

3225 MAIN STREET • P.O. BOX 226  
BARNSTABLE, MASSACHUSETTS 02630



CAPE COD  
COMMISSION

(508) 362-3828 • Fax (508) 362-3136 • [www.capecodcommission.org](http://www.capecodcommission.org)

**Minutes**  
**Cape Cod Commission Subcommittee Public Hearing**  
**Wireless Communications Tower/Mashpee Fire Station #2**  
**(Commission File No. 18012)**  
**September 5, 2018**  
**Mashpee Public Library**  
**Mashpee, MA**

Subcommittee Members Present: Ernest Virgilio (Mashpee – Subcommittee Chair), Fred Chirigotis (Barnstable), Richard Roy (Dennis), David Weeden (Native American Representative), and Harold Mitchell (Sandwich)

Commission Staff Present: Jonathon Idman (Chief Regulatory Officer), Michele White (Regulatory Officer), and Kristen Clothier (Regulatory Officer)

---

**Minutes Summary:** At the September 5 public hearing, the Cape Cod Commission’s “Commission” Subcommittee held a public hearing on a Development of Regional Impact (“DRI”), **Wireless Communications Tower/Mashpee Fire Station #2 (Commission File No. 18012)**. The DRI is being reviewed pursuant to Section 13 of the *Enabling Regulations Governing Review of Developments of Regional Impact* (revised April 2018). The applicant’s representatives, Commission staff, and a Wireless Consultant to the Commission presented information about the proposed project and responded to questions. The Subcommittee heard comments from members of the public. Following Subcommittee discussion, the Subcommittee decided to continue the public hearing to Monday, September 17 at 5:30 p.m. at Commission offices at 3225 Main Street in Barnstable, MA.

---

### **Introduction and Project Overview**

The Subcommittee Chair Mr. Virgilio opened the public hearing on the **Wireless Communications Tower/Mashpee Fire Station #2** DRI. Jonathon Idman, Chief Regulatory Officer of the Commission, then reviewed the hearing notice for the proposed project (“Project”). The applicant is Blue Sky Towers II, LLC (“Applicant”) and the carriers that initially propose to locate on the Wireless Communications Tower (“WCT”) are Verizon Wireless and T-Mobile (“Carriers”). The proposed project is the construction of a 150-foot-tall wireless communications monopole with appurtenant equipment and supporting site improvements within a 100’ x 100’ leased area on land owned by the Town of Mashpee at 101 Red Brook Road.

Mr. Idman stated that anyone wishing to testify orally would be welcome to do so during the public hearing, and that written comments could also be submitted at the hearing or delivered by mail to the Cape Cod Commission at

P.O. Box 226, 3225 Main Street, Barnstable until the hearing is closed. Project documents and meeting notices are also available for the public to review on the Commission's website (<http://www.capecodcommission.org>). He said that the Commission received a number of public comments for the Project, which are posted on the Commission's website along with all the project materials. The materials are also available at the Commission's office. The hours of operation and the phone number for contacting the Commission for further information or to schedule an appointment were also provided.

Mr. Idman said that Commission staff would be audiotaping the public hearing for the purpose of compiling minutes.

Ernest Virgilio introduced himself as Mashpee's representative to the Cape Cod Commission and asked the other members of the Commission Subcommittee to introduce themselves: Fred Chirigotis, Barnstable; Richard Roy, Dennis; David Weeden, Native American Representative; and Harold Mitchell, Sandwich.

Mr. Virgilio said that due to the number of people in attendance and the number of people who signed up to speak, he would hold everyone to 3 minutes for their public comments to give everyone an equal opportunity to speak during the public hearing, following the presentations by the Applicant, Commission staff, and the Commission's Wireless Consultant.

### **Applicant Presentation**

The Applicant then had the opportunity to present on the proposed project. Attorney Liz Thompson introduced herself as the attorney for the Applicant. She then introduced those in attendance to present on and answer questions about the project: Jesse Moreno, Project Engineer, ProTerra Design Group; Keith Vellante, C<sup>2</sup> Systems Radio-frequency Engineer on behalf of Verizon Wireless; Richard Kariuki, T-Mobile Radio-frequency Engineer; and Phil Cotto of Structure Consulting on behalf of Verizon Wireless.

