the design nature of the streets where they're installing?

The way that we have decided to address that and to be consistent amongst carriers as well as street character is to utilize existing types of poles that are already in the District's public right of way.

So the first one that you will see is the Washington standalone pole. This is a pole that would be further articulated and extended in height given the needs of the carriers.

Our Washington standalone poles, the highest that we have right now is an 18-foot pole, which isn't fully sufficient for the needs of the carriers, hence why you see a taller pole.
The idea though is that it has a very similar base. It has very similar articulated fluting at the top.

And instead of light at the top, you would find an antenna attached, as you can see in the two different types of antennas that we have in that picture. We are currently proposing that the Washington standalone pole be used for installations where you currently see Washington globes or twin-20s, within the District of Columbia.

So if you're on a street in which you have Washington globes or twin-20s, which are not allowed to be attached to given their articulated nature, and their historic significance, then the carriers would be permitted to install this type of standalone pole along those streets.

The second standalone pole type that you will see is the pendant pole. So it's, again, taking our standard pendant pole at the same exact height, but instead of attaching an arm and a fixture to it, the carriers would
attach their antennas to this.

I should note that both of these pole types will not be owned by the District of Columbia. These would be owned solely by the carriers themselves when they install them.

It should also be noted that to any District-owned asset that they attach to, that we permit them to attach to, such as the D.C. street lights, those will be able and continue to be owned and the D.C. part of the infrastructure maintained. The carriers will be responsible for maintaining their own attachments on those poles.

Next slide, please.

This is a map that currently shows the permissible types of poles that are owned by DDOT. Again, you have a clear print off in your design guidelines but just showing generally where we own poles and in what areas.

You can see that the green dots are the 5A alley poles. The purple dots, which is the most prominent are pendant poles. It should be noted that the poles that occur in this map do
not include tear drops. So this map only shows
pendant poles that have cobra head attached to
them.

So this is only showing what the
design guidelines currently permit. The last one
is the orange-yellow-golden dot, which is our
DDOT-owned wood poles. It should be noted that
the majority of wood poles that are in the
District are not owned by the Department of
Transportation.

They are owned by third-party
carriers, namely Pepco and Verizon. So these are
just the wood poles that are owned and maintained
by the District of Columbia. You can see an
overall count in the bottom right-hand corner
that shows the total number of poles with over
11,000 pendant poles available within the
District. Next slide, please.

This chart shows the permissible
spacing and frequency of installations. As I
mentioned previously, this is something that a
lot of thought went into in terms of how do we
address equitable spacing along the streetscape to avoid clustering of poles and to make sure that there's enough spacing between these installations.

Just as our street lights are spaced at a specific distance to create a rhythm walking down, so they're less noticeable, so this is something that again we've put a lot of time to.

So there are a couple of terms that I would like to define for you. They are defined within the design guidelines as well, but I would just like to put out there. One term that we use is block-face.

So this is one side of a street. Let's say the north side of a street. And it is the one block from corner to corner. That is what we refer to as a block-face. Whereas in the last column, you will see that we use the term, block. This is an entire block, corner to corner that includes both faces of the street.

So to explain that further and read the chart, the first column addresses what is the
average length of the blocks within the District of Columbia. We felt that because our streets do vary in the length that it was important to, in the same way, be proportional to how many installations we allow.

We wouldn't want multiple installations on a very short block that was, let's say, 150 feet long, but at the same time, there are longer blocks that are over 700 feet, where it might be appropriate or fine to have more than a handful of installations.

And thus we have proportionally defined how the frequency and spacing of installations can occur. You will also notice that we have separated out what is allowed within the monumental core, as well as what is allowed outside the monumental core.

Given the historic nature of the historic districts and the monumental core, we felt that reducing the overall number that were allowed was an appropriate restriction within the design guidelines.
So you can see in the second column, this is the number of small cell facilities that are permitted per block-face, again, one side of the street, let's say the north side of the street outside of the monumental core and historic districts.

So an average block size within the District of Columbia is approximately, let's say, 500 feet. That is one of our most frequent block sizes. So on that, according to this chart, if you are outside of the core and historic districts there can be four installations on a block-face.

That means there can be a total of eight installations on that block, four on the north side and four on the south side for a total eight installations.

We also have set out a minimum distance between the installations on the same block-face. So we have made this consistent, if you are outside of the monumental core and the historic districts for a distance of 60 feet.
In relation to how our spacing of our street lights, that's about half the distance. So we have been generous in terms of the frequency that we have allowed these to be spaced with in there.

Typically street lights are spaced anywhere between, typically 120 is our minimum. You will see some that are less, but 120 feet is a typical spacing.

You will also see in the second to last column that we have further increased that within the monumental core and historic districts.

The last column addresses the total number of installations that any one carrier can install on a block. So this includes again, as my example, both the north and the south face of a block. A carrier on a long block, which we have determined is anything over 600 feet, can only install two.

This is basically to reduce the overall number and to ensure that monopolies
aren't created by taking up space where they
don't necessarily need this coverage.

We feel, given the information that
we've been provided by the carriers and the
distance between installations that are needed,
that this is more than sufficient to address
their needs.

And again, helps us to restrict the
overall numbers so that we don't have clutter and
cluster that we might have otherwise. It should
be noted that this entire chart is agnostic to
the type of attachment.

So you have 60 feet between an
installation, whether it's yours or someone
else's, you have 60 feet between an installation
whether it's a new, free-standing pole or whether
it is attached to a street light. It is agnostic
to the type of installation that is being put
into place. Next slide, please.

This last one, again it's a little bit
easier to see within your design guidelines,
address some of the boundaries that I've referred
to previously. The hatched green sections include all historic areas within the District of Columbia, which you can see there are several.

There is also a pink dotted line that starts at the north most hip and it goes down around Rock Creek Park, into Georgetown and into the monumental core. This is addressed in the Shipstead-Luce Act.

So these are boundaries of that act that has special provisions and guidelines that must be followed. The large purple boundary might be a familiar shape to you. This is the L'Enfant plan.

We have included all of those to define what we're saying is historic areas and the monumental core. Next slide, please.

That's the end of my presentation. I'd be happy to address anything that I spoke of today, as well as any specific questions that you might have on the design guidelines.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you very much.

That was a very thorough presentation but gave us
a good overview as well. Truly appreciate it.
I'll leave it for other committee members to be
asking questions right now they have of Ms. Roos.
Mr. Shaheen.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: I do have some
questions about the purpose sections of the
goals.

MS. ROOS: Sure.

CHAIR MARCOU: They're asking us to
speak up. There are microphones so let's make
sure that they're turned on. This one's not.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: This one is now
turned on.

CHAIR MARCOU: In the meantime, Mr.
Shaheen, your question?

MEMBER SHAHEEN: I'm just making --
can you hear me? Can you hear this. Oh,
perfect. Great.

So my question was about the purpose
section of the guidelines and what sort of
background discussion went into that. So in
terms of Office of Planning, we have a big
concern about aesthetics and character.

And it seems like that purpose section is what is queuing up all of the, what is driving a lot of the design guidelines. So we did have some questions about where those priorities came from in the current graph?

MS. ROOS: So I can say that those sections specific to the draft, and just for clarification of those in the audience, I believe that you're referring to the guidelines themselves versus my presentation.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: That's correct.

MS. ROOS: Okay. So the Section 3 within the design guidelines, this was a lot of the language that was actually provided by our working group partners at NCPC as well as CFA, and language that they helped provide that we obviously at DDOT and as a working group also provided some edits and some additions to.

But I would say that the majority of that language was driven from comments provided by them. If there are specific comments that
would be helpful or specific questions, I'd be happy to address those specific questions as well.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: Okay. I think our agency will probably be preparing more formal comments after the hearing.

MS. ROOS: Okay.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: With their, that focus on the -- that's what I've got for now.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. Mr. Wiley? Ms. Chamberlin? Ms. Hudson, any questions for Ms. Roos? Mr. Shaheen?

MEMBER SHAHEEN: We did have questions about more the process and how its administered, like ensuring when the technology's obsolete, how does it get removed, or if there are some installations on a block and then the city comes in and reinstalls street lights and all the spacing changes, who would be responsible for reinstalling the small cells?

MS. ROOS: So while I'm not the permit expert, you have those on your dais with you, as
well as other members of Director Marcou's staff,
I can address a couple of those items in terms
of, if we were to do an upgrade of what -- what
we refer to as an upgrade of our street lighting
system, in which we were either changing the pole
type or we were addressing spacing by adding new
poles, all equipment would have to be removed at
the cost of the carrier that existed on any
poles.

As well as if there were new
standalone poles in the public right of way that
were now in conflict with a new plan, they would
have to be removed at the cost and expense of the
carriers themselves.

And they would have to apply for new
permits on any new assets that went into the
space. So that is not a cost that the District
incurs, aside from the normal permitting and
inspections that go alongside that.

The cost would be incurred completely
by the carriers, that is one of, as I believe --
and Associate Director Marcou can address more,
is that is a condition of the permit that they
have to, this cannot impede upon our ability to
put in safety elements into the streetscape, such
as street lights.

        CHAIR MARCOU: Right. So thank you.

Can you all hear me, because I talk with my
outdoor voice all the time. And this is a good
place to use your outdoor voice just to make sure
that you’re heard.

        So this is both something new. This
is small cell technology. It's a different
method of providing telecom services. It
involves new types of equipment. It involves,
you know, space age technology that George Jetson
is using. Okay.

        But it's also very much like Fred
Flintstone, to complete the Hanna Barbera
connection of cartoons. This is just another
piece of utility equipment going into public
space and its use and its maintenance and its
impact both on and when DDOT is doing streetscape
work is always subject to the utility owner's
duty to relocate, remove and reinstall at their own costs and only with, in coordination with the District based on both its programs, as well as what the streetscape will look like at the end.

So this is very much another type, just another type of permit in that regard. So in terms, Mr. Shaheen, to your question, it's simply going to be treated like any other utility line, any other pole, any other piece of utility equipment in public space.

Okay. Thank you. Further questions for Ms. Roos from committee members?

MEMBER CHAMBERLIN: I'm guess following up on what you just mentioned, I saw we got a lot of comments about health concerns. Were health concerns considered in the guidelines?

MS. ROOS: So that is not something that DDOT or the District of Columbia regulates. That is something that the FCC regulates in terms of the permitted radio waves. I'm assuming that that's what you're referring to when it comes to
health concerns.

So that's not something that we regulate. As we have stated both in the master license agreement, as well as within the design guidelines, all state, local and federal regulations must be abided by, in addition to these guidelines.

So that's something that we just don't have purview over.

CHAIR MARCOU: Correct. Let me also again back to the point I just made, while this is a different type of utility use, there are many utility operations in the District of Columbia that require a public space permit, that is approved either by the Public Space Committee or by its delegation of authority to the Department of Transportation by the Department of Transportation, Public Space Permitting Office that are subject to other industry -- other regulators.

So for example, we do not regulate the material that goes into a Washington Gas Line.
That's not the authority or jurisdiction either
of the Public Space Committee or the District
Department of Transportation.

        What goes into a Washington gas line
is subject to regulation by other appropriate
regulators. The same thing is appropriate here.

        The frequency use of radio waves is
not subject to the jurisdiction of or the
responsibility of the Public Space Committee or
the District's Department of Transportation.

There are other regulators who have looked into
that.

        Those regulators are the ones to whom
questions related to radio frequency and radio
wave health should be addressed, but they are not
part of this process. So they will not be
addressed specifically in the guidelines, nor
will they be part of the public space permitting
process.

        Okay. Further questions for Ms. Roos?

Great, thank you very much, Ms. Roos.

        MS. ROOS: Thank you.
CHAIR MARCOU: At this time we would like to bring up a group of presenters to be one panel. We have representatives from the Historical Preservation Office, the National Capital Planning Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts and the Office of Planning.

Our next panelist after this will be OCTO to talk about the wireless access points but it's a slightly different element than these four. So if the four groups that I just mentioned would like to come forward and take a seat at the table.

And if you have material that you'd like to present to the committee, we're more than happy to take it and distribute it. If you don't, you don't. Okay. So why don't we begin as they're listed.

So we'll begin with the Historic Preservation Office. I believe the microphone is on. I can see the green light from here.

MS. BROCKETT: It's not coming out of the speaker. So I will try and speak loud.
CHAIR MARCOU: And so we have our AV group looking at that. Yes. So please use your outdoor voice.

MS. BROCKETT: Good afternoon. My name is Ann Brockett. I am with the Historic Preservation Office, which is part of the Office of Planning. You'll hear from my colleagues at the, representing the rest of the office as well momentarily.

CHAIR MARCOU: So just a reminder, when you say your name, spell your last name for the transcriber. Yeah, let's try this microphone. Thank you. Can you hear that one? Okay.

MS. BROCKETT: Okay. Better? Yes? Okay. Thank you for the reminder. My name is Ann Brockett. That's B-R-O-C-K-E-T-T. I'm with the Historic Preservation Office with the Office of Planning and you will hear from my colleague regarding the Office's comments on this. But I did want to offer something to the record, just on behalf of the
Historic Preservation Office.

We have participated in the developed
of the draft guidelines under Section 9B of our
act, which is the Historic Landmark and Historic
District Protection Act, which requires DDOT to
take into account the effect of its undertakings
on any property that is listed in or eligible for
listing in the District of Columbia inventory of
historic sites, and to consult with and afford
the state Historic Preservation Officer a
reasonable opportunity to comment on the
undertaking.

So we find that our collaborative
process to date in developing these draft
guidelines has satisfied that requirement. We do
have a few comments on the draft, which are
really more of technical edits than substantive
content related ones, and we will send those to
staff.

But otherwise, I would just like to
say that the Historic Preservation Office is
looking forward to the continued consultation
with our sister D.C. and federal agency partners
as this process moves ahead. Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you very much,
Ms. Brockett. Next on our list is the National
Capital Planning Commission.

MR. FLIS: Good afternoon. My name is
Matthew Flis. I'm a senior urban design with the
National Capital Planning Commission, and the
last name is F-L-I-S. Can you hear me pretty
well?

CHAIR MARCOU: Yes. I checked in the
background and they could.

MR. FLIS: Okay. Well thank you again
for the opportunity to provide comments on the
draft small cell design guidelines. We
appreciate those collaboration with DDOT staff as
well as the other District and federal agencies
represented here.

There are thoughtful questions and
insight along with staff and NCPC staff analysis
have been critical in our understanding of the
issues that are related to this important topic.
I will note that our comments today do not reflect our commission's office position but are a preview of the issues staff will bring to our commission for their meeting in November.

NCPC staff recognizes the growing demand for wireless technology, and more importantly, that the need to relieve congestion on existing networks is essentially for people living and working in Washington D.C.

We are also aware that the installation of small cell infrastructure will affect the function and esthetics of the public spaces we experience every day.

Balancing the need the accommodate increasing cellular demand while preserving public space character and function is critical important, as is the need to design and place proposed infrastructure in an appropriate way.

This is especially true in Washington D.C., the nation's capital where the public spaces both streets and reservations are defining elements of the city.
As the federal planning agency for the nation's capital, NCPC has a focused interest on preserving and enhancing the form, character and experience of the nation's capital, particularly within the historic L'Enfant city, and around the significant concentration of federal interests and prominent national resources found in the core.

These include the views and settings of the U.S. capital, the White House, the National Mall, nationally significant civic spaces and its institutions, national memorials and parks, and those streets, avenues and reservations, as well as the experiences that link these elements and reflect the framework of the original plan for the city of Washington.

Over the last month, NCPC staff undertook an evaluation of the draft guidelines to understand potential impacts to the federal interests.

We selected a study area, which I believe you have a copy of that map and our
comments today that focus on the area around the National Mall and those areas with the highest concentration of federal facilities and other areas of national importance, including the museums, memorials and open spaces.

The study area also includes a number of important streets that provide critical views and vistas to and from landmarks, such as the White House and the U.S. Capitol.

Through field visits and GIS analysis, staff evaluated potential small cell infrastructure locations as would be permitted by the guidelines, including installations on existing poles, as well as new standalone poles. The map shows the result of that work.

We've also provided the sequence of steps that NCPC staff has used to draft this map, and they are also included in our comments that I provided today.

As DDOT has recognized with the protection of federal buildings and reservations in the draft guidelines, the study area is
inherently unique in the District due to its unprecedented number of monumental Beaux Arts buildings, historic Washington globe and twin-20 light fixtures, landscaped building yards, terminating view sheds, integrated perimeter security and tree coverage.

Every aspect of the public realm is purposely planned to reflect its role as the seat of the nation's capital. We truly appreciate the sensitivity that the draft guidelines show for federal properties, both buildings and reservations.

We also note that this might result in areas without enough small cell coverage based upon statements by the carriers indicating that they need increased coverage downtown to meet demand.

Overall, the application of the draft guidelines indicates that there are possible gaps around the National Mall, including the Federal Triangle, portions of the Northwest Rectangle and also the Southwest Federal Center.
This is largely because the guidelines would not allow small cell infrastructure in front of federal buildings or adjacent to reservations, but also because they're not allowed on Washington globe or twin-20 light fixtures and this is the guideline that staff strongly supports.

Therefore, the challenge is how to create a set of guidelines for this unique area around the National Mall that allows for modern technology and innovation, while preserving the defining characteristics of the nation's most important public realm and buildings.

So in preparation for our commission's review of the guidelines in November, NCPC staff will analyze the guidelines regarding four important topics.

First, the spacing and frequency of standalone poles. Our analysis that indicates that new standalone poles tend to cluster along certain block-faces while other block-faces may have less due to a combination of various
criteria related to set backs and spacing.

   The introduction of new poles in the
study area, in conjunction with the existing
streetscape elements could contribution to
additional visual clutter in front of buildings
and with view corridors.

   The size and repetition of the new
poles may also feel intrusive to pedestrians and
could appear relentless when interspersed with
existing light poles.

   This may be particularly true in the
study area that we focused on due to the
frequency of highly designed streetscapes,
perimeter security and other features that occupy
the public spaces around federal buildings.

   The second topic is related to the
location of standalone poles in regard to
building architecture and entrances. If the
current guidelines allow standalone poles in
front of federal buildings many could be located
at entrances to significant buildings such as the
National Archives, Department of Commerce,
Portrait Gallery and National Building Museum.

This is largely because there are no trees in these areas and they're also open to allow for high volumes of pedestrian traffic. The guidelines may also need to address how placement might related to important architectural elements or features, particularly in our civic buildings and public spaces.

Third, given the unique historic setting of much of central Washington D.C., and the presence of many nationally significant historic buildings and landscapes, we strongly support underground cabinetry and other related equipment.

Above ground cabinetry would unnecessarily distract from the views of many historic federal buildings and sites particularly around the National Mall. It is also understanding that the providers have significant concerns with this regarding vaulting, but NCPC staff will look at the possible impacts of equipment above ground in this area.
And then fourth related to pole attachments, we understand that each telecommunication provider may have a unique antenna style and configuration.

For example, an antenna may be top mounted or also installed as a collar.

Installations of varying designs on multiple poles within a block-face may look disjointed to cluttered particularly when set against the backdrop of monumental federal buildings.

We also want to echo the recent points made by the Commission of Fine Arts at their September meeting when they advised the development of an elegant and holistic design topology for small cell installations.

So as I mentioned earlier our commission will provide formal analysis and recommendations of the guidelines at their November meeting.

We anticipate there our commission will make recommendations regarding potential revisions or clarifications to the guidelines and
given this unique setting, which I have described. Alternative solutions may be necessary, including a map designating allowed standalone pole locations to meet future coverage needs but also to protect our nation’s most important public spaces.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the draft guidelines. We look forward to additional discussion and coordinating regarding this important issues and also welcome future questions and discussion.

Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. And now we will move to the next group on our agenda, the Commission of Fine Arts.

MR. FOX: Good afternoon. My name is Daniel Fox, F-O-X, and I'm on the staff of the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts. Thank you for the opportunity to provide brief remarks regarding the small cell initiative.

The Commission appreciates the role that each agency as well as the public has had in
the development of the guidelines and the
Commission has endorsed the programmatic approach
to reviewing the small cells as has been
discussed, including the guidelines.

As you may know, the CFA was
established by Congress in 1910 and its seven
members appointed by the president provide expert
advice to the congress, the president and the
federal and D.C. government on matters of design
and esthetics as they affect the federal interest
and preserve the dignity of the nation's capital.

As the role of federal government in
the District has changed over the years, we've
continued to work closely with our partners in
the D.C. government, not just to guide the
development of the city as a national symbol but
to help create a beautiful, livable and equitable
city for all of the District's residents and
workers.

The commission has seen two
presentations on small cells, a general
information presentation by NCPC in July and a
more detailed presentation by DDOT in September
about the draft guidelines.

In both July and September, the
Commission didn't take an action, but it has
offered many suggestions and recommendations for
the small cell initiative in general and for the
development of the guidelines in particular.

You should have before you the letters
that the Commission -- the letters that detail
the Commissions comments, hopefully. And I'll
summarize them for you now.

The Commission members have generally
observed that small cells are essentially
privately-operated public infrastructure like
electricity, natural gas, water and sewers and
that they should be regulated as such.

They have therefore emphasized that
the small cells require a public advocate to
protect public values, not just a facilitator to
implement private sector enterprise.

The CFA recognizes the potential
benefits of improved 4G service and 5G
technology, however, the Commission has expressed concern about the great impact from multiple new poles and other installations in public space, especially on streets with narrow sidewalks.

In particular, they voiced concern about the potential visual impact of many thousands of installations on both the monumental core and the residential areas of the District and especially the size and appearance of the components that comprise the installations.

Regarding the city's existing lamp posts and fixtures, the Commission has noted that they were developed at particular times with particular performance standards ranging from iconic early 20th century Beaux Arts designs such as the twin-20, which was designed by the Lincoln Memorial architect and CFA commission member Henry Bacon to more functional modern designs.

And the Commission has affirmed that these historic fixtures are not suitable for small cell equipment installations. Overall, the Commission has identified that there is a
fundamental inconsistency between the elegance and precision of contemporary consumer cellular devices and the obtrusive appearance of the infrastructure systems in public space required to support them.

While most residents would likely welcome the increased service capacity, the Commission has heard little support from the community in its meetings or otherwise for the imposition of more visual clutter, among other concerns.

The Commission has therefore repeatedly emphasized that the successful integration of this new technology into the public realm is a design problem that requires a holistic design solution and have advised the development of a new typology for small cell installations, rather than allowing a discordant kit of parts, buoy and pizza shaped boxes -- pizza box shaped antennas, refrigerator sized equipment cabinets and a tangle of cables to be clumsily attached to existing or new street light
poles.

Developing a design that would make a positive contribution to the city streetscapes could be achieved by directly engaging outside industrial designers, architects and other design professional both in the refinement of the guidelines and in the design of the poles and the equipment.

Or perhaps by the project sponsors holding a design competition to develop the best solution. The commission members themselves have also offered to participate in a collaborative design workshop.

Regarding the draft guidelines themselves, the Commission has noted that the city is composed of numerous types of public space with unique experiential qualities and has therefore advised the development of 3-dimensional design drawings to test the proposed pole type, location and spacing matrices set forth in the guidelines.

The Commission has commented that the
guidelines also require further refinement to meet the state goal of treating all areas of the city equitably in cellular service and in design.

They've suggested further refinements to the allowable small cell installation matrix you saw earlier with consideration to applying consistent standards across the entire city, perhaps by requiring underground equipment vaults in all locations and providing more nuanced criteria for regulating varying areas such as our commission's Shipstead-Luce Act jurisdiction.

Finally, the Commission has requested the construction of full-scale mock ups to evaluate the design details and overall impact of the completed assemblies. Thank you again for the opportunity to present the Commission's comments and recommendations.

And we anticipate the continued review of the guidelines for this major public infrastructure project and look forward to developing a solution that appropriately integrates this promising technology into the
Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. And now, we'll hear from the Office of Planning.


We do appreciate the close collaboration between DDOT, National Capital Planning Commission, Historic Preservation and the Commission of Fine Arts on the input and the bringing us all together that sort of crafting and brought about these guidelines. I --

(Off microphone comments.)

MR. MAHER: All right. Can everybody hear me now? All right, great. There are four sort of key points I would like to highlight for the Committee today, and they are, in OP's opinion, the current allowances and limitations for locations of small cells.

We do feel they are appropriate and
possibly not nearly as restrictive as they may seem, and that more analysis may be needed to determine the real and lasting impact to the public streetscape, and I'll highlight that in more detail in a moment.

My second point is that we deeply support the prioritization of cell locations in alleys, first and foremost, prior to locating them within the streetscape, and that's part of the current guidelines, as drafted.

We also want to highlight our deep support for the prioritization of all the cell, small cell equipment outside of the antennas themselves into underground vaults in those locations where they're highlighted in the guidelines. We have strong support over that aspect.

And then, lastly, I do want to make a point of prevalence, or, but make a point on the prevalence of wood poles, specifically third-party wood poles throughout the District. And I would like to sort of highlight a need to ensure
quality design for the installed equipment on these poles as well.

I think a lot of this discussion today will primarily be focused on the downtown area, and for DDOT's streetlight poles, but those poles that represent the wooden ones throughout the city roughly account for, once you remove all of the prohibited poles, based on pole type, based on location, so if you remove all of the Twin-20s from consideration, all of the Washington globes, all of the streetlights on bridges, all of the streetlights on medians, what you roughly come up with is, out of the total 74,000 streetlights in the District, possibly 50,000 locations that are still opportunities for citing small cells.

And of those remaining, approximately 36 percent of them are DDOT's. The remaining 64 percent are wooden poles, and they are primarily located in the outlying wards of the city. So in Ward 3, Ward 4, Ward 5, Ward 7 and Ward 8.

Each of those wards, having roughly 70 to 80 percent of their poles in those wards are
the wooden, either Pepco or Verizon poles. And so I think, because they take up such a prevalent, they are so common throughout so many District neighborhoods, that I do think there is, there ought to be some level or some design requirement regarding those poles so that we don't have sort of eyesores in most of the city's neighborhoods.

I would like to, and Matt, if you could pull up my presentation really quick --

CHAIR MARCOU: Sure.

MR. MAHER: There's actually just a few slides in it I'd like to highlight.

MR. MACNICHOL: I think it's the PDF, correct?

MR. MAHER: Correct. And if you could go to page 4. Okay. The PDF isn't interested in cooperating today?

CHAIR MARCOU: Apparently not.

MR. MAHER: Okay. I have a copy with me today. I would be happy to provide that to the Committee.
CHAIR MARCOU: And I'm just trying to see if it, let me take it out of there, because we were able to see it a second ago.

(Mr. Maher: Say it again.

(Off microphone comments.)

MR. MAHER: I don't quite understand what you're --

CHAIR MARCOU: So it's on the thumb drive, correct?

MR. MAHER: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: Is the thumb drive still in there?

MR. MAHER: It is not.

CHAIR MARCOU: We'll try this one more time. We appreciate your patience. I am good at the audio part. It's the visual part that I probably need some assistance with. No, unfortunately the Pierre is like that, for whatever reason, it's not reading it. It's just reading a few pages, but not others.

MR. MAHER: Okay. All right. Then,
I would be happy to provide some of the visuals to the Committee and to the public after this meeting. I can just talk to, through them really quickly.

I did a very brief analysis of Rush Street, just east of Dupont Circle, P Street between 19th and 16th Streets, just to compare existing streetlight locations with the guidelines. And roughly speaking, it shows the possibility of, and all, the possibility that each streetlight that exists on that three-block stretch has the potential to have a small cell on it, and still meet the guidelines.

So I think, if we start to hear comments that some of these are a little too restrictive, I think it's very dependent on the specific block and the specific type of infrastructure that exists on a street, but there are some streets that do exist in the District where the guidelines do mean, potentially, and I'm not saying that this is what the carriers would do.
It may be too much of an overlap in coverage, but there is the possibility that, on these three blocks, each streetlight that exists would have small cells on them, and still comply with the guidelines.

And then, just really quickly, I did want to highlight that, once more, Ward 1, Ward 2, and Ward 6, and those predominantly make up the downtown core through Columbia Heights, I think just shy of Petworth, and also all of Capitol Hill, heading towards the Anacostia.

These three wards, once you remove the types of poles and locations prohibited under the guidelines, roughly, in each, 92 up to 94 percent of all of the remaining poles in those, in those wards are DDOT poles.

However, in each of them, between 30 and 40 percent of those poles are located in alleys. So I think prioritizing alleyways as the sort of first hierarchy as to where small cells should be installed are still, they still provide a sufficient, in our opinion, a sufficient amount
of coverage and even spread throughout those wards.

In the outlying wards, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8, that actually reverses. Between 70 and 85 percent of the poles in those wards are third-party wooden poles, not DDOT poles. However, the number of poles located in those wards, though slightly less than the more downtown wards, alley poles range from between 20 percent and 40 percent of the available poles.

And so based on those wards being less densely populated, but also having slightly fewer percentage of alley poles, I still feel, and it is in OP's opinion that locating poles first and foremost in alleyways is sufficient to provide the kind of coverage, at least in the next 10 years, that we've been sort of anticipating on this. I'll close that out now and open it up to the Committee for questions.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. Questions from Committee Members for the presenters?

MEMBER CHAMBERLIN: So can, I guess
can you guys hear me?

CHAIR MARCOU: Is this one on?

MEMBER CHAMBERLIN: So Tim, I had a question about the design guidelines for wooden poles. So I heard there aren't any. Is that because they would be owned by Pepco, or would there, would there be any design guidelines subject from DDOT for the poles? And if it's just because they're owned by Pepco, is there any permitting authority over wooden poles or not?

MR. MAHER: The permitting authority, I would leave to the permitting group.

CHAIR MARCOU: Hold on. Yes, let me -- hi, I'm Matthew Marcou, Associate Director of the Public Space Regulation Division. Yes. If anything gets attached to that pole, it requires a new permit from the Public Space Permitting Division.

MEMBER CHAMBERLIN: For Pepco-owned poles?

CHAIR MARCOU: For Pepco-owned poles. It doesn't matter who owns it. If you're putting
a new piece of infrastructure on it, it requires a public space permit. Thank you for your time and attention.

MEMBER CHAMBERLIN: Okay. I guess my question is then, why aren't there any design guidelines for the wooden poles?

MR. MAHER: I'm not sure. I think it's only been through more recent analysis on my office's part that we've come to really grasp and understand the true prevalence of wood poles throughout most of the District.

I think, early on, leading into sort of the working group that put a lot of these together there was a focus on sort of the more dense locations, the areas where NCPC and CFA and HB have the most concern.

I think OP took a step back and tried to do a more holistic view across the city. And as of, as of right now, right, I'm not aware that the guidelines have specific design criteria for the wooden poles.

I would like to advocate that at least
there is some consideration for how they look, rather than allowing just anything that may be of varying sizes, varying wires that stick out sort of thing.

It may not need the level of design guidance that poles on, within historic districts, or within the monumental core may need, but I do think that some small minimal level of design is necessary to ensure that our communities throughout the District are not where we force a lot of the eyesore equipment.

MEMBER CHAMBERLIN: So will OP be submitting any recommendations for the wooden poles?

MR. MAHER: We can.

CHAIR MARCOU: For the record, that would be helpful.

MEMBER CHAMBERLIN: Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Hi, if anybody is interested in the public with giving us notes or comments, this is a discussion between the Public Space Committee and the individual presenters
right now. So every time there's a panelist, we'll be asking them questions.

If you have questions that you'd like us to be aware of, please feel free to reach out to Ms. Felder in the back, and she'll be happy to give them to us.

In addition, when it's your time to speak to us, we look forward to hearing what questions you'll have, because, again, this is not a final action. This is the next step in a discussion to create final guidelines.

So we definitely appreciate, and I, and I guarantee you, you aren't the only one who has a question in the audience. Ms. Roos has something she wants to speak to to those guidelines, but I'd like to pull you up later, if you don't mind.

MS. ROOS: That's fine.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. Thank you.

Further questions for this panel? Mr. Shaheen?

MEMBER SHAHEEN: I'm going to follow up, is this mic working? Okay, great. I'm going
to follow up from my earlier questions about the purpose section of the guidelines. It seems to be very focused on the monumental core.

I mean, it does talk in general about the streetscape character for the city, but I think it's not covering that outer part of the city where Mr. Maher was having where all of the wooden poles are.

Is there a reason why the general character of the neighborhoods outside of the downtown area was not looked at specifically in that stricter section, or is that something that's being looked at?

MS. BROKETT: I don't really, I don't really have an answer to your question, other than that we know DDOT's guidelines could certainly look at amending the purpose statement for historic districts, because many of ours are located outside the monumental core, and we definitely didn't the necessary steps for all historic districts.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: Yes, I know that that
first, the purpose section prefers to lay a plan, which I really want to know. There's also the highway plan, which would include the major roadways like Nebraska, South Dakota, Minnesota, which are very character-defining for those parts of the city.

I know that the highway plan is going to be more in size than the coming sections of the revised federal and District elements of the comp plan. I think it might be useful to take it back that way and form some additional corridors outside of the downtown that might want additional study.

And I just agree with Ms. Chamberlain's comments, looking at where are the wooden poles, and if there are any requirements to help bring some consistency to what's being added to those required of all the different carriers. The last comment, and this is more at, an easy one, there's a lot of discussion in the guidelines about using the six-fluted paper poles, but there's not much in the purpose
section really talking about why that's important, and I think it goes back to the standards that were defined by the CFA.

It's, it is an infrastructure system. I think it is, would be worthwhile to make that point a little more stronger, and of laws governing what the District can do in terms of aesthetic requirements on this need to be objective and clearly defined.

I think putting something in that front section that makes those as clearly defined and objective as possible will be helpful in giving more clarity as to why we have the design guidelines that we are adopting.

CHAIR MARCOU: Great. That, see? Jonathan, I don't believe this microphone is working. Can you all hear me? Right? No. So Jonathan, I don't think that mic -- well, no, I know this one is -- Jonathan, I don't think that microphone is, this one, either one is working. Thank you. So I did have a few questions. Did you have any questions, Ms. Hudson?
MEMBER HUDSON: No, not at this time.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. So Mr. Maher, I want to follow up on some of your math, because it was higher calculus, and I wasn't able to follow along. So the takeaway number for me was 64 percent.

What I think I heard you say was that, once you take away all of the ineligible poles, and you restrict the universe of poles in the District of Columbia to poles eligible for placement of small cell technology, that 64 percent of those remaining poles are third-party-owned poles. Is that correct?

MR. MAHER: That is correct.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. Thank you. And that a substantial number of those are in wards other than 1, 2, and 6, where 1, 2, and 6, the substantial majority appear to be DDOT poles. Is that correct?

MR. MAHER: That is also correct.

CHAIR MARCOU: And I think the numbers you gave were in the 90-plus percent range for 1,
2, and 6?

MR. MAHER: Yes, 93 percent for both Ward 1 and Ward 2, and 94 percent for Ward 6.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. So then I have a question that is perhaps for all of you. So one of the concerns we've heard is that you -- or not concerns -- one thing, one of the concerns we've heard is about the proliferation of new poles.

However, we've also heard that you don't want them attached to Washington globes. Help us thread that needle. If you were to pick between new poles versus attachments to Washington globes, which would you pick, because if you can attach to Washington globes, there's a not insubstantial section of the city where all that's available are Washington globes, and therefore, it has to be attached to something.

