## Town of Charlton Saratoga County Town Board Open Meeting Regarding proposed Cell Antenna Installation

## September 12th, 2016

An Open Meeting was held by the Town Board of the Town of Charlton, Saratoga County, New York at the Charlton Town Hall, 758 Charlton Rd, Charlton, NY and called to order by Supervisor Grattidge at 6:03 p.m. to hear a presentation for a proposed installation of a cell antenna within the Town of Charlton.

Present: Councilman Gay, Councilman Grasso, Councilman Heritage, Councilman Hodgkins, Supervisor Grattidge, Town Clerk Brenda Mills.

Supervisor Grattidge opened the meeting by saying that the purpose of this meeting is a follow-up to a meeting held in January 2016. In January, the Board heard for the first time a presentation to put a cell antenna on the Town's water tower. At that time, questions were raised by the public, and the Board tasked the Verizon representatives with getting answers to the questions that were raised and also to look into possible alternative sites. The Board is interested to hear the new information being presented tonight, but does not plan to take any action this evening.

Supervisor Grattidge introduced Dave Brennan, Attorney from Young Sommer, LLC representing Verizon, and Rick Andras, RF Engineer from Verizon. Nick Smith, Site Acquisition Specialist from Airosmith Development will join the meeting later.

Attorney Dave Brennan said that at the January meeting, everyone seemed to agree that better cell service is needed in Charlton. At that meeting, the Town Board asked Verizon to further address the following:

- Concerns raised about health effects/safety
- Concerns raised about property values
- Requested to look at location alternatives to water tank

Attorney Brennan provided the following information:

HEALTH EFFECTS / SAFETY

- THE WATER TANK SITE IS LOCATED A SUFFICIENT DISTANCE FROM ANY NEIGHBORING STRUCTURES TO PROTECT THEM FROM FALLING ICE OR TOWER FAILURE.
- EACH SITE HAS A REPORT BY A NEW YORK STATE P.E. INDICATING THAT THE RF IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH FCC REGULATIONS.
- THE REPORTS INDICATE THAT AT FULL OPERATION THE RF IS LESS THAN 1% OF THE MAXIMUM ALLOWED ON THE GROUND AT ANY DISTANCE.
- THE 700 MHZ FREQUENCY WAS USED FOR YEARS AS UHF TV STATIONS BEFORE BEING AUCTIONED TO CELLULAR COMPANIES.
- FOR THE SAKE OF COMPARISON, THE FOLLOWING CHART IDENTIFIES THE VZW SIGNAL STRENGTH RELATIVE TO OTHER COMMON ITEMS.

Attorney Brennan said that a neighboring property owner was concerned about the fall zone. He stated that the water tower with the antenna on top is a distance further away than the combined height. If the water tower is knocked over, there is a concern that it would hit houses, but the setback is greater than the distance of the houses.

Attorney Brennan addressed concerns about the health safety of the signal strength. He has a report by a New York State Professional Engineer who stated that it is in full RF compliance with the FCC. The Radio Frequency is at less than 1% below the allowed FCC levels. They transmit at such a low power that is essentially 1 billionth of a watt from the distances shown.

Common Wireless Device Signal Strengthe			
dBm LEVEL	POWER	NOTES	
40 dBm	10 W		WiFi Router at Best Buy (approx ¼ Watt)
36 dBm	4 VV	Maximum ERP allowed by FCC in U.S.	
30 dBm	1 W		
27 dBm	500 mW		
26 dBm	400 mW		
25 dBm	320 mW		Typical Mobile Device Output Power (generally tenths to ½ Watt). 865 MHz Baby monitor (approx 1/100 <sup>th</sup> Watt)
24 dBm	250 mW	K	
23 dBm	200 mW	Typical output from WLAN devices at 915MHz	
22 dBm	160 mW		
21 dBm	130 mW		
20 dBm	100 mW	Maximum ERP allowed by E.T.S.I. In Europe	
15 dBm	32 mW	Typical Wreless LAN transmission power in laptops	
10 dBm	10 mW	<	
5 cBm	3.2 mW		
4 cBm	2.5 mW		
3 cBm	2.0 mW		
2 cBm	1.6 mW		
1 cBm	1.3 mW		
0 cBm	1.0 mVV		
-1 dBm	0.79 mW		3G Signals between -60 and -85 dBm considered "strong" 4G RSRP signals from -80 dBm to -105 considered "strong"
-5 dBm	0.32 mW		
-10 dBm	0.1 mW	Typical maximum received signal power (-10 to -30 dBm) of wireless networks	

-85 dBm approx 1-trillionth of a Watt

DISCUSSION OF IMPACT ON PROPERTY VALUES

1-millionth of a Watt

1-billionth of a Watt

Receive threshold for most WLAN devices

20 dBm

-30 dBm

-40 dBm

-60 dBm

-60 dBm

-70 dBm

0.01 mW

0.001 mW

0.0001 mW

0.00001 mW

0.000001 mV

0.0000001 mW

0001 mi/V

- A CONCERN WAS RAISED THAT ADDING ANTENNAS TO THE EXISTING WATER TANK WOULD LOWER PROPERTY VALUES.
- VERIZON WIRELESS HAS PROVIDED THE TOWN BOARD WITH AN APPRAISAL REPORT THAT ANALYZED THE PRICES PAID FOR HOUSES IN NEIGHBORHOODS THAT HAD A VIEW OF A TOWER WITH THE PRICES PAID FOR HOUSES IN THE SAME NEIGHBORHOOD WITH NO VIEW OF A TOWER.
- THE ANALYSIS FOUND THAT BUYERS PAID SLIGHTLY HIGHER PRICES FOR THE HOUSES WITH CELL TOWER VIEWS COMPARED TO SIMILAR HOUSES IN THE SAME NEIGHBORHOOD THAT LACK TOWER VIEWS.
- IN THIS CASE THE WATER TANK ALREADY EXISTS AND THE IMPACT ON PROPERTY VALUES (IF ANY) WOULD HAVE ALREADY BEEN FACTORED INTO THE PROPERTY VALUES.
- THE ADDITION OF ANTENNAS TO THE WATER TANK WILL NOT HAVE ANY APPRECIABLE EFFECT ON PROPERTY VALUES.

