# STATE OF CONNECTICUT <br> CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL 

IN RE:
APPLICATION OF HOMELAND TOWERS, LLC AND
DOCKET NO. 499
NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC d/b/a AT\&T
FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE

May 11, 2021
CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND
OPERATION OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS
FACILITY AT 16 COOTE HILL ROAD, TOWN OF SHERMAN, CONNECTICUT

## RESPONSES OF HOMELAND TOWERS, LLC AND NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC d/b/a AT\&T TO CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL PRE-HEARING INTERROGATORIES SET ONE <br> General

Q1. Referring to Application pp. 7-8 and Attachment 13, of the letters sent to abutting property owners, how many certified mail receipts were received? If any receipts were not returned, which owners did not receive their notice? Were any additional attempts made to contact those property owners?

A1. Certified mail receipts were sent to all abutting property owners and all but two certified mail receipts were received. The Applicant re-sent notice to these two abutting property owners by first class mail on March 29, 2021. A copy of this mailing is included in Attachment 1.

Q2. Referring to Application pp. 26-27, how is the construction cost of the facility recovered for both Homeland and AT\&T?

A2. For Homeland, the cost of tower construction is recovered through rent from tenants that utilize the tower/facility. For AT\&T, costs are recovered as part of business operations for their customers.

Q3. Referring to Application p. 25, how many residences attended the November 21, 2020, public video conference What concerns were raised by residents and town officials and how were these concerns addressed?

A3. Twenty-three (23) residents spoke at the November 21, 2020 public video conference with a majority speaking in favor of the tower, including First Selectman Don Lowe. The Board of Selectman conducted the meeting and were there to listen. Some concerns raised by residents who attended this meeting were: perceived health effects, visual impacts, use of and impacts to Coote Hill Rd, lack of cell service to make 911 calls and lack of reliable cell signal for wireless home security systems. The Applicants addressed some of these concerns by stating a health and safety report had been included with the application and the site will operate within FCC guidelines, a balloon test will be publicly noticed providing residents the opportunity to view firsthand
locations where the balloon may and may not be visible, the Applicants have the legal right for the use of Coote Hill Rd and public safety/911 calls along with wireless security systems will become much more reliable with the installation of the proposed facility.

## Site Search

Q4. Identify the approximate center and radius of the site search area.
A4. Please see the map enclosed in Attachment 2 for the site search area.
Q5. Application Attachment 2, p. 2 AT\&T obtained a lease for a property at 32 Leach Hollow Road in 2009. Is this property still a viable candidate for a tower facility? Who objected to a tower in this location?

A5. This site received heavy community opposition based on visual impacts, so AT\&T opted to pursue a better site at 16 Coote Hill Rd which has less of a visual impact to the community. In addition, in Homeland's discussions with both the prior and current First Selectman it was recommended by the Town that a site not be pursued at 32 Leach Holl Road due to the previous history.

Q6. Application Attachment 2, p. 2 states 7 of 9 possible candidate sites were rejected by AT\&T's RF engineers. What heights were modeled in these locations?

A6. AT\&T analyzed the following possible candidate sites included in Application Attachment 2 at the same antenna centerline height as the proposed facility: $166^{\prime}$ AGL:

> Sites 13 \& 14: o Route 37 South
> Site 22: o Mauweehoo Road
> Site 23: o Wagon Wheel Road
> Site 24: 104 Route 37 South
> Site 25: o Wakeman Hill Road
> Site 31: Wagon Wheel Road

Q7. The summary for Site \#28 (o Route 37 South, Sherman) states the site was rejected due to extensive wetlands on the site property. What is the estimated impact to wetlands to develop a tower facility?

A7. Please see the map included in Attachment 3, which shows the extensive wetlands on this parcel preventing development of a tower.

Q8. Referring to Application p. 22, did the Sherman Telecommunications Committee determine there was a need for reliable town-wide communications coverage or wireless carrier coverage?

