

Planning & Development Committee
April 8, 2015 – 5:30 p.m.
1st Fl. Council Committee Room – City Hall
-Minutes-

Present: Chair, Councilor Greg Verga; Vice Chair, Councilor Paul Lundberg; Councilor Paul McGeary (Alternate)

Absent: Councilor LeBlanc

Also Present: Councilor Cox; Linda T. Lowe

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. Councilor McGeary entered the meeting at 5:36 p.m.

1. A) *Special Events Application re: request from Cape Ann YMCA to hold Backshore 5 Mile Road Race on May 8, 2015*

Barbara Berry, representing the Cape Ann YMCA and Race Director, said that all these races are annual events. There are some road closures for the Back Shore Five Mile Race, she said, with the race starting at 6 p.m. and was framed as not disruptive. Addressing the two Labor Day road races, Around the Cape 25K and Run the Goose 7K, Ms. Berry said that the Around the Cape race doesn't close any roadways throughout the race. However, with the Run the Goose race there is a brief window of time at the start of the race lasting approximately five to 10 minutes where the roadway is closed to get all runners off. She noted that at the suggestion of the Special Events Advisory Committee last year, the races start at 8 a.m. so it is less disruptive to vehicular traffic. All other race details are the same as previous years, she said. **Linda T. Lowe**, City Clerk, confirmed that the three races before the Committee were reviewed by the Special Events Advisory Committee. She confirmed there were no real differences from the previous year for any of the three races.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Lundberg, seconded by Councilor Verga, the Planning & Development Committee voted 2 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council permit the Cape Ann YMCA to hold on Friday, May 8, 2015 the Backshore 5 Mile Road Race with the following conditions:

1. **Certificate of Insurance:**

A Certificate of Insurance naming the City as an additional insured party is on file with the City Clerk's Office.

2. **Road Closure Plans:**

Applicant must have Police/Fire Department approval of any road closure/traffic plans 30 days before event, including any police details. Roads to be closed are to be marked with signage directing the public as to the duration of the closure and alternate routes. Any substantial changes, as determined by either the Police or Fire Chief or their designees to the route or related to safety issues will require Council approval.

3. **Refuse and Comfort Stations:**

All refuse and recycling due to this event must be removed by the organizer. Any portable toilets (with two handicap accessible) are to be provided and maintained by the organizer, placed the evening before the event or early on the day of the event and removed by 9 p.m. the day of the event.

4. **Emergency Services** are as determined by City EMS Director.

5. **Staffing:**

Event staff is to have cell phones and wear distinct shirts. A list of event staff and cell phone numbers is to be submitted to Police, Fire and DPW Departments.

6. **Notification to Immediate Abutters and Businesses to Race Course:**

Written notice shall be made by event organizer at least seven days in advance of the event to function halls, motels and hotels and other businesses along the route.

7. **Responsibility of the Cape Ann YMCA:**

The applicant is also required to obtain any necessary approvals from the Licensing Board, the Public Health Department and the Licensing Commission. It is the sole responsibility of the Cape Ann YMCA to ensure that all required documentation is timely filed with the appropriate City departments as indicated. Failure to comply with any conditions precedent may result in permit revocation.

B) *Special Events Application re: request from Cape Ann YMCA to hold Round Cape Ann 25K*

Road Race & Run the Goose 7K Road Race on September 7, 2015

MOTION: On motion by Councilor Lundberg, seconded by Councilor Verga, the Planning & Development Committee voted 2 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council permit the Cape Ann YMCA to hold on Monday, September 7, 2015 the 25K Around the Cape Road Race and the 7K Run the Goose Road Race with the following conditions:

