Amy Harvey

From:	Roger Stancil
Sent:	Tuesday, May 22, 2018 3:19 PM
To:	Allen Buansi; Donna Bell; Hongbin Gu; Jeanne Brown; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Town Council; Michael Parker; Nancy Oates; Pam Hemminger; Rachel Schaevitz; Roger Stancil; Ross Tompkins
Cc:	Loryn Clark; Ben Hitchings; Scott Clark; Amy Harvey; Beth Vazquez; Carolyn Worsley; Catherine Lazorko; Christina Strauch; Dwight Bassett; Flo Miller; Mary Jane Nirdlinger; Rae Buckley; Ralph Karpinos; Ran Northam; Roger Stancil; Sabrina Oliver
Subject:	Council Questions: Item 12: Wireless Communications

<u>Council Question</u>: Just so I understand the language on p.116 of the packet correctly, does town staff believe there is no potential for disruption in the public rights-of-way and thus, staff agrees with the industry request that the Town eliminate the preference for siting ancillary small wireless facility equipment in underground vaults. The language I'm referring to is quoted below:

"<u>Industry Request</u>: That the Town eliminate the preference for siting ancillary small wireless facility equipment in underground vaults. <u>Staff Response</u>: We agree with this request. We think that the potential benefit of siting small wireless equipment in underground vaults is eclipsed by the disruption in public rights-of-way and possible damage to existing underground utilities. We revised Ordinance subsection 5.20.9(d)(2)(vii) to reflect this change."

<u>Staff Response</u>: *Town staff believe that there is a benefit to concealing equipment in underground vaults but that there are more drawbacks than benefits. There is potential for significant disruption, particularly since we anticipate that hundreds of these facilities will be constructed in the community. Siting equipment in underground vaults is: 1) Potentially disruptive to public rights-of way to construct the vaults; 2) Potentially disruptive due to the possibility of hitting existing underground utilities; and 3) An untypical location for these facilities that is not an industry standard.*