

1
2
3 **KENSINGTON, NEW HAMPSHIRE**
4 **KENSINGTON PLANNING BOARD**
5 **WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19, 2023, 6:30 P.M.**

6 **At Kensington Town Hall 95 Amesbury Road, Kensington, NH**
7 **Meeting Minutes**
8

9 *I believe that the below minutes depict what each speaker intended to relay to the board and the public,*
10 *it is not exactly verbatim as some of the comments were hard to hear on the tape. I do believe that the*
11 *minutes are a true recollection of the meeting.*
12

13 **In Attendance: Vanessa Rozier, Chairwoman, Mary Smith, Vice Chairwoman, Justin McLane,**
14 **Carly Fenton, Marty Silvia, Robert Solomon, Selectmen's Representative, Glenn Greenwood,**
15 **Planner**
16

17 V. Rozier opened the meeting at 6:33 pm.
18

19 The Kensington Planning Board will meet at the Kensington Town Hall, 95 Amesbury Road to conduct
20 a meeting on Wednesday, APRIL 19, 2023, at 6:30 pm.
21

22 **Introduction of Planning Board Members and other meeting Participants**
23

24 **PUBLIC HEARING**

25 **Continued Public hearings from MARCH 15, 2023, are listed below.**
26

27 **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**
28

29 V. Rozier read the following:

30 Pursuant to NH RSA 676:4, I (d), and 675:3, notice is hereby given of a public hearing to be held by the
31 **KENSINGTON Planning Board** on WEDNESDAY FEBRUARY 15, 2023. Application for Vertex
32 Towers for telecommunications tower.
33

34 V. Rozier explained that there is a public comment sheet for people to sign up to present public
35 comments to the board. They are trying to limit the public comments to 2-3 minutes per speaker, and
36 for the public to direct all comments to V. Rozier.

37 V. Rozier went over the following documents posted with the agenda, the meeting Public Comment
38 Protocol and What to Expect at our meeting tonight. These will be addendums to the minutes.
39

40 V. Rozier explained that there were a number of comments that are related to the radio frequency
41 question, having to do with the wireless tower and we all want to hear all of those questions. To start
42 kind of with an explanation of the parameters that the planning board has to operate within, and those

43 include not only our local regulations but also state law as well as federal law. The
44 Telecommunications Act, which I believe many of you are very familiar with, Kathy. Would you mind
45 pulling that section up I believe that it is in Section 104 and I know that the applicant is also prepared to
46 do a presentation on this, but I just wanted to start with this act in Section 704. Which reads as follows:

47 “(iv) No State or local government or instrumentality
48 thereof may regulate the placement, construction,
49 and modification of personal wireless service facilities
50 based on the environmental effects of radio frequency
51 emissions to the extent that such facilities comply
52 with the Commission’s regulations concerning such
53 emissions.
54

55 V. Rozier asked G. Greenwood to paraphrase the above in layman’s terms.

56 G. Greenwood explained that the goal was to set up a comprehensive framework for the provision of
57 telecommunications facilities throughout the nation. This has been amended twice but the goal was to
58 establish how these facilities would be placed and how the network would be established nationwide to
59 provide the service. From the federal standpoint, they wanted to make a few things clear and one thing
60 they wanted to make clear was that the act was not superseding the local zoning authority. So, it was
61 clear from the start of the implementation of the Telecommunications Act that local zoning provisions
62 over the placement of cellular towers are a viable responsibility of the zoning power of the community.
63 So, an important fundamental aspect of this is allowing communities to be very much in the driver's
64 seat for the placement of towers. It did require that towns if they wanted to use that power
65 appropriately create telecommunication zoning ordinances, which the town of Kensington did in early
66 2000. He explained that it further states that there will be a prohibition against any action that would
67 discriminate between providers of personal wireless services and the law also specifies certain
68 procedures that must be followed on acting on requests to place these different types of facilities and a
69 very comprehensive approach, but it should be unrecognized that section (v) is placed there and it is a
70 governor on the actions that the local can take. It states that if the reason that you’re going to deny the
71 placement of a cell tower in your community is based on the science of radio frequency emissions your
72 going to most likely be challenged because the federal law is saying that isn't really within the purview
73 of the locality. It is important that folks understand that there is a limitation to powers that are granted
74 through this kind of law for this board to undertake. It also requires that the FCC establish what are
75 perceived to be safe levels of the impacts or effects of radio frequency emissions . Those are the
76 guideposts that must be followed, not something developed at the local level. He explained that there
77 is a framework that has been in place for 30 years, and it has created many interesting discussions at
78 the local, state, and federal levels, and will continue to as long as this kind of service is deemed
79 important by the citizens of the United States.

80 G. Greenwood referred to the following section (v):

81 “(v) Any person adversely affected by any final
82 action or failure to act by a State or local government
83 or any instrumentality thereof that is inconsistent with
84 this subparagraph may, within 30 days after such
85 action or failure to act, commence an action in any
86 court of competent jurisdiction. The court shall hear
87 and decide such action on an expedited basis. Any
88 a person adversely affected by an act or failure to act
89 by a State or local government or any instrumentality

thereof that is inconsistent with clause (iv) may petition
the Commission for Relief.

V. Rozier addressed the public and asked them to please avoid duplication in their comments.

V. Rozier asked K. Felch to call the commenters up from the sign-up sheet. V. Rozier opened public comment at 6:43 pm.

K. Felch started with the first person on the list. Ann Smith.

Ann Smith replied- No, I'm not. First, I was here first.

V. Rozier commented that Glenn reminded her that it was a good idea to clarify the difference between the planning board and the zoning board. Because they are kind of happening in parallel right now. So, the zoning board decided in March to grant the variance for the use of the wireless telecommunications facility in the residential and agricultural area, we are not here to discuss the zoning board decision tonight. We have no say in that process. And so, the planning board is here to review the application for the conditional use permit, which sounds like it's use, but that's not all of what we're discussing, and we'll discuss to the extent of what we can discuss as far as use and what the planning board has purview over as far as use later in the meeting. So again, we're not the zoning board of appeals, that is a separate process. So, I just wanted to clarify that.

V. Rozier asked if there were any questions about that process, there were none.

Mary Rezendes Brown spoke first. Good evening. First of all, thank you for giving us the opportunity to address the planning board this evening. I realize that every one of you probably are on more than one committee in town and you volunteer your time because you care we want you to know that we care too. My name is Mary Rezendes Brown. And I own the property at 66 Moulton Ridge, it was my brother, my late brother's home for 55 plus years, he had a long history with Kensington, a town he loved. His concern for the environment this was very evident when he conserved over 2/3 of this land in conservation, in order to save green space and space for animals and people alike. He, like several of his neighbors thought that this was very important. They give up developmental rights in order to plan for the future generations. He also was a board member of many committees in this town and community, to preserve and restore historic town buildings. Everyone from the library to the Grange to the cemetery, Universal Church, Congregational Church, brick schoolhouse and this town hall. And his imagination and motivation and knowledge made it happen, with many hard-working community members. I am going over this because of the importance of this town to him and to others, he left me a beautiful piece of property and this time of year, it couldn't be better. Sometimes I have to pinch myself when I look out the window and wonder what I ever did to deserve it. But it's beautiful, but responsibility comes with owning it. And I need to continue conservation and preservation for future generations. We need to make the right decisions and choices for Kensington. We as a group have serious concerns about the best and safest practices for telecommunications networks. We ask you to please work with us neighbors, and abutters to do research. To deliberate and have conversations to exercise due diligence. We ask that you do not rush the decision on this proposal but work together with us. That's all we're asking. Kensington is a very unique special place, I love it too, and this deserves the time and attention that we need to give to it. Thank you.

132

133 Patricia DeCaprio spoke next.

134 Good evening, Patricia DeCaprio, 31 Osgood Road. Valued board members and residents of Kensington
135 we appreciate your time and attention. The two prior zoning and planning meetings left
136 me and other residents with many unanswered questions. We felt unheard. And a very
137 important process and decision felt rushed. I am one of the many residents who filed an
138 appeal against the zoning board's decision to grant the variance for a cell tower in a
139 residential zone. One reason for my appeal is I believe it is the responsibility of town
140 officials and residents to ask many questions and seek independent research and factual
141 data on the many negative risks associated with cell towers. The expansion of
142 telecommunication networks into a residential zone is a major issue that requires a
143 complete risk-benefit analysis. It is on each town official and resident, to protect the
144 townspeople and the environment from unnecessary harm. I cannot in good conscience
145 sit silent and allow a cell tower with proven risk and negative impact to be approved
146 complete and imposed 24/7 on neighbors and wildlife. Information I have presented at
147 the February meeting was not considered. Additional information I prepared for the
148 March zoning meeting was not permitted. Planning Board, I appreciate that one month
149 ago you accepted my 4 pages of questions, concerns, suggestions and research statements
150 in preparation for this continuation meeting. And I thank you for placing public
151 comments first this evening. Our Concerned Citizen Group asked to be on the agenda
152 tonight to continue discussion and briefly present on the important relevant topic, best
153 and safest practices and options for planning telecommunication networks. We are not on
154 the agenda. You will hear highlights from our presentation through public comment.
155 General concerns, Grid networks. Insurance and liability, Health and environmental
156 concerns, best and safe practices, Unanswered questions and summary. Our handout
157 includes visuals and links that support our presentation. This information also available
158 on kensingtonconversation.net. Planning board we request you record the detail of our
159 groups public comments and our handout in the public records. Anyone speaking tonight
160 your perspective and questions are important. We want to hear everyone. Please take
161 your time and speaking into the microphone clearly. Through open dialogue and sincere,
162 respect of all of all perspectives we will learn about and achieve the best and safe
163 telecommunications network options for this very special town. It's unique and beautiful,
164 and I'm grateful to live here. Thank you.

165 V. Rozier thanked P. DeCaprio.

166 She continued that she just wanted to address one comment quickly. There was a request to have the a
167 few members of the Community put onto the agenda for a presentation. The reason why, and we did
168 discuss how that would be possible, but within the parameters of the public hearing. It needs to happen
169 within the public hearing and so in order to allow for a fair and organized process. You can't put an
170 agenda item inside of a public hearing. Is it is my understanding. So, I appreciate your comment. About

171 that, it was seriously discussed and considered, and there was a reason. I appreciate that you brought
172 that up and that you are structuring it in a way that will work with the structure of the meeting.
173 P. DeCaprio stated I hope that you will include us in the public record.
174 V. Rozier confirmed that all comments will be included in the public record.
175

176 Ami Delgado spoke next.

177 Thank you for your time this evening, my name is Ami Delgado I've lived at 5 Hoosac Rd. for 18 years
178 here in Kensington. This is my favorite time of year because I love to wait for the
179 peepers to appear in the ponds and it reminds me of our developing ecosystem and our
180 resonance of the Schumann Resonance of the earth or natural resonance and we can
181 regenerate ourselves during our night sleep in this resonance. When we look at the
182 Environmental health trust work sites, there's a lot of research there that they put a great
183 body of work together to discuss radio frequency, RF. How it is resulting in a lot of
184 health risks for a lot of people in a lot of other parts of the country and other parts of the
185 world such as breast cancer, acoustic neurons, parotid gland tumors, DNA repaired
186 habitations that start directly related to the immune system. DNA damage, Narrow
187 degenerative diseases, even things like dizziness, and ability to concentrate, and even
188 reproductive health allow studies that I encourage you to visit this website or other
189 websites that you can learn about this as well and who will be responsible that this
190 technology is deployed. Our human cells, our flora, and our fauna are no longer
191 imbalanced. Thank you.