So I'm just asking the question. I'm not looking for a particular answer one way or the other. I'm just interested in knowing your thoughts, because as Mr. Maher pointed out,
particularly in the downtown areas, Washington
globes are a not insubstantial portion of the
poles, and almost all of the poles are owned by
the District of Columbia itself.

MS. BROKETT: And I, you know, I'm not
really sure I'm the right person to answer this,
but there is somewhere in the guidelines sort of
prioritization of preference where poles are
located, and alleys, I think, were at the top of
the list.

I don't know where that is, just
looking at the guidelines off the back, but
because there is a prioritization, it takes into
account that there are Washington globes and
Twin-20s to which the drafters of the guidelines
did not wish to see attachments, but where there
are no other opportunities for attaching, there
is the opportunity for the new poles.

So it's not, I don't think it's
limiting because it, although we sort of
established a list, a check box, if it's not
here, then you go to the next one. If you can't
do it here, you go to the next one. So it
doesn't eliminate the possibility of putting up
the small cells.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you.

MR. FLIS: I just want to echo one of
the things that we've mentioned previously is
that, again, much of the streetscape has been
purposefully planned and designed. I think the
Twin-20s and the Washington globes, as my
colleagues have mentioned, are part of that
streetscape that were designed with an intent.

And so I think one of the challenges
with that attachment is how you reconcile from a
design perspective, which I know the Commission
on Fine Arts has discussed as well. So that's
just one of the considerations, but I do want to
echo the Historic Preservation Office's comments
that there is, there are opportunities and
potential to balance these issues in terms of the
way the guidelines are laid out, and providing
several opportunities to provide coverage.

MR. FOX: I don't, I don't really have
much to add. I agree with what's, with what's been said. I think the Commission agrees, so they're generally, they're interested in a lot of these issues, not just in the monumental core, as we sort of outlined in the comments.

It may be a misperception that the Commission of Fine Arts is just interested in the monumental core, but in fact, we're concerned about the entire city.

And the question of equity that's brought up in here is a, was a big concern to our Commission Members, not just, you know, a consideration about the wood poles in wards outlying the monumental core. So we very much appreciate the comments regarding that issue.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. I just want to, I want to put a little bit of a fine point on it, or make sure I understood what you were saying. The guidelines specifically prohibit the use of Washington globes, and allow the installation of new poles.

So what I'm hearing you say, it's
just, and it's just what I'm hearing, is as a preferential matter, it would be better to maintain that and allow the installation of new poles rather than an installation attaching to Washington globes.

In other words, rather than opening a portfolio to Washington globes, it would be, it is a preference then to allow new poles in those areas where Washington globes are installed.

MR. MAHER: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: Let the record show that everybody's nodding.

MS. BROKETT: Yes.

MR. MAHER: Yes.

(Off microphone comments.)

CHAIR MARCOU: I will simply say that they, let me clarify. Because they used Washington globes as one example, and Twin-20s are not Washington globes, just to be clear.

So when you say a Washington globe Twin-20, you're conflating that you do not, you do not want to expand the types of poles that are
eligible for installations beyond those that are currently recommended in the guidelines, and that new poles would be preferred to increasing the menu of existing poles to which attachments are allowed.

The answer I'd like, we'd like to go back and talk with others and make a more formal recommendation is a perfectly acceptable answer.

MS. BROKETT: Because my office only represents historic districts, we would be okay with other mounts outside of historic districts because we have no regulatory authority.

CHAIR MARCOU: Right. But in the historic districts, you --

MS. BROKETT: We, the guide --

CHAIR MARCOU: -- the preference I said now.

MS. BROKETT: The guidelines are, and what you are, what you are summarizing from the guidelines is correct.

CHAIR MARCOU: Just want to make sure.

Is that true for NCPC and for CFA?
MR. FOX: Sorry, what is true?

CHAIR MARCOU: Broadly speaking, you would prefer that the menu of poles to which attachments are permitted is not expanded, and that instead, the preference to allow for new poles in those areas where there aren't poles to attach to is allowed.

MR. FOX: Yes, it's, that's what our Commission has said, but they're also concerned about the design of the standalone poles and the installation. So it's --

CHAIR MARCOU: And that's a perfect segue to my next question, which is particularly for CFA, but probably for everybody. How long would a design program take that would get us to the really eloquent language that you all used, that I would never be able to imitate again, but it used the word typology?

MR. FOX: I don't have a specific answer for that. I think it's initiative --

CHAIR MARCOU: Well, just roughly?

MR. FOX: I could not begin to give
you a time frame. There are experts that run
design competitions, so there are people that can
be consulted to actually, that can give you a
better idea of what it takes to run a design
competition.

CHAIR MARCOU: We'd like, that would
be helpful for us to hear from the Commission of
Fine Arts, because it's been a recommendation
from the Commission of Fine Arts, so it would be
helpful to understand how long they would think
that that would take.

MR. FOX: Sure, it's --

CHAIR MARCOU: I'm not asking you to
put it on the record right now, just to think
about it.

MR. FOX: Yes, sure. It's something
we can discuss more. It's --

CHAIR MARCOU: That would be great.

Thank you. And then, I had one last question for
you all, and this, again, relates to the idea of
seeing a mockup.

Would you all be interested in a pilot
where installations were permitted at select
locations to identify what the world would look
like, based on a variety of types of
infrastructure installed, and locations
permitted, to get a real-world sense of that
installation?

MR. FOX: Yes, I think so. I think it
depends -- our Commission has said that there are
many different types of public spaces throughout
the District, so a pilot program, I think, that
addressed all of the varying conditions of the,
of the District would be positive.

CHAIR MARCOU: Great, thank you very
much. I had one last question for you, Mr.
Maher, about P Street, between 16th and 19th.

MR. MAHER: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: You said that the, you
said that it, that you, from a, just a cursory,
that you didn't do a detailed analysis, but that
it appeared like all of them would allow
attachments. How many poles are we talking
about?
MR. MAHER: Yes, let me pull up that drawing. So not to confuse you with a bunch of numbers, this is a much easier graphic to see.

CHAIR MARCOU: My mom was a math teacher. I'm okay with numbers.

MR. MAHER: Between Dupont Circle and 18th Street, you have a 230-foot block face that would allow one streetlight per side of the street. There's only a Washington globe on the north side, so that would need to be a new freestanding pole.

On the south side, there's only one Cobrahead, so that one Cobrahead would be all that is allowed. On the block between 18th and 17th, that is an 875-foot block face that, yes, and it's not one of the longest in the city.

So there are one, two, three, there are five Cobrahead pendant poles on the north side. There are four Cobrahead pendant poles on the south side. Per the size of the block, and being in a historic district, they would be permitted five installs per side of the street,
so there are five Cobraheads on the north.
That's occupying all five.

There are four on the south, so they
could occupy those four and have room to add in a
standalone pole. Between 17th and 16th, it's
roughly the same story. It's a 500-foot block
face. They would be allowed three.

There are three Cobraheads on the
north side, so they could take up all three.
There are two on the south side, so they would be
allowed to install on two, and then add in a
single freestanding pole.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you very much.

MR. MAHER: So if you can paint that
mental picture in your head.

CHAIR MARCOU: I can, because I walked
that, walked those blocks at P Street many times.
Okay. Thank you very much. We really appreciate
it. Oh, Mr. Shaheen?

MEMBER SHAHEEN: Actually I just have
one other questions. So I did wonder about the
hoteling and the independent carrier, did the,
did the working group consider a guideline
requiring hoteling versus the individual
carriers, and why was the route taken to
courage, to not, to not encourage to require
hoteling?

MR. MAHER: I can begin with that, but
I think I'd also allow --

CHAIR MARCOU: Why don't we let Ms. Roos --

MR. MAHER: Okay.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- speak to that, if
you don't mind. I think she has a, Ms. Roos has
been a bit more comprehensively engaged
throughout the process, and not that you haven't
been an excellent partner in the process, but she
have a bit more context and history to it. So
were there any other questions for this panel?
Thank you very much for your time. We appreciate
it.

MR. MAHER: Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Ms. Roos, why don't you
come back up? We have a few quick questions that
you can hear that came up. Thank you. So Mr. Shaheen, your question for Ms. Roos?

MEMBER SHAHEEN: Well, there were two, but now I can only remember the second one, so if there's a recording, maybe I can --

MS. ROOS: Maybe it will come back to you.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: But the second, the second question was, why do the guidelines not encourage or require hoteling and instead encourage -- well, it doesn't discourage, but why does it not require that as, I think some other municipalities have done that.

MS. ROOS: So in our conversations with the carriers, and their technology needs, it has been expressed that the current hoteling configurations do not work for their next level of technology, particularly 5G.

I think that's a great question to ask them specifically when they are coming up here, as to why their technology does not allow for that, but again, in trying to find a balance
between the technological needs of the carriers, as well as, how do we incorporate this within the public space, that was a consideration that we took.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: Were there any design considerations as to whether or not one would be preferable over the other?

MS. ROOS: In terms of hoteling?

MEMBER SHAHEEN: Yes.

MS. ROOS: I think one of the issues that was discussed within the working group is that hoteling, from the designs that we've seen of it, from the carrier that does provide hoteling, is that you get much larger equipment and antennaeas. And so it's the balance between how many poles do we want things attached to versus how large are the attachments?

We've seen anything from, I think the drawings that you saw had a two or a two and a half foot tall antennae on top. We have seen designs that that antennae could be under a hoteling situation, anywhere from five to seven
feet tall.

And so, again, that was a balancing and a consideration, not only given as the asset owner, and having the responsibility to be the caretaker of the streetlight assets. There is a structural concern there, as well as an aesthetic concern, given how large the equipment that is required to do hoteling, in addition to the, what we've been told in terms of 5G technology, has not been successfully tested within hoteling at the moment. But again, I would encourage you to ask that of the carriers when they are up here later.

CHAIR MARCOU: And I remember the second question, which was really the first question. It was about, wood pole and --

MS. ROOS: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- utility poles inclusions in the design guidelines.

MS. ROOS: So I just wanted to clarify that they are included with the design guidelines. So if you go to Chapter 9 of the
design guidelines, that is exclusive to third-party utility poles, and it is in fact entitled, Guidelines Regarding Existing Utility Poles.

I would also, while that is a short section within the guidelines, I would also note that all of Section 5, which is titled, General Guidelines, applies to every single type of installation. So every existing third-party utility pole has to abide by all of the guidelines that are general to installations, that is Section 5.

I think one exception, and I think it is noted within Section 5, is that obviously you will have exposed wires on utility poles, because you cannot hide them from within the pole, but it does state that they need to be, you know, linear in fashion and very straightforward in terms of their installation.

The chart on page 7 of the design guidelines also does address existing utility poles. It is the last row there that you see in that chart, and the only difference that you see
in the design guidelines that they currently
contemplate that is different from any other type
of installation is their ability to have the
cabinetry attached to the pole.

This was thoroughly discussed and the
decision was made that, because you generally see
that on utility poles already, you see
transformers that are much larger, or as large as
these cabinets, et cetera, that because that is
currently allowed, that we would also allow,
similarly, that cabinetry to be attached to
third-party utility poles. Again, that is what
the design guidelines currently contemplate.

MEMBER CHAMBERLIN: And certainly, my
fear on the poles, on the wooden poles, is
there's already stuff on it. And is there, can
we limit the amount of stuff, like we're putting
more and more, so like how wide can it get, how
tall, full of cabinets can it, you know -- too
much clutter on a pole, I guess would be my
concern.

MS. ROOS: So to that point, you are
correct, that the design guidelines do not state how much stuff can go on a utility pole, because I think it changes utility pole to utility pole.

Some don't have anything on it right now, and they serve as a connector to the wiring above. Some have smaller cable boxes, et cetera. It is my understanding, from further discussions with the carriers, that the poles will most likely have to be taken out that are currently there, because they are not structurally strong enough, nor are they tall enough, given the necessary separation between poles.

Again, I am not a technical person when it comes to this matter, and I encourage you asking the providers when they are there, but my basic understanding is that there are requirements between different sections of the pole.

A pole is divided up within sections, such as there is a section specifically designated where streetlights can be attached. There is also a section of a utility pole in
which communications equipment can be attached.
And there are certain regulatory distances that
must be maintained between each section.

So it is my understanding that there
is a request to have taller poles installed. We
have asked the providers to provide that
additional information for us, but currently, the
guidelines contemplate, and this is in the
general section of Section 5, that no pole can be
taller than 10 percent of what's there.

So if a utility pole that is currently
there is 30 feet tall, any pole that goes in its
place that has small cell attachments to it can
be no greater than 10 percent on top of that, so
33 feet, 3 feet being 10 percent of the 30-foot
pole that's there.

So we have attempted to address that
in terms of the overall height and restrictions
when it comes to the utility poles. I will also
say that, generally, to go back to Chris's
question regarding hoteling, is that overall, all
of the restrictions that we have placed within
the guidelines, to a certain extent, encourage hoteling, because eventually there will be no ability to attach to streetlights.

They will run out in terms of the areas where they prefer to be, and the spacing regulations. So eventually, they might be forced into hoteling because there are no other locations that they can attach to, and thus, it does encourage hoteling in that respect.

CHAIR MARCOU: Mr. Shaheen?

MEMBER SHAHEEN: I have two other questions. So one, what do the guidelines say about corridors that currently have poles that are eligible for the facilities, but DDOT's policy is that they eventually be replaced with Washington globes?

MS. ROOS: So again, to your earlier question I think that you asked when I was here before, is that if those were to be, or let's say that they are pendant poles of Cobraheads right now in a corridor, and there were small cell installations attached to that.
If we did an upgrade project in which those poles were switched out to a Washington globe or a Twin-20, they would no longer be eligible, and thus, they, all of their equipment would need to be removed, and they would have to go through a re-application process to install new poles along that corridor that abided by the final guidelines.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: My other question is about that 10 percent height that's allowed for the new poles, and is fixed upon the adjacent poles. How is adjacent poles being defined if you have multiple poles on a block that are, some are private, some are District? There are different kinds. Which does the 10 percent apply to?

MS. ROOS: So it is the closest pole that we would be looking --

MEMBER SHAHEEN: The most immediate layout --

MS. ROOS: The most immediate -- yes, correct. We don't find that situation very often
in which you have multiple pole types on a block. It does happen occasionally, and where, but most likely you're, when you're finding that, that is a pendant pole or a Twin-20 or a Washington globe.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. Further questions for Ms. Roos? Okay. Seeing none, we will continue on with the next group, which are the master license agreement holders.

Master license agreement holders are referenced to the entities that have submitted a master license agreement with the District of Columbia. This is a requirement prior to -- oh, I'm sorry. I'm completely wrong, and I've just been identified, I've just been told that, because I'm jumping the gun.

We have representatives from OCTO here, who are going to present upon their element related to telecommunications, which are wireless access points. I will point out that a member of the OCTO team is wearing a lanyard that has the New Orleans Saints logo on it.
I won't point out that I was in the Superdome on Monday last week, but I was. And we will not hold that against you --

MR. CLOW: Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- Mr. Clow, with OCTO.

So if you'll please present.

PARTICIPANT: Yes, it was a great game.

CHAIR MARCOU: If you're going to go on the record, you're going to have to state your name for the record and spell your last name. That's why I studiously avoided doing that.

MR. CLOW: And Matt, I forwarded -- OCTO gave you an updated presentation, but I did forward you one from September that we can use, if you wanted to share something.

CHAIR MARCOU: Which would you like us to use?

MR. CLOW: If you have some up here, I can follow that.

CHAIR MARCOU: When did you send that?

MR. CLOW: About five minutes ago.
CHAIR MARCOU: Five minutes ago. I can, literally, to my email?

MR. CLOW: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay, I can pull that up real quick. So give --

MR. CLOW: Oh. In the meantime, my name is David Clow, C-L-O-W. I am the Associate Chief Technology Officer under OCTO, over DC-NET and Telecommunications. I'm here representing the interim CTO, Barney Krucoff, K-R-U-C-O-F-F.

CHAIR MARCOU: And for the record, OCTO has made it that we can access our email via the internet anywhere in the world. I do it on my phone just by going to the internet. I don't see it. C-L-O-W, right?

MR. CLOW: Yes, sir.

CHAIR MARCOU: Does it show that it was sent?

MR. CLOW: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: To Matthew.Marcou, M-A-T-T-H -- oh, there we are.

MR. CLOW: No, that's fine.
CHAIR MARCOU: No?

MR. CLOW: All right. I'll just go from what I have here.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay.

MR. CLOW: So OCTO is the central technology organization for the District of Columbia. We develop, implement and maintain the District's technology infrastructure. So DC-NET, we have over 700 miles of District-owned fiber in the District.

We have 100 gigabyte core connecting 650 buildings. We are the phone company for the District agencies. We process more than 80 million phone calls a year, and our free Wi-Fi program covers about 11 percent of the populated areas in the District.

Our involvement with the small cell program is not so much focused on the small cell aspect, but increasing the District's outdoor Wi-Fi footprint.

CHAIR MARCOU: Sorry, is it, is this similar to the presentation you made on, in
September?

MR. CLOW: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. So we have that presentation on our website, so we're pulling that up now. Oh, it's a PowerPoint. Got it. Is it a PowerPoint or a PDF?

MR. CLOW: It should be a PowerPoint.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. No, this is the, that's the one from Kathryn, so, okay, great.

MR. CLOW: And then, I'm on the, about DC-NET side. One back, please.

CHAIR MARCOU: Oh, sure.

MR. CLOW: So we have about 40,000 users who connect to our Wi-Fi daily, and about 14 million annually. Next slide, please. So OCTO sees free Wi-Fi as an economic driver.

I kind of think of it in real estate terms. We got, where we are along corridors, we approve the walkability scores. It's a bridge to digital buy. It's a boon to tourism. It's a public convenience, and it's also utilized by the District's public safety agencies. Next slide,
please.

As you can see here on the map, this is where we're at right now with Wi-Fi. Green is existing outdoor Wi-Fi. It's pretty sparse, but kind of well set to divide it throughout the city, and the biggest driver for outdoor Wi-Fi right now is where there's District-owned buildings.

So of the 447 outdoor APs, about 400 of them were actually physically located on the roof or side of a building, and the ones that are on poles were done during the PA 2040 pilot, done with the Golden Triangle BID. Next slide.

The priorities for Wi-Fi is where we have existing fiber. This is the outdoor wireless AP, or you might hear it called a WAP, or access point, or AV, a lot of lingo in the technology field.

The cost of this is about $1500 each, so it's not really the cost inhibitor for this project. The real cost is the plant to support spreading Wi-Fi throughout the city through fiber
Our focus areas in our planning are underserved communities, public housing, main streets, great streets, around firehouses, schools, libraries, parks and transportation hubs.

So this is, Matt, is the wish list of everything we wish we could do if we had unlimited resources. Right now, we have 600 -- I think this is a little bit outdated. We have 600 APs in stock right now.

We're waiting for this program to launch, as well as another DDOT program, the streetlight program, and we're also working on finalizing some agreements with pole attachments with the other providers: power and whatnot.

We will prioritize our deployments based on the information on the previous slide, and we also, as Barney likes to say, we want to go where we're welcome. So based on the feedback we get from ANCs and BIDs who really want to have outdoor Wi-Fi as part of their community, that'll
be our top priority. Next slide.

Again, the cost drivers are not so much the cost of this device here. It's the labor, the fiber and the power and maintenance of the device.

CHAIR MARCOU: Just as an aside, did you want to point out that that's a bike line, so the work zone would normally provide a safe accommodation for the bicyclists as they come to that work zone.

MR. CLOW: The reason we're involved with small cell is part of a partnership, and kind of an economy scale. If there's an MLA holder who's doing work on a street.

They've already done their traffic plan, they've already rented a bucket truck, they can place this small device on the pole at the same time they're doing work without the District having to come back separately with a different traffic plan, and without having to hire the same contractors again.

We call it a ride-along, and the one-
touch is a cost savings for the District to deploy outdoor Wi-Fi. We planned a lot, the majority of the main street great streets in the city, and this next street, the next slide is an example of what it would look like.

Here, you can see where, this is where Benning Road and Minnesota Avenue cross. You can see parts of Wards 7 and 8, going up Minnesota Avenue, into the Deanwood area. And you can see the red dots are our planned locations, where we'd like to be.

Of course that's subject to DDOT permission. We haven't gone on a deep dive to make sure there's no transformer or pole or anything like that, and we would follow the DDOT standards and the carrier rules, as far as where on the poles we would place. Any questions?

CHAIR MARCOU: Questions from Committee Members?

MEMBER SHAHEEN: I stepped out at the very beginning. Is this just information in terms of what your OCTO plan is for Wi-Fi?
MR. CLOW: Yes, but we're also partnering with the MLA holders to get these deployed. So when they're going to the pole to install a small cell, they are also, they have the traffic plan and everything diverted, and they have the bucket truck there, they can install this for us at the same time.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: And is that on each site, or is there a master plan and --

MR. CLOW: No, we have a, we loaded our wish list up, and we will be responding individually as they submit their permits whether that's a pole we'd want to be on or not.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: And is the overlap only that they would go to install?

MR. CLOW: Yes, they would be owned and maintained by the District.

MEMBER CHAMBERLIN: I guess that we have mockups and what it looks like. I guess the small cells plus the Wi-Fi?

MR. CLOW: Yes, the AP usually goes beneath the small cell, and I brought the actual
physical model here so you can see what it looks like.

MEMBER CHAMBERLIN: I guess we don't have something visual to look at with this?

MR. CLOW: I think there are on the website, but not in this slide deck. And some of the carriers will have it included in their mockups as well.

CHAIR MARCOU: What's the standard height at which you install a wireless access point?

MR. CLOW: Fifteen to 25 feet high, and really, we leave it to the pole owners. They have the certain rules about where it can be in relation to the power lines, relation to other equipment, but we kind of rely on their subject matter expertise for the placement. We just have a general zone we would like to be.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. Do Committee Members have any further questions?

MEMBER HUDSON: Yes, I just have one question. So OCTO is basically just tag teaming
with the carriers? Is that what we're doing?

MR. CLOW: Correct.

MEMBER HUDSON: Is OCTO just tag

teaming with the carriers is, was my question,

and you said --

MR. CLOW: Right.

MEMBER HUDSON: Okay.

MR. CLOW: We're just taking

advantage, like I said before, when they're doing

along a street, they'll have to put it in a

traffic plan with VDOT, and they'll have a truck

out there with the lift.

So while they're up there working,

it's a, it's a small add-on to do this work at

the same time, and it saves us money of having to

go out separately to these poles. We're doing

the same kind of partnership involved with the

streetlight project as well.

MEMBER HUDSON: Good. Thank you.

MEMBER CHAMBERLIN: Sorry. So one

more question. Just as a user, who's this free

Wi-Fi intended to help? Because for me, when my
phone picks up the D.C. free Wi-Fi, it slows
everything on my phone, so I literally have to
turn the Wi-Fi off my phone. So I guess I'm just
trying to figure out what, who benefits from
this.

MR. CLOW: Right. And that's one of
the reasons we're trying to expand it, so we have
more ubiquitous coverage. Sometimes your phone
will pick up the signal, and you can receive the
signal, but your phone is too far away to
transmit back.

So again, we've had different agencies
tell us they're really interested. Department of
Health has asked us to cover areas where they
have farmer's markets. DPR and DCPS are very
interested in expanding coverage around their
sports fields and that sort of thing. And then,
our next main focus is D.C. Housing, and then
main streets, great streets.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. Further
questions for OCTO? I just had, I just want to
make sure I put it on the record, that is the
color of your wireless access point, correct?

    MR. CLOW: That is the color, and it is paintable.

    CHAIR MARCOU: It is paintable? So it could be painted to match whatever --

    MR. CLOW: Yes, as long as it's not lead-based paint.

    CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. Great. Yes, that would be bad. Thank you. Even though we don't regulate that portion of it either, but -- okay. Thank you very much. Really appreciate your time.

    MR. CLOW: Thank you.

    CHAIR MARCOU: And I prefer playing the Panthers to the Saints. So with that said, why don't we move to the industry? We invited, I believe we invited the CTIA. I don't know if they are present. Okay.

    I, that may be an error on my part, so I apologize if the invitation did not get to them. Why don't we bring up the entities to make presentations on their particular programs? We
have AT&T, Crown Castle, Mobilitie, and Verizon.

And rather than bring up four people from each group at a time, why don't we have one representative from each of the groups come to the table? Within your groups, you can do rock, paper, scissors to see who should present. So if, we have your presentations from the September 15th meeting. I think it was September 15th. It might have been the 25th.

MEMBER CHAMBERLIN: Twenty-fifth.

CHAIR MARCOU: So let me close this out. See if I learn how to use a computer soon. Okay. And so why don't we begin, Verizon it looks like your, where's the, they are here, correct? Right. So AT&T, let's go with yours. Yours is the first one up. So if you'll state your name for the record, spell your last name.

MS. VAN RIPER: Jennifer Van Riper. It's V-A-N, capital R-I-P-E-R. And so this is presentation that we reviewed on the 25th. It is a high-level review of the program.

AT&T's intention is to expand a much
needed capacity in the District. Go to the next slide for me. All right. So general overview, I did have to laugh when you said you had to turn the D.C. free Wi-Fi off.

That's a capacity problem. That's why we're all here, right, is to not only expand, obviously the industry's networks, but to partner with OCTO to get their wireless access points out as well.

CHAIR MARCOU: I just want to clarify, is everybody able to hear? Good. Thank you.

MS. VAN RIPER: All right, great. So essentially, we have spent the last four years modifying our macro network. The existing cell sites, adding capacity to them, and we are capacity-busted.

We need more capacity and network for today's customers. I know we talk a lot about 5G, and about 5G technology, emerging technologies, and autonomous cars. But essentially, while all those are very important, why we are here today and have such an urgent
need is today's capacity problem.

Augmenting the existing network so that you don't have to turn off Wi-Fi, so that you can use apps in a farmer's market, for public safety needs. We can walk through this. I, honestly, I think everybody has seen this presentation a number of times.

CHAIR MARCOU: I don't know if the Public Space Committee Members have.

MS. VAN RIPER: Okay.

CHAIR MARCOU: I may have because I have no life and I go to all of the meetings. They have not seen this because they have other items that they work on. So it might be helpful to give them an overview --

MS. VAN RIPER: Okay.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- of your equipment and materials.

MS. VAN RIPER: Let's go through it. We've done this together a few times, Matthew.

CHAIR MARCOU: Sure.

MS. VAN RIPER: Let's go through it.
So essentially, what we're proposing here is a small cell approach, right? So it is, we've spent over a year coming up with a streamlined design that, we'll go through some photo simulations to show you.

We have, AT&T's design looks a little bit different than some of our partners. We have eliminated the need for the cabinetry. We have a smaller streamlined antennae at the top.

We are one of the carriers who, from a technical perspective, we are not proposing what's been referred to today as hoteling or co-locating. AT&T's installations are single-carrier installations.

We also have included some details about construction. When we met with the ANCs, there was some concern about the disruption that this program would have to neighborhoods. We have also come up with a scope of work that reduces the construction timeline so that we're in and out of peoples' hair, and they get the service without a lot of disruption. Next slide.
This is a great review of what we've done to the network, right? And so everybody's heard about spectrum auction. Spectrum is not readily available. We can't just go out and grab more spectrum to solve this problem.

We have repurposed spectrum. We have carved. We've added more macro cells. People that are involved with planning have seen us often to add additional macro sites in the District. We've also modified those to add as much capacity to them as possible.

We've added more fiber. We've added more technology to it, and we still have the capacity problems. So the answer to that problem is to add small cells to bring the frequency and the coverage down closer to the end user, so that you get, you know, ultra-low latency and the capacity that we need to run, not only, you know, stream whatever it is that you like to watch, but so that as we move to, you know, autonomous cars and trash cans that tell you when to empty themselves, so that they have the service that
they need as well. Next slide.

CHAIR MARCOU: So I'm sorry, I'm

breaking my own rule, but we have a question from

--

MS. VAN RIPER: Rebel.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- a Committee Member.

Essentially, you're saying, now we've got to go
to item number four. Okay. Can you clarify
items numbers one, two, and three, be a little
bit more, help us understand.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: My question, my
question was what is spectrum? What is, what is
that?

MS. VAN RIPER: Sure.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: I don't know what it

--

MS. VAN RIPER: So I'm not an

engineer.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: I'm sure it's all
making a, to your point, but it doesn't --


I'm not an engineer, so I'm not going to get
super technical, but what I'll tell you is, right, so the FCC auctions off spectrum, right? And that's what we're in the business of, but it has limitations, and you can only do so much with the spectrum that you have. And so then you have to --

CHAIR MARCOU: Spectrum is radio frequency spectrum, correct?

MS. VAN RIPER: That's correct. Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: So the amount of bandwidth --

MS. VAN RIPER: The actual amount of bandwidth.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- in radio waves that you can transmit at.

MS. VAN RIPER: That's correct. And so once you've exhausted what you have, you know, you go to technology solutions. And so we've, you know, the industry has gone from 3G to 4G. We've made advances in the type of technology that are at each individual cell site. We've added capacity to those cell sites, but
we've reached the technological kind of end, right? And so what we need to do is bring the spectrum and the resources down closer to the users. All right?

And that's that number four. That's the idea of deploying small antennae closer to the user, at a higher frequency, right? More of them.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: That is very helpful.

MS. VAN RIPER: No problem. Next slide. Right, and so this is just kind of driving home what we just talked about, right? Bring them down closer to the user.

While we don't have a photo simulation of what a wireless access point from OCTO would look like, that's the general setup, right? Above the light is our radio antennae, mid-pole, you could do the OCTO wireless access point.

Next slide.

This is a photo simulation of what AT&T's proposed installations would look like. Above the luminaire, you have the radio and
antennae equipment. We use no pole, no mid-pole cabinetry. That's not part of, not part of our design.

CHAIR MARCOU: To clarify, there is one small piece of equipment that is on the exterior of the pole, which is the --

MS. VAN RIPER: Power meter.

CHAIR MARCOU: Right. So there's a small power meter required by Pepco to be placed on the exterior of the pole, correct?

MS. VAN RIPER: That's correct. And so this was AT&T's proposal for a new pole design. This is different than what was proposed in the guidelines.

We proposed what we would refer to as a slick stick, or a slim line pole, where everything is included interior to the pole, with the exception of the Pepco meter, because they wouldn't let us put it inside. But this could be integrated.

It could be shaped like the other poles around it. It could be fluted. This one
is shown as straight line, as we discussed in our meetings. Interior to this pole, this is a 12-inch pole, interior to this pole, we can work with OCTO to come up with ways to either put their access point clearly, it could go banded on the outside, or we could work with them and the technical specs to put it on the interior of the pole as well, so we could integrate the wireless access point. Next slide.

And this is just, we discussed about construction timelines, and not being a constant disruption to the neighbors. You know, we want to make sure that people understand that this is not, you know, you build a macro site and you could be out there for months. That's not what we're proposing here.

We could do it in stages and be in and out of somebody's hair, you know, in a week. So that is the last slide. Again, we are here today, we really appreciate, there have been lots of working sessions.

Department of Transportation has spent
lots of time with us, and we appreciate all of
that, and I just want to urge, while I know that
we are working on the guidelines, and it is an
iterative process, we have customers, and I'm
sure they'll speak as well.

We have customers today that have
problems with the services that they're paying
for, and we would like to bring them as swift of
a solution as possible. Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. So this is
your chance, because we're going to be the ones
in, just to make sure everybody's on the same
page, the guidelines will be adopted by the
Public Space Committee. So if there are changes
you would like made to the guidelines, right
here, right now, with the five of us, is the time
to articulate those.

MS. VAN RIPER: Okay, we have
submitted comments to the, AT&T has submitted
comments to the guidelines. There are, we've
submitted extensive comments to the guidelines.
I can tell you that there are, you know, three or
four that I can explain briefly, that are the
most concerning.

So there is a height concern in the
guidelines. On one of the pages, the pole is
referenced as 25 feet. Our installation on top
of it is five feet tall, right? That's the
radios and the antennae that go on the top of
it, and I apologize it's, our installation is six
feet tall, right?

But the actual pole itself, when we
went out and did field investigations, was not 25
feet. It was 28 feet 6 inches. So by the,
what's drawn in the guidelines, our installation
would be fine, but when we went out to the field,
those poles are slightly taller.

So what we would ask was that it not
be a 31-foot height limitation, but that it be,
that you cannot add more than 6 feet to the top
of a pole. That way, it would take care of any
of those changes, you know, from what's written
in the guidelines to what is actually out in the
field.
CHAIR MARCOU: So what I'm hearing you say is that your recommendation is that the height guideline be amended to allow up to six additional feet on an existing pole?

MS. VAN RIPER: That's correct.

CHAIR MARCOU: So for whatever the height of an existing pole is, an additional six feet, regardless of whether that's 10 percent or not, though I can't imagine that it is 10 percent, in any --

MS. VAN RIPER: That's correct.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. Okay. And thank you. So that's very helpful to know --

MS. VAN RIPER: Okay.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- that that's the specific, that is a very specific part of the guidelines that you would like to see modified.

MS. VAN RIPER: That's correct. We do have, also have a comment in reference to the spacing. There are areas of the District where we are concerned that only allowing one installation per carrier will negatively impact
our ability to service the customer, right?

There, our hope is that the guidelines be amended so that in the areas of the District where the blocks are smaller, right, where, that the frequency be increased. We would certainly be willing to sit down and go through actual maps of the city, and look at the installations, right?

I understand that you can't fit it, there has been apprehension to make a kind of sweeping decision about spacing, and I think that's appropriate. But there are instances where we are concerned that it ends up being a prohibition of service if there are no new installations allowed, or if one installation is only allowed per carrier.

They are very short, they are very close to the customer, and the frequency would need to be closer together than one per block.

CHAIR MARCOU: So that would be to the chart on page 8, that you would want to have the chart modified so that, this is Chart 1, which is
called -- sorry, Chart 2, which is called Permissible Spacing and Frequency of Installations.

And what I'm hearing you say is that on block faces that are, they're categorized up to 150 feet, 151 to 300, 301 to 450, et cetera, that you said smaller ones, so what I'm hearing you say is that on blocks, and as I, as I read the guidelines, it says, limit per carrier per block -- not just block face, but per block, which includes both sides -- is that you would prefer to see those limits, you'd like to see the limit per carrier per block raised?

MS. VAN RIPER: That's correct.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. Do you have a recommended number? The numbers currently are 1 per block for blocks up to 600 feet, and then 2 per block for blocks that have block faces greater than 600 feet.

MS. VAN RIPER: I would like to circle back and provide you comments.

CHAIR MARCOU: That would be great.
MS. VAN RIPER: At a minimum, it would be two. I think that there are areas --

CHAIR MARCOU: By definition, if we would increase, it would have to be two.

MS. VAN RIPER: I, well, and I'm not sure two's enough. So I think we need to circle back and give you some specific locations.

CHAIR MARCOU: This, that, and this, okay. So the reason that unfortunately you're the guinea pig for this, okay, that's, okay, that's exactly what we're looking for. A very specific statement about a specific provision, with a specific recommendation.

So we would not be able to get coverage if we were limited to 1 per block when the blocks are between 301 feet and 600 feet. We would therefore like to have two per block. That helps us. Thank you.

MS. VAN RIPER: We can provide those numbers.

CHAIR MARCOU: So far, I've heard those two for you, which is height and limit per
carrier per block. The best part is you can all tag team, because they'll be able to then say --

    MS. VAN RIPER: Okay.

