1. ROLL CALL
The clerk called the roll and a quorum was determined to be present.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The group Pledged Allegiance to the Flag.

3. CELL TOWER PROPOSAL FOR AT&T – CHESHIRE STREET
Mr. Milone introduced Dave Vivian from AT&T, who has prepared a packet of information to present to the Council. There was an error in the revenue estimates carried forward, and maps are included in the packet.

In the packet Mr. Vivian noted under tab #1 is the original correspondence with Mr. Milone, two cash flow projections with assumptions. Tab #2 is the proposed tower location at the water treatment plant. Tab #3 includes different sample tower photographs for discussion of form versus function and benefits to each type of tower. Tab #4 is information on AT&T's type of equipment, shed at the base of each tower, along with antenna information. Tab #5 is a preliminary analysis.

Regarding the cash flow analysis Mr. Vivian has discussed this with Mr. Milone. Presented in the packet are two different options; one with AT&T owning and operating the tower which is the first of the two cash flows; and the second is with the Town owning and operating the tower with AT&T paying rent. The error was corrected in this packet for year 2011, and the information is more true for a 20 year cash flow if AT&T owned the tower. AT&T would pay the Town ground rent of $2,000 a month plus 25% of any revenues from additional carriers, going for 20 years. In both cash flows there are only two carriers for comparison. In actuality, there are four AT&T licensed carriers, including AT&T, in this area. It is likely we will end up with a 4th carrier for this tower, with assumptions made as to when the carriers come on board and what they would be paying. It is assumed AT&T would go on once the tower is built in year #1; a 2nd carrier in year #2; and year #3 would be Sprint. In both cash flow projections this is the least assumption.

The difference with AT&T paying the Town ground rent and Town owned is AT&T paying as a co-locator as opposed to owner/operator with higher rent. To
offset its cost, AT&T would take free rent of actually constructing the facility. There is backup information on where these end numbers come from. AT&T would have 10 years of free rent, and then begin paying co-location revenue. In year #2 there is $30,000 with tenant #2 going on, and in year 3, it is bumped up with tenant #3 coming on. In year 11, AT&T rent kicks in with another $30,000, and over 20 years a Town owned facility is more beneficial to the Town.

Mr. Milone said the Town owns only one tower because it was the Town's to begin with, and we were looking to replace it, and AT&T came along and paid for the construction of the tower.

In similar situations Mr. Schrumm asked about town owned towers.

Mr. Vivian said that in some towns the revenue is part of their thinking, and others do not want to be bothered. He said there is something before the Siting Council for the Town of Reading with similar cash flows, but they do not want to deal with the liability and other issues.

Mr. Schrumm commented on the fact that the Town would have to insure and maintain the tower, and he asked who owns the equipment shed.

Each equipment shed is personal property for each carrier and Mr. Vivian said each carrier stores its stuff in their shed.

Mr. Sima asked about the rental agreement, and the revenue stream.

In reply, Mr. Vivian said this is shown in the assumptions, giving the Town 25% of the rental revenue.

Mr. Sima asked about the design used, the flagpole or the graystick design, and limitation on the number of antennas that can go inside the structure.

Mr. Vivian said that in tab #3, there is information regarding the design.

Once we do this, Mr. Sima said more vertical space is taken up, and there is a limit on the number of possible tenants.

According to Mr. Vivian it is yes and no...structurally, no. AT&T and Verizon would be verticals. The big pine tree towers still have functionality, and from his perspective there is an appropriate form for each case. AT&T needs 150 feet here, and the average tree height in the area is 45 feet, so there would be a 100 foot large ugly tree sticking out from the treatment plant. The suggestion is that this is not the most appropriate form for this particular location. It is appropriate in other areas such as along I-91, exit 36.

Mr. Schrumm asked about the likelihood of maximizing other people.
There will be four licensed carriers and Mr. Vivian said he is not sure about other carriers building out in certain sectors, such as Clearwire or Pocket Communications.

(Mr. White entered the meeting at 7:55 p.m.)

Ms. Giddings said the tree type towers are more attractive.

Mr. Sima asked if the Town is offered, free of charge, space in the building for something small, not taking up much power.

Mr. Vivian said it would be space within the tower complex for small equipment. This will be discussed with staff, and if physically possible, it would be offered.

(Mr. Perugini entered the meeting at 8:00 p.m.)

Mr. Sima said it would be a 24’ x 24’, 12” deep cabinet that would be needed.

Regarding the lease, Mr. Vivian said it is initially a 5 year lease.

In the future if technology changes and the tower is not needed anymore, and it belongs to AT&T, Mr. Schrumm asked if they take it away.