A8. Yes, please see the map included in Attachment 4, which is the Town of Sherman Wireless Telecommunications Coverage Assessment prepared by the Siting Council in 2014. This map confirmed for the Sherman Telecommunication Committee (STC) that there is no wireless carrier coverage in southern Sherman. The STC was formed to bring reliable cell service in particular to southern Sherman. Whereas the northern portion of Sherman has reliable cell service due to existing infrastructure, the southern
portion and the arteries of Route 37 and Route 39 South have no reliable service. The lack of cell service in the southern portion of Sherman creates a serious safety issue. The Town of Sherman is split in two... the northern end of Sherman has service on both Routes 37 and Route 39. There is no reliable service on Routes 37/39 south from the Town Center, and as you continue south on these roads there is no service. In southern Sherman there are two large communities... one is Timber Trails - 150 home owners and Deer Run Shores with 100 home owners. Combining these two communities and other homes in the Route 37 / Route 39 corridor there are approximately 800 home owners with no cellular capability. In November 2014 the Department of Transportation ("DOT") reported that the total traffic traveling north and south on Routes 37 and 39 was a combined value of 10,900 cars/trucks daily on Routes 37 and 39. The Sherman portion of Routes 37 and 39 is a major conduit for supplies and materials being delivered to the northern portion of Fairfield County, and Litchfield County.

## Site/tower

Q9. Would any blasting be required to develop the site?
A9. Homeland does not anticipate the need for blasting to construct the proposed Facility. The geotechnical investigation will evaluate subsurface conditions. If ledge is encountered, chipping is preferred to blasting. If blasting were required, an appropriate protocol would be followed in accordance with state and municipal regulations.

Q10. What measures are proposed for the site to ensure security and deter vandalism? (Including alarms, gates, locks, anti-climb fence design, etc.)

A10. The tower and related equipment would be surrounded by an eight-foot-tall security fence and a locked gate. AT\&T's radio equipment cabinets are equipped with silent intrusion alarms. If someone attempts to tamper with or break-in to the cabinet, cell site technicians monitoring the site will be alerted and local police will be contacted.

Q11. Would the tower have a galvanized gray finish?
A11. Yes, the tower will have a galvanized gray finish.
Q12. Pursuant to CGS $\S 16-50 \mathrm{p}(\mathrm{a})(3)(\mathrm{G})$, identify the safety standards and/or codes by which equipment, machinery or technology that would be used or operated at the proposed facility.

A12. The applicable safety standards include:

- 2015 International Building Code with the 2018 CT Building Code Amendments
- National Electric Code (NFPA70)
- 2005 CT State Fire Safety Code with the 2009 Amendments
- TIA-222-G-4 "Structural Standards for Steel Antenna Towers and Antenna Supporting Structures"
- Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA).


## Coverage/Capacity

Q13. Application Attachment 7 indicates other frequencies will be installed in addition to the 700 MHz frequency. Does the 700 MHz frequency act as the "base frequency" of the network where most of the wireless traffic occurs? How do the other frequencies interact in AT\&T's wireless system?

A13. The 700 MHz frequency has the best propagation characteristics of all the spectrum available to AT\&T and its coverage defines the "footprint" of the AT\&T wireless network. The other frequencies ( $850 \mathrm{MHz}, 1900 \mathrm{MHz}, 2100 \mathrm{MHz}$ and 2300 MHz ) serve to augment the capacity of the network. By serving as many "close-in" customers as possible, they also minimize the number of customers the 700 MHz network must serve and maximize its geographic reach.

Q14. Would the proposed antennas be capable of offering 5 G services or would new antenna be required to transmit 5 G once this service is deployed in this area?

A14. AT\&T delivers two methods of 5 G service:

- AT\&T 5G, using low-band spectrum (700 MHZ, $850 \mathrm{MHz}, 1900 \mathrm{MHz}, 2100 \mathrm{MHz}$ and 2300 MHz )
- AT\&T $5 G+$, which is broadband $5 G$ delivered via millimeter wave spectrum (24 GHz to 39 GHz ).

The antennas that will be installed at the proposed site will support 5 G in the low-band spectrum. The antennas that will be installed at the proposed site do not support the millimeter wave spectrum where broadband $5 G+$ operates.

Q15. Referring to Attachment 1, p. 5, how may many miles of new coverage would the facility provide to State Route 37 and State Route 39?