    CHAIR MARCOU: -- because I guarantee you those are on their list as well, and then they'll be able to say their parts as well.

    MS. VAN RIPER: They are. So I'll add one more, and then I'll turn it over to my friends. So there was conversation earlier about placement and prioritization of alleyways.

    So if you think about antennae and how they work, they need to have clear space around them, and if you place them between two buildings, they're not going to serve anyone. And so there are very few instances where a small cell would provide any additional capacity to our customers if it was placed inside of an alley.

    CHAIR MARCOU: Except for those people who are literally facing onto the alley. And even in that case, there might be challenges if a person has a fence or some other medium that blocks.
MS. VAN RIPER: That's correct.

CHAIR MARCOU: Am I, is that, what I'm hearing you say is that there needs to be, let's call it visual connectivity between the device and the antennae.

MS. VAN RIPER: That's correct. A

line of sight.

CHAIR MARCOU: Is that accurate?

MS. VAN RIPER: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. If I can't see it, it's like a, it's like a mirror, you know, how on trucks and buses, you'll see the sign that says, if I can't see my mirrors, if you can't see my mirrors, I can't see you. It's the same basic concept.

If the, what I'm hearing you say, and I'm not the technical expert, but my cell phone needs to be able to visually connect to an antennae. If there is a physical obstruction, it makes it harder, and the more substantial that obstruction is, the harder it becomes to connect.

Is that accurate?
MS. VAN RIPER: That's correct. And it becomes increasingly sensitive when you move into 5G technology.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you.

MS. VAN RIPER: 5G is not going to work in an alley.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. Okay. Why don't we go to the next presentation? Oh, sorry. Mr. Shaheen?

MEMBER SHAHEEN: So you said that AT&T, you've eliminated the need for cabinetry? For AT&T, you've eliminated the need for cabinetry, and you have smaller antenae, correct? So does that, is there a correlation between the range of your facilities, or are they as great as the other larger -- do you know?

MS. VAN RIPER: So what I'll say is that we have used different designs in different areas, right? And so northern Virginia, I have deployed some cabinets. When we went to see what that looks like in the District, it felt like it was more appropriate in the District to use what
we would refer to as a combination shroud.

So the shroud at the top of the pole brings the radios closer to the antennae. It doesn't change the footprint of the small cell. It doesn't change the performance.

It does improve the performance if the radios are closer to the antennae. But is just a different, a more streamlined design, and we felt it was more appropriate for the District.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: And then, what's your spacing requirement that you need between your facilities, specifically? Like, do they have be under 200 feet? Under 150 feet?

MS. VAN RIPER: Yes, that's, it's very, the spacing is very specific to the user's behavior. So spacing, say, on the mall, where there are a lot of people, is going to be different than in different areas of the District.

So I can't give you a flat answer to that question. It would really depend on the location, the trees, the line of site details.
All of those impact how frequently we site some.

    MEMBER SHAHEEN: You had said that you think you need more facility, or you'd like the option to have more facilities on smaller blocks. What do the smaller blocks, wouldn't there be less demand, because there are going to be fewer people, fewer cars? Why does that, why is that not a correlation?

    MS. VAN RIPER: Sure. I apologize that my comments weren't clear there. What I meant to say is my recollection of the chart was the smaller block faces limited, or block faces limited us to one installation per carrier, and I know when we went to do our mapping tools, there were plenty of locations where, when we mapped it out, it looked like we needed two on that particular block.

    So the comment, again, was just specific to, you know, my knowledge that there are areas where, on the chart, we needed two, where it limited us to one.

    MEMBER SHAHEEN: And is that a
correlation to land density?

  MS. VAN RIPER: Population density?

  MEMBER SHAHEEN: Population density.

  MS. VAN RIPER: Yes.

  MEMBER WILEY: I just have a question for you. Have you actually installed any of these cabinet-free antennae-yet in the inner cities, or is this going to be the first?

  MS. VAN RIPER: We are currently installing them in multiple jurisdictions in Maryland.

  MEMBER WILEY: And as far as the type of problems that you think that we would encounter if we used the spacing as shown in the guidelines, can you just describe what kind of problems that you would perceive from the surface perspective?

  MS. VAN RIPER: Sure. We, in the near term, you have people that say, you know, that they're experiencing a spinning wheel. I mean, that's what's going to happen. You're going to look at your phone. You're going to see you've
got bars, and the wheel's going to spin. You won't be able to load, you know, Uber.

MEMBER WILEY: Right.

MS. VAN RIPER: No ride home, right? I mean, so, and what happens is, as people, you know, in a particular area that is heavily populated, what you're going to see is that one area of it is going to experience better coverage than another, right?

Have you ever tried to use your phone and said, oh, doesn't work here, but then you go down, you know, go down the block or go towards a window, or, those are the kinds of issues that you're going to experience.

And in the areas of the city where it is, there are lots of Washington globes, it is, it is a concern, right, that won't be able to evenly space and deploy today's capacity problem, and then when you, when your car drives itself, that becomes a problem, right, when you have these huge kind of gaps in that 5G coverage.

MEMBER WILEY: Thank you.
CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. I just want to point out for the record, my car will never drive itself because it's just too much fun to drive. Thank you. Crown Castle.

MS. DIDDEN: My name is Carley Didden, D-I-D-D-E-N. I am the government relations manager for Crown Castle. Good afternoon, Committee, Chair Marcou, and members of the Public Space Committee. Thank you for allowing me to testify this afternoon on the draft small cell guidelines, and the critically important role that small cells and 5G technology play in the District.

As the nation's largest provider of multi-tenant or hotel wireless facilities, we have a long track record of working with jurisdictions and municipalities to deploy wireless infrastructure.

In particular, we, our customers are wireless carriers that provide service to end user customers. We have worked closely with Maryland and Virginia to deploy wireless small
cell networks for their residents, visitors, and businesses.

In fact, we have already deployed over 1,000 small cell node locations in Maryland and Virginia, many of which provide service for multiple carriers. Our work with the District is no different. Over the last two and a half years, we have worked alongside government officials, other stakeholders, and the community to find solutions that work for the District.

The adoption of the small cell guidelines in front of us today are a result of those conversations over the last two years. In order for the District to continue to position itself as a leader and competitor in the new economy, all wards of the District will need to be prepared for 5G.

The small cell guidelines are an integral piece of that puzzle. If adding us on to RFP taught us anything about economic investment, it's that livability plays a huge role in a company's investment decisions.
We know that today, reliable, fast wireless cell phone service is a large component of a location's livability. This means building a robust small cell network where residents work, eat, study, and play is critical to the District's plans for the future.

Today, 80 percent of all 911 calls originate from wireless devices. Small cell technology will deliver police, fire fighters, and other first responders access to the information they need, like the ability to accurately and quickly locate where the call was placed, allowing first responders to send the right jurisdiction's personnel, a problem that first responders face when locating calls that originate close to District boundary lines, something the District's first responders and residents are no stranger to.

When we build out a network designed to address wireless service in urban and residential areas, we follow a rigorous process for identifying proposed node locations based on
where customers need improved network performance. We do not construct on speculation. We work closely with local municipalities and other stakeholders and community groups to identify node designs and locations that are respectful of the streetscape, and meet the needs of our customers.

Crown Castle appreciates the efforts of all of those involved in the development of the draft small cell guidelines. We filed written comments on the draft guidelines, and highlight a few of our concerns here.

Wood pole small cell attachments are constructed pursuant to detailed guidelines and attachment agreements between the pole owner and small cell companies, as well as other federal and local laws.

Crown Castle requests that the Public Space Committee move forward with small cell attachments to wood poles, while the guidelines for attachments to metal streetlights and new poles are completed.
We have a wood pole pilot location in Ward 5. We have an attachment license from the pole owner, and the make ready work is complete. We are waiting for a right of way permit, and would be happy to construct this facility as a pilot location.

The use of above ground cabinets should be more widely permitted under the guidelines. Radio equipment could be installed in a pole, on a pole, in a cabinet installed on the pole or near the pole, or in the base of the pole. The use of only vaults for radio equipment is too limiting.

We respectfully request that the guidelines permit the use of existing poles in areas where spacing requirements prohibit the deployment of a new pole for the attachment of small cells.

On behalf of Crown Castle, our employees, contractors, and the hundreds of thousands of people that live, work, and visit the District, who rely every day on the network
we build, we encourage you to take the next step in preparing for the future, and release wood poles for small cell attachments while the guidelines for metal streetlights and new poles are finalized.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak this afternoon. If you could pull up, toward the end of our presentation, I just want to show what some of our proposed facilities will look like. Okay.

So this is a wood pole installation. We have filed applications for this installation. In the window that was opened earlier this year, there is a canister in town at the top of the wood utility pole, and a brown cabinet about halfway down the pole. Next slide, please.

Another type of installation is what we call strand mount. We are able to run a wire between two utility poles, and then attach our equipment on the wire. We then install a smaller power cabinet every few installations to power these facilities.
The difference is we do not need to
use a canister antennae on the top of the pole,
or install a radio equipment cabinet. Next
slide.

As similar to what AT&T provided, we
have our own, what we call stealth pole design.
This is Pennsylvania Avenue, which is not a
District right of way, but for representative
purposes, we were trying to show what it would
look like in a different environment.

Again, the radio equipment is stacked
inside the pole. We can put the power meter
inside the pole, but we have to cut a hole in the
pole so it can be read, and the antennae is
integrated into the top of the pole.

CHAIR MARCOU: So just a reminder for
everybody, if you read the Washington Post
magazine, at the very end, it has a puzzle where
it's like the same photograph twice, but with
changes. That's very much what this is like.
You have to compare the two pictures, and you'll
see the difference from one picture to the other
that helps identify what they're doing.

So this is a case of a new pole being installed here. In prior iterations, it was cabinetry being, this was a strand mount with a cabinet on the pole, and then this was an antennae being attached to the top of the pole with a cabinet just, coincidently, right in the background of the beige building right behind it, being installed. Will they always be at the line of sight of beige buildings when they're beige colored?

MS. DIDDEN: Well, the guidelines ask us to paint them gray, so it'll stand out more against the beige building.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. So this is --

MS. DIDDEN: This is another design of a new pole plan next to the curved Cobra style light. It's a skinny pole. It has the radio equipment in the base of the pole, and then an antennae on top.

We've actually been able to reduce the size of that base so that it's not as tall, which
helps for footprint in the right of way. Next slide, please. Again, not District-controlled right of way. May also not be permitable under the guidelines, but we'll make that accommodation.

Next to the, to the left of the Washington globe is, again, a new pole plan. It's black. There's an antennae at the top, and there's actually a cabinet, a brown, a metal cabinet about halfway down the pole. Again, just another type of installation.

CHAIR MARCOU: That's here, correct?

MS. DIDDEN: That's correct. And then, moving forward, you have installations on Cobra styled lights. So one option is to, this is what's called an integrated antennae. So the antennae and the radios are all contained in a small shroud, and that's installed right under the luminaire. Next slide, please.

This is an installation. If you look on the right, there's an antennae at the top, and then there's a black box next to the base of the
pole. That would be ground furniture. Next slide.

CHAIR MARCOU: I just wanted to make sure people see it.

MS. DIDDEN: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: This is the cabinetry that she was discussing.

MS. DIDDEN: And again, this is just another example. This is a 5A looking pole, cabinet on the pole, and then the antennae at the top. So that's, that gives you a cross section of what we're going to build. And this light is not, we're not to, we're not permitted to use the teardrops.

CHAIR MARCOU: Right. Thank you. Just because we've already done it this way, do Committee Members have questions for the representative from Crown Castle?

MEMBER CHAMBERLIN: I know you put this in your, in your response, but you stated that the guidelines are unreasonable. Can you briefly explain I guess what parts you feel are
unreasonable?

MS. DIDDEN: So what we would like to see is greater flexibility in the guidelines. We understand that there do have to be limitations, but overall, we would like to see some greater flexibility with, for instance, the type of cabinetry that we could use.

Above ground, right now, it seems, it's, we're limited to vaults, and that's problematic for us and how we do deployments. There's already a lot of underground utilities, so it's going to be difficult to be able to place vaults close enough to our facilities in order to be able to properly operate those small cells.

MEMBER CHAMBERLIN: That's, I guess, the main one, or --

MS. DIDDEN: That's one. I can provide you with some additional color.

CHAIR MARCOU: Mr. Shaheen?

MEMBER SHAHEEN: Another one of your written comments were, or was that you thought that this, these types of infrastructure for
facilities should be regulated similar to other
types, to other types of similar infrastructure,
and I wondered what other types of infrastructure
you thought was similar that you would refer to
as an example.

MS. DIDDEN: So we're concerned that
other users of the public space are not, do not,
are not subject to the same kind of stringent
regulations to deploy their facilities that are
identified in the draft small cell guidelines.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: Such as? I mean, as
far as I know, we have regulations for everything
in public space, so it's not unusual to regulate
something in public space.

MS. DIDDEN: Right. And we, and we
understand and appreciate that, but --

(Off microphone comments.)

MEMBER SHAHEEN: Yes, I can.

MS. DIDDEN: To our knowledge, that
there are not separate extensive guidelines like
this for other types of --

CHAIR MARCOU: I think it might be
your microphone, people. Is it on?

MS. DIDDEN: Okay. Okay. Our concern

is that --

CHAIR MARCOU: Yes, I don't think it's

on. Will you pull it out for a moment, and then

see if the green light is on on the, on the,

midway through the base.

MS. DIDDEN: Okay. Okay.

CHAIR MARCOU: All right.

MS. DIDDEN: Our concern is that other

users of the public space do not have similar

detailed guidelines that they have to comply with

in order to deploy facilities. So that could,

that could be anything. It could be bike racks.

It could be planters, or, newspaper boxes.

CHAIR MARCOU: And you had to mention

newspaper boxes? So there are regulations that

are very specific about newspaper boxes. They

regulate the height, the width, and the depth of

a newspaper box.

They, Ms. Edwards will go chapter and

verse on it with you, because the old regulations
were literally -- hold on a second. I don't want
to get in trouble with my attorney. Can I say
that they were questionable? Good. Okay.

They were questionable,
constitutionally, because they like required them
all to be green with one-inch lettering, okay?
So there are substantial guidelines, and we've
developed a guide. Ms. Edwards has done an
elegant job.

These are great guidelines that detail
into, like, with pictures, what's an acceptable
publisher's box and what's an unacceptable
publisher's box. They tell them they can't be
covered in graffiti. There's no regulation about
yours and graffiti.

They tell them they can't be, they
can't be discolored. There's no regulation about
yours and discoloration. They tell them they
can't be, they can't be attached to, in fact,
they said they can't be attached to streetlights.
So see, we're allowing you guys to attach to
streetlights.
So for the record, there are substantial regulations related to a variety of infrastructure, utility and otherwise. For example, we also have very specific bike racks that the District of Columbia has adopted.

So if you want to install a District bike rack, more power to you. If you want to have a non-District standard bike rack, you've got to come before the Public Space Committee. So just as in the case here, if you have guidelines and you follow them, and they're adopted guidelines that have gone through a full vetting process and you follow them, yay.

If you don't, then you would need to come before the Public Space Committee. So we're treating this very much, like I'd said before, this is just another permit. What we're doing is establishing the standards and guidelines for this type of permit. Thank you.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: My last question, and this is I guess for all the carriers, because it's come up from each of you, which is the alley
location, which for us, is a real preference, but
it sounds like for you, it's a real problem.

MS. DIDDEN: Right. So the biggest,
the biggest problem with alleys is that there are
too many obstructions, so we do not get the full
benefit of the small cell coverage.

So for instance, our facilities
normally have a 300 to 500 foot coverage area,
but that's much smaller than the width of an
alley. So we're going to have the problem that,
if we deploy our small cells in alleys, we run
the risk of them getting hit by garbage trucks
and other users of the alley, and we're going to
have to deploy significantly more of them because
we're not getting the coverage where we need it.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: Is this the same for
a single family node districts, where the
buildings are more spaced out, because of the, or
as to a townhouse neighborhood, or apartment
building?

MS. DIDDEN: It's going to apply to
both of them. So an alley between two single
family homes, depending on the size of the alley, may work better than installation of a facility in an alleyway between two townhouses or apartment buildings, just because the structures aren't as large, and there may be more open space.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: And I don't know the answer to this, but have you worked in other cities that have an extensive power network as it is in District of Columbia?

MS. DIDDEN: We've built 50,000 small cell cities throughout the United States, so yes, we have worked in many cities that have alleyways and other areas that are preferred for deployment, and we've run into the same issues, that we just don't get the same kind of coverage, and we run the risk of damaging, you know, the use of the alley itself potentially damages our facilities, and our facilities can damage, like, trucks, for instance, that are trying to use the alley.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: I don't see, I mean,
I understand some of your other points. I don't see that point so much. I mean, we have trucks that drive on the street, so I don't see why that's so different. But I mean, the alleys are narrower, whether we have --

MS. DIDDEN: Right. So the problem is the area. The alleys are narrower. Under the guidelines, it's, we've done some research on our design, and it's not clear that we can even abide by the spacing requirements. For instance, 10 feet from a building. We can't be 10 feet from a building in an alley most of the time.

So even if we can build in an alley, it's still not going to provide us the kind of coverage footprint that we're going to get from being in the, on the street itself.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. So I think I'm loud enough that you all will be able to hear me. So what I'm hearing you say is that in addition to the coverage elements that were initially discussed by AT&T, you also see concerns related to adherence to some of the
general standards in the guidelines related to placement.

So you would, if we were to continue with the prioritization of alleys, you would like to see the guidelines, what I'm hearing you say, or what I'm implying that I'm hearing you say, because you didn't actually say this, but I think it's the nature extrapolation, is that you'd like the guidelines, you'd like the guidelines modified to ensure that alley placements have clear allowances that would protect the asset from damage, as well as not hinder their placement based on existing, both private property and alley elements.

So distance from buildings is one example. Width of an alley for clearance is another.

MS. DIDDEN: That's correct.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. Oh, yes? You all, the other two, you're being very patient. Thank you.

MS. VAN RIPER: Not to just continue
to drive home the alley point, but the best way
that I can say it, just if I can make an
impression on this one the intention is to put
small cells where people are, right?

We need to be where the people are,
and in most cases, we find that our traffic is
not consolidated in the alleyway. All right.
Thanks.

MEMBER HUDSON: Hi. You mentioned
that you already had, did I hear you correctly
that you already had an antennae and a, and over
already existing in Ward 5?

MS. DIDDEN: No.

MEMBER HUDSON: You didn't?

MS. DIDDEN: We have a red light.

MS. VAN RIPER: There's a red light on
the microphone.

MS. DIDDEN: There's a red light on
the microphone. We applied for a, there was a
small cell wood pole filing window that opened
this summer, and we made some applications during
that window, including one proposed location in
Ward 5.

We have not built anything at this point. That particular location, we have been through the make ready process with the utility company, and have an attachment license.

So to the extent that the District is looking for possible wood pole pilot locations, this is one that we would suggest, because it's right for a right of way permit so we can construct.

MEMBER HUDSON: Okay, great. And then, as it relates to the actual installation of antennae, based on your past experience, what has the impact been actually to neighborhoods?

What is your guestimation of a timeline with respect to implementing them, and then what would the, what would the impact be? Would it, does it entail, like, the closure of streets, or digging up streets, or what exactly does it entail?

MS. DIDDEN: So this particular wood pole has above ground utilities because it's on a
pole line, so we don't have to dig up the street.

At this point to finish our
collection, we need to go out with a bucket
truck and install the canister antennae on the
top of the pole, and then a cabinet about halfway
down the pole. And once we do that, then the
Pepco will come out and put in a meter.

MEMBER HUDSON: Okay. And then, you
mentioned also, every other poles would have, I
guess the, you would have antennae on a few, and
then every, after several, then you would have a
cabinet?

MS. DIDDEN: Right. So that's called
strand mount.

MEMBER HUDSON: Okay.

MS. DIDDEN: That is a single carrier
solution. The canister antennae and the pole,
and the cabinet mounted on the pole is a multi-
carrier solution. So for the individual carrier
solution, it's mounted on a wire between the
poles. We can power a few of those installations
from one power cabinet on a pole.
MEMBER HUDSON: And how large are those cabinets?

MS. DIDDEN: They're smaller than our other cabinet. I can get you the exact dimensions.

MEMBER HUDSON: Okay. Thank you --

MS. DIDDEN: Yes.

MEMBER HUDSON: -- very much.

CHAIR MARCOU: So I just want to clarify one point. Are you saying that the pole to which you would be attaching a new antennae does not need to be replaced?

MS. DIDDEN: It's already been replaced.

CHAIR MARCOU: I really look forward to talking to the utility who did that. That was Pepco? We'll have this discussion --

MS. DIDDEN: Okay.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- offline. I'd like to know the Pepco pole number, and the permit number under which they did that work. I look forward to receiving that information from you.
promptly. Thank you. Hi.

MS. McCLELLAN: Hi. I think we're a little out of order. I am Jennifer McClellan, representing Verizon. I don't know if you want to hear from Mobilitie first, or you want me to go ahead?

CHAIR MARCOU: We'd love to hear from you because you are the next person with the antennae.

MS. McCLELLAN: Okay. All right. I believe you received a revised PowerPoint that added two slides that summarized the beginning, some of the data that were in the comments that we filed on October 5th.

CHAIR MARCOU: Did these come from --

MS. McCLELLAN: Owen?

CHAIR MARCOU: Mr. Strohmer, correct?

MS. McCLELLAN: Yes. And Mr. Strohmer and I will be tag teaming. You may have --

CHAIR MARCOU: By the way, for the record, you'll now need to say his name, spell his last name, and so it can be on the record.
MS. McCLELLAN: Okay. Okay. I will, so I am Jennifer McClellan, M-C-C-L-E-L-L-A-N.

MR. STROHMER: Owen Strohmer, S-T-R-O-
H-M-E-R.

CHAIR MARCOU: See, this is the problem with Verizon is that there's both a Stover and a Strohmer.

MS. McCLELLAN: That's why I just say Owen.

CHAIR MARCOU: So that's what threw me off, because I originally was looking for Brian Stover, who I believe is in the room with us today.

MS. McCLELLAN: That's why I just say Owen or Brian.

CHAIR MARCOU: So is it, is it this one or is it this one, or is it this one?

MS. McCLELLAN: It's Owen, so --

CHAIR MARCOU: So is it this one?

(Off microphone comments.)

CHAIR MARCOU: Are you sure it's this one? This looks like it's --
MEMBER CHAMBERLIN: Is it not the one on the website?

MS. McCLELLAN: Well, I don't need it. We had added two slides to --

CHAIR MARCOU: There we go.

MS. McCLELLAN: -- yes, summarize some of the data that was in our comments.

CHAIR MARCOU: Right. This was on Friday.

MS. McCLELLAN: Yes. If you want to go to the next slide.

CHAIR MARCOU: I'm waiting --

MS. McCLELLAN: Oh, okay.

CHAIR MARCOU: I'm actually going to open it up in PowerPoint, which is easier to work from. Okay.

MS. McCLELLAN: All right. Thank you. So we thought it would be helpful, you've heard a little bit already about how wireless usage has exploded, and we thought it would be helpful to put that in context with some publicly available data on wireless usage in the District.
And so these lines show, the blue line at the top shows the growth in wireless subscriptions in the District. The red line shows the decline of wire line and interconnected VoIP services in the District, and the gray line shows, roughly, the population of the District.

So you see we have more cell phones than people, and just looking at voice data, voice alone, what we have found is that the country in general, and the District in particular, are cutting the cord at rapid paces. And if you go to the next slide, I can show you -

CHAIR MARCOU: I can't go to the next slide until I clarify that your showing of the population of the District of Columbia as, from December 2016, is woefully out of date, because the District of Columbia is approaching, if it has not already surpassed, 700,000 residents.

Well, on --

MS. McCLELLAN: Well, the --

CHAIR MARCOU: I know.
MS. McCLELLAN: -- 700's in the middle. It's, unfortunately --

CHAIR MARCOU: I know.

MS. McCLELLAN: -- the way they're --

CHAIR MARCOU: I'm merely touting the District of Columbia as --

MS. McCLELLAN: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- the greatest city in the history of ever.

MS. McCLELLAN: The city is growing.

The city is growing. Thank you. So since 2008, wireless subscribership in the District has increased 36 percent from 1.1 million subscribers to 1.5 million subscribers.

Un fortunately, 2016 is the last year we have publicly available data, because the FCC usually has a two-year lag in there, but this is all carriers within the District.

When you look at the data of the National Center for Health as part of the CDC's surveys, in 2007, only 20 percent of District households were wireless only.
In 2015, for the first time since the NCH started collecting that data, over half of District households were wireless only, at 54.2 percent. That was the first time over half of the households in the District were wireless only for their voice services. Again, voice only.

In 2016, which is the last year we have District-wide data, 55.3 percent of District households were wireless only, 17.8 percent mostly use their wireless phones, 15 percent were dual use households. That means they use their land line phone and their wireless phone roughly equivalently.

Only 3.8 percent of households exclusively used land line phones, and only 3.9 of households mostly used land line phones. The, that does not equal 100. The rest don't use any phones at all.

Cord cutting in the District outpaces the nation. Wireless only households crossed the 50 percent threshold nationally in the second half of 2016. You see it across in the District
in 2015.

Now, while we only have District-wide data for 2016, these numbers have undoubtedly grown since, in between the second half, in the second half of 2017 -- wait, no, I read that wrong. Sorry.

In the second half of 2017, 53.9 percent of American households were wireless only, compared to in 2016 alone, it was 55 percent. So basically, what that is showing is the District outpaces the nation in voice services only, completely cutting the cord and relying on cell phones. Now, that does not even account for data.

And now, people are using their wireless phone more for data than voice. Today, there are 8.4 billion internet of things-connected devices, nationally, and that is expected to grow to 20 billion by 2025.

So this, these two slides are to show that the need for more capacity for, just to reach current demand under current technology is
great and growing. 5G, which is the next
iteration of services, will also require more
deployment, as you've heard, and just to say, 5G
is no longer hypothetical.

Verizon announced recently it has
begun providing fixed wireless 5G residential
services. It now has 4G in four cities in the
country. We would love to do it in the District,
but it will require more facilities.

With that, we appreciate the delicate
balance that the public, that the Public Space
Commission has to reach between the demand for
services and the highly designed nature of the
District of Columbia. There are some concerns
that we have with the guidelines.

I will highlight just a few from our
comments on the 5th. We, it has been alluded to,
but the guidelines could be clearer, that any
installations that do not comply with the
guidelines would have a path forward for approval
before the Public Space Commission.

If that were clearer, I think a lot of
our concerns would be mitigated, because particularly, if you look at Section 5.2.1.4 of the general limits that provides, if there is an existing pole within the guidelines that allows for attachment, then no new standalone pole would be permitted.

But there are very real possibilities that the existing poles in a particular place, that hypothetically meet the guidelines, do not meet the design need for the -- the capacity needs, are not in locations where small cell equipment would actually provide service to meet the capacity of that particular area.

And so we need some assurance that, on a case by case basis, while such applications should be rare, if there is a path forward for non-conforming uses to be considered. I think we also --

CHAIR MARCOU: Done.

MS. McCLELLAN: Thank you. We echo the concerns that have been raised before with underground vaulting requirements, and just to
summarize our comments on that, we have actually
done some vaulting installations in other cities
where we have found that they increased the
likelihood of service disruptions.

The bottom line is, the equipment does
not work if it's submerged underwater. The
equipment does not work if the area, and they are
very sensitive to heat.

And so when you have an area like the
District that is, that is highly susceptible to
moisture and flooding, putting equipment in an
underground vault increases the likelihood that
that equipment will fail.

And so that is at a high level, our
concern with the vaulting requirements. We also
echo the concerns that you have heard for
alleyways. I won't belabor that, other than to
say most of the coverage needed is on the street,
-facing the street, either people driving on the
street, walking down the street, and in most
cases, installations in alleyways will not
provide coverage to reach the people in the front
of the building.

And I think, at this point, I will, well, two other high level points, and then I'll turn it over to Owen. We want to reiterate some of the concerns around third-party poles. Third-party poles, in most cases, will need to be replaced, because in most cases, those poles were placed decades ago, and would not comply with existing current standards for the, for the placement of poles that would hold small cell equipment. So as a result, some of those poles will need to be replaced.

The carriers do not control the height of a pole that is installed. While yes, you have regulations that would govern that replacement, the carriers cannot control the height of that new pole.

And so our concern with the guidelines that I think we've a higher level, of up to 32 feet, or an extension of 10 percent, we are concerned that in some cases where poles, particularly electric poles, are replaced, and
you have to have a certain distance requirement
between electric equipment and communications
equipment, that a pole would likely be higher
than 32 feet, but, and we did offer a specific
recommendation in our comments.

I'm not finding it at the moment, but
we did offer a recommended alternative to the
language in that section. And then, finally, and
-- sorry. We have raised some concerns with the
restrictions in Section 8.2.9, regarding whether
standalone poles should be allowed in areas where
DDOT attaches streetlights to existing third-
party poles.

This is related to our first comment,
but there may be areas where there is a third-
party pole where DDOT has a streetlight, and the
way we read the guidelines, under certain
circumstances, a new pole could not be placed
across the street, but that, but the pole is in a
pole line where DDOT has its lights, may not be
available for attachment for a variety of
reasons, and we think under some circumstances,
if those are the, there are many areas of the
District where the only third-party poles have
DDOT lights on them.

We are concerned that there's not
enough flexibility to allow the placement of new
poles, perhaps across the street, rather than in
that pole line. And so we ask for that
clarification.

With that, I'd like to turn it over to
Owen, who can answer more technical questions.
He might have to answer your question right now.
Okay.

CHAIR MARCOU: Not yet.

MS. McCLELLAN: Okay.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. One of
these is going to be a technical question for him
probably. In your recommendation regarding the
height, and your point about the need for
separation from electrical equipment --

MS. McCLELLAN: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- and telecom
equipment --
MS. McCLELLAN: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- did you provide the specific OSHA guideline or standard, or the other applicable federal/industry standard for separation of equipment and materials? Because I'm assuming it's probably like an OSHA standard so that a worker --


CHAIR MARCOU: -- or Electrical Safety Code.

MS. McCLELLAN: I did not provide the exact cite, but I can if you want.

CHAIR MARCOU: You didn't provide a NESCO cite?

MS. McCLELLAN: I did not. I'm sorry.

CHAIR MARCOU: That's -- you can supplement. That would be totes awesome. Yes, because it --

MS. McCLELLAN: We assumed you know.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- it helps us, because then we can do the legal, we can do the research,
and we go, okay, so they're saying that according
to -- it starts with this. They can't be that
close because they are not allowed to be that
close, and it's like, okay. Well, what doesn't
allow them to be that close?

Well, the National Electrical Code
does not -- okay, great. So where in the
National Electric -- it's here in the Electric
Code. And then, boom, we go to the subject
matter experts, and they'll be able to say, yes,
that's absolutely correct, and it helps us
understand why you're making your recommendation
that there's a reasonable, practical, regulatory
basis for that.

It might be safety-related, it might
be equipment management-related, whatever, but it
helps us. So whenever you're providing us with --
everybody can find a reason they don't like the
guidelines.

What is helpful is to understand the
purpose of the guidelines, and to find an
explanation why a standard might not be
applicable, and a recommended standard in its place, because that helps us rather than going through the iterative process of asking that question. Well, okay, so why not?

And then, getting us, it gets us to the back, it gets us to the end line, as my good friend Snoop Dogg said, it's better to start at the end line than at the, it's better to start at the finish line than the start line.

MS. McCLELLAN: We will provide that.

CHAIR MARCOU: That's from Starsky and Hutch. It was an excellent line from that.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: I have a question about one of your comments about below grade vaults. Could you explain a little more about why our humidity --

MS. McCLELLAN: Yes.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: -- and our location in the Chesapeake drainage basin are problematic for some of these?

MS. McCLELLAN: So there was, and this is on page 9 of our comments, there was a study
done by FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management
Agency, in 2010 that noted the District's, so
this is their words that we're just summarizing,
but that study, which we did provide a cite to,
noted that the District's location results in
three primary sources of moisture: air moving
inland from the Atlantic Ocean, air of tropic
origin in the Gulf of Mexico, and air contained
in moisture recycled from land surfaces, lakes,
and reservoirs.

And the National Capital Region
Planning Commission, in a report issued in
January of 2008, which was a flood report that I
believe was addressing some of the reasons why
the District was more prone to flooding.

In that report, they noted that the
District, and this is a quote, the District's
location at the confluence of the Potomac and
Anacostia Rivers combine with three buried
waterways, broad flood plans, and relatively flat
elevations, render it highly susceptible to
periodic flooding.
MEMBER SHAHEEN: So I think that is specifically in the areas where the two rivers combine, like the Buzzard Point neighborhood, which has been identified, areas across the river, and parts of downtown. I don't think flooding is a concern throughout the entire District of Columbia. I think there are some neighborhoods that are more susceptible, but I don't think that's a reason to, across the board --

MS. McCLELLAN: Well, we were not suggesting that the entire District is susceptible to flooding, but part of the issue here is, when the carriers are going to decide where to install small cell equipment, they are going to base it on where are our capacity needs.

And some of our capacity needs could require equipment to be in a place that is susceptible to flooding. Now, from -- I also represent Verizon the landline, and there are number of instances where heavy periods of rain in certain portions of the District will flood
Verizon telco vaults.

And so it's the same concern, but the equipment, the wireless equipment at issue is much more sensitive to flooding than the telco equipment, because usually with the telco equipment, you're talking about a copper wire.

But with, and not necessarily electronics in that manhole, but the equipment we're talking about here includes electronics. So we already see, in a number of portions in the District, where heavy periods of rain alone are enough to cause service outages.

Our concern is that is much more likely to happen in those areas if you were to put small cell equipment underground.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: No, I understand, and there are certainly are the increments where it's more of an issue than others, but there are others maybe where it's not an issue.

The District has a long history of requiring underground utilities. We go back to our street cars, we did not allow overhead street
car lines. You go, you look at our Pepco vaults. We require that our Pepco vaults have some covers and they have to be air conditioned.

You take into consideration, are the vaults associated with the small cell facilities. So I think there are definitely solutions to be found, and I think all of the review bodies that have helped draft the guidelines, have been very strong in the consensus that having some of these things belowground is an important factor for the District.

MS. McCLELLAN: And again, if the, if the purpose is to allow non-conforming uses on a case by cases, to look at that specific area where you want an installation and the needs, but I cannot emphasize enough that other, unlike other utility equipment that is going underground, this equipment is much more susceptible to outages due to moisture and heat than your telco, your landline wires that go on, in a, in a vault, or your Pepco wires that go in a vault.
CHAIR MARCOU: Maybe I missed it, but why?

MS. MCCALLEN: And I --

CHAIR MARCOU: Sorry. Did you all hear me? My question was why.

MS. MCCALLEN: At a high level, I can answer that. At a more technical level, I'll have to defer to Owen. But, in general --

CHAIR MARCOU: I'm right there with you because --

MS. MCCALLEN: Okay.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- it gets -- and we'll all be like, ah.

MS. MCCALLEN: Right.

CHAIR MARCOU: So --

MS. MCCALLEN: So, if you think about your -- I'll focus on landline telephone equipment. A majority of the landline telephone equipment that is in a vault, underground, is a copper wire that is wrapped inside of some sort of insulation.