If AT&T owns the tower, Mr. Vivian said they would be responsible for it.

Mr. Schrumm asked if this would have to go through the Siting Council.

If it is AT&T owned, Mr. Vivian said it must go to the Siting Council, but first through the Town with an 8-24 type review. If the town is in favor of the tower this weighs with the Siting Council.

With the possibility of going through a plant renovation, Mr. Sima said we want to make sure that the site location is close to the back.

Mr. Vivian said an alternative was discussed about going just outside of the fence. It is further away from the ball fields.

On the map, Mr. Sima pointed out where he would like the storage area, farther away from the soccer fields.

Mr. Vivian sees no problems with the location pointed out by Mr. Sima.

On the plot plan, the square area, Mr. Schrumm asked if the entire area would be taken up.
Mr. Sima said all of this would be discussed and decided before agreements are signed.

On the tower, Mr. Milone asked if the Town of Cheshire would have first position, or where it would end up on the tower.

According to Mr. Vivian, AT&T would want the top, the 150’s.

Regarding the revenue stream, Mr. Milone asked about the assessed value of the equipment and tax revenue on this equipment.

Mr. Vivian said this has not been included in the calculations; this is just lease revenue.

In that regard, Mr. Milone said there would be some tax revenue generated, and asked what the gross value of the equipment might be.

It is all over the map, and Mr. Vivian said the assessor could determine this, but he estimates $300,000.

For the last tower at the police department Mr. Milone said the assessed value range was $250,000 to $400,000. So, it could be assumed that the Town would have the value of the personal property taxes generated.

This is real estate property and Mr. Vivian said if it is Town owned, it is exempt.

On the property tax component, Mr. White asked about the $300,000 number, and personal property devalued over time.

Mr. Vivian said the $300,000 number is for the real estate.

Mr. White asked for a ball park number on rental income from other carriers.

Mr. Vivian said it is not the antennas, it is the electronics equipment. Much of this is provided, but he is not sure how AT&T’s equipment is assessed. Verizon is the most expensive, and least expensive would be T-Mobile.

In calculating the numbers, Mr. Schrumm said with a 4th carrier it is another $625 per month, or $7,600 annually.

Mr. Vivian said he noted one co-locator per year, but it could be two the second year. As for other spots in town, he does not know about them, but the 8-24 review will have this information.

Mr. Sima said the tower is a 5 spot tower, and the closest we will get is a 100 foot zone. The Town would get the very top.
AT&T needs 150 feet and Mr. Vivian said the alternative is opting for a flag pole, without a flag, going to 180 feet, and this is what was done in Reading. To maintain future capability, the suggestion is to go higher for level functionality.

Mr. White asked if there is confirmation on the Town receiving a 25% revenue share.

That can be confirmed in many ways and Mr. Vivian said it is a site lease agreement. The one caveat is a future lease agreement with specific rental numbers and arrangements which occurs between carriers.

Mr. Sima said there would be validation of that through the other tower. Mr. Sima noted there would be three users, Public Works, Fire and Police Departments.

For an emergency situation Mr. White asked if there is boiler plate wording on priorities on who takes control, or an understanding. If there are equipment problems or flooding at the treatment plant, and equipment goes bad, who is in control of the situation.

According to Mr. Vivian there is no specific prioritization, but AT&T wants 24 hour access to its equipment. In remote mountain types of sites there have been concerns, but sometimes a lock box is required by the public safety departments for access to the facility. The equipment shed is on the ground.

Mr. White said this shed should be outside the flood area.

Mr. Schrumm said the highest point is inside the dike.

This tower will go 24/7 and Mr. Sima asked about a power outage, and if there would be a generator on site, using natural gas or diesel, with proper containment.

Mr. Vivian said AT&T is looking at a different form of generator, which is easier to operate. In addition to the shed there would be a 4'x11' pad with the emergency generator next to it.

Mr. Milone requested AT&T to submit a generic contract to the Town offices for a review by the town attorney.

Mr. Sima asked that this matter be discussed with Mr. Dievert and Mr. Michaelangelo to insure all this goes with what is planned at the treatment plant site.

Projecting forward, Mr. Vivian reviewed how the Siting Council works, going through the legal issues, staff review, etc., and there will be a hearing in
Cheshire. A balloon will have to be floated before hand, and this will be done as part of the 8-24 review process, and everything will be coordinated through the Town Manager and the plant supervisor. Pictures will be taken, with a photo simulation of what AT&T wants to do, with the Town given two alternatives – standard form or flagpole form. There is a view shed map within a 2 mile area of study...where the tower can be seen year round, seasonally, and from where it cannot be seen. With a 180 foot tower there is no cost change to the Town.

