



CITY OF CONCORD
New Hampshire's Main Street™
Community Development Department

David Cedarholm, PE
City Engineer

CITY OF CONCORD - POLES AND WIRES COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

The City of Concord's Poles and Wires Committee held a committee meeting on April 22, 2021, at 1:30 PM.

COVID-19 – Public Meeting Procedures Notice

Due to the COVID-19 / Coronavirus crisis and in accordance with Governor Sununu's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, the Poles and Wires Committee is authorized to meet electronically. The committee will be utilizing the Webex platform for this electronic meeting.

Please note that there is no physical location to observe and listen contemporaneously to the meeting, which was authorized pursuant to Governor Sununu's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04.

Cisco Webex Meeting Link:

<https://cityofconcordit.my.webex.com/cityofconcordit.my/j.php?MTID=m7843db87ca386c1cf66b9cc288019a41>

Telephone Dial: 1-408-418-9388

Meeting Number (access code): 132 135 1476

Meeting Password: 39353778

ATTENDEES

David Cedarholm, City Engineer
Chip Chesley, Director, General Services Department (10 minutes late)
Heather Shank, City Planner
Paul Gendron, City Surveyor
Rick Wollert, Fire Department
Kathryn Temchack, Director of Real Estate Assessments
David Hall, Code Administrator
Stefanie Breton, Public Information Officer
Sean Conway, Principal Engineer, Verizon Wireless

David Cedarholm called the meeting to order, read the COVID-19 public meeting procedures notice, and called a roll call.

Chip Chesley arrived late, but there is a quorum with Mr. Cedarholm and Ms. Shank.

APPROVAL OF 10/8/2020 MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Cedarholm opened the item. Ms. Shank moved to approve the 10/8/2020 Poles and Wires Committee meeting minutes. Mr. Cedarholm seconded the motion to accept the minutes. The minutes were approved with a unanimous vote.

FINAL APPLICATIONS

Mr. Gendron stated that the first 23 applications are for 5G small cell wireless canisters on an existing utility pole. Some of the canisters are proposed to be mounted on the top of the pole and some of the canisters are proposed to be mounted on the side of the pole by a bracket. While showing a google earth image of a portion of the City that indicates the locations of the canisters, he also stated that all of the locations will be integrated into the fiber optic system currently in place and owned by Consolidated Communications. He stated that he has been told by both Verizon Wireless and Consolidated Communications that no new fiber optic wires will be installed on the poles which would require make-ready work as part of this project; either the fiber optic is already in place or new fiber optic will be overlashed onto existing copper.

Sean Conway introduced himself and clarified that the proposed small cell wireless canisters are 4G, not 5G.

1. Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless request for licensure of one small wireless facility on one (1) pole and structure within a city right-of-way.
White Street at 10 Blanchard Street

Mr. Gendron stated that the first application is for a canister on White Street near 10 Blanchard Street. Due to the meeting being held via Zoom, he shared his screen and opened the first application. He highlighted the proposed design which includes the canister being attached to the sidewalk side of the pole with a bracket, and the electrical equipment on the side of the pole facing down the street.

2. Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless request for licensure of one small wireless facility on one (1) pole and structure within a city right-of-way.
Centre Street 47

Mr. Gendron stated that the next application is for a canister on Centre Street near 47 Centre Street. He shared his screen and opened the application. He highlighted the proposed design which includes the canister being attached to the top of the pole, and the electrical equipment on the side of the pole facing down the street.

Ms. Shank stated that she had reviewed all of the applications and said that she had several questions regarding the various designs. She asked why some of the applications have the canister on the top of the pole and why some have it mounted to a bracket. She stated that the canister mounted on the top of the pole was more desirable. Mr. Conway responded that he also prefers the top mount, but that he needs to comply with the utility company's requirements. He stated that if the primary electrical source is on the

top of the pole, then all communications equipment, such as the canister, needs to be below the primary and mounted by a bracket.

Ms. Shank asked about the length of the bracket for the canister mounted on the pole. Mr. Conway stated that to avoid RF blockage, the optimum length of the bracket is 3 feet. Ms. Shank stated that it is preferable that the bracket mounted canister be installed parallel to the street and not over the sidewalk. Mr. Conway stated that the basic design standards have the sidewalk as the best case and over the road as the worst case. Ms. Shank asked whether there was a restriction against the side mounted bracket, or parallel to the roadway. She asked if there was a regulatory restriction. Mr. Conway stated that he doesn't think there is a regulatory restriction, but that Unitil prefers the bracket opposite the street, per their master agreement with Unitil.