192 V. Rozier thanked A Delgado.
193

194 Peter Merrill spoke next.

195 Good evening. My name is Peter. Merrill, of 275 N Haverhill Rd. I look at the board and I see many
196 people that I've worked with in the many years that I was on the board from 2001 until
197 almost 2017, and then took a break and came back for a couple more years. So I sit where
198 you sat and I have the greatest respect for the work you have to do and the decisions you
199 have to make. I have sensitivity and a recollection of the many challenges I had during
200 my time on the board. I wanted to put, just sort of an interesting perspective. When I
201 looked through the application and one thing that I saw was interesting was a clause
202 about when there is obsolescence for the potential of abandonment of the tower, either
203 due to changing technologies or just, you know, something goes on, they just decide that
204 the clients won't be utilizing the tower anymore or different reasons. I believe there is a
205 clause within the application that says that there will be some funds that are set aside for
206 that. I don't know if that's in the form of a bond. I didn't get the detail, so I'd be curious as
207 to who holds the bond, and whether the bonds are used on a regular basis to make sure
208 that the amount of money that's set aside there is truly enough to do what would be an
209 appropriate removal and remediation. Unfortunately, the town, in the past has been
210 involved in times where there have been bonds through different projects. And I won't

211 call out but would be happy to speak to them if you want me to, where bonds have
212 unfortunately, either lapsed or have been allowed to lapse, and then what was supposed to
213 have been completed on remediations of projects was never done, never accomplished,
214 and as a result of this, buyer beware to the next person. So, I would caution that you think
215 more seriously about where that bond is. Make sure that it just can't just expire. Or can't
216 be abandoned, can't be walked away from and it has the complete amount of money to
217 make sure that the remediation takes place. And then also one of the things that I saw in
218 the presentation in the February meeting there was discussion about how the Rosencrantz
219 Tower that is being replaced currently. My understanding from the presentation was that
220 the tower was not possible to be able to support the new technology and that's why is
221 being replaced. However, that is also being cited as the theory or the science of once that
222 tower has been erected and installed and is operational that there are still going to be dead
223 spots. And again, this is theoretical. They're dead spots that are going to be there and so
224 as a result, the Moulton Ridge project that's proposed would address some of those
225 discrepancies. I find it interesting as somebody who comes from a background in science
226 and research that is great to have theories, but we typically make our big money decisions
227 on actual data that exists from true testing. I would also encourage the board to consider
228 the idea that perhaps you want to see what the true discrepancies are when the tower is
229 truly operational at Rosencrantz before you decide well, you know, we really need to be
230 doing this down road, as well, before we even build the first one. So, on that, I will thank
231 you for your attention and your appreciation of what the concerned citizens are trying to
232 voice to just make sure that this is not a rushed procedure but that it is a properly
233 measured procedure and that if there are precautions that need to be done, they will be
234 adhered to. Thank you.

235 V. Rozier thanked P. Merrill.

236 V. Rozier continued, I heard two questions in that particular comment that I think it would be
237 appropriate for F. Parisi to answer. The first was related to the bond which we do have a copy of in our
238 application. I don't believe that there is an amount on that bond. At this point, but then secondarily the
239 question related to the science behind the modeling that is created that is also part of this package.

240
241 F. Parisi commented next.

242 Good evening my name is Fran Parisi and I represent the applicant Vertex towers. In response to
243 bond there is zoning requiring us to post a bond. We provided that as part of the original
244 application package a draft bond that we used in many similar situations in many towns
245 throughout New Hampshire as well as estimate of the cost that the engineers certify is what it
246 will cost to remove. So the bonds that we get are one year bonds, they're annually renewable and
247 so it would be presumably a condition of the zoning approval that we annually renew it. We do
248 that have a team that has a system in place to make sure that they are annually renewed, and they
249 have never had an issue with any of them expiring. We have never had to exercise this due to the
250 technology. With respect to the science and the data, most of the data that we use is software

analysis that takes into account at maximum our data based on topography and terrain and the frequency of the bandwidth of the telecommunications signal the power output. We can do with great accuracy predictions of the coverage area of a particular site. We knew Rosencrantz was coming here soon, but we talked about that in the original case discussion, we talked about it earlier in this discussion that it's apples and oranges. They're miles and miles apart. I can't say I'm guessing they're 5 or 6 miles apart. It's based on data and science and many different variables and is very accurate.

F. Parisi brought up his presentation in section nine, on the screen.

V. Rozier informed the public that if anyone had another question to feel free to come up and sign up. If there is a follow-up question and there is no endpoint to the sign-up sheet during the public comment.

F. Parisi

This is the propagation survey and down at the very bottom is Rosencrantz and we expect to be building it sometime this year. We can anticipate what the signal is going to be from that based on the power frequency of the telecommunications signals and the topography and the terrain. There is a tower in East Kingston that has some effect on Kensington and there is a tower in Exeter that has some effect on Kensington and we can propagate all of that very scientifically. V. Rozier asked if this is with the Rosencrantz tower or existing now without any tower?

F. Parisi stated that it is existing now with the Rosencrantz Tower because we know that that is going to happen. That is with it and then they submitted a map showing what this tower will do. Based on the propagation, we show that it fills in the gap in what we call the center of Kensington, going to Exeter and going to East Kingston as well. So, it's not perfect, but it definitely fills the gap for Kensington. We look at it in a variety of different ways we look at it, and this is just one of the multiple analyses that we have in our data file. The rest was unable to be heard clearly.

P. Merrill had a follow-up question.

He can't really see clearly but isn't there a guide of how many miles on the lower left? And if you are looking at the red dot can someone tell me how many miles that is?

F. Parisi – that looks more like three. The towers will be, based on this map, 3 miles apart.

V. Rozier what is the average distance between towers in Exeter?

F. Parisi -Exeter has a tower right off of Route 101, there's a tower just north of downtown, and we built a tower on the road coming out of Exeter, going towards Kingston, and so my suspicion is those are about the same distance apart. It is only two miles out of downtown and the one in Downtown Exeter wasn't that tall, so I understand the question, but it's very difficult question to answer because it's very site specific based on topography. We're a little bit higher here in the Moulton Ridge Rd. site so we get a little bit better coverage. The site in the Rosencrantz is down in the lower area that was built a long time

290 ago for different purposes. Actually, it was build when the nuclear power plant was built to provide
291 radio communications and public safety network for the nuclear power plant.
292 And our software takes into account the topography and the terrain, also what we call clutter, the
293 vegetation, which is actually an impediment to our signal, the dense the forest it becomes impediment.
294 So, the towers along the highway get better coverage, they have no vegetative clutter around. It is
295 generally hard to say generally how far a tower will reach.

296

297 G. Greenwood spoke.

298 Mr. Parisi, so if you look down 150. There's a lot of white there. So those
299 white areas remain service deprived with both towers?

300

301 F. Parisi- With the white this is all done on a very specific threshold. As you can see in the key it says -
302 95dBm and what that means is ideally what we want is a lower threshold, so it's a better-quality signal
303 inside a building. As opposed to outdoors as opposed to in a car. The -95 is what you get in a vehicle for
304 coverage. So, we're anticipating the we are going to get very good coverage in a vehicle throughout all
305 of Kensington, East Kington and Exeter. That's not saying you're not going to get indoor coverage, its
306 just that this map shows where you are going to get that quality of coverage. They can produce maps
307 that say what the indoor coverage will be and the outdoor coverage, but this map is most representative.
308 And what the white shows is, it's not saying you're not going to get coverage but that it is less than
309 reliable. You might get a signal depending on topography. They have sites proposed in Hampton and
310 North Hampton.

311 V. Rozier- so this is in-building coverage that we are looking at?

312 F. Parisi- no that's in vehicle coverage. The building is more structured and I can get you any one that
313 you want, I just thought that was the easiest.

314 V. Rozier thanked F. Parisi.

315

316 K. Felch- We have four more is there any particular order that anyone wants to go in now or are we go
317 to just call the next person?

318

319 **Barry Thompson-**

320 Good evening, everybody, my name is Barry Thompson, I live at 32 Osgood Road, I have been a
321 resident here for under 10 years as you can tell by my strong American accent I moved here from
322 the UK 27 years ago. The US is my home, and I am a US citizen. I have many different
323 opinions on the towers. I do think I know firsthand personally from my brother-in-law, he was an
324 engineer on BT towers and there are severe health risks. He was an engineer out in the field, for
325 BT putting these towers in wiring them. So, he was on site and using the equipment. Yeah,
326 headphones all time. My brother-in-law Will died of a brain tumor the stem cell brain tumor and
327 many of his colleagues have a greater risk of cancer than you would normally expect.
328 Everything gets washed and there's never any proof of this thing but the numbers of data is
329 proof. It is a higher risk health policy. That's just my opinion. I can't provide you facts or data,

330 but just going back to the gentlemen's opinion regarding the Rosencrantz tower. No with them
331 putting in the new proposed tower in, which is going to be 3 miles as the crow flies and this
332 would just be a stopgap. The filler for the gaps that we've had in the communication system
333 currently. So, when you say it's a filler that means that you don't really know what the impact is
334 going to be. Is it going to be good enough? Is it going to be sufficient for what your needs are
335 going to be going forward and when you say it's a filler that concerns me. So if you need a tower
336 every three miles as the crow flies. That means that if you approve this tower, the new proposed
337 tower, you're setting a precedent for multiple towers to be set up in a three-mile grid. All across
338 this area. And once you said yes to 1 Rosencrantz one has only been allowed because it is
339 grandfathered in because it was there before and it's being repurposed. This is a brand-new
340 tower, set for this specific thing and it's setting the president to say, Oh well we underestimated
341 the requirements. There is still, you know, bad spots or black spots. So we need another tower
342 here and we need another tower there, and that's all its gonna do. Your topography is gonna
343 change, and it's gonna be a network of towers and we are all gonna be surrounded by towers, and
344 the long term health effects won't be known for 10, 15, 20 years. And then see what the growth
345 of cancer is from there. I think that it is a bad idea personally.
346 I work from home quite often. I do teams calls globally. My cell phone receives calls and I make
347 calls. And I use my fidium Wi-Fi. You know, I was on the Teams call on the way back here on
348 my car, I lost the signal couple of times on 150 that came back. And I was able to get home and
349 finish the call in the car and before I came up here. So system works It's just, you know, some
350 people want it to be even better. Technology and advancement, is not always what is best for you
351 as a community and your overall health and we won't find ramifications out until many, many
352 years later. So that's just my opinion. But thank you for this. Thank you.