With a 180 foot stick, Mr. Schrumm said we run some risk of the 4th or 5th carrier not coming because it is not high enough.

Mr. Vivian said with 180 feet, given the flat terrain on the site, it would be okay. The problem is shooting to the east towards Meriden. When this gets to the Siting Council it must be known what form the tower will take, and the Council can change the form.

In figuring out the view of the tower, Mr. Sima asked if there can be a rendering from the ground level, with the different designs and what they look like.

Mr. Vivian commented on the picture of the tower in the packet, stating the top is the standard monopole design, with a low profile platform mount. Below it is the flush mounted antenna, taking 3 antennas. The stick is the 2nd picture, i.e. flagpole, and this is where there is a pipe for a 150 foot tower with 4 carriers, a 100’ monopole, then a 50’ pipe, and antennas on the encased pipe. This is the most functional proposal, giving the most possibility for rental. A rendering will be provided to the Council.

Ms. Giddings asked if the tree is as functional as the monopole.

It is functional, but Mr. Vivian said a tree tower will draw attention to itself. With high winds, the branches fall off the tree tower, and this type of tower increases the costs. AT&T can do a tree tower, but there is an appropriate form for each location, and with the location being discussed, there is an open spot with surrounding tree height of 45 feet.

AT&T will provide Mr. Milone with the rendering, generic lease agreement, and Mr. Milone said there will be an 8-24 review before the Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. Milone will put Mr. Vivian in contact with Town Planner Voelker and Plant Supervisor Dievert. Mr. Milone asked for a time frame for the entire process.

The fenced in footprint area will be about 50’ x 50’ for 3 carriers, and Mr. Vivian said with 4 or 5 carriers, they could be squeezed into a 75’ x 75’ area. The standard is 100’x 100’ area.

Mr. Schrumm said the storage area would be better inside the dike.
If we are building in a flood plain, Mr. Vivian said it will take some time because an E.A. must be done through the FCC. He advised that the Siting Council is asking for 90 day extensions on applications.

Mr. Sima said this location is in a flood plain.

(Mr. White left the meeting at 8:30 p.m.; Mr. Perugini left the meeting at 8:35 p.m.)

4. CASERTANO LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN
Mr. Milone reviewed the changes to the Land Management Plan.

Under General Statement, the words “at least” were removed; for public water supply the word “public” was taken out; paragraph #3 was restored.

Item #4 – at the bottom “limited” was taken out, and it says…biodiversity with proper timber resource.

Item #5, sentence #2…phrase “in its current condition” was stricken.

Item #6 – “while maintaining agricultural use” was questioned and it was decided to keep it in.

Those were the only changes made.

Mr. Sima said there was discussion about “while maintaining agricultural use” and something was said about the upper and lower sections.

Mr. Milone said it was discussed and decided to keep it in.

According to Mr. Sima he mentioned “it encompasses the brook area” and asked if “while maintaining agricultural use” was kept in. It encompasses both sections. Mr. Sima said he will ask that the plan be moved for acceptance and approval.

MOTION By Mr. Schrumm; seconded by Mr. Sima.

MOVED that the Casertano Land Management Plan be accepted, as amended.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

5. STATUS REPORT ON THE DOG PARK.
At this point in time Mr. Sima said the discussion will be about the parking lot and the ability to put it over the covered structure. He does not think this is wise to be done.
The aerial photograph of the site was reviewed. Mr. Milone pointed out where the VFW property is located, and the designated area for the parking. He said Mr. Michaelangelo received a DEP e-mail (after March 4th) indicating they would allow construction of a lot, about 35 feet by 165 feet, with 18 new spaces, with two lost to provide an aisle, thereby picking up 16 spaces. The DEP would not allow gravel material and the paving stones would have to be used. The cost estimate is between $20,000 and $25,000 to do this work.

Mr. Milone noted that Mr. Sima had asked to look at another site, and Mr. Michaelangelo thought there could be only 10 spaces there, costing about $10,000 to $12,000 to have this work done. Also, Mr. Milone was asked to check with Fine Arts, and they indicated that they could not say, with confidence, that they would have spaces available on a regular basis. When Fine Arts has shows they are parking on the grass, from May until August, there are rehearsals for summer theater so there is a lot of traffic 3 days a week. Classes are sporadic and when there are many classes the lot is full, but this is not consistent. The bottom line is that, on a day to day basis, there will not be availability of a fixed number of spaces for the dog park.

