



**Benton County Planning Board
Public Hearing**

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

September 16, 2020
6:00 p.m.

Benton County Administration Building
215 East Central Avenue
Bentonville, AR 72712

Meeting Minutes

2020 OCT -8 PM 1:27
BETSY HANFELL
CO. & PROBATE CLERK
BENTON COUNTY, AR

FILED

PUBLIC HEARING:

Call to Order: The meeting was convened at 6:00 p.m. by the Planning Board Chair, Mr. Torrez.

Roll Call: Bob Bracy, Ron Homeyer, Terry Maienschein, Stephen Torrez, and Rick Williams were present.

Staff present: Taylor Reamer – Director of Planning, Madison Kienzle – County Planner

Public Present: Four members of the public were in attendance.

Disposition of Minutes: September 2, 2020

Mr. Williams motioned to approve the September 2, 2020, Planning Board Meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Maienschein.

Motion approved: 5 – 0

General Public Comment:

Old Business: None

New Business:

1. **Capps – Verizon Telecommunications Tower, case no. 20-179, 22078 US Hwy 62, Garfield; 18-00305-000**

Representative: Jennifer Waymack Standerfer

Staff gave a presentation.

The Capps – Verizon Telecommunications Tower was discussed by the board, Ms. Jennifer Waymack Standerfer, and the project engineer Dave McGhee.

Ms. Waymack Standerfer: This parcel is two trapezoids, one on top of the other. With the bigger trapezoid on top of the smaller trapezoid. The original application had placed the tower in the lower trapezoid, in the Northeastern corner. It was much closer to Highway 62 at that time, and closer to the neighbor. As a result, Verizon needed a

variance which was denied. At the time it was denied, the Board recommended moving the tower to the Northwest part of the total parcel, which is what we've done in this application. The new application meets all requirements, County and State. It meets the setback requirements, the fall zone, and buffer zone requirements. It is a 250ft self-support tight monopole tower facility with 65 ft by 65 ft compound. It does have a lightning rod on it, and due to the height restrictions by the FCC and FAA and County codes, we will be required to light that at dusk, which will be a lazy red blink which will not illuminate the area.

There have been a number of concerns voiced to planning staff which I'd like to address. Concerning the buffer zone, there was concern about the buffer zone extending into the Northern neighbor's property. We are in compliance with code, and I want to note that the encroachment does not prevent that neighbor from developing the property further. We also looked at the topography of the area, and we want to note that the area in the buffer cone is very sloped, which means it would be difficult to develop.

Concerns about the aesthetic of tower have been raised several times. I believe that by moving the tower northwest part of the parcel we have decreased the aesthetic impact on the area as whole. It is farther away from Highway 62, it will also be obscured by the natural features of the land. I know that some were requesting that this highway be made a scenic highway, but I believe we have minimized the aesthetic impact to the best of our ability while not sacrificing coverage.

There were other objections about the Mark Twain national forest in Missouri. Firstly, the national forest does not extend into Arkansas, and the tower will not be a neighbor to the national forest. There are actually a couple of lots that will buffer that. This forest is huge. It covers 3 million acres. Half of it is public owned and the other is private. The interesting thing is that there are wilderness areas that are throughout the national forest. The area that is closest to the tower is the Piney Creek Wilderness area, to the East is the Hercules Glades area, between these two areas is Branson, Missouri. So we are located South of the forest, buffered from the forest, and to the Western most part of the forest. In addition, at the edge of Piney Creek there is Branson Missouri with large concert venues, bright night lights, towers, billboard, exhibition towers, above ground electrical lines. So it's interesting that while the forest is beautiful and its preserved there is a substantial amount of development within that area itself, and this type of development is not inconsistent with what you already see withing the national forest area.

Lastly, there is a real need for additional coverage in this area. Verizon has tried to explain that they are trying to close a coverage gap. There are no more towers within 2 miles of this property, and we need it to provide telecommunications services appropriately and adequately. In the midst of this pandemic we are relying on telecommunications for this meeting, for attending school, attending doctor's appointments. It is becoming more essential every day, and Arkansas is lagging so far behind the rest of the country that our governor, and our Arkansas Cares Act committee, and our Arkansas Commerce Department have pledged 100 million dollars of taxpayer money to increase broadband and internet access. We receive reports this week that Arkansas is number 50 of 50 states in our ability to provide these sorts of services. It has become such a major issue that we are spending taxpayer money now. I believe this is a great example of a private company stepping up to provide an

essential service, even if the surrounding property owners are not please about the aesthetic of the tower.

