

# Proposed Public Safety Communications Tower

## Questions and Answers

The following questions and answers are intended to inform the public about questions that have been submitted to the City Manager concerning the tower. Visit the [project timeline webpage](#) for more information and links to supporting documents.



### **Q1. What were the findings of the Winchester Medical Center location evaluation as a potential site?**

#### **Respondent - Emergency Management:**

- At the August 27, 2013 Work Session, Council requested additional information be supplied for the Sept. 10, 2013 meeting including consideration and analysis of a site on the Winchester Medical Center campus.
- [Click here to review the report from Motorola concerning the potential Winchester Medical Center site.](#)

### **Q2. When was meetings held with adjacent property owners and who was included? Please list any specific meeting dates with the Bridgeforths, if any.**

#### **Respondent - Emergency Management:**

- All adjacent property owners were contacted in accordance with the notification requirements of the Zoning Ordinance as identified in the response to question #3.
- There was a public meeting presentation advertised and conducted at Daniel Morgan Middle School the evening of March 5, 2013 at 6:30 p.m. The presentation relating to the Communications Tower was an agenda item and included a narrative and visual components. This meeting also included a discussion of the John Kerr Elementary School and a large number of nearby residents attended.
- The communications tower and its location at Jefferson Street have been a topic of discussion and presented to the members of City Council on numerous occasions. Agendas with supporting documents are posted on the City's website the Friday prior to every meeting and all City Council meetings and work sessions are telecast live on cable channel 6 and rebroadcast the following Thursday at 7:00 p.m.
- Articles covering the issues and actions of City Council have been published in the Winchester Star newspaper a publication of general circulation in the City (refer to the project timeline).
- I have had two lengthy telephone conversations with Mrs. Bridgeforth relating to the tower. I do not have the specific dates of the conversations but estimate the first conversation was between 2-2.5 months ago and the most recent was within the past 3-4 weeks. I did receive an e-mail from Mrs. Bridgeforth on 8/23/13, containing several questions relating to the communications tower and responded to her on 8/24/13.

**Respondent - City Manager:**

- On January 4, 2013, I met with Mr. Scott Bridgeforth at my office on the third floor of Rouss City Hall. I shared all available information regarding the communication tower and the selected site on Jefferson Street. At the time of this meeting the height of the tower was estimated to be 250 feet. Mr. Bridgeforth asked several questions related to his future plans for development of the vacant property west of his residence. I agreed to make myself available to him and his spouse Lauri regarding this matter should either have questions. [Email correspondence](#)

**Q3. When was the Jefferson Street site location discussed publicly as a potential or as a preferred site and what public discussion/notice has occurred in regard to this as a site?**

**Respondent - Emergency Management:**

- Two public hearing notices were sent by to all adjacent property owners within 300-feet of the subject parcel.
- One round of notices was sent to the property owners on August 5, 2013 in advance of the August 20, 2013, Planning Commission public hearing.
- The second round of notices was sent to the property owners on August 28, 2013, in advance of the September 10, 2013 City Council public hearing.
- The City of Winchester Zoning Ordinance has more stringent public notification requirements than is required per the Code of Virginia. The Zoning Ordinance requires that all properties within 300 feet of any point of the subject property receive a public hearing notice. However, in this particular instance the surrounding properties are of a size that there are only three properties that fall in the 300-foot radius of the subject property (the Glass Glen Burnie Foundation property, the Bridgeforth property, and the Handley Board of Trustees property).
- Additionally a public notification sign was posted on the subject property in advance of both the Planning Commission and City Council public hearings.