Atty. Thompson then provided an overview of the Project. The proposal is for a 150-foot monopole-type wireless communications tower ("WCT") within a 100-foot x 100-foot leased area at Mashpee Fire Station #2 at 101 Red Brook Road. While Verizon Wireless and T-Mobile are not technically co-applicants, they are fully committed in binding writing to co-locate on this facility upon approval.

Verizon Wireless will be located at 146 feet above ground level ("AGL") and T-Mobile will be located at 136 feet AGL. The application also includes the town's EMS antennas which are proposed to be placed at 100 feet AGL. Both Verizon Wireless and T-Mobile are proposing a 12-panel antenna array at their respective WCT locations, with ground equipment and a propane fuel backup generator for each company for emergency purposes within the fenced compound.

The site is the result of a Request for Proposals ("RFP") issued by the Town of Mashpee; Blue Sky Towers was the successful bidder. Atty. Thompson said that what this means is that the Town recognized that there was a coverage gap in this area of Mashpee and selected this site as the preferred Town location to place that facility. The facility would be located to the east of the Mashpee Fire Station, as close to the existing fire station as possible to limit disturbance and to preserve the woodlands in this area which provide a natural buffer. Access to the site would be over a 20-foot-wide access drive over the existing paved part of the Mashpee Fire Station and then continuing over a 12-foot proposed gravel driveway. A 70-foot x 70-foot area would be surrounded by a chain-link fence, topped with barbed wire for additional security; the fence would be locked at all times. The facility would be generally maintenance-free and not create any traffic; there would only be routine maintenance about once/month.

The proposed facility can also accommodate up to two additional wireless service providers below where Verizon Wireless and T-Mobile will be locating. Atty. Thompson said that this might limit the need for additional new WCTs in the area in the future.

On April 14, 2018, the Applicant had a balloon test performed which was publicly noticed. Town of Mashpee planning staff and Commission staff helped identify representative locations from which to assess tower visibility. The balloon was flown at 150 feet and 125 feet. Photo simulations were prepared by the Applicant. Based on comments provided by the Commission's Wireless Consultant re: scaling issues in some of the photographs, the Applicant revised the photo simulations and resubmitted them to the Commission. The Applicant also provided photo simulations at 125 feet per the comments of the Commission's Wireless Consultant and submitted these to the Commission.

Atty. Thompson said that the 150-foot height provides optimal coverage for Verizon Wireless and T-Mobile. She noted that as the WCT height is lowered, so is the coverage. In addition, the WCT is still visible at 125 feet in the photo simulations. The taller height allows for two additional providers in the future. She urged the Subcommittee to recommend the proposed 150-foot tower to the Commission.

Mr. Vellante of C<sup>2</sup> Systems then presented on behalf of the Verizon Wireless RF group. He briefly discussed their network in the area of Mashpee, some of the deficiencies it's faced with, and how the proposed site benefits their network. Mr. Vellante presented coverage maps from the RF report that was prepared on 4/3/18, including coverage for the existing Verizon Wireless facilities in the area and the proposed site. As you get further away from the sites, impediments such as tree cover and topography degrade the signal to the point where it becomes unreliable and affects service. They are aiming to fill out coverage areas and provide more reliable networks to users without losing connectivity. In addition to presenting on the need from a coverage standpoint, he noted that the network also needs to be able to support all the demand on the network (capacity). He then presented maps that showed that in addition to coverage, there is a capacity benefit. It is a 2-fold scenario: improve coverage and handle capacity/demand on the network.

Mr. Karinki then presented on behalf of T-Mobile. He presented a map showing the existing coverage for T-Mobile and the coverage gap. The new site at 135 feet shows that they would cover most of the southern part of the coverage gap, which is the objective for the site in terms of T-Mobile coverage. At the lower height of 110 feet they lose coverage of the southern part and more so at 85 feet. The higher height of 135 feet would provide good coverage for their customers, especially for the 4G network.