A15. The facility as proposed would provide new coverage to approximately 2.4 miles of State Route 37 and approximately 2.8 miles of State Route 39.

Q16. Can coverage objectives be met by installing antennas at a lower tower height? Identify the lowest possible antenna height and describe how this height would affect coverage needs and/or capacity relief within the service area.

A16. AT\&T's objective, particularly with respect to FirstNet service, is to maximize the coverage achievable from this site. Any reduction in centerline height would reduce the coverage of the site. Even at the proposed height, the tower would not fill every coverage gap in Sherman. Reducing the height of the tower would also reduce the coverage achievable by collocators, possibly necessitating the construction of more towers than would be needed if the tower were constructed at the proposed height. This would be contrary to the Siting Council's statutory obligation to minimize the proliferation of towers.

Q17. Can flush-mounted antennas be installed at the site to provide the required coverage? Describe any antenna/tower modifications that would be required to achieve coverage objectives.

A17. Due to the space constraints of flush-mounting antennas, AT\&T would require at least 2 ten-foot sections of the tower for its facility. In all likelihood, subsequent collocators on the tower would also need to occupy 2 ten-foot sections of the tower. This would significantly reduce the antenna centerlines of the collocators and limit their ability to achieve the necessary coverage from this tower.

Q18. The application states the tower site was relocated to the west to avoid impacts to Statelisted species. How would lowering the tower elevation from 902 feet above mean sea level to 878 feet above mean sea level affect AT\&T's coverage objectives?

A18. The tower location shift at the Site did not materially impact AT\&T's coverage objective.

Q19. How would the tower relocation to a lower elevation affect emergency communication services provided by Litchfield County Dispatch?

A19. Litchfield County Dispatch states "lowering the elevation 24" will have minimal effect on performance".

Q20. Were any studies conducted on the Town's wireless service requirements? Is it necessary to install the municipal antennas at the top of the tower?

A20. Yes. The Town's consultant for municipal wireless services is conducting an analysis of the Town's requirements and has indicated that it is necessary for the town's municipal antenna to be located at the top of the tower.

Q21. Referring to Application p. 4, provide a copy of the Radio Communications System Analysis \& Recommendation Report prepared by RCC Consultants, Inc. dated January 15, 2013.

A21. Included in Attachment 5 is a copy of the Radio Communications System Analysis \& Recommendation Report prepared by RCC Consultants, Inc. for the Town of Sherman, dated September 26, 2013.

Q22. Referring to Application p. 22, provide documentation from the Sherman Telecommunications Committee that confirmed the need for reliable wireless service in the Town.

A22. Please see the March 15, 2021 letter from the Sherman Telecommunications Committee included in Attachment 6.

Q23. Besides AT\&T, have any other wireless carriers expressed an interest in co-locating on the proposed facility? If so, provide documentation of their request.

A23. Yes. Please see email correspondence from Alejandro Restrepo, Senior Manager RF Design- Verizon, expressing their interest in collocating on the proposed facility included in Attachment 7.

## Backup Power

Q24. The Application narrative and sound study describe a propane fueled generator; however, the site plans depict a diesel-fueled generator. Please clarify and submit revised site plans, if necessary.

A24. Please see the revised Site Plans included in Attachment 8 which depict the propane fueled generator described in the sound study provided in the Application.

Q25. What would be the respective run time for the proposed generator before it would need to be refueled, assuming it is running at full load under normal conditions?

A25. The 500 gallon propane tank will supply approximately 112 hours of backup runtime for the 15 kw generator before refueling is required.

## Public Safety

Q26. Would the proposed facility support text-to-911 service? Is additional equipment required for this purpose?

A26. Yes, the proposed Facility will support text-to-911 service and no additional equipment is required.

Q27. Describe the additional equipment necessary to operate FirstNet services.
A27. FirstNet services will be supported by the equipment already proposed for the facility. No additional equipment is necessary. FirstNet operates on spectrum known as Band 14. Band 14 is part of the 700 MHz band that all the major wireless operators use in their networks. This specific portion of the 700 MHz spectrum is deployed by AT\&T as part of the FirstNet Public-Private Partnership. Under normal circumstances, this spectrum is available to both public safety users and AT\&T customers, but priority is given to public safety use. In the case of a major emergency, the entire Band 14 can be dedicated to public safety users. If Band 14 is dedicated to public safety users, 700 MHz Band 5/12 will still be available to non-public-safety AT\&T customers.

