

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

VILLAGE OF



KENILWORTH, IL

**Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees  
May 17, 2016**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Village President William Russell called to order the special meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Village of Kenilworth in the Kenilworth Village Hall, Kenilworth, Illinois at 6:36 pm on May 17, 2016.

**ROLL CALL**

President Russell requested that Deputy Village Clerk Brennan call the roll:

**Trustees:**

Trustee Scott Lien	Present
Trustee Kevin Lennon	Present
Trustee Ann Potter	Present
Trustee Joe Konen	Present
Trustee Alison Winslow	Present
Trustee Peter Shadek	Present
President William Russell	Present

**A quorum was present.**

**Others Recorded as in Attendance:**

*Village Officials and Staff:*

Patrick Brennan	Village Manager
Susan Criezis	Community Development Director
Nadim Badran	Assistant to the Village Manger
Peter Nickell	Management Analyst
Barbara Adams	Village Attorney

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

**Others, Signing In:**

Comment/Participation cards were distributed to each attendee. The cards have been electronically retained in the Clerk’s folder and are available for review upon request. Forty-five persons submitted cards. Additionally, the following persons were present representing AT&T: Andy Fitz, Mastec Network Solutions; John Lenahan, attorney representing AT&T; Tricia Conway, Director of External Affairs, AT&T.

**AGENDA ITEM II: REGULAR SCHEDULED BUSINESS**

**1. Discussion of a Proposal to Relocate the Existing Cellular Antenna from the Water Tank to a Proposed Monopole at 347 Ivy Court.**

President Russell introduced the item and thanked those in attendance for being present to participate in the meeting. He provided an overview of the process being followed for the meeting which included comment cards for those who wished to speak. The comment cards may also be filled out by those who do not wish to speak, but wish to having their opinion presented. President Russell presented a brief background on the structural concerns with the elevated water tower. Further, he explained that the Board of Trustees was currently in a vetting process to ascertain the options available to the Village to best deal with both the structural problems of the water tank and the need for effective cellular access within the Village. He explained that the order of the meeting would include a presentation of the existing conditions by the Village Manager, followed by a presentation by the consultants for AT&T, and finally a period of time for questions and answers by both the Trustees and the public.

Village Manager Brennan directed the group’s attention to a PowerPoint presentation. He provided the audience with the background of the 200,000 gallon elevated water storage tank that was constructed in 1976 and its purpose of providing peak water, emergency, and water pressure needs. He explained that the tank was constructed before it was common to locate cellular antenna on water tanks and that now three cellular service providers have equipment on the water tank. Additionally, there is public safety communication equipment on the tank.

Manager Brennan explained the process that is followed when requests are made to change equipment on the water tank. He stated that the structural evaluations are necessary because the communications antenna change the way in which the wind forces act upon the tank. In 2011 Sprint and AT&T asked to modify the antenna on the water tank, triggering a structural analysis. Brennan stated that a report from Klein & Hoffman Structural Engineers was received by the Village in March 2012. He said that the review indicated that the requested antenna changes could be made, but that operational limitations would be necessary. The limitations required that the tank

1 contain a minimum of 20,000 gallons and no more than 160,000 gallons due to the  
2 stresses on the tank during high winds. Brennan stated that he could not find any  
3 indication that the operational limitations were imposed, but that the changes in  
4 cellular equipment were authorized.

5 In 2014 a new round of equipment upgrades was requested by the incumbent carriers.  
6 Additionally, Verizon Wireless made a request to locate equipment upon the water tank.  
7 Brennan stated that he reviewed the prior structural reports before selecting a firm to  
8 conduct the new round of analyses. He discovered the requirement for operational  
9 limitations and subsequently authored an Administrative Order to impose the  
10 operational limitations. In November 2014, an analysis from the Burns Group confirmed  
11 the necessity of the operational limitations. The report stated that removal of the  
12 antenna would lift the need for operational limitations.

13 Brennan next provided the group with an overview of the actions taken after  
14 discovering the operational limitations. He stated that requests to modify existing  
15 cellular equipment were denied and that carriers were told that the Village was  
16 exploring the option to force removal of cellular antennas from the tower. He explained  
17 that the wireless providers responded with concern that without the antenna, there  
18 would not be adequate cellular coverage in Kenilworth. The wireless carriers requested  
19 that the Village consider providing an alternative site for their antenna.

