

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL**

IN RE:

APPLICATION OF OPTASITE TOWERS LLC
AND OMNIPOINT COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL
COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR
THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND
OPERATION OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS
FACILITY AT 52 STADLEY ROUGH ROAD,
DANBURY, CONNECTICUT

DOCKET NO. 366

October 10, 2008

APPLICANTS' SUBMISSION OF SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Optasite Towers LLC and Omnipoint Communications (T-Mobile) (the "Applicants") respectfully submit this supplemental information in furtherance of the Applicants' Certificate Application and in response to certain public comments and resident submissions in this proceeding.

ALTERNATIVES SUGGESTED BY THE RESIDENTS AND THE CITY OF DANBURY

The Applicant's Certificate Application (Applicants' Exhibit 1) included a detailed analysis of the search for potential locations for the siting of the needed facility proposed in this Docket. The City of Danbury (the "City") and some residents suggested other locations for the siting of the needed facility. The resident suggested alternatives included maps with locations noted, however, specific addresses and/or property owner details were not provided.

The Applicant's offer the following comments on the City and resident suggested alternatives:

Resident Suggested Alternative 1:

This suggested location appears to be the location of a 9 to 12 lot residential subdivision by The Sycamore Trails Group. The subdivision plans for this property would preclude placement of a facility as there would not be sufficient space for a facility.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that a 140-foot tall monopole at this suggested location would have a significant visual impact. As detailed in the viewshed map of this alternative and report included in Exhibit A attached hereto, the year round visibility associated with a 140' tall facility at this location is estimated to be approximately 971 acres with approximately 97% of the views occurring on and/or immediately adjacent to Candlewood Lake.

As demonstrated in the Visual Resource Evaluation Report included in the Applicants' Certificate Application (Applicants' Exhibit 1, Tab 5), the proposed Facility is expected to be visible from approximately 25 acres with seasonal visibility from an additional 19 acres. The proposed Facility will not be visible from Candlewood Lake.

Clearly, a comparison of a facility at this suggested alternative and the proposed facility reveals that the suggested alternative will have a much greater visual impact. Indeed, the viewshed map of this alternative attached in Exhibit A demonstrates that the suggested alternative location will be visible to more residential areas as the densely populated residential areas along Candlewood Lake to the north and east will have views of a facility at this suggested location. Moreover, as noted in the City's submission of the 2006 Candlewood Lake Authority memo, a tower at this suggested location would have an impact to the scenic views from Candlewood Lake, while the proposed Facility will not.

Accordingly, based this analysis, it is respectfully submitted that this suggested alternative is not a feasible location for the siting of the needed wireless facility.

Resident Suggested Alternative 2:

Based on the limited information provided, this suggested location appears to be the site of an approximately 5,400 square-foot residence.

The viewshed map for this suggested alternative and visibility report attached in Exhibit A reveals that a facility at this location would also have a greater visual impact than the proposed Facility. Year round visibility of a facility at this suggested location would consist of an approximately 508 acre area, compared to an estimated 25 acre year round visibility area for the proposed Facility. A facility at this suggested location would be located near and visible from several residential areas, including residential areas located within the Huckleberry School area. Visibility is also expected from Candlewood Lake. As noted herein and demonstrated in Applicants' Exhibits, the proposed Facility will not be visible from Candlewood Lake.

As such, it is respectfully submitted that a facility at this suggested location is not feasible given the existing development of the property and the visual impact of a facility at this location.

Resident Suggested Alternatives 3 & 4:

Both of these suggested sites are located on or near the shore of Candlewood Lake. Suggestion 3 appears to be Lating Landing, property owned by the State of Connecticut that is improved with a boat launch. Suggestion 4 is also a marina and the size of this property is not sufficient for the placement of a wireless facility.