Q28. Why was the proposed site selected for FirstNet deployment?
A28. AT\&T and the state of Connecticut agreed upon Sherman knowing that coverage was lacking in the area; that the two state highways through the rural town were the scenes of numerous crashes; and the popularity of recreation opportunities in the area all pointed to the need for increased coverage for emergency responders.

## Environment

Q29. Referring to Application p. 19, was a response received from the State Historic Preservation Office? If so, please provide.

A29. Yes. In a letter dated April 12, 2021, the SHPO concurred that no historic properties will be affected by the proposed Facility. See the SHPO determination letter included in Attachment 9.

Q3o. Referring to Attachment 5, Environmental Assessment Statement, p. 3 states, "It is noteworthy that when a 170 foot tall facility was previously proposed on the parcel in 2013, the SHPO determined that there would be no historic properties affected." Please submit the SHPO determination letter.

A30. The 2013 SHPO Determination Letter dated August 5, 2013 is included in Attachment 10.

Q31. Was a preliminary assessment and/or determination letter from DEEP NDDB received when a 170 foot tall facility was previously proposed on the parcel in 2013? If so, please submit the letter(s).

A31. Yes, please see the 2013 SHPO Determination Letter dated August 5, 2013 is included in Attachment 10.

Q32. Referring to Application Attachment 10, provide a map or aerial image that shows the slimy salamander conservation zones and the proposed limits of disturbance.

A32. Please see the Slimy Salamander Conservation Zones map included in Attachment 11.
Q33. Referring to Application Attachment 8 - Visibility Assessment, revise Table 1 on pp. 5-6 to include a column that estimates how much of the tower is visible in each photograph (in feet).

A33. The table included in Attachment 12 titled "CSC Docket No. 499 - Interrogatory \#33" includes a column with the estimated height above the treeline that the proposed tower could be visible on a year-round or seasonal basis. These heights represent a range of potential visibility that characterize the estimated heights above the treeline from locations within the vicinity of the photographs, not just the static point from which the photo was taken. The height estimates only pertain to the tower structure and do not include the proposed 20' municipal whip antenna (which is typically not discernable at distances greater than 0.25 mile away). Please note that, Photo locations 28 and 33 do not extend above a treeline.

Q34. Referring to Application Attachment 8 - Visibility Assessment, estimate the number of homes that would have seasonal and/or year-round views within 0.5 miles of the proposed facility.

A34. One home is estimated to have year-round views within 0.5 mile of the proposed Facility, which is the property owner's residence at 16 Coote Hill Road. The estimated number of homes that would have seasonal views within 0.5 miles of the proposed facility is 5 .

Q35. Referring to Application Attachment 8 - Visibility Assessment, how many residences are in the area of Photo 29 that would have a similar view as shown in the photo?

A35. Two residential properties and the Lake Mauweehoo Club property will likely have similar views as shown in Photo 29.

Q36. Would the proposed facility be visible from any Town-designated scenic roads within two-miles of the site?

A36. Both seasonal and year-round views are expected along an approximate o.5-mile stretch of Route 39 North to the northeast of the proposed Facility. No visibility is predicted along the remaining Town-designated scenic roads (Cozier Hill Road, Briggs Hill Road, Spring Lake Road, and Orange Pepper Road).

Q37. Would the project require a DEEP Stormwater Permit? If so, do the proposed stormwater controls conform to the requirements of the Stormwater Permit?

A37. Yes. Since the limit of disturbance exceeds 1 acre this project will require a DEEP Stormwater Permit. The stormwater controls depicted on the drawings conform to the requirements of the Stormwater Permit.