20 To explore the options for relocating the cellular antenna, a review of existing public  
21 properties was conducted. The Plan Commission was asked to look at the public land  
22 areas and determine the preferred location for a cellular monopole should there be a  
23 need for one. Concurrently, the cellular carriers discussed options for relocating their  
24 facilities. The conversations included the use of small antennas placed on telephone  
25 poles, small sites on the sides of taller buildings, and a single monopole for all cellular  
26 antenna. The Village Board was informed of the Plan Commission consensus that the  
27 Public Works Facility was the best location if the existing antennas could not remain on  
28 the water tank. Additionally, the potential benefit of having just one site for the  
29 antennas in the Village was discussed.

30 Next, Manager Brennan displayed graphics that reflected an overview of the Village and  
31 close-up aerials of the Public Works Facility and immediate area. Brennan also  
32 displayed a graphic that showed that the location under discussion would be  
33 approximately 60 yards closer to the closest corner of the school.

34 President Russell asked Andy Fitz of MasTec Network Solutions to begin his  
35 presentation. Mr. Fitz explained that he was representing AT&T Wireless and stated  
36 that he had given a similar presentation to the Zoning Board of Appeals during the  
37 Public Hearing. Mr. Fitz displayed and explained maps that graphically displayed the

1 strength of cellular signal for AT&T. The propagation maps indicated that without the  
2 existing site at the Kenilworth Water Tank, the quality of wireless coverage in the Village  
3 to be “quite poor” and that in-home coverage may not exist. He next displayed a  
4 propagation map that displayed the anticipated coverage if the proposed monopole  
5 were constructed. He stated that the graphic demonstrated that adequate coverage  
6 would be possible as well as reliable in-home coverage under the proposed plan. Mr.  
7 Fitz explained that he was not representing Sprint, T-mobile, or Verizon, but that he  
8 would display their propagation maps. For each carrier, he showed the loss of coverage  
9 if the water tank was not available and the increased coverage provided by the  
10 proposed monopole.

11 Mr. Fitz next displayed graphics of the proposed ground equipment and monopole. He  
12 explained the details of the drawings and the proposed 145’ monopole which would be  
13 designed to support four different carriers with ground equipment located under the  
14 existing canopy of the Public Works Facility. Mr. Fitz also displayed photo simulations  
15 that were intended to display the appearance of the proposed monopole from various  
16 locations within the Village. Finally, Mr. Fitz showed the considerations that guided the  
17 Zoning Board review of the application for a special use permit.

18 At the conclusion of the presentation, President Russell stated that it was the point in  
19 the meeting where he would open the floor to questions from the Board of Trustees  
20 and then the public.

21 Trustee Konen asked about the feasibility of putting the monopole adjacent to the  
22 water tower. Manager Brennan said that he had been told that an adjacent monopole  
23 would need to be taller than the water tank to avoid blocking signal. He asked Mr. Fitz if  
24 that information was correct and it was confirmed.

25 Trustee Winslow stated that a major obstacle of managing the water tower’s water  
26 levels was the fact that the water plant operated on two shift cycles. Now that the  
27 decision to purchase water from Wilmette has been made, this fact may now be moot.  
28 Trustee Winslow then stated the Village should do a structural analysis on maintaining  
29 the water tower at 160,000 gallons while keeping the carriers’ antennas on the tank.

30 Trustee Lennon stated that antennas can only safely be maintained on the water tower  
31 when it is operating at 160,000 gallons. Trustee Lennon then asked the Village to figure  
32 out, at what water level will residents experience a change in water pressure. Trustee  
33 Shadek asked if there are other ways to create pressure within the column of the water  
34 tower to maintain operating pressure at certain levels.