Mr. Torrez: Does the Board have any questions or comments, specifically about the fact that proper notification was not given to all residents within half a mile?

No Comments.

Mr. Torrez: Taylor, since some neighbors in Missouri were not notified do you have a recommendation on how to proceed?

Mr. Reamer: I had a conversation today with the County's legal counsel George Spence about the issue. Mr. Spence believes there is a valid argument to be made that those residents within Barry County do fit within the definition in our ordinance regarding who should be notified of a public hearing. There are few options, they can make a decision on the current proposal, they can take into consideration this issue and allow notification by the applicant. They can continue the public hearing or table the public hearing, it is really up to the board.

Mr. Maienschein: How many landowners are involved.

*Mr. Maienschein was disconnected at this point.

Mr. Torrez: Does the board have any other questions?

Ms. Waymack Standerfer: Is this raised because of an objection raised by a resident in Missouri who received notice?

Mr. Reamer: It was brought to our attention by a petition submitted late today. There were multiple objections by adjacent property owners related to the proposed tower. The petition outline various issues, but also that satisfactory noticing within a half mile had not been completed because they had requested a list of addresses that were notified as well as the USPS certified mail receipts.

In response to Mr. Maienschein's question, I can provide you the total number of addresses that are located in Benton County which were 40 properties. However, I do not have the number of properties which are located in Missouri which should have been notified.

Mr. Torrez: Was there any objection from the Missouri residents?

Mr. Reamer: We do not have that information at this time. We were notified via a petition from notified neighbors in Arkansas.

Mr. Bracy: Since this property is located so close to the Missouri border, what responsibility do we have to other states? We have no jurisdiction in that area.

Mr. Reamer: That is correct. We do not have jurisdiction across state lines, however, our ordinance states "property owners", it doesn't define Arkansas or Benton County property owners, within a half-mile shall be notified of a proposed tower.

Mr. Torrez: My recommendation is to table this public hearing.

Ms. Waymack Standerfer: From the legal perspective, the current landowners who have been notified do not have standing to raise this, they would not be able to raise this in a courtroom. They only people who could would be the landowners who were not notified; however, I don't know who they are or how many there are at this time. What I would ask is that we go ahead with this hearing and public comment. Those who have been notified are here. If a Missouri landowner came back after the vote and asked the board to reconsider, the board would certainly have the authority to make a motion to potentially reopen the hearing to take additional public comment. At this time, we complied with everything we were given, and additional public notice comes at a cost to us, so if it is tabled and reset, and we are required to provide notice to all 40 Arkansas residents and now the additional Missouri residents and then re-do signage, which I can't comply with signage requirements for two weeks from now today. That's not possible. So, if we reset this it would be four weeks from now at a substantial cost to my clients, which would be inappropriate. I would ask that you go forward with the public comment and vote, and if members of the Missouri community raise an objection, then this body could revisit the issue.

Mr. Torrez: I'd like to open this up to the board.

Mr. Bracy: Would the applicant have to redo all of the noticing for the Arkansas landowners or just the Missouri landowners?

Mr. Reamer: Signage would definitely need to be revised, but that wouldn't necessarily require a new sign. In other instances, when public noticing was satisfied but the board chose to table a vote this public hearing served as the notice to any interested parties of any future public hearing. So potentially, only individuals who were not adequately notified would need to be notified. So there are two modes of the thought, either noticing should be completely redone, or this public hearing could serve as a notice of future public hearings to those who have been notified. Also, staff is willing to help the applicants in renotification via mail to remedy this issue.

Mr. Bracy: I don't feel comfortable voting on something that hasn't been published to all of the sites required under our statutes. If we table today, we would have to open up the public hearing again.

Mr. Reamer: I believe it would be consistent with this board to continue with the public hearing tonight and hear public comment and discuss those comments with the applicant. And the board can make a determination on this noticing as well.