1. **Certificate of Insurance:**
A Certificate of Insurance naming the City as an additional insured party is on file with the City Clerk's Office.
 2. **Road Closure Plans:**
Applicant must have Police/Fire Department approval of any road closure/traffic plans 30 days before event, including any police details. Roads to be closed are to be marked with signage directing the public as to the duration of the closure and alternate routes. Any substantial changes, as determined by either the Police or Fire Chief or their designees to the route or related to safety issues will require Council approval.
 3. **Refuse and Comfort Stations:**
All refuse and recycling due to this event must be removed by the organizer. Any portable toilets (with two handicap accessible) are to be provided and maintained by the organizer, placed the evening before the event or early on the day of the event and removed by 9 p.m. the day of the event.
 4. **Emergency Services** are as determined by City EMS Director.
 5. **Staffing:**
Event staff is to have cell phones and to wear distinct shirts. A list of event staff and cell phone numbers is to be submitted to Police, Fire and DPW Departments.
 6. **Notification to Immediate Abutters and Businesses to Race Course:**
Written notice shall be made by event organizer at least seven days in advance of the event to function halls, motels and hotels and other businesses along the route.
 7. **Responsibility of the Cape Ann YMCA:**
The applicant is also required to obtain any necessary approvals from the Licensing Board, the Public Health Department and the Licensing Commission. It is the sole responsibility of the Cape Ann YMCA to ensure that all required documentation is timely filed with the appropriate City departments as indicated. Failure to comply with any conditions precedent may result in permit revocation.
2. *SCP2015-001: Concord Street #250, Map 248, Lot 13, GZO Sec. 5.13 Personal Wireless Service Facility*

Councilor Verga said that there will be a presentation from the applicant and that while this meeting was not a public hearing he would assent for the Committee to hear briefly from a spokesperson of a group of concerned citizens. He said there will also be a Committee discussion of the next steps to be taken by the Committee and the Council.

Attorney Edward Pare, Jr., Brown, Rudnick LLP, Providence, Rhode Island, representing SBA Towers V, Inc., and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC by and through its Manager, AT&T Mobility Corporation presented an overview of the Special Permit application for a new cell tower proposed at 250 Concord Street (Map 248, Lot 13), the property which is owned by Pamela J. Fryklund and Carrie Fryklund, Co-Trustees of the Donald L. Fryklund Living Trust. All area coverage plot plans, maps shown to the Committee by the applicant as well as the Zoning Board of Appeals decision referred to during the discussion on the cell tower are on file as part of the Special Council Permit application with the City Council.

Reviewing site maps in the application under Tab 14, **Mr. Pare** described the lot (T-1) as a type of tree farm, highlighting nearby roadways – Whale Rocks Road, Bray and Concord Streets. He said because of the great elevation of the property it was a great location for a cell tower site. He pointed out the property (+/- 32.4 acres) has a significant setback from Concord Street which he said was a great elevation and a key factor for locating a cell tower from a frequency and visibility perspective. He said another reason for the appropriateness of the site is that it is a large property enabling the siting of the tower with significant a setback from surrounding roadways -- 1,500 feet from Concord Street.

Referring to Plot Plan C-1, **Mr. Pare** highlighted the left side of the plan showing two circles radiating out from the proposed location of the cell tower, the inner circle depicting a three hundred foot radius with no buildings

within that radius, and the outer circle at 500 feet which also is uninhabited but does abut two property lines (west/northwest side) of the outer circle. There is an undeveloped property adjacent, he said.

Referring to a letter dated February 26, 2015 to the City Council which was submitted with the Special Council Permit application, **Mr. Pare** said that AT&T is the only applicant for the cell tower proposal. The applicant proposes that the cell tower of 150 feet in height that would contain 12 panel antennas which he described as the size of a fluorescent light. He said to obtain signal, the tower would have four panel antennas to make a 360 degree coverage plot/signal (each panel being able to cover 120 degrees). The wires to the antennas are inside the pole and attach to electronic equipment inside a shelter at the base of the tower and contain all the switching equipment. The pole is designed for co-location pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance and that the tower can take five additional carriers.

A depiction of the cell tower compound was shown (Z-1-Proposed Site Plan). Proposed is a chain link security fence for the site's perimeter. **Mr. Pare** described: the centrally located is a top down view of the tower with the antennas attached to a frame which is attached to the pole (tower) that gives it a triangular look and propagates the signal in a 360 degree pattern. Pointing out the shelter at the base of the tower, he said that there is an emergency back-up generator surrounded by noise-attenuating fencing as well.

Mr. Pare said that the basic tree elevation runs between 30 to 70 feet depending on the type of tree. He referred the Committee to the application showing why AT&T needs to locate the tower at 250 Concord Street. He said that the co-applicant, SBA is a cell tower developer and doesn't provide service to the public, but AT&T will be its lead tenant on the proposed cell tower. He said that Verizon was an original applicant but that company decided not to proceed and withdrew the day of the Zoning Board of Appeals public hearing.