### **Commission Staff Presentation**

Mr. Idman then presented on behalf of Commission staff. He noted Commission staff, the Mashpee Town Planner, and the Commission's Wireless Consultant, David Maxson of Isotrope LLC, prepared reports for the hearing which were included in the materials. As is the case with any WCT that the Commission looks at, the primary issue is the potential regional visual impacts that could be associated with the WCT. The Subcommittee, and then the Commission, will have to chart the course for this review. After hearing all the presentations and the public comments, the Subcommittee should determine what course it wants to take. If the Subcommittee feels there will be regional visual impact associated with the Project, then they may want to ask some questions of the Applicant regarding coverage, alternative designs, etc. that may ultimately lead to changes in the proposed siting and design of the project to address identified impacts.

In terms of Commission staff review, Mr. Idman noted that there are some distinct positives associated with this particular proposal:

- Limited and minimized amount of clearing
- The existing parcel is developed in part (with Mashpee Fire Station) and otherwise heavily wooded
- Footprint relatively close to Mashpee Fire Station to minimize amount of new disturbance
- Woods can serve to visually buffer the WCT
- Set back from property lines according to Commission's regulations set out in the Wireless Technical Bulletin

Mr. Idman also said that there are distinct benefits associated with siting a WCT on municipal property:

- Municipal permitting relationship; additional level of ownership control when a WCT is located on municipal land
- Important in case of abandonment; direct property right between landowner and lessee to remove WCT
- Applicant is relying on natural vegetation to screen site; if any site clearing is considered, Town is in control

Commission staff didn't have concerns under the Regional Policy Plan analysis.

Some of the items referenced in the staff report were provided subsequently by the Applicant. At the request of the Commission, the Applicant submitted: a stormwater management report; alternative photo simulations at 125 feet; and alternative coverage maps for T-Mobile and Verizon Wireless investigating proposed coverage at different heights and frequencies.

The WCT is visible from a few residential properties within direct vicinity of the fire station as shown on the photosimulations. Commission staff identified important public viewsheds – bay, scenic, historic, important conservation land; from those vantage points either the proposed WCT can't be seen according to photosimulations or there is very limited visual impact. The Subcommittee will have to ultimately determine whether the WCT is regionally visually impactful; if yes, they should have a further discussion with the Commission's Wireless Consultant and with the Applicant about possible alternative designs.

Commission staff would suggest that this site seems to be a pretty good candidate given the amount of restricted conservation land in this part of Mashpee; this site is not on conservation land/restricted for conservation.

If the Commission were to discuss alternative siting/design, it might consider discussing lowering the height of the WCT, but this might give up some of the co-location potential; this should be done in consultation with the Commission's Wireless Consultant and with the Applicant in terms of what lowering the height might mean for coverage.

### **Commission Wireless Consultant Presentation**

David Maxson, Wireless Consultant to the Commission, said that the Commission's Wireless Technical Bulletin sets out standards for what the Commission is looking for from Applicants when they file their applications and he then reviewed items from the Wireless Technical Bulletin relevant to the proposed project. He reviewed the findings outlined in the report he prepared for the hearing and discussed supplemental materials submitted by the Applicant.

Mr. Maxson began by discussing radio-frequency emissions associated with the proposed tower and wireless towers in general, the relatively low risks to human health and safety of emissions from wireless towers, and under Federal law the limits on local jurisdictions in considering emissions in decision-making, where Federal agencies maintain safety standards and jurisdiction over emissions. He said that the Applicant included an expert analysis of the radio-frequency emissions from the proposed site if it were fully occupied using the standard methods. He evaluated their analysis and confirmed that their analysis is correct and falls well within limits established under Federal law.

He said that the Wireless Technical Bulletin contains guidance on heights, setbacks, etc. He also reviewed the Mashpee Zoning Bylaw relative to the proposed project and made some mostly procedural comments in his report, including which height limits or zoning districts might apply, which height limits require a waiver to exceed, etc. He said that the Mashpee Town Planner confirmed that the Project location is within the Wireless Facility Overlay District.

Mr. Maxson said that the Wireless Technical Bulletin includes a camouflage section. It will be up to the Subcommittee and ultimately the Commission to decide whether there is sufficient screening with woods,

distance, etc. or whether instead the proposed WCT should be in some camouflaged form (ie. fake Pine tree, firetower, water tank).