Mr. Torrez: In the past, we proceeded with the public comment, the applicant responds, and when it comes to a vote, we may table it. When it comes back in two weeks then we can open it back up to public comment, which would give Missouri residents the opportunity to make a comment.

Mr. Bracy: I believe we should proceed as we have in the past.

Mr. Homeyer: I think we should take the comments from those who are present tonight and then make the decision as a group whether we want to table or vote on it tonight.

Mr. Torres: In that case, I'll ask for public comments at this time.

Mr. Steve Hardin: I am an attorney representing two people who are objecting to this tower, Kei and Susan Pang. At their request, I prepared a petition of items that they and the others object to. Today they were able to get 13 people to sign that petition. I do not represent those other people; I only represent the Pangs. I will summarize the petition and then the Pangs will want to make some personal comments.

Primarily they object to this, they do not think it is appropriate, they do not think it is needed. As a side note, we do not think that tower of the magnitude that is proposed is necessary in any event. In my research in preparing for this, I have found out that under federal law local zoning and planning commissions have the power to reject new towers if they do not think it is appropriate, however, if a structure is permitted then it can be amended without objection from the Planning Board, so you would lose control over this project which concerns me greatly. My research has indicated that companies overbuild, rather than build what is necessary so that later they can add and expand later and the Planning Board would lose authority to restrict that. So, I do caution you to bear in mind, that anything that is approved you will be giving carte blanche for further additions and improvements in the future. My people strongly object to that.

They bought their properties because it was a beautiful, rustic, scenic area. They love being in nature, and a facility like this will disrupt their enjoyment of their property. There will be noise, there will be lights, there will be a tower every time they look up to the sky. There is a current business, the chocolate factory, where people will come and sit in their yard eating chocolates and enjoying the view, and now that view will be marred by a tower right across the street. The tower is 250 ft, the trees are much shorter than that so the tower will be visible for a very long time. The visual pollution has been determined to impact adversely land and the surrounding area. One study indicated that visual pollution can actually reduce the value of land by as much as 20%. A 20% decline in my clients and the other neighbor's land is not necessary, it's not needed and it's very disruptive to their families, to their estate plan, and enjoying the property they have. So, we ask that the proposal be denied, because it is of economic difficulties to them.

The nature of this area, there have been several recent purchases by conservation groups along this corridor along Highway 62. Bringing in more natural and return to nature type land use in the area. This would impact that and prevent further development in those natural ways. This is a scenic highway, travelled and enjoyed by many people. This tower would be a disruption and detraction from this enjoyment.

There are also concerns about the medical or health risks of building a tower. While there are no conclusive studies that say they do cause health issues, there are also no studies that say that they don't. Not withstanding that, this is a concern that many people have. So, my clients and other neighbors will be adversely affected if and when they try to sell that land because other people will have fears about health consequences.

It will increase traffic; Highway 62 is a dangerous highway anyways. There was a wreck there yesterday, that blocked traffic for about 4 hours. A trailer truck had overturned. More traffic will be brought in for constructing this. Some large equipment will be brought in which will be a hazard. There will be regular maintenance, which will

increase the flow on the highway and cause problems. Furthermore, there are several residents who raise bees or intend to raise bees. The herbicides used in maintaining the structure could be damaging to any bees or development of that industry.

One of the parties involved is considering having a yoga retreat on the adjacent property. This development would severely impact that use, because people doing yoga outside do not want to see a cell phone tower. That would be very disruptive to the frame of mind. Some of the people are interested in the mindfulness movement, and that would impact adversely in that regard.

Also, of great consequence, is that the 300 ft structure buffer extends across 3 adjacent properties. One of which is XLIV, who is not a client, they're concern is that due to the topography of the area they are very limited in their ability to build. The prime building site will be within this 300 ft buffer. The tower would prevent them from building because it would be within the setback. Also, they would not want to build a house next to a cell tower.