Dan Goulet, C Squared Systems, LLC, Manchester, New Hampshire, retained by SBA and AT&T, referred all his remarks to Tab 4, RF Report dated February 23, 2015. He highlighted in that section Exhibit 1: AT&T Network Plan and said that it showed the AT&T existing sites in Gloucester, Rockport and Manchester, and not all were cell tower locations but had cell arrays at the Addison Gilbert Hospital, the Annisquam Village Church, on a smoke stack, a lattice tower, an existing guide tower with co-location, the top of a building at the corner of Pleasant and Main Streets, and on a water tower. **Mr. Pare** added that in the AT&T nomenclature it uses designations of "MALH followed by a four digit number which is depicted on Exhibit #1 for each cell location. Centrally located on the plot plan is the proposed site of the cell tower (MALH3583SA). **Mr. Goulet** pointed out how far apart the cell locations were in Exhibit 1 currently covering Gloucester which he said created gaps in service that were described as unreliable service areas.

Mr. Goulet referred to Exhibit #2: Existing Coverage which shows a large area of white which he described as an area that AT&T considers not having reliable service. He pointed out green spaces (cell coverage areas) which coincide with high terrain which can access 4G signal. **Councilor Verga** clarified with **Mr. Goulet** that the white area may have 3G technology, but that AT&T is focused on 4G technology now. **Mr. Goulet** said that AT&T has currently deployed the 4G network in this market and are trying to fill in all the coverage gaps with 4G in the area. He described 3G technology carrying voice and data as is 4G technology, but 4G includes broadband data which services smartphones, PDA's, laptops, air cards and wireless broad band. **Mr. Goulet** said that he downloaded from the Federal Communications Commission's (FCC) website that the majority of 911 calls placed in this country last year and prior year to that were on wireless phones. He said that the effort is to try and better pinpoint people during emergencies not just outside buildings, but inside a building and so the FCC is looking for further E911 signal enhancement.

Mr. Goulet reviewed:

Exhibit #3: Planned Coverage shows the area that AT&T would like to fill in with 4G service. The footprint at 150 feet was shown in a light green area. He said it is not that there is no coverage outside of the light green area, which is the proposed coverage area, but it is depicted that there is a large white area depicting unreliable LTE coverage or no reliable service. The dark green areas show good (existing) coverage. AT&T will be unable to fill in complete coverage in the white area by the building of this one cell tower, **Mr. Goulet** said, due to the terrain and topography.

Exhibit #4: Terrain-3D View showing the area's topography. AT&T will be unable to fill in complete coverage in the white area by the building of this one cell tower, **Mr. Goulet** said, due to the terrain and topography. The proposed site was in approximately the center of the 3D view and indicates at 150 feet the area of coverage that would be achieved. Three other sites were looked at in the area but were not described but were depicted on Exhibit #4. The coverage objective was described as Concord, Summer, and Bray Streets encompassing as many residences as possible and create connectivity on those streets (Reference: Tab 4, Page 2 of RF Report "3. Coverage Objectives.). He noted in the RF Report Page 3 showing a table of estimated coverage in terms of population. There is a gain of secondary road coverage of 12.6 miles, or 885 people which he said was not a huge number of people but are people

who may not have reliable service now. The area covered is indicated in the RF Report as 4.5 square miles. AT&T is more concerned with how many people and roadways that will be covered, not physical area.

Mr. Goulet said that the demand for voice and data has increased by 267 percent adding that most everybody has smartphones and want the latest technology to produce a response immediately. He said it is not just accounting for coverage, but once many people are on the same network emanating from on the same site, the signal has to divvy the coverage up the more people using the network and then there is less coverage as a result because the signal is now overburdened.

Mr. Pare said the applicant is in compliance with all the FCC standards with respect to emissions. He said most people are concerned about the height of the cell tower. He noted he has read press accounts have confirmed that, and that it is up to the applicant to justify the need which is for 150 feet in height, but the site would be optimal at 170 feet. He pointed out that at a height of 130 feet the cell tower loses some significant coverage. He noted the site visit and balloon test is scheduled (advertised in the Gloucester Daily Times by the applicant and for information a website by the company responsible for the test: [www.cadsins.com\Gloucester](http://www.cadsins.com/Gloucester)) for either Friday, April 10 at 9:00 a.m. and Saturday, April 11 at 9:00 a.m. or Sunday, April 12, 9 a.m. and Monday, April 13 at 9:00 a.m.