And usually that insulation keeps it
from getting wet, unless there's a slice that
gets damaged. And then, once water hits that
copper wire, it's out. The radio equipment --
or, the small cell equipment that we're talking
about here, you can't wrap it in an insulating
ing thing or it won't work.

And so, it is much more likely to get
wet than the copper wire in an insulator in that
vault. And that is my non-engineering, lawyer
understanding. Anything deeper than that, I'll
have to defer to Owen.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. Thank you. My
question is less about the copper wire -- and
just so everybody understands, when we're talking
about wireless technology, it's kind of a fib.
The only wireless part is between you and the
antenna.

Once you hit the antenna, it's all
wire, all the time. It goes into the existing
wire network and feeds wire to wire to whatever
to Alexander Graham Bell and then back to you.

So, the reason I bring that up is
because Pepco, in its transformer vaults, has a lot of sense of electronic -- electric equipment. And it might be their equipment is shrouded or encased or enclosed or entombed or interred or some other word meaning in something, but I don't know because I'm not the technical expert.

So, what will help us better understand your issue related to vaulting of equipment -- which, by the way, some people at the table with you don't have, hint, hint -- is that you're stating that your equipment is susceptible to outages and shortages related to flooding.

So, we need the technical data, not here, but in writing, that we can then go over with a fine-tooth comb and have people much smarter than I am, who are not hard to find, go over that.

MS. MCCALLEN: Thank you. We will do that. Do you still want to hear from Owen on this point, or?

CHAIR MARCOU: If he'd like to talk
about it, that's fine. But, Owen, don't go
ing engineering on us. It's up to you. And, really,
thank you. You're being very patient. We'll get
to you eventually.

PARTICIPANT: No problem.

MR. STROHMER: Just a little bit more
about the underground vault equipment. So, it's
not just about water. Small cell equipment
produces heat, okay? That heat will decrease the
performance of a -- of the small cell equipment.
It is high-tech electronics. It is not
waterproof, it is not heat-proof.

So, to counteract that, we have to
have fans in the vaults. To counteract water or
humidity, we have to have pumps, okay? You have
pumps, you have fans, you have the equipment.
You need space for the equipment manufacturer or
the company to work in. That creates vaults that
are approximately six feet wide, 11 feet long and
eight feet deep. Those are large, underground
structures, okay?

Currently, the DC right-of-ways
already have -- are extremely congested with existing vaults, utilities, trees, and DDOT infrastructure, okay? I think everyone knows that we're looking to deploy several hundred of these in the next couple years and there is just, definitely, not enough space in the DDOT right-of-ways to allow for this.

Not only that, other challenges are where are we going to discharge the water from those sump pumps? Next is that ventilation from those fans. We're going to need above-grade -- below-grade vents in the sidewalk, which I'm not actually sure are allowed in the DDOT right-of-ways under current code.

So, for these reasons, we believe that underground vaults are not a good solution for the industry and that we believe the designs that we have presented today, that I'm going to show you in a second, are aesthetically pleasing enough to make sure that we're able to provide our service in a practical and cost-effective way.
MEMBER SHAHEEN: Did you say 6 by 11 by 8?

MR. STROHMER: Correct. And even under those conditions, a lot of the problems would just be mitigated but not -- would not completely resolve a lot of issues at times.

CHAIR MARCOU: So, to be clear, you're saying that, for your vaults, you would need them to be six feet, let's call it, wide by 11 feet long by eight feet deep.

MR. STROHMER: Correct. That would include the grates, the ventilation grates that would be required.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: That's almost as big as.

MR. STROHMER: Exactly.

MEMBER WILEY: What kind of operating temperature range are you trying to keep the equipment within?

MR. STROHMER: That's a good question. We'll get to that technical spec. Go ahead.

CHAIR MARCOU: Sorry. I was going to
pull up some examples of vaults in the right-of-way where I don't think that that's the size, but it's all good.

MR. STROHMER: Any more questions about the vaults?

MEMBER SHAHEEN: And what's the size of the equipment that that vault was for?

MR. STROHMER: Well, if you want to pull up -- why don't you go to the first slide that we have? All right. So, this is a -- our proposed small cell. So, as you can see, in the first photo sim there, we have a cabinet that's on the pole and that cabinet is approximately five-feet, seven-inches tall, 16 inches wide, and 14 inches deep, okay?

So, the equipment that would fit in there would fit in the vault. Again, the worker would have to be able to work inside that vault. You'd have to have room for the sump pumps, the fans and the ventilation system, and that still doesn't include where we're going to do -- what we're going to -- how we're going to discharge
the water.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: You said 14 -- you said five-feet, seven-inches, by 11 by 14 inches?

MR. STROHMER: Fourteen inches deep, correct.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: I guess, I have so many questions about that, I don't really think.

(Off microphone comments.)

CHAIR MARCOU: I think what would be prudent, then, would be, rather than getting into the weeds, give us your technical explanation, make that another technical supplement to your comments, and then we can look into them and get back to you, including your -- any provision where you believe that it is not permitted by regulation. So, both your technical specifications and any regulatory prohibitions you think exist.

MR. STROHMER: You got it.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you.

MR. STROHMER: Okay. So, this is our design here. So, we have two designs: we have a
Class A and we have a Class B, okay? So, the
first photo sim here is a decorative pen and pole
with the teardrop arm that was talked about
earlier.

Currently, the draft guidelines do not
allow for this type of pole to be used, but we do
recommend it be included as a type -- a pole
type, especially a ward such as six because there
are a lot of redevelopments there and we believe
that this type of pole would be applicable to
that.

So, the first photo sim has our Class
A antenna on the top there. It's approximately
two-feet, six-inches high. We have a separation
there of two and a half feet to our collar mount
antenna. That's approximately 19 inches high.

And then, below that, we have our
cabinet mounted to the pole. And then, below
that, you can't really see it from this distance,
but you have the electric meter and a disconnect
box.

The next photo sim is the same design
with the two antennas at the top, but instead of
the equipment cabinet being on the pole it is in
the base. And that is approximately, to the top
of that, five-feet, eight-inches, and about 26-
by-26 round, octagonal shape. And the meter and
disconnect would be in the base.

And then, our third photo sim there is
our Class B only. Those are the collar mount
antennas. And this type of design does not
require an equipment cabinet. It just requires
the electric meter and the disconnect at the
base. The next slide, please?

This is the same location, a little
farther out. This is your cobra-head-style pole
that is being approved. Again, it's -- the first
one shows with the equipment cage on the pole,
second of all -- second photo sim is the
equipment at the base and the third is just the
Class B antenna on the collar and the collar and
the -- I'm sorry, the meter and the disconnect at
the base. Next slide?

This is a location in Georgetown. One
thing I want to point out here, it's not -- we
don't always have to be at 31 feet. Sometimes
antennas can be at shorter distances depending
what RF requirements are, okay?

So, in this location, we don't really
feel like a 31-foot pole -- this is a -- this
would be a new location -- a new pole location,
okay, because Georgetown doesn't seem to have a
whole lot of the 31-foot pendant poles. So, this
would be a new pole location and this is a photo
sim of what it would look like.

As you can see here, it's the Class A
pole. This one is 22-feet tall in total. It's
got the two antennas and the equipment in the
base, and it lines up with the two -- the dual
globes at the corner and the single globe to the
right of it. So, we believe that this is an
appropriate design in locations where there are
dual globes and single globes. Next slide?

And this is just our Class B design.
Again, same location, the 22-footer dual globe on
the left, single globe on the right. And you
have the collar antennas at the top, and the
disconnect and the meter at the bottom. Next
slide?

This is a 31-foot new pole plant.
Again, equipment on the cage -- on the pole, next
is equipment in the base and the third is the
collar mount antennas with just the meter and
disconnect at the bottom. Next slide?

And, finally, this is our utility
pole. For this location, you have your antenna
at the top, your two antennas, you have your
cage-mounted pole. And then the second one is
just the Class B design with the meter and the
disconnect at the base.

I just wanted to talk about utility
poles just a little bit more depth. Currently,
what we were asking for in our recommendations is
10 feet or what the utility pole company
standards -- separation safety standards that
they require or a maximum of 50 feet.

CHAIR MARCOU: Sorry, 10 feet for
what?
MR. STROHMER: Ten feet taller than what the current structure is or what the utility pole standards are -- safety standard. So, there's a NESC code, okay, which they have safety standards from electrical standpoint. Utility companies each can increase that code based on whatever they feel those standards are.

So, it's not just one company has the same standards. Pepco has a little bit more stringent standards than a Verizon landline -- or, Verizon landline pole, so that's something to consider, also. We can give you some more details about that. I've actually sent DDOT some -- an explanation on that and we'll be happy to send it again.

CHAIR MARCOU: And it included the National Electrical Code citation?

MR. STROHMER: I believe so.

CHAIR MARCOU: Yes. If you'd resent it, that'd be great.

MR. STROHMER: Sure. Any other technical questions or design questions I can
answer?

CHAIR MARCOU: Mr. Shaheen?

MEMBER SHAHEEN: Why can't all of the insulation be Class B, which are the smallest ones?

MR. STROHMER: Sure. Different parts of the city require different ways to handle the capacity. Your Class A is going to provide a more robust capacity solution. It's all dependent on how the macro network's set up. It's also depending on users and the amount of capacity that's required, okay?

Again, you can have one block that has this type of capacity requirement, and you can go two blocks down and it has a different capacity requirement. It's just -- it's dependent on the capacity needs, the user needs and what the existing infrastructure that we have in place is able to handle.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: So, does that mean if you go with Class B, you just have to have more of them?
MR. STROHMER: Possibly. Correct.

CHAIR MARCOU: But not always? You said possibly.

MR. STROHMER: Possibly. Again, it's just -- it's dependent on capacity needs, existing infrastructure, what type of buildings are around, those type of things.

CHAIR MARCOU: Can you meet your capacity requirements if all you used is Class B?

MR. STROHMER: Not necessarily, no.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: But that's what AT&T's doing with their -- well, I know you probably work with all different, but --

MR. STROHMER: That's correct.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: -- AT&T is using only the smaller facilities.

MR. STROHMER: So, Verizon Wireless, as I said, we have different spectrums and different frequencies and different companies that provide the equipment. And these companies do it in different ways. We have to operate different ways on different frequencies. And for
Verizon Wireless in the DC market, we need both Class A and Class B service.

Now, as time goes on, we do feel that we are going to use more Class B designs. But in its current state, as stated before, there's an immediate need for capacity and both Class A and Class B are there to serve those -- help us serve those needs.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. Further questions for Verizon?

MEMBER HUDSON: I have a quick question. And this may be an apples and orange question, but how -- will this implementation of new 5G, does that affect FiOS in any way because I know a lot of neighborhoods in DC that are still waiting on FiOS.

So, is it -- so if -- obviously, this is 5G cell and the FiOS may differ, but I didn't know if it -- again, this is probably apples and oranges, but I just wanted to pose that question while I had you guys here.

MR. STROHMER: I'm going to let Jen
take that question.

MS. MCCALLEN: So, it is an apples and oranges issue. FiOS is a landline-based network that can provide landline-based internet, VoIP or voice service or television service by Verizon DC -- the tel co, which is a completely separate company and a separate network from wireless service.

So, I'd say the only way they are in any way related is that both FiOS -- a FiOS network and a Verizon wireless network could both be used to provide broadband. But other than that -- or, one can be used to provide -- FiOS can be used to provide landline switch access or voice over internet protocol voice. But the wireless technology is to use -- is used for wireless voice that goes over a radio frequency.

MEMBER HUDSON: Okay. Thank you.

MS. MCCALLEN: Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: One clarification.

Another thing that they have in common is they both have adorable spokespeople on TV. I don't
have a TV, but I've seen two -- apparently, every five ads on television are for wireless and telecom services. I just watched a Redskins game yesterday and every ad was for you-all.

MS. MCCALLEN: I will pass that along that you noticed that. Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. Oh, don't leave. We're going to be asking more questions of you-all.

MS. MCCALLEN: Okay. I didn't know if you wanted him back.

CHAIR MARCOU: No, no, no.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MS. MCCALLEN: If you want to go, our presentations were quick.

MS. WAITZ: My name is Erin Waitz. It's W-A-I-T-Z. I'm from Government Relations for mobility. I also have here with me Laura O'Dell, who was at the meeting on the 25th. So, if you want, I can kind of run through --

CHAIR MARCOU: Could you spell Ms. O'Dell's last name?
MS. WAITZ: Oh. It's O, apostrophe, D-E-L-L.

CHAIR MARCOU: Great. Thank you. And you spelled your last name, right?

MS. WAITZ: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay.

MS. WAITZ: If you want to go to the next slide? So, mobility is through our wireless infrastructure provider. We have six different solutions. Obviously, here today to talk about small cells. Go on.

So, this is a photo sim of what a small cell facility for DDOT would look like. At the top, we have an antenna shroud. And then what we're proposing is a cabinet shroud that would contain the remaining pieces of our equipment, so nothing on the ground. So, that's our standard of what we would like to be deployed here.

CHAIR MARCOU: So, how frequently would you be deploying this?

MS. WAITZ: So, obviously, final
design guidelines will dictate which poles we're choosing, where. But when available, this is a really easy deployment for us because all -- the actual cabinet is already put together.

So, when we go out, it's just a bucket truck and we're putting those two pieces of equipment on, and it's pretty seamless and minimal disruption to any traffic being out there.

CHAIR MARCOU: Yes. Except that you have to replace the pole, correct?

MS. WAITZ: Yes. If structurally the pole needs to be replaced, we will have to replace the pole.

CHAIR MARCOU: Yes. I think it would always have to be replaced --

MS. WAITZ: So, then, yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- because we're not going to take holes drilled into our poles.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

CHAIR MARCOU: This is not Dr. Seuss. No holes in poles.
MS. WAITZ: Understand. So, yes. But once the pole -- which a pole can be done, removed and set, I think, two to three days and that can all be taken care of. You want to move on to the next slide?

This is just showing some of our deployment throughout the country. So, New York City, we deploy with the cabinet. In the City of Chicago, we paint equipment externally to match the pole. And then, in Los Angeles we also used the cabinet. You want to move to the next slide?

This is another photo sim of what it would look here with the cabinet attachment, this shows 10 on the top. You can go to the next slide. This is what a Pepco pole would look like, again, with the shroud and antenna. Go to the next. And this was just a map of potential coverage areas that we would be seeking for the first year.

CHAIR MARCOU: Hold on for one second.

I want to go back to this.

MS. WAITZ: Sure.
CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. Is this the same -- this is a picture, right? Kind of like as a before and after, right?

MS. WAITZ: Exactly.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. Why is the vegetation in the upper-left-hand corner different?

MS. WAITZ: Sometimes Adobe can be a little crazy when you're putting Photoshop stuff in, so that would be my --

CHAIR MARCOU: The only reason I ask is because --

MS. WAITZ: I understand -- yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: I want to make sure because when you -- once you look at it, the pole head is lower in the one on the right than the one on the left.

MS. WAITZ: Yes. Sometimes when we take an existing structure and we go and add it, we're internally using it. We don't have all the fancy stuff that we have available when we're actually preparing our construction drawings for
you-all to review, so this is in-house, what our
Photoshop Adobe looks like for the different
colors in vegetation.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. For the record,
for those of you who keep track of the 12
differences you'd have to find in the photo from
Richard Mays, that would be at least two of them.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

CHAIR MARCOU: But, I mean, this is
important because -- and here's why I'm bringing
that up, okay? Because this? I love that.
There's a -- the picture makes it pretty darn
clear and it looks very much the same.

In fact, the photo on the right makes
it even look bigger because you can see how the
poles become a little bit bigger in the
foreground of the photo. And these are two
different photos. You've moved a little bit
closer to it, right?

So, this is very realistic. And it's
helpful because part of the simulation process is
to give people a real-world understanding. This
is -- I never even noticed this before and I'm sorry I didn't say this to you-all before, this is -- perhaps it would've been better if I had noticed it before I said it, sort of off-line-ish.

But, yes, as much as you all can, as you're preparing and presenting your materials, make them as consistent as possible internally as well. So, I would recommend changing this photo. And I would recommend to everybody going through all of your photo sims just to make sure that everything is clear and clearly shown.

The other thing I will tell you that Mobility has done in theirs, which I think is very admirable, is this is definitely visible. They did not -- they have a brace guy behind it and you got a pole, and you can see the cabinet, you can see the antenna, you can see the whole thing.

They did the same here. The one in Los Angeles, you can definitely see the cabinet, you can see the antenna. The one in Chicago --
but at least you can see it. And they definitely were showing the cabinet in New York City. So, in here, there same thing.

So, I do really encourage you all not to minimize -- don't diminish, don't -- flaunt it. It's your equipment. You're proud of it. It's going to provide great coverage for your customers.

MS. WAITZ: Then you can go to the next. I'm not sure if there's another slide. Okay. So, that's pretty much who we are. The presentation we've been giving the past few times.

I know a lot has already been said about comments to design guidelines. Earlier this month we did submit and we appreciate that you're allowing us to collaborate with you on the standards. I'd say our biggest concern is the underground vaulting. We like to keep as much on the pole as possible and did also have a lot of concerns about sufficient ventilation due to the sensitivity of the equipment.
CHAIR MARCOU: So, AT&T, you don't have an issue with the vaulting because you're not using -- you're not doing installations that require --

MS. VAN RIPER: That is correct.

CHAIR MARCOU: Correct.

MS. WAITZ: And we're not planning to. But in the event, if it ever happened, we wanted to make sure that we were --

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. But, Verizon, you specifically are -- have a concern because you will be doing installations that would be subject to the vaulting. You don't have to -- that was more statement than a question.

And I forgot Crown Castle. Is that true for you as well?

MS. DIDDEN: Yes. We --

CHAIR MARCOU: Hold on a second. You need to have the microphone.

MS. DIDDEN: Our proposed -- a large majority of our proposed installations will require a cabinet being above ground or below
ground.

CHAIR MARCOU: So, those that are -- do you have an issue with vaulting?

MS. DIDDEN: Yes. We would prefer not to vault.

CHAIR MARCOU: Do you have the same issues that Verizon has, that it has an equipment challenge, or is it merely that it would be more expensive?

MS. DIDDEN: It's an equipment challenge.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. Either you-all should combine your comments so that you have, kind of, similarity to them in terms of the standards that you're identifying or, if you each want to provide your own that gives us a scattershot, we can look through all of them. That'd be okay. But we really would prefer consistency and uniformity in the comments.

MS. VAN RIPER: Matthew, just to be clear. While AT&T's existing installation does not require cabinetry on the pole, if technology
down the road required us to have cabinetry down on the pole, we also would have -- create a concern with vaulting. I think we would echo Owen's comments and we'll get together with them and provide comments back.

CHAIR MARCOU: Great. Thank you.

Questions for Mobility from committee members?

MS. MCCALLEN: Can I make one clarification for Verizon? To be clear --

CHAIR MARCOU: Yes. Of course you can.

MS. MCCALLEN: You might've recalled from the pictures, it's Class A installations that -- where this cabinet are the ones that were for a cabinet. And where there's a vaulting requirement we would have a concern.

The Class B that don't have a cabinet -- so wherever you saw a picture that had a cabinet, it's that cabinet we would have a concern about vaulting. But where we're doing Class B without a cabinet we don't have a vaulting issue. So, we have both types and it
depends what our need is in a particular area.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. Your issue
is where you have a cabinet that would need to be
at grade, you would want to be able to do it
rather than a vault?

MS. MCCALLEN: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: Yes? Okay. Further
questions for Mobility from other committee
members? Ms. Hudson?

MEMBER HUDSON: Not necessarily for
mobility, but for the entire group. Where does
DC place right now as it relates to 5G technology
because I've heard you reference other cities
that you already done this in. Is that -- or, is
my understanding correct?

So, where -- how many major cities
across the nation do you think you -- where
you've already implemented 5G technology? Has it
been implemented in -- because I heard -- there
was some reference to Chicago. I've heard about
Philadelphia, maybe.

PARTICIPANT: You want to go first?
MS. VAN RIPER: Sure. I think the best way to answer the question is to talk about where small cells have been deployed. That's an easier answer for me. So, there are -- well, I'm only responsible for Washington/Baltimore. My colleagues in other parts of the country in major cities, I mean, while I'm responsible for Washington/Baltimore, my colleagues have lesser cities that they're responsible for. And so, I am behind my colleagues in New York and in Atlanta and in multiples cities in California. We are -- we're a source for concern here, right? We are behind and it's -- we have a program now that is -- that's top 20 cities and we answer to them weekly. And I don't have great answer right now. So, when I gave my comments about just urgency and capacity needs, that's really what's driving them is that we're taking customer complaints. And, as a company, the District is important. It's one of the elite cities on that top 20 list and we're behind.

MS. DIDDEN: So, I can echo the same
comments. We have small cells deployed in almost all of the top 20 markets at this point. DC's definitely behind its other top competitors.

MEMBER HUDSON: Thank you.

MS. MCCALLEN: I would answer there are four cities that Verizon has already announced 5G deployment. And in those cities, the small cell installations were already installed in the right-of-way, so it's sort of a chicken and an egg thing.

So, you have enough equipment installed that will support 5G technology, you can't roll out 5G in a locality.

MEMBER HUDSON: Got it.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you.

MEMBER HUDSON: Mobility, really?

Okay. Thank you.

MS. MCCALLEN: No. I mean, it's 100 percent the same. It depends on where we've already been and where we've already made, kind of, headway, seeing what small cells are
providing in the capacity that they're able to
fill the gap in.

MEMBER HUDSON: That's very helpful.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR MARCOU: Mr. Shaheen?

MEMBER SHAHEEN: I had a question for
Kathryn. In terms of other cities, how long has
-- because I want to be -- this is technology
that the District needs. I want to make sure
we're doing this correctly. Do you know how long
the process was in other U.S. cities that have
gone through this?

MS. ROOS: Yes. So, the city that we
looked that had the most, what I will -- my
personally opinion, had the most --

CHAIR MARCOU: Hold on a second. Sir,
are you able to pick her up? Thank you.

MS. ROOS: That had the most thorough
guidelines. They worked for nine to 12 months on
those guidelines with the providers as well as
with the community, going through, what I would
assume is, very similar community processes of
public hearings, et cetera.

But I -- in talking to at least two or three, it was nine to 12 months to come up with guidelines. And I'll just state that he had been working on the -- these guidelines since about May, middle, end of May.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. Further questions for the industry representatives from committee members? Yes. I mean, I have one basic question. This is your chance. You're telling us what your issues are.

I hear two basic issues with a third sub-issue. Issue Number 1 is -- and this isn't in order -- vaulting. We don't want to be required to install our infrastructure in vaults. Issue Number 2 is height restrictions.

And then, an -- Issue Number 3, which is -- I'm going to call it a quasi-issue, is alley installations. Is that it? Just to be clear, I want you to understand, you're on the record right now.

This is exactly where you should be
saying, "Our 17 issues, with sub-paragraphs 14, 17 and 25, are the following." You've listed three issues. Is there a fourth one? Is there a fifth one?

MS. MCCALLEN: So, Verizon does have more that were outlined in our comments that Owen will go over a bit. Let me sort of give you big picture. The big picture is our overarching concern with the guidelines is, in total, it has a limited number of attachable poles.

And I think everyone's preference -- well, maybe not everyone, but it sounded to us -- and I think one of the guidelines even says, "Co-locations are preferred over new poles." It sounds like the preference is to attach on existing poles rather than put new poles in place.

And our concern is, as drafted in total, the guidelines have a limited number of attachable poles or places where new poles would go so that there won't be enough places to install small cell equipment to meet all of the
capacity needs of the District for the foreseeable future.

So, we did provide about six or seven other specific suggestions in our comments that Owen can go through. They're already in the written record. We didn't know if you wanted us to say them each.

CHAIR MARCOU: I apologize. There was an additional issue that AT&T raised, which was the number of locations per block face.

MS. MCCALLEN: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. Recognizing that you will not get everything you want --

MS. MCCALLEN: We highlighted today the ones that are the most important.

CHAIR MARCOU: If the ones that were brought up today were addressed, would the industry have issues moving forward with the guidelines?

MR. STROHMER: I still have some things.

CHAIR MARCOU: Say that again?
MR. STROHMER: I still think that there are some things that we want to put in the record.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. That's not the question I asked. I asked that question as a -- pretty much as a yes/no question, so I just want to clarify the question.

We have highlighted here four issues: one, frequency of placement; two, height of poles; three, vaulting of cabinetry; and, four, alley preference. There are other items and those are noted on the record.

My question is the following: if these are addressed, can the industry move forward with the guidelines? It's a -- I think it's a fairly straightforward yes or no question.

MR. STROHMER: I think there are about two more points that --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

CHAIR MARCOU: Great. What are those two other points? Recognizing it -- and I just want you to understand you're not going to get
everything you ask for. Nobody is. Nobody in this room is likely to get everything they ask for.

It's just -- it's the circumstances of creating a sound, complete regulatory standardization of anything. Person X is going to want everything on this side of the spectrum. Person Y is going to want everything on that side of the spectrum. And, in fact, Persons A and Z are going to want the things in the spectrum that moves in a perpendicular position to X and Y.

The reality is and the final point will be somewhere in the middle where all of those are acceptable, tolerable, preferable, but not what is ultimately requested. So, what are the other items that you want to make sure the committee is aware of today that need to be addressed in the guidelines for the industry?

Also, so that the public hears them and understands what your issues are.

MR. STROHMER: Sure. First of all is 5.1, General Limits/Locations. Currently, small
cell infrastructure is not permitted to be installed on poles that have traffic control devices, okay? We believe and recommend that small cell infrastructure be permitted on non-electronic traffic control device poles.

Non-electronic traffic control devices are located on the lower portion of poles and Verizon Wireless small cell equipment will not interfere with the driver's ability to see and understand non-electronic traffic control devices.

Note that multiple cities do allow small cell equipment on traffic control poles with electronic devices. But again, we are looking on poles that have stop signs, one-way signs, street blades. We believe that we are limited under the current guidelines and that these poles should be viable options for us to use.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. Before you go any further, I just want to make sure we're on the record, the localities that you're talking
about that allow them on traffic -- on poles that
have, for example, traffic signals have a
completely different type of traffic signal
infrastructure than the District of Columbia
does.

   For example, I believe it's
Pittsburgh, if I'm not mistaken, where it's
permitted and Pittsburgh strings across the
right-of-way with their traffic signals, and I
don't believe the infrastructure's allowed there.

   When I moved to Pittsburgh, I was
like, "Oh, my God. They have traffic signals in
the middle of the roadway. Don't people run into
those?" So, long story short, it appears like
that happens in different infrastructure
circumstances.

   But what I'm hearing you say is
clarify that to be only electronic signal
devices, such as walking pedheads, traffic signal
lights, et cetera, so -- and not those that have
-- involve signs such as stop signs, yield signs,
one-way signs. Is that accurate?
MR. STROHMER: No. We're saying that we want to be able to -- ones that have non-electronic --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

CHAIR MARCOU: That's what I just said.

MR. STROHMER: No. You said the opposite.

CHAIR MARCOU: I said it the other way around? I said it was -- I was wrong. Whatever it was, I was wrong. You're right. You don't want to be on ones with signals that are electronic. You would like to be allowed on ones that have signs.

MR. STROHMER: That is correct.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay.

MR. STROHMER: That is correct. Next, you have a guideline in there, small cell infrastructures should not be located within 20 feet of the front or side boundary lines of a DC landmark; a national, historic landmark; federal properties or a property individually
listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

Now, what this does is it severely limits the industry's ability to locate small cell antennas throughout the District, especially in the downtown core area where antenna densification is needed the most.

CHAIR MARCOU: So, to assist us with that, just that's one you're likely to lose. I'm not saying you're going to, but that's a harder slog for you. Provide a map that shows the limitations.

MR. STROHMER: Okay. At least, if nothing else, we would like the federal property piece taken out.

CHAIR MARCOU: Of all the ones, that's the one that's least likely -- that's the one that's most likely to stay. But that's -- we have some subject matter expertise in the committee on that, so that's one that's least -- that you're pretty likely to not get, but it's good to know. Okay. So, which section was that?
MR. STROHMER: That was 6.1.

CHAIR MARCOU: 6.1. You would prefer to have federal properties dropped from the list.

MR. STROHMER: At least have that distance increased for federal property limits.

CHAIR MARCOU: I think you mean decreased.

MR. STROHMER: Decreased.

CHAIR MARCOU: Decreased, right?

MR. STROHMER: That is correct.

Correct. You got me on that one. We're not keeping track --

CHAIR MARCOU: But right now, it'd be one to one --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. STROHMER: Yes. You got it. Next would be medians. Sorry about that. So, small cell infrastructures not permitted to be installed on --

CHAIR MARCOU: Cite? Can you give us --

MR. STROHMER: 5.1.2, under General
Limits and Locations. Medians and traffic islands. Any public space that is contiguous only to roadways and does not border any private property, regardless of whether it currently houses a District-owned streetlight or third-party pole.

We're not asking for every median, but we believe there are areas of the DC where there are medians which you have existing street lights, such as a cobra head that we talked about, that should be allowed and should be permitted to have small cell locations, either from a co-location and/or for a new pole placement.

CHAIR MARCOU: Great. So, you'll provide recommended language, right?

MR. STROHMER: Correct.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you.

MR. STROHMER: We're talking about on DDOT right-of-ways and not on federal properties. And one other thing I just wanted to clarify with utility poles. The gentleman here from the
Office of Planning gave some numbers about all these utility poles that were options; significant numbers.

Locating on a utility pole is extremely tough, okay? Utility companies have strict standards that will not allow us to locate, actually, on most utility poles, okay? That's due to transformers, the type of equipment that are on there, other -- Verizon also has strict standards on what they're allowed to do.

So, it's not just as easy as saying, "Hey, there's a couple of utility poles on there. You can locate on those," okay? So, it's not as large number of possible candidates as the gentleman seemed to make it out to be. I just wanted to kind of highlight that factor.

The whole point of this is we believe that we're just trying to make sure that we have enough candidates that meet your guidelines and meet our network needs. And when you say this is a negotiation, it needs to go both ways to make sure that we have enough structures so we can
supply the type of service that DC demands.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. Just to be clear, he was pointing out that, of the remaining poles that were available, 64 percent were third-party poles. He didn't apply the limits and standards and restrictions that you had talked about they have.

MR. STROHMER: Correct.

CHAIR MARCOU: And I'm going to use the words "limits and restrictions", rather than standards. And so, to help us, can you get a -- can you get us those standards, those limits and restrictions?

MR. STROHMER: Sure.

CHAIR MARCOU: So, it'd be great to know if Pepco has these limits and restrictions, Verizon pole has these limits and restrictions. You know how Verizon is, so it'd be great to get those pieces of information. We also have contacts at both Pepco and Verizon, so we can trust they're verified.

In addition, if you can get a map that
indicates from those utilities what poles are therefore available because they are not part of that list. I know.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

CHAIR MARCOU: Not everybody is going to get what they ask for. That might've been something I won't get what I ask for, but I'm still going to ask for it.

MR. STROHMER: Fair enough.

CHAIR MARCOU: Right?

MR. STROHMER: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: Great. Thank you.

MS. DIDDEN: Chair Marcou --

CHAIR MARCOU: Yes.

MS. DIDDEN: -- please? So, we would like the guidelines to include strand mounting of equipment between utility poles.

CHAIR MARCOU: Strand mounting?

MS. DIDDEN: Strand-mounted equipment.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. Do you have standards on your strand-mounted equipment?

MS. DIDDEN: Yes. Our equipment's
been approved by the utility companies for
deployment based on their requirements.

CHAIR MARCOU: Good for them. So,
could you provide the specs on your strand-
mounted equipment?

MS. DIDDEN: Sure. You have them.
I'll re-send them.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: And the strand
mounting, that's -- the strand mounting option so
far has only been asked by the Crown Castle.

MS. DIDDEN: Right. Strand mounting
is actually a single-carrier solution. It's not
a co-locatable solution. We would have to deploy
-- for each carrier, we would have to deploy on
separate -- on a separate wire. But it does
allow us to use existing assets, such as the
space between the utility poles, which'll help
minimize some of the clutter.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: And is the strand
mounting something that all of the carriers
likely take advantage of or only Crown Castle?

MR. STROHMER: Verizon would not be
able to do that.

CHAIR MARCOU: Verizon's a no. AT&T?

MS. VAN RIPER: No.

CHAIR MARCOU: AT&T is a no.

Mobility?

MS. WAITZ: No.

CHAIR MARCOU: No. Mobility is a no.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: Why do I feel like I was reading some -- okay.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you.

MS. DIDDEN: Section 5.3.3 states that approved lettering is limited to one inch in height. We suggest that that approved lettering has to conform with FCC and NESC code requirements. In some instances, it may need to be larger or smaller.

CHAIR MARCOU: Great. Can you give us the cites from the FCC? What was the other one? FCC and who?

MS. DIDDEN: NESC code requirements.

CHAIR MARCOU: NESC. The old NESC.

They are rearing their heads throughout this
process. That's great. By the way, for the
strand-mounted equipment, we'd like to get -- the
specs on your equipment, as I said, but also the
language, so your proposed language for the
placement. We're going to see a theme here.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

CHAIR MARCOU: It's like, "Hey, tell
us what the language should be."

MS. DIDDEN: Okay. We can look at
that.

CHAIR MARCOU: And now you know why
this is going to be an iterative process because
all that language is going to need to be looked
at. We want to get it right. Again, this is a
-- you're giving us, "Hi. My name is Santa
Matthew," and this is -- give me the whole list.
It doesn't mean we're going to get everything,
but at least it tells us what all of your items
are.

So, so far we have everything from
Verizon, correct? So far we have everything --
some people are saying we don't have everything
from Verizon.

MS. HARRIS: But you said -- the process -- I mean, you asked us to submit something publicly and then you're saying, "If it's not spoken verbally, we're not going to look at it." I mean, the process is a bit flawed, I would say. I mean --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

CHAIR MARCOU: What you have to do now is come up, state your name on the record, spell your last name, and we'll have this conversation.

MS. HARRIS: Sure. LaTara Harris, AT&T, last name spelled H-A-R-R-I-S. So, when you asked the question about whether or not all our comments have been reflected here, we went through the process. We submitted to you line-by-line the items that were of most concern.

And, of course, we're trying to identify high level right now, but they're not everything. And it sounds to me that if we're not testifying verbally about issues that are of importance to us, then they're not going to be
1 heard. Is that the case?

2 CHAIR MARCOU: No, that's not the

3 case.

4 MS. HARRIS: Okay. I'm just trying to

5 understand.

6 CHAIR MARCOU: Hi, Ms. Harris. How

7 are you?

8 MS. HARRIS: I'm good.

9 CHAIR MARCOU: Great. There are a lot

10 of people behind you who aren't aware of our

11 record, so they're here, diligently, patiently

12 waiting. So, one of the reasons I want to make

13 sure that this is all being articulated is so

14 that those parties, whom you are well aware are

15 very invested in this process and from a very

16 constructive, positive perspective, just as all

17 -- as the industry is, are aware of the issues.

18 For example, I bet you that they

19 weren't quite aware that strand mounting, for

20 example, might've been one of the things that one

21 of the utility -- one of the telecom providers

22 was interested in providing. Some of them might
not have been aware that there is an NESC requirement or limitation on the proximity of equipment on a pole.