This tower will affect people, it affects their livelihood, their finances, their children, their plans, and their enjoyment of life. It is appropriate for the Planning Board to look at those things when making a decision whether to allow a facility like this to be constructed or not. There was a recent case in Arkansas, that acknowledged that the aesthetic value of zoning is very important. How property looks affects how it is enjoyed and how it is used. We feel there are sufficient towers, there are other towers within a three-mile radius that have available slots that more equipment can be used on those, and can be done in such a way to improve coverage. Furthermore, there is adequate service out there.

Also, we are concerned with Benton County. This structure is built almost in Missouri. The coverage in Missouri is largely forest land which is sparsely populated. If the structure was five or six miles south, the structure would cover much more area in the County, serve more people instead of servicing an area that is mostly deer and coyotes. We think they should mitigate and find a location that does serve their needs, but does not have the impact on other areas. And we don't think that they should be able to add to it carte blanche at their will. They are asking for more than they should be entitled to, so we think the Planning Board should consider the concerns of my clients, should deny the application. We raised the notice issue because in looking at it we did not believe the notice was adequate.

Kei Pang: I am a property owner East of the proposed location. We own thirty acres, and we live in highland lake near Garfield. Mr. Hardin explained our situation very well. We are nature lovers, we donated 67 acres to the nature conservancy on Highway 89. We fell in love with this area because of the natural environment, without industry. People come here because they don't want to see factories and big towers. I often walk around the property, two miles in and I still get three bars. The presentation that I have forwarded to the Board, on the last page you can see that if you walk around the hwy 62 from Gateway to the other tower outside of the radius, you will get minimum 3 bars but most of the time 4 bars. I walked two miles from the chocolate factory into the property I still get three bars. I carry two phones myself, I am a customer of Verizon, I work for an electric modem company. We owned a factory in Arkansas and we make cell phone modems for Apple. They bought 500 million dollars' worth of product from us. I love cellphones. I'm not against technology. I would love to have good reception.

The thing is Verizon, is they have not done their homework. I'm a business man, I know how business is run. I went to Gateway today and took pictures of those two towers and provided them in the presentation. There were only two transmitters out there. You can see on page 7 or 8 on Gateway. On the last page you can see what a cell tower should look like. You can put many equipment on a tower. I'm not against building towers, or against development, or having children have cell reception. However, Verizon should do their homework and find a more suitable place, where it is more conducive to serve the population at large. There is no housing development within six miles of where they want to put the tower. Each cell phone tower can travel 20 miles radius. There is no need for them to destroy the natural environment.

Cameron McNabb: I have two questions and a comment. In the area, internet is provided by Verizon mifi, or Centurytel. AT&T is providing wireless. AT&T's wireless is a less expensive. My question is: How is the intermodulation of this tower going to affect the AT&T tower in Garfield? Will I have a problem with my current AT&T, which is less expensive? My second question is, from Highway 62 below the tree line, what is visible? What am I going to see from my property below the tree line? Will there be anything visible from the Highway. Lastly, I understand with COVID this is awful, we are out in the hallway, 15 ft between a small laptop which has the presentation, and a phone which is broadcasting the voices. So, I'm not sure I got everything. I guarantee I didn't catch it all, we lost somebody, I'm not sure who was talking. It's back and forth between the two. You have an opportunity to table this, for the notification. Is it possible to get a transcript or audio recording of the meeting to see what I have missed? This is not a good situation in the hallway.

Susan Pang: My husband was wrong. We own almost 37 acres next to this property, we bought it over a three-year period over 2017, 2018, and 2019. I'm a yoga teacher, my daughter is a yoga teacher, my son is a mindfulness coach, I'm a master naturalist and master gardener. I've worked a lot with the conservancy, as my husband said we donated land to them on County Road 89. I know Tom Wagner is a master naturalist. We had a different vision for the land. One of my rules with my yoga students, is leave your phone at the freaking door. The whole idea and essence of this is digital detox. People are overloaded, over-wired, overstressed. The whole idea of my mindfulness and yoga and native plant center is to do the opposite of what is going on here. I am not willing to invest money into something that I don't feel that Benton County is on my side. There is a Chocolate factory there, we're willing to put money into another vision. I can bring in people, spiritual teachers, native plant people and so forth. But I can't do it if Benton County is not on my side. I can't work with a government that is representing Verizon. How many people is Verizon going to hire? What growth is there is developing a cell phone tower that is servicing Bambi and Bambi's family in Mark Twain National Forrest. Most of the coverage from the cell phone tower is going into the State of Missouri. So, I don't get it. Thank you.