Since the whole issue has fallen into semblance as an issue Mr. Schrumm said to let it ride until we see some action on the rest of it.

Mr. Sima stated that the people interested in the dog park must be informed that this is a cost they would incur, and they need to know the particulars. The committee can inform the dog park people that it has looked into the issue, and there may have to be a paved parking lot.

As a courtesy, Mr. Milone said he would like to contact them via e-mail letting them know it has been discussed, and the cost is anywhere from $20,000 to $25,000, and the Town is not prepared to put any money into the project. If the group wants to pursue it and pay for the parking spaces, they must get back in touch with the Council.

6. BOULDER KNOLL FARM STATUS
Mr. Sima said this goes back to Mr. Cipriano from New Haven’s public schools asking to use some land to farm. There was a meeting between the Curriculum Department of the Public Schools and Mr. Cipriano regarding this.

There is a letter from Assistant Superintendent Dietrich and Mr. Milone said the bottom line is there was no plan at all, and Mr. Cipriano did not know there was no water available on the land. The BOE did not want to say anything because they did not feel they were in a position to control things.

It was stated by Mr. Schrumm that the committee needs to see some sort of plan of what Mr. Cipriano wants to do, how it might work, etc.
Mr. Giddings said this must be pinned down with specifics, such as where Mr. Cipriano will get his equipment, who will supply his labor, etc. He has wonderful ideas, but so far has not shown much information.

According to Mr. Milone there was not a morsel of detail submitted, and Mr. Cipriano did not even know there was not water available on the land. He will correspond to Mr. Cipriano informing him the committee wants to see a detailed plan before anything happens.

7. DEMOLITION OF THE BARN AT BOULDER KNOLL.
Mr. Milone reported that Mr. Michaelangelo received an estimate of $11,800 to demolish the barn, but this does not include an asbestos survey, and this could cost between $500 and $800. The bottom line is that this demolition must go out to bid and requires committee approval.

Regarding the back part of the barn, Mr. Milone explained it collapsed and had to be taken down. It was not a demolition.

MOTION By Mr. Schrumm; seconded by Mr. Sima.

MOVED that the demolition of the barn at Boulder Knoll Farm, removal of all footings, and bringing it back to grass condition, go out to bid.

Discussion
It was noted by Mr. Sima that what is stated is full grade off to soil conditions.

Mr. Schrumm said this should be done as we do not want a foundation sticking out of the ground. The lower part is down and in.

There are some slabs there and Mr. Sima said they could be used for parking or something. He explained that full grade off to soil conditions means removing the foundation, all concrete, all stone, and bring the site to grass.

If a slab is left there, Mr. Schrumm asked if this is where cars could be parked, or if we are better off getting rid of it. The floor of the barn is cement, so the question is whether to bury it.

It was originally a stanchion barn, and Dr. Giddings said there are two trenches running down the barn.

Because of all this, Mr. Sima said it is better to just chop it up and return it to grade. The shed stays untouched.

Mr. Schrumm commented on knocking out the side supports, and if there is any concrete footings coming up above, this should all be covered with dirt, reseeded, rather than moving all the concrete out of there.
Mr. Sima said you either bust it up or leave it in place. The price quoted was to remove everything off site.

VOTE  The motion passed unanimously by those present.

Mr. Milone said this matter will come back to the committee once he decides where this could be paid for. The money can be encumbered before the year ends.

8. INVASIVE SPECIES REMOVAL
Mr. Milone informed the committee that Ms. Simone spoke to Northeast Utilities and they will not do more than what they have already done. A plan was received from the Forestry School but was not useful for what is planned. Ms. Simone is checking into finding someone statewide to do this work. There may be an arm of the DEP which will do this work, and Mr. Milone will check on this.

The outline from Ms. Simone was given to the committee members. Over the next few months is a good time to get in and do the cleaning if the Council approves. There is $20,000 set aside in the CNR fund for this purpose or demolition, and the question is whether we proceed or not. In the meantime staff will research who is out there to do this work and the costs involved.

Once this is done, Mr. Sima said the initial costs will be more than future costs. It will be less costly to get someone to mow this property once the invasive species are removed.

Mr. Schrumm commented on the growth on the land and the many species involved, and once this is removed, some volunteers could assist in the work.

Ms. Giddings has personally attacked Japanese Knotweed and she plans to eradicate it.

Dr. Giddings stated that the Town of Wallingford has been mowing nearby properties once a year and now there is a gorgeous meadow there. Signs are posted for Town of Wallingford Open Space.