So, this is helping inform people. One of the reasons I'm kind of being insistent in an articulation here was that I wanted to make sure that everybody has the same record moving forward. As I said at the beginning of the meeting, we will be providing all of the material that has been provided to us as part of the record on our web page, which we've been looking at periodically today, so that everybody is on the same page moving forward.

But it's important for everybody to know what the issues and concerns are because they are going to raise their issues and concerns, and we want to make sure that you're aware of them. And we've gotten those in writing from them. Some of them have been shared with you-all because some of the ANCs have been particularly proactive with you, which is awesome. But some might not have been able to.
So, we just want to make sure everybody has the same record moving forward.

So, one of the reasons we're articulating them here is to ensure that clarity of message. It's not about if you don't say it now, speak now or forever hold your peace. It was a bit more about, "Hey, I want to get out from you exactly what you're interested in."

MS. HARRIS: That's fair. Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you, Ms. Harris.

So, Crown Castle, I think we have everything from you now. Is that correct?

MS. DIDDEN: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: Great.

MS. VAN RIPER: Okay. I'm back. So, one of the issues that was included in our written comments that we should probably discuss here that, I apologize, I left it out of my top four, is there is 8.4.1, and it talks about the distance from -- I believe that's right. Yes.

The distance from tree roots.

And so, what we've found in our
investigation, it's -- it requires you to be minimum of 15 feet away. And what we found is that that is very restrictive. There were some blocks, and I will provide you with the details, where the -- we could find plenty of poles that worked, except for many of them -- all of them were within 15 feet of tree root.

It was, 12, 10. There was room. We actually provided a study. There are a couple universities that their requirements are significantly less. And so, we would ask that that portion of the guidelines be reviewed. And we will provide you with maps to give you some examples of why it is a burden.

CHAIR MARCOU: And just to be clear, it's not distance from tree roots, period. It's distance from a particular element of trees.

MS. VAN RIPER: Right.

CHAIR MARCOU: So, I just want to be clear with people. Trees don't grow down. Trees grow out. And so, tree roots grown basically within the drip line. It's the most critical
root zone.

And then, beyond that, tree roots do grow, but it's for the purposes of a tree. As I understand it from our foresters, the drip line, which is, essentially, the canopy above, is the most important part of the tree root. So, if you -- propose language and then our urban foresters would love to look at them.

MS. VAN RIPER: Yes. We provided a study that we suggested would be more appropriate. And if you don't have it, I'm happy to re-send it. I think that the balance of our comments are in our written comments and then mostly echo what the rest of the industry has --

CHAIR MARCOU: There isn't anything in your comments that we haven't addressed today, correct?

MS. VAN RIPER: Not to my knowledge.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. By the way, if there is, it's not the end of the world, as I pointed out to Ms. Harris. They will be part of the record and they will be, ultimately, part of
the response so we make sure that we do have a complete and accurate understanding and distillation so we have the best guidelines moving forward. Mobility, how are you?

MS. WAITZ: I'm good. How are you?

CHAIR MARCOU: Great. Sorry. I'm driving this train a little bit, everybody.

MS. WAITZ: I just have two things that I would add and they're more points of clarification. For 8.1, in the appearance, the illustration one for the 5A, the illustration doesn't clearly identify a maximum antenna dimension.

We would suggest using the FCC standard of three cubic feet rather than capping the height at two-feet, six-inches as depicted. And this would help reduce the need for additional ground equipment, which we highly recommend.

CHAIR MARCOU: So, that was three cubic feet instead of the two and a half linear feet, right?
MS. WAITZ: Mm-hm. And then, we would suggest using the pole-mounted cabinets when necessary, not to exceed the 20 cubic feet, which is also an FCC standard.

CHAIR MARCOU: And that's also in 8.1?

MS. WAITZ: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: And that's with the illustration?

MS. WAITZ: Illustration one for the 5/8 pole.

CHAIR MARCOU: And what I'm hearing you say is that you would like the illustration for the 5/8 pole to reflect the FCC standards, generally speaking, right?

MS. WAITZ: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay.

MS. WAITZ: That's correct. Then our final comment would be for 8.4, specifically, 8.4.3. We feel the section is a bit overly broad and effectively prohibits a standalone pole in any of the District, especially with regard to the planting of the trees. We would just ask for
a little more clarification on that. We can provide language if you'd like with regard to that.

CHAIR MARCOU: Great.

MS. WAITZ: Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you.

MR. STROHMER: And, actually, I just want to clarify one other thing. In the presentation that we had, I did state that we do feel like, as it relates to Section 7.1, that pendant poles with the teardrops also be included along with the cobra head fixtures. If not for Class A, for Class B.

CHAIR MARCOU: So, include teardrop for Class B -- for all. And then your fallback is at least Class B.

MR. STROHMER: Yes. Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. Anything else?

PARTICIPANT: No.

CHAIR MARCOU: Got to get back to the North Pole and talk to the elves if we're going to get all of this done for you. Okay. Okay.
Thank you all very much. Wait, wait. Do committee members have any other questions? Okay. Committee members are more than welcome to wash their hands as needed. I'll be here for the duration. Thank you very much.

PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: With that said, let's move to the members of the public who are present to speak to the applications. We'll start with ANCs. I see ANC 5E is represented. We prefer -- I'm sorry. 2E is represented.

We prefer to have one representative from ANC 2E who would speak for ANC 2E. Are there other ANCs who are present who would like to speak to the -- to these materials? Any other ANC that's present? Okay.

(Off microphone comments.)

MR. GIBBONS: Good evening, Associate Director Marcou and commissioners. Thank you very much for having this meeting and including us in the process. And I want to say ANC 2E has been proud to attend almost every meeting you've
had, and we appreciate the inclusion and openness
and transparency, so thank you.

(Off microphone comments.)

MR. GIBBONS: OH, it's not working?

CHAIR MARCOU: No, it is working. It
just wasn't close enough.

MR. GIBBONS: We want to thank you
very much for including all of us in your
meetings. Before I get to the resolution that
was passed, one quick question that's came up,
when will you be including the comment --

CHAIR MARCOU: You need his name?

MR. GIBBONS: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm
sorry. ANC 2E Chair Joe Gibbons, G-I-B-B-O-N-S,
representing ANC 2E, Hillandale, Georgetown and
Burleith. One quick question that was brought
up. When will the comments that were submitted
and future comments be listed on your website?

CHAIR MARCOU: We're planning to do it
within a week of the hearing, but we can't make a
guarantee. But that's our goal. Our goal would
be that by next Monday, the 22nd, that the
material would be available on the website.

MR. GIBBONS: Thank you very much.

CHAIR MARCOU: That would include meeting minutes.

MR. GIBBONS: Thank you very much.

CHAIR MARCOU: Uh-oh. That's us.

Okay. Great.

MR. GIBBONS: Just going to read our resolution that was passed by a vote of six-oh. One commissioner had to abstain in the above referenced matter. "ANC 2E supports the DC Government's advocacy of broadband infrastructure deployment with the goal of ensuring that residents, businesses, public safety operations in DC have reliable access to wireless communications, network technology and the state of the art in mobile broadband communication services."

"ANC 2E advises the Public Space Committee that before the Draft Small Cell Design Guidelines are adopted, DC's Urban Forestry Advisory Council should be asked to render an
opinion or provide commentary on the possible effects of small cell deployment on the District's three canopy goals."

"Furthermore, the proposed guidelines should be submitted to the Historic Preservation Review Board, the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission for a full review within their jurisdictional authority and a vote before adoption."

"ANC 2E advises the Public Space Committee that ANC 2E requests that the committee incorporate the following into the Draft Small Cell Design Guidelines. One, a full-scale mockup of the small cell installations by each carrier should be constructed for review, comment and CFA approval prior to the consideration of initial applications for Georgetown."

"Two, the size, color, diameter, and finish of all small cell equipment, including antennas, antenna-related equipment, cabinets, shroud, and conduit with no exposed wiring should be specified and mounting hardware should not
"Three, the guidelines should require carriers to submit yearly photographs of all small cell installations to ensure compliance. Four, real-time maps of all actual small cell pole locations should be made publicly available. Five, real-time maps of all proposed small cell pole locations should be made publicly available.

"Six, all small cell facilities should be required to perform pre- and post-installation radio frequency emission measurements on a minimum of three selected nodes yearly within the small cell system to confirm compliance with the FCC, the Federal Communications Commission, regulations as ANC's entire community will be subject to involuntary radio frequency exposure. And this exposure may have negative effects for people with radio frequency emission disabilities or sensitivities."

"Seven, there should be no fans, cooling devices or backup generators permitted to
be placed on or near small cell facilitates or installations. Eight, small cell facilities or installations should be located intersecting residential property lines. Nine, small cell facilities or installations in residential neighborhoods should be located to reduce any obstructions to property sight lines as much as possible."

"Ten, when installed in a business or commercial district or mixed use zoned area, care should be taken to locate the small cell facilities or installations so as to avoid negatively impacting businesses. Small cell facilities or installations should not be located in front of storefront windows, sidewalk cafes, outdoor patio seating, primary walkways, primary entrances or exits, or in such a way that would impede deliveries to the establishment. Small cell facilities or installations should be located within properties as much as possible."

"Eleven, the number of poles installed in ANC 2E should be minimized. ANC 2E advises
that hoteling should be seriously considered as a
requirement, that the maximum number of poles per
block face that are specified in the guidelines
should not be increased."

"Twelve, any additional poles that are
installed in ANC 2E should be required to conform
to the illustrations set forth in the guidelines,
unless any modifications are approved on an
individual case-by-case basis by this Public
Space Committee, the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts
and the Historic Preservation Review Board."

"Thirteen, as proposed in the
guidelines, and as stressed by members of the
U.S. Commission of Fine Arts during its most
recent public hearing, the vaults for all poles
should be required to be located underground.
Fourteen, small cell technology that becomes
obsolete and/or the pole owners cease conducting
business in the District of Columbia, these poles
should be removed within 60 days."

ANC 2E advises the Public Space
Committee to incorporate, in the current version
of the draft of small cell design guidelines, the
Office of the Chief Technology Officer, OCTO, Wi-
Fi hardware concept design for the hardware that
is proposed to be attached in all -- in the small
cell poles." I didn't read it right, but we want
the Wi-Fi component to be in the current version
of the small cell draft guidelines.

"ANC 2E advises the Public Space
Committee that the following should require a
30-day notice to the affected ANC and the
specific single member district commissioner.
One, any small cell facility installations; two,
all small cell facility maintenance; three, all
small cell facility upgrades; and, four, any
location changes to existing small cell facility
deployments."

"ANC 2E advises the Public Space
Committee that any future changes to the small --
to the Draft Small Cell Design Guidelines should
require a 30-day notice to the ANCs and to the
public. ANC 2E advises the Public Space
Committee that this resolution has the support of
the Citizens Association of Georgetown, the
Burleith Citizens Association, the Hillandale
Homeowners Association, Trees for Georgetown,
Georgetown Main Street, the Georgetown Business
Improvement District, and the Georgetown Business
Association."

ANC 2E advises the Public Space
Committee to incorporate the recommendations
contained in this resolution into the revised
Draft Small Cell Design Guidelines and to then
hold public hearings for community input as soon
as possible." Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you,
Commissioner. I'm going to mirror back to you
the comments you made. I know that ANC 2E has
taken a very proactive and a very constructive
engagement regarding this program at large. For
example, ANC 2E with the Georgetown bid and, I
believe, the Georgetown --

MR. GIBBONS: Citizens Association.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- Citizens Association
hosted a small cell neighborhood town hall in, I
want to say, September, if I'm not mistaken.

MR. GIBBONS: September 13th.

CHAIR MARCOU: 13th, right?

MR. GIBBONS: And that would be


CHAIR MARCOU:

www.smallcelltownhall.com, which should be your
homepage, if I could recommend, when you open up
Google. And coincidentally, I was actually at
your ANC meeting for a separate matter when you
brought this subject up, I believe, for the first
time --

MR. GIBBONS: Right.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- back in maybe June

--

MR. GIBBONS: July 2nd.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- July. There we go.

So, I think that type of proactive engagement has
been very productive, very fruitful. I've seen
you at our meetings, as you had mentioned, both
before and up to today, from when these first
started, so that's very appreciated.
I do want to go through some of the specific points you made and I'll start with your comment about ANC 2E advises that the Public Space Committee incorporate in the -- this is about the OCTO point, so let me go -- let me give -- let me BLUF this, which is, as I've learned, BLUF is the Bottom Line Up Front. It's a very helpful technique.

So, I want to start with the comment that you made about the Office of the Chief Technology Officer. So, my question for you is -- "ANC 2E advises the Public Space Committee to incorporate, in the current version of the Draft Small Cell Design Guidelines, the Office of the Chief Technology Officer, Wi-Fi hardware concept design for the hardware that is proposed to attach to the small cell poles."

Do you want us to incorporate it by reference? Are you asking us to regulate their wireless access points? Or is it more like this is the standard wireless access point that has been adopted by OCTO, though it may be subject to
future modifications by OCTO as it sees fit?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes. Thank you. Yes.

We admire, we appreciate OCTO. We've had Interim
Chief Krucoff at our meeting. We want to see the
poles as going up. So, he says they're going to
be attached, they're going to be -- I believe
they're going to be piggybacking.

We want our design to -- your designs
to incorporate -- for ANC 2E to see how the poles
look with the Wi-Fi attachment to it so that the
Commission of Fine Arts and the Old Georgetown
Board and Historic Preservation Board can get an
accurate view of what the pole will look out in
our neighborhood.

CHAIR MARCOU: So, is that a bit more
toward the mockups, then? Like here's what the
standards are for a wireless access point. Here
is what the standard for a wireless access point
attached to various iterations would look like.
Is that what you're looking for?

MR. GIBBONS: Well, obviously, we'd
like both, but we'd like to see the mockups --
we'd like to see it with a mockup. And then when OCTO determines which poles are advantageous or works for them, we'd like to see that so we could incorporate to the CFA and the old Georgetown Board.

Because, again, what I have found in my experience working with the Old Georgetown, the CFA and the Historic Preservation Board, when they're given the right tools, when they're given the right site plans and the context, they make really good recommendations.

And maybe when there's an area of design or -- where you can put the Wi-Fi component within 15 or 20 feet, maybe on some poles it'll work different depending on the technology. Maybe we can use it on a different pole that is not so much in front of maybe a historic building or structure or an area in Georgetown, so that we would have the ability to provide advice and recommendations, but not deny the District's goal of Wi-Fi coverage.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. So, one element
is that once the guidelines are published, the
general goal would be that any application that's
consistent with the guidelines would go through a
standard review process where it would not come
to the Public Space Committee, it wouldn't go to
the ANC for review and comment.

And the only ones that would be coming
to the Public Space Committee and would go to
ANCs for review and comment would be those that
are non-standard, those that don't comply with
the standards or the guidelines as they're
published. Are you asking that all of those in
ANC 2E go to the Commission of Fine Arts?

MR. GIBBONS: We're asking in the
beginning to see draft guidelines include the Wi-
Fi component.

CHAIR MARCOU: And then we'll go from
there?

MR. GIBBONS: We'll go from there.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. Understood.

Thank you. You also note in here that if there
are changes to the Draft Small Cell Design
Guidelines, that should require a 30-day notice to the ANC and to the public. Generally speaking, substantive changes would go through a process like that.

Those that are more technical in nature, like we dropped a comma or we included a person or NC whose name needs to be changed, those would normally not go through that type of process. But, generally speaking, if we go through a substantive change, we will absolutely go through this same process.

MR. GIBBONS: And we appreciate that. Just one quick question. In the MLA, we're not discussing that, but you used the phrase "de minimis" for -- and now used "substantive". Is there a Public Space dictionary that would describe with an example what would be an example of a de minimis or non-de minimis or substantive? I mean, is it something that just you see it -- like pornography. You see it when you look for it?

CHAIR MARCOU: Justice Potter Stewart
notwithstanding, yes. It would be generally speaking. If we were to list this is de minimis and this is not de minimis, we can give you some examples. But to say that this is the definition of de minimis would probably, unfortunately, invite the fact that some things that might be de minimis didn't fit within it.

Or if we said this is what substantive means and some things that didn't fit within it were substantive, we would then be excluding those. So, we would rather avoid getting too distinct or find in those.

MR. GIBBONS: Because we're worried -- our community's worried that de minimis might include additional antenna that the carrier finds -- "I need the antenna -- I need one more slight radio frequency antenna. I need the antenna to bend more this way. I need it to go this way."

We're afraid that in the actual use by the people who are maintaining and upgrading equipment, that they're going to say, "My meter's not reading properly. I need to put the antenna
this way." We'll never get a notice of that. 
That's why we're asking for the yearly 
photographs. We're also -- we're recommending to 
our Citizens Association of Georgetown and all 
our other members, Burleith and Hillandale, that 
people have technological block captives, take 
pictures of the installation so they don't change 
slightly by de minimis over time. 

We're afraid of that extra antenna. 
We're afraid of that antenna being closer. I 
think in the MLA you said 10 feet to a 
residential building? 

CHAIR MARCOU: That's my recollection. 

MR. GIBBONS: We're afraid that 
somehow it would get closer because, as you all 
know, especially in Georgetown, our walkways are 
very narrow. Very narrow. 

And we're -- and that's why we put in, 
in some of our points why the installation should 
be at intersecting property lines when possible 
to avoid the sight line because, as you well see, 
that -- they're going to be at our second-floor
and third-floor bedrooms, in some cases, of our
townhomes. And we'd like to avoid -- even though
we all want good cell coverage, we'd like to not
to see the cell coverage every night.

CHAIR MARCOU: Understood. From the
District Department of Transportation, which
provides you street lights that are important for
safety and walkability, we know that some people
are concerned about those lights themselves. So,
we're familiar with the idea --

MR. GIBBONS: So, that's what we meant
by de minimis and that's why we were concerned,
and I think that's why we said that to you before
that we're worried that when it goes through the
top system, which we are in favor of, the top
system will determine what is kicked out.

And we're just concerned that there's
reasonable standards that everybody agrees to
that goes through the top and then doesn't get
kicked -- and then gets kicked out of the top
system, as you pointed out.

CHAIR MARCOU: And so, actually,
that's a great segue for me to our permitting system. So, the permitting system will require all of these applications go -- to go to a variety of reviewers. Every application will go to OCTO; every application will go to the Urban Forestry Division; every application will go to a set of reviewers; and then, if it's in a historic area, it will Historic Preservation.

If it's a in CFA area, it'll go to CFA for them to confirm that, yes, for the purposes of CFA, it matches what the guidelines require in this area. For the purposes of Historic Preservation or for Urban Forestry, it matches what the requirements are, so that we have the subject matter experts reviewing individual applications.

So, I think you can rest assured that, if we have guidelines that every is comfortable with and applications come in, they will still be reviewed substantively by the subject matter experts in those areas for that. And deviations, then, as I said, will come before the committee.
MR. GIBBONS: And that's why we trust you. And that's why we put in our very first -- well, our second paragraph, we understand that it's been going through working groups and comments but, at the end of the day, we'd like the Urban Forestry Advisory Council, which is made up of, I believe, DDOT, and the CFA and the NCPC, and the HPRB to actually vote on the final guidelines.

So that -- all that ANC 2E wants is what every resident has to go through: the same procedures and jurisdictional requirements. And so, if this gets voted on, not just commented on, then we feel more assured that this is something that falls into what we're looking for.

CHAIR MARCOU: Understood. That's why we've been partners with Commission of Fine Arts. We've been partners with NCPC, Historic Preservation and others. But we can't make them do something any more than we would ask that they -- in the same way that we would ask that they not make us do something.
So, if CFA chooses not to take a vote, that's fine. If CFA chooses to take a vote, that's great as well. We would encourage them. We would encourage CFA, NCPC, Historic Preservation to formally, actively adopt the standards. But that's their choice.

MR. GIBBONS: So, you've asked them to formally adopt the standards?

CHAIR MARCOU: I believe we have and we'll make sure it goes in writing to them, if that's what you're interested in. I don't think it iterates anything that we haven't said before, which is that these guidelines are important. They have to reflect the most important elements related to management of the right-of-way.

And each of those bodies has a unique -- a role to play. The Urban Forestry Division is looking at the guidelines and providing substantive comment. Is that who you meant by the Urban Forestry Advisory Council?

MR. GIBBONS: Yeah there's the Advisory Council that deals with the tree canopy coverage.
And we just wanted to make sure that this -- as you all know, after everything gets approved, but through time when Pepco or whatever utility needs to treat, we want to make sure that the canopy goals of the District of Columbia, which are so laudable, are always being enforced, and through deed and through work, and it's very tough.

CHAIR MARCOU: Well, that's one of the reasons why Urban Forestry is very directly involved in these guidelines because they have a responsibly to manage and maintain the street tree canopy, which is the effective one here because we're not talking about canopies on private property or in the public parking area.

We're talking about the ones that are directly adjacent to the street trees. That's why they're the most critical and responsible agency for it because, like Ms. Roos and the -- is for streetlights, Earl Eutsler is for street trees.

So, we feel very comfortable that they've got the best interest of their asset in
mind. I leave it with them to make decisions about who --

MR. GIBBONS: And we have Trees for Georgetown who can speak in really much more detail. I just wanted to make sure that's -- but that's why we put in our first -- that's what we're very concerned about, having the jurisdictional binds that we live with every day.

I mean, my commissioners and I, we review 60 OGB along with the Citizens Association of Georgetown, the Chair Elsa Santoyo was here, we -- the three of us review -- well, the both of us review 60-some odd submissions every month to the -- and we want to makes that this submission, being so important, gets their same vote, just like person replacing -- or, wanting to replace their front door.

CHAIR MARCOU: So, would you be interested -- to your idea of about a mockup, is that a volunteering by ANC 2E to be part of a pilot?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes, sir. Absolutely.
CHAIR MARCOU: Okay.

MR. GIBBONS: I mean, I'd have to --

I can't speak for the entire commission. We could put it to a vote.

CHAIR MARCOU: Oh, you can, because you've been authorize to speak for the commission.

MR. GIBBONS: I'm just reading the --

CHAIR MARCOU: I know. But with that said, the one last thing I wanted to say, and then leave it up to -- the last two things I wanted to say are that a lot of the mapping asks that you have either already exist or will exist independently of these specific guidelines. Our permits are already available electronically in a map-based system.

MR. GIBBONS: Right we just --

CHAIR MARCOU: --- And in a few years, we're planning to modify that so that you can really drill down in very granular detail to the types of permits that you would see. So, you could filter by ANC and by occupancy and by date
and by permit holder and by type and X, Y, and Z.

So that just through our mapping system you'll be able to very finely point out in a mappable system, that hopefully will be exportable to PDFs and others and Excel, for example, exactly what you're looking for.

MR. GIBBONS: Great. Because the District has a really great metadata site, so.

CHAIR MARCOU: Yes, it does. One last thing. So, you mentioned the group Trees for Georgetown. Is that actually the trees themselves are for Georgetown?

MR. GIBBONS: We have the chair right here.

CHAIR MARCOU: So, we apparently have a Lorax, who speaks for the trees. No, no. We'll come to you in a moment when we go to the community organizations. But I thought that -- is there a group that's Trees Against Georgetown or just -- thank you. Further questions for the commissioner from committee members?

MR. GIBBONS: We have neighbors that
sometimes it seems like they are.

CHAIR MARCOU: Mr. Shaheen?

MEMBER SHAHEEN: In your comments, you said something about no fans or --

MR. GIBBONS: Yeah.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: Is that only for above-grate facilities or --

MR. GIBBONS: No.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: -- would that go for vaults as well?

MR. GIBBONS: No. For vaults as well.

We want no fans, no cooling devices, for the noise. Again, if there's a noise level that is consistent with the District of Columbia and our standards, then we can review it. But right now, we don't have any idea what it could be, so we want no noise.

Because --- have you walked by some of those appliances that have the Internet and some of those other -- they make a hum. And the last thing we want is more cabinetry on our narrow walkways and our historic streetscapes, first of
all, to blight them, but the second they have now a hum.

And if the small cells are going to be in front of our bedroom windows, the last thing people want to do is have everything -- now we want audio interruptions as well as a visual interruption. So, we don't know what we don't know, so if you could help us with the decibel levels, we'd be happy to work with you on that.

But it's more about -- not a no, but we're no to the noise. I guess, we don't want to seem inconsistent about calling for vaulting and then not calling -- not allowing to vault.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. There is one more point I wanted to make specifically. You had raised the issue about -- let me just find it so I can quote it exactly. It's Item Number 6. All smell cell -- by the way, it is a challenging thing to say after a period of time. It'll sound like small/smell.

So, all small cell facilities should be required to perform pre- and post-inspection
-- installation radio frequency emission
measurements on a minimum of three selected
nodes, yearly, within the small cell system to
confirm compliance with Federal Communications
Commission regulations.

I'm not -- we're not saying that
that's not a bad idea and we're not saying that
that shouldn't be encouraged. We're saying that
that is not within our purview or jurisdiction.
That's the equivalent of having us require
Washington Gas perform a test of its gas itself
or its gas lines itself.

In terms of the jurisdiction and
authority of the Public Space Committee and the
Public Space Permitting Office though a delegated
authority, it's not germane to their authority.
Federal Communication Commission is the one -- is
the entity where that would start and they are
the ones who have the authority to regulate, as
we understand it, radio frequency and radio
frequency emissions.

And you may want to check with their
-- either with their local office or with the federal office, which is probably pretty much the same thing, on what the standards of requirements are for testing, et cetera, and they could help guide you in terms of finding a mechanism to ensure compliance with some level of testing.

MR. GIBBONS: But who -- would that be the DOEE that would -- what department or district would -- because the -- we have the Public Service Commission that regulates that and we also have the OPC that handles problems with it. So, all we're asking is, basically, you have the MLA -- I believe you have section in the MLA that calls for -- the have to comply to the FCC requirements.

CHAIR MARCOU: Correct. We explicitly state that they have to comply with FCC requirements.

MR. GIBBONS: And that's all we're asking for, too, but we're asking for it to be done before you install them, after you install them and yearly. We're not asking that they be
extra compliant. We're not asking them to have a
-- I understand from the Environmental Health
Trust that there's different levels, peak and so
forth, and we're just saying --

          CHAIR MARCOU: Right. All I'm
explaining is that's not our jurisdiction to
require a particular regimen of testing or
limitations or standards. That is something that
FCC has the authority to do.

          And if it delegates that authority to
a state or if it authorizes a state entity or, in
this case, a District of Columbia entity, to do
that, it is not the Department of Transportation
and it's not the Public Space Committee. It
could be DOEE, it could be DOH, it could be any
one of a number of entities that occur to me.

          But they are best -- the best situated
entity to tell you to whom it's been delegated is
the Federal Communications Commission. We
haven't explicitly reached out to them about that
question simply because, within our bandwidth and
purview, it's almost like, I'll call it a, quote,
other duty as assigned. It's something that's outside of our jurisdiction, but it is something that we noted is some interest.

You may even want to find from the small cell providers, they might have information about that, that would help you, to let you know what the FCC requirements and standards for testing are, so you may want to follow-up with them.

MR. GIBBONS: Well, thank you. This dovetails to something you said earlier. Is the small cell facility installations going to become a utility like Pepco? Are they going to become a utility over the course of the years where it's -- they're just accepted after they establish their right-of-way in our neighborhoods? That they're going to go through a -- the Public Service Commission or are they going to have to --

CHAIR MARCOU: For the purposes of installation in the public space, like any other owner of infrastructure, they have to go through
a permitting process. And currently, based on
the Master License Agreement, anything that is
approved for installation in the right-of-way has
a drop-dead date, I believe, that is 20 years
from the MLA.

So, as I recall correctly from -- and
I hope I'm correct. From the Master License
Agreement, it doesn't matter if something has
been approved under a permit and it's 20 years
later, the MLA dies and the equipment installed
under it dies.

Okay. Now, I don't know where I'll be
20 years from now, but that record will be set
for the me who will be me to manage and handle
that.

MR. GIBBONS: So, basically, you're
saying -- you're literally saying for the next 20
years it's under your control?

CHAIR MARCOU: So far. The element of
installation in public space is under our
purview. Now, who knows what the FCC will do,
but I can also tell you that, based on our review
of the FCC decision from, I believe --

MR. GIBBONS: The 25th?

CHAIR MARCOU: -- the 25th of September, we are fully within what they're requiring. So, there's nothing that we're doing that is contradictory to or outside of our authority, based on what the FCC has mandated or prohibited states to do.

MR. GIBBONS: So, when that order takes effect in 90 days, is that when the shot clock will start for us?

CHAIR MARCOU: I'll want to get back to you on what you mean by the shot clock, but we'll make sure that we are in full compliance.

MR. GIBBONS: Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. Do other committee members have questions for the commissioner? Okay. Great. With that said, is there any other ANC who is present who would like to speak to this -- these set of guidelines? I did not receive that there was another ANC. We do have comments from other ANCs as official
resolutions. So, with that said, thank you very much.

MR. GIBBONS: Thank you. Thank you very much.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. Thank you very much. And we will come to commissioners in a minute, but I do know that there are some associations or organizations. And for those associations or organizations -- for example, we know that there's Trees for --

MR. JAMES: Georgetown.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- Georgetown. We also know that the Kalorama Citizens Association is here. Would those two entities bring forward a representative to sit at the table? Are there other organizations who are here to speak to the regulations? The Georgetown Citizens Association, correct?

So, who is representing the Georgetown Citizens Association? Kalorama --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. HEINS: Richard Heins.
CHAIR MARCOU: Wait, wait, wait. Go ahead and have a seat.

MR. HEINS: Yes. Sorry.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. We have a representative from the Kalorama Citizens Association. Have you all provided -- before we go any further, Ms. Felder, do we have the list of everybody who has requested to speak before the committee, including their organizations?

MS. FELDER: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: Can you please come forward and let me have that list?

Ladies and gentlemen, we're gathering the list from the sign-in sheet that was provided at the beginning. But, Mr. James, you were saying that you are representing yourself and not the Kalorama Citizens Association?

MR. JAMES: I'm the president, so I can't help but represent them, but -- so we submitted, prior to --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

CHAIR MARCOU: You did submit
comments. That's the reason why I thought you were here to speak to the comments.

MR. JAMES: I'm here in case you want to ask any questions about that. That would be the president part. The other part is I would like to give my own personal testimony.

CHAIR MARCOU: That --

MR. JAMES: I don't mind waiting.

I've already waited --

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay.

MR. JAMES: -- this long.

CHAIR MARCOU: Yes. Okay.

MR. JAMES: So, you want me to go back --

CHAIR MARCOU: Yes. If you're not -- if you're representing yourself as an individual, please wait and we will call you up. If you're representing an organization, we'd like to take organizations next.

MR. JAMES: Okay. Well, if the committee had any questions about our written testimony, I would be here to answer that, but I
can wait on that.

CHAIR MARCOU: Let's do that because you do have four pages of very substantive comments with specific delineation of the items. Please give us a few more minutes while we compile the list.

Yes. In fact, why don't we take five minutes so that a variety of people can, perhaps, wash their hands. So, we'll go off the record and we'll come back on the record in five minutes. The time now is 5:42.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 5:42 p.m. and went back on the record at 5:51 p.m.)

CHAIR MARCOU: Ladies and gentlemen, again, good evening. We are going back on the record. It's 5:51, which is nine minutes, rather than the five minutes I promised. I apologize.

So, I'm going to read a list of entities who we know are interested in speaking.

We know that the Georgetown Citizens' Association is interested in speaking.
In terms of organizations, I'm going
to read the list of organizations whom we know
are interested in commenting to the committee.

We have the Committee of 100. We have
the D.C. Chamber of Commerce. We have the Dupont
Circle Conservancy. Is that correct, the Dupont
Circle Conservancy?

PARTICIPANT: Correct. Do you want us
to take a seat?

CHAIR MARCOU: People can sit, they
can stand, they can do what they'd like.

PARTICIPANT: No. I mean, if you
called our organization.

CHAIR MARCOU: Yes. If I called your
organization, please take a seat so far. You're
D.C. Chamber, correct?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. Great. And so,
we have the Committee of 100. So, we have the
Committee of 100. We have the Georgetown
Citizens' Association. We have the --

PARTICIPANT: Greater Washington
Hispanic Chamber.

CHAIR MARCOU: Hadn't gotten to you yet.

PARTICIPANT: Okay.

CHAIR MARCOU: So, is the Committee of 100 here?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: So, we have the Committee of 100. We have the Georgetown Citizens' Association. And we have the D.C. Chamber of Commerce. Is the Dupont Circle -- and I heard that the Dupont Circle Conservancy left.

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: We have a representative from zero5g.com. Are they present?

PARTICIPANT: Oh, she had to leave and is going to play a video. I have the video from her.

CHAIR MARCOU: So, she's not here?

PARTICIPANT: Her dad's in the hospital and she had to go.
CHAIR MARCOU: I'm sorry. So, we'll take the video as -- unless you plan to go on the record, we'll take the video on the record and committee members will review it. But if the person's not here to present the video, then we would normally not take their video as something to be presented without the opportunity to engage with the person whose video it is.

PARTICIPANT: Like I said, she left it.

CHAIR MARCOU: Understood. So -- but, we will still be here. So, in that case, the Greater Washington Hispanic Chamber of Commerce is the next entity on my list. Please have a seat.

Now, I'm going to read the rest of the entities who I have on my record. So, I just want to make sure I'm keeping track. So, we have the D.C. Chamber. We have the Georgetown Citizens' Association. We have the Greater Washington Hispanic Chamber of Commerce. And we have the Committee of 100 at the table in front
of us.

Also on my list of entities who'd like to speak is Capital Interact. No, they've left. Kerb Technologies. Okay. Gala Theater.

And that's it for entities. Is there another entity who'd like to speak who is not on this list? Okay. Great.

So, with that said, we'll start with this group and we'll go from my right, your left. And if you'll state your name for the record.

No, my right, your left. So, that would be you.

Oh, the microphone.

PARTICIPANT: We've got one more entity.

PARTICIPANT: Trees for Georgetown.

CHAIR MARCOU: So, I'm going to clarify for Georgetown. Trees for Georgetown is a subsidiary group within the Georgetown Citizens' Association. It's not that we don't think it's not an important organization. But it doesn't exist without the Georgetown Citizens' Association.
We are accepting comments from the Georgetown Citizens' Association, which we assume incorporate, in part, Trees for Georgetown. You'll be welcome to come up and speak as well. But, for right now, we're dealing with the organizations as a whole.

So, if you would?

MS. WADLINGTON: Good evening. Good evening, members of the Committee. I am Erika Wadlington. That's W-A-D-L-I-N-G-T-O-N. I am the Director of Public Policy and Programs with the D.C. Chamber. And, on behalf of the D.C. Chamber, would like to read some comments into the record.

At the D.C. Chamber of Commerce, we're committed to advocating for business-friendly policies with the D.C. Council, the Office of the Mayor, and our community stakeholders. Our goal is to work collaboratively to make the District a more attractive and to remain competitive in the region, nationally, and globally.

Just last month, thanks to Mayor
Bowser's leadership and the participation of so many individuals and organizations, including the Chamber, the WeDC Fest was held to showcase collaboration and innovation in the world's most powerful global city, the District of Columbia.

This event created an opportunity to showcase to the world that our city is the best startup hub, among the best places to live, the best tech city for women, and a top global city for entrepreneurs, and many, many more accolades.