353
354 **Karen Parker Feld spoke next.**

355 Thank you very much for moving the public comment to the beginning of the meeting we really
356 appreciate it and we appreciate all of your hard work and difficult decisions and thanks for
357 everybody who came here tonight. These meetings are very exciting. So, taking time out of
358 your evening to listen to planning is not something that people do every day.
359 Karen Parker Feld Crow's Feat Farm 178 Drinkwater Road. The house in which I live was built
360 in 1744, before the American Revolution. History is written into its Timbers and its whispers and
361 although we've all become accustomed to change, we are now expected to forget the past. It still
362 lives with us. It's not wrong it's not forgotten, and we are very fortunate to remember where we
363 came from, that's one of the things that I love about living in the town of Kensington. It's the
364 same with the soil. Soil is not a tool it's not a thing for us to use, it's what keeps us alive. Our
365 connection with land and nature sustains us. It bestows honor on us and gives our lives meaning.
366 I hope you keep that in mind when considering the effects of technology on our farms, our
367 farmers and most importantly the birds, the bees, the plants, the animals upon which we all
368 depend. Let's talk about this tower this second tower, which those feel is essential to life and
369 safety in this town. The first paragraph of the vertex project description tells us that they are

building a grid and a rather tight one. In the old days, low frequency cellular radiation allowed towers to be located 20, 30 miles apart. Those radiuses did not include Kensington as we all know. We might have appreciated a phone call back then, but there wasn't enough money in the wireless carriers to bother with us. Too small. Modern wireless technology is a whole different ballgame. We rely on frequencies that are far, far higher and more intense, with shortness of distances. That require distances between towers and between towers and other antennas. It's not as just the gentleman mentioned. It's not just about having more towers, it's about the antennas that project those frequencies into homes. And the Vertex representatives spoke about getting the signals to go through walls and avoiding clutter. I guess was the word he used to describe nature. These higher frequency high intensity radiation does pose risks to health and safety. Are appealed as document. There are now billions of dollars, 9,000,000 billions of dollars riding on getting every small town and family, indeed, every device and every body connected to the Internet grid. They call it the Internet of Things they call it the Internet of bodies. Some have described it as the internet of everything. That all of nature should be connected to this grid, not just people. So it's now apparently urgent that Kensington except 2 cell towers in close proximity to one another. The 1st has already been approved and just discussed at Rosencratz. That's less than two miles from this town hall, three miles from the edge of Kensington, as the crow flies. Seems to me that it's worth letting that tower be placed and testing the effectiveness of the additional radio frequencies in dealing with dropped calls, cell phone coverage ect. and also measuring the intensity of the radiation that it produces. The telecommunications act of 1996 is obviously critical governing document for these decisions, but the standards established then are badly out of date and are much more lax than virtually all other industrialized countries, with the exception of Japan. And many, many lawsuits have been brought, including by towns and municipalities against the radiation associated with these newer technologies, which wasn't even contemplated when that act was written. And the federal judge in the DC Circuit of appeals, mandated that the FCC reviewed its exposure standards. Which it deemed to be arbitrary and capricious. That decision mandated the FCC to conduct serious research, given all the other private sector research that has been done regarding health and safety issues. So yes, if the tower compliance with these out of date FCC standards, apparently nothing can be done, but the fact is that many towns are regulated placement. You know, commercial zones, other things like that. My concern is that high frequency radiation will be mandated upon all of us in Kensington unless we say no, no insurance company, will indemnify the cell tower companies with the hundreds of antennas they claim to install, you cannot sue them because they can't get insurance. And in my view, all other reasonable options have not been explored. There are better and safer technologies related to Wi-Fi calling, satellite technologies, fiber optics, etc. And given that safety is indicated as one of the primary reasons for adding this tower, I think that those options should be explored and that they could have been explored previously. So again, thank you very much for your time. We would be so deeply appreciative if you would slow the process down, allow more public hearings on how to make the use of technology safer. We all love our phones,

409 but there are things that we can do to make sure that we can have the benefit of these
410 communication devices in a safe and effective way. So, thank you very much for your time.

411 V. Rozier thanked K. Parker Feld. And asked Kathy who else was on the list.

412 K. Felch named Ann Smith, Alan DeFreitas and Al Brandano.

413 V. Rozier – my initial reaction was for the applicant to address some of those issues, Fran would you
414 like to wait until the remaining commenters are finished? She would like to continue with the public
415 comment to gather questions so that we can have Fran address all of the comments.

416

417

418 Ann Smith went next.

419 My name is Ann Smith, I live at 63 Moulton Ridge and I am now 51 years in Kensington and 45
420 of those, and I have lived at 63 Moulton Ridge and so I am very happy that we've put all our land
421 in an easement. There are five other people that put lands and easements in our area and they are
422 contiguous to what we have to our land and that makes it up to 6 to 700 acres of contiguous
423 block of land. And that is according to the Southeast Land Trust. So good for wildlife and so I
424 feel very good about that. We the residents the land owners, abutters and interested parties in
425 Kensington have many unanswered questions. We are now asking the planning board to give us
426 more time to study many of the positives and negatives of the issues involving the cell tower
427 telecommunication proposal. Abutters actually need the time to hire appraisers and for lands to
428 be appraised of their properties to make sure there is no devaluation due to the construction of
429 the neighborhood cell towers. Which is going to be at the top of Moulton Ridge Road and that's
430 at 70 Moulton Ridge Road. We also would like a pause from the construction of this cell tower
431 on Moulton Ridge and because the one on 184 has been approved and 184 South Rd. it's been
432 approved and we want to follow that and see what happens with that area. The one on 184 South
433 Road is in a commercial zone, the one that this planned for Moulton Ridge is now in the
434 residential agricultural area. That's why they need to go to the zoning board needs to make the
435 determination on that. Another of the Kensington zoning, says that there shall be no location
436 concerning the residential agricultural, there should be no cell towers on that. Which I feel is
437 quite serious, that they are making a decision, or they've made a decision on that. Another
438 Kensington zoning ordinance which established their goal is to reduce adverse impacts such
439 facilities. The facility can be the cell tower including but not limited to impact on aesthetics,
440 environmental sensitive areas, historically significant locations, flight corridors and health and
441 safety. Like injurious accidents to person and property and prosperity. This, through protection
442 of property values this is the one and most important reason for our appeal to the zoning board.
443 We need time to have ourselves and be appraised, which I've just said before, but that is so key.
444 And the Kensington ordinance which permits the construction of new towers only where all
445 other reasonable opportunities have been exhausted. We, the group that we seem to have gotten
446 together. Is we would like to work with the town for a better and a safer telecommunication
447 solution for the town, its residents, the environment, the wildlife and even the farm animals. We
448 do have farms and I have to say, prior for what many people say they would like to live in

Kensington and the reason for that is the open spaces and the farms, and we now even have a Raptor and that's up at the top of Shaws Hill. Which takes care of the birds or the avian family and I think they have five or six of the birds that need to be taken care of and then maybe hopefully be released back into life. Thank you very much for coming tonight. If anyone interested in what we are doing, please get in touch with us and we'll direct you, and figure out where we're going. I just want to read one thing about a letter that I got, I got several letters in the last few years and it was a family that is looking to get back to farming and homesteading. They have three children and the wife is a flower farmer and they are very passionate about regenerative farming, local agriculture and community. They just happen to know somebody who's in this area and they said we have dreams of ending up on a quiet road just like Moulton Ridge. And it makes me feel so good because of our agriculture and our rural. The 51 years is been absolutely great. So and a tower would be a real problem. My daughter would like to move here and she's very much into the horse scene and she loves farming and she loves the land. I think because she lives in Housatonic Massachusetts and she's going to be 31 miles from Pittsfield and Pittsfield, Mass, is now going through all sorts of problems because of cell towers. So she said, you know, mom, I'm not sure. I don't think that could come and live there if there's a cell tower. So, thank you very much.

V. Rozier-Thank you.

K. Felch- Alan DeFreitas

Alan DeFreitas

Good evening, my name is Alan DeFreitas I live at 6 Brewer Rd. Kensington. First of all, I'd like to ask Francis, is that it. I think it's Francis, is that this is a monopole. Site antenna. It's a site antenna correct, so that within the site is all you will really be able to catch as far as radio waves. Just to be clear I've worked in the industry for 47 years. I've worked in computers all my life. I've built them and I'm very familiar with cell technology and things of that nature. At the same time, like a lot of my neighbors here, I'm very sensitive to people in the Community and I don't want to dismiss any of the concerns out of hand that have been raised. And if there was a lot of time, I'd be happy to discuss some of these notes. But I was brought here because somebody dropped this off at my house. In the interest of time, I think maybe I'll just address two issues. And then talk about something else that I think. One, is there some things on here that are not correct and this lady and very eloquently said that there are alternatives. There really aren't in terms of the cost and the capabilities. This is the capability that you're going to get best service and best capability as far as being able to connect devices, the other thing is that since birth, we've all been bombarded with radio waves, not radiation. Radio waves and high frequency signals. So this is nothing new, right? Whether you approve this application or not when we leave here, this will continue. The cell tower in my estimation is needed. It's important to this community and we should be building it. And I'm very much in favor of the approval of the application. I know I'm not going to be very popular here, but even if you don't approve it at this point, you're going to have to approve it in the coming years. And the reason is

489 that we have technology, we have business and government. The Internet of Things, as was
490 brought up edge computing and other technological advancements. There's no way to avoid it.
491 It's important, and in fact, we're probably going to need a lot more towers because of the
492 topography. So, we can either make the decision now or we can wait for the next generation to
493 do it but it is going to have to happen. Thank you very much.

494 V. Rozier-Thank you.

495 K. Felch- Al Brandano

496
497 **Al Brandano**- Al Brandano of Kensington, 2 West School Road.

498 I'm going to go in a little bit different direction because I really want to find the hidden piece of
499 the puzzle, that I need to understand. Can you tell me what is the purpose of the Planning Board
500 as far as its Charter, and what exactly are you responsible for? Technically.

501 G. Greenwood-The state law allows the planning board to oversee the development, the proper,
502 systematic and timely development of the Community.

503 A. Brandano- Kind of development it's just specific development and on safety. Specific to
504 development.

505 G. Greenwood-No, The very essence of the power that the zoning ordinance in the town stems from is
506 the police power so it's for the general benefit, health and safety of the.

507 A. Brandano-OK. And that comes from the state charter.

508 G. Greenwood- state charter

509 A. Brandano-The State charters Kensington, and Kensington in order to stay within the bounds of the
510 Charter has to follow certain guidelines and so this creates the zoning board and then the planning board,
511 right?

512 G. Greenwood- No, the town has a right as a community to adopt zoning provisions, but if they choose
513 to, they have to do 2 things they have to adopt the master plan first, that outlines development guidelines
514 and desires for the Community. And then they also have to adopt, either by appointment or election, a
515 planning board and a zoning board. Because state law doesn't allow you to have a zoning ordinance if
516 there is no relief mechanism to address how the zoning ordinance impacts individual properties, so you
517 can't have a zoning ordinance without having a way of appealing the zoning ordinance, and that's why
518 the ZBA exists.

519 A. Brandano- So, the planning board exists not just for development, but for safety is that a correct
520 statement?

521 G. Greenwood- For the general health, benefit, and safety of the Community, yes.

522 A. Brandano- So, my question based on that is, in 1996 , there was probably five of you on the board
523 and in and in 1996, it wasn't 5G, obviously.

524 G. Greenwood-There wasn't 5G.

525 A Brandano- It wasn't a 5G network in 1996, I'm guessing.

526 G. Greenwood-Sure. I believe that since I think 5G's only came in about in the last five years.

527 A. Brandano- And so when the ordinance was initiated well, when the rule was adopted by the federal
528 government and passed down through the states. At some point still the justifications or the approval
529 still rests with this planning board right based on what you just explained to us.

530 G. Greenwood-No, there its site can definitely can be a responsibility of the town. If the town adopts a
531 zoning ordinance in much the same way that this community has. But the Telecommunications Act
532 specifically said that the science of the RF Section of these devices is not within the realm of the global
533 community.

534 A. Brandano-I understand what I'm saying is. As the woman was saying before, this is much more brief
535 than what she was talking about. They were court cases I think you said there were several court cases
536 that had a chance to take a look at it or at least discussed the difference between the technology in 1996,
537 when this was adopted too now. So, my question and probably won't be answered tonight, but because
538 of the basis of how you get your authority in the planning board, and one part of it being the safety part.
539 And it may be convoluted, but it is the safety part. That the responsibility still can rest with this board is
540 what I am trying to basically get to. That if the board said for safety reasons, that we're not going to do
541 this, and I know it's in this case a violation of federal law. Can you explain what happens if this pending
542 board says no to this, can you please explain what happens next?

543 G. Greenwood- The aggrieved party in that instance, the telecommunication provider or in this case an
544 entity that provides services to develop this industry, has the right to sue the town. They can. They can
545 sue.

546 A. Brandano- They would sue the bondholder, they would sue the town, which is the bondholder, right?
547 They would not, they cannot sue the individuals.

548 G. Greenwood- correct.

549 A. Brandano- So that everyone understands its bond holder for the town, and if any board violates its
550 duties, they can be held accountable right through the bond.

551 G. Greenwood- The Planning Board, on behalf of the town. Can be sued.

552 A. Brandano-So I just want to make everyone here aware that if you are an abutter that this board has
553 the power to say no. If it does say no, that there is a possibility that town could be sued. And if the town
554 were to be sued, they would have to defend itself. That's correct?