Ms. Waymack Standerfer: Mr. Pang expressed that he was looking at phone bars, saying that they plenty of coverage, that they get plenty of coverage. Also, it was alleged that it might interfere with coverage. I want to make it clear that however much expertise My. Pang has in his own field he is not an RF expert. Telecommunications experts and RF experts will tell you that phone bars are not an accurate measure for telecommunications capacity. Further, Mr. McNabb believes it could interfere with coverage, this is regulated by the FCC and the FCC has approved this tower. We

provided the ASR for that. Verizon relies on RF experts; they rely on information from them and work with them every day. These towers don't work on just one tower which only takes care of its radius around it. These towers talk to each other. I'm not an expert, so I can't get into the science of it. What I can tell you is what they tell me which is that these towers boost each other. It is about connectivity between them and close these gaps and helping them work together. So, I don't doubt that Mr. Pang has 3 bars, but that does not mean there is not a need for service. Experts who understand how this science works and how you boost this coverage and how you cover these gaps requires a system of towers that interconnectivity between them. That's why the federal government has gotten involved. That's why there are federal regulations involved with the Federal Telecommunications Act, because its not something that is just supplied in the 2-mile radius around the one tower. If that were the case, neighborhoods wouldn't mind them going in so much because they wouldn't be able to get service otherwise. It is about how they connect up with each other and provide service nation-wide and throughout our State, and throughout our County, and to our localities. My clients are looking this as a provision of services for the whole, and for these individuals as well.

Mr. Hardin raised concerns about property value, but there have been no appraisals. We have not seen what the property is worth now, or what it will be in the future. Also, there were general objections based on future development. While I'm sympathetic to and I understand their concerns, this is the nature of development. This is what we do every day. This is why our codes build in this sort of protection for people. This is why we have a setback requirement which kept us from building before. This is why we have buffer zones, and fall zones that we look out for. All of the code requirements that exist right now, have been adopted by your board and by your Quorum Court, and guided by State and Federal Law to account for minimizing the effect of one development upon the next. I think over the past year and a half we have gone above and beyond to minimize the impact on the neighbors. There is still an impact. And I'm not going to say that it is easy to do yoga next to a cell tower. But the fact is, this is allowable development, its appropriate development, it provides a necessary service, it has certain protections under federal law because of that. We have gone above and beyond to comply with everything this County, State, and Federal government requires. Now we're finding out that there are things that the County Missed. That there are additional hoops we're going to have to jump through, and we will gladly assist with that. We're going to comply with law. We're going to do what we need to. But the law also protects us. The law protects Mr. Capps, and allows Mr. Capps to use his property as he sees appropriate, and he sees it as appropriate to lease this property to my clients to build a cell tower on it.

There was an allegation of a traffic hazard. There is absolutely no indication anywhere in the Country, no science to back up that a traffic hazard would exist because of a cell tower. I'm happy to answer additional questions.

Mr. Torrez: How tall was the tower from the original tower application?

Ms. Waymack Standerfer: The tower was originally presented as 250 ft, however in the course of working through the application it was lowered in the course of requesting the variance in order to get the variance. I can't remember the exact height, but it was reduced slightly less than that to avoid the lighting. It was a good faith effort by my client to attempt to get the variance. When the variance was denied, we went back to the drawing board and by moving it they went ahead and put it back at the original

height to get the service it needed.

Mr. Torrez: Why can't Verizon use an existing tower to place the satellites where there is existing space.

Ms. Waymack Standerfer: My RF experts having been telling us that this doesn't exist, and they've been looking at this for 2 years now. This location is needed to close this gap. There is not another option available.

Mr. Torrez: Does a tower serve better where the population is denser? Why are you choosing this site when so much of the coverage is serving people to the North when so much of our population is to the South?