35 Trustee Winslow stated T-Mobile has cell sites in Winnetka and Wilmette and the  
36 carriers should look to see if they have coverage in the Village due to the proximity of  
37 these sites. Trustee Winslow asked Mr. Fitz why AT&T coverage remains strong despite

1 not having a monopole, or monopole-alternative, at every mile. Mr. Fitz responded that  
2 coverage offered by different monopoles depends on multiple factors including height  
3 of the pole and the type of antennas utilized. Mr. Fitz also explained that power of the  
4 antennas cannot be increased as limits to their power are set by the Federal  
5 Communications Commission (FCC). Mr. Fitz also explained that the propagation maps  
6 are accurate in terms of what cell phone coverage in the Village would be like if the  
7 antennas were taken off the water tower and not relocated. Mr. Fitz also mentioned  
8 that there was no existing tower in the area for the antennas to be relocated on.

9 President Russell asked if Mr. Fitz had any opinion on safety issues given the proximity  
10 of the proposed monopole to Sears School. Mr. Fitz responded that a lot of sources  
11 including the American Cancer Society and National Institute of Cancer have both  
12 released statements that monopoles do not cause cancer and both organizations have  
13 detailed explanations available on their websites. Mr. Lenahan responded the FCC has  
14 the responsibility of regulating wireless equipment in the country. Mr. Lenahan  
15 mentioned that the FCC has done research on RF emissions from cell towers in regards  
16 to health concerns. Mr. Lenahan said cell towers and antennas safety requirements are  
17 regulated by the FCC and that a community cannot deny a monopole application for  
18 health or environmental reasons, per federal law.

19 President Russell asked Mr. Lenahan whether a small cell site could replace a monopole.  
20 Mr. Lenahan answered that small cells cannot replace a monopole; rather that they are  
21 intended to supplement them. Mr. Lenahan said small cells are typically 40 feet tall and  
22 one small cell is allowed per utility pole. Each of the four carriers would need to install  
23 their own small cells throughout the community which could lead to several small cell  
24 sites throughout the Village.

25 President Russell asked Mr. Lenahan what the difference was between placing devices  
26 on top of poles compared to antennas on buildings such as the ones on Plaza del Lago.  
27 Mr. Lenahan said he was not familiar with the antennas mentioned but there small cells  
28 are located in residential areas of Glencoe and can be identified by a cylindrical  
29 container on the telephone pole resembling a small garbage can. Additionally the poles  
30 would need to be 30-40 feet tall with the small cell antenna extending seven feet above  
31 the pole.

32 President Russell opened the discussion up for public comment.

33 Georgia Wern, a Kenilworth resident, said she found the AT&T presentation to be  
34 misleading as it did not show the perspective of homes closer to the proposed  
35 monopole location. Ms. Wern said small cells should be considered and then asked for  
36 the name of the consultant the Village hired to verify the specs of AT&T's proposed  
37 structure. Manager Brennan said Dr. Alan Taflove or Northwestern University had been

1 retained by the Village. Ms. Wern then stated her concern of living under the shadow of  
2 the monopole and the damage it would cause to the community.

3 Patricia Kaufman, a Winnetka resident, asked if there were any small cells on the New  
4 Trier building. Mr. Fitz said he did not believe there were any on the building. Ms.  
5 Kaufman asked if Winnetka has explored placing small cells on their utility poles and  
6 whether Kenilworth could benefit from their placement. Mr. Lenahan said maximum  
7 coverage offered by the small cells would not extend to all of the Village so benefits  
8 would be minimal. Ms. Kaufman then said the Village should look into using Wilmette  
9 and Winnetka's small cells if available.

10 Linda McNelley, a Kenilworth resident, said the monopole was near the schools and  
11 children and was worried about adverse health effects a monopole would have. Ms.  
12 McNelley was also worried about the aesthetics of the monopole and asked what the  
13 difference in height would be between the top of the water tower and the monopole.  
14 Mr. Fitz said vertical separation of 10 feet between antennas would be necessary  
15 leading to the monopole to being roughly 145 feet tall. Ms. McNelley concluded by  
16 suggesting the monopole should be placed in Townley Field.

17 Stacy Dale, a Kenilworth resident, said she was worried that the pole was within reach  
18 of her property if the proposed monopole were to fall over.

19 Joslyn Blokell, a Winnetka resident, stated her main concern was the size of the  
20 monopole.

21 Jim Radley, a Winnetka resident, stated he did not believe the monopole met the Zoning  
22 Board of Appeals' standards prior to it receiving their recommendation approving the  
23 monopole's special use.