555 G. Greenwood-Yes, but that happens not without frequency.

556 A. Brandano-And do you know if that happens a lot, or has that happened a lot in cases like this? that we
557 would hear cases? Where you involved in some of this that had to do with these challenges. Do you have
558 any background?

559 G. Greenwood-One of the towns that I have been with for 35 years has had a cell tower disapproval. No,
560 I'm sorry. Had a cell tower approval challenged by another firm that wanted to go in. And so there were
561 dueling applications, one application, one, the other application, sued. And in that event, there was still a
562 winner who was able to construct a tower, and that was the process. I haven't been involved in a case,
563 but I'm aware that those cases exist.

564 A. Brandano-Thank you very much.

565 V. Rozier asked if there was anyone else on the list.

566

567 **A. DeFreitas**-I would just like to clarify something.
568 I would just like to clarify something concerning 4G and 5G. First with all, 5G does not exist across the
569 United States. 5G equipment is very expensive, it's coming into play. It is in some places in New York
570 City, it's not generally here. What we have here mostly is 4.3 or 4.5. That's so. Try to understand that
571 some of these things we throw around are technical terms. Some of it's done by the marketing and sales
572 group. And so you should understand there is a difference between the two.

573

574 **Sara Batterson** 268 N Haverhill Road

575 268 N Haverhill Rd. So this may be just a procedural question. And I know it may not be to you
576 guys. This whole process I have felt like we are sort of on step 3.

577 When I'm not sure what happened to step one. So, if the town has an ordinance against it and I
578 know I'm not using the right terms I'm sorry. If the town says they can't build a cell tower in the
579 residential or agricultural area. I don't quite understand how a telecommunications company can
580 then sue if it's within the regulations. I know the zoning board made the decision and I'm also
581 confused about the appeal process and what happens there, and I know what is being space to
582 find that out. So, I guess my question is why does the telecommunications provider or?
583 Representative or whatever Vertex is. Why are they threatening in that sense? Why are they
584 suing or threatening to sue? Based on.

585 V Rozier- Nobody's threatening to sue.

586 G. Greenwood-There has been no threat from them to my knowledge.

587 V. Rozier-Not at all.

588 S. Batterson-But if our regulations say you can't have cell tower in the residential area.

589 G. Greenwood-You understand the concepts.

590 S. Batterson- I've learned a lot in past few weeks.

591 G. Greenwood-That's terrific. As I said earlier, if the town chose to adopt the zoning ordinance they
592 have to in corollary, adopt A process for waiving or varying that zone ordinance. In particular cases and
593 there is a state authorized and guided process for doing that. And in this particular case, we have an
594 ordinance that says that you can't do a tower in the rural residential zone. In that instance, a property
595 owner has the right to request the variance of the requirements of the ordinance. When that happens, it
596 goes to the zoning board of adjustment, the Zoning Board of Adjustment has a process that they have to
597 follow in order to either approve or deny a variance, and in this instance, they approve the variance after
598 having gone over the criteria that are required by state law for them to address. And then as is always the
599 case in America, when a decision is made and an aggrieved party is created, there has to be a process for
600 that aggrieved party to speak to that. That's the appeal process that is currently ongoing. That's all
601 separate. From the planning board. It does very strongly impact the planning, the planning board at this
602 point. If and when they made a decision, if that zoning board process hasn't been completed, the best
603 that they could do is conditionally approve because the use has yet to be finalized and without the
604 permission of that use the planning board can't go past a point.

605 S. Batterson-It does feel like a lot of what was said tonight is directed at the planning boards, decision.

606 And I know that you have a different set of regulations.

607 G. Greenwood- Correct, the planning board hasn't come to a decision.
608 V. Rozier-Well, we do. We still we have to follow the zoning regulations, right. We have the zoning
609 regulations and we have the site plan regulations and we have our subdivision regulations. OK. So
610 there's three different sets of regulations. The zoning regulations will apply to this application, correct as
611 well as the site plan regulations. If we choose to if, we decide that we need to apply some of like the
612 dimensional regulations or the logistics of like where it is and what it looks like and construction
613 concerns.
614 S. Batterson-So is anything that we said tonight. Is any of that able to be factored into your decision
615 process right now.
616 G. Greenwood-I've heard a number of things that could be. And I've heard some that I think are
617 troubling from the planning board perspective, but they are the issues that the planning board will have
618 to deliberate on.
619 S. Batterson-And they will wait to hear about the zoning board appeals?
620 G. Greenwood-That that is done entirely separately. It's my understanding. That the zoning. Board has a
621 hearing date set to consider the appeals. At the beginning of May May 2nd.
622 V. Rozier-so that that hearing is May 2nd at 7:30pm.
623 G. Greenwood-And that's a completely public process as well, so. The public is completely invited and
624 allowed to participate and review that process.
625 S. Batterson-Thank you for doing that.
626 V. Rozier-I think that was a great question because I think maybe perhaps a lot of people have it.
627

628 **Patricia DeCaprio- 31 Osgood Road**

629 Thank you, Patricia DeCaprio- 31 Osgood Road. As I was listening to other people speak it just
630 jogged my thought process on the gentleman who spoke to that we've been exposed to these
631 radio waves grown up in them and such and that's true we have. I grew up in the city probably
632 exposed to more in my earlier days, but I also worked for the next mobile communications
633 corporate and corporate sales of major accounts. I was trained on cell towers and cell phone use.
634 And they are very different now. In the day when I worked for the company in the early days we
635 had bag phone we did not have so much that we had big hand phones. Then we went to the small
636 little phones flip phones. Cell phone transceiver was in the car in the in the trunk. I remember
637 being told that there is a court case coming up about a woman suing because of a brain tumor
638 and we want you to ensure our customers when you are selling to them that you are not going to
639 lift the phone against your head. When they use the 1.6 watt phones you are going to sell them
640 the handheld kits it so that they can use the phone hands-free in the car. So that was one of the
641 earliest experiences I transitioned out of the Communications industry and then into holistic
642 health and Wellness and I have watched people struggle to regain their health when they are
643 living in an area where they are bombarded 24/7 with cell towers and lifestyle. And these close
644 proximity towers they're not related under 200 feet, so we don't know what the emissions are
645 going to be, we don't know the full overlapping spray of what's coming off of different towers.
646 And the magnified effects of those overlapping areas and the biggest concern, as I know working

as working in health and wellness improvement is when you're sleeping, having quality downtime where your electromagnetic field is able to go into a proper round and deep sleep where your brain is able to detox it's the only time that the body has the ability to detox the brain. When you get into a deep rem sleep at night, and these towers you can't opt out of them when they are in your backyard. And that's not just humans, we're talking about all plants, the animals, everything. The frequency these vibrational frequencies are different than nature's frequencies. What we image and what plants image with the all plants, animals, bees but bees are not able to navigate. They're having problems because these radio frequencies they can't pollinate. We don't grow food. I mean, there's so many ramifications and domino effects that this stuff has. We have to take it seriously. We have to go carefully. Thank you.

Peter Freeman

Peter Freeman 178 Drinkwater Road.

I have not heard anything said about the extra 30 feet on the tower and the width of it, I heard that it was 12 feet is that with the arrays or without the arrays?

F. Parisi- the arrays are about 12 feet it's a triangular platform.

P. Freeman- so they only stick out 12 feet. I am concerned about the extra 30 feet above the tower that these people who bought so. What I'm thinking is if each array is 6 feet tall. You know, so you've got 30 some feet right there with six arrays and the space between I'm not sure what the space is between because there is nothing saying anything. So I'm thinking that then if it was moved four feet, so it's smaller than one of those arrays, and I'm thinking that the array system is probably as long as this room, and at least as tall as room. And I am also concerned about these white areas, so they're going to bring in the small antennas to grab from the big antennas. And how much more mediation or whatever it is that the cell towers do. So you guys have a hard time getting the signal here so they are going to put a small antenna up here. You're just going to throw off all kinds of radiation along with the big one too. Thank you.

Mike DeCaprio 31 Osgood Road.

And I was also in the telecommunications industry for 20 years. Just wondering about a couple of points. One in terms of propagation maps. From what I understand, those do not belong in the report. I advise, I asked that we do true drop call data with a drive by analysis once the South Road tower is in place then you have true data, versus propagation maps that are based on the software. Naturally, they don't belong in the report because they are not representative of what's going to happen when the tower is up. Second. We touched on it a little bit, so I apologize for the kind of repeating. But I just want to add a little bit to it. In terms of RF measurement of the tower the tower is up. Is anyone going to measure it, measure the what it's emitting because often they find that these towers emit more radiation than the FCC allows. So I advise that someone measures the signal from the tower on a regular basis. It really shouldn't be the tax payers that pay for that, but it should be an independent contractor or engineer. And third, there are safe alternatives 20 years being telecommunications industry, fiber, cable, ethernet inside the house

the download and upload speeds exceed any wireless download and upload speeds, and latency is better, so there are safe alternatives. They're just they're better. We have fiber to the premises in most cases. I have a landline phone I have issues processing large amounts of data from my house. In cable, I use Xfinity for cable and then I use ethernet for the house. So that's it. Thank you very much. Appreciate it.

- this may be a procedural question. If the town has an ordinance against/ town says that you can't build a cell tower in a residential area, she does not understand how the cell tower can sue question is why does the telecommunications provider why are they threatening or threatening to sue? V. Rozier clarified that there have been no threats to sue. But if the regulations of the town state If the town chose to adopt the zoning ordinance then they have to adopt the ability to give relief. This ordinance states that you can't do a tower in the town and in that instance then the property owner has the right to request a variance to the zoning. The ZBA has approved the

V. Rozier asked the applicant to approach and asked if he had been keeping a running list.

F. Parisi- Good evening, everyone I am Fran Parisi the applicant. I was surprised by the comments that we're rushing this process. Kathy, when was the first time I contacted you? I can tell you it was 2015, when the town hall was in the temporary building, I've been working with Kensington for almost 10 years to find an appropriate location for telecommunication facilities. We have locations in other towns, including the town of Brentwood. I have built towers in Exeter, Stratham, Brentwood, Raymond, I could name a dozen other towns throughout New Hampshire and also Salisbury Massachusetts. Anyone that watches any television, Super Bowl, or basketball tournaments, ATT and Verizon are one of the biggest companies in the country and all the advertising they do. The telecommunication side between having of the screen was adopted in 1996, so this has been coming for 25 years, and in I think it was 1998, after the verdict at the state the town adopted very comprehensive zoning laws to regulate telecommunications. And with one variance we've met all the requirements of the zoning about 25 years later. This has been coming, this is no surprise. And also I was in this room almost a year ago with the Rosencrantz tower and we said that we were coming back and the town said when are you going to build something up north to cover the north campus, then we showed them what the Rosencrantz tower would not cover that area.

V. Rozier-I'd like to just clarify this. The town did not say when are you going to build something there were are individuals that said that.

