

Location: Microsoft Teams

In attendance for the 5G Council Meeting: Laura Cruickshank, AVP for Planning Deisgn, University of Connecticut; Paul Hinsch, Office of Policy and Management, State of CT; Doug Moore, Facilities Director, Department of Administrative Services; Graham Stevens, Bureau Chief of Water & Land Use, Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection; Peter Kuzma, Data Center and Operations Manager & Yolanda Hacia, Director for Capital Planning [in place for Armen Beermann], Connecticut State Colleges & Universities;

Absent Council Members: Nick Simmons, Office of the Governor; Richard W. Andreski, Bureau of Public Transportation (DOT).

Meeting Notes:

GS: Do we need to approve master plans of ATT?

PH: ATT hesitant to share master plan and not necessarily calling their plans “master.” So we asked to receive whatever they have available to ascertain whether we are looking at a thousand of these requests or along the lines of a dozen or so over a period of time (our current priority). ATT indicated the latter.

GS: Carriers have not indicated a willingness to co-locate antenna.

PH: In an earlier meeting, carriers have indicated it hampers signal.

LC: Let’s begin and review one-by-one.

PH: This is a priority of the Governor to be one of the leading states for 5G technology. In the past, carriers have expressed frustration over management of funds with agencies. This council has been tasked with mitigating the hang ups and managing requests. Happy to use this meeting to simply discuss and vote at a later date if better for everyone. We have received one comment for the three proposed sites. ATT has submitted a request letter, master plan, FCC licenses, exposure reports. All of these will have to fit under the FCC guidelines, which in this case is placing on light poles. We must also allow for comments to be made. The council will not manage DEEP and DOT rights of way properties, due to a separate existing procedure. Carriers do not *have* to go to the 5G council for approval. They have every right to go through the agency of custody and control. Most carriers have indicated an interest to work with the council, except in a few instances with DOT Rail.

LC: UCONN has been working with carriers directly as well. It has slowed significantly with COVID but still underway.

PH: We are seeking consistency for all parties in terms of agreements and submission for approval. We hope each state agency will utilize these pre-approved methods for consistency purposes. Although, they have every right to use the form of choice.

LC: Will check out forms with my team to assess best path forward with UCONN’s work. Are you going to post this information on the 5G website?

PH: Yes, they are planning to provide a portal online but due to COVID that has been delayed. The applications are online for print and submission currently. The intention is to provide an online portal soon. The public comments will be able to go through the 5G website as well.

YH: The carriers will be able to fill in the application with whatever info is available...Will they be able to upload the required documentation to meet the council standards, including master plans? So that the council can review the appropriate materials and make an informed decision?

PH: Yes, but for now, the carriers will provide attachments to me and I can share with the council. Have you received those materials on Armen's behalf?

YH: No, I have not.

PH: Okay. We need to get you those documents.

LC: The carriers are not necessarily required to show their master plans, and what they are calling their master plans are not up to industry standards. They do not tell us everything they are doing, due to proprietary concerns.

PH: This was never meant to be gained in the legislation. It was more to understand the volume of requests to expect.

YH: The guidelines have called for a master plan or equivalent so maybe we received the equivalent plan.

PH: Correct. We are here to approve plans which adhere to the council standards for the benefit of the state. Carriers are hesitant to share what they believe to be their proprietary information. The council guidance was more about understanding volume of expected applications, not detailed strategy for business operations.

LC: Where in this whole package? Are they showing where they are augmenting and densifying their existing systems or whether they putting up something for 5G needs in the future?

PH: The two real requests for small cell facilities are them asking for a facility to put on a new pole or they want to upgrade a facility on an existing pole. The transmittal letter should indicate the information you are looking for. The application should have most of the information that we need.

LC: Looking at the bottom of page 1 "...ATT facility will work within existing small cells..." Sound like this is filling in a coverage gap. This sounds more like their 4G technology but they will then plan to upgrade to 5G.

GS: Yes, this appears to be more focused on 4G at the time.

PH: Great points. We are not necessarily here to get into technology. More of the focus is whether they can have access to a site. We have every right to ask for technology information. But the focus is on siting access.

LC: Yes. From discussions with John Emra at ATT, he has indicated the 5G rollout will be slower than other places. So, we may face a delay in receiving 5G requests.

PH: Correct. Either way, this is an application to approve the use of state-owned property. I would suggest setting up a meeting to discuss these requests in more detail after Yolanda and Peter have time to make informed decisions.

GS: Not opposed to voting today. The master plan appears to be pretty simple.

YH: At this point, Peter and I do not want to hold up the process.

PH: Potential voters would include Laura, Gram, Doug and myself. Do we have a quorum to vote?

LC: Where does it state that if the pole is over 350 feet away, this is sufficient distance? Where does it state that there are not health issues.

PH: Have to look at the exposure report for compliance.

LC: So, you guys are telling me it's there?

GS: Yes.

PH: Does any one on the line not feel comfortable moving forward with a vote today?

All: No objections.

LC: One concern. These are community colleges and state universities. Is it okay that we are going ahead without representation from these agencies voting?

PH: Good point. I do not have an issue rescheduling if there is concern from Yolanda and Peter.

YH: We are fine with rescheduling.

PH: Yes, let's do that to allow for ample time and informed voting decisions and for public comment. We will reschedule for next week.

GS: Have we notified the agencies with enough time?

PH: Yes, we have informed them. We can take an extra step to confirm their receipt and opinion.

GS: Considering it's the first three, it may be good practice to confirm their receipt, even though the current requests are on lands represented by the council.

PH: I can send this again to the appropriate agencies and to one or two others to ensure receipt. Just to be prudent. Does that sound good?

LC: Maybe not in this instance. So long as there are council members representing the agencies. If they are not on the council, then we should be more intentional.

PH: Great point. For those not in the council, I will take each request and send an email for each agency that's effected. I will include the highest position in the agency and any relevant facility people.

GS: I think that is a great protocol moving forward.

PH: When I receive the request, I will send it out immediately and allow for 30-day notice.

Future meetings to be on the first Monday of every other month at 9:00am – 10:00am.

Next meeting Thursday, April 8th 9:00am – 10:00am.