If we want to maintain our leadership position in today's economy and into the future, we need to make sure our government policies will welcome continued investment, especially in our technology infrastructure.

People are using their smartphones, their tablets, mobile devices, more than ever before. Data traffic on wireless networks has grown exponentially in the past decade. And it will continue to grow as more devices, from cars to trash cans to water pipes, are connected to the internet and as businesses and individuals
use their devices to stream videos.

To meet this demand and to prepare for future technologies, wireless carriers need to install equipment known as small cells. Many of you already know this. It was, you know, described earlier. These devices are on antennas and can be attached to existing utility poles, street lights, or other structures to enhance mobile voice and data services in a defined area.

We know that the District leaders have been working hard, including yourselves, on establishing guidance and rules for this new technology. And we want to ensure that the investment in our city continues to progress.

We would welcome the opportunity to work with you to expedite this process so that we can help D.C. maintain its place as a global technology leader. We thank you for your consideration of our request and our comments.

I'm happy to answer any questions at this time.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. Do you have a copy of those comments? Because I don't
believe we received them for the record.

MS. WADLINGTON: Sure. Who do I give them to?

CHAIR MARCOU: You can give them to any of us. We'll be happy to distribute them. I think you've experienced that we are not like a formal body with under-oath testimony and cross-examination. It's much more of a dialogue, though I have been reminded that -- I've just been reminded how important this communication is. So, we appreciate that. So, these are the official comments of the Chamber of Commerce, for the record?

MS. WADLINGTON: Yes. For the record, correct.

CHAIR MARCOU: Great. Thank you very much.

MS. PURCELL: Good evening. My name is Beth Purcell, P-U-R-C-E-L-L. I'm testifying on behalf of the Committee of 100. We submitted our comments earlier.

What I wanted to talk about today was
co-location or a hoteling. And we are urging the Committee to amend the guidelines to add -- first of all, add a definition for co-location, which is not there right now. Second, to amend the guidelines to basically state that all applications must be for co-location unless the carrier can justify a difference. And I'll come back to that in a minute.

We also hope that this Committee and the carriers will agree to amend the Master Licensing Agreement to contain these same requirements.

At the various public meetings that were held, a lot of residents were absolutely, like, shocked and unhappy at the idea that there could be one pole per carrier per block, in certain situations. And what we've heard today is even in some ways more upsetting, is because some carriers are asking for the possibility of having two poles per block.

We've also heard several carriers say that putting small cell installations on alleys
may not be technically feasible. That will mean more pressure to have more poles and more facilities on blocks. So, encouraging co-location would basically help to avoid some of this clutter, avoid some of these very bad impacts.

The other thing we wanted to point out is the Master Licensing Agreement has a potential life of 20 years. We believe that these protections for co-location, to encourage co-location, need to be built in now, so that even if today there was some technical barrier that would prevent co-location for a particular permit, it's either when it's necessary to reapply or if technology changes sometime between now and 20 years from now, is that, if it's feasible, that the mechanisms are already in place to encourage this.

We think this would be sound policy. We think this is better than the potential law of the jungle. It wasn't mentioned in so many words. But, basically, if there start to be too
few suitable poles, that then there will be this scramble and carriers will be competing with each other to try to get the right to put their small cell infrastructure on a diminished number of poles.

So if you encourage co-location in the beginning, try to get it to happen, a lot of these positive things will take place and a lot of the negative ones will disappear.

So, back when small cell was still starting, it arrived in some cities sooner than it did here. One of those was Nashville where, in 2016, they basically faced this issue. And they basically said that any carrier who applies for a permit without co-location must provide detailed justification in writing.

So, these are things that would have to be reviewed by corporate legal departments. These are not just the statements at working group meetings. So, basically, asking questions like, that would have to be answered in writing, what's the structural and technical information
to document why you say this is not feasible?

What are all of the eligible support structures
and alternatives that you considered before you
reached the conclusion that you believe it's not
feasible? What are the radio frequencies you're
going to propose to use? And then, to
demonstrate that without co-location that the
location constructre or stealthiness would be
basically -- still produce a good result.

So, basically, that's what we're
suggesting, is to basically make this the default
process, have carriers attempt to do this, do it
now, and have the infrastructure in place in the
design guidelines and in the Master Licensing
Agreement so it's possible to get this to happen
as soon as it becomes feasible, which could be
very soon. So, thank you for considering our
comments.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you.

MR. HEINS: Good evening. I'm Richard
Heins and I have a sore throat, apparently. I'm
the general counsel of the Citizens' Association
at Georgetown. And we have, the Citizens' Association, better known as CAG, has filed comments with the Committee that I will attempt to quickly summarize.

As you may know, CAG is dedicated to preservation and protection of the historic character of Georgetown, including the streetscape of this National Historic Landmark District which is a very sought-after location for tourists to visit and see how things were back when. And we're sort of, by bringing us into the future here, jeopardizing that very thing that people come to Georgetown to see, how things were back then.

We were a co-sponsor and a presenter at the small cells town hall held in Georgetown that was mentioned. And we're providing these comments after careful and thoughtful review and input from our membership who attended that meeting. And we're very concerned about what the guidelines, the draft guidelines would permit.

I would now like just to quickly point
out some of the key things that we hit in our
written testimony that are of concern. We
actually like a lot that's in the guidelines.
And I don't want to give the impression that we
only have complaints. But, due to shortness of
time, we like a lot of things that I'm not
mentioning. And the whole effort, we think, is
laudable. But we do have some specific issues
that I'd like to highlight.

One is that the draft guidelines are
not consistent with the Master Licensing
Agreement with respect to notice and comment. The
MLA requires that permit applications go to the
ANC, and I've heard Director Marcou say that that
is, in fact, going to happen. And what I would
just suggest is that the guidelines be amended to
be consistent with the MLA and say it has to
happen.

And also, as I understand it, that the
guidelines will also require the NCPC and CFA or
HPRB, depending on which historic district is
involved, to also be given notice. What I
haven't heard, though, is anything about civic associations or property owners.

And we would certainly hope that DDOT would provide some kind of public notice on its website and solicit comments by mail from civic associations like CAG and the owners of any residence or business whose property lines front or abut the proposed pole. And, in Georgetown, we're talking mostly about proposed poles, because we have the Georgetown light fixture.

We also think -- and perhaps this is now clear, but it wasn't in the guidelines -- that subsequent applications that differ in any material respect, including location, from the original set of applications should also be subject to the same requirements. And including notice to the owner of a property whose property lines front or abut the proposed pole.

And I think that, you know, the property owner here is a very important person to, you know, be able to really focus on, does the guidelines, you know, permit this particular
While CAG tries to review applications of this type, we have limited resources, limited in many cases, to me. So, that -- and a very hardworking committee. And there's just -- you know, we need to get people notified who can actually spend the time to consider whether there's a problem with the proposed location. So, leaving property owners out is, I think, is a big mistake and I would hope would be fixed.

I think also that the guidelines require some more detail on what the appearance of these antennae and cabinets are. And, for example, the guidelines now have some sort of dimensions that are listed without indicating what they are. I mean, are these maximums, minimums? You know, what's the relationship to what carriers are supposed to do? And it was recently suggested that a three cubic feet diameter, or three cubic feet volume be the guideline.

Well, whatever it is, I think it
should be specified that this is a requirement, not just something that's on a figure without any indication that it's a requirement. So that's maybe a technical legal point. But if you want to enforce guidelines, it's pretty important.

Also, I think the guidelines are deficient in some respects. They treat wooden poles, which we do have in Georgetown, and we also have wooden poles where people live, in carriage houses, in small houses. And I think it's very important to them, and to the look of these historic alleys, that the poles looks right and not have unshrouded wires, not run-in conduit.

And, in any event, I think, you know, there was the standards for wood poles should be the same as the standards for new poles. There shouldn't be any sort of exception for poles, for wood poles. Right now, as I read it at least, there was an exception for wood poles. The only thing that was required for wood poles is that the cabinet was specified to be gray. Well, gray
is probably the wrong color. If you're going to specify a color, I would suggest brown or black, something that ties in with the pole.

    The standard for other poles in Georgetown would be the same color as the street lamps. And that's appropriate for street lamp poles. But, the wooden poles, they need their own standard.

    And, in general, we think it's important to require that all antennae be shrouded. Right now, it's not 100 percent clear from the guidelines that everything has to be shrouded. Everything should be shrouded. These things are unsightly enough without shrouding them. If you have unshrouded antennae, it's going to look a lot worse than the pictures that you've seen. So, requiring that those pictures be reality, however you decide to do it, I think it's important.

    We've heard from the carriers that they don't like vaulting. And I understand what the issues are with vaulting, and all I can tell
you is that, while in favor of it, we're very
careful about what was involved in the
vaulting. And when a carrier said that it would
have to be, you know, extremely deep and wide,
you know, it would create problems for, you know,
utilities, for tree roots. Trees have to grow.
And so, you know, I see about as many problems
with vaulting as the utilities to.

While we would prefer vaulting, and
the ANC has testified in favor of it and we
support it, I think we need to come up with
another solution that maybe is satisfactory to
everybody.

I won't get into the details about the
permissible spacing because it seems to be
changing. The carriers want to change it. I
just think that hoteling may be the answer. If
they don't have enough pole locations, then
they'll be forced to hotel. If you don't require
them to hotel, they'll each want to have their
own piece of free real estate or $270 real
estate, which is, you know, from their point of
view, free.

On the dimensions of the equipment,
I've already indicated that I thought that there
were technical issues with the guidelines that
should be fixed. And we need to have some
standards.

Now, one standard that is not in the
guidelines at all is any standard relating to
health concerns. And, you know, it is my
understanding -- I'm not an expert in FCC matters
-- but it's my understanding that we're talking
about radio frequencies, that, if they're enough
of them and strong enough, that they can
 basically do the same thing to you that a
microwave does to food.

So, is this something that we're
concerned about or not? I'm not so sure that the
FCC is concerned about it. Their standards for
frequency radiation date to 1986. And I do not
believe -- or 1996, perhaps, but it's a long time
ago. It's 20 years ago.

CHAIR MARCOU: It begins with a 19.
MR. HEINS: It begins with a 19.

CHAIR MARCOU: By definition, it's at least 18 years ago.

MR. HEINS: Yeah. And it's a long time ago. And the FCC has had a very kind of vague rulemaking to revisit those standards, but hasn't ever done anything on them in that rulemaking, and I don't think is going to.

So I think that there needs to be -- I think the District needs to take some prudential measures here to deal with the health concerns of its citizens. I don't think it can rely on the FCC to do anything in that respect.

The FCC seems to be, you know, all speed ahead on deployment and no standards at all. So, basically, if the FCC has standards, which I don't believe they do, then they should be enforced and they should relate to the diagrams in your guidelines.

If they don't have any standards, I think that this Committee should, as a prudential matter, establish some minimum distance from the
street and from windows that is realistic in the
sense that the carriers can comply, so you're not
doing anything that the carriers cannot comply
with and therefore run afoul of the FCC. But
you're saying that, you know, we want to have
these radio frequency emissions as far away from
people as possible. And I don't think that would
be preempted by the FCC.

I've reviewed the order. I am an
attorney. And I think that -- I'm not suggesting
you go as far as Mill Valley did, in California,
who said that we don't your small cells because
of the health concerns we have. I think that has
been preempted. But I don't think that some
modest steps to protect the public health are
preempted. And I think you should consider doing
so. There ends my epistle.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you.

MS. QUIROGA: Good evening. Good
evening, Committee members. My name is Nicole
Quiroga. I'm the President and CEO of the
Greater Washington Hispanic Chamber of Commerce.
Thank you for the opportunity to speak about bringing 5G to Washington, D.C.

At the Hispanic Chamber, we are acutely aware of the economic development and job creation that a rapid 5G deployment will bring. Just in the District alone, 5G build-out is expected to grow GDP by over $1 billion and create over 6,500 jobs.

That's serious economic promise. And it will be the result of hundreds of millions of dollars in network investment. Small cell deployment represents much of this investment. Small cells will be the backbone of 5G. Their deployment is absolutely necessary if Washington residents are to ever receive the unprecedented speeds and data capacity that characterize 5G.

That's why it's so important we collaborate to ensure a speedy small cell deployment process. We know from experience that the sooner our community and country deploy the network of the future, the more economic rewards there are to enjoy.
Small cells are essential to maintaining Washington's vitality and I hope you will develop a set of standards that ensure their efficient deployment. Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you for your comments. This is a question for the two Chambers of Commerce representatives. Broadly speaking, you've simply said, as I've heard it, "we'd like you to implement guidelines as quickly as possible that the small cell technology can be implemented."

Did you have anything specific about the guidelines or the Master License Agreement or anything that you wanted us to take into account or to address? The answer no is a perfectly acceptable answer. We just want to make sure that we're documenting specific items or concerns that anybody has.

MS. QUIROGA: Not at this time.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. And I'll note for the record that the representative from the
D.C. Chamber of Commerce was nodding as well.

MS. WADLINGTON: Yes. Correct. I was nodding as well. Yes. So, in general, we just wanted to put our voices on the record as to how we would like this committee to move forward with this process so we can begin implementation of the infrastructure. So, if there's any other specific questions you may have, I'm happy to follow up.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. We have questions. I have some questions and some clarifications for the other two representatives. Just generally speaking, that's great. Thank you very much. We appreciate that.

If you have written comments, we'd appreciate receiving them for the record. I don't believe we received written comments from the District Hispanic Chamber of Commerce -- the District of Columbia Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, right?

MS. QUIROGA: So, we're the Greater Washington Hispanic --
CHAIR MARCOU: Greater Washington?

MS. QUIROGA: Yes, sir.


(Laughter.)

CHAIR MARCOU: Sorry. Speaking, perhaps, parochial.

So, I just want to reiterate about the general concept of our authority to regulate. And I'll use this example with the U.S. Department of Transportation. They authorize us to regulate the provision of hazardous materials through PHMSA. That's the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, which has regulations. But it delegates those regulations to different entities. So, some entities have authority for one part, some entities have authority for another part.

And so we do hear the concerns that people are raising related to the radio frequency
matters. We have noted that they are a requirement, as a general standard, for compliance in the Master License Agreement, but they're not necessarily within our purview.

So, I just want to reiterate that it's not that we don't think that they're important, it's that we have authority for certain things and we don't have authority for other things.

So, for example, we can very clearly limit small cell technology from not being placed in the roadway, because we have the authority to permit. The roadway is an inappropriate location for small cell technology to be implemented within. And that's definitely within our purview. But it doesn't necessarily apply to all elements related to small cell technology.

I do also want to make sure that you're aware, as we noted before, that those applications that are in particular areas, like CFA, NCPC, Historic, will be reviewed by those entities at the application level.

In addition, the Urban Forestry
Division will be reviewing every application. So, there isn't an application that comes in that they won't see. They are one of our most prolific reviewers. And we are very thankful to have them as part of our reviewing team.

I wanted to follow up on your point about notice. So, the Master License Agreement does require notice to ANCs for any new installations in neighborhoods.

MR. HEINS: The initial one.

CHAIR MARCOU: We're going to have a very frank conversation with the small cell providers because they'll want to interpret that statement as broadly as possible. We look forward to having a further dialogue with them about that, because our interest in it is making sure that it complies with our standards and objectives for notice and comment to -- or notice to the affected neighborhoods.

MR. HEINS: Well, I think the guidelines could straighten that out, because they're incorporated by reference in the MLA.
CHAIR MARCOU: That's an interesting recommendation. So, what I'm hearing you say is you'd like to hear put into the small cell guidelines something that clarifies what that clause means?

MR. HEINS: Exactly.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. I also want to note that we are a big believer in transparency. Our lawyer isn't here, but I don't think he'll be objecting to me saying that we're big believers in transparency. And so all of our permits are available online. All of our -- oh, Glen, I just committed us to transparency, if that's okay.

So, all of our applications are online. Every public space permit application is available online for any person to look at: particular information about the application, the tracking number, the address. And it's available not by -- you don't have to search out knowing the tracking number or knowing the specific address. You can search using a map function
that just takes you to an intersection. And you can start at an intersection or a 100 block or a neighborhood and you can look at all of the applications in that area.

It's a relatively simple, interactive tool. I'm not committing to anything right now. But our goal would be to be even more proactive about that in the future, to allow entities who are interested, individuals or entities who are interested, in finding ways to pull that information out on an automated basis.

I'm not making a commitment today that you'll be able to do that tomorrow. But we would much rather that you have information and that you have access to our applications than that you don't. There is no interest on our side in preventing that.

And that also applies not just to ANCs, but also to community organizations and associations, individuals, organizations like the Chamber of Commerce, the BIDs. We want to make sure that everybody has access to our information
and that we're being as transparent as possible, which is exactly what this meeting is about.

So, I want to thank you all for your comments. Do committee members have questions for the representatives in front of us? Mr. Shaheen.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: I have a question for Ms. Purcell. It sounds like the Committee of 100 is very strongly supportive of hoteling as opposed to each carrier having their own installation. And you referred to Nashville. I mean, have you been to other cities where you've seen both approaches? Does the Committee of 100 feel like there is a clear benefit from going with one or the other?

MS. PURCELL: No, sir. I have not traveled to any other cities. We learned about this Nashville ordinance and it seems like a very good way to take a scarcity of locations. And what we learned today was a much bigger demand than at least I believed existed for, you know, more wireless service. So, no, we have not
studied all these.

It seemed like, if you have a problem with scarcity and a desire for -- like, one carrier said that they need two poles on a block -- is like it seemed like building some engines for efficiency into the guidelines in the MLA seemed like a good idea.

If it's not feasible, then nothing happens. If it is feasible, then we basically try to get these efficiencies to avoid basically a potential crisis, is almost what we were hearing today.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: I see. So, it's much more about efficiencies of space as opposed to an aesthetic concern?

MS. PURCELL: Yes.

MEMBER SHAHEEN: Okay. And then I had a question for the Association of Georgetown. The association was advocating for shrouding the antennas?

MR. HEINS: Correct. To have them in something that you don't see the actual antenna,
which is, you know, an electronic gizmo. And
there's 64 of them in each one of those little
cabinets at the top of the pole.

**MEMBER SHAHEEN:** So, I guess, for me,
intuitively, the shrouding would make the antenna
more visible.

**MR. HEINS:** Yes. Yes. Unfortunately.
But better that than having electronics just on
display.

**MEMBER SHAHEEN:** Okay. So, it's not
just the antenna, it's all of the equipment that
is installed at the base of the antenna that's
associated with it?

**MR. HEINS:** Yes. I think basically
everything should be shrouded.

And if I could just add one comment.
We also think that something that has not been
mentioned so far is rooftops. You know, the
carriers are putting antennae on rooftops right
now for 5G. And, you know, there's a lot of
rooftops in Georgetown that would be potentially
useful for that purpose instead of relying
exclusively on poles. And I don't even know why
we're -- you know, why the guidelines don't
address that.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. That's a
question we can make sure is directed back to the
MLA holders for their response.

MR. HEINS: Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: I believe we've heard
from them related to the challenge with rooftop
equipment in terms of direct access to the actual
equipment that individuals are using and that
their equipment on rooftops is related to that,
but would be related into the antenna.

But that's another story for another
day. If you could give us your question in
writing that you'd like to hear them address,
we'd appreciate receiving that because then we
can make sure that that gets directed more
specifically.

MR. HEINS: Yeah, I'd be happy to do
that.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. And it
should always be through us as -- oh, look.

Somebody's cell phone has just rung inside this room. That's okay. It's ironic and, perhaps, perfectly timed.

Because, in the end, we are talking, again, about communication facilities. I did want to make sure though that we had also addressed this point, which is are you preferring shrouding to -- you're preferring shrouding to the exposure of equipment. Let me ask you another question.

Some of the equipment can be installed in a pedestal. And we saw some examples of this in some of the material that was provided. Would your preference be to have material installed in the pedestal of a pole rather than on the exterior of a pole?

MR. HEINS: We would like it to be as inconspicuous as possible. And this is really where the Commission of Fine Arts and possibly the HPRB come into play. I mean, they're the experts on design. And, you know, anything I'd
say would just be my personal preference. But I do think we're trying to make this equipment as less obvious as possible.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. Do committee members have any further questions for the representatives before us today?

I want to thank the Committee of 100 particularly because you gave us both written comments for the record as well as comments here. That's always appreciated, to have as much information as possible to go through.

MS. PURCELL: Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. So, with that said, we'll move forward to the -- I'm sorry. If you're going to go on the record, you need to sit at the table and put yourself on the record.

MS. MEDRANO: I'm with an organization. I just somehow wasn't up there. I didn't know if I --

CHAIR MARCOU: I just -- I apologize, I probably didn't ask you about that. Are you
with the zero5g.com?

MS. MEDRANO: No. That's not me.

That's was someone else. That's why --

CHAIR MARCOU: Are you with Kerb Technologies? The person in the back identified themselves as Kerb Technologies. I don't have you on this list, then. What organization are with?

MS. MEDRANO: Gala Theater. I have extensive comments. But somehow I'm not listed as an organization.

CHAIR MARCOU: Got it. It was not listed as an organization on the agenda.

Understood. Okay. So, why don't we then move to those entities.

So, if you'll, if you'd like to take a seat at the table. Is the representative from Kerb Technologies present? Thank you. And is Mr. Viteri, will you read the material for Gala Theater?

MR. VITERI: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: Great. If you'll step
forward as well.

MS. MEDRANO: How do I put this in?

CHAIR MARCOU: We'll get it. Mr. Viteri, do you have copies of the material for us?

MR. VITERI: From Gala, I have four copies. Five copies.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. So, I just have a quick question before you begin, Mr. Viteri.

Ms. Medrano has identified herself as with the Gala Theater. So, are her comments on behalf of the Gala Theater or on behalf of herself?

MR. VITERI: She told me it was on behalf of the Gala Theater. But I'm reading her testimony and it seems like it's personal.

CHAIR MARCOU: Great. Thank you.

MR. VITERI: Do you want me to start?

CHAIR MARCOU: Yes, please. And so, identify yourself for the record and spell your last name.

MR. VITERI: Gus Viteri, V-I-T-E-R-I.
I'm reading this on behalf of Ms. Medrano.

CHAIR MARCOU: Can you spell Ms. Medrano's last name?

MR. VITERI: M-E-D-R-A-N-O.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you.

MR. VITERI: Ms. Rebecca Medrano is a citizen of D.C., a resident of Columbia Heights. Like many, she chose to live in Columbia Heights for the historic buildings, beautiful scenery, and lively streets. We're lucky to live in D.C. because those descriptions happen to fit many of our cities and neighborhoods.

There's a lot of beauty and history throughout Washington. And it is our responsibility to preserve those aspects that make D.C. great. That's why the transition to the next generation wireless infrastructure is so encouraging.

Small cells are designed to unobtrusive and blend into existing surroundings. A D.C. resident or visitor would likely never notice those little devices unless they
specifically went looking for them.

   Historically, there's been a trade-off between sacrificing community aesthetics for necessary network infrastructure. Thankfully, small cell technology eliminates the competition between a beautiful neighborhood and a well-functioning wireless network.

   As with many urban residents, I chose to live in D.C. for its forward-leaning culture. This means embracing the future, and 5G is certainly part of this future. We want to see our city at the forefront of the offering of the latest in revolutionary technology.

   That's why we urge you to prioritize a speedy small cell deployment for developing standards for those necessary devices. Thank you all for your attention. Rebecca Medrano.

   CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you.

   MR. BUKO: Hi. My name is Stephen Buko and I represent Kerb Technologies. That's Buko, B-U-K-O.

   CHAIR MARCOU: Have you provided
written comments?

    MR. BUKO: I have them here and I can
hand them out after I testify.

    CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. That'd be
helpful. If you have them for us to hand out
now, that'd be great, too. Thank you, Mr.
Viteri.

    MR. BUKO: How are you all doing?

    CHAIR MARCOU: Good.

    MR. BUKO: I'll be short and quick
here. We are getting there.

Hello, my name is Stephen Buko and I
am the cofounder and CEO of Kerb, K-E-R-B. We
are a D.C.-based startup that uses technology to
measure sidewalk foot traffic for our local
clients, identifying ways for them to grow their
business.

    Whether we're upgrading our platform,
transferring data, or performing analytics,
reliable and speedy connectivity is at the heart
of our business. I want to speak today because
5G will likely be the future of online
As an entrepreneur, I'm excited about the way 5G could improve the way that we, and technology in general, operate. Whether it's offering instantaneous data analysis or optimizing our foot traffic collection routes, there's a lot 5G can offer.

While our business relies on HD cameras to offer our service, 5G will rely on a dense sample of small cells. Some people think that transition to 5G is somewhat straightforward, but a small cell deployment has the potential to be a drawn out process. I believe it's important to do what we can to expedite the small cell build out as much as we can.

5G will be an integral to the health of the D.C. startup community, and we should strive to be the first among cities to offer a reliable 5G network. And this isn't in your notes, but our company has to operate -- you know, we operate here locally. But my team is
actually traveling to New York on Friday because they have 5G and we don't. Okay? So I'm losing time, productivity, and finances because my team is traveling on Friday.

So, any way that we can get that here helps me, saves me money, and allows us to grow our team.

So, thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I hope that you will develop small cell standards that optimize rather than impede deployment. Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you.

(Off the record comments.)

MS. SCARATO: So, my name is Theodora Scarato. And I'm an executive director with Environmental Health Trust. I submitted extensive --

CHAIR MARCOU: Sorry. Could you spell your last name?

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you.

MS. SCARATO: Environmental Health

Trust is a scientific think tank. And we
submitted substantial comments and attachments to
the Commission as well.

I do respect the challenge before you. And I just want to add really quick that you can
regulate, to a degree, because this is about
future needs and also about speculation. And
service is different from capacity. And I can
talk to you about that afterwards.

History is rife with those moments
where regulations in the books have not caught up
with science showing human and environmental harm
-- lead paint, asbestos, cigarettes, the spraying
of DDT and Agent Orange on entire countries and
on servicemen and -women.

And this is that moment, when
Washington D.C. is ground zero, poised to allow
5G in the front yards in front of people's
bedrooms, even though the American Academy of
Pediatrics and countless medical organizations
are recommending that we decrease exposure to this radiation. And the people are completely uninformed.

Environmental Health Trust has shared technical information related to the radiation frequencies currently used, and 5G, which will be in use as well.

There are over 250 scientists calling for urgent action to protect the public. Not only will small cells expose people to a radiation that is considered in peer-reviewed research a human carcinogen by independent scientists, that this radiation has also been shown to affect bees, birds, and trees.

Next slide, please. When a chief of obstetrics at Yale, and who is also in the National Academy of Sciences, did research exposing pregnant mice to cell phone radiation, he found the mice had what he would say, if there was a term for this, if mice could have ADHD, that's what they had. They were born with -- they had damaged memory and they had
hyperactivity when they did tests when they got older. This corroborates research in humans and other animal studies that has found memory problems and brain damages. There are actually multiple studies which -- I believe there's references in what I sent to you.

The BabySafe Project, which I have a slide from the website, has been signed onto by over 200 medical experts and educational experts. It's EPA recognized as well. They recommend reducing exposure -- I do have handouts for you on this -- to protect babies' brains.

I want to tell you that wireless companies -- next slide, please -- are warning their shareholders. As an example, Comcast states in a 2016 10-K report, "We cannot guarantee that claims relating to radio frequency emissions will not arise in the future, or that the results of such studies will not be adverse to us. If the connection between our emissions and possible negative health effects were established, our operations, costs, or revenues
may be materially and adversely affected. We currently do not maintain any significant insurance with respect to this matter," because 20 years ago, insurance companies decided not to insure companies because of the brain cancer cases that were moving forward. And, of course, the research has significantly increased since 20 years ago.

Many wireless companies, from AT&T to Nokia, Sprint, all of them actually have issued similar warnings to their shareholders. Why not, if you are going to deploy this, are not the people of Washington, D.C. being informed, just as these shareholders are being informed, about this issue? Because really the people are not aware right now.

There are white papers of insurance industries that compare this risk to asbestos. They classify it as high-risk. And that is why most insurance companies will not insure for electromagnetic radiation. They do not insure for damages. It is considered a pollution. It's
defined as a pollution. You have to buy a special pollution clause.

Cities nationwide are opposing the unfettered rollout of 5G, as was discussed. I believe that public spaces should be safe and environmentally healthy for our children and for the elderly and for people with immune systems which are compromised, of which research has shown harm. And children are more vulnerable. They absorb the radiation deeper into their bodies.

If the citizens own the right-of-way, then they should be fully informed about these health effects, about the studies that are showing harm. Because you said this was -- your most valuable asset was the right-of-way. Then I think our children and the people are our most valuable asset that would be in this asset that they own.

The EPA was defunded from setting proper safety limits. We had no federal safety limits related to radio frequency radiation in
1996. And, at that time, we adopted the outdated limits that we have.

I think the conversation needs to pivot and be about protecting the people from this pollution, which is being called an environmental pollution. I sent you Dr. Sidney Russell's published paper on 5G, because the millimeter waves which are going to be employed in 5G are used as weapons at a much higher power. But because of the way they affect the sweat gland -- and I can talk to you about that, I'm quite familiar with the research and the researchers. We did an international conference where we had presentations as well.

The FCC is under regulatory capture right now. And there is actually no federal health and safety agency that has done any systematic review of the current science to understand at what level is this safe?

So, what we have are outdated limits based on outdated and erroneous assumptions that heat is the only problem. Microwaves, obviously,
will heat you. So, they're set so that you're not heated one degree Celsius. Before allowing these antennas, I think there should be a cost-benefit analysis in terms of medical bills to the District of Columbia.

Because if indeed what happens in the rats and mice, such as the National Toxicology program that found clear evidence of cancer from cell phone radiation at non-trivial levels, then I think that the government is going to be incurring costs and it should be looked at.

And I'm glad to answer any questions. I actually want to just say that, you know, this is not a public utility. So, they're not -- landline phones are regulated as a utility, but there are not such regulations with this. And so they don't even have to fix things they put out. And we consistently will see certain populations not getting what they need. And there are no regulations in place to ensure that. And I would like to be clear that you know the difference between service and capacity. Right now, there
is service. So, why would we be putting something in that could cause harm for something that so many scientists are concerned about?

I'm glad to answer questions and I do have handouts as well.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. We'd appreciate the handouts, if you'd like to give us the handouts. Thank you.

MS. SCARATO: These are our resources on how to reduce exposure that we wish the D.C. government should share with the people.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. So, actually, if you don't mind, I'd like to start with you first. And this might help explain our circumstance and help identify where the gap might be.

So, I'll use the example -- I used the examples earlier about, like, hazardous materials in pipelines. Another differentiation between what we do and what others do is public space versus private property.

So, we regulate uses of public space
that are specific to how public space is used. And there are regulations related to private property and how private property is used. But then there are regulations that cover both. I'll use the example of OSHA. The Occupational Safety and Health Administration establishes standards related to, for example, excavations and how you would properly shore an excavation to ensure the safety of the worker within the excavated area.

And those apply whether it's on public space or private property. So, OSHA regulations are not ones, again, that are directly relevant to public space. They're relevant to another activity, part of which occurs in public space and part of which can occur on private property.

As we have heard earlier, it could be the case that 5G technology -- and I don't know, because I'm not the industry -- but that 5G technology and small radio frequency is being deployed on private property. I wouldn't be surprised to find that on larger campuses, like universities, that is the case, right? I would
assume that if I were -- I went to Catholic University here in Washington, D.C. So I would assume that, in some way, the technology is being deployed there.

So, it would appear that there is, perhaps, a different body that would be constituted to regulate that element. And it would, again, seem to come from the Federal Communication Commission.

So, what is it about this that you believes gives -- and this is why I'm asking a question rather than making a statement. I just want to make sure. What is it that you believe gives us that specific authority to regulate the radio frequency?

MS. SCARATO: I'm not asking you to regulate the radio frequency. I'm asking you to have guidelines in place that protect the public.

CHAIR MARCOU: From?

MS. SCARATO: You would be -- you can have guidelines that de facto protect the public. For example, with much larger setbacks. You do
not have to do whatever industry wants you to do
to put in these small cells.

You can -- do you see what I'm saying?

I'm not saying regulate, because the FCC is who
is charged with regulating, even though they're
not a health and safety agency. In other
countries, this radiation is exceeding their
limits.

CHAIR MARCOU: And we understand that.

But I'll use this example. We can absolutely
regulate their location in relation to traffic
safety. So, you heard earlier that they had a
concern about our limitation of these being
placed on poles that have traffic signal
equipment or traffic control devices. And they
wanted us to differentiate one set of traffic
control devices from another.

That's clearly within our purview and
our jurisdiction and our authority. So, I just --
- I think I'm going to need to leave it there.

It would be helpful for us to have an explanation
in writing about how you believe the location of
infrastructure in the right-of-way is the
mechanism by which -- you mentioned setbacks --
radio frequency setbacks should be regulated.

MS. SCARATO: Could I just answer
that, then?

CHAIR MARCOU: Sure. Sure.

MS. SCARATO: I'm not asking you to
regulate radio frequency. I'm asking, since
you're doing these small cell guidelines, even
though there is not currently 5G, a need for 5G;
people have service. And, by the way, there is
reports that show how you can get super-fast
speeds without putting all of these up. So,
that's a separate side conversation.

But, answering your question, I'm not
asking you to regulate radio frequency. I'm
asking you to have guidelines that protect the
public from cell antennas 10, 20, 30 feet from
where their children sleep. It's not -- you
don't have to do this.

CHAIR MARCOU: What element of the
antenna are you asking us to regulate related to
the setback. Is it the --

     MS. SCARATO: The installation.

     CHAIR MARCOU: No. We understand

     that. That's what the setback means. But what's

     the purpose or intent? Why do we have to have

     that setback, based on what you're saying?

     MS. SCARATO: Well, the further you

     are from an antenna, the less radiation exposure

     that you will be receiving.

     CHAIR MARCOU: Right. And so the

     basis is on radio frequency. So, that's what I'm

     getting back to.

     MS. SCARATO: That doesn't mean that

     you'd be regulating the radio frequency

     emissions. That simply means -- you know, we

     were simply recommending that you have guidelines

     that minimize exposure of radio frequency

     radiation to people, rather than increase, which

     is what this is going to do.

     For example, in Poland, because their

     limits are more restrictive than the United

     States -- we have the most lenient, among the
most lenient, allowable limits of radiation from networks in the entire world -- they are trying to get the government to change their limits. That is different. That is regulation of radio frequency because they want to fully deploy 5G and they can't with those limits, which are more protective.

But I'm talking about -- well, they're, right now, if I understand, can't an antenna be 10 feet or 20 feet from a building? That means a person could be in that building. There could be children down here and the antenna up here.

I mean, there are ways that you can have guidelines that are protective that are not regulating radio frequency, but that are simply minimizing the antenna to the people.

CHAIR MARCOU: It seems, at least as I'm hearing it, that you're asking us to regulate radio frequency exposure.

MS. SCARATO: No. Just where the -- I'm recommending that your guidelines minimize
the distance between antennas and people and animals.

CHAIR MARCOU: Right. Based --

MS. SCARATO: And I'm not talking about regulating radio frequency ratings. Many jurisdictions are -- like, Fairfax was mentioned, Petaluma, Mill Valley -- they are enacting ordinances and guidelines to minimize the antenna in relation to the people. That's all.

