REPORT OF COMMUNITY MEETING REQUIRED BY THE CHATHAM COUNTY WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATION ORDINANCE

To: Chatham County Planning Department

Date: April 30, 2014

Proposed Tower Location: 464 Old Farrington Road, Chapel Hill, NC 27514

The undersigned hereby certifies that written notice of a community meeting on the above Wireless Telecommunications Permit application was given to the adjacent property owners set forth on the attached list by first class mail on (date) 4-15-2014A copy of the written notice is also attached.

The meeting was held at the following time and place: at 7:00 p.m. at the Aqueduct Conference Center, 1620 Mt. Carmel Church Road, Chapel Hill, NC 27516-6788

The persons in attendance at the meeting were: See attached list.

The following issues were discussed at the meeting: See the attached Report of Community Meeting held April 30, 2014, specifically "issues discussed at the meeting".

As a result of the meeting, the following changes were made to the Wireless Telecommunications Permit:
Please see the attached Report of Community Meeting held April 30, 2014, specifically "changes made to the Wireless Telecommunications Permit".

Date: May 1, 2014

Applicant: American Towers, LLC and AT&T Mobility

By: M. Gray Styers, Jr.

M. Gray Styers, Jr., NC Zoning Counsel

Please submit this Report to the Chatham County Planning Department located at 80-A East Street, Dunlap Building or mail it to Zoning Administrator, PO Box 54, Pittsboro, NC 27312.

Report of Community Meeting held April 30, 2014

The following issues were discussed at the meeting:

The meeting began with a background discussion on the site selection process, including the need for greater coverage in the Governors Lake/Governors Village area and technical and zoning requirements when choosing a site location. The county ordinance and approval process for telecommunications facilities were explained, as well as the need for more facilities to be built in Chatham County in the coming years to meet increasing demand. The gap in coverage in northeast Chatham County was illustrated and explained by coverage maps displaying the current and projected coverage areas.

Those in attendance asked about alternatives, such as using more, shorter towers, locating a tower in the Duke Energy utility right-of-way, or increasing the height of the Edwards Mountain water tank facility instead. Each alternative was discussed; however, the reasons supporting the proposed location as the best option were also explained in detail. Those in attendance also expressed concern about the absenteeism of and past challenges with the proposed location's fee simple landowner, which seemed to be a concern un-related to the tower.

The need for a tower 195' in height was also explained, including why this height is preferable to a tower of shorter height (e.g., needing to be above tree-line obstacles to provide coverage, accommodating multiple collocations, but not requiring lighting). The details of the upcoming balloon test on May 3 to simulate the top of the tower were conveyed, and those in attendance were invited to both attend and take photos.

Questions were asked about construction, which is projected to occur in the fall. The site plans for the tower and driveway were shown using an area property map, topography map and site survey. The dimensions, potential noise, potential collocation of other antennas, and requirements for future maintenance were discussed. The tower's impact on health and medical devices was also questioned and explained in detail, and materials on the subject were made available to those in attendance. Suggestions that broader notices and information be sent to additional neighbors were also offered by those in attendance. The meeting concluded with an explanation of the approval process, as well as the timeline for upcoming hearings before both the County Commissioners and the Planning Board.

As a result of the meeting, the following changes were made to the Wireless Telecommunications Permit:

Under the initial tower location proposal in October of 2013, the tower would have been very near Old Farrington Road, in an open field, with a short, straight driveway that led directly to the fenced compound. However, subsequent to the initial proposal, the location has now been moved farther away from the road (over 300 feet back on the property) and behind the tree line, so that it will be completely surrounded by mature woods. The proposed tower will now be accessed by a curving driveway, so that there is

no unobstructed line of site to the base of the tower. All those changes will reduce the visibility of the tower and associated equipment.

In addition, at the meeting, AT&T agreed to guarantee that brown, opaque slats would be part of the fence at the site. AT&T also stated that it would evaluate whether additional landscaping around the fence would be practical and beneficial.

EMF emission information regarding cellular towers will continue to be made available to any interested person. In addition, the type of CMRS antennas proposed to be initially used by AT&T on the tower – and whether the RF coverage maps were based upon that type of antenna -- will be confirmed at the public hearing.

In addition to the line-of-sight study required as part of the application, a balloon test will be conducted on May 3, 2014, from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. and neighbors have been informed of the date and time of that balloon flight and invited to observe and take pictures. This notice, invitation, opportunity are not required by the ordinance. Pictures will be taken of the balloon flying at the proposed height of 195'. Photo simulations with a monopole tower in place of the balloon will then be created with the photos and shared with those in attendance prior to the public hearing.

Questions were raised as to whether a shorter tower would still provide adequate coverage and the extent to which a shorter tower would be less visible. The AT&T representative agreed to fly the balloon at lower heights (e.g., 150 feet and 120 feet) at the end of the test (for a few minutes after 10:00 a.m.). AT&T will also be asked to prepare coverage maps of the projected service that could be provided with antennas at these lower heights. The practical limitations on future collocations on a shorter tower was explained.

Finally, a question was raised as to whether the Duke Energy utility corridor could be used for the tower location. The width of the easement, safety considerations, required lower height of the antennas, the need for access, and Duke Energy policies were explained. Further documentation and explanation will be provided at the public hearing as to whether this location is a feasible alternative.