Q38. Please submit photographic site documentation with notations linked to the site plans or a detailed aerial image that identifies locations of site-specific and representative site features. The submission should include photographs of the site from public road(s) or publicly accessible area(s) as well as Site-specific locations depicting site features including, but not necessarily limited to, the following locations as applicable:

For each photo, please indicate the photo viewpoint direction and stake or flag the locations of site-specific and representative site features. Site-specific and representative site features include, but are not limited to, as applicable:

1. wetlands, watercourses and vernal pools;
2. forest/forest edge areas;
3. agricultural soil areas;
4. sloping terrain;
5. proposed stormwater control features;
6. nearest residences;
7. Site access and interior access road(s);
8. tower location/compound;
9. clearing limits/property lines;
10. mitigation areas; and
11. any other noteworthy features relative to the Project.

A photolog graphic must accompany the submission, using a site plan or a detailed aerial image, depicting each numbered photograph for reference. For each photo, indicate the photo location number and viewpoint direction, and clearly identify the locations of site specific and representative site features shown (e.g., physical staking/flagging or other means of marking the subject area).

The submission shall be delivered electronically in a legible portable document format (PDF) with a maximum file size of <20MB. If necessary, multiple files may be submitted and clearly marked in terms of sequence.

A38. Please see the Remote Field Review photo documentation reports included in Attachment 13.

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this day the foregoing was sent electronically and one hard copy via first class mail to the Connecticut Siting Council.

Dated: May 11, 2021

Lucia Chiocchio, Esq.
Cuddy \& Feder LLP
445 Hamilton Ave, $14^{\text {th }}$ Floor
White Plains, NY 10601
(914)-761-1300
cc: Manny Vicente, Homeland Towers
Ray Vergati, Homeland Towers
Harry Carey, AT\&T
Brian Leyden, AT\&T
Christopher B. Fisher, Esq., Cuddy \& Feder LLP
Kristen Motel, Esq., Cuddy \& Feder LLP
APT
C Squared

## ATTACHMENT 1

Lucia Chiocchio, Esq.<br>lchiocchio@cuddyfeder.com

March 29, 2021

## VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL

Steve M. Quaranto
Loretta Quaranto
14 Coote Hill Road
Sherman, CT 06784
Re: Homeland Towers, LLC ("Homeland Towers") and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC ("AT\&T")
Wireless Telecommunications Tower Facility 16 Coote Hill Road, Sherman, Connecticut

Dear Mr. and Ms. Quaranto:
Our office previously attempted to contact you on behalf of our clients, Homeland Towers, LLC and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC, with respect to the above-referenced matter. A certified return receipt envelope was sent to your attention on March 3, 2021 but a signed receipt was not returned. The address listed for you corresponds with the records on file with the Town of Sherman's Assessor's Office as an owner of property abutting the subject parcel detailed in the attached notice. This letter along with a copy of the notice sent on March 3, 2021, is being sent via first class mail in the hope that this method may be successful in reaching you.

If you have any questions concerning this information, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Very truly yours,


Lucia Chiocchio

Enclosures
cc: Kristen Motel, Esq.

March 3, 2021
VIA CERTIFIED MAIL/

## RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

STEVE M. QUARANTO
LORETTA QUARANTO
14 COOTE HILL ROAD
SHERMAN, CT 06784
Re: Homeland Towers, LLC ("Homeland Towers") and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC ("AT\&T")
Wireless Telecommunications Tower Facility
16 Coote Hill Road, Sherman, Connecticut
Dear Mr. and Ms. Quaranto:
We are writing on behalf of our clients Homeland Towers, LLC ("Homeland Towers") and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC ("AT\&T") with respect to the above referenced matter and our clients' intent to file an application with the State of Connecticut Siting Council ("CSC") for approval of a proposed wireless communications tower (the "Facility") within the Town of Sherman.

State Law requires that record owners of property abutting a parcel on which a facility is proposed be sent notice of an applicant's intent to file an application with the CSC. The Facility is proposed to be constructed at 16 Coote Hill Road, identified as Map 51, Lot 28 on the Town of Sherman Tax Map. We are writing to you to provide notice as you are an abutting neighbor to 16 Coote Hill Road. The Facility is proposed within a 5,625 square-foot lease area in the southwestern portion of the parcel. The Facility consists of a new self-supporting monopole $170^{\prime}$ in height within a 2,400 square foot fenced equipment compound. AT\&T will install antennas at a centerline height of approximately $166^{\prime}$ above grade level as well as unmanned equipment and an emergency backup generator within the fenced equipment compound. Access to the Facility would be provided from Coote Hill Road over the existing paved driveway a distance of approximately 415', then along a new 12 ' wide gravel access drive approximately 1,635 ' to the tower compound. Please see the notice included with this letter.