F. Parisi- OK, yeah but we have been working on this for a very long time. As has the industry too. We are, I am also were very, very conservation conscious. We picked a location that utilizes the existing topography surrounded by trees utilizing those things are very rare in our building world because we're encouraged to go in undeveloped areas. Away from residential uses where trees provided mitigation visual indication and we have all that. But also we don't have to take down any trees to build this. So this is actually environmentally sensitive. We looked at the locations on the property farther down the hill, which was much more environmentally sensitive than any other project. We could move farther

away, but it would just move closer to other abutting properties. It would be at a lower elevation, which would require a taller tower. It will require more revenues, wetland crossings and other much more extensive grading and it's more expensive and more environmental disturbance. So, we're very conscious. In addition, unlike any other project in the town of Kensington we are very heavily federally regulated, which requires us to environmentally do our diligence so that we don't have any impact on any other environmental resources like Native American artifacts, endangered species and wildlife and the impact on migratory birds. People can build farms and structures on their properties but we have are required to show the impact on migratory birds. The town of Kensington with all the conservation land makes it much more difficult to find the proper locations, we looked at a lot of areas. Does it have any significant environmental impact. This is really the only viable alternative for this cell tower, it meets all the requirements of the zoning bylaw. We talked about it it's actually quite easy because Kensington does not have an industrial zone except for the south most corner of the town by Seabrook. So let's see. So there's just nowhere to go in Kensington. It's the same issue that's happened in the last 25 years is that this is evolved from mobile technology people using their phones in their houses and placing the business in their schools and in their workplaces and they want the signal where they are. So we are forced to go in residential areas we are forced to go where the need is. But at the same time be sensitive to that, so when we found this spot on Moulton Ridge Road it all made sense. I will also say that on the most part really didn't have an issue with this particular site, with minor exceptions, they have issues with towers in general. I agree Kensington is a special place. But it's really no different than the rest of New Hampshire, we all enjoy technology, we all need technology, there is a real public safety component to technology. The gentleman said he was driving here and dropped the signal a few times, but he made it. On my way in I was talking to my dad, he had decided to go visit a friend in South Carolina today and he is driving to South Carolina and he finally called me as I was coming into Kensington, actually on the Seabrook line, and I had to stop at the farm stand and wait to have a conversation with him because I knew if I went any farther towards town hall I would have dropped the signal. So that connectivity we all need and crave and the safety aspect of it. And the last thing I want to talk about is the telecommunications act.

The telecommunications act was designed to encourage development of telecommunications infrastructure in the United States, it was at a time when they were all beholden to one telephone company AT&T. That Bill was 100 pages long because it broke up that Telephone company into multiple different telephone companies which increased competition and to encourage the development of wireless technology and alternative to wireline because the federal government saw the need for it. And along with that the states all got involved to encourage the deployment of telecommunications infrastructure because the states also see a need. The Telecommunications Act is really it, let's make it very clear it does not require you to say yes. It just limits your ability to say no unless there are very good reasons. If and I don't know if that means or what it would be but if it were painted pink or, you know, in an area that is truly obnoxious or visceral, but we had some impact we were driving through wetlands or we had some other environmental impact. Then the town could use its zoning power to say no, but specifically says that use the perceived environmental effects or RF to deny the application and

that's because the federal government has preempted that jurisdiction. They want to regulate it from a national perspective, there is they have very stringent regulations. Yes, they're being updated as technology improves. They have very stringent regulations, and they just don't want cities and towns to get in the way of this national effort. Because what happened in Kensington also has benefits in East Kingston and what happens in Seabrook has some benefit to Kensington. So, it's all you know inter jurisdictional what happens in New Hampshire has some effect on Massachusetts and vice versa so you know the federal government is looking at it very nationally and making sure we have a national set of regulations to respect. I want to read it very carefully

“(iv) No State or local government or instrumentality thereof may regulate the placement, construction, and modification of personal wireless service facilities on the basis of the environmental effects of radio frequency emissions to the extent that such facilities comply with the Commission’s regulations concerning such emissions.

And we submitted evidence in the record that this is all science. We can measure the output because at the height that we're proposing the frequencies that are broadcast from this facility have the power output and a maximum power output permitted we can measure all that. We anticipate putting four telecommunications and we can accumulate that, and it still comes in much less than the federal regulations in this case. It was like .2% of the federal regulations and if you think about it if we were in a more urban area your zoning bylaws encourage us to look at existing structures. Structures like water tanks and church steeples, tall buildings. Every tall residential building in Manchester and Worcester and Boston has similar antennas on them. The church that I sit in every Sunday has a very tall steeple, and there are two sets of antennas in the church steeple. I built the tower in the parking lot of the school that my kids go to. It's a high school and it shares the parking lot with a fire station, fire station wanted better telecommunication. My kids park every day at the base of this tower because it is the shortest walk to the high school. This technology has been around it is safe. Your own zoning bylaw states that I have to map everything within 200 feet of the tower, and we are 1000 feet from the nearest anything. So, we found a space and complied with whatever setback requirement that the town required. This has been very heavily mitigated nationally and Massachusetts in the first circuit there was a case in Randolph, MA on a tower. You can deny for the impact on wetlands or environmental impact

The law is very clear it is the jurisdiction of the federal government, if people have concerns with the levels they should be complaining to the FCC. RSA 12k states:

V-a. It is the policy of this state to facilitate the provision of broadband and other advanced personal wireless services across the state; and to promote access to broadband and advanced personal wireless services for all residents, students, government agencies, and businesses to ensure the availability of educational opportunities, economic development, and public safety services throughout New Hampshire. Deployment of personal wireless service facilities infrastructure is also critical to ensuring that first responders can provide for the health and safety of all residents of New Hampshire.

810 So that's the policy. So, I understand there are concerns, but I really don't think there are warranted here.
811 And this time. I think they want to do this, which was so separate like that and truly a benefit to the town
812 to increase public safety. I believe when we submitted a very simple application and we met all the
813 requirements for the site criteria. We don't need height variances or setback variances we meet all the
814 requirements of the site plan approval, our site plan review by the town's engineer and town planner
815 were approved by them. We would respectfully ask the board to grant the special permit, the special use
816 permit and site plan approval so that we can move forward. Just so you know, we're not done, we have
817 to complete the environmental review and make sure that it does not impede the process for that. We're
818 not trying to railroad this through we are just trying to move forward in the process. So we ask the board
819 to made a decision tonight. So that we can keep moving in the process.
820 Thank you.

821
822 **Peter Freeman-** spoke out – I have a question are they going to put small antennas in town. If they
823 don't have a signal, are they going to put small antennas in?

824 F. Parisi- Can I answer that question? V. Rozier- Yes, please do.

825 F. Parisi- Small antennas are a newer technology that is being deployed in urban areas. Not in rural
826 areas where there is dense tree coverage. Because take for example the city of Boston there is antennas
827 on top of every tall building and there is still such a demand for signal and there is a capacity issue with
828 the antennas on tall buildings, so they are putting antennas on telephone poles. It is highly unlikely that
829 there will be a capacity issue in Kensington. I do not foresee that happening.
830 So that technology is not coming to Kensington. It is starting to be thought about in Manchester and
831 some other locations, its not coming to Kensington.

832
833 V. Rozier – Thank you. I would just like to remind everyone to please address comments in an orderly
834 fashion. Yes, sir.

835
836 **Peter Sawyer-** Brief comment. 50 Moulton Ridge Road- and I have heard you on several occasions
837 refer to the area where the tower is going to be built, that there is an actual clearing. Is that right? F.
838 Parisi- I didn't say it was a natural clearing, but it is a clearing. P. Sawyer- it's clear. And I wanted you
839 to know why the clearing is there. I'm sure you don't know but I do because I have lived there back
840 when Mike Dingman was out on Moulton Ridge Road. That clearing was Mike Dingmans personal
841 dump. That road was created for him to cart all of his stuff down and dump it. Basically he wondered
842 all over the woods and he dumped all sorts of material and I think before any digging is done we need to
843 know what is there. Especially where there is a wetland just below the site.

844
845 **Susan Varn 106 Drinkwater Road-** does the planning board have to decide one way or another
846 tonight? Why is it not possible to wait and see how the Rosencrantz tower performs before deciding.

847
848 V. Rozier-So there is and Glenn, maybe you're better to speak to this, but there is a statute that the
849 planning board has 65 days from accepting the application as complete to make a decision. The

850 applicant and the board have the availability to work together to well to agree to continue the hearing.
851 You can't keep continuing it though. G. Greenwood- that is absolutely correct. V. Rozier- you can't
852 keep continuing without reason. So, we have one more meeting within the 65 day, kind of bookends
853 that we have imposed on the planning board. So, it's not something that you can just say I don't feel like
854 making a decision just because I'd like to put it off.
855 S. Varn-That's not what I heard. What I heard was that people wanted to actually see some results from
856 the first cell, which seems to me a very legitimate and concrete reason for saying we need to wait.
857 V. Rozier-OK, that will certainly be something that we'll discuss. I've been keeping a list of all of the
858 concerns and questions to ensure that we touch on all of them either in the point in the meeting when the
859 board will continue to ask questions of the applicant or within the deliberation portion of the meeting. So
860 Yes.
861 S. Varn- Thank you very much.
862 J. McLane-PB Member- Chairperson is there an appropriate time for me to ask a question of the
863 applicant?
864 V. Rozier- when we are outside of public comment. I have another public comment.
865
866 K. Parker Feld- It's not a comment but she forgot to mention that we circulated a list of outstanding
867 questions there is not time to go through them tonight but they would appreciate the board answers those
868 questions in their deliberations. And eventually makes responses available.
869 V. Rozier- Yes, my plan was to kind of put some bookends on public. Actual public comment and then
870 read those letters into the record and then discuss how to address those questions, OK. And I may not
871 read the entirety of every single letter for the benefit of all of our evenings. So, with that. I'm going to
872 informally kind of close the actual public comment but read the letters that we have into public comment
873 and then we can discuss then we'll formally close the public comment and move on.
874 Kathy do you, you sent me that right, not sure why my email is not populating. I do have it.
875 K. Felch- are all the comments there for the planning board or are some for the ZBA?
876 V. Rozier- read the following letters submitted:
877 • Kensington Fire Rescue- Addendum 1- read into the record
878 • Mary Rezendes Brown- Addendum 2- read into the record
879 • Ann Smith- Addendum 3- read into the record
880 • Patricia DeCaprio- Addendum 4- read into the record
881 V. Rozier- do federal laws allow for the height to increase by 20 feet with no notification?
882 G Greenwood- that is not how I would interpret our site review requirements. We require them
883 to tell us the tower height and we hold them to that height. I have not experience with any of my
884 towns on the tower height being increased after approval at the local level.
885
886 V. Rozier-Oh, here we go. All right, so first letter that we have is from the Kensington Fire Rescue from
887 Chief True. And he was thanking us for the opportunity to review the proposed cell tower. He indicated
888 that our current cellular signals are poor at best throughout the town, and this project will help increase
889 the ability of people being able to call for help during an emergency. With that said, there are a few
890 things I would like to consider. The first rescue, excuse me, the Fire Rescue would like to have access to

891 the site. Another is a knox box, so I think that we need to just make note of that. Somebody remember
892 that because I'm not typing right now, any hazardous items. Examples, batteries that require Tier 2
893 reporting should be reported annually to the fire department and EMD whats EMD- Emergency
894 Management department. Thank you. Any LP, fuel tanks and equipment, including generators and our
895 heaters, will require permits through the fire department and building Inspector. Hey, I'm sorry, can we
896 limit the talking in the audience? It's really super distracting for the board members. Thank you. Let's
897 see where was I? I understand that this is a monopole style antenna so we cannot ask for a site on the
898 tower, but if feasible please ask the tower company to work with us if we need an additional VHS
899 receiver only site for our fire police and EMS radio, so maybe we can discuss that in the board question
900 portion.

- 901 • Kensington Fire Rescue- Addendum 1- read into the record

902
903 The second letter that we have is from Miss. Miss Mary. I'm sorry. I'm not gonna go by miss and Missus
904 because I don't know. Mary Rezendes Brown, 66 Moulton Ridge Rd. She spoke earlier.
905 All right, so she was surprised that as being planned in a commercial zone project. I'm sorry. Very
906 surprised that it was being planned for a commercial zone project. That's what it says. OK, I'm just going
907 to read it verbatim from the second paragraph. I received the certified letter regarding the construction of
908 the telecommunications facility in a residential agricultural zone. I was very surprised that it was being
909 planned for commercial zone project. I understand the need to improve communications. However, I
910 thought that zoning is put in place to protect residents who invest in an area that they feel can be
911 protected. I am still confused and have major concerns about the location of the tower. I would like an
912 engineer from Vertex to show me the area and then walk to my property and to have them perhaps do a
913 rendition of how my scenery will appear with the tower. This was dated February 15th, prior to the
914 balloon test. Let's see, we have the review letter from our third party engineer. We'll review that later.

