



PUBLIC WORKS ADVISORY COMMISSION

MINUTES

CITY OF LANGLEY

February 10, 2021 - 3pm

112 Second Street
P.O. Box 366
Langley, WA 98260
(360) 221-4246

I. Call to order

Dominique Emerson called to order the regular meeting of the Public Works Advisory Commission at 3:05 PM on February 10, 2021 online via Zoom.

II. Roll call

In attendance: Dominique Emerson, Randi Perry, Stan Berryman, Tom Fox, Jim Dobberfuhl, Fred Lundahl, Peter Morton, and Peter Morton. Stan Berryman was excused.

III. Approval of the Agenda

Tom made a motion to approve agenda. Second by Jim. Motion passed unanimously.

IV. New Business/Discussion:

1. The topic is Langley Wireless Telecommunication Ordinance and code review. Existing code is inadequate, no discussion needed. Each section of Draft Code 18.23 prepared by Mike Kenyon-Langley City Attorney was reviewed and time allowed for commissioners to comment. Below are areas needing clarification or modification from PWAC perspective.

- Goals: Add goal along with Safety to meet FCC regulation and address RF concerns verbiage such as “impacts WCF’s on community by adhering to state and federal regulations”.
- PWAC discussion took place regarding RF radiation level new meters compared to proposed meter and that of other devices. AMR is same frequency 900-megahertz must transmit at greater range. AMI can relay between meter to meter, so they emit less frequently and shorter range than current meter. Personal choice of opting out the meter does not communicate at all; someone must read the meter. Benefits include demand response peak shaving, insight into energy usage to encourage efficiency, reduction in energy footprint means less infrastructure to keep up with demand and fewer devices which equals less cost.
- 18.23.050- Is there a threshold criterion that established WCF for permit for small wireless network? A power rating for permit requirement. Are these defined in the ‘state regulation’?
- 18.23.060- MK1-comment-Should addressed by zoning code- question should be reviewed by PAB. MK2-should be out of sight triangles, and safety. Need more background and basis for inclusion to decide specific criteria that would be appropriate for Langley. Why is it a consideration? MK3- Why is it a consideration? Is it an aesthetic concern or something more substantial- community decision defer to Design Review Board? MK4- PWAC does not support relaxing.
- 18.23.070 – Clarification- what is Type 1 permit? Type 2?
- 18.23.090- 4. A. Clarification- Zoning Setbacks. B. Clarification Definition-Small wireless locations.
- 18.23.100- 2. B.2. Defer for DRB? 3. Discuss replacement pole. 4. Pole mounted equipment a. who decides on feasible? c. Establish maximum load and ultimate capability – engineering to be kept on file.
- 18.23.110- MK8- What does this mean? Is there the fee structure established? E. Tolling-clarify nomenclature.
- 18.23.120- D.2.- Dismantling-Mechanism of enforcement-collection. Are bonds required for franchise agreement? Do we need bonding requirement?

Discussion took place regarding budget for this project. Tom made a **MOTION** PWAC to recommend funding be made available for adequate legal review. Second by Jim, motion passed unanimously.

V. Citizen Comments

Mark Wahl cautioned PWAC to know bounds of the comments made by the Attorney, not to be intimidated by the “barriers of entry”. Decisions about Aesthetics and quality of life should be taken

VI. Announcements

Next Board Meeting Wednesday March 10, 2021 2pm (Virtual-Zoom).

VII. Adjournment

Jim made a motion to adjourn, second made by Jim. Dominique Emerson adjourned the meeting at approximately 5:13pm.

Minutes submitted by: Randi Perry