24 Sherl Calarco stated she was concerned with the monopole's proximity to New Trier  
25 High School and questioned why the village did not notify the school district. She then  
26 stated she believes coverage standards by wireless companies were arbitrary.

27 Jean Corvine, a Kenilworth resident, said she was concerned with the timing involved  
28 with filing the monopole with the Zoning Board of Appeals. She stated the application  
29 was not filed 45 days prior to the Zoning Board meeting.

30 Meredith Daw, a Winnetka resident, was worried that the foot print of the monopole  
31 fell on her home which is in the National Historic Register.

32 David Marray, a Winnetka resident, asked how much money would be generated from  
33 the monopole. Manager Brennan stated one more carrier would generate  
34 approximately \$40,000-45,000 per year.

1 Anne Crowley, a Kenilworth resident, asked about a discrepancy in the Zoning Board of  
2 Appeals meeting minutes and asked about the strength of the monopole during high  
3 winds. Mr. Fitz said the proposed monopole is designed to withstand winds up to 90  
4 miles per hour. Chairman of the Zoning Board of Appeals, Vicky Thompson, said the  
5 minutes were subsequently corrected to fix the discrepancy mentioned by Ms. Crowley.

6 Eileen Macdonald, a Kenilworth resident, mentioned that the engineering firm  
7 contracted to conduct the 2012 water tower operational analysis and the firm  
8 contracted to conduct the 2014 water tower operational analysis used the same  
9 engineer to author both reports. Ms. Macdonald read from meeting minutes dated back  
10 in 2012 about the limitations of the monopole and water tower.

11 Patrick Zelten, a Kenilworth resident, expressed his desire to have the Village Board poll  
12 the community before voting on any action.

13 Don Stephani, a Kenilworth resident, supported the monopole and suggested allowing  
14 New Trier High School students and Sears School students to analyze emissions of rays  
15 from the monopole thereby making it an educational experience.

16 Jay Menton, a Winnetka resident, mentioned that he believed the propagation maps  
17 were out of date. Mr. Menton then yielded the remainder of his allotted time to Ms.  
18 Macdonald who read from Zoning Board minutes of the monopole and limitations of the  
19 water tank.

20 Gail Conway, a Winnetka resident, said she was concerned about the adverse health  
21 effects and adverse property value affects the proposed monopole would have on her  
22 and her neighbors. Village Attorney, Barbara Adams, mentioned that radio frequency  
23 emission regulations are regulated by the FCC and are outside of the scope of the  
24 Village. Ms. Conway then yielded her time to Ms. Macdonald who continued reading  
25 minutes from previous zoning board meetings.

26 Steve Kek, a Kenilworth resident, would like to hear the Village's hired consultant's  
27 opinion on the proposed monopole. Mr. Kek also asked what would happen if the  
28 Village took the antennas off the water tower and did not relocate them. Mr. Fitz  
29 answered by stating that cell phone coverage would "go dark" which would mean no to  
30 poor coverage in the village if the antennas were taken off the water tower and not  
31 relocated.

32 Robert Zielinski, a Winnetka resident, said a cost-benefit analysis should be conducted  
33 to figure what it would cost to strengthen the water tower. Mr. Zielinski also asked how  
34 the monopole was being financed and expressed his displeasure of dedicating public  
35 land for a private cause and the possible adverse effects the proposed monopole would  
36 have on property values. Brennan answered that under the current discussions, AT&T

1 would front all costs associated with constructing the monopole and bill back carriers  
2 for their portion of the total cost.

3 Eric Miller, a Kenilworth resident, urged the Board of Trustees to preserve Kenilworth's  
4 history and oppose the monopole.

5 Thomas J. Ramsdell, who introduced himself as an attorney retained by a group of  
6 Kenilworth residents, questioned whether the proposed special use met the Zoning  
7 Board of Appeals' requirements and whether procedures were properly followed with  
8 the application of the proposed monopole. Mr. Ramsdell introduced Steve Lennet who  
9 will work with Mr. Ramsdell. Mr. Lennet said the Board of Trustees needed to remand  
10 the proposed monopole application back to the Zoning Board of Appeals for another  
11 public hearing.

12 Warren Radler asked for a study, comparable to Kenilworth, which demonstrates no  
13 correlation between the value of a home and its proximity to a monopole. Mr. Fitz said  
14 there was no comparable study that he knew of.