Ms. Waymack Standerfer: The short answer is no. Putting these towers in denser areas are not addressing the broader issues with connectivity and broadband access. I do come back to that because I think it is a very important thing for all of us in the State to look at. The connectivity of these towers is essential for us to get the sort of access statewide. If it were a situation where this tower only provided service to the 2 miles around it, that would be a no brainer, but that's just not how the technology works. We know that because we have them placed in the denser areas, and we have them placed in some rural areas as well but we don't have the connectivity still. We don't have them working together in the ways that we need them to. Our schools are suffering, our kids are suffering, those of us who are working remotely are suffering. Some of us are luckier than others, and I think Benton County is pretty lucky, for the most part. But in order to keep this technology going, it's essential that my clients be allowed and able expand their facilities and expand their capacity. This is what their experts are telling them they have to do. It's what they're telling me is essential. I think it bears out in what we're seeing throughout the State as well, I think it's good evidence that they're right.

Mr. Torrez: I did here some comments about pesticides being used during maintenance throughout the lifecycle of the tower. Do you run environmental impact tests at any other sites and would you consider doing one in our County?

Ms. Waymack Standerfer: I am doing to defer to Dave from CMI.

Mr. McGhee: We don't typically use a sort of pesticide with the sites. This site is in a wooded area, they'll clear just enough to build the site and not disturb anymore after that. In fact, on our survey it calls out a couple of trees that the property owner doesn't want disturbed. They compound facility at the base, they put a geonet down before they put the pressed limestone so that they don't have to come in and spray for weeds or anything. So, there are no hazardous chemicals or pesticides associated with these towers. I think there is a hazardous chemical form that the County already has that must be filled out prior to permitting.

Mr. Torrez: Do other jurisdictions require an environmental impact study?

Mr. McGhee: I believe that is a part of the FCC approval process. The FCC heavily regulates that, and it is apart of FCC approval.

Mr. Bracy: Will this tower have a positive, negative, or neutral effect on first responders

in this rural area?

Ms. Waymack Standerfer: It would have a positive effect. We are all upgrading in Benton and Washington County to the AWIN system. The AWIN system is a more advanced system that uses this technology. Any technological upgrades in this area that help our law enforcement departments to communicate together and to give each other backup and to assist each other when necessary are positives. Especially in these more rural communities like this that may need assistance because of the sheer geography of how our cities and counties are laid out and the difficulty of one department covering such a large land mass.

Mr. Bracy: I understand that AT&T has taken a large position on AWIN process. How would that carry over into Verizon because you operate on different frequencies and don't overlap. So is that going to be a impact for AWIN.

Ms. Waymack Standerfer: I believe increased service allows for increased 911 access.

Mr. McGhee: I would agree. Verizon has promoted their cooperation with first responders. The availability of reliable wireless communications in these types of areas is always helpful in general. And as you said the FCC regulates those so they don't overlap.

Mr. Bracy: How far is this tower from Highway 62?

Mr. McGhee: Approximately 800 feet. I don't have the exact number.

Mr. Bracy: A 200 ft tower in a wooded area, from line of sight what will the closest residents see? What will their line of sight be? Has a study been done on the line of sight?

Ms. Waymack Standerfer: I don't believe there's been a direct line of sight study.

Mr. McGhee: Correct we have not done a study. It is very hilly in this area. The access road is on the east side of this property, and there's a drop off to the west of the drive. There's also a drop off south of the proposed location. So, the drive and structure are on the high ground and it drops off as you go south. It is all wooded, and they're just going to clear enough for the tower and the fenced area, so there will be a significant tree buffer that will shield a lot of that site from view. On highway 62 there would be a couple of places where you could see it, mostly the turns and the trees will obscure most of it.

Ms. Waymack Standerfer: That is a property owner that we did send notice to as requested.

Mr. Bracy: My experience is that in wooded areas, the line of sight is more effected. As if you go down interstate 49 and you get to the southern part before you hit the east west interstate, you'll see cell towers off in the distance because you are miles away. But when you're within hundreds of feet from the site, the trees would obstruct that view?

Mr. McGhee: I would agree with that.

Mr. Bracy: We've asked on other projects a line of sight study. One of our obligations is to mitigate and buffer not only noise but sight. I think that is a high impact in their vision. What are they going to see when they are sitting in their back yard? Are they going to see trees, because the trees are taller than the line of sight to the top of this tower?