- 915 • Mary Rezendes Brown- Addendum 2- read into the record

916
917 Anne Smith. Requested to be notified when the balloon test would be set up.

- 918 • Ann Smith- Addendum 3- read into the record

919
920 And then where is the question from the Mrs. DeCaprio I don't have that one in this particular e-mail,
921 but I know I have it.

- 922 • Patricia DeCaprio- Addendum 4- read into the record

923 V. Rozier-You're still here. Would you prefer for? Me to read the entire thing into the public record? To
924 the to the audience, we it will be in the public record as it is public. A public document. Would you like
925 me to read the entire letter?

926 P. DeCaprio-I mean, I would. It's long and I know that you know, the time is precious to people. So I
927 mean it's really up to you.

928 V. Rozier-OK.

929 Questions answered during the reading of the questions to the board.

930 V. Rozier- do federal laws allow for the tower height to increase by 20 feet with no notification?

931 G Greenwood- that is not how I would interpret our site review requirements. We require them
932 to tell us the tower height and we hold them to that height. I have no experience with any of my
933 towns on the tower height being increased after approval at the local level.

934 V. Rozier-There are two sets of limits for FCC. Radiation exposure limits, which limits is the site
935 developer referring to? General population radiation exposure limit or occupational exposure limit? Can
936 you answer that Fran, F. Parisi-general. V. Rozier-OK, thank you. I guess let's another Fran, you might
937 as well come on up here. Fran, this letter states that there was a statement made in your February 15th
938 presentation where you stated that the Moulton Ridge tower would be much less wattage then that of
939 WBZ radio station broadcasting out of Boston, can you address that?

940 F. Parisi-Yes, these towers originally broadcast about 100 watts. That's the limit of the signal. WBZ
941 broadcasts have 15,000 watts because that's a whole different technologies versus broadcast over a very
942 large area. This is not designed to cover large areas.

943 V. Rozier- OK. Thank you. We can just stay right there. The FCC never registers inspects or test any
944 cell tower facility under 200 feet. And height. Once these sites are up and running, they are completely
945 unregulated. Can you speak to that?

946 F. Parisi-The efficiencies and the power of the towers are very heavily regulated. They're very specific
947 that they can broadcast and its all regulated by the FCC.

948 I believe that there is a regulation in our bylaws that allow us the to impose a testing requirement which
949 we could discuss during deliberation. OK, thank you. Local government is a first and only line of
950 defense for protection of their constituents not being exposed to illegally excessive radiation. Is there a
951 plan and budget in place for monthly radiation emissions testing, recording and publicly posting the
952 results? I think that this. Would be a good time for us to clarify the difference between radiant and
953 radiation? And the radio frequency that is referred to in the projection that you had pulled up earlier.
954 Could you speak to that, Fran?

955 F. Parisi-There's a radio staff and frequencies that have been developed the frequencies better than and
956 delineated by the federal government for FM, AM, public safety, WI-FI. Well, newer digital signal and
957 then going to a whole higher level of being that's the frequency. So every telecommunications provider
958 they're given a very specific frequency range and which then in addition they're limited by the power
959 output that they can. Right. Just like I said and I think you brought that up to 50,000 watts and cellular,
960 which is a whole bunch of different frequencies somewhere. Some in the hundreds and 25 and
961 broadcasting about 100 watts. And so then you take the frequency times the wattage and gets final
962 conditions and then we talked about the exposure limits that's what the federal government regulates it's
963 if someone receiving the signal and it differentiates between occupational and general. People you're
964 talking with work in telecommunications they have a different exposure because they're working and
965 even when Scott was on site, he wears a meters to make sure that is not exceeding any exposure limits.
966 People that are hundreds of feet away on other adjacent properties and things like that are subject to a
967 general exposure and it's all very heavily regulated as well, and it's just an explosion that that measures
968 the amount that people are exposed to over time, so it's a time factor as well. It's regulated by the FCC.

969 V. Rozier-OK. It's a natural time to ask a question, so it's .2% of the. Maximum radio frequency levels
970 that the FCC imposes on the wire, the telecommunications tower at .2% you know. Would that what are

971 the chances that somebody approaching, and I and I acknowledge what the the boards limitations are as
972 far as.

973 F. Parisi- There's also a function of distance no member of the public is going to be five feet away from
974 these antennas. The closest member of the public is going to be at the fence or at the property line and
975 they can measure that. They can say that at no point does it exceed more than .2%

976 V. Rozier-I see. At no point?

977 F. Parisi- At no point where a member of the public could be. Yeah, like I said, there are working on the
978 tower I go up and stay 3 minutes but that is because I am only 5 feet from the antenna, not 3000 feet or
979 so.

980 V. Rozier-OK. Thank you. All right, continuing on this letter. Oh, is there a plan and budget in place for
981 monthly radiation emissions testing? Is there a plan in place for if the site developer is not in compliance
982 with the FCC and the facility exceeds the legal limits for general public radiation exposure? It would it
983 be possible for? This the tower as designed with any foreseeable technology to go over the FCC limits
984 with it now being at .2%.

985 F. Parisi-It is measured if there were four different carriers and the lowest setting on the like totem pole
986 we have to stack one on top of the other so one at
987 Growth totem pole we thought of so that we have attacking one at 25 one at 50. So, we could propose
988 we presume that there would be four sets of carriers, and operating at various frequencies, the regular
989 power outputs, will it ever exceed that, maybe, but never anywhere near the FCC regulations. And I've
990 never had any testing monthly but an annual or what I've seen work more frequently is people will do it
991 within 30 days of operation. But if there is a change, if someone adds another antenna which you have to
992 go through the building permit process, then we can say 30 days after its installed do it then. If there is
993 no change then there is no change. If there is a change, if we add a carrier or and antenna, we would
994 have to go through the building permit process and you can request the testing after that.

995 V. Rozier-OK. Thank you. All right, moving on. Would there be town procedure in place for notifying
996 the site developer and or service provider and surrounding residents if the facility is not in compliance
997 with the legal limits for general public radiation exposure? Is there a procedure in place if the facility is
998 repeatedly not in compliance to give notice, shut down the facility, revoke the permit and remove the
999 tower. According to attorney Campanelli the town pays for testing. The owner of the facility required to
1000 test monthly for radiation limits. This is not recommended. The town requires monthly random tests of
1001 the facility with no notification to the site developer or service carriers. If higher than FCC allowed
1002 radiation is being emitted the town gives 30 day notice to remedy the situation with repeat offended
1003 offenses, the town can revoke the permit and require the site developer and or service carrier to pay for
1004 and execute removal of the facility.

1005 Owner of the facility required to test monthly for radiation not recommended Key Town provisions.
1006 Every citizen of the city or town is deputized and given the ability to randomly test the facility and
1007 report any noncompliance of FCC regulations. I think that's more of a comment than a question. In
1008 Pittsfield, MA, residents are suing the city over lack of attention to investigate health concerns stemming
1009 from a nearby cell tower. York Maine town opposed to Vertex Cell Tower on church, and there was a
1010 recent article. Let's see.

1011 G. Greenwood-That was only your application. The one in wells, I'm sorry. And so that got denied and
1012 didn't go forward.

1013 F. Parisi-It's in federal court right now.

1014 V. Rozier-All right, cell tower questions, comments, and suggestions. I think that's just a new header.
1015 Should state legislature is in process of implementing bills that are influenced by the recommendations
1016 from the New Hampshire legislative report, she provided a link to the General Court. I would is that link
1017 for the state legislation that is in that you're referring to in process?

1018 P. DeCaprio- Correct and I also submitted a hard copy to Kathleen when I submitted the list of
1019 questions.

1020 V. Rozier-OK. Thank you. The New Hampshire legislative report was commissioned in 2019 to
1021 research the dangers of 5G and other wireless technologies. Many notable researchers took part in the
1022 project, including Doctor Kent Chamberlain, Chair of the University of New Hampshire's Electrical and
1023 Computer Engineering Department, and Frank Clegg, retired President of Microsoft Canada. The report
1024 is groundbreaking and is considered one of the most detailed research reports on the subject in the US
1025 and in Europe documents the conflicts of interest that exist between industry and the federal
1026 Communication agency, and highlights 15 recommendations for municipalities. The state of New
1027 Hampshire's minimum required set back from a dwelling is currently 1640 feet. Is that true?

1028 F. Parisi-There was legislation proposed it was sent committee, which is basically rejected and it never
1029 got out of committee and no new legislation is proposed. That commission was done, there were no
1030 politicians on the committee then but scientists and others.

1031 G. Greenwood-Can I just ask, could you repeat that?

1032 The New Hampshire legislative report was commissioned in 2019 to research the dangers of 5G and
1033 other wireless technologies. There are many notable researchers at. Part it was groundbreaking and it is
1034 considered one of the most detailed research reports on the subject in the US and. In Europe and.
1035 Documents the conflicts of interest that exist between industry and the federal communication agency
1036 and highlights 15 recommendations for municipalities.

1037 The state of New Hampshire's minimum required set back from a dwelling is currently 1640 feet.

1038 G. Greenwood-OK, that's not true.

1039 F. Parisi-That's not true.

1040 G. Greenwood-That's absolutely not true.

1041 F. Parisi- The Commission recommended the towns should have setbacks.

1042 G. Greenwood-There is not a state law that says that a cell tower has to be 1600.

1043 F. Parisi- It was rejected by the legislature. There's no, that's not science, it's not state law.

1044 P. DeCaprio-I just wanted to clarify that. It is written a little bit confusing there and that I'm not saying
1045 that's the current law that I'm referring to what the recommendation is saying in the legislative report
1046 which has been tabled and is still in process, our representative Susan Porcelli was here this evening and
1047 she is keeping us abreast of what's going on with that so it's not fake science.

1048 V. Rozier-I'm not saying that. It was. I'm just reading the letter.

1049 G. Greenwood-My request to hear it over was because I'm not saying it's fake science. I'm saying the
1050 statement that says in your letter that that's the state law is absolutely not true.

1051 P. DeCaprio- that is correct I meant to state that it was a very yes.
1052 G. Greenwood-OK, That's all that the only point
1053 V. Rozier- other technologies that are far superior and safer. Notes that the technology moves quickly
1054 and could be outdated soon. Who would be responsible for removing old and outdated towers, which we
1055 will address later on that there are higher quality, safer technologies with less visual impact available,
1056 such as satellite fiber optic cable in home Wi-Fi calling and in home Ethernet calling for the home use of
1057 cell phones, 911 calls will connect to any tower, regardless of the service provider contract. The cell
1058 phone user has and which I think we should talk about like emergency services. That during our
1059 deliberation, perhaps is everybody.
1060 F. Parisi-OK, sure. 911 calls from an and AT&T phone will connect to Verizon signal, that's a mandate,
1061 but no phone will connect in town that doesn't have a connection. Your in the middle of Kensington
1062 and you dial 911 you can't get a signal.
1063 V. Rozier-OK. Thank you.
1064 G. Greenwood-Like that unfortunate girl this week, who died in rural New York because there was no
1065 cell service. And she pulled into a driveway because she was lost and the owner of the house shot her in
1066 the neck and they literally drove 6 miles before they could get cell service and they were lost.
1067 V. Rozier-Thank you. That's really sad.
1068 G. Greenwood- this is upstate New York, in an environment much like Kensington because my wife is
1069 from upstate New York, who spent a lot of time there. It's very similar to Kensington.
1070 V. Rozier-I'm sure we'll get into that discussion as we deliberate and discuss. Let's see, CC Doucett
1071 offers online and local presentations on the best and safest way to move forward with wireless
1072 technology. Let's see next page, the impact of Rosencrantz cell tower facility has no coverage should be
1073 thoroughly reviewed prior to considering the permit. What is the status of the Rosencrantz cell tower
1074 facility?
1075 F. Parisi- we are just finishing up the regulatory requirements. V. Rozier- do you have a rough date? F.
1076 Parisi- I would say third quarter.
1077 V. Rozier-Thank you. Suggesting that we evaluate the service of the Rosencrantz cell tower and with
1078 hard data on the sites. Service referral to devaluation of property and offers an article related to that.
1079 New Hampshire Department of Energy is required to provide sample zoning ordinances and historical
1080 act. The ZBA is required to obtain from NHDE zoning ordinances that include fire, electrical and ANS
1081 I/A, PCO, site hardening standards that are included in HB 298 as well as NEPH and historical act
1082 language.
1083 F. Parisi- I don't know about anything about that. I know this kind of thing in the past the state
1084 V. Rozier- OK, so was this just a suggestion of where we could get additional information on zoning,
1085 P. DeCaprio- Yes, There's suggestions on things that you might want to look into and research further.
1086 V. Rozier-OK, additional notes. Most common reasons to not approve aesthetics, property value,
1087 insufficient fall zone, height limitations, set back requirements the prior comment regarding the industry,
1088 the insurance industry not insuring cell towers would you like to? Speak to that, Fran. The insurance
1089 comments.