The zoning ordinance was described by **Mr. Pare** as being quirky. He said the applicant went before the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) because they are looking to locate a tower outside the Personal Wireless Overlay District and was granted relief so that the City Council could hear this as a Special Permit even though the tower wouldn't be located in the overlay district.

Councilor Lundberg said it seemed that the ZBA concluded there was no choice; that federal law trumps local zoning in such a situation, and if the Council's denial of this permit contributes to the continuation of the so-called gap (in service). **Mr. Pare** expressed his agreement with the Councilor. He said that the Zoning Ordinance bifurcates the zoning relief -- the ZBA for variances and the City Council having jurisdiction over Special Permits, but the cell tower permits are restricted into a wireless overlay district which he said are nowhere near where the coverage has to be. He pointed out that the Zoning Ordinance on wireless facility permitting in the city hasn't kept up with the technology and demand not unlike many cities and towns in the state which he said the city may wish to consider. He said that the applicant thinks that 250 Concord Street is a great site. He suggested that in looking at the site and the unreliable coverage for the area that it would be an appropriate area for a wireless facility overlay district. He reiterated that the ZBA granted relief so the applicant could come before the Council to apply for a Special Permit for a 150 foot cell tower. He said the ZBA was adamant that they weren't granting height relief, but did enough where the applicant didn't have to be confrontational with the city which he said was not the goal, but rather to have the group of concerned citizens be AT&T's customers and to work with the city to come up with a solution. He said he felt that the Council would find the applicant's approach to be reasonable.

Councilor Lundberg said it seems that everyone is hopeful to have better cell phone coverage in the area of the proposed cell tower, but the question is whether the requested height is necessary and suggested that should be the focus of the Committee. He said if they can find a way to analyze the effect of the different heights and to do the balloon test. **Mr. Pare** said the towers aren't invisible -- it will be a 100 foot piece of steel rising up above the trees because they have to be above the trees or the signal is lost in the foliage. He added that the signal has to have free flow in order to have full coverage because every time the signal hits a branch, a leaf or a building, or a wall, signal coverage is lost and is why the tower has to be above the trees. He said the applicant shows the analysis of what happens when they drop the height of the tower. This was provided in data in the RF Report because there were many questions about the height.

Councilor McGeary said in looking at Tab #4, Exhibit 5: Height Analysis he was looking at coverage at various heights and the existing coverage. According to Mr. Goulet's analysis he said it appears that there is a marginal difference between 130 and 150 feet which is fairly small. **Mr. Pare** pointed out this exhibit was prepared for the Special Council Permit at the request of a Councilor who was at the ZBA public hearing. **Mr. Goulet** then reviewed Exhibit #5 which was colored to represent 110 feet representing the lowest height at 110 feet, 130 feet, 150 feet and 170 feet. He said there is a substantial difference in coverage between 110 and 130 feet. The red under the 130 is fill in and another layer for 170 feet which is orange. He showed another plot for impact. He said that at a height of 170 feet the cell tower signal could hit all of Concord Street and capture many more homes. He also indicated there is a housing development in the Concord Street area that the applicant is trying to capture. If the tower height is dropped to 130 feet, the signal will only cover part of those homes and not cover much of Concord and Bray Streets, he said. He added that with a twenty foot of loss of height the angle change from 150 to 130 feet to the human eye is not a lot.

Responding to a question from **Councilor McGeary**, **Mr. Goulet** said that the unreliable coverage is in a building rather than outside, and that people prefer to call from inside rather than outside especially in an

emergency. Because of the terrain in the area, and because of the frequency of 1900 MHz, which is what AT&T is licensed for, the problem is that the wavelength approximates the length of the leaves and pine needles which have a greater absorption of the signal. The lower the tower the lower the signal, he concluded. **Mr. Pare** said that where the white areas are depicted is where there will be population increases, and there will be a site that will be developed to accommodate the demand by that population increase be it AT&T or another telecommunications company. He said if the tower is lowered coverage will be lost. If they agree that at "X" height it makes sense and is a good location the opportunity is maximized to get as many carriers up as possible at 250 Concord Street. **Mr. Goulet** added said it will hopefully minimize the need for future cell towers needed for the area. He said that if the height of the tower is lowered from 150 feet, it means that the next co-locator goes to 120 feet, the next at 110 feet which is about 25 to 30 feet just above the tree line. He said now the Council is promoting the need more sites rather than less. **Mr. Pare** said they knew Verizon was interested because they had been with AT&T as a co-applicant initially interested but dropped out for budget reasons. He said that in talking with the city it was learned that there are public safety communications issues. He noted that in speaking with the Mayor's office they agreed to provide space for Police and Fire who he said have a demonstrable need, and will be attached to the tower, if it is approved, at a height which is below what carriers typically use. This tower will provide that relief, he said, and that a letter from former Mayor Kirk was a part of the application (found under Tab 17) indicating the agreement reached between the applicant, the Mayor and the city solicitor.