Mr. Maxson said that the visual impact analysis was done using standard techniques with a balloon test and photosimulations. The photosimulations were shown on-screen while he presented.

Mr. Maxson referenced the photosimulations provided by the Applicant at 150 feet, with 2 and 4 carriers. He reviewed the locations where the WCT would be visible based on the photosimulations. The WCT will be visible from behind the fire station along a brief section of the road that is mostly wooded. It is visible from a few residences as depicted in the photosimulations. He noted that the first set of photosimulations the Applicant provided have been revised and corrected to be more accurate, as recommended in the staff report.

Mr. Maxson then reviewed the photosimulations at 125 feet. The WCT is still visible but lower/less dominant from the locations where it is visible at 150 feet. A height reduction might mitigate some of the visual impacts in the locations where it is visible but a lower height also potentially reduces the number of carriers who would find the WCT usable (probably to 2 or 3 carriers total for a 125-foot WCT); co-location is a tradeoff with height.

Mr. Maxson didn't ask the Carriers to provide photosimulations for a 100-foot WCT, as based on the coverage analysis a height that low would not be practical. If the WCT were proposed at a lower height, this might mean that another carrier might want to come in and put in another WCT in the future. He said that sometimes two towers at a lower height on a large property can be better than one taller one, depending on the circumstances.

The Applicant provided a list of alternative properties that had been considered. Mr. Maxson noted that a lot were conservation land and said that it's hard to find a large wooded parcel to site on to minimize the WCT's visual impact on the community. Mr. Maxson said the proposed site does a good job of minimizing visual impact, although there is still some evidence of visual impact.

Mr. Maxson reviewed the Applicant's noise analysis and found that the methods are consistent with noise analyses for these kinds of facilities. He said that there is no reason to disagree about the noise level conclusions.

Mr. Maxson referenced the 150-foot coverage maps provided by the Applicant. Applicants are required per the Wireless Technical Bulletin to provide computer calculations and field measurements (called drive test data) that help verify that the coverage maps and modeling are accurate. He reviewed these and was comfortable with the methods used. He noted that computer models estimate coverage based on land cover type, topography, etc., which means that not every "green spot" on the map actually has good coverage and not every "white spot" has no coverage; the maps provide general indications of coverage.

Mr. Maxson said that one difficulty with what Verizon Wireless is proposing is that the proposed antennas biased/pointing south are addressing quite a bit of territory and a lot of residences; over time they may end up with capacity issues because of user demand.

Mr. Maxson referred to one of the public comments submitted which asked about the possibility of a Distributed Antenna System ("DAS"). He said that a DAS is a possibility, but it wouldn't replace the WCT, it would supplement the WCT if in the future there is a need to address a capacity problem in the very densely developed area near the coast. There is a lot of area covered by the proposed WCT that would not be covered by a DAS on the coast; they would work in a complimentary fashion.

Mr. Maxson feels that putting in a 150-foot facility in the general area proposed will be effective in providing good coverage and good capacity, including for residences close to the facility, but this proposal will not cover capacity issues near the coast long-term; in 2 or 3 years there may some other wireless proposal to do something closer to the coast.

Mr. Maxson then reviewed the coverage maps for Verizon Wireless at the 125-foot WCT height. The coverage down at the coast is reduced, but he doesn't feel it is fatal to the proposal.

A 100-foot tower is much less viable based on the coverage maps. He wouldn't recommend going any lower than 121 feet for Verizon Wireless (125-foot-tall tower). It's a tradeoff between the number of carriers that can use the WCT and the WCT height. Pushing Verizon down to 121 pushes a 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> carrier down much lower to where it may or may not be desirable and they may or may not want another tower.

He then reviewed T-Mobile's coverage maps. In the original application, they showed coverage at 2100 Mhz, which covered a smaller area close to the proposed WCT and the surrounding streets/developments. At Mr. Maxson's request, T-Mobile provided coverage maps at 700 Mhz. At 135-feet (WCT height of 150 feet), the coverage is somewhat filled in further versus at 2100 Mhz. There is less coverage at the reduced height of 110 feet for T-Mobile. He said that a 3/4-mile radius around the WCT is covered at both heights.