CHAIR MARCOU: It would be helpful if you gave us the background and information related to the legal analysis that gives us the authority to do that as an entity regulating infrastructure in the right-of-way, not related to regulating radio equipment. Because, as we're all saying, we're not about regulating radio equipment, we're about regulating infrastructure in the right-of-way. And, in addition, those standards that you think would be appropriate. So, that'd be great if you could give us both of those.

MS. SCARATO: It's in there. And,
also in the Master Licensing Agreement, it does say that public welfare and safety can prioritize over the companies.

CHAIR MARCOU: I apologize if I missed it in your material, but it would be great if you could give us an executive summary that crystalizes that. Because that helps us understand more specifically where you think we have the legal authority to do that and what you recommend we exercise under that legal authority.

MS. SCARATO: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. Sir, I think you're pretty much along the lines of the Chambers of Commerce in the prior panel. You're supportive of small cell technology deployment and you're interested in that happening soon. I just have one question for you about your testimony. You said that your employees are going to New York because it has 5G.

MR. BUKO: It has 5G test nodes.

They're not deployed 5G.

CHAIR MARCOU: Right. So, they're
probably going to particular facilities that are
in New York?

MR. BUKO: Correct.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. You do know that
the District of Columbia was also a location
where a small cell provider, who's located in
this room, conducted a test that was the first
successful test of a particular component of 5G
earlier this year, right?

MR. BUKO: Correct.

CHAIR MARCOU: Yeah. So, we're at the
forefront as well. So, take that to your --

MR. BUKO: I guess it's more that, if
I'm hedging my bets, New York gets it before D.C.

CHAIR MARCOU: What's that?

MR. BUKO: If I'm hedging my bets on
what city gets deployed 5G first, everything I've
seen and read is that it will be New York.

And I guess if you look at -- if they
have test nodes first today, up in New York, and
they're using them, and then we are hopefully
getting them soon, you could assume a similar lag
in deployment over other products and services.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you.

MR. BUKO: So, yeah.

CHAIR MARCOU: And Mr. Viteri, thank you very much for reading those comments into the record.

It didn't quite seem like they were from the Gala Theatre, but sometimes people make statements and then, it turns out that there's perhaps more ambiguity to them.

But since you're up here, did you have anything you wanted to say, because you clearly came here for a reason, and I can tell you right now, the Trees for Georgetown behind you and the other representative from the Georgetown Citizen Association are not happy with me at this moment.

And I apologize, but Mr. Viteri was here, we understood it was for the Gala Theatre, and then, when we saw it, it clearly was different.

MR. VITERI: Yes, and I apologize, that's what I was told was for the Gala Theatre.
I do have some personal, I can wait until after
them, I understand.

You've all been here the whole day, so
I have no problem waiting to do my testimony, it
is short, it's not too long.

CHAIR MARCOU: You're here, Mr. Viteri

--

MR. VITERI: Okay, thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- why don't you go
ahead and -- do you have it in writing?

MR. VITERI: Yes, I do. I have four
copies, I didn't know how many --

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you.

MR. VITERI: Yes, hello. My name is
Gus Viteri, V-I-T-E-R-I. I'm a resident of Ward
4 and a District resident. I work in technology
in the private sector for over 20 years.

I currently serve as the Chief
Technology Officer at a charter school here in
the District. Thank you for providing me the
opportunity to offer community input.

My current position places me squarely
in the intersection of two vitally important components of D.C.'s future success: technology and education.

I'm here today because I know the future of these two areas will center around connectivity and availability of wireless networks, such as 5G.

As many experts have written, by 2020, it's expected there will be approximately four internet devices for every human on our planet. As there is no sign of that trend showing down, we need a wireless network that will provide strength and low latency, such as 5G, which will be able to support growing consumer demand, especially in populous areas such as Washington, D.C.

5G will help us unlock new opportunities for innovations, to experiment and develop new technologies. Some innovations could improve classroom experiences, sooner rather than later, and include virtual reality, augmented reality, the internet of things, and classes on
demand.

Cities that tap into the power of 5G and small cell technology will be better equipped to implement improvements for city services, especially in the areas of public safety, transit, emergency preparedness, and provide access of Wi-Fi in underserved areas.

Of course, this only becomes possible through robust small cell presence. As you develop a set of standards that affect deployment, I would encourage you to consider the importance of achieving an expeditious rollout. The sooner D.C. has small cells, the sooner we can welcome 5G, next generation technologies, and all the benefits. Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you, Mr. Viteri. Long story short, you're in the same position as Kerb and the --

MR. VITERI: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- Chamber of Commerce.

Thank you. Do Committee members have any questions for any of the panelists? Great.
Thank you very much. We'll move on to our next panel.

I'll also note for the record that an ANC is looking to get in here behind us, but we are going to continue through our process, because we did reserve this room.

So, with that said, we'll move to our next set of panelists. Let me go to my list. Is -- we already had Mr. Heins, we already had you speak.

So, why don't we pull up Mr. James, the representative for Trees from Georgetown. If you would like to also speak as well, that would be great. And is there any other person who would like to speak before the Committee? Great, we have two more.

Commissioner Wilcox, why don't you come up and then, we'll have all of Georgetown at once. And, ma'am, then we'll have you come up. Would that be all right? Then, you'll have our undivided attention.

Is there anybody else present to
speak? Great, you won't be alone, there will be three people. Mr. James?

MR. JAMES: Okay. Hello? Okay. I don't know if you have the testimony of the Kalorama Citizens in front of you, which we submitted electronically beforehand. So, you have that? Okay.

So, I'll be happy to answer any questions you might have about the KCA's official testimony, which, again, was submitted prior, by the deadline, in advance of this hearing.

It was the product of a meeting where the issue was discussed to the best of our ability, because it's a very complicated issue and we're all busy learning more about it as days go on.

That's why I have my own separate personal testimony, I can't make a KCA meeting happen out of thin air, we meet once a month. But this, again, mine, not Kalorama Citizens.

CHAIR MARCOU: Yes, sir.

MR. JAMES: All right.
CHAIR MARCOU: Please go ahead.

MR. JAMES: So, I want to start off by just mentioning that the four companies that sat up here, the providers, showed you pretty pictures, but they didn't show anything that looked like any place I've ever seen that people live in Washington, D.C.

Like, I live in a row house community, with four and five-story apartment buildings around. And I know what Georgetown looks like, I know what Dupont Circle looks like.

But when I heard objections about alleys, it didn't make any sense at all. The alleys are freer space in the areas that I'm familiar with.

And I'm a carpenter, I've worked in alleys, behind people's houses, for the last 40 years. And most often, in downtown D.C. neighborhoods.

And they generally are not populated with trees, to the extent that streets are, where the leaves are apparently going to interfere with
the signals. So, I just really do think that you were shown some pictures that were misleading.

And before I get to my actual testimony, another thing that I thought about was Mr. Maher's from OP's, example of P Street, between 16th Street and Dupont Circle, which is in the Old City and it's in a D.C. Historic District.

It was interesting to hear what he thought could happen on the street itself, but he didn't talk about what might be able to happen in the alleys. And that will be what is recommended, I believe, by these design guidelines. Anyway.

I've been a resident and home owner in Adams Morgan since 1971. I was drawn to the District, and my neighborhood in particular, by the beauty of so much of the architecture, its human scale, and the tree-lined streets.

Over the years, I became a preservation advocate and worked to create Historic Districts in my neighborhood.
Now, the beauty of all D.C. neighborhoods, historic or not, is to be put at risk for more corporate gain to provide what will almost certainly be just a stopgap technology on the way to the next big thing.

The idea of treating Historic Districts in a special way at first sounds logical and proper. But upon further consideration, why should certain residents be treated better than others.

Also, there are neighborhoods that could easily qualify as historic, but the work has not yet been done to make this happen.

I've studied the proposed design guidelines and find them wholly inadequate. For instance, it would not be okay to have such an installation ten feet from my front bedroom window.

It is not okay to put the trees that many residents work hard to protect and maintain at risk, either from digging to install new poles close to their roots or to grotesquely trim them
so that small cell signals can travel more easily.

It would not be okay to have a device the size of a refrigerator perched 30 feet over the sidewalk or a whole flock of them hoteled on the poles, which will almost certainly be new poles stuck in at irregular intervals, deforming the streetscape symmetry.

The fiber optic cable that would go along with this endeavor would be buried, creating even more of a threat to street trees or massive expense in digging up our streets or sidewalks and repairing them afterward.

The small cell technology question is also reputed to include signals that will make self-driving cars in D.C. possible. I find this totally unacceptable. D.C. can't even run scooters safely, so spare me self-driving cars.

Too many of the statements in the proposed guidelines sound good, but are not strong enough or would allow waivers. Cabinets in Historic Districts are to be placed
underground. But we understand that the service
providers are fighting this requirement.

The problem is that the Executive
Branch is trying to ram a fait accompli down our
throats. The whole process is backward.

The Master Licensing Agreement should
only be crafted after a thorough public vetting
of all the issues that small cells raise. Then,
the MLAs would reflect residents' concerns.

I must say that outreach on this issue
has been abysmal. It's barely known about in the
city. ANCs, you might have had some meetings
about -- with ANCs, but it hasn't generally been
known.

And at my ANC, ANC 1C, somebody from
Crown Castle was supposed to show up to talk
about it in the October meeting and called and
told them, oops, can't be there, 20 minutes
before they were supposed to appear.

So, a halt should be placed on this
endeavor until DDOT, and where appropriate, DC
Historic Preservation Office representatives have
presented project information to every ANC in the city.

The MLAs should be subject to revision after the public's concerns are heard and incorporated into the project.

Each application to install this equipment in Historic Districts should be heard by the DC Historic Preservation Review Board and the Old Georgetown Board for Georgetown, in Georgetown, if that's where --

CHAIR MARCOU: I understand.

MR. JAMES: -- the application is.

Installation should occur only in alleys.

There should be no discount for installing more poles, that is a recipe for having provider companies seeking advantage to overpopulate the city with this ugliness.

Washington Globe lampposts should not be subject to installation of this technology.

It is premature to create guidelines for a technology that doesn't even exist yet and is not expected to be ready until at least 2020.
When we understand how it really works, then we can more readily create appropriate guidelines.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you very much, Mr. James.

MR. JAMES: Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Please, Commissioner Wilcox.

MR. WILCOX: Sure. My name is Jim Wilcox. I'm the Commissioner for ANC 2E06. I fully support the comments on the resolution -- I'm going to explain that --

CHAIR MARCOU: Is this what you just handed out?

MR. WILCOX: I'm going to explain that to you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay.

MR. WILCOX: Okay.

CHAIR MARCOU: I will say, I was taken aback, but go ahead.

MR. WILCOX: Well, I want to give you a surprise, it's late in the day.

CHAIR MARCOU: Well done.
MR. WILCOX: Okay.

CHAIR MARCOU: But I'm paying attention.

MR. WILCOX: I fully support the resolution that Joe Gibbons read earlier today on behalf of the entire ANC, but I also submitted some supplemental comments, which I provided to the Chair, regarding the draft small cell design guidelines.

And I'd really like to just emphasize a couple of points, including the document that I surprised the Chair with.

I completely agree with one of the comments the Chair made at the start, which is that the right-of-way in the District of Columbia is its most valuable asset.

And I heard the various providers say that the purpose of small cells is, quote, to bring the antennas down to the street, or sort of get the antenna range down to the street.

And I've also heard from the providers that they want to go at least 30 feet, plus six
feet, 36 feet high, in some instances. I think I heard one of the providers say that they might even want a pole that's 50 feet high.

But in any event, the poles were quite high, notwithstanding the idea that the concept is to bring these small cells down close to the ground.

And the point I wanted to make, which is based in substantial part on the documents that I just provided to the Chair is that one of the four companies which has executed the Master License Agreements, Verizon, is already in the process of installing multiple 5G facilities on the rooftops of commercial buildings in Georgetown, that are about 40 feet high.

Now, historically, what we have in Georgetown is a large number of antennas, that are presumably 4G antennas, that are on rooftops of the commercial area.

Now, we have currently applications, that's just one example of them. If you look at Page A1, you'll see the 5G antenna on it, which
is why I thought I'd give you the document.

That's a supplement that they've provided for our OGB overview. They're already putting antennas on top of buildings, commercial buildings, that are four and five stories high in Georgetown.

There's no problem with them servicing those antennas, or else they wouldn't have been doing it for the last ten years.

So, the idea that it can't be serviced or it's sort of impractical to have antennas on rooftops is, first of all, belied by the fact that that's just what they've been doing for the past ten years in Georgetown, and secondly, by the fact that Verizon is right now seeking authorization to install 5G facilities on, five 5G facilities on rooftops in Georgetown, approximately 40 feet high.

So, they may be actually shorter than some of the poles that the providers say that they would like to use to bring 5G down to the street. I mean, it's ridiculous.
And from our point of view, if in fact 5G facilities are installed on rooftops, it's going to greatly diminish the adverse impact on the streetscapes and on the right-of-way, which the Chair has correctly pointed out is the city's most valuable asset. It's practical, it ought to be a first priority.

And from our perspective and my perspective, the final guidelines should provide that poles can only be used if a provider establishes by clear and convincing evidence that there is no property owner willing to rent rooftop space for a 5G installation within an area that is necessary to provide 5G service. Nice and simple.

That's exactly what's going on now with 4G, why can't we do it with 5G? It eliminates almost all the adverse impacts on the streetscape, consistent with the Chair's objective, and most of the concerns that have been raised by others here. I think it's a wonderful idea and it should get a top priority.
And then, we don't even have to worry about most of these pole issues, because in fact, I believe that most residents, for example, if there's a requirement to install in a residential area, would choose to have an installation on a rooftop, where they're also charging the providers a fair market rent and providing access, just like the providers are getting on the commercial structures right now, and that they'd prefer that to having a pole right in front of their houses.

So, it's a very workable thing, it's actually happening now, and I believe that the guidelines should provide the incentive that I just described to continue that.

CHAIR MARCOU: And that language is in your comments, correct?

MR. WILCOX: I can give you that further. It's in my oral comments, but I can submit something else.

CHAIR MARCOU: That would be great.

MR. WILCOX: Okay.
CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you.

MR. WILCOX: Second, in the comments I submitted, I referenced a video from the CEO of Verizon and one of Verizon's 5G engineers. It was actually on the news. And I encourage each one of you to just take a look at it.

I was actually going to bring it here to play it, except I was under the impression that we only had three minutes and the video runs a little bit over three minutes.

But most people are very impressed by seeing video of the head of one of these major companies that is here talking to you today telling the truth to the national news networks. So, please take a look at it.

What he states is that the range of 5G antennas is not the 300 to 500 feet that is being represented by these folks who are testifying here today, but is between 2,000 and 3,000 feet. Okay? So, the range of the antennas is vastly greater than what's been represented.

They also state clearly that, based on
Verizon's own experience, there's no line-of-sight requirement, despite what people have been saying here today, and that trees and foliage are not a problem, despite what people have been saying here today.

Again, I think if the CEO of Verizon states that quite clearly on the national news, that's something you want to take into consideration.

AT&T and others are actually trying to increase the number of poles that are provided under the guidelines. I think that those are a maximum.

In fact, what I think is that, because it's clear to us that you considered the range of these antennas when you tried to decide how many antennas would be appropriate on blocks of different lengths, that if you assume that the range of the antennas is not 300 feet, but indeed is 3,000 feet, which is ten times as much, obviously, fewer antennas are required.

And that's even if, in fact, we don't
put them -- well, first of all, we should put
them on the rooftops where that's possible. To
the extent they're on the street, far fewer are
necessary than are being suggested by the
providers.

I think what they want to do is
essentially just get a cheap right-of-way for
future development, since, as you all know, there
are absolutely no facilities currently, in terms
of smartphones, computers, or anything else, that
can even use 5G.

So, indeed, since the cost of these
new poles to them is way sub-market, it's not
even currently usable, because there's no
facilities, in terms of smartphones, that can use
the equipment, they're just getting a cheap buy
to establish multitudes of poles for future
development in the neighborhoods, when indeed, by
Verizon's own actions, as one of the major
carriers who testified here today, it's
practical, reasonable, doable, and is currently
being done, to put these facilities on rooftops,
which avoids the problems that most of us are concerned about and which I think the Chair was sympathetic to when he said that right-of-way is our most valuable asset.

In closing, I'll say that I think that there's little, if any, reasonable need for the Public Space Committee to allow additional poles to be constructed in the residential areas of Georgetown, taking into account both the availability of rooftop installations and extended antenna range.

The final guidelines can enable 5G to be fully implemented in Georgetown, and across the city, while minimizing adverse impacts. This approach is fair and prudent and should be adopted. Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you very much, Commissioner. If you'll pass the microphone on?

MR. WILCOX: Certainly.

MS. SANTOYO: Good evening.

CHAIR MARCOU: Good evening.

MS. SANTOYO: I'm Elsa Santoyo, S-A-N-
T-O-Y-O, and I am a Director of the Citizens Association of Georgetown. I'm also the Chair of its Historic Preservation and Zoning Committee.

In this capacity, I support the resolution the ANC 2E submitted about the design guidelines on October 3, 2018, and offer the comments CAG submitted about the guidelines October 1, 2018, and the resolution CAG submitted to DDOT previously dated April 24, 2018, requesting DDOT to encourage applicants to seek CFA approval prior to the installation of small cell --

CHAIR MARCOU: Hold on for a second. Got to bring your -- stop, you've tangled the wire in your feet --

MR. WILCOX: I don't --

CHAIR MARCOU: -- I just want to make sure he's covered for recording.

MR. WILCOX: I think I'm okay now.

CHAIR MARCOU: I've got eyes on, so --

MR. WILCOX: Okay, I'll get my feet back.
CHAIR MARCOU: -- I just want to make sure he's okay, because this is being recorded for posterity.

MR. WILCOX: Sure.

CHAIR MARCOU: So, we want to make sure that we've got an accurate document. Okay.

MR. WILCOX: I apologize for my big feet.

CHAIR MARCOU: That's okay. The wire's also under the table, so I should have warned you.

MR. WILCOX: Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Please continue.

MS. SANTOYO: The Citizens Association of Georgetown Board of Directors approved the latter during two separate meetings of its Board. Georgetown, like the rest of the city, is very proud of its streetscape and we totally appreciate your opening comments.

But Georgetown, particularly, remains a unique Historic District defined by its architecture and that of its streetscape. Its
relatively few lamp poles and abundance of trees significantly characterize that streetscape setting.

As in early preservation efforts, preservation of Georgetown today must extend beyond the built environment to its setting.

In finalizing the small cells design guidelines, please consider the following comments, which represent my own views now, in addition to CAG's formal comments, which I was also an author of, to preserve Georgetown's unique character.

First, I'm concerned that locating bulky antennas at the height of street lamps, as one of the providers suggested, will detract from and obscure the globes of the street lamps. They will also obscure the cornice and entablature details that are at the same level, that are considered highly significant characteristics of Georgetown's architecture. This would be damaging to perspectival streetscape views and also obscure views to the
streetscape from second-story windows.

Locating the bulk of antennas well above the 20-foot height instead, as recommended in the guidelines, will mitigate those adverse effects, placing the bulk of the small cells above the parapets and eaves of the majority of Georgetown's houses.

I worry that the resulting potential visual and health concerns that loosen the guideline restrictions, as requested by the carriers today, could drastically adversely affect the value of the individual properties adjacent to the small cell facilities.

This is backed by numerous studies, that conclude that there have been up to a 20 percent drop in property values adjacent to cell towers.

Could this potential deleterious effect be considered a taking, because the potential future of the property is constrained by the installation of the small cell?

I support the comments submitted by
the ANC 2E, CAG, Mr. Wilcox, the Environmental Health Trust, which they provided to you guys on October 5, 2018, about the health issues related to small cells.

EHT's comment that worldwide, many regions are investing in wired fiber optic connections, as a healthier, more cyber-secure alternative, that offers faster service and increased capacity, seems to be buttressed by the fact that Comcast has made a decision to stay out of the small cells race, because their position is that they can offer what other providers are promising using their existing cable infrastructure.

Finally, I do support Commissioner Wilcox's comments about pursuing the feasibility of roof-mounted 5G wireless transmission towers to the pole-mounted antennas prior to approval of the guidelines and the deployment of small cells in Georgetown.

The 5G towers, with a coverage range of 2,000 to 3,000 feet that Verizon is touting
and testing, as Mr. Wilcox said, in five
locations across Georgetown, now, could well
provide 5G access throughout the entirety of
Georgetown, which is less than 6,000 feet by
9,000 feet. That is the extent of the area we
occupy. So, 2-3,000-foot coverage, you can
imagine how we could lessen the impact.

Benefits of the roof-mounted 5G towers
over numerous added antenna poles include
providing income streams to property owners,
preserving the setting of our historic community,
and perhaps even our community's health.

So, I ask you to please make my
comments here, as well as those you have heard,
part of the formal record before the Public Space
Committee. Thank you. I appreciate your time.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you very much. If
you'll pass the microphone on?

MS. SANTOYO: Yes. Here you go.

MS. EMES: My name is Betsy Emes,
spelled E-M-E-S. I'm Chair of Trees for
Georgetown, which is a nonprofit organization
under the auspices of the Citizens Association of
Georgetown.

And we raise funds from the community
to plant and maintain street trees in the
residential areas of Georgetown. And we educate
the community on the importance and care of these
trees.

We plant our trees with the permission
of the Urban Forestry Division of DDOT and also
work closely with Casey Trees. We have planted
almost 3,000 street trees since our inception in
1989.

Trees for Georgetown would like to
express its concern for the potential damage to
the D.C. street trees by the 5G small cell
installations.

With regard to the placement of
standalone poles vis-a-vis street trees, the
draft design guidelines call for these poles to
aligned with street lights, third-party poles,
and street trees in order to maintain a visual
and physical organization of structures within
the right-of-way.

Trees for Georgetown supports the guidelines in that these standalone poles should not be placed where it limits the ability of the District of Columbia to plant a street tree in the future, regardless of whether the District plans to plant a tree in that location at the time the application is submitted. In other words, don't put a pole in an empty tree box.

We further support the guidelines in that a standalone pole should not be placed within the critical root zone of existing street trees.

Street trees should not be removed, nor have their critical root zones compromised for the installation of any small cell infrastructure. The 15-foot minimum should be maintained.

However, Trees for Georgetown has grave concerns that 5G small cell implementation would have adverse impact, not only on the appearance of street trees, but also their
health, which the guidelines fail to address.

We are told that standalone poles must
be in clear line-of-sight to each other, as well
as cell phones and houses, which would involve
tree trimming.

Trees for Georgetown urges that the
guidelines put in place a permit process
requiring the oversight of a certified arborist
for any prune, with stringent penalties for
noncompliance attached.

Random, unsupervised pruning by
nonprofessionals would be a disaster, causing our
street trees to be grossly disfigured or worse
yet, killed. Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. I'm going to
start with that last point. And I just want to
be clear to everybody and we've said this to the
Master License Agreement holders.

It is illegal to prune a street tree
without a permit and all permits for street tree
work and all permits for small cell will be
reviewed by the certified arborists at the Urban
Forestry Division. All the small cell providers understand that, correct?

(Chorus of yes.)

CHAIR MARCOU: Let the record show that they said yes.

So, while there are people who do perform improper or unpermitted, I'll just the term unpermitted, acts in public space, and trust me, we try to fine them every place we can, but we've only got a certain number of inspectors, in this case, they know full well that their applications will not be approved until they've gone through Urban Forestry's review and they know that they cannot prune trees without a permit from the District Department of Transportation that are reviewed and approved by the Urban Forestry Division.

So, please rest assured that that is absolutely covered.

MS. EMES: Yes, but just because it's covered doesn't mean it won't happen. And once it's happened, that's it.
CHAIR MARCOU: Once it happens --

MS. EMES: They should have a certified arborist hired by them if the city can't provide it to supervise every bit of the pruning.

CHAIR MARCOU: That assumes that the pruning is permitted. So, I'll start from that --

MS. EMES: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: Right. So, I'll start from that. The Urban Forestry Division will manage all of that. That is in their purview, that's their authority, they tell us how trees get pruned, that's how trees get pruned. Okay?

MS. EMES: Are they getting more staff? Because they're having trouble right now doing that just on the trees --

CHAIR MARCOU: I look forward to our getting more staff and their getting more staff. You might want to make that recommendation to people who have that ability to make that happen.

I do want to move on to another --

MS. SANTOYO: Can I just add something?
CHAIR MARCOU: Of course.

MS. SANTOYO: I thought her point about a certified arborist was a good one, from the standpoint that you would be requesting the carriers, through the guidelines, to make sure that, prior to asking for the permit from you, that a certified arborist has checked what they're going to do.

Because that way, if you're short staffed, you would be able to --

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay, let me stop you there. I'm not being clear enough, so I'll be clear enough. A permit to install a small cell device does not include at all a permit to do any pruning whatsoever --

MS. SANTOYO: We know that.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- to a street tree. It is a separate type of permit. So, for them to get a permit that, if they were to do an installation and it required pruning, it would be a second element of the permit.

It would have to be explicitly stated
on the permit application and it would go to
Urban Forestry and they would set whatever the
criteria standards Urban Forestry wants for that.

A certified arborist sounds like an
excellent suggestion to make to them. If it's
not a condition that -- if they want us to add a
condition, it can go as a condition like that.

So, we're all on the same page. Yes,
we've heard this repeatedly from you, at a
variety of fora, so we just want to make sure you
know that we've heard it, you are totally on top
of it, and it currently is illegal.

And, yes, illegal activities occur in
public space, that doesn't mean that we don't
still include them. Just because people speed,
doesn't mean that we don't include speed limits.

MS. EMES: Yes, but there's --

CHAIR MARCOU: So, I want to continue
and move on -- I'm sorry, please, go ahead.

MS. EMES: I would like to say one more
thing. There should be stringent penalties for
this. Tickets are rarely given, fines are rarely
levied.

I mean, hit them in the pocketbook and they'll stop doing it. But we're not doing that, the city is not doing that on any venue.

CHAIR MARCOU: So, the guidelines are not an authority in which we could do that. There are standards for enforcement activity and fines that are given based on violations. Those are already well established.

Urban Forestry Division, I'm sure is an advocate to make sure that those fines are properly calibrated to prevent bad acts. They are probably the best entity to work with on that.

Our office is also happy to hear any recommendations related to modifying the fines related to enforcement activities.

MS. EMES: Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay? Okay. I wanted to clarify two things that I thought I heard. Did you want the small cells to be taller? It sounded to me --
MR. WILCOX: Are you asking me?

MS. SANTOYO: Are you talking to me?

CHAIR MARCOU: Yes. It sounded --

MS. SANTOYO: What I actually said was that I lauded the height that's called out in the design guidelines --

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay.

MS. SANTOYO: -- right now. And that one of the carriers earlier had talked about bringing down that height and that we opposed bringing down that height, from what the design guidelines are currently.

CHAIR MARCOU: I think that they recommended increasing the height levels.

MS. SANTOYO: There was two things said. It went up and down.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay.

MS. SANTOYO: One of -- when, I forget if it was AT&T or Verizon, showed slides, they showed facilities that were the same height as the globes. And so, that's what that comment was about.
That comment was about that particular carrier showing a lower height than what is recommended in the guidelines. So, we were speaking in support of what the guidelines currently --

CHAIR MARCOU: It would be helpful to review the guidelines, I don't know if they set a minimum height, but if they don't --

MS. SANTOYO: They didn't set a minimum height, but they set a maximum height of 31 and there's also a diagram that shows a height. And so, we would urge that they -- that you don't exceed --

CHAIR MARCOU: If you'd like the guidelines to be clarified related to minimum and maximum heights --

MS. SANTOYO: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- of installations, we look forward to getting that specific comment in the --

MS. SANTOYO: That was in the CAG --

CHAIR MARCOU: So, what's the specific
MS. SANTOYO: -- comment to you.

CHAIR MARCOU: What's the specific minimum height that you're looking for?

MS. SANTOYO: We did not give you a specific minimum height, we said in our comments to you that we submitted electronically before --

CHAIR MARCOU: Yes.

MS. SANTOYO: -- the deadline for comments --

CHAIR MARCOU: Yes.

MS. SANTOYO: -- that maximums and minimums should be called out in the guidelines and that is something that we would encourage.

CHAIR MARCOU: Right. So --

MS. SANTOYO: The --

CHAIR MARCOU: -- let me stop you --

MS. SANTOYO: The authors of --

CHAIR MARCOU: Let me stop you there for a second, because I want to be clear, a minimum and a maximum recommendation, the recommendation to have minimums and maximums is
great. The recommendation to have a specific minimum and maximum is what we're asking for.

MS. SANTOYO: And what I just was telling was that we would leave it to the Commission of Fine Arts to make that recommendation, in their wisdom.

We think it's better that the authors of the design guidelines actually set that. And we're just asking you to take that into consideration, as our comment.

CHAIR MARCOU: We leave that in the intelligent, capable hands of the Commission of Fine Arts, then. So, you made that recommendation to them, not to us?

MS. SANTOYO: No, I made it to you, because they're one of the authors of the design guidelines. It was a collaborative effort, as we understood it.

CHAIR MARCOU: It was, but ultimately, the Commission of Fine Arts, as you're pointing out, is the authority related to --

MS. SANTOYO: I wasn't asking the
Commissioners to make the recommendation, I was asking the authors of the guidelines to just make that clear.

There was a wonderful Commissioner on the NCPC that, when the draft design guidelines were presented to her, she said, you know, one of the problems with design guidelines is that you can drive a truck through them.

And for that purpose, we believe that you just need to tighten them up. And I believe that Richard Heins actually said that to you as well. Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. We look forward to hearing from the Commission of Fine Arts on its recommendation related to the minimums and maximums --

MS. SANTOYO: You didn’t understand.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- that you're requesting. So, I do want to point out another point, which is that I believe that if they could install just ten cells and cover the District of Columbia, trust me, they would only want to
install ten cells.

They have no interest in going beyond that, as I would think anybody who could accomplish something would ten, would probably not prefer to do 100. But I'm going to leave the comment at that. It's --

MR. WILCOX: It just does seem to me that they're not being charged very much per pole.

And I think to establish that as a beachhead for 20 years is really of substantial value. I think you're selling it way, way, way short. And I can see why they would want to have that. Okay?

CHAIR MARCOU: Sure.

MR. JAMES: If I might?

CHAIR MARCOU: Make sure you have the microphone.

MR. JAMES: Okay.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you.

MR. JAMES: So, I don't believe that the design guidelines prevent other future
providers from entering the marketplace.

CHAIR MARCOU: Correct.

MR. JAMES: Okay. So, I can see why
the four entities that are there so far would
want to gobble up all the places and keep others
out of the marketplace.

So, that might be why they like the
idea of having numerous places to go. If they
have it, then someone else can't use it. So,
just one other point, when you were discussing --

CHAIR MARCOU: I'd like to know if the
Committee members have any further questions for
the panel.

MR. JAMES: Oh, sure.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. Mr. James,
you had something you wanted to add?

MR. JAMES: Just that, regarding the
height, the Master Lease Agreement establishes a
50-feet height limit, unless in the Department's
discretion, a greater height is accepted.

So, that's at odds with the guidelines
and that needs to be dealt with. It's in 5.1.2
of the MLA. It's in our Kalorama Citizens testimony. It was --

CHAIR MARCOU: Right.

MR. JAMES: -- something we discovered.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you.

MR. JAMES: Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. Thank you all very much. I noted that there were three people who also wanted to provide comments, there might be a fourth. So, if you'll step forward?

Is there anybody else present who'd like to put comments on the record with the Public Space Committee? Ma'am, you've already spoken to the Committee, we're moving forward. That was your opportunity to speak to the Committee.

So, we appreciate that, but you can't speak in both a professional and then, come back and speak in a personal capacity. That was your opportunity to provide us with your comments.

You can do so in writing.

MS. POLS: You did let the Gala Theatre
guy do that.

CHAIR MARCOU: I'm sorry?

MS. POLS: You did let the Gala Theatre
guy do that.

CHAIR MARCOU: No, what I did was I
allowed him to read onto the record somebody
else's comments, because that person was no
longer here, and that's all we had him do was
read the comments.

PARTICIPANT: But I wanted extra
comments that I had the video for and you said
she couldn't play it.

CHAIR MARCOU: Right. So, with video,
we need the person here for those comments. For
written testimony, which we receive into the
record, a person can read it into the record.

So, with that said, we look forward to
hearing from the four of you. We'll go from your
left to your right. If you'll state your name
for the record, spell your last name.

MS. POLS: My name is Cynthia Pols,
last name is spelled P-O-L-S. I submitted
testimony on October 5, I hope you have that for
the record.

       CHAIR MARCOU: We do.

       MS. POLS: Okay, great. I'm a member
of the Kalorama Citizens Association and
professionally, I'm a telecommunications
attorney. I don't work for providers, I work for
municipalities, so I have some perspective on
some of these issues.

       I think, for starters, there's all
this talk about 5G. In reality, it's not coming
until 2020. Most of what you're hearing about is
experimental pilot project type things.

       The FCC has yet to auction the
spectrum off that they're going to use for the
5G. The manufacturers are not yet making the 5G
equipment, that's happening next year. The
standard setting bodies are still working on the
standards for the networks.

       So, things are not quite as urgent as
we were led to believe, in terms of needing to
act quickly to allow this technology to get
going.

On the other side of the coin, I would say that 5G is going to have all kinds of revolutionary impacts and we need to think about that and plan for that. But not in the hasty way that the industry would like, which is basically to let them do as they would like to do.

From what we know about it technically, they're going to be operating at very high frequencies, the 28 gigahertz range, which means that their signals don't travel very far.

And in fact, their equipment does have to be very close to the user, that's in the nature of the beast.

Rooftop stuff is sort of a different kind of interim technology that they're doing. So, that probably is not an answer.

But I do think it would be helpful to get a much clearer picture of how the technology's going to work before we set up the rules for the new antenna poles.
We know -- I think part of the talk about not wanting to go into the alleys has to do with the fact that the technology will be used for autonomous vehicles, in all probability, so they want to be on the street side for that reason, as much as the things they said about it somehow being difficult to get into the buildings from the alleys.

I don't think there's any difference between alley versus street for getting into the buildings. As we go through this, we have to think about the visual impact of all of this.

We could, if I'm correct that it's intervals of 250 to 300 feet between antennas, and we're talking about as many as five to ten providers, then we can do the math and figure out how much new poles and new equipment we're looking at in our right-of-way, that's already pretty crowded with all kinds of things.

And I also remember something that has not been talked about at all, which is, a number of these providers intend to connect their
antennas via fiber optic links.

So, they'll be feeding the antennas by a fiber optic network, that's to the good, because that actually reduces some of the emissions people are concerned about.

But it also means there's going to be an awful lot more work in the rights-of-way than you're contemplating, because they're going to be digging for all that. They'll be digging the sidewalks, they'll be digging in the roads.

And so, I think really what we're looking at right now is, they want to do what they call network densification, initially, which is just basically enhanced 4G. That doesn't require things being as close to the user as 5G does, but that equipment will be adaptable to 5G.

So, that's essentially, I think, the industry plan is, we'll improve our existing network with enhanced 4G and that'll be good to go for the 5G.

That's great for them, not so great for us, because we're not thinking about the
significance of unloosing all these new poles in our streets.

So, we have a unique streetscape, it's been talked about at great lengths today, so I won't go over that, but we know it's beautiful. It's got all these great trees, it's got all these wonderful buildings. And so, we want things to fit with that and it's going to be hard to do.