**Q4. The original proposal was a \$6M system that included multiple location towers (I believe). Please describe the discussion of how this price was reduced and why ultimately leading to a \$3.5M solution.**

**Respondent - Emergency Management:**

- The original conceptual design presented by Robert L. Kimball and Assoc. addressed the performance standard and was addressed as multiple sites having an estimated cost of between \$5-\$6M.
- Council indicated they were disappointed with this presentation and the cost and indicated this was not acceptable.
- As I recall the CIP budget contained the Communications Project of \$5M in amounts of \$1M in 2011, \$2M in 2012 and \$2M in 2013.
- During the Regular Council meeting of June 19, 2012 City Council adopted a resolution authorizing the City Manager to execute a contract with Motorola Solutions for the communications project and the project cost was not to exceed \$3,571,005.60. I am presuming

that upon review of the response to the RFP by City Council the appropriation was reduced from \$5M to the \$3.5M to that amount identified in the RFP response.

**Respondent - Kimball:**

- The \$5M-\$6M was an opinion of probable costs from Kimball for a multi-site system, not a proposed amount from a vendor.
- Kimball decided not to provide a cost estimate for a single site solution because the only site identified during the conceptual design phase that was capable of providing adequate coverage throughout the city was the Jefferson St site and FAA regulatory restrictions for this site posed a liability to site development.
- It was the vendor who proposed a \$3.2M single site solution based on the expectation that this site could be developed

**Q5. How many sites including Jefferson Street were fully studied and vetted?**

**Respondent - Kimball:**

- During the conceptual design phase Kimball ran propagation studies to determine design feasibility and estimates of probable cost to guide Council's budgetary expectations to acquire a radio system. These were not site feasibility studies.
- Responsibility to select and develop sites is the vendor's responsibility within the RFP. A non-exclusive list of 11 potentially available sites was provided in the RFP to the vendors. The vendor's proposal identifies the assumptions that the Jefferson site is available.
- A transmitter site is considered fully vetted when any critical criterion is identified that causes the site to be unable to meet system performance specifications. The most common failure criteria are the coverage provided by the site, the site development costs, and regulatory restrictions.

**Respondent - Motorola (from the Teltronic site selection letter to the City):**

- Before proposing a new tower on the City property on Jefferson Street, Motorola Solutions considered every potential location listed in the RFP. We also looked for other existing towers that might be suitable, but found none.
- Because the City's budget precluded a system design using multiple towers, we needed to find a location where a single tower of reasonable height would provide the radio coverage and performance required by the City.
- Our starting point was to evaluate coverage using the existing water tank at Jefferson Street. Our studies showed that it was not possible to meet the City's coverage requirements without raising the antennas above the existing tank, and we determined that a tower 250 feet high would be needed.
- The Jefferson Street location appeared to be a good choice since it was owned by the City, was zoned ELP, is already fenced, and has sufficient space to accommodate the tower and associated equipment and generator. It is also on relatively high ground and is located close to the center of the City.
- We evaluated coverage using the existing Shentel tower on Fairmont Avenue and found that this tower is not high enough to meet the City's coverage requirements. It is also at the North end of the City, which reduces its coverage in the southern part of the City.

- We also evaluated coverage using a tower at the Timbrook Public Safety Center, another location proposed by the City. We determined that a 350 foot high tower would be needed to meet the City's coverage requirements using this location. Informal discussions with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) indicated that this tower would be less likely to be approved than the 250 foot tower at Jefferson Street.
- The results of these studies indicate that the remaining proposed locations would require a tower significantly higher than 250 feet because they are on lower ground or are not centrally located within the City of Winchester. As a result, these sites would be more costly to construct, would likely be more visible because of the higher tower, and would be less likely to be approved by the FAA. We therefore did not perform detailed engineering studies for these less desirable locations..

## **Q6. What is the estimated cost to do a multi-location tower site to meet the 95/95 standard?**

### **Respondent - Kimball/Motorola:**

- The Kimball presentation to Council on (August 16, 2011) provided an opinion of probable cost of \$5M for a 2-site system with towers at Jefferson Street and the Timbrook Public Safety Center (PSC).
- The opinion of probable cost of \$6M was provided for a 3-site system with towers at Jefferson St., Timbrook PSC, and the Frederick Douglass Elementary School.
- Current cost projections are not expected to exceed the original opinion by more than 25% including non-vendor costs that will be incurred by the city.