Mr. Maxson noted that there is a risk in reducing the WCT height in terms of the number of additional carriers that the WCT will be useful to, so the question is whether there is enough of a benefit in reducing the WCT height to bear that risk. The Commission will have to make that judgement.

Mr. Maxson notes that the Commission's perspective is reviewing this project as a Development of Regional Impact, taking into consideration what the regional impacts are of this WCT, and of this WCT among all WCTs on the Cape. If approved by the Commission, the Applicant would still have to go through the Mashpee Planning Board's standard approval process, which may decide to make additional adjustments or not to approve the facility.

#### **Subcommittee Initial Questions/Comments**

Mr. Virgilio asked if any members of the Subcommittee had any initial questions/comments.

Mr. Roy asked what the height would be for two lower WCTs if they were to replace the single WCT at the taller height. Mr. Maxson noted that less than a 125-foot-height wouldn't work from a computer modeling standpoint. He said that potentially if the Commission approves the 125-foot WCT and that didn't work for a 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> carrier, that's where a second WCT in the future might be in order, either on this site or on another site.

There were no additional questions from Subcommittee members at this time.

#### **Public Comments**

Mr. Virgilio said that they would now take public comments. Mr. Idman facilitated the public comments portion of the meeting. He said they would start with comments from public officials. He began by asking whether there were any Federal officials who wanted to speak. Seeing none, he asked whether there were any State officials who wanted to speak. Seeing none, he then asked for comments from local officials.

Rodney Collins, Mashpee Town Manager and resident, said that when he was the Police Chief of Mashpee, they had all sorts of communications issues in the New Seabury area which they were hoping to address long before now. Since he became a Town Manager in 2015, he doesn't know of any issue that has drawn more passion than people going out to the beach or for a walk and not being able to reach public safety officials. The police are also very concerned that if someone dials 911, they may not get police or fire. He said that this is a critical public safety issue that needs to be addressed as soon as possible, whether it's with one or two towers.

Tom Rullo, Mashpee Fire Chief, said that he concurs 100% with the Town Manager. It is critical to be able to respond to emergencies; they can't respond if they don't get the call. When you dial 911, you aren't just dialing

911; that person keeps you on the phone and feeds fire/safety critical information while they are responding. With this system, the 911 system triangulates the call and with better wireless service the department will be able to determine where the call came from and still respond even if the call is dropped or if the department misses a call. He is going to overlook all the other issues because his primary focus is public safety and to be able to help everyone in an emergency situation.

As there were no additional comments from public officials, Mr. Idman called members of the public one-by-one from the list to provide comments.

Bill Uzell (68 Sea View Lane) said that the safety issue happened with his wife and son. His son has special needs and he had a grand mal seizure that got severe. The call to 911 kept dropping while police and fire were trying to provide assistance step-by-step over the phone to his wife. He said that it's serious, it happened to his son; he feels that something must be done to improve coverage.

Jon Furbush (57 Greensward Rd) said that he has no coverage at his house; it is critical to have though, it is a health and safety issue.

Michael Evans (President of the Mashpee Firefighters Association, represents the Fire Department) said that he has been working for the town for going on 30 years. He said that a recent letter to the Mashpee Enterprise suggesting that fire department staff are opposed to the proposed tower is not accurate, and in fact contrary to sentiments in the department. He is about health and safety. It's not a matter of if, it's when someone will die if coverage is not improved. He said that they have a lot of transient people renting houses in town and landlords don't provide land lines. People just have cellphones. He said the people don't know where they are, they need help, and if we can't find them, we can't help them.

Linda Lubelczyk (56 Tracy Lane) asked if in 1 or 2 years this may not be enough coverage for the area, why isn't the celltower located more towards the New Seabury/Popponesset area where they have problems instead of in her area/Degrass Road where she says that they don't have a coverage problem.