There was a brief discussion about the mowing required for the land, baling the hay, the type of equipment required for the work, and putting the work out to bid. Dr. Giddings displayed the map and pointed out areas of the property, some of which is heavily overgrown with invasive species.

If this work is to start, Mr. Milone said he would prefer to hire someone to do the work, and he will get prices. The areas to be cleaned up were pointed out and Mr. Milone asked that he receive a map outlining defined areas where the work must be done.
Dr. Giddings pointed out all the areas (4 large sections) which he believes should be mowed on the property.

Mr. Sima estimated that all this work could be accomplished in one week, and $12,000 would be the stop-gap amount for the job.

Once he receives the aerial map with the defined areas, Mr. Milone will give it to Ms. Simone, get people out there to see the site and get quotes for the work.

When this work is done Mr. Schrumm said the area will look like a new site, and will need mowing once a year.

Ms. Giddings advised that the Environment Commission was going to take on the Casertano property as their project, and may be interested in this project.

9. NON-USE OF PESTICIDES
Mr. Sima stated this is a proposal from the Environment Commission requesting the Council to adopt a non-use of pesticides. The committee will review this and think about it, and take up the matter at another time.

10. ROUTE 10 TRAFFIC STUDY
Mr. Sima said this really started due to trouble at the high school, and it was learned that multiple traffic lights are dysfunctional, and triggering mechanisms are not being used to get the lights to work. He is trying to stay on top of this; the contractor was just in town and dug through the traffic triggers; and the Town must stay on top of the contractors so the lights are not wrecked. We need someone to go back to for insurance that the lights are functional.

It was stated by Mr. Schrumm that the water company did some damage to lights in the north end, and now the gas company is coming through the center of town. It is now the time to have the damage repaired and make sure the State recalibrates the lights getting the timing sequence right.

According to Mr. Sima the only coordinated light is the new intersection.

Mr. Schrumm wants to re-check with the water company and gas company to make sure the lights are back in sequence.

Mr. Sima wants to contact the DOT on this matter.

Mr. Milone will check on what happened with Highland Avenue. There is a meeting scheduled with the DOT in 10 days on the Linear Trail, and the issue of the lights will be added to the agenda. He confirmed that the Town wants to insure that timing, triggering, and sequencing on the lights is restored. Also, he will insure that the gas company work will restore the lights to their original timing.
At a future Planning Committee meeting, Mr. Schrumm said it might be worth having Northwest Communications from Prospect CT attend. They do the dispatch, cover 12 towns, and have a good system. We should see if there is any benefit to Cheshire from a long term cost standpoint to farm out our dispatch.

Mr. Milone commented on the study done at the high school crossing, and there are many unnecessary delays down there.

Information from the State on all the critical points along Route 10 was given to the committee by Mr. Milone.

Mr. Schrumm questioned what is to be done about the rail trail.

Stating this is a good question Mr. Milone said we must go to DOT in a few weeks, and beg them to hold the $320,000 grant open. DOT will be told this is being discussed as part of the capital budget. Mr. Milone said there is no formal approval yet, but the Town was told it was getting $250,000 for the grant for the trail. Mr. Milone thought it had to be used for the Cornwall to West Main section since this was in the grant request. This has been checked out by Mr. Sitko and was told by DEP that Cheshire can ask to have this changed to another section of the trail. This would require an action by DEP. With federal money it is Cornwall to West Main or nothing, but the State portion can be reallocated.

It was noted by the committee that Southington is doing their trail very quickly.

In this year, Mr. Milone said the plan was to do Cornwall to West Main, and he needs guidance and direction on how he Council wants to go with the trail, i.e. north to south, in the middle, and get numbers together.

Mr. Schrumm said it was clear that going out into wetland into Willowbrook, building the boardwalk, was not feasible. He questioned whether the Army Corp of Engineers could clarify this. He asked if there is any chance of going back to the federal government, stating this is a $2 million project, may not be feasible from a wetlands/environmental standpoint, and if it could be shifted a few hundred yards.

In the upcoming meeting, Mr. Milone said he would ask about this.

If the Cheshire IWW and Army Corp of Engineers said no to the project, Mr. Schrumm asked whether the federal government would approve shifting it up. Or, the better argument is that Southington has the trail to a point and Cheshire has it to a point, this is programmatical, and there would get more for the $350,000 going from West Main Street north than going through the swamp.

Mr. Milone will ask DEP about all of this at the upcoming meeting.
11. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Mr. Schrumm; seconded by Mr. Sima.

MOVED to adjourn at 9:35 p.m.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

Attest:

___________________________________
Marilyn W. Milton, Clerk
Recorded from tapes.