

**Latah County Planning Commission**  
Minutes, 13 December 2000

Planning Commission [PC] Members: Skyler Schlueter [SS], John Hunt [JDH], Suvia Judd [SJ],  
Kathleen Warnick [KW], James Hagedorn [JH], Janet Hohle [JanH], Louise Barber [LB];  
Planning Director, Gerard Billington [GB]

**Present/Absent:** SS, KW, SJ, JDH, JH, LB present; JanH, absent. Staff: GB, S. Moberly, Michelle Fuson (newly with the Planning Department). Present in the audience: Don Morse

**Packet materials:** agenda; minutes from 11-8-00 and 11-30-00 public meeting; draft of wireless telecommunications ordinance.

**Additional handouts:** letters from Wayne and Annette Olson

**Meeting:**

SS opened the meeting; minutes of 11/8/00 and 11/30/00 passed with minor corrections. GB then introduced the draft ordinance. Questions about safety/aesthetic proximity to neighbors in the cases of both existing structures and towers; 150% of height of tower not good enough; 2000 feet floated. GB reminded PC that we cannot require higher (standards) than FCC RF emission standards, therefore our only issue is aesthetics. What about distance from existing structure/antenna? 2000 feet. Questioned if neighbors could be notified at application stage? PC loosely decided that 2000 feet was good idea for administrative approval, but the ZC should have discretionary flexibility.

JH brought up the three wind generators in the Potlatch vicinity that are ca. 150 feet high and have caused no problem; problem exists in his view that towers for whatever purpose should be regulated uniformly. GB: these are not permitted uses and a potential problem; will investigate.

Returning to wireless telecommunications, SJ suggested that the ZC should have 1000 feet or 150% of height of tower or whichever is greater. Regarding fencing; six-foot fence preferred over higher; signage should be required, no larger than 3 sq. ft, with name and telephone number of service provider.

SJ: "other limiting factors that render existing antenna support structures or alternative antenna support structures [are] unsuitable" (f in 11.05.04) a potential loophole; can cost be a factor? Yes. Determined that ZC would be able to handle these factors.

Returning to distance question, SM suggested that 2000 feet from existing structures/antennae would probably have the effect of sending providers after CUP for towers; implication that we might be being too restrictive. PC decided that 1000 feet was more prudent for distance from existing structures/antennae to residences or commercial buildings, 150% of height from roads, property lines, and 2000 feet distance to residences and commercial buildings from towers, 150% of tower height from roads, property lines, with suggested ZC discretion. Co-location could occur on existing structures, but would require a permit for any change.

Suggested that documentation from 11.05.04 should become a part of required documentation in 11.05.05. SS questioned maximum wattage output; GB: County cannot limit wattage; that is the jurisdiction of the FCC; lien explained (is against the entire property, not merely the piece of property that tower sits on; applicant understands this at the application stage and signs off on it).

Does the FCC do inspections/reviews? No. County should be responsible via independent third-party inspector. Suggested that along with the annual registration fee, there be an annual review fee to cover the costs of this necessary review and inspection. SS will inquire from radio tower operators just who is available to county for this purpose. Costs of inspection could be considerable and should be borne by provider/tower renter. Property taxes cover only county services; this is separate cost.

Misdemeanor or some other penalty might be considered for 11.05.11 (Failure to comply). Suggested that term throughout the ordinance be “wireless telecommunication(s).”

Don Morse invited to comment: He had read that permissible radiation levels in Moscow, Russia are lower than levels in Moscow, Idaho; also complimented the PD/PC for its serious consideration of this issue.

Next meeting, 16 January 2001 at 5:30pm, County Courthouse, 2-B. The new times for PC meetings are the first and third Tuesdays each month at 5:30 pm.

Submitted by: \_\_\_\_\_ 5 December 2000  
Louise D. Barber