*(Mr. Virgilio requested that Commission staff, the Applicant, or Mr. Maxson, as applicable and appropriate, respond to questions from the public as they arise at the hearing, rather than wait until the completion of public comments).*

Mr. Maxson responded that it's not an either/or situation. It will be a new WCT either at this site or some nearby site and, because of the density of development along the coast, in a number of years they will see additional wireless facilities anyway. To get basic coverage to the entire area being targeted, beyond just the New Seabury area, this site functions well enough and an alternate location won't preclude the need for more facilities in the future.

Ms. Lubelczyk then asked whether any studies had been done on how the proposed tower might affect property values.

Mr. Maxson responded that if that's a topic the Commission believes it should consider, the Subcommittee could request that the Applicant provide such a report, though it is not as simple as providing a realtor's opinion of value for instance; he says that the report if requested should be an independent appraiser's professional scientific assessment.

Jennifer McDonald (103 Degrass Rd) agrees that they need cell service in the area of New Seabury/Popponesset; she agrees it's a safety issue. She is concerned with her view and wants to be certain that they have looked for other locations that are closer to New Seabury/Popponesset before they put the WCT at the proposed location. She believes that a tower located closer to New Seabury/Popponesset will best provide coverage to those "white" areas shown on the coverage area maps as lacking existing coverage.

Andrew McKelvey (11 Menemsha Rd) said he lives in the Popponeset/New Seabury area. He gets around the issue a bit with Wi-Fi/cell booster which is helpful, but when they lose power, there is no cell signal, sometimes for days. They can't send a text message or dial 911. There is a real need in an emergency/storm for coverage. People with kids who live in the area, people at the beach, and the elderly can't make a call in an emergency. He is in favor of the WCT at 150 feet.

Peter Michaelson (Degrass Rd) said he and his wife are concerned about their property value. They would like to see the tower pushed closer to Red Brook Road so they can't see it. He said that the Town is pushing hard to get this and wants the revenue. He asked the Commission to consider putting it further back from his property/lowering the height.

Frank Fantasia (9 Fairway Knob) said that his main concern is public safety. He understands where the police/fire/Town Manager are coming from. There is spotty cell service. It's a simple public safety issue to provide better coverage and allow the proposed tower.

Ken Bates (10 Chippers Lane) said that he used to live in Popponeset; he was there representing his daughter /family. He said that they live in an area with zero cell phone coverage. He hopes the tower can be installed and provide coverage to Popponeset/New Seabury.

Ellen Hoffman (19 Fells Pond Circle) said that her father-in-law is in his 90s and has no cell phone service. She is an AT+T customer and asked whether AT+T was approached. She also asked what the height of the existing tower on Industrial Drive is and wondered if it could be raised in height instead. She noted that advances in technology down the road might improve. She said that you absolutely must have cellphone service for safety and other reasons.

Atty. Thompson responded that all licensed carriers were reached out to. They don't have a commitment but there was some interest from the other carriers. She fully anticipates that if the WCT were built it would be very likely that AT&T would locate on it. She doesn't foresee technology advancing so quickly that the need for wireless towers would be eliminated in the near future.

The RF engineer/representative from Verizon Wireless said that the centerline for Verizon Wireless on the WCT on Industrial Drive is 142 feet so the WCT there is at least that tall. Given the location of that site about 1.5 miles north of the proposed site, if that tower were raised in height, you may get some benefit but it wouldn't sufficiently fill in the large coverage gap Verizon is interested in filling with the proposed site and would not address the capacity issue at all. Increasing the height of that WCT wouldn't replace the need for the proposed WCT. He also indicated that the need for WCTs is not anticipated to go away with 5G; 5G will be building off of the macro sites of the 4G network supplemented with small cell or other technology.

Jerome Hoffman asked whether if they build a 150-foot tower, it would guarantee full service to everyone in the area who does not have service at this time. He would like to know if everyone suffering from lack of service would end up with service.

Atty. Thompson responded that they cannot guarantee that every area with deficient coverage will be covered. It will be improved coverage for the two Carriers that are proposing to locate on the facility. It is an evolving process, as capacity demands increase and as usage increases. As technology is always changing, they are continuing to try to improve the network. There is an FCC mandate to continue to improve the network under the licenses the carriers hold from the FCC.