Councilor McGeary said he was in receipt of an email from the Fire Chief today that he hadn't had an opportunity to forward to the Committee yet (placed on file). He said that according to the agreement Mr. Pare referred to earlier, the antennas for the city's Police and Fire Departments are set at 107 feet which **Mr. Pare** confirmed. **Councilor McGeary** said if the height of the tower were to come down, the Police and Fire Department's antenna array would move down accordingly which **Mr. Pare** also confirmed. **Mr. Pare** said that the top of the cell tower would be reserved for the prime telecommunications carriers -- AT&T, T-Mobile, Verizon, Sprint and other carriers in the area. He said Public Safety doesn't have the same need for height and so are located at 107 feet because they use whip antennas and use something different from the prime carriers. If the tower comes down 20 feet then they come down 20 feet, he added, and is the way the current agreement is structured. **Councilor McGeary** informed the Committee that according to Fire Chief Eric Smith, the Fire Department needs to be co-located at 90 feet or higher to get the maximum return on their signal. He asked how much of the 150 feet is reserved for prime carriers. **Mr. Pare** said they are separated at 10 feet vertically. There would be five arrays they believe eventually. He said if they build it the carriers will come. The ordinance requirement on co-location will force them to come to that tower first before another is built. The applicant wants to reserve the top forty feet for prime and then the city, he said, adding that as they move down the tower the signal dissipates. He said if T-Mobile comes in last and is at 100 feet they won't have much coverage and find the tower useless. He noted as a result, T-Mobile may then come and say that they need another tower and apply to build one nearby. If the site is a good site they maximize the use, he said.

Councilor Lundberg said the federal Telecommunications Act (TCA) requires municipalities to cooperate to fill in the (coverage) gaps and doesn't specify how that cooperation should be done. He said if you say 150 feet maximizes the cell signal and, if the tower is not permitted at 150 feet but at a lesser height, carriers will say they need another tower which is an economic driver for them not for the city. **Mr. Pare** said it is about coverage and to build a site where there is demand which is what generated this application. As to the TCA, he said there are no existing structures, towers, water tanks, or tall buildings in the area of the proposed cell tower site as shown in the application which is how a lot of Gloucester is currently covered. There are two test standards under federal law, he said -- the carriers have to fill a gap and show there are no feasible alternatives. He said to him the feasible alternatives are squared away. He noted that there is nothing there but a tower on a lot next door at a lower elevation requiring more height which makes it worse, so it comes down to the gap in service. He said if the Council suggested strongly that they'll approve the tower at only 100 feet, should the carriers find that leaves them with a significant gap, then they would have a case under the TCA. He said he would surmise there would be substantial evidence to defend, and in the end it is a balance and can they come to a solution that where everyone is satisfied understanding that the tower will be visible.

Councilor Verga reiterated that the Committee meeting was not a public hearing and that all the members of the public present would have an opportunity to speak before the Council at the public hearing and asked Councilor McGeary in his role as Council President further describe the Council process for the public hearing.

Councilor McGeary, speaking as Council President, said when the matter is moved forward to the Council by the P&D Committee, there will be a formal public hearing. He said anyone who wants to speak will be allowed to do so and may also submit written testimony under the Council's Rules of Procedure. It is likely that the public hearing will take place before the Council about 45 days from today. He added that the public hearing will be

advertised in the newspaper. Councilors will alert concerned citizens in as many ways as possible. He urged that anyone speaking from written remarks or wishing to submit written testimony should bring it with them to be submitted for the record at the time of the public hearing as it will be the formal public input process into this matter.