## **Q7. Were any radiation studies conducted? Are these required?**

### **Respondent - Zoning:**

- The Winchester Zoning Ordinance Section 18-8-2-1.2 requires that “[t]he electromagnetic fields do not exceed the radio frequency emission standards established by the American National Standards Institute or standard issued by the Federal Government subsequent to the adoption of this Ordinance.” A typical condition with these conditional use permits has been to require the submission of an as-built emissions certificate to ensure City staff that the construction and resulting emissions are in conformance with Federal requirements.
- The applicant submitted up-front EME assessment estimating the potential exposure and the proposed compliance with national and Federal standards and requirements.

### **Respondent - Motorola/Kimball:**

- A review of the Electromagnetic Emissions (EME) study provided by Motorola, which was provided by the vendor within the scope of their current contract for the proposed Jefferson Street site, shows that the methods and analysis used in the study comport with the methodology defined by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Office of Engineering Technology (OEM) Bulletin 65, “Evaluating Compliance with FCC Guidelines for Human Exposure to Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields.”

- The EME analysis shows the exposure level is always at least 5,000 times less than the FCC limit for the general population in the VHF-HB frequency band and at least 10,000 times less than the FCC limit for the general population in the 800 MHz frequency band.

**Q8. Is it possible to use existing towers within the City to accommodate our communication needs?**

**Respondent - Kimball:**

- It is not possible to use existing towers with the budget currently appropriated for this project.
- If sufficient budget is appropriated to evaluate alternate sites (either existing towers or new potential sites), then a new radio project proposal and cost estimate can be prepared. Analysis of existing sites should include a total cost of ownership (TCO) analysis for comparison with the amortized cost of city owned and constructed sites. Typical site leases do not guarantee site availability for more than 5 years.

**Q9. What happens if a single tower on Jefferson St is impacted by an event such as tornado, etc. What is back up system/plan?**

**Respondent - Emergency Management:**

- Should the Jefferson Street tower be impacted by a catastrophic weather event such as a tornado the system has been designed with redundancy from a fixed location remote from Jefferson Street as well as the utilization of the Mobile Command Unit. The redundant location or the mobile location will not provide the robust coverage as is designed into the system when the Jefferson site is fully operational, but coverage of a lesser degree will be obtained.
- It should be noted that even with a multiple site system should an event such as identified occurs it would not be unusual for the system to experience a reduction in coverage as multiple site systems are normally designed to have a partial overlap in coverage. If the overlap area is interrupted the coverage will be reduced.
- It is possible to design a system where total coverage redundancy is possible but in most cases this is not accomplished due to fiscal restraints.

**Q10. When was the water tower and reservoir built? Did the Bridgeforths purchase their home before or after this tower was built? Were the other adjoining neighborhoods built before or after tower?**

**Respondent - Finance:**

- The publicly available land records reflect that the Bridgeforths purchased their land after the water tower and reservoir were built. Specifically, they purchased the land in 2004 and built their house in 2005.

**Respondent - Utilities:**

- The elevated water storage tank was constructed in 1976. The ground level water storage tank was constructed in 1970.

- We estimate that each tank will have a useful life of at least 50 years – hopefully longer because they have been well maintained.
- With regard to replacement, we are actually in the process at looking at our long term needs for water storage and the options available to meet that need. We won't have any final recommendations from that study for another year or so. We may find that it is best to replace these current tanks in the same location at some time in the future or build new tanks in other locations.

**Respondent - Planning & Zoning:**

- Most of the homes in the Williamsburg Heights, especially those along the north side of Seldon Dr, were built in the 1987-1989 timeframe.
- Linda Ross' house on Jefferson Street was built in 1949, but she moved there well after the water tanks were constructed.
- The home on the north side of Jefferson Street closest to John Kerr Elementary School was built in 1963, but the current owners purchased it in 2004.
- Everything in Meadow Branch North was built in 1988 or later with most of the closer homes near the Mews being mid-1990's or later.