1090 F. Parisi- I think she was referring to cell phones not cell towers we have insurance for the life of a cell
1091 tower.

1092 V. Rozier-OK. Let's see. The Telecommunications Act grants powers both sides. Suggest watching a
1093 video. There's a documentary that was referred to. OK, so that covered the entire letter.

1094 P. DeCaprio- Thank you.

1095 V. Rozier-You're welcome. Do you feel like all of your questions were answered? I know a lot of it was
1096 kind of like supplemental information to for review.

1097 P. DeCaprio-Well, yes and no. I just feel that they, as I mentioned in my early comments this evening
1098 that the ability to look at this through an independent lens, that's not necessarily a sales person that's
1099 promoting it to the towns and getting a second opinion. And so a lot of what I presented. That letter,
1100 which was intended for the zoning board and was not allowed and was not allowed to give it to them and
1101 you just said, well, we'll take a look at it for you and I understand some of it doesn't pertain to your area,
1102 so you know and just feeling like we need to look deeper and ask questions and get independent
1103 information and studies and things for the second opinion.

1104 V. Rozier-OK. Thank you. All right.

1105 M. Silvia-The clock is ticking on the 60 days, right?

1106 V. Rozier-We have one more meeting.

1107 M. Silvia-You have your clock ticking to you.

1108 G. Greenwood-55 days, but yeah.

1109 M. Silvia-I don't think a lot of people understand that.

1110 V. Rozier-We did explain it earlier actually.

1111 M. Silvia-I don't know if it's not getting through.

1112 V. Rozier-OK, so let's.

1113 Mary Rezendes Brown-When he said that he has known about this for years, we didn't know about it till
1114 February 2023 That's why we're feeling it so fast, because we had no input during all of that time. And
1115 so that's why it seems fast to us. It's long for you, but we were not involved. Until, two months ago. And
1116 it's a big impact on all of us. So that's what's and that's how it goes. You may be dealing with it all those
1117 years, but we didn't. And that's not fair really. I have to say it's really unfair.

1118 G. Greenwood-That you're absolutely correct. As a planner in this state, and I've been a planner in New
1119 Hampshire since 1987. I've only seen the period short that a town has been granted to look at any kind of
1120 development proposal. The private sector. Here's my take on the philosophy of the state New
1121 Hampshire. The private sector is very important to the state government of New Hampshire it's maybe
1122 their primary concern. Because when I started, a planning board had 90 days to review an application.
1123 90 days is short. But that essentially got 1/3 15 years ago to 65 years. And so it's not lost on the board
1124 that you would have a comment like the one you just had the private sector does have. As much time.
1125 As they need to prepare their plans and that's why, towns see \$1,000,000 Walmart stores come in and
1126 that a community is concerned with how much time they have to review. And so there is an element in
1127 the statute that allows for a period beyond 65 days. But make no mistake the Telecommunications Act
1128 has thought about that, and they have limited it to 120 days or 150 days, that is like an absolute outer
1129 limit for looking at these issues. I have dealt with Fran many times, he has never been, from my

1130 perspective, someone who has forced the hand of a community because it doesn't make sense to force a
1131 town to say no if they're uncomfortable with their decision making process. But we do have very
1132 confined time periods with which to look at this application.

1133 M. Brown-Yeah, that's it.

1134 G. Greenwood-And it does, it puts. It's unfortunate because it puts residents against residents from if you
1135 want to look at it that way, I prefer not to look at it that way, but I've seen it looked at that way twice
1136 already this week. So, it happens everywhere, not just in Kensington. It is an artificial constraint, but it
1137 is one that is very much in play here. So, the board isn't trying to bully you in any way. I don't want you
1138 to feel any way except the way you feel because. It's a legitimate feeling. We have a limited time. To
1139 look at these things and come up with a decision. And so, I hear you saying it feels rushed in all and that
1140 you don't want a decision to be rushed because they don't want a decision to be rushed either. But there
1141 are time constraints and there. Has been a lot of information that has been generated already and I
1142 understand that the perception that much of that is from the enemy, the other side, and so having these
1143 discussions is exactly why.

1144 M. Brown-I mean it takes us a long time to gather information and two months to do it. I know that's
1145 his job and you have been doing it for a couple of years with the town, it's real.

1146 G. Greenwood-It's the nature of the way planning happens in New Hampshire.

1147 V. Rozier-All right, one more question. We're going to close public comment.

1148 P. Freeman-I just want you guys to remember that all this research is back in the 90s. It's not 5G and
1149 that's not very good because you're throwing out twice as much power. In a shorter distance. Than what
1150 you were in the 4G, and just be ready for whatever decision you make. Be ready.

1151 V. Rozier-All right. Thank you. Yes.

1152 F. Parisi-The science hasn't changed. What 5G stands for is the 5th generation of telecommunications
1153 technology. And when they talk about the bag phone in early definition of technology and we have an
1154 analog system and analog signals travel and part of the digital signals. And then we went to 3G which is
1155 a digital signal, and then we went to 4G which is more of a data centric technology. 5G is the newest
1156 technology and we are the one gentleman talk about the Internet of Things. What that means is machines
1157 and be able to talk to machines. Here already have that in some ways, but on the radio frequency hasn't
1158 changed the bandwidth frequency the power options haven't changed. It's just what the technology does.
1159 That we went from having flip phones to phones that we can make a phone call to, phones that we could
1160 access the Internet to phones that we could text message and send pictures and watch video, and that
1161 technology is going at a faster transmission speed. So the technology is not the frequency, the
1162 regulations haven't changed because the science hasn't changed just the use of that science.

1163 V. Rozier-So I'm not sure if you're going to be able to answer this and this is more of like a curiosity.
1164 The radio frequencies of the, you know, original flip phone and the cell towers then and the cell towers
1165 now. And the devices that are on those now, what's is there a difference between the radio frequency
1166 then and now.

1167 F. Parisi-There's a spectrum of radio frequencies and television and those are really low band those are
1168 in the 400 600 you know when we had the VHS. And the channel 56 and all that that just prior to the
1169 frequency match and then the AM stations are in the 200 and 300 megahertz range and public safety is

1170 in the 400 500 range and they used to be in the 700 range but they transferred those to commercials uses
1171 so early analog within the 600 range and then the 1st digital, the 1st 4G where in the 1900 range and then
1172 they migrated to the 2500 range. So it just along the same frequency. And then there are future uses for
1173 wireless telecommunication they'll have them in the 3500 range, but it's still the same frequency range.
1174 It's still the same regulation as in power output and as we go higher on the frequency. The signal travels
1175 less distance. Two people said the real issue is this. This is such a low output it's a two way
1176 communication. So that has to be low power in order for this to be lower. And can be perfectly honest.
1177 This has to work harder the farther you are away from the signal, so if you're concerned with this(cell
1178 phone), you want more antennas closer to this, so this this doesn't have to work as hard. I have peer
1179 down in the Mid-Atlantic, where they realize that kids use cell phones and so if you want to create more
1180 safety for kids you should put antennas closer so it's not farther away from schools. But they still wanted
1181 a signal within the schools because, see, the concerns are in the schools. It's a real mix, we feel like we
1182 found a very appropriate location for us given that we can assist in the residential or education use, but
1183 still not able to get a signal now so.

1184 V. Rozier-OK. Thank you. All right, I'm. Going to close public comment. For the meeting. So what it's
1185 9:00 o'clock. So, I'd like to just converse with the board on. You know, we still have further questions.
1186 We close the hearing and then we would deliberate and potentially make a decision. So, it seems to me
1187 like that process, well, what do you guys think? Do you want to do? That process is going to probably
1188 take some time.

1189 J. McLane- I do you have a question or two for the applicant I would love to be able to ask the applicant
1190 while it is fresh on my mind.

1191 V. Rozier-So do we want to do we want to move forward for another 30 minutes and continue and OK.

1192 J. McLane-No, I do not want to.

1193 V. Rozier-And Fran, I appreciate that you'd like to make a decision tonight, but it's not going to happen.
1194 In my personal opinion.

1195 F. Parisi- I mentioned that there are some federal regulations around this and I am not rushing you. But
1196 what the federal regulations are designed to do, is to prevent people kicking the can down the road. And
1197 the federal regulations are that you have to make a decision within 180 days after the application is
1198 submitted which was back in December. So I think it's actually, before the May meeting, you have to
1199 make a decision. What the federal regulations due to prevent kicking the can down the road is allows me
1200 to assume a negative decision. Which doesn't do me any good. So I'm not sitting up here and saying we
1201 have to make a decision tonight. What I would take offense to is kicking the can way down the road.
1202 And you know, they said to wait until Rosencrantz is built, and I still have other due diligence to do and
1203 waiting for that is too long. I'm not saying you need to make a decision tonight.

1204 V. Rozier-OK.

1205 F. Parisi- As long as we are moving forward I am fine with that decision.

1206 V. Rozier- I think that is all of our intents to move this as quickly and expeditiously as possible, while
1207 still being diligent with the concerns that have been have raised by the public. So, alright, so we we're
1208 gonna do a 930 hard stop. So Justin questions.

1209 J. McLane-Yes, two kinda of two questions while I'm. On a roll and this may be for Glenn, it may be for
1210 you. I seem to recall reading somewhere. And I apologize.

1211 I'm sorry I didn't write down. From my research I was doing in the past couple of weeks, but I believe I
1212 read somewhere that there are limits to what the planning board can request or require from an applicant
1213 regarding testing. This is in regards to wishes for hard drop call testing is that a even a viable option?

1214 F. Parisi- No, for a couple reasons 1. The propagation maps that we have used are the science that's
1215 available to us and it's been used and approved by planning boards and federal courts in American very
1216 standard model this software. has. Drop call data is very protected, ask Verizon give me your dropcall
1217 data. They don't want to share that because and we can't get that and they will never give it to us so that
1218 People ask for it because they know it is something that they can't get.

1219 J. McLane-OK please.

1220 G. Greenwood-And if I just can. Our ordinance actually asked them to provide us in essence
1221 propagation maps as the substantial evidence that we want to see as we go about doing our conditional
1222 use permit. And I've heard several times tonight that the propagation maps are not accepted or not
1223 viewed in court cases and I'll just say I. Haven't been involved in a lot of court cases, but every court
1224 case I've been in, they have very much been a part of the evidence used by both sides.

1225 J. McLane-And that goes to my next question, which is. With the idea of waiting until the Rosencrantz
1226 tower goes in RF signal is line of sight essentially right. It'll penetrate some minor obstructions, but it
1227 doesn't bend around things or go over things. It's a straight line. Is that correct?.