Maps and photos of potential water tower location were shown, and the following information was given:

# WATER TANK

## PROPOSED DESIGN

- BASE STATION EQUIPMENT DIRECTLY TO WEST OF TANK
- SPACE FOR ADDITIONAL SET OF ANTENNAS FOR FUTURE CARRIER USE
- LEASE AREA SIZE REDUCED (25' X 30')
- SCREENING PROPOSED EVERGREEN TREES AND SOLID FENCING
- DISTANCE OF WATER TANK TO NEAREST TWO RESIDENCES: 175 FEET AND 199 FEET

(See photo of representative image on next page)



Photo of representative image – Charlton Water Tank

Maps of the proposed site plan were shown from the January 2016 presentation and the September 2016 meeting. The base station location has been moved westerly in the September plans.

## ALTERNATIVE SITE LOCATION

- LOCATED AT 764 CHARLTON ROAD ON PRIVATE LAND
- ROUGHLY LOCATED 2,300 FEET NORTH OF CHARLTON ROAD AND GENERALLY CENTERED BETWEEN JOCKEY STREET (1,575 FEET) AND MAPLE AVENUE (1,030 FEET). PACKER ROAD IS 4,775 FEET AWAY
- ACCESS FROM CHARLTON ROAD OVER EXISTING DRIVEWAY
- 120 FOOT MONOPOLE, DESIGNED FOR UP TO THREE ADDITIONAL CARRIERS
- BASE SCREENING NOT REQUIRED

Maps and photos of the proposed site plan were shown for the alternative site. Numerous photos were also presented to show the visibility of the balloon test that was done for the alternative site.

Maps of coverage were presented that showed the current cell coverage in Charlton, the proposed coverage with an antenna on the water tower, and the proposed coverage if the antenna went on the alternative site.

Attorney Brennan closed his portion of the presentation with the following:

## POTENTIAL NEXT STEPS

- CONSIDERATION OF WHETHER AN ADDITIONAL BALLOON TEST IS NEEDED AT THE ALTERNATIVE SITE TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL VIEWSHED INFORMATION.
- CONSIDERATION BY THE TOWN BOARD ON WHETHER TO LEASE SPACE ON THE WATER TANK.
- APPROVAL OF LEASE (IF APPLICABLE)
- SUBMISSION BY VERIZON WIRELESS OF A COMPLETE APPLICATION PACKAGE FOR THE SELECTED ALTERNATIVE.
- MUNICIPAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCESS COMMENCES.

The floor was opened for public comment.

The following residents stated they were opposed to the antenna being placed on the water tower: Ramona and Brad Swartz, Stacy and Bert Wilson, Monica Mare.

Ramona Swartz, 10 Cherry Lane is concerned with radiation effects. She asked if the Town has gotten SEQR approval. She has found controversy of radiation levels depending on proximity.

Brad Swartz, 10 Cherry Lane questioned why the Board would consider the water tower other than for the revenue. He said this goes against the Zoning Ordinance and impedes on health and wellness.

Stacy Wilson, 6 Cherry Lane said she has grave concern about what is emitted from the antennas, and will fight the effect on property values.

Bert Wilson, 6 Cherry Lane said that he is skeptical of Verizon's comments about the impact on property values. He is also concerned with health issues.

Monica Mare, 12 Cherry Lane said that the tower is 40 feet from her property line. Her children play in the yard and she is concerned about the antennas falling during a wind storm. She said properties in the fall zone cannot get FHA mortgages.

Ken Crotty, Newman Road said that the alternate site appears to be the answer and wanted to know how quickly it can happen.

Dennis Pokrzywka, Town of Ballston resident, said he grew up in Charlton and owns land on Maple Avenue. He is in favor of the alternate site

Everyone had a chance to speak.

### Town Board Discussion:

Supervisor Grattidge thanked the audience for coming out and giving their comments. The Board has not predetermined anything. The reason that they asked Verizon for the presentation was to see what the options are. The Board is going to thoroughly discuss the pros and cons of each site. The Board will then need to tell Verizon which direction the Board wants to go in, so that Verizon can prepare an application and go through the special usage process.

Councilman Grasso said there was a common question raised tonight, and that is, why is the Board continuing to hear about the water tower site. The reason is because the Board wanted a clear comparison of the two sites. Regardless of which site we pick in the Town, people are going to come out with concerns. The Town Board needed to hear the comparison and go through all of the issues. He does not want people to think that the Board is slighting their comments and concerns. They will take them into consideration when they make their decision. He said that within the next month of two, the Board will render a decision of which site they should move forward with. It will be communicated at one of the Town Board meetings.

## Additional Public Comments:

Kevin Epps, resident said that after hearing the lady say that properties are in a fall zone, if the Board puts the antenna up, he and his neighbors will get together and get their properties reassessed.

Nick Mare said that \$24,000 revenue for 600 water customers is \$40 each and that is not enough for a trip to the grocery store.

#### RESOLUTION #138 Adjournment of meeting

Motion by Councilman Hodgkins Seconded by Councilman Gay

Vote: All Ayes, No Nays. CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,