Clearly, as demonstrated in the viewshed maps and report attached as Exhibit A, a tower site at either of these locations would be visible to a greater number of residences than the Applicant's proposed tower given the density of existing development in this area. Indeed, approximately 90 residences are located within 1,000 feet of suggestion 3. Also, a tower at either of these locations would certainly be visible from Candlewood Lake, while the proposed facility would not have any visibility from Candlewood Lake. Therefore, as noted in the City's submission of the 2006 Candlewood Lake Authority memo, a tower at either of these suggested locations would have an impact to the scenic views from Candlewood Lake, while the proposed facility will not.

For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that a tower facility at either of these suggested locations is not feasible.

Resident Suggested Alternatives 5 & 6:

Based on the map locations provided, these suggested locations appear to be City owned properties. A review of detailed aerial photos and topographic maps indicates that the property at the suggestion 5 location is characterized by steep slopes and dense vegetation. As such, significant cut and fill and vegetation removal would be required for construction at this location. Suggestion 6 is also characterized by slopes and construction of a significant access drive would also be required at this location. In comparison, the proposed Facility would require minimum cut and fill.

Visibility of a facility at either of these suggested locations would impact views from Candlewood Lake as shown in the attached viewshed maps and report in Exhibit A. As indicated therein, the visibility of a facility at these suggested locations would be similar to the visual impact of a facility at location 8 as shown in the Johnson property viewshed map. This analysis demonstrates that a facility at suggested location 5 or 6 would be visible from a much larger area than the proposed Facility.

Given the topographic challenges of these suggested locations and the greater visual impact of a facility at either of these locations, it is respectfully submitted that neither location is a suitable location for the siting of the needed facility.

Resident Suggested Alternative 7 and City's Suggested Location: Johnson Property

The resident suggested alternative 7 appears to also be the City's suggested alternative of the Johnson property. This property is characterized by steep slopes and dense vegetation. Accordingly, significant cut and fill and clearing in the vicinity of Candlewood Lake would be required for the installation of a facility on this property, as opposed to the proposed facility, which requires minimum cut and fill.

Moreover, the Johnson property is landlocked and the only practical access to the Johnson property is via the adjacent Federal Correctional Prison property. It is our understanding that a recorded easement does not currently exist for access to this property.

Also, as shown in the viewshed map for the Johnson property and visual report attached in Exhibit A, a facility at this suggested location would have greater visual impacts than the proposed Facility. A tower at the Johnson property would be visible from Candlewood Lake and from several residential areas located to the northwest, southwest, southeast and east of the location. Visibility from a tower at this location would cover approximately 391 acres, compared to expected year round visibility of 25 acres for the proposed Facility.

Given the construction challenges of the Johnson property, the fact that it is landlocked and the greater visual impact to the community than the proposed Facility, it is respectfully submitted that the Johnson property is not a suitable location for the siting of the needed facility.

Resident Suggested Alternative 8:

This location appears to be the location of the Federal Correctional Prison. As noted in Applicants' Exhibit 5, Response Number 2, it is generally known that this property is not available for use.

Moreover, a facility at this location that could accommodate a wireless telecommunications installation would have a significant visual impact. As detailed in the visual analysis included in Exhibit A, the visual impact of a facility at this suggested location would be similar to the visual impact shown in the Johnson property viewshed, which is a greater impact than the expected visibility of the proposed Facility.

For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that this suggested location is not feasible for the siting of the needed Facility.

VISUAL INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE RESIDENTS

A core group of residents conducted a balloon float at the site and submitted its photos taken during this balloon float. The residents claim that their photos show greater visibility of the proposed facility than the Visual Evaluation Report and analysis conducted by VHB. See Applicants' Exhibit 1, Tab 5. As the Siting Council is aware, VHB conducts its visual resource analysis using both computer modeling and in-field verification. As detailed VHB's Visual Resource Analysis Report, a series of constraints are applied to the computer model to achieve an accurate viewshed visibility analysis.

For the reasons detailed in the visual report and diagram attached hereto as Exhibit A, it is respectfully submitted that the visual study and analysis performed by VHB accurately represents the anticipated visibility of the proposed facility and that the residents' visual analysis was not an accurate representation.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING THE PUBLIC NEED FOR THE PROPOSED FACILITY

The City submitted information regarding its claim that the proposed facility is not needed to provide reliable wireless service in this area of Danbury. The City's information contained a chart that noted a series of "OK" results for a spot "drive test". For the following reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the City's information is not an accurate analysis of the need for a facility in this area to provide reliable wireless service.

