11-30-10 Hearing



THE CHAIRMAN: That is what I thought.

MR. BARACH: One more question. At the last meeting there was a discussion of a secondary site. I forget where that was.

MR. CUCE: Do you mean with Mr. Dymant in terms of the proposed or alternate sites that were looked into?

MR. BARACH: Yes. Could you show us on the map where that would be?

THE WITNESS: I can talk about that. There was a water tank. There is a red water tank not quite at high ground elevation but going towards the proposed location. My understanding was that the owner was not interested in executing a lease, so that kind of withered on the vine.

The other alternate that I was aware of is another utility structure a bit north of here and significantly lower in ground elevation. There were some leasing complications, but from a radio frequency perspective far inferior because of the delta and the ground elevation.

MR. BARACH: And adding additional footage, what does that do visually for

the tower from different perspectives on 82?

THE WITNESS: Now we are getting away from my area of expertise, but I can just tell you as a layman that the site as it is proposed is tucked back in the woods where Metro could add another thirty feet to it, and you wouldn't be able to see the additional ten feet or the difference in ground elevation from there to the other or both.

MR. POMPO: What about the addition of ten feet visually?

THE WITNESS: The addition of ten feet, if you want my opinion -- and I have seen site photographs -- it's tucked away far enough in the woods where no one is going to notice that ten feet, twenty feet or thirty feet was added to this utility structure. Most likely no one will notice any antennas or equipment at the base.

MR. CUCE: And this ten feet is within the proposed maximum height for co-location on existing structures. That is in line with the conditions.

MR. BARACH: Does that bring it to 130 or 140 feet then?

THE WITNESS: The antenna center