**Q11. Is it possible to use the water tower as a location?**

**Respondent - Kimball:**

- It is not possible to use the existing elevated water tank to meet system performance specifications.
- The elevated water tank was the starting point for design considerations because of its superior location (elevation and central area of the city), it is city owned, it would require no recurring lease payments or land procurement, and it is appropriately zoned. However the elevated water tank will not provide adequate structural locations for antenna mounting (with vertical RF isolation), nor is it of sufficient height to provide adequate coverage throughout the city. Antenna mounting on the perimeter of the tank distorts the antenna propagation characteristics further limiting its suitability as an antenna mounting location.

**Q12. What is time estimate and expense if Council were to decide to look for alternative sites/options?**

**Respondent - Kimball:**

- There is an estimated minimum project delay of approximately 11 months for the vendor to assess and confirm the viability of existing candidate sites and design a radio system to use the existing sites. Lease negotiation times are not included. For new sites the estimated minimum project delay is approximately 15 months from the date of site identification and system redesign to initiating construction. Time estimates are based on a nominal impact from legal and regulatory delays and are from the date of notification by Council authorizing the budget to proceed.
- The Kimball presentation to Council on August 16, 2011 provided an opinion of probable cost of \$5M for a 2-site system and an opinion of probable cost of \$6M for a 3-site system. Current cost

projections are not expected to exceed the original opinion of \$5M - \$6M by more than 25% including the costs for which the city is responsible.

- Considerable time and expense has been expended to date to vet design options including alternate sites (see the response to Question 4 for a summary of the process). The proposed single site Jefferson Street 237-foot tower design is the only design that meets performance requirements within the appropriated budget. The funds expended to prepare the current design are not recoverable. There has been no budget appropriated for system redesign, nor is it within the scope of the current contract with Motorola or Kimball.

*See also the responses to questions 6 & 8 for additional information.*

**Respondent - Zoning:**

- Should City Council decide to pursue an alternate site or sites, the conditional use permit process would have to start again from the beginning. As a result the application would restart the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) process, which can be 2-3 months at a minimum depending on the timing of the application.
- If multiple sites are considered, each site would be a separate application to be considered. Each site/application would need to be evaluated on its own individual merits and potential impacts on surrounding properties.

**Q13. What are the specifics concerning the ACTUAL penalties that Winchester taxpayers would incur should this project be delayed past the current waiver? What are the penalties for failure to comply with the January 1, 2013 deadline?**

**Respondent - Emergency Management:**

- The following was copied from the Narrowband Technology Enforcement Advisory, Advisory 2012-05. The entire document can be found searching "narrowbanding" on the [FCC website](#). This will permit review of the entire document.
- The Enforcement Bureau is committed to aggressively enforcing the narrowbanding transition deadline and violators may be subject to enforcement action. Penalties for non-compliance may include license revocation, and/or monetary forfeitures of up to \$16,000 for each such violation or each day of a continuing violation, and up to \$112,500 for any single act or failure to act.

**Q14: For a relatively small increase in investment/costs, isn't strong consideration for multiple sites/towers reasonable, given the significantly reduced visual/aesthetic impact it would have compared to a single, large tower that drastically impacts the City's skyline and views, especially when the City is going to greater lengths to beautify its appearance?**

**Respondent - Emergency Management:**

- Based on the original cost estimates the differential between the budgeted amount of \$3.5M reflected an additional \$2.5M. Aesthetics should most certainly be a consideration; a redesign could result in at least two additional sites that may also have an aesthetic impact.

- In addition, the City Council has a fiduciary responsibility to the citizens of the entire City.

**Respondent - Kimball:**

- A system redesign for multiple sites is not a small cost. First the initial site assessments are required to select the optimum constellation of sites. The site assessments evaluate technical parameters required for the system to meet contracted performance standards, lease terms, and total cost of ownership for the city. Once the sites are selected the vendor can prepare a cost estimate for the revised design.