Mr. Maxson also responded. He said that even when the coverage maps show and model 100% coverage there are likely to be locations in actuality that will not have good and reliable service. There is no way to guarantee 100% coverage. That being said, at the proposed WCT height of 150 feet, Verizon Wireless did get pretty good

coverage to the New Seabury area but there is an area heading towards Popponesset that is shadowed in terms of RF signal due to a hill. They will have to see how the network behaves and may need to fill in pressure points over time.

Paul Thurston (9 Deans Hollow Road) said that he lives in Popponesset. He has a lot of experience building infrastructure/towers. He said that the demand on networks is intense, everything is moving to mobile with GPS, apps, photos, etc. – real time, real information. He said that as a community, they need this infrastructure. He was concerned about instances where people in Popponesset can't get help when they need it.

Christine Hirshland (8 Sand Dunes Court) said that there are safety issues. She said that her husband was playing golf and someone's pacemaker went haywire on the golf course and they couldn't reach 911. They lost valuable time; the person was ok but it's a real safety issue.

Mike Richardson (47 Slice Way) said that he runs the New Seabury Association. He expressed concern about not being able to reach anyone and safety; cellphones don't work in the area. He doesn't care about the tower's location but noted that experts are saying that this is the best location. He asked everyone to do the right thing, make it safe.

Yvonne Courtney (35 Prestwick Lane) said that she lives in New Seabury. She said that the most important thing is safety and said that it is time to act for the safety of the entire community. She supports building the 150-foot tower immediately.

Teresa Ronhock (104 Degross Road) said that she lives near the tower. She said that no one should ever be in a position of not accessing health and safety but noted that a few residents will take a very big hit with this project. She referenced a real estate impact study which showed a reduction in property value for properties near cell towers. She was concerned about the difficulty of selling property if the tower were built near her property. She said that although towns and the Commission can't consider health issues, she expressed concern about the health effects, and thinks that the Federal government should change its regulations for local reviews of towers to consider the potential health effects of RF emissions. She said that the regional impact of real estate should perhaps be considered by the Commission.

Mike Ronhock (104 Degross Road) noted that the Commission's concern is aesthetics/impact on visibility. He said that 80% of the coverage map is conservation land where no one is ever going to live and it doesn't even cover the area needed in full, which he said is not acceptable. He counts 68 houses that will be able to see the tower and whose property values he thinks will be affected. An additional 16-17 house lots are currently being built that will also be able to see the tower. He said that the people presenting on behalf of the Applicant represent the company and are interested in the bottom line; why would they buy an expensive piece of land if they could just lease from the Town? He suggested raising the existing tower on Industrial Drive or putting the tower close to houses in need of coverage. He said that if it has to go on Town land, the property is 29 acres; instead of putting it so close to houses, he suggested siting the tower further away from the houses, closer to Red Brook Road, where it wouldn't hurt people's property values.

Members of the public who had not signed up previously were then given the opportunity to provide comments.

Judy Kahalas said that she thinks maybe people have become anesthetized to the aesthetics of towers just like people have with utility poles over time; it might not impact property values as millennials wouldn't want to move to where there is no cell service, millennials aren't doing land lines anymore. She described two recent incidents on New Seabury beach where cell phones failed in an emergency.

Steve Bell of Popponesset Island Road said that he does feel for the people who will be in sight of the tower but said there are whole areas without service, including a whole business area. He asked about the project timeline and, if it were moved closer to the street, what would the timeline be then.

Nancy Wilder said she lives in Popponesset and that her house is in the middle of a “white spot” on the proposed coverage map (indicating lack of coverage), and she has several year-round houses around her. She said that this is not acceptable, and that even the proposed tower doesn’t fully solve the coverage problem.

Diane Scannell said she lives on Degross Rd in a house that directly faces the tower. She asked if any other areas have been considered that may work better.

Jewel Blake (709 Great Neck Road S) said that she was an abutter. She asked about a wireless proposal that came forward a few years ago in New Seabury and wasn’t pursued.

Laraine Michaelson (120 Degross Rd) asked whether there is a survey plan (that shows acreage) for the entire fire station property. She said that she empathizes with those without cell service but said that no one can guarantee that there will be no health impacts for her grandchildren who live close year-round. She knows health can’t be discussed but it is her biggest concern.

