

Minutes of Civic League Monthly Board Meeting
Wednesday, April 6, 2022
Hybrid-Zoom and Roland Park Presbyterian
4801 Roland Ave. (at Upland Rd), Baltimore MD 21210

Attending: Claudia Diamond, Tom Hoen. Ed Goodlander, MK Battafarano, David Fitzpatrick, Steven Ralston, Bobby Marinelli, Ann-Barron Carneal, and Ken Rice. On Zoom: Raman Tallamraju, John Morrel, Alisya Davis, and Rachel Dawson. **Absent:** Margaret Black, David Blumberg, Patricia Carroll, Martha Holleman, Andy Niazy, and Rita Walters.

The meeting began at 7:05PM as local media arrived. The Board APPROVED March minutes.

Baltimore State's Attorney, Marilyn Mosby joined us in person at her request to share a Term Report covering 2015 to 2021. Copies of the 52 page document were handed out and a new interactive dashboard announced (both available [online](#)). After acknowledging the unacceptable level of violence in our City and her mission to reduce it; Ms. Mosby invited us to review the reported outcomes data directly. She then spoke at length on the complexities of nontraditional prosecutorial work balancing: conviction integrity, racial disparities and public health recommendations; forming the basis for recent policy changes to forego prosecuting minor offenses. A Q&A session followed during which the overarching concern expressed was the SAO's accountability for crime acceleration. Ms. Mosby concluded with a reminder that in our criminal justice system the prosecutor is "not responsible" for the citizens' decreased sense of safety. She cited instability based on events (2015 Uprising, 2016 Police Corruption trials) and atypical turnover of Mayors and Police Commissioners during the last seven years leading to a "false correlation" with her term in office. When asked about her pending federal indictment, she provided assurance it is not a distraction from her important work of pursuing justice for the victims and witnesses of crime.

Routine Business

In our Community: Ken Rice recently returned from a humanitarian trip to Ukraine transporting a variety of donated supplies and shared details of this experience.

Old Business: 5G

Claudia acknowledged Joel DePalma and his leadership in bringing to our attention in October 2021 Verizon's imminent 5G installation plans. She followed with a Power point presentation including a timeline, along with photos of existing installations on cobra style metal poles and existing wood poles (see text slides attached here). After recently speaking to the City Solicitor's office, Claudia concludes the best avenue to advocate for changes to the Verizon installation plan is by participating in the Section 106 review

underway, noting the deadline of April 15th. The City Solicitor's office confirmed that the pole replacements underway were approved and an informal appeal (there's no right to an appeal) to the head of the planning department would most likely affirm the department's decision.

A robust discussion took place with approximately a dozen residents in attendance, who shared in detail their concerns and expectations that 5G installations not be permitted in Roland Park. VP Tom Hoen shared his recent informal polling of neighbors where another dozen residents expressed interest in having this new connectivity option. We concluded with the Board voting to APPROVE the following two actions:

1. Creation of a new ad hoc Committee to continue working on this issue including several volunteers from those attending tonight. A formal written charge for this Committee will be created and shared within the week.
2. As a consulting party to the Section 106 review underway, the Civic League Board will in the next ten days submit comments representing tonight's discussion to meet the deadline.

New Business

Nominating Committee

Ed Goodlander, Chair requested and was given approval of his Committee members in keeping with bylaws: Kathy Hudson, Cara Koehler, Ken Rice and Mary Kay Battafarano. Ed also reported the Committee has identified and interviewed candidates for open positions. Nominees will be finalized in the next week to be included with a mailed invitation to our Annual Meeting scheduled for the evening of Wednesday, May 4th in our current location.

Roads and Maintenance Corporation

A motion was introduced by John Morrell, President nominating Ed Schaefer of Plat 3 who is willing to serve on the Architectural Review Board. A vote to APPROVE this appointment passed.

The meeting concluded at 9:15PM.

10/6/21	Joel DePalma	Resident, 123 Hawthorn	Hawthorn Rd residents attend regular RPCL BD Mtg to seek action re: front yard site
10/7/21	Claudia Diamond	President, RPCL	requested hold on Verizon installations, pending additional details
11/3/21	Paul Plymouth Matt DeSantis	Director, Verizon and City Planner	Attend in response to "Hold" request; all 5G sites identified. One site cancelled today.
12/1/21	Board of Directors	RPCL	"major impact" determined, Project Review initiated
12/21-1/21	Brooks Thacker	Trileaf Consultants	first contacted Claudia Diamond, RPCL President
2/2/22	Becky Roman Brooks Thacker	MD Historic Trust Trileaf Consultants	Attended Monthly RPCL BD Mtg. re: Sec. 106 Review
2/3/22	Claudia Diamond	President, RPCL	Community Impact Assessment sent to City Officials
3/8/22	Kayla Lauer	Trileaf Consultants	Letter: bundled 5G sites (10) for sec. 106 review
3/16-4/15/22	Kayla Lauer	Trileaf Consultants	Sec. 106 Historic Review Comment Period
Before 4/15/22	Board of Directors	RPCL "Consulting Party"	Submit comments for consideration, Sec. 106 review



5 Wooden Poles (Using BGE Poles) - Currently Cell node is not installed.

- Loyola 55: Club & Upland
- Loyola NR29: Hawthorne/Park
- Loyola 60: Woodlawn/Upland
- Loyola 47: Ridgewood/Kenwood
- Loyola 35: Elmhurst/Club

Accordingly, the Civic League respectfully requests that the Planning Department consider the following actions for the benefit of all city neighborhoods and citizens:

- Improve visibility and transparency of the WCF installation process. Currently, finding any information on the City's planning agency website regarding the City's role in approving small cell installation is very difficult. The Civic League would ask the City to consider implementing a page on the City's website that addresses wireless communications facilities; one [example](#) is the City of San Jose, CA. This page should list a dedicated point of contact for City residents to address questions/concerns they might have about planned wireless facilities. This page should also clearly communicate to City residents the limited scope of the City's authority pertaining to wireless communication facilities.

- Build and maintain staff resources sufficient to conduct timely and thorough review of applications for 4G and 5G small cell wireless communication facilities.

- Provide direct notice to property owners and community associations in proximity to planned 5G residential sites (in conjunction with Verizon and other carriers) by establishing a policy for timely notifying owners and community associations of installation applications.

- Retain an engineering consultant to advise on both technical and policy issues related to application, permitting, and approvals processes for towers and small cell WCFs as this type of technology will increasingly be part of the City's infrastructure. In addition, or alternatively, create an advisory board, comprised to provide input as the City navigates its ongoing technology planning strategy.



just pulled up the submission (attached) from January 2020. The submission did include the new pole height of 46'. I had no comment with the proposed height and still have none. There are similar poles within the neighborhood - a few are a mere 200' from the Loyola_60 - so I don't see how these new poles are objectionable. Additionally, the site is surrounded by trees that greatly exceed



As we discussed, if an installation meets the City's Aesthetic Guidelines, it receives an expedited review from the Planning Dept. When an installation fails the Guidelines, it receives a closer inspection. In other words, if a proposed installation fails the Guidelines, it doesn't get a closer inspection. The proposal is rejected. It means the proposal gets a closer inspection if it fails the Guidelines. Whether the placement can be approved despite falling outside the parameters of the Aesthetic Guidelines.



Appeal rights?

106 Review



11 SUBMISSIONS.



SPECIFIC TO
HISTORIC IMPACT.



DEADLINE IS
APRIL 15.