Councilor McGeary noted a federal court case involving a New York state municipality versus Sprint in which the court apparently held that 4G technology was an information service not a telecommunications service, and therefore wasn't governed by the TCA. **Mr. Pare** said that AT&T and other carriers are migrating over to Voice Over Internet (VOI), or VOI LTE and that voice is now integrated into 4G technology. He said AT&T and other major carriers are integrated, and he offered to send the Committee FCC rulings that say if the products are integrated they are covered by the TCA. He added that because AT&T has added voice into LTE, the voice and the data are one. **Councilor McGeary** confirmed with **Mr. Pare** that voice over data trumps the fact that it is purely informational where that was only data. **Mr. Pare** said when AT&T launched LTE in Gloucester early on, they modified all of their sites which were informational only and didn't spend much time on coverage. The LTE 4G service now provides telephone service as do some of their competitors.

Pete Radochia, 259 Concord Street, noted his packet of information on file (contained in emails to the Committee) spoke representing a group of concerned citizens about the height and visual impact of the proposed cell tower.

He then reviewed seven areas of concern briefly as follows:

- 1) Visual Impact of the Tower Height: The site is set 100 feet above sea level at the base making the entire structure 250 feet above sea level; this area views Cranes Beach and is a pristine area.
- 2) Proximity to coastal Visual Overlay District.
- 3) Actual benefit to residents based on Applicant coverage maps (on file). This tower will benefit only a small number of area residents (17 percent of the identified population without "good service") or 800 people.
- 4) Broadband versus voice service.
- 5) Tower design. It was indicated that the applicant has not offered any tower design options to the city.
- 6) Town of Dartmouth case. The Town of Dartmouth has the same applicant before them to erect a tower on the shores of Padanaram harbor for a 150 foot cell tower but with local opposition reduced the height to 100 feet.
- 7) Co-location on the tower. The coverage map submitted by the applicant shows that a single tower at 150 feet will not serve all of West Gloucester.

Mr. Radochia suggested different tower designs with repeaters on telephone poles as an alternative. He said the group of concerned citizens wants to ensure that the area remains pristine and that if there are other technologies to protect that they wish to see those technologies explored. He then asked a series of questions -- if this tower goes up how many other towers will be needed; did the tower need to be 150 feet; what is the minimum height for the city's emergency services. Will the tower require any lighting on it -- would there be beacon and at what height did it not require a beacon. He added that the group would like the city to hire an independent firm to assess the technology.

Councilor Verga said at the public hearing there will be equal time for presentations given for the applicant and for those who wish to express their concerns. **Councilor McGeary** said when the time comes it would be appropriate for the group of concerned citizens to nominate main speakers or spokespersons and to advise the City Clerk in advance.

Councilor Verga said the city will be asked to review the tower ordinance against federal regulations and have an expert that might be shared by the applicant look specifically at this application, with a cost associated with that analysis. He said the Committee is not ready to make a decision, but advised that whatever the Council does, they would like to ensure that the final decision is not challenged. He said that zoning is written local to restrict rather than allow, and that the federal government is trying to make sure they don't restrict more than they should. He assured that the process will be slowed down and done right.

There was a discussion of the Committee with Mr. Pare about the balloon test and the Committee and other City Councilors viewing that test from possible locations other than 250 Concord Street which would not yield any information. The Committee determined the end of Coffin's Beach would be an optimal viewing site and would gather there on Saturday, April 11 at 9:00 a.m. for that purpose. It was noted that sites will be visited by individual Councilors. **Councilor McGeary** asked that if a balloon was flown at 150 feet it have a flag or some kind of obvious indicator attached to it at 130 feet or if at all possible to have two balloons, one at 130 and one at 150 feet. **Councilor Lundberg** said the Committee understood that the assembled residents are not really opponents, in that they all want better cell coverage, but that there are issues being raised that are important and will be dealt with as scientifically as the Committee can. It was also indicated by the Committee that residents can submit photographs of the balloon test from various locations but the photographs must show the time, date and location of where the photograph was taken from and be submitted to the City Clerk's office.

This matter is continued to April 22, 2015.

A motion was made, seconded and voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 6:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

**Dana C. Jorgenson
Clerk of Committees**

DOCUMENTS/ITEMS SUBMITTED AT MEETING:

- **Email from Fire Chief Eric Smith dated April 8, 2015 and GFD Preliminary Radio Analysis Dated March 26, 2013**