The City's spot "drive test" lacks several pieces of data that would be required for it to be a useful and accurate drive test. The act of pressing send and waiting for a call to be connected does not indicate any meaningful information of the quality and reliability of the call. After the call is established and a talk channel is obtained, there are many factors that affect that call. These factors include signal strength, signal quality and the ability for a dominant server to be located in a given coverage area. The City's "drive test" information provides no additional information other than establishing a connection with a serving sector at the extreme edge of its coverage potential.

T-Mobile has driven the area surrounding Stadley Rough Road, as it does continually throughout the year, to confirm the existing status of its network. T-Mobile's drive was performed with an external receive antenna to remove any route directionality or vehicle environmental variables to establish this baseline. These results are therefore a best case scenario since it ultimately represents the signal level of the on street coverage that T-Mobile has in this area. T-Mobile's latest drive data is provided in Applicants' Exhibit 5, T-Mobile Response Numbers 7, 8 & 14.

This data, as post processed and reviewed by T-Mobile's RF Engineers, verifies that the existing signal environment in this area is far below the T-Mobile minimum design threshold of -84 dBm, even at the on street level without adding the losses associated with being inside a vehicle. At levels below this minimum design threshold, it becomes increasingly difficult to maintain a high signal quality, especially when the terrain of the objective area is elevated and susceptible to many external interfering sources. Low signal quality and receive strength such as this, coupled with the fact that there are several serving sectors converging on this area, yield a coverage scenario that is plagued by multiple handovers, or ping ponging, between several serving sectors with low signal quality which leads to an environment rich in dropped calls both on the commercial voice and data traffic as well as E-911 calls placed within this footprint.

It is respectfully submitted that the data provided clearly demonstrates a need for the Facility proposed in this Docket.

ZONING AND SAFETY CONCERNS RAISED BY THE CITY AND THE RESIDENTS

Wetlands: Applicants' Exhibit 4 includes a Wetlands and Watercourse Delineation Report that demonstrates that the proposed facility is not a regulated activities and that there will be no adverse impacts on wetlands in the area. Also, as noted in Applicants' Exhibit 5, Response Number 20, pursuant to judicial decisions of the United States Second Circuit Court of Appeals and the Courts of the State of Connecticut, no local zoning, wetlands or other land use permits are required for the proposed facility.

Lightning Strikes: Attached hereto in Exhibit B is an explanation of the monopole grounding system for lightning protection. Also enclosed is a diagram of the lightning protection design. As detailed therein, the monopole grounding system ensures that no damage or loss would result in the remote event of a lightning strike.

Noise and Fall Zone: As detailed in Applicants' Exhibit 5, Response Number 15, the proposed facility is not expected to have any noise impact to surrounding properties. Optasite is willing to comply with a condition of Siting Council approval to enclose the equipment area with noise dampening materials, if deemed necessary.

Also, please see Applicants' Exhibit 5, Response Number 5, which notes that the proposed monopole is designed with a yielding point that would reduce the radius of the "fall zone" in the highly unlikely event of a failure.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this day, an original and twenty copies of Optasite's and T-Mobile's supplemental submission were served on the Connecticut Siting Council by overnight mail and an electronic copy sent via email with a copy via overnight mail and electronic mail to:

City of Danbury
Laslo L. Pinter, Esq.
Robin L. Edwards, Esq.
City of Danbury
Office of the Corporation Counsel
155 Deer Hill Avenue
Danbury, Connecticut 06810
(203) 797-4518
R.Edwards@ci.danbury.ct.us
L.Pinter@ci.danbury.ct.us

Dated: October 10, 2008



Lucia Chiochio

cc: Charles Regulbuto
Hans Fiedler
Hollis Redding
Christopher B. Fisher, Esq.
Paul Lusitani
Michael Libertine