*See Question #2 for more detail regarding schedule delay and cost estimates.*

**Q15: If a multi-site system is feasible, couldn't part of Jim Barnett Park be considered? It seems some of the land there, north of the Christianland area, is high ground and might provide good coverage. After all, the City already owns the land, it is near a highway where there are already numerous tall towers and signs, and it does not decrease the residential home values in nearby neighborhoods. Also it is, I believe, zoned appropriately for this use.**

**Respondent - Emergency Management:**

- The area within Jim Barnett Park was included in the candidate sites for consideration. Any site that would be selected must be in a location that is served by infrastructure (i.e. electrical, phone, etc.). Jim Barnett Park is located in the far northeast section of the City and a tower at that location would not provide the standard of coverage for the southern end of the City of Winchester.

**Q16: How is it at all possible that City staff accepted the very misleading photos of the balloon test provided by the consultant? Anyone who has spent a few minutes in our city would recognize that those photos were not at all representative of a true "balloon test," and know that 5 yards lateral to any views would provide a significantly different sight of the balloon/tower.**

**Respondent - Emergency Management:**

- The balloon test was a requirement of the Virginia Department of Historical Resources (VDHR) and was focused on specific properties that were located in the Area of Potential Effect (APE) that are eligible for or listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The City did not request or require this test be performed.
- It is my understanding in reviewing the report that the specific places from where the photos taken were selected by Cultural Resources Inc. The determination of sites was determined by CRI in accordance with criteria of VDHR. The city did not request, was not consulted and had no input with regard to the test and/or acceptance of the test photos.

**Respondent - Kimball:**

- The balloon test was performed by an independent contractor hired by the radio vendor to ensure that the Jefferson St site tower will meet NEPA/SHPO compliance requirements. The photo requirements are specified by the agencies requesting their submittal.
- The city neither required, nor requested, the balloon test.

**Q17: Are you yet immediately applying for another waiver/extension of the mandate deadline, recognizing that to get this project correct it is likely to take longer than a few months?**

**Respondent - Emergency Management:**

- Yes, we are aware of and will be initiating a request to have the waiver extended. Regardless of the matters currently being discussed, the January 1, 2014 date cannot be met.

**Q18: Will these and similar citizen questions and inquiries be included in the public record, and answers by City Staff and Council be included as well?**

**Respondent - Emergency Management:**

- The direction provided identified that responses by City staff and technical consultants be posted on the City's website and distributed to Council.

**Q19. At any time, for any reason, could a fallout of emissions occur, the tower topple, or any air or ground be contaminated on any land not owned by the City of Winchester causing possible legal action against the City?**

**Respondent - Kimball:**

- In the event of a tower collapse, all radio emissions would cease and there are no hazardous materials involved in the radio project to produce air or ground contamination.

**Q20. With the erection of the tower, at any point in time, and for any legal or other reason, could the adjoining property owned by the Handley Board of Trustees be condemned and taken out of consideration as a possible site for the proposed construction of a new John Kerr Elementary School?**

**Respondent - Zoning:**

- From the Zoning Ordinance perspective, no development impacts would result as of the proposed location of the tower at 700 Jefferson Street. Zoning and Inspections staff has only seen one proposal for the existing John Kerr Elementary site which was presented during the Winchester Public School meeting on Monday, September 9, 2013. This proposal showed that no buildings or parking lot features would be within a 237-foot radius around the proposed tower.

- The City of Winchester has the legal authority to condemn property for public use. The proposed communication tower is a public use. The City's contractor, Motorola has identified the proposed site at 700 Jefferson Street as the best site for this facility. Therefore, the City has no interest in acquiring the adjacent property owned by the Handley Trust for this purpose.

**Q21. Does the single tower limit the footprint for the new John Kerr Elementary School?**

**Respondent - City Manager:**

- The proposed single tower located at 700 Jefferson Street does not restrict the proposed footprint of the proposed new John Kerr Elementary School as submitted on 7.12.2013 by SHOCKEY P3, LLC .

**Q22. Will construction of the tower, in any way, risk damage to or cause a rupture of the current water tower or reservoir?**

**Respondent - Utilities:**

- The construction of the tower will have only a very minimal risk to damage or rupture the existing water tanks. Since the contractor is well versed in this type of construction and will take the necessary precautions, no issues are anticipated.

