

## **5G Council Round Table (9am – 10am)**

**November 16, 2019**

*In attendance for the 5G Council Meeting: Laura Cruickshank, University of Connecticut; Paul Hinsch, Office of Policy and Management, State of CT; Doug Moore, Department of Administrative Services; Graham Stevens, Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection; Richard W. Andreski, Bureau of Public Transportation (DOT); Armen Beermann, Connecticut State Colleges & Universities; Nick Simmons, Office of the Governor.*

5G Council has ownership to direct where fees go, except under certain “carve-out” agreements (e.g. DEEP & UCONN).

A standard agreement already exists for small cell and tower – UCONN and SCSU need to have those reviewed by their Boards before approved. For now, Council feels it would be advantageous to remain with \$250 fee mandate. Streamlining our fees will make this process easier and benefit all parties to be at the forefront in the US. Council cannot force a municipality to follow but can set a precedent for a small cell leasing fee. Attention will be paid to other states and cities fighting the FCC mandate, which some entities are charging higher and ignoring mandate.

Council will wait until a white paper comes out to navigate health concerns. Provisions will be included to take down small cells should issues arise. Colocation will require additional separate research. While it may be beneficial for aesthetic purposes, carriers prefer otherwise – less maintenance coordination issues on their part.

5G Council must consider how to maintain equity in building areas.

Preference will be given to those plans by carriers who address aesthetic and building maintenance concerns. Consideration must be given towards the impacts of installing 5G networks into building infrastructure (e.g. rooftops)

To coordinate the review process, carriers may be required to find which state agency is in control of the site. Council needs to determine ease in which a digital approval process could be standardized. In the beginning, 5G Council will review first few applications to understand carrier plans. Council must also coordinate with agencies involved in sites of interest to review and approve carrier applications.

## **5G Council & Town Meeting (10am – 11:30am)**

*In attendance for the 5G Council Meeting: Laura Cruickshank, University of Connecticut; Paul Hinsch, Office of Policy and Management, State of CT; Doug Moore, Department of Administrative Services; Graham Stevens, Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection; Richard W. Andreski, Bureau of Public Transportation (DOT); Armen Beermann, Connecticut State Colleges & Universities; Nick Simmons, Office of the Governor; Lynn Haig, City of Bridgeport; Donna Hall, City of New Haven; Erik Johnson, City of Hartford; Erin Howard, City of Hartford; Joe McGrath, City of Waterbury; Clifford Brammer, City of Waterbury.*

Municipalities are getting a lot of pressure from carriers to advance 5G networks. Coordinated efforts are ideal for a prosperous relationship so an Urban Cities Working Group (Connecticut’s 5 largest cities) has been created to advance city economies.

Municipalities want Council to begin sharing work with them, so they can review and approve accordingly. Cities overburdened so making this easy on them is important – aesthetic and implementation.

May have to coordinate with PURA and private property owners – permit processing system needed

Guidance focus of municipalities:

- Need to define who is going to maintain this small cell network infrastructure
- Need a 2-year plan for fiber optics infrastructure implementation
- Aesthetic requirements, even on private property
- Open conversation with carriers even before master plan is delivered to mitigate any angst from pushback by governments
- Coordination between cities and suburbs on keeping each area of munis on par
- Policies for historic building and districts (Laura managing)

Technical assistance needed – possibly by carriers with State – to manage fees and distribution to cities for construction, power, infrastructure and design (+ 2-year master plan coordination)

Each municipality is different on their approved zoning and legislation to address carrier proposals. A systematized process is needed to handle carrier applications (100s per city) on a grand scale via an MLA to cover the entire master plan and coordinate efforts. A master plan will only be useful that shows detailed locations of each small cell.

### **Most Important Items**

- (1) Open communication with state and municipalities, meeting with carriers to have a round table discussion & third-party consultants to advise;
- (2) Funding support from carriers to address strained municipalities' resources;
- (3) Stipulate infrastructure demands (construction, underground, etc.) by implementing 5G networks by carriers;
- (4) Understand the specifications of the technology and required hardware;
- (5) A uniformly agreed master plan (MLA) to present to carriers with a formalized, simple process adhering to municipalities ordinances and plans.