Ms. Shank asked about the location of the electric meter on the bottom of the pole and whether the design height of 8 feet above the ground was a standard height. She noted that some meters were lower, and asked whether they could be moved higher up the poles. Mr. Conway noted that the 8 foot height was a design standard by Unitil to avoid climbing the poles during their site visits.

Ms. Shank asked about the specifications for the color of the canisters. She asked whether the metallic silver color could be changed to black as having the canisters not reflective would be preferred. Mr. Conway stated that they are actually known as a New England grey which blends in with the pole similar to transformers. He stated that he could paint one black for a test for the committee.

Ms. Shank asked if Mr. Conway could reach out to Unitil to see if it had any flexibility in the design standards. Mr. Conway stated he would.

Mr. Wollert stated that his preference for the location of the bracket and the canister would be either parallel to the street, or over the sidewalk, as the street side of the pole would inhibit his work on the pole while he was in his bucket truck.

Mr. Cedarholm also noted the difference in the location of the electric meter in relation to the ground and stated that the 8 foot minimum height would help alleviate potential vandalism. Mr. Conway stated that he was not aware of any vandalism with the electric meters he has installed.

While looking at the applications, Mr. Cedarholm stated that a Fort Eddy Road location and an East Side Drive location had the bracket and canister over the road and asked Mr. Conway why these were designed that way when he had stated that over the road was the worst case scenario and that Unitil prefers the bracket opposite the street. Mr. Gendron shared his screen to look at the two applications. Mr. Conway said he believed that they were designed that way because the poles were far enough from the road that the canister didn't actually hang over the pavement.

Kathryn Temchack asked whether the canisters would be connected to existing fiber optic or would more wires need to be installed. Mr. Conway stated that fiber optic exists at all of the poles, but a new wire would be attached to the pole to connect the existing fiber optic to the canister.

Ms. Shank reiterated that she prefers that the bracket and canister do not hang over the sidewalk and asked that Mr. Conway reach out to Unitil.

The discussion changed back to the color of the equipment and Mr. Conway stated that the lower equipment on the pole cannot be painted as it would void the warranty. Ms. Shank asked if the equipment could be ordered in black. Mr. Conway stated that the equipment was a different finish.

Ms. Temchack asked if they have experienced vandalism with the equipment and Mr. Conway stated that they have over 1500 canisters in New England and the only damage they have encountered is when a vehicle hits a pole.

Mr. Cedarholm asked Mr. Gendron to share the next application.

3. Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless request for licensure of one small wireless facility on one (1) pole and structure within a city right-of-way.
Downing Street 31

Mr. Gendron stated that the next application is for a canister on Downing Street near 31 Downing Street. He shared his screen and opened the application. He highlighted the proposed design which includes the canister being attached to the top of the pole, and the electrical equipment on the side of the pole facing down the street.

4. Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless request for licensure of one small wireless facility on one (1) pole and structure within a city right-of-way.
East Side Drive at 195

Mr. Gendron stated that the next application is for a canister on East Side Drive near 195 East Side Drive. He shared his screen and opened the application. He highlighted the proposed design which includes the canister being attached to the top of the pole, and the electrical equipment on the side of the pole facing down the street. He noted that this application actually includes a piece of equipment that hadn't been noted yet. He stated that a 36" fiberglass extension was included on the top of the pole underneath the canister.

The discussion changed to the size and orientation of the electrical equipment on the lower part of the pole. It was noted that the details did not clearly show the size of the equipment in relation to the pole. Mr. Conway stated that he had sent several pictures of other locations in Nashua and in Manchester. Mr. Gendron shared those pictures.

The discussion changed to the different designs being proposed and Mr. Wollert stated that Unitil should be involved in the discussion. Mr. Conway asked the Chair to halt the discussion to get Unitil involved. While looking at the application for 218 East Side Drive, which is in front of a residential house, Chip Chesley asked whether the upper management of the City should be involved, such as Carlos Baia, as he believes that there are residential concerns and the committee should look at the site specific situations.

Ms. Shank stated that she has often worked with Gary Miller of Unitil and she volunteered to reach out to him to see what flexibility is available for changing the designs.

Mr. Cedarholm asked if this project will create better cell phone coverage and capacity and Mr. Conway stated it would. Mr. Cedarholm asked if this equipment can be switched to 5G. Mr. Conway stated that no it cannot be switched; it would be different and new equipment would be installed.

Mr. Chesley made a motion to continue to a date to be determined. Ms. Shank seconded the motion. Mr. Gendron asked Mr. Conway to reach out to Unitil and try and find a day and time during the first week of May, and he would then schedule another meeting with the committee.

5. Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless request for licensure of one small wireless facility on one (1) pole and structure within a city right-of-way.
East Side Drive at 218

Continued to May.

6. Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless request for licensure of one small wireless facility on one (1) pole and structure within a city right-of-way.
East Side Drive at 262

Continued to May.

7. Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless request for licensure of one small wireless facility on one (1) pole and structure within a city right-of-way.
Fort Eddy Road 73

Continued to May.

8. Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless request for licensure of one small wireless facility on one (1) pole and structure within a city right-of-way.
Fort Eddy Road 89

Continued to May.

9. Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless request for licensure of one small wireless facility on one (1) pole and structure within a city right-of-way.
Hall Street 30

Continued to May.

10. Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless request for licensure of one small wireless facility on one (1) pole and structure within a city right-of-way.
Loudon Road 133

Continued to May.

11. Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless request for licensure of one small wireless facility on one (1) pole and structure within a city right-of-way.
North Main Street 185

Continued to May.

12. Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless request for licensure of one small wireless facility on one (1) pole and structure within a city right-of-way.
North Main Street 190

Continued to May.

13. Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless request for licensure of one small wireless facility on one (1) pole and structure within a city right-of-way.
North Main Street 266

Continued to May.

14. Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless request for licensure of one small wireless facility on one (1) pole and structure within a city right-of-way.
Pine Street 36

Continued to May.

15. Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless request for licensure of one small wireless facility on one (1) pole and structure within a city right-of-way.
Pleasant Street 250

Continued to May.

16. Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless request for licensure of one small wireless facility on one (1) pole and structure within a city right-of-way.
Pleasant Street at 2 South State Street

Continued to May.

17. Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless request for licensure of one small wireless facility on one (1) pole and structure within a city right-of-way.
Shawmut Street 8

Continued to May.

18. Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless request for licensure of one small wireless facility on one (1) pole and structure within a city right-of-way.
South Main Street 59

Continued to May.

19. Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless request for licensure of one small wireless facility on one (1) pole and structure within a city right-of-way.
South Main Street 82

Continued to May.

20. Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless request for licensure of one small wireless facility on one (1) pole and structure within a city right-of-way.
South Main Street 218

Continued to May.

21. Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless request for licensure of one small wireless facility on one (1) pole and structure within a city right-of-way.
Stickney Avenue 11

Continued to May.

22. Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless request for licensure of one small wireless facility on one (1) pole and structure within a city right-of-way.
Union Street 33

Continued to May.

23. Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless request for licensure of one small wireless facility on one (1) pole and structure within a city right-of-way.
Warren Street 33

Continued to May.

24. Unitil Energy Systems, Inc., Request for Licensure of one utility pole within a City Right-of-Way.
Pleasant Street

Mr. Gendron stated that this application is for a new pole on Pleasant Street along the frontage of the Concord Hospital. He shared his screen to show the location of the pole. He stated that Unitil had already installed the pole after discussions between himself, Mr. Cedarholm, and Stan Balch of Unitil. He stated that Concord Hospital had approached Unitil about improving reliability to the Hospital. The Hospital was seeking accreditation at a higher level and improved reliability would be a consideration in that

review and approval. One of the ways to improve their reliability is to install an electronic recloser immediately after the feed to the hospital. With this new recloser any fault downstream would be interrupted by the new recloser and there would not be any interruption of their service. In order to install the recloser before any other load, Unitil will need a pole next to their main feed.

Mr. Gendron recommended approval of the application as the pole had already been installed.

Ms. Shank made a motion to approve the application. Mr. Chesley seconded the motion and the application was approved.

25. segTEL, Inc., d/b/a FirstLight Fiber, Request for Licensure of fiber within a City Right-of-Way.
Chenell Drive

Mr. Gendron stated that this application is not ready for review and FirstLight asked that it be pulled from the agenda.

26. segTEL, Inc., d/b/a FirstLight Fiber, Request for Licensure of fiber within a City Right-of-Way.
Garvins Falls Road

Mr. Gendron stated that this application is for three poles on Garvins Falls Road starting at the intersection of Garvins Falls Road and Manchester Street. FirstLight currently has plant on Manchester Street. Their proposal is to extend southerly along Garvins Falls Road to the Red Blazer restaurant.

Mr. Wollert stated that he had not seen the make-ready work information yet. Mr. Gendron stated that he would get in contact with Linda Hanson of FirstLight.

Mr. Gendron recommended that the application be approved subject to FirstLight allowing Mr. Wollert to perform any make-ready work that might necessary.

Ms. Shank made a motion to approve the application. Mr. Chesley seconded the motion and the application was approved.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further items to discuss, Ms. Shank made a motion to adjourn and was seconded by Mr. Chesley. Mr. Gendron indicated that the next meeting will be scheduled for the first week of May.