The surveyed site plan was put up on the screen. Mr. Idman said that it was the site plan for the proposed project which shows the perimeter lines of Mashpee Fire Station property and total acreage, with the wireless project site depicted; it’s not of record at the Barnstable County Registry of Deeds. It’s not a tax map, it’s a stamped survey plan.

Mr. Virgilio said that he would accept testimony from everyone just once. Following the conclusion of the public comments, the Applicant, Commission staff, and the Commission’s Wireless Consultant provided responses to questions raised during the public comments.

Atty. Thompson responded to some of the questions that were raised. She said that she couldn’t provide a definitive permitting and construction timeline, but after conclusion of Commission proceedings, the Town of Mashpee would proceed with special permitting proceedings and, if successful in obtaining a special permit, there would be a 30-day appeal period, followed by the building permit process. The construction timeline would depend on permitting, but the Applicant feels it’s in everyone’s best interest to move as quickly as possible in order to provide coverage ASAP.

Atty. Thompson said that other structures/locations were considered. There were no existing tall structures on which to site. They then considered raw land sites. They started with raw land sites on public parcels which need to be a certain acreage, looking at public parcels that were larger and would meet the zoning bylaws (needing only a special permit, not a variance). Fifty sites were evaluated in the alternative site analysis. They said that they are not sure that they gave any consideration to an alternative location on the site itself, but they aimed for minimum impact to the site as conceived of in the town’s RFP.

Mr. Maxson said that the WCT is centered on the parcel’s width and positioned not too great a distance from the already paved area of the fire station to make the least disturbance possible. If the WCT is pushed back, a longer driveway would be needed into forested areas. He reviewed the possibility of locating the WCT closer to Red Brook Road. There needs to be a 156-foot fall zone. They need to visualize where the treeline is relative to the tower and angles of view. In order to reduce the view from Degross Road, they would have to move the WCT closer to Red Brook Road. They might end up creating more visual impact in another location by reducing visual impact elsewhere. The Commission could ask for information on and investigate whether there is another place on the property that is less visually impactful.

### **Subcommittee Discussion**

Following a five-minute recess, Mr. Virgilio said that the Subcommittee needed to talk about whether they wanted to ask the Commission’s Wireless Consultant or the Applicant any questions.

Mr. Mitchell said that the visual impact is a question and asked whether they can paint it so that it's not so stark. He asked how much the visibility would improve by painting the WCT. Atty. Thompson responded that they would be willing to paint the WCT. Mr. Maxson said that brown reduces contrast but it's still there. Gray/light blue still won't make it disappear. Camouflage could be simulated to see what that might look like, for example if it were designed to look like a Pine tree, water tower, or a fire tower.

Mr. Mitchell said that he is not necessarily for faux towers but he'd like to see what a "Pine tree" might look like. He said that as a builder, he knows that to move the WCT would delay the project so much further. He doesn't have a problem in terms of location. Mr. Mitchell said that he is in favor of the project but wants to see what they can do to tone it down/make it less stark.

Mr. Idman said that Commission staff look to balance the amount of disturbance and clearing. He mentioned that there had been an in-depth study of archaeological resources. If you move the WCT to another location, you have to be careful of disturbing some of the character of the open space and potential archaeological resources, which are values and resources protected under the RPP.

The Applicant was asked to provide a photosimulation of a monopine for a follow-up hearing. Atty. Thompson said that this shouldn't take more than a week.

Mr. Virgilio said the public session was over and asked about continuing the meeting to another date. Dates were discussed and it was determined that the meeting would be continued to Monday, September 17<sup>th</sup> at 5:30 p.m. at Commission offices at 3225 Main Street in Barnstable, MA.

Mr. Idman then described the process going forward: The Subcommittee will make a recommendation to the full Commission. The full Commission will then hold a public hearing where the process will repeat. If approved by the Commission, the project will then go to the Mashpee Planning Board.

**Motion**

Mr. Virgilio made a motion to continue the hearing as discussed, Mr. Mitchell moved the motion, and Mr. Weeden seconded the motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Ernest Virgilio, DRI Subcommittee Chair

---

Date