Mr. McGhee: I would that they would see a lot of trees. Interstates are clear and wide open typically flat with more gradual curves, and here with the geography with the hills and the trees and such and the proximity you would likely not see it at all. Now as you come down 62 there will be a couple of turns here and there where you might see the top of it. But due to the nature of that road there will be a lot of times it is not visible. In this proposed location certainly much less visible than the original site that was proposed closer to 62.

Mr. Bracy: 5G is becoming a popular opportunity. I understand 5G is not available in Arkansas, it's being developed in higher density areas. Will this tower benefit or have the ability to support 5G systems in the future? Will you have to petition us or the FCC to expand into that system?

Mr. McGhee: I'm not an RF engineer, but I've been in this industry since 1999. This tower as designed is for 4G. A 5G tower is typically lower in height, and does not work well in very densely populated areas. Typically, you're 5G poles are 40 ft 35 ft but it takes a lot of them and can work really well in town. The towers and the 5G work in tandem, they're not mutually exclusive, but as to whether it could be utilized it will certainly in the grand scheme of coverage. That technology could change.

Mr. Bracy: This being a Verizon project, will other telecommunications be set on this tower or will it solely be a Verizon venture.

Ms. Waymack Standerfer: There will be no collocation on it.

Mr. McGhee: This is going to built and used by Verizon, but it built and designed to hold multiple tenants should another carrier need service in the area. Verizon has provided a statement that they would allow that. As it stands its designed for Verizon but it could allow other tenants.

Ms. Waymack Standerfer: With regard to notice, it sounds like there's a good chance that we're going to table this for the next two weeks and then complete notice to the Missouri landowners. If that is the case, I would ask that you consider limiting public comment and public notice on that to solely the Missouri landowners since it's been taken care of for everyone else. I would request that we only give additional notice to the Missouri landowners and if we reopen, we reopen just to the Missouri landowners.

Mr. Ron Hommeyer motioned to table issue until the next meeting.

Mr. Rick Williams seconded the motion.

Mr. Reamer: The specific date of the next meeting is October 7th in three weeks. The noticing should be completed by the 23rd.

Mr. Bracy: In the past when we've tabled projects, if we have a public hearing it would be available to the public. We usually suggest that comments that were already made are not repeated. We cannot restrict any comments in a public hearing.

Motion approved: 5-0

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Old Business / Ongoing Applications:** None
3. **New Business:**

- I. **WEN Investment Group Site Plan Review – Major Amendment, case no. 20-194, 14635 US Hwy 62, Garfield; 18-04272-000**

Representative: Derek Hileman

Staff gave presentation.

The Board had no comments or questions.

4. **Other Business:** None

5. **Staff Updates - Administrative Approvals:**

- I. Pitts Minor Subdivision, case no. 20-070, 13775 Pitts Rd, Garfield; 18-01257-000
- II. Gerdson Minor Subdivision, case no. 20-087, 10301 Jims Trl, Rogers; 18-01647-013
- III. Stanford Replat, case no. 20-152, 21889 Ridgeview Ln, Rogers; 15-02238-001
- IV. Conduff Property Line Adjustment, case no. 20-154, 13153 Rosario Rd, Garfield; 15-08103-001
- V. McKinney Minor Sub, case no. 20-165, 11413 Stage Coach Rd, Gravette; 18-12170-003
- VI. Lundholm Minor Sub, case no. 20-167, W Hwy 102, Decatur; 18-14275-001
- VII. Miller Minor Sub, case no. 20-169, 19611 Nokes Farm Rd, Siloam Springs; 18-13140-006
- VIII. Goldman replat, case no. 20-171, 15082 Logan Cave Rd, Siloam Springs; 18-11020-000
- IX. Loyd Replat, case no. 20-183, 15904 Logan Rd, Siloam Springs; 18-10384-002

6. **Discussion Item:** None

Meeting Adjourned: 8:00 p.m.

Next Meeting: October 7, 2020

APPROVED THIS 7 DAY OF October, 2020.

ATTEST:



PLANNING DIRECTOR

APPROVED:



PLANNING BOARD CHAIR or
PLANNING BOARD VICE CHAIR