15 Carin Unnikrishnan, a Kenilworth resident, said she could no longer qualify for federally  
16 backed loans because her home was within the fall distance of the proposed monopole.

17 K.P. Unnikrishnan, a Kenilworth resident, mentioned that the 160,000 gallon level in the  
18 water tower should be safe for the community once water is purchased by Wilmette.  
19 Mr. Krishnan requested that the Board of Trustees run an experiment to ensure this fact.

20 Katherine Radler, a Winnetka resident, asked about the fall zone of the monopole. Mr.  
21 Lenahan said monopoles are designed to fall within themselves. Ms. Radler said it was  
22 not discussed at the Zoning Board of Appeals and members of that board should have  
23 asked more questions.

24 Frank Vanderploeg, a Kenilworth resident, asked how closing the water plant will affect  
25 the water tower. Manager Brennan stated that the water system engineers were asked  
26 to opine and they determined that the water tower should not be eliminated even after  
27 the Village begins purchasing water from Wilmette. Brennan also stated the water  
28 tower is critical for emergency storage, if needed.

29 Jack Pressman, a Kenilworth resident, expressed concern for property values if the  
30 proposed monopole was build.

31 Shari Kvam, a Kenilworth resident, asked if Mahoney Park was considered for the  
32 proposed monopole. Manager Brennan said the Plan Commission looked at all public  
33 properties for a potential site. Trustee Lennon added that Mahoney Park may have  
34 additional restrictions due to historic designations for that area.



1 Maggie Zielinski, a Winnetka resident, said real estate values should be discussed more  
2 and asked if the Village Board to consider appeals for more time and information.

3 George Kocalis, a Kenilworth resident, said he grew up under the water tower and asked  
4 if the new antennas would be more powerful. Mr. Lenahan said strength of the  
5 antennas could increase up to 25%.

6 Emily Tzur, a Kenilworth resident, urged the Board of Trustees to not reinforce the  
7 water tower. Ms. Tzur urged the Board of Trustees to look into small cells along Green  
8 Bay road and to investigate other options.

9 At this point, there were no additional residents who requested to address the Village  
10 Board on this matter and the comment cards had been exhausted.

11 President Russell told those in attendance that the Village Board was not voting on any  
12 action tonight. President Russell then said more information could be found on the  
13 Village’s website. President Russell encouraged residents to sign up for the Kenilworth  
14 Contact, the Village’s electronic newsletter, and to look into the dangers of owning a  
15 lead water service line. President Russell then asked for comments from Trustees.

16 Trustee Konen reminded the audience that an independent consultant was hired to  
17 review all of the proposed plans and that the results will be available in the near future.  
18 Trustee Konen then inquired about the option to revisit evaluation of the current  
19 structural integrity of the water tank . Trustee Lennon repeated Trustee Konen’s  
20 sentiments.

21 Trustee Lien would like the Village to explore more options. Village Attorney Barbara  
22 Adams reminded the Board of Trustees that any ability to regulate and control the  
23 proposed monopole and possible alternatives would have to be within the parameters  
24 set by federal law. Trustee Shadek mentioned he was very interested in alternatives  
25 especially given how water management in the Village is changing.

26 Trustee Potter repeated Trustee Shadek’s sentiments and would like to know how other  
27 communities are responding to similar situations. Trustee Winslow mentioned  
28 Winnetka began the process of looking into regulating small cell technology. President  
29 Russell said safety issues must be managed first and repeated Trustee Konen’s reminder  
30 of more information to come from the consultant.

31

32 **AGENDA ITEM VIII: BUSINESS FROM THE PUBLIC RELATED TO ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

33

34 President Russell opened the floor to the public to discuss items that were not related to items  
35 on the agenda for the meeting. No members of the public expressed a desire to raise non-

1 agenda items and President Russell stated that he would entertain a motion to adjourn the  
2 meeting.

3

4 **AGENDA ITEM IX: ADJOURN**

5 With no further business, Trustee Lennon offered a motion, and Trustee Lien seconded the  
6 motion, to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was concluded by voice vote at 9:02 pm.

7

8 Respectfully Submitted,

9

10 Patrick Brennan  
11 Deputy Village Clerk