



VIA E-MAIL

December 10, 2003

City of Rapid City Planning Department

Attn: Todd Tucker
300 Sixth Street
Rapid City, SD 57701

**RE: Additional Information on Coverage
Verizon Wireless**

Dear Todd,

This letter pertains to the conversation we had earlier this morning. I was asking why there was a need for examples of site drawings for an existing stealth tower. As with many things, no two towers are the same and there are many different factors with relation to each tower site.

I believe that the main issue regarding this particular tower was in respect to capabilities for co-location on the two kinds of towers being discussed. More specifically, the advantage the traditional tower has over the stealth design. It is true that both towers would allow for co-location by other carriers. However, a stealth design would 1) limit the types and number of antennas that could be used by future co-locators/carriers and 2) would limit the types and numbers of antennas Verizon Wireless would be able to add in the future to the site as needed.

If Verizon Wireless were required to construct a stealth flagpole on this site, there would be no immediate impact upon coverage. The concern would lie with the availability of space for future co-locators/carriers. If a carrier were required by zoning to co-locate on the tower, they would be limited as to what kind of antennas to use and the number of antennas that could be used. Many carriers would shy away from this type of tower due to these limitations. Additionally, there would only be so much room within the inside of the pole to put antennas up. Co-locators would have to use special or different types of antennas to make sure they could fit enough in to get the coverage they desire. The possibility also exists that there would not be enough room to run the proper amount of coax cable needed to connect the antennas (since Verizon Wireless would have already run a substantial amount of cable through the pole for their equipment).

RECEIVED

DEC 11 2003

**Rapid City
Planning Department**

The issue becomes even more complicated if an additional (third) carrier would be required to co-locate on this tower. The complications would remain the same, but the solutions would become fewer and much harder to implement.

The second issue ties into the first one understandably. If at some time in the future, Verizon Wireless would need to install more antennas in the tower due to growth in Rapid City and the need to handle a larger volume of calls, it would most likely not be possible. All of the room inside the pole will have been used and even if there were room left, Verizon Wireless would run into the same problem of needing a different kind of antenna to be able to fit the space available inside the pole. Either way the City runs the risk of seeing another wireless carrier requesting approval to construct another tower much sooner than it anticipated due to the limitations the stealth pole would create.

While construction costs for both towers would run about the same amount, the main issue lies with the ability to utilize the tower to the fullest extent. Chances are if a stealth tower would be constructed, it would only serve the purpose of being aesthetically pleasing, while making the chance greater for more tower requests to be put before the City.

Thank you the opportunity to present this additional information to you.

Sincerely,

Danielle M. Epp
MegaCom

enclosures

cc: Mark Maenner, MegaCom w/ enclosures

RECEIVED

DEC 11 2003

**Rapid City
Planning Department**