



SGVCOG Planners TAC Approved Meeting Minutes

Date: July 26, 2018

Time: 12:00 P.M.

Location: Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District
602 E. Huntington Dr., Monrovia, CA 91016

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 12:07 P.M.
2. Roll Call

Planners TAC Members Present

M. Ronzio-Garcia, P. Lam; Alhambra
M. Nakajima; Diamond Bar
J. Mikaelian, M. Elguira; El Monte
M. Carnahan; Glendora
E. Scherer; La Verne
N. Lee, B. Lynch; Monrovia
M. Huntley; Monterey Park
C. Hanh; Rosemead
D. Whipple; South Pasadena
H. Liu; Temple City
M. Kim; LA County DRP

Planners TAC Members Absent

Arcadia
Azusa
Baldwin Park
Claremont
Covina
Duarte
Irwindale
Pomona
San Dimas
San Gabriel
Sierra Madre
Walnut
West Covina

SGVCOG Staff

P. Duyshart

Guests

I. McAleese; South El Monte

3. Public Comment.

No public comment.

CONSENT CALENDAR

4. Planners TAC Meeting Minutes – 05/24/2018
Recommended Action: Approve.
5. Planners TAC Meeting Minutes – 06/28/2018
Recommended Action: Approve.
6. Election of Chair and Vice Chair for FY 2018-2019
Recommended Action: Nominate and elect Craig Hensley as the Chair of the Planning Directors' TAC for FY 2018-19, and nominate and elect Michael Huntley as the Vice Chair of the Planning Directors' TAC for FY 2018-19.

There was a motion made to approve the Consent Calendar as recommended by staff (M/S: M. Carnahan / E. Scherer).

[Motion Passed]

Ayes	Alhambra, Diamond Bar, El Monte, Glendora, La Verne, Monrovia, Monterey Park, Rosemead, South Pasadena, Temple City, LA County DRP
Noes	
Abstain	
Absent	Arcadia, Azusa, Baldwin Park, Claremont, Covina, Duarte, Irwindale, Pomona, San Dimas, San Gabriel, Sierra Madre, Walnut, West Covina

ACTION ITEMS

PRESENTATIONS

7. AT&T's 5G Towers and Small Cell Technology

Amir Johnson, the SGV Area Director of External Affairs for AT&T, provided this presentation to the Planners TAC. A. Johnson began by mentioning how AT&T and other cellular providers are constantly challenged with filling holes and gaps in its network, improving network speeds, and improving network capacity. An average family of four has 10 cellular, Internet, and/or "smart" devices in the home. Thus, the cellular network is very impacted and stressed.

The presenters explained that 5G network capability will be anywhere from 2 to 15 times faster than current 4G network capabilities. Johnson also went on to discuss how "small cell" technologies are needed in order the 5G network to operate properly, since the network will need as much capacity and bandwidth as possible. A. Johnson reiterated that network capacity must be upgraded and enhanced in order to keep pace with the surging demands for data consumption.

The majority of the second half of the presentation included information about different types of cell sites (and why small cells are the most practical and effective), how small cells can be situated on light poles or other utility poles, and how cities can work with cellular companies from a public policy perspective (i.e. permitting processes, Master Leasing Agreements, and pole attachment rates and fees) in order to facilitate deployment and installation of small cell technologies. Samuel Cha of AT&T provided more technical overviews about how small cell technologies function.

A. Johnson stressed that AT&T is willing to work directly with cities to help them understand their network technologies, operations, and equipment better, and to help with the permitting process. AT&T also wants cities to provide them with transparent public feedback. Additionally, AT&T wants to set up a streamlined process through which they receive feedback, and, eventually, approval, from City Planning Departments. Johnson also pointed out that AT&T is doing these presentations and having these types of meetings with cities to start an open dialogue with cities about how to facilitate small cell investment in their communities.

Questions/Discussion: The following issues were asked about and discussed:

- A TAC member pointed out that competitors have said that they will need extra equipment off to the side from where their small cell technologies are. Why do they need add space and equipment, but AT&T doesn't?
- Where are you putting your radio units? The radios would be enclosed inside the shroud? Can you separate radio units and put it underground?
- How big is the small cell structure on the top of the light? A. Johnson stated that the structure is about 66 inches, and he added that undergrounding the radios are not

possible at the time since their radios are not able to emit signals from underground (Ericsson radios).