**Q23. What is the City's level of confidence regarding the Hoe-Ram's impact on the water tower and reservoir?**

**Respondent - Utilities:**

- We are very confident that the construction will be completed without any damage to the water tanks. Appropriate staff will be present on site during the construction to monitor the tanks to ensure there are no damages created.

**Q24. Has there been a structural evaluation of both the water tower and reservoir in the last five years? If not, will this be done before construction begins?**

**Respondent - Utilities:**

- The water tanks are inspected every year by an outside contractor that specializes in water tank construction and maintenance.
- The most recent inspection reported that both the elevated ([February 19, 2013](#)) and ground mounted tanks ([October 25, 2012](#)) are in good condition and there are no structural issues that currently exist.

**Q25. Has the construction team drilled the site to determine what they will encounter underground?**

**Respondent - Motorola:**

- EIA standard 222-G requires soil testing for Class III (public safety) towers. Our contract includes soil testing (drilling) after the tower location has been approved. The soil testing (drilling) part of the process which is to be performed by our Site Team is pending the outcome of the conditional use permit currently being considered by City Council.
- We have had all existing buried utilities located and have determined that there are no existing buried pipes, cables, etc. that would be affected by construction of the tower.

**Q26. How deep are the footers for the radio tower?**

**Respondent - Motorola:**

- This tower implementation will utilize a “slab and pier” method to ensure the most secure installation. The final tower foundation design will be determined once the soil borings have been completed and examined by a structural engineer.
- EIA standard 222-G requires soil testing for Class III (mission critical) towers. Our contract includes soil testing (drilling) after the tower location has been approved. The results of the soil test will be used to design a foundation which is appropriate for the tower and soil conditions.
- Typical foundation design for normal soils uses a 35 ft square buried slab with three 4.5 foot diameter, 6 ft tall buried piers.

**Q27. Will dynamite be used in any way during any phase of the radio tower construction?**

**Respondent - Emergency Management:**

- This would not be an acceptable practice.

**Respondent - Utilities:**

- Explosives will not be used during the radio tower construction.

**Respondent - Motorola:**

- No dynamite will be used in the construction and installation of the proposed tower.

**Q28. If the John Kerr Elementary School is relocated and this property is to be sold (or used for other purposes), has there been an economic impact analysis regarding the possible negative impact the radio tower will have on potential resale value?**

**Respondent - City Manager:**

- No, such an analysis has not been conducted. Without a defined development plan such an analysis would be completely hypothetical.

**Q29. What other sites have been or can be considered that incorporates the radio tower's "drop zone" so that it does not overlap into LR, MR, HR, and all other zoning districts listed in 18-2-1.2 of the City's Zoning Ordinance?**

**Respondent - Zoning:**

- In addition to the Jefferson Street location, site analysis and propagation studies were performed at 231 E Piccadilly Street (Timbrook Public Safety Center), 799 Fairmont Avenue (National Fruit), and 1840 Amherst Street ([Winchester Medical Center](#)).
- Neither the Winchester Medical Center nor the National Fruit sites would conceptually have a fall zone radius that would overlap onto residentially zoned properties. Depending on placement of the tower on the Timbrook Public Safety Center location, properties in the HR or HR-1 zoning district could be overlapped by the radius.
- All but two of these overlapped parcels near the Timbrook Public Safety Center are currently developed by residential or institutional structures. The two remaining undeveloped parcels are nonconforming lots of records that could potentially be developed with single family residences. However, the Winchester Zoning Ordinance does not discuss a "drop zone" or "fall zone" requirement; it only discusses setback requirements for new towers proposed within a residentially zoned parcel.
- The Winchester Zoning Ordinance does not discuss a "drop zone" or "fall zone" requirement; it only discusses setback requirements for new towers proposed within a residentially zoned parcel.
- In an April 24, 2012 Zoning Interpretation, the Zoning Administrator stated that there is no maximum height or setback requirement outlined in the Zoning Ordinance for proposed towers in the Education, Institution, and Public Use (EIP) zoning district (include link to Interpretation document). The proposed tower site on 700 Jefferson Street is zoned EIP and as a result there is no maximum tower height or setback requirement from property lines.