So, I mean, my biggest takeaway from all this, from hearing -- sat through things all day is, we need to slow this train down to get it right, to understand better how the technology's actually going to work so that when you set in place regulations that are supposed to accommodate, you understand what it's going to do.

And I certainly didn't think that, sitting here today, we got a clear, honest picture of how it's actually going to work.

I also want to remind people who may not have been around, 1999, it was a couple years
after the Telecommunications Act was enacted, and everybody thought fiber optics was going to be this really great thing.

And the D.C. Government basically gave permits to every Tom, Dick, and Harry who wanted to tear up our streets to lay fiber optics. And we did and they tore up the streets and made a huge mess and pretty much all the companies went bankrupt.

It was a very sort of unregulated thing. I'm a little bit concerned that we're sort of headed down that road again, based on the fact that we don't have a clear picture of what this technology's actually going to do.

So, that's sort of my cautionary tale to you is, remember that, that was 20 years ago. This could be much worse, because we're talking about a much -- we're talking about fiber optics and all the antenna poles.

I want to -- I don't want to criticize you guys as a body, but I wonder if the Public Space Committee --
CHAIR MARCOU: You're more than welcome to, there's a long list of people who are happy to criticize us.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR MARCOU: But that's part of our job.

MS. POLS: It's not --

CHAIR MARCOU: That is absolutely part of our job.

MS. POLS: It's more a criticism of the fact that I'm not sure that you are structured and equipped to deal with what I'm talking about down the road.

The volume of the work that would be associated with getting this right, if they really are going to do what they say they want to do, it's a huge undertaking.

And I kind of feel like maybe there's a need for a more specialized panel that has oversight over this type of thing, with people who are expert in the area.

And I don't know whether you can do
that under your existing mandate, whether you need new legislation or whether you could just do regulations.

Which takes me to another point, which sort of generally speaking, I would like to see regulations here, as opposed to just guidelines and this sort of vague thing of some guy who grants permits maybe getting these guidelines implemented right.

I think we need a little firmer foundation for things than we have now, in terms of the law.

I didn't really find any regulations that I saw that truly addressed the questions we're dealing with. So, that's kind of the step-back thing that I would advise, that we should try to get regulations.

And if we don't have the legal authority to do them, then perhaps we should speak to the Council and get some framework in place, so that we can do things correctly and some of these issues can be thrashed out in a
more public way, which I think they really need
to do.

And I think on some of the small
details, the things that I would like to see done
better, the guidelines don't require them to
publicly disclose their deployment plans.
There's a process where they can sort of share
them in secret, super-secret.

I kind of think that that should
happen in a more public sort of way, kind of like
when we franchised the cable company, they
disclosed their plans.

This is a little bit more like a cable
franchise than traditional, you know, casual
permits. So, a better sort of public disclosure
of their plans and some more input from the
public.

That seems like, if they disclose the
plans, we have a better opportunity for
coordination. And that's sort of lacking in the
existing guidelines.

And, I mean, I think the CFA has it
right, on terms of the design standards. I mean, we did hear from some of the providers that they all have sort of different plans, so that may be easier said than done. But I think we should explore whether or not that can happen.

And I think our meeting featured the ANCs, I think they need a more clearly defined role in the process, so that they're brought in, on both the plans and the -- I mean, checking the database is a little bit -- it's a hard way to keep track of things.

And then, finally, I think that there's nothing in the guidelines that requires that the adjacent property holders be notified. I really think that they should be.

I also didn't see anything that required that when an applicant comes to you that they have to give you a plan of, not only what they're going to do, but its relationship to the other things that are on the block, so that when you look at this, you know where it is in relationship to the trees, where it is in
relationship to all these other things, so that
the people that are reviewing it are not just
looking at this very narrow drawing of the tower
or the pole and nothing else. So, that's there.

But bottom line, I think a stronger
foundation of regulations would help a lot and
that slow the train down, understand what this
technology's going to do.

Don't accept the industry's -- they
want to do this, we understand that, they want to
do this, but don't accept their say so as to
exactly how it's going to unfold. We need to
independently confirm things. So, I'll stop and
take questions later.

CHAIR MARCOU: No, actually, I'm going
to follow up on --

MS. POLS: Okay.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- a few of the things
you said.

MS. POLS: Okay.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you very much and
we really appreciate it. Some of this was a
little walk down memory lane for me, as a
motorist in the District of Columbia, from 12th
Street specifically, that I think was a, like, a
--

MS. POLS: Yeah.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- local, like, nexus
point for every fiber optic installer in the
late-1990s.

MS. POLS: It was wild.

CHAIR MARCOU: So, a few important
points. Thank you very much.

And thank you very much for the
materials you've provided, I really did -- I read
through them and it was very interesting to
recall some of the issues and the history on
this.

A few points. First, we've been at
this for well over a year, this is at least our
eighth public meeting. We've been holding public
meetings left, right, and center on this.

It's great that it's getting traction,
but we've been putting the notices out there,
we've been telling people about the meetings,
we've been looking forward to public
participation, and it's been a smattering, up to
this point.

It's great that it's happening, it's
just that, in terms of slowing up the train, the
train hasn't been moving at breakneck speed, it -
- this is -- and that's why it's so important
that we have -- frankly, this book is filled with
a lot of information from the public and we love
having it.

We are getting it now, when, as part
of the prior process, it would have been helpful
to have had it then, just as it always is for
everybody. So, that's an important part of this.

Another important part of this is, you
had said you were worried that people wouldn't
know where things were, in relation to the
streetscape.

That's actually a required plan. So,
the required plan will indicate not just, I want
to put an antenna and I want to put this cabinet
MS. POLS: That's in some other regulation.

CHAIR MARCOU: What's that?

MS. POLS: That's in some other regulation, it's not in the guidelines.

CHAIR MARCOU: No, it's in the public space permitting process.

MS. POLS: Okay, that's what I mean --

CHAIR MARCOU: Right.

MS. POLS: -- by other regulation.

CHAIR MARCOU: So, this is an excavation of public space. So, there are, as we've mentioned before, there are other regulations that govern this as well, right? And by other, I mean, additional, right?

So, these guidelines talk about location, frequency, et cetera. I should say frequency of placement. But it doesn't discuss, for example, what the restoration standards will be.

Why? Because the restoration
standards are clearly delineated and defined in Title 24, Chapter 34 of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations, which is, you hire me to be a nerd, that's the nerd part of me.

Title 24, Chapter 34, Section 3403 is a good one to read. If you'd like to learn more about restoration standards, they'd be covered in the standard specifications for highways and structures, which is currently called the Gold Book, it's about this thick.

It used to be the Green Book, before that, it was the Red Book, before that, it was the Blue Book. So, these are very important, very fully robust items that manage the right-of-way.

And review of applications that come in will not be by a person who is pushing papers across the desk. First, it won't be paper, it'll be electronic.

Second, it will go to very relevant, very professional reviewers in particular areas, so that they can work on a comprehensive whole to
make sure that it doesn't damage the street tree,
that it doesn't impact traffic safety, that it
does work within a historic area or Commission of
Fine Arts area, et cetera.

So, we really have a very robust
system that I'd love to give trainings to
everybody on, because it is a state of the art
system in the country.

And it's one that we also look forward
to continuing to improve, which comes back to one
of the other items that you said, so I just want
to make sure I touch that point.

Which is, ANCs are going to be
receiving notice about applications on a fairly
frequent basis.

More frequently than the companies
might initially think, which goes back to what we
talked about in terms of defining the language
about neighborhood from the Master License
Agreement in the draft guidelines.

MS. POLS: I guess I had the impression
on that that the ANCs were brought in in the case
of contested.

CHAIR MARCOU: No.

MS. POLS: The things that get --

CHAIR MARCOU: They are not, they --

MS. POLS: -- kicked up to the --
you're saying they're getting brought in earlier?

CHAIR MARCOU: The specific language is
the following, and this is in the Master License
Agreement, it's -- let me see if I can find it,
just so I can make sure we put it on the record
again.

It's on Page 10 of the Master License
Agreement, it's Section 5.4.4. Prior to
submitting a permit application for the location
and installation of the first wireless
communication facility --

MS. POLS: Yes, that's just the first
one, though.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- in any neighborhood
of the District --

MS. POLS: That's just the first one,
that doesn't --
CHAIR MARCOU: -- the key word there being neighborhood. So, I'll get to that further down the road. But I'm just clarifying for you that there is an ANC notice --

MS. POLS: But that's just the first --

CHAIR MARCOU: If I may finish, just to --

MS. POLS: I have read that, I am familiar with it.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. Well, then, you're familiar with the fact that it requires notice to the ANCs. I'll simply --

MS. POLS: For the first one --

CHAIR MARCOU: -- leave it at that at this point.

MS. POLS: -- we're expecting --

CHAIR MARCOU: In a neighborhood.

MS. POLS: -- many of these.

CHAIR MARCOU: In a neighborhood.

MS. POLS: And neighborhood is not defined.

CHAIR MARCOU: Neighborhood is an
opportunity for us to make sure that it is clearly made notice to the community, as it moves forward.

MS. POLS: But why just the first one?

CHAIR MARCOU: Say that again?

MS. POLS: Why is it just the first one?

CHAIR MARCOU: We'll come back to that --

MS. POLS: It seems an odd --

CHAIR MARCOU: We'll come -- if you --

MS. POLS: -- configuration.

CHAIR MARCOU: If you'd like more specific, we'll make sure that it's covered in the guidelines.

So, if you have a recommendation about how that language could be clarified in the regulation, pardon me, in the guidelines, that would ensure the type of notice that you're looking for, we'd appreciate seeing it. Thank you.

MS. POLS: Okay. I think, just one
second. That was part of why I wanted the plans
to be disclosed to the ANCs, so that they would
have a sense of what was --

    CHAIR MARCOU: They are.

    MS. POLS: -- the deployment plans, not
the site-specific ones, but the broader
deployment plans, so that --

    CHAIR MARCOU: They are. That's why
it's in there.

    MS. POLS: No. No, those are not the
deployment plans, that's the first pole that they
want to put up.

    CHAIR MARCOU: It's not first pole.

    MS. POLS: Initial.

    CHAIR MARCOU: It's not initial pole.

    MS. POLS: That's what it says. Thank
you.

    CHAIR MARCOU: I'm just going to state
one thing to make sure you understand this, okay?
We are very cognizant of our responsibility and
duty to the citizens of the District of Columbia,
who have entrusted in us the responsibility to
manage that right-of-way.

We have those interests fully in mind and we look forward to making sure that your concerns about it are addressed. Okay?

MS. POLS: Thank you.

MS. MLADINOV: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. My name is Ann, A-N-N, Mladinov, M-L-A-D-I-N-O-V. I'm representing ANC 3B.

I'm sorry that we're not on the list as speakers, but our meeting in October was just last Thursday, when we adopted our position on the small cell technology. That was the first time that we could get to it, so we didn't have a chance to make the October 5 deadline.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay.

MS. MLADINOV: We really appreciate the invitation to participate today that came to all the ANCs and your public presentations.

We were also very happy to hear at our October meeting that our Councilmember Mary Cheh is hoping to hold her own roundtable discussion on the small cell technology issue and gather the
perspectives from DDOT, as well as others who are interested.

It's clear today, from all of the presentations, that you've reached to a very wide range of the citizens of Washington, at this roundtable, and I really appreciated the chance to hear them.

I wanted to read our letter, not all the boilerplate, but the key sections. I'll go on that.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you.

MS. MLADINOV: We support development of systems to accommodate effective higher speed telecommunications in the District, but we have major concerns about the content of the draft guidelines, the rushed timetable for review, and the significant flaws in the process of developing the regulatory framework for this technology in the city, including the short notice and very abbreviated opportunity for ANCs and the public to comment on the proposed guidelines.
From our perspective as an ANC, the almost invisible process DDOT has followed to develop and finalize the guidelines and the MLAs, the absence of provisions for ANC and public input on specific proposals for small cell installations in public space, as well as on the provisions of the basic MLA and the specific terms of the MLAs signed to-date.

The terms of the MLAs allow providers to go forward with their desired small cell installations without further public review, once the provider has received approval for its first installation.

And DDOT's proposal to allow providers to put as many as two new poles on each block to hold small cell units and install a refrigerator size auxiliary unit above ground on every block.

Though DDOT has recognized that shared poles, including public utility poles, could be used and the auxiliary units could be placed underground where they would not intrude on public space and the look for the area.
For residents and visitors to Washington, D.C., the visual appearance of the city's residential and commercial neighborhoods is a major factor in the quality of life and day-to-day experiences in the District.

Protection of the vistas in the parks around the city, on the National Mall, and in Historic Districts is also essential to preserving the historic architectural and cultural heritage of the District and the nation, which is also a foundation of the region's economy and tourism.

We are very concerned that having so many additional poles holding small cell boxes over sidewalks and in other public space, along with sizable auxiliary boxes above ground, would create significant visual clutter, as well as safety risks, in our residential and commercial neighborhoods.

The added objects in sidewalks and public spaces would create obstacles and block sight lines for pedestrians, motorists, and those
who use assistive devices, bikes, and scooters.

The ANCs, community organizations, and the public in general have had very little notice of the steps being taken by DDOT to facilitate small cell technology, the design guidelines DDOT is proposing, or the changes that DDOT's proposal could mean for our communities and the health and well-being of people in the city.

DDOT notified ANCs in late August about the proposed small cell technology guidelines, held one information meeting for ANC Commissioners about the proposed guidelines the first week of September, immediately after Labor Day, which was not well attended, organized a second informational meeting on September 25, after most ANCs had held their September meetings, set a deadline of October 5 for ANCs and members of the public to submit written comments, which was before most ANCs had their October meetings, and scheduled the roundtable today, on October 15.

That time table has significantly
reduced the chance for ANCs to participate in the process.

DDOT notes in the proposed guidelines the unique nature of the District's streetscape and states that the public space enhances the quality of life for residents and visitors, and also provides the foundation for the city to become a more walkable and sustainable city.

But the guidelines fail to protect the unique streetscapes and public space that are so vital to the District.

DDOT and its Public Space Committee have the authority for regulating the small cell technology installations in public space and must take into account these matters before adopting design guidelines and standards for governing installation of this next generation of communications technology.

For all the above reasons, we strongly urge DDOT, one, to delay consideration of the proposed guidelines until further informational meetings about the small cell technology can be
held in each Ward, the D.C. Council has held
hearings on the subject, and residents and ANCs
have had fuller opportunity to review and comment
on the proposed guidelines.

Two, to provide the public with more
detailed information about the technology.

Three, to analyze in greater depth and
report to the public on the potential impacts of
the installation of small cell technology on the
city's streetscape, quality of life, and the
health and well-being of the public.

Four, to amend the proposed guidelines
to ensure that affected ANCs and the public have
at least 30 days to review and comment on each
proposed installation of small cell technology in
a neighborhood, and also, to put in place a
process to hear and respond to any ANC comments
and objections to the installations.

Five, to amend the MLAs with
providers, including agreements that providers
and DDOT have already signed, to require that
notice be given to affected ANCs and the Council
about proposed small cell installations, beyond
just the provider's initial installation.

And also, to call for DDOT to consider
comments from affected ANC s and the public on
proposed small cell installations in public space
in a neighborhood, before DDOT approves the
additional installations beyond that first one.

Six, to require companies installing
small cell technology in the District to provide
additional benefits to residents, such as free
Wi-Fi in disadvantaged areas of the city, in
exchange for the permission to install their
technology in public space or on public utility
poles.

This letter was approved by a vote of
5-0 at a duly noticed regular meeting of the
Commission on October 11, 2018, in which a quorum
was present.

Thank you for your attention to this
important matter for the city. Sincerely, Brian
Turmail, Chairman. Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you.
MR. ENKAMIT: Can you pull up the video on the --

CHAIR MARCOU: Sure, is it in the USB drive?

MR. ENKAMIT: Yes. DNA Damage.

CHAIR MARCOU: I'm sorry, which one?

MR. ENKAMIT: DNA Damage.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay.

MR. ENKAMIT: Before you begin --

CHAIR MARCOU: Sure, give me a second, it'll probably start playing, so I'm going to put it on pause, so we can increase the size and make sure -- I'm -- Jonathan, if there's audio from that machine, are we able to hear it? Okay.

Well, we'll find out in a second.

Okay. Would you like me to start playing? I think you need to introduce yourself and spell your last name, at a minimum.

MR. ENKAMIT: My name is Brian Enkamit, last name is spelled E-N-K-A-M-I-T. I'm a resident Brightwood area of D.C. and I have a business in the Manor Park area of D.C.
CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you.

MR. ENKAMIT: And I'm sorry, maybe I've been asleep for the last year, but I haven't heard any announcements about any of this discussion about bringing small cell into D.C. So, I just found out about this meeting last week and I rushed back from out of town to be here.

CHAIR MARCOU: May I ask you, ask everybody at the table, real quick, before we go forward, so, you're an ANC Commissioner, correct? Do any of you look at the D.C. Register, where notices are published about public meetings on a regular basis --

MR. ENKAMIT: No.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- and serves as the official organ for the District of Columbia Government for providing notice to the public of meetings?

MR. ENKAMIT: No.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay. Thank you.

That's all I --

MR. ENKAMIT: I do listen to the radio.
I do watch T.V.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay.

MR. ENKAMIT: So, those are options in terms of getting the word out as well. More effective than having people look in the Register, that most people can't even find, probably. Just saying.

CHAIR MARCOU: I hear you.

MR. ENKAMIT: Okay. I was listening earlier to a lot of the -- I wish the people from those companies were still here.

CHAIR MARCOU: They are.

MR. ENKAMIT: Really?

CHAIR MARCOU: They're all -- I'm looking at a representative from AT&T. I'm looking at a representative from Verizon.

MR. ENKAMIT: The people who were testifying, are they here now?

CHAIR MARCOU: Yes, they're here.

MR. ENKAMIT: How many of you all live in the District? Okay. I just wanted to know.

CHAIR MARCOU: No, Gus, they wanted to
know who from the companies lives in the District of Columbia.

MR. ENKAMIT: Yes. But you want to bring your product in to me, right? I just want to make sure I'm clear about that part.

CHAIR MARCOU: I live in the District.

MR. ENKAMIT: I do too, which is why I'm concerned about this issue.

CHAIR MARCOU: As are we.

MR. ENKAMIT: I heard you talking earlier about regulations for newspaper boxes --

CHAIR MARCOU: Yes, sir.

MR. ENKAMIT: -- how specific they are, the size, the paint, the lettering. If I wanted to put a newspaper box up and I wanted to put lead paint on that box, would you allow it?

CHAIR MARCOU: See, we don't regulate lead paint. That's a great -- thank you, that's a perfect example. We don't regulate lead paint. That would --

MR. ENKAMIT: So, I could do it?

CHAIR MARCOU: -- be a -- no, I didn't
say you could do it, I said we don't regulate that.

That would probably be a Department of Health matter and that would be the entity to whom you would turn, because the Department of Health has the subject matter expertise, the authority, and jurisdiction to regulate that element.

We would have the authority to, just like they wouldn't have the authority to regulate whether it was attached to a streetlight, we would.

So, different government agencies have different authorities and jurisdictions to govern those things that are within their purview and within their authority. So --

MR. ENKAMIT: So, if I want --

CHAIR MARCOU: -- in our case --

MR. ENKAMIT: -- to put a box up --

CHAIR MARCOU: Sorry, say that again?

MR. ENKAMIT: If I want to put a box up, I have to come to you and get approval for
the box, the colors, whatever. I go to them to figure out the paint is good. Is that what you're saying? Is that how the process works? I'm just --

CHAIR MARCOU: Generally speaking, that would be the process.

MR. ENKAMIT: Okay.

CHAIR MARCOU: But I don't know that you need to go to them to get official permission for the paint.

I think you would find that a paint sold in the District of Columbia would presumably meet guidelines, if you went to Home Depot. But I leave that with the Department of Health. That's a great question to ask them.

MR. ENKAMIT: Okay. So, my concern is, if it's in the public space, you're not concerned about that?

CHAIR MARCOU: About --

MR. ENKAMIT: The effect of the paint on the box, in terms of the people that might be exposed to that paint.
CHAIR MARCOU: Do I have a concern about that?

MR. ENKAMIT: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: That's --

MR. ENKAMIT: Your agency?

CHAIR MARCOU: That's an irrelevant question for the purposes of the Public Space Committee.

MR. ENKAMIT: How is --

CHAIR MARCOU: We don't have -- and I'll tell you why. We don't have jurisdiction or authority over paint in public space.

MR. ENKAMIT: You're talking about --

CHAIR MARCOU: Sorry. Let me be clear. We hear your question, why don't you tee up the question for us in writing and we'll make sure you get a response?

MR. ENKAMIT: Okay. Because you said you had very -- a lot of regulations about the boxes. I just assumed that paint would be a part of the regulations. Let's play the video, please.

CHAIR MARCOU: So, the regulations on
newspaper boxes are available at dcregs.dc.gov, as is the D.C. Register.

It's a great one-stop-shop for all sorts of information related to the District of Columbia Government and its regulatory authority and its announcements.

MR. ENKAMIT: Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Okay.

(Video plays.)

MR. ENKAMIT: So, I've got a suggestion. Because we want to roll out this 5G technology, there's a rat problem in D.C., why don't we put them all underground?

Because there won't be anybody to ride around in these driverless cars in 150 years, if this man and the scientist are saying, what they're saying is true. There will be no people to ride in driverless cars to need 5G.

There's no 5G technology, there's no -- it's just a rush to make money for companies, without -- putting the health of the public citizens at risk.
And it's a signal, if you only
regulate the public space, then why are you
allowing the signal to come into my house?

CHAIR MARCOU: Again, those are great
questions to take to the relevant authorities.

MR. ENKAMIT: Well -- okay.

CHAIR MARCOU: In this case, our
understanding is that it would be the Federal
Communications Commission.

And then, from the Federal
Communications Commission, whichever agency or
department of the District of Columbia would have
jurisdiction or authority over that element of
the Federal Communications Commission's standards
and guidelines.

MR. ENKAMIT: So, what you're saying to
me is, you regulate the public space. You don't
put something in the public space that's going to
impact me in my private space. That's what
you're doing.

CHAIR MARCOU: I'm sorry. So, what I'm
hearing you say is, your concern is about radio
1 frequencies reaching into your private property.

   MR. ENKAMIT: Exactly. I don't need to
2 know how much trash is in my trash bin, I can
3 figure it out myself.
4
5 I don't need to know how much milk is
6 in my refrigerator, I can look in it and see. I
7 don't even drink milk. So, the 5G, the internet
8 of things, is all a gimmick.

   But the most important point is made
9 here, that if we don't stop this train that's
10 rolling down the track, there will be nobody
11 running around for you to build the internet.
12
   It's a very serious thing. We can
13 stay within our little boxes and act like we're
14 not -- and be tunnel vision about this.
15
   But we need to take a little broader
16 approach to dealing with the realities of what
17 this internet is doing to us, what the radio
18 frequencies are doing to us and our children.
19
   And there's all kinds of evidence that
20 shows, thousands and thousands of scientific
21 evidence that show that when you combine one
toxin with another -- so lead is a problem,
there's a problem in the environment in D.C.
When you combine radio frequencies with lead,
they done studies that show it increases the
amount of toxicity in your system.

So, a lot of children in D.C. have
lead in their systems. So, it's okay to push out
this energy and adversely affect these children,
because we don't regulate the public -- we only
regulate the public space. I think it's a cop out. Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you, sir. Hold on
one second, sir. Sir? Let Jonathan assist with
removing it and putting in a new one. Thank you.

And I want to say to the staff who
have been here throughout this, thank you very
much, we truly appreciate your support of this
event.

It allows -- I don't believe that's
ours, I believe that is that gentleman's, or that
young lady's.

MR. MCCLAIN: Next one up, one up,
right there. Okay. My name is James McClain.

CHAIR MARCOU: And how do you spell your last name, sir?

MR. MCCLAIN: M-C-C-L-A-I-N. I'm a long-term resident of D.C., I grew up here, I was born here. I've seen the city and how it's changed over the years.

CHAIR MARCOU: Me too.

MR. MCCLAIN: I'm very, very concerned about 5G and it coming into my neighborhood, on my street. And --

CHAIR MARCOU: Do you want to let us know what address you live at? You don't have to, but if you are interested -- or what Ward, or what neighborhood?

MR. MCCLAIN: I'm in Cardozo area, Adams Morgan. And as you know, that area's been very, very impacted by parking.

And when you say you do public space, I'm kind of -- I keep reflecting about all these move-in signs that go up and you have to clear that parking spaces on almost the entire block,
when it's almost like battling to get a parking space on a daily basis. So, but anyway, that's another matter. You may not deal with that.

But this one right here, there's a public impact by the use of our right-of-way, that affects children, the elderly, people whose health is compromised.

And in the public way, where the 5G would be at, despite what industry hasn't said about the health effects and hasn't gone into how that's going to impact the people of the District of Columbia, all these people are going to be right there on the street where this 5G is taking place.

Now, I'm retired. I used to be a customer service engineer at Xerox. And we had cell phones that we had strapped to our side. And after a while, I didn't want to keep it to my side, I didn't know why, but I took it off my side. And then, after a while, I said, there's pain there.

And there's talk about the effects of
this Wi-Fi and 5G and the combined
electromagnetic frequencies affecting us. And
I've heard people say they get headaches and they
get all this.

    Well, I didn't have any of that. But
after a while, I felt pain on that side. And so,
I would cut it off and I would walk down the
street and I would say, okay, it's fine, no
problem.

    And one day, I felt it and I said,
there's still pain there. So, I cut if off and I
pulled it out and it's on. So, it does affect
the system. Okay.

    So, if our children and elderly and
who have compromised immune systems are on that
street with that 5G, it's like putting them in
the line of something that's deleterious to their
health at the moment, and it continues with a
long-term exposure. They can't even sleep,
because of the effects coming into the house also
at that street level.

    So, when I see these antennas go on
top of buildings, I seen one it's on a high-rise 
at the corner there, at 14th, way up high, and 
it's the kind that I see in the magazines that 
says, this is the kind that sends out microwave 
radiation, I get appalled.

And when I see 5G coming to the 
street, less than probably 30-50 feet to my 
bedroom window, that's too much.

So, am I not -- I'm not just saying 
that I'm against it, I'm saying the public health 
effect is not being addressed or looked at. And 
if you're talking about the health of the people 
of the District of Columbia, this is foremost.

But, the video.

(Video plays.)

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you.

MR. MCCLAIN: One other thing.

CHAIR MARCOU: Yes, sir.

MR. MCCLAIN: Children are walking 
around through the streets with their cell phones 
to their ears constantly.

In the small print in all the
companies, it says, it's not to touch the head. But they don't push that out. You're looking at an epidemic in the future, if it goes through.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. Do Committee members have any questions for the panel? I just want to note how it's clear how fervently and how committed to this concern you are. I strongly encourage you to follow up with the appropriate authorities about it.

MR. ENKAMIT: But if you are already setting the standards on deployment, you can put a stop to the deployment, can you not?

CHAIR MARCOU: So, we really appreciate the panel's time.

MR. ENKAMIT: So, you can't?

CHAIR MARCOU: If you'd like to put that question in writing, please do so.

MR. ENKAMIT: Okay, I will.

CHAIR MARCOU: And to that end, we're going to keep the record for the Public Space Committee hearing -- pardon me for one second. Is there anybody else present who
would like to speak to the Public Space Committee regarding this material who hasn't already had the opportunity to speak?

MS. SCARATO: I haven't as a person, as a mom. I delivered the Environmental Health Trust, as a scientist, I'm -- I'm --

CHAIR MARCOU: So, you had the opportunity to speak to the Committee --

MS. SCARATO: But I didn't understand that, I thought that was the Environmental Health Trust, the organization. If I had known that I could do my personal then, I would have done that too. I thought I was separate.

I tried many times to call, I was on the phone with the D.C. Government trying to reach someone to ask questions about the public hearing and the guidelines, and I could not reach -- I wrote to someone named Elliot, I spoke to someone on your panel, who sent me to someone else --

CHAIR MARCOU: Then, I'll do the following. Thank you all very much, we
appreciate your time. We'd appreciate the
opportunity to hear from you as a mother.

MS. SCARATO: Thank you. I truly
believe that if all the mothers and fathers in
Washington, D.C. were aware of this issue, if
they looked at the Federal Register -- which I've
never looked at myself, and I apologize for that,
I found out about this from an email from someone
several weeks ago, of course, professionally.

Personally, nobody I know who I've
spoken to, when I tell them about this, they say,
what? What are you talking about?

And this is happening, of course, in
Montgomery County and in Maryland as well, but I
come to D.C. a lot with my kids.

And I know a lot of people who live in
Washington, D.C., parents who are not aware that
this is happening, that there are going to be
antennas on their street, in front of where they
live.

And I don't think this is in the
interest that they have not been informed about
this. It's not good enough to just put it in the Federal Register, you have to let people know. This is not like newspaper boxes, this is --

MR. JAMES: I need to ask a question, excuse me --

MS. SCARATO: -- antennas -- and are you interrupting me?

MR. JAMES: -- are people allowed to film what's going on?

CHAIR MARCOU: Pardon me for one second.

MR. JAMES: I apologize for that.

MS. SCARATO: Oh, yes. Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: So, Mr. James, if you'll have a seat please, I'd appreciate you having a seat.

MR. JAMES: Sure.

CHAIR MARCOU: Unless there's an urgent matter that requires you to stand. I'd like to keep some relevant decorum to the meeting.

MR. JAMES: Okay.

CHAIR MARCOU: And so, as I said at the
very beginning and I will clarify again, and I believe this meeting has primarily been almost entirely recorded, correct?

MS. SCARATO: Actually, no, I only did certain ones, I didn't have enough --

CHAIR MARCOU: But you've recorded --

MS. SCARATO: -- the little thing that has the data on it, I didn't have enough to record the whole meeting. I really wish it were all recorded with views. But she can record, that's fine.

CHAIR MARCOU: So, with that said, I just want to clarify, Mr. James, as I said at the beginning, yes, this is an open public meeting. It is subject to being recorded and the people who speak at the meeting are subject to being recorded.

MR. JAMES: It sounded like that was by this Committee or the Government, which I would expect so there would be a record, but not, like, the companies who want this favor from this Committee, when there's somebody here who's
obviously in opposition to their point of view.

To me, it seems very threatening.

Unless I'm totally mistaken that this woman here is filming this woman here.

CHAIR MARCOU: Well, Mr. -- I'm going to leave it at this. The activity that I have seen today regarding recording of the meeting has not created a hostile environment or threatened anybody, as we've seen it objectively here on the dais.

We have been aware of the recording going on, but by both the person who is testifying now and earlier, by AT&T, when this person was first testifying, and now again. So, are you going to turn that off while I'm talking about the recording?

MS. SCARATO: No, I'm just showing him --

CHAIR MARCOU: Great.

MS. SCARATO: -- if I'm recording.

CHAIR MARCOU: So, with that said --

MS. SCARATO: It's okay.
CHAIR MARCOU: -- everybody is on the same page. These are open public meetings, they are subject to being recorded by any person who is present.

MR. JAMES: Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Sure, no worries.

MR. JAMES: I apologize.

CHAIR MARCOU: You did that -- Mr. James, I'm very familiar with you, you and I have had a long and very fruitful relationship regarding public space in Kalorama and the city generally.

I would simply say that you are reflective of your concern. And it's an important concern to have expressed and have addressed. So, with that said, I would like you to continue, if you may.

MS. SCARATO: Thank you. And I appreciate your concern as well. I was shocked when I found out, not only about small cells coming into front yards, but several years ago, when I found out that there was a memo that
Motorola had written about war gaming the science related to this issue.

And that's how we're here today, where you are in the uncomfortable position of having to decide on something so important and there are no federal guidelines that protect the people.

But I think that the people need to know and I hope that you will consider, maybe in the public space, since that's what you do, putting up signs about cell phone radiation and impacts on our health.

Because there is much literature in the science that shows effects, including the conclusion that this kind of radiation is a human carcinogen by several independent scientists. There are actually several papers that conclude that, based on the body of evidence.

So, I just think that you can -- you asked me earlier about what can -- do we have authority? You do have authority.

You're about to have authority to allow these installations, so you do have
authority to decide what will be in the right-of-way.

And I think that you should consult with the Washington D.C. lawyers that are part of the D.C. Government and ask them about what you can do, in terms of what is your authority? Can you say, we're not okay with this in our public space? What can you say? I hope that you will figure that out.

So, thank you for letting me speak. And I hope you'll learn more about this issue, because most people are completely unaware and they need to be informed. But they're not reading the Register, nor are they reading the peer reviewed science.

So, that's the problem, is that our airwaves are governed by companies that sell us things, advertisements, T.V., and people are not being informed about this issue at all. Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you. I did want to clarify one point. When I said the Register,
I apologize, I wasn't clear, I meant the D.C. Register.

The Federal Register, more power to them, it's about the federal government. But the District of Columbia Register is where our --

MS. SCARATO: Yes.

CHAIR MARCOU: -- public meetings are noticed. And so, that is at dcregs, R-E-G-S, so, it's dcregs.dc.gov.

MS. SCARATO: Could I also add that the FCC currently has in place a former lawyer for a company, for a wireless company, and the former commissioner, the head of the FCC, was the former top lobbyist for the CTIA, who of course, wasn't here to speak.

But I wanted to point out that our -- the FCC is under regulatory capture. They are not acting in the interest of protecting people in terms of health, they have no health people who are even working for them. They are moving forward with this at lightning speeds.

So, telling us to go to the federal
agencies or telling people, like me as a parent, to be told to go to the federal agencies, when they're not -- we're not seeing any action there.

There's actually been an open docket on human exposure to radio frequencies for years now, for about five years now, and there's been no action on it.

So, there's nothing happening there, that's why at the very local level, I hope, as a parent, that D.C. will make the right decision for families in the open space. This is their space. Thank you.

CHAIR MARCOU: Thank you very much. With that said, unless there is anybody else who is interested in speaking to the Public Space Committee about this matter, we'll conclude the meeting at 8:29 in the evening on October 15, which is the day it started.

I will note that we will keep this record for this particular meeting open for another two weeks, so that means October 29 is the deadline for any of the follow-up questions,
comments, or materials that was requested by the Committee, or that anybody would like to provide to us.

    You can do so by emailing public.spacecommittee@dc.gov. That's public.spacecommittee@dc.gov. That's the official email address of record for the Public Space Committee. Any other email form of notification is not considered official to the Public Space Committee.

    In addition, you can either hand deliver to our offices at 1100 Fourth Street Southwest, on the Third Floor, or you can mail to us at our offices, the District Department of Transportation, care of the Public Space Regulation Division, at either 55 M Street Southeast, which has a zip code of 20003, I believe, or 1100 Fourth Street Southwest, Third Floor, which has a zip code of 20024. And with that, our meeting is adjourned.

    (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 8:30 p.m.)
nealgross.com
Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.
Washington DC
www.nealrgross.com
safely
safest
safety
sacrificing
scarcity
scattered
security
select
seeking
seek
seeking
services
set
setup
settings
sessions
setback
setup
seven
seven-chances
seven-inches
serving
servicemen
service
services
sessions
set
setup
seven
seven-chances
seven-inches
CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Small Cell Technology in DC

Before: DC Public Space Committee

Date: 10-15-18

Place: Washington, DC

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

[Signature]

Court Reporter