1228 F. Parisi- it doesn't bend around mountains or topography it can go into buildings some.

1229 J. McLane- OK, so where I'm going with this is trying to understand if there is any potential benefit. I
1230 understand your timing comments that you just made to trying to see what that would do in any way
1231 other than the propagation maps. I'm an engineer. My brain immediately thinks of it, visually. And is am
1232 I right in saying that Moulton Ridge is higher than the tower at Rosencrantz, therefore, that Rosencrantz
1233 Tower will never provide service on the other side. Of Moulton Ridge.

1234 F. Parisi-And because there are other. If you look at the maps you looked at before they're kind of hard
1235 stops and I could pull up topography and show you why that happened and I provide that in the
1236 application. A lot of the propagation map is geography limited not signal limited. If I built a site on the
1237 coast where there's nothing in the way the signal might go out 5 miles, but in the town of Kensington
1238 where there are hills and valleys it goes out as far as the topography will allow.

1239 J. McLane-Yeah, I lived in North Idaho for 10 years and I'm very familiar with that. It's a you're in and
1240 out all the time. No matter how many towers are around so, OK.

1241 F. Parisi- I was on the highway a couple years ago and on the side of the highway where it said cell
1242 phone signal for the next mile. And at the top of the hill there was a turn out and people were talking on
1243 their phones.

1244 J. McLane-Right, OK. So the. There may be some improved coverage from the Rosencrantz Tower in
1245 the immediate area. Because is it going higher or is it accommodating additional carriers and additional
1246 technology?

1247 F. Parisi- It's not much taller, that was built for different era that was actually built for antennas for
1248 public safety communications. We couldn't use that.

1249 J. McLane-OK. So that one is not likely to cover a larger area. It's likely to provide more carriers and
1250 more service in the same general area.

1251 F. Parisi- Correct, it's basically going to provide more capacity for more telecommunications companies.

1252 J. McLane- Capacity.

1253 F. Parisi- we've already had commitments from Verizon to go on that and AT&T to go on that. But they
1254 were already on the existing tower and they are migrating to a public safety tower so they can have their
1255 antenna on the tower. So in addition Tmobile will be going on there. Its designed to increase both
1256 telecommunications towers.

1257 J. McLane-OK. So then the idea is and I'm maybe saying things that are obvious to others. I'm just
1258 trying to be sure I understand it completely, but with the tower and the location that it is essentially
1259 maybe close to, if not the highest point in the area. It's like you standing on top of that podium, You've
1260 got the best opportunity to reach around if we were to put one on the opposite side of Moulton Ridge it
1261 would potentially fill the gap there that Rosencrantz can't ever see. But it wouldn't cover other areas.
1262 Such as the school.

1263 F. Parisi-If I go towards East Kingston or North or West along Moulton Ridge you wouldn't get any
1264 coverage in Kensington because the hill where Moulton Ridge is the structure. Rosencrantz is the
1265 benchmark because you go into the center of town and it goes up and then back along the ridges.
1266 Rosencrantz is not ever going to be able to get more than what is shows because of the topography.

1267 J. McLane-OK, so if this site or a similar site at the top of Moulton Ridge we're not used, we'd be
1268 looking at it sounds like to me based on my visual, be looking at two or three other sites in lower lands
1269 required to cover a maybe a similar area.

1270 F. Parisi- At least.

1271 J. McLane-At least. OK. Thank you that that helps me. That helps me. Thank you.

1272 V. Rozier-Have any questions?

1273 C. Fenton- I just have one I think we've heard earlier about the distinction between the tower itself that's
1274 proposed and then the antennas that are being placed on the tower. What is the anticipated size of the
1275 antennas that get attached to the top of the twelve third floor?

1276 F. Parisi-We build the tower. The tower is just the pole and then different telecommunications compnaies
1277 will attach to the platforms. And the platforms they will attach in sections. The platforms are triangles
1278 and the triangles base is 12 feet.

1279 F. Parisi- So it's a 12 foot by 12 foot by 12 foot, which means it doesn't project that 12 feet. The reason
1280 why is there are multiple platforms, is to prevent interference. They all operate similar. They're all very
1281 regulated, but they have to have some separation between them. So the antennas themselves.

1282 Basically, the size of those files but they have to be separate by height from the next one, so that's why.
1283 So we say the attachment in place we go to the centerline because that's where the center and 145 feet.
1284 The next will antenna will be attached at 135 feet.

1285 M. Smith-So why are those, the low ones. Aren't they going to be blocked by trees.

1286 F. Parisi-No, that's we're very conscious of that. We make sure that the lower arrays are just as visual as
1287 the higher arrays. So we've done analysis to show that 150 is the minimum to provide the signal. From
1288 multiple telecommunications lines. So that even at that low side of 14, it still gets above that, it still gets

1289 above the topography to provide the same coverage. You don't want to be short sighted, no content and
1290 to those short.

1291 M. Smith-And you have no commitments at all for this tower. Right?

1292 F. Parisi- No, I heard the word spec used, this is not spec. We know by science where the need is. But
1293 you're absolutely right, we don't have a commitment yet. to and we don't intend to build it until we have
1294 a commitment. So if the board were to impose a condition that we don't build it until we have a
1295 commitment, we cannot get a building permit until we show evidence of a committed carrier.
1296 So we're not going to build it given the length of the development process.

1297 M. Smith-That makes sense, I mean, makes sense that with all the money there is in cell phones that
1298 you're going to have carriers, but. Just in case, I think that would be a good idea to have that.

1299 B. Solomon- Is there any ability to adjust the location of where we're going to get coverage. We're
1300 thinking the park there was a little bit white on a couple of areas of white right on right on Trundle Bed
1301 road, which is going to be a really bad thing. If it turns out that when this thing really gets built, if it gets
1302 built is there a way to get coverage at the park?

1303 F. Parisi- All they can do is adjust the down tilt on one of the antennas once they build it so they can say,
1304 well, we took this one so we can try to do the best we can.

1305 B. Solomon- so there is some possibility there?

1306 F. Parisi- absolutely. You know we're limited in so many ways of 180 foot height limit, people are
1307 concerned with the visibility, how tall which we don't want and the most communities don't want so we.
1308 Try to do the best we can. But it will solve more problems, but it will create more problems.

1309 V. Rozier- Marty? You got nothing?

1310 V. Rozier-As it relates to height, and I'm not suggesting that we would want to increase the height, but if
1311 you were to increase the height to, say 180 feet, which is, is that what our height limitation is and our
1312 regulations, would that provide any benefit to the area of coverage.

1313 F. Parisi- we look at that I am not advocating it. Because it was such small pockets of solid coverage, I
1314 think someone mentioned the school and when you have a small area like that you can correct it easier
1315 with a small antenna on the school or the park. We can look at some of the taller towers and we look at
1316 it very specifically at this location at this height.

1317 V. Rozier-I'm not saying that we are. Would you, be amenable to placing the small antennas at the
1318 school and the park. I'm not sure what like in the event that there's not coverage there because like to me
1319 those are our most vulnerable places in town for, you know, our families. And if for some reason we
1320 weren't able to resolve the coverage issues in those two areas. Or not necessarily just those two areas
1321 that would be you know a discussion point, would you be willing to erect antennas in order to resolve
1322 those service issues?

1323 F. Parisi-Two different issues I told you when we showed our propagation maps, assuming certain
1324 threshold that are higher thresholds that we could display, but we just didn't here. But at a higher
1325 threshold is an outdoor coverage. You usually get more coverage from an outcome coverage the reason
1326 why we did this because then you probably get some overlap, Rosencrantz, but that's really not what
1327 what we are trying to do but in a place like the park you're gonna get better than what we showed
1328 because you would get better outdoor coverage. And at the places where they were at the fringe at the

1329 school, I personally would wait because you might. It's might be good enough. Its not going to change
1330 dramatically. I'm not saying wait until Rosencrantz comes on, I am saying wait until this one come on.
1331 And then see how well the school does. Because I think you'll find it may not be very good but it may
1332 be good enough.

1333 V. Rozier-And we talked a little bit about like the booster concept I think, was that at the Rosencrantz.
1334 So we talked about a booster system at some point, like how, you know, we personally can get a booster
1335 for our house, but that's only applicable to the service provider correct. It's not like a collect all signals
1336 and like hey, anybody can use it, no matter what your provider is.

1337 F. Parisi-A booster actually pulls the signal as opposed to push the signal. That's you have one at your
1338 house you get a better signal at your house. So if you were so inclined to do that for that tried to do that
1339 they try to improve the coverage but they're not in the fringe, it's not going to get it doesn't get on the
1340 individuals that.

1341 M. Smith- I agree we want to wait and see what falls out, but at the end of this whole process, sorry if in
1342 fact say the school, I mean, obviously that's a particular concern. Most of us I don't have kids anymore,
1343 but I can see where. It's a big issue. Is that something people would design? I mean, or is it some other
1344 place we have to go to ask?
1345 To have that done.

1346 F. Parisi-We don't desire small sub infrastructure. We build towers. There are other people that can do
1347 that though. It's more of a carrier specific thing that is a shared infrastructure thing we, wouldn't have
1348 anything to do with this.

1349 G. Greenwood-Now this is weird because I'm stepping away from being a town planner and just being a
1350 resident.

1351 V. Rozier-But the public comment is closed one. I'm just kidding. I'm kidding. Ask the question.

1352 G. Greenwood-All right, I'm going to. Accept that

1353 M. Silvia-Have you ever looked at putting the tower in the church or on top of this building for a small
1354 supplemental for the downtown area?

1355 F. Parisi-I'm in general, putting antennas inside buildings was very creative 20 years ago. Putting on
1356 churches and things like that. The problem is, over time the antennas have been, we call them smarter.
1357 When I say the antenna is the size of the file cabinet, I am exaggerating they are actually only half the
1358 size of the file cabinet. And there's a lot of electronics in the antennas. That being said, a lot of places
1359 that weren't designed for communication antennas like church steeples are no longer viable. And so in
1360 my church was an old stone church, which is radio translucent so you can't get signal. My church had at
1361 150 feet in the air they have 8 foot statues of the four apostles and we took them down and make them
1362 fiberglass and put the antennas in them. It's not modifiable.

1363 V. Rozier-All right, so this seems like a natural place to end for the evening. We still need to review the
1364 application and address, you know, regulatory stuff. So I'm going to confirm with you that you're willing
1365 to continue the meeting. In May.

1366 Does anybody have any comments about continuing?

1367 And you're OK with continuing. F. Parisi-OK, so may I please get a motion to continue the hearing to
1368 May, what's the date?

1369 **M. Smith made a motion to continue the application to the May 17th planning board meeting at**
1370 **6:30 pm seconded by 9:23 pm M. Silvia was all in favor.**
1371

1372 The board continued the meeting.
1373

1374 M. Smith stated that the checklist was updated. M. Smith sent some corrections and they will be
1375 adjusted and voted on at the next meeting.
1376

1377 **Approve Minutes from March 15, 2023**

- 1378 • **M. Smith had 3 adjustments to the minutes. M. Smith made a motion to approve the**
1379 **minutes from March 15th as edited, seconded by M. Silvia all in favor.**
1380
- 1381 • **The February meeting minutes will be tabled until the workshop.**
1382

1383 **Election of Board-**

1384 **The elections for the board were discussed.**

1385 **M. Smith nominated V. Rozier as chair, J. McLane seconded, all in favor.**

1386 **V. Rozier abstained.**
1387

1388 **M. Smith nominated J. McLane as vice chair, M. Silvia seconded, all in favor.**
1389

1390 M. Smith motioned to close the meeting at 9:30 pm, seconded by M. Silvia, all in favor.
1391

- 1392 • Workshop, Wednesday, May 3, 2023, at 6:30 pm
1393

1394 Next Regular Monthly Meeting:

- 1395 • Wednesday, May 17, 2023, at 6:30 pm
1396

1397 Respectfully submitted,
1398

1399 Kathleen T Felch
1400