**Q30. What percentage coverage would the City have using the backup versus the multiple site system should the single pole system fail?**

**Respondent - Motorola/Kimball:**

- The contingency plan in the event of a catastrophic failure of the Jefferson St tower invokes the use of the backup control stations to be located at the Timbrook Public Safety Center. Dual-band mobile coverage would be the same as currently exists when the city uses the Timbrook backup stations which are on-street coverage for the majority of the city. Out of range portable in-building coverage would be addressed using NIMS ICS-100 protocols and command mobile-relay.
- The mobile command vehicle deployment will supplement the Timbrook backup coverage.
- Propagation studies and performance specifications for the Timbrook backup system depend on the deployment of the mobile command vehicle and frequency band utilized. To determine the

coverage provided by the failure of a single site of a multi-site system will require a system design, defined sites, and propagation studies for specified design.

- We are unable to answer the question without additional information and design assumptions.

*Also see question #8.*

**Q31. Can the bid process be reopened for a short period to accommodate new suggestions for multiple towers?**

**(Respondent - Finance/Purchasing:**

- No, the bid process closed upon the signing of the contract.

**Q32. Will the City's current contractor/high bidder bill the City for time spent so far?**

**Respondent - Emergency Management:**

- Yes. Invoices for work rendered thus far have been processed and the payments have been made.

**Respondent - Motorola:**

- Implementing Public Safety communication systems is Motorola's core competency. We have thousands of accepted systems installed in the United States alone.
- A milestone payment schedule is part of our contract documentation. The City of Winchester and Motorola have agreed through negotiations to specific milestone payment terms.
- Motorola, once a task is completed and agreed to such by both parties, invoices the City for payment of the completed milestone task. Motorola has billed for milestones achieved.

**Respondent - Kimball:**

- Kimball bills for the consultant services that are rendered within the scope of the current contract.
- We are currently in the implementation phase of the public safety radio system project and have billed for the services provided to date.
- Kimball understands that a project may require services outside of the contract scope of work due to unforeseen circumstances in a project of this complexity.
- Kimball is available to provide additional services either as a change order to the existing contract, or on a time and materials basis, in order to assist the City of Winchester with modifications to and completion of the proposed radio project.

**Q33. Will the radio tower need to be enlarged to meet communication needs in the future?**

**Respondent - Emergency Management:**

- The system and infrastructure has been designed and engineered based on a minimum life expectancy of 25 years.
- The performance standard is based on recognized standards to meet current and future communications requirements.
- There is no indication the proposed communications tower would require enlargement in the future.

**Respondent - Kimball:**

- The proposed radio tower at Jefferson St. will not need to be modified to meet future Winchester public safety communications requirements. The radio system is designed to provide coverage for mission critical communications at the proposed height.
- Expansion of system capacity (the quantity of users) will not require any modification to the proposed tower.

**Q34. Exactly where will the radio tower be located on Jefferson Street?**

**Respondent - Emergency Management:**

- The proposed location of the tower will be within the city's utility compound located on the north side of Jefferson Street at the dead end of Jefferson. The proposed location of the tower within the utility compound will be between the elevated water tank and the ground reservoir with the base of the tower located approximately 25' – 30' west from the ground reservoir.
- There has been some discussion that the tower could be moved approximately 75' north of the originally proposed location but this has only been discussed.
- The proposed tower would be required to remain in the restricted identified area to maintain compliance with the FAA ruling.

**Q35. What impact, or influence, will the proposed communications tower location on the Jefferson Street site have on the City's decision for the future location of John Kerr Elementary School?**

**Respondent - City Manager:**

- The location of the communication tower at 700 Jefferson Street will not have any impact or influence on the site location decision related to a new John Kerr Elementary School.