- A Planning TAC member remarked that AT&T is not getting much traction from local government, and then asked: Why is this happening? What are some of the issues that AT&T has faced pertaining to development and expansion of network capabilities? Mr. Johnson answered by saying that: one of the main concerns is how many of these will be proliferated throughout the city. Cities are concerned about volume, and thus cities want a master plan from AT&T to show the extent of the 5G technologies and the amount of equipment that will be installed. There's also the concern of public health relating to radiofrequency emissions.
- Another TAC member asked: What is AT&T doing to help cities come up with the arguments and justification to provide answers to some of the health concerns? What is AT&T doing to provide proof, data, and information to substantiate what they're doing?
- One City mentioned that they hired their own consultant on this matter and similar matters, and that has been helpful in understanding what information is out there and what some of the facts are. The optics of this are good to, because then to the public, the information and arguments are coming from the cities, NOT from the cellular companies such as AT&T, which would be seen as very biased.
- Another TAC attendee asked: What is the difference between small cell sites and larger macro sites? Also, why does AT&T sometimes count the length of the light pole or utility pole as part of the total "feet" count.
- How is a small cell different from a micro cell? They are very similar and mostly synonymous. Another local agency answered by point out that small cells seem to be a redesign of current AT&T cell sites. A second TAC member agency added that, for small cells, the radio units and the antenna are all combined into a small device, and is even more compact than micro-like units which are mounted on buildings, etc.
- Small cells don't replace existing cell sites, they supplement or augment them.
- A city asked Mr. Johnson: how far is your hub from your node? Mr. Johnson noted that the maximum limit is 6 miles.
- A City expressed the following concern: how will putting infrastructure in before a City approves a node comply with City code and compatibility?
- Would AT&T have to increase the capability and antenna signal on the macro sites as AT&T adds more 5G capable small cell sites. Do these developments threaten to change the physical look of the macro sites and towers? Would the macro sites be obsolete? A. Johnson stated that macro sites would still be necessary because they provide the COVERAGE. Small cell sites provide the increased CAPACITY.
- Different cellular companies have different equipment designs. Are these small cell technologies compatible and co-locatable? A. Johnson said that while the short answer is yes or possibly, it is very difficult to do this.
- Cities are worried about dealing with inconsistent and un-uniform designs on this matter across different companies. It's possible that some cities will be rewriting some practices and designs to adapt to these new cellular coverage technologies.
- One City mentioned that a lot of the cities are Edison territory, and then followed-up that up by asking: what is the SCE approval process for this issue? Mr. Johnson replied that AT&T has to get conceptual approval from SCE, and then cities have to approve of the location, still. SCE still owns the light, though. Designs will be dependent on who owns the light pole.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

INFORMATION ITEMS

UPDATE ITEMS

8. Update on Measure M Subregional Fund Programming

P. Duyshart provided an update to the TAC on this matter. He reminded TAC members that in the late Spring / early Summer, SGVCOG Chief Engineer Mark Christoffels announced a call for projects for both First-Last Mile program project proposals and Active Transportation and Greenway program project proposals. P. Duyshart reminded TAC members to please send in their proposed projects, as Measure M subregional fund allocation and programming cannot occur until the COG receives more proposals. While the original deadlines for cities and the County to submit proposed project ideas was July 13, this submission deadline has now been extended to July 31. While the First-Last Mile program call for projects was only sent to cities which have a rapid transit station (i.e. Metro Rail, bus rapid transit, and Metrolink) located within its jurisdiction, all cities received the call for projects notification for the Active Transportation program. Duyshart notified the TAC that the COG will begin prioritizing project requests in August once all MSP submission are in from SGV local agencies.

9. ACE/COG Integration

P. Duyshart updated the TAC on this item. He provided a chart which showed the timeline of the various integration activities, projects, and aspects for the next year. He also reported that a compensation and classification study for the integrated agency is still being conducted, and the initial results of the Classification portion of the study were presented to the ACE Integration Ad Hoc Committee last month. Duyshart also reminded TAC members that the draft LOI for the new COG/ACE Project Review and Selection process for capital construction projects was released earlier this month, and that agencies have until August 31 to submit projects for consideration. Unlike the Measure M solicitation of projects, cities can submit any capital construction project under the COG/ACE Project Review and Selection Process, not just transportation-related projects.

10. Subcommittee on LA County Fire Department Compliance

P. Duyshart provided a short update on this item to the TAC. He reported that the City Managers directed COG staff to work with contracting cities first, and then to schedule a meeting between City Managers and high-ranking LACFD representatives, but only after the City Managers initially try to work through the California Contract Cities Association (CCCA). COG staff is currently in contact with the CCCA to provide the CCCA with more information about the issues that COG cities are facing regarding this matter, and to also try to schedule meetings with the appropriate LACFD representatives to try to resolve issues of increasing contracting costs and customer service and plan check problems and delays.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

There were no comments or announcements from, or on behalf of, the SGVCOG Executive Director.

CHAIR'S REPORT

11. Solicitation of presentation topics

There was no discussion on this item.

12. Current City Projects

There was no discussion of city projects.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

P. Duyshart announced that there will be no Planning Directors' TAC meeting in August. The next Planning Directors' TAC Meeting will be on *September 27th*.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 1:11 P.M.