The location, height and other features of the Facility are subject to review and potential change by the CSC under the provisions of Connecticut General Statutes $\S 16-50$ g et seq.

If you have any questions concerning this application, please contact the CSC or the undersigned after March 12, 2021, the date which the application is expected to be on file.

Very truly yours,


Lucia Chiocchio
Enclosure
cc: Kristen Motel, Esq.

## NOTICE

NOTICE IS HERBY GIVEN, pursuant to Section $16-50$ g et seq. of the Connecticut General Statutes, as amended, and Section 16-50j-1 et seq. of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, as amended, of the intent of Homeland Towers, LLC ("Homeland Towers") and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC ("AT\&T") (together the "Applicants") to file an Application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need with the Connecticut Siting Council ("Siting Council") on or after March 12, 2021 to construct a wireless telecommunications tower facility ("Facility") at 16 Coote Hill Road in the Town of Sherman.

The Facility is proposed on a 19.87 -acre parcel of land owned by Michael J. and Suzanne J. Berger identified as Map 51, Lot 28 on the Town of Sherman Tax Map and includes an approximately 5,625 square-foot lease area in the southwestern section of the parcel.
The Facility consists of a new self-supporting monopole that is $170^{\prime}$ in height located within a 2,400 square-foot fenced equipment compound within the 5,625 square- foot lease area. AT\&T's antennas would be installed at a centerline height of approximately $166^{\prime}$ above grade level. AT\&T will also install unmanned equipment and an emergency back-up generator within the equipment compound. The monopole tower and fenced equipment compound are designed to support the antennas and equipment of other FCC licensed wireless carriers as well as the municipal emergency communications equipment. The location and other features of the proposed Facility are subject to change under provisions of Connecticut General Statutes §16-50g et seq.

The Application explains the need, purpose and benefits of the Facility and also describes the environmental impacts of the proposed Facility.

A balloon, representative of the proposed height of the facility, will be flown at the proposed location on the first day of the Siting Council public hearing on the Application, or on such other day specified by the Siting Council at a time to be determined by the Siting Council, but anticipated to be between the hours of 12 pm and 5 pm . The Siting Council public hearing on the Application will be held in the Town of Sherman.

Interested parties and residents of Sherman, Connecticut are invited to review the Application during normal business hours after March 12, 2021 when the Application is anticipated to be filed, at the following offices:

Connecticut Siting Council 10 Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051

Carol L. Havens, Town Clerk
Sherman Town Clerk
Mallory Town Hall
9 Rt 39 North
P.O. Box 39

Sherman, CT 06784

Or the offices of the undersigned. All inquiries should be addressed to the Connecticut Siting Council or to the undersigned:

Lucia Chiocchio, Esq.
Kristen Motel, Esq.
Cuddy \& Feder LLP
445 Hamilton Ave, $14^{\text {th }}$ Floor
White Plains, NY 10601
(914) $761-1300$

Lucia Chiocchio, Esq.<br>lchiocchio@cuddyfeder.com

March 29, 2021

## VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL

Tricia Dwyer Krueger
18 Coote Hill Road
Sherman, CT 06784
Re: Homeland Towers, LLC ("Homeland Towers") and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC ("AT\&T")
Wireless Telecommunications Tower Facility
16 Coote Hill Road, Sherman, Connecticut

## Dear Ms. Krueger:

Our office previously attempted to contact you on behalf of our clients, Homeland Towers, LLC and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC, with respect to the above-referenced matter. A certified return receipt envelope was sent to your attention on March 3, 2021 but a signed receipt was not returned. The address listed for you corresponds with the records on file with the Town of Sherman's Assessor's Office as an owner of property abutting the subject parcel detailed in the attached notice. This letter along with a copy of the notice sent on March 3, 2021, is being sent via first class mail in the hope that this method may be successful in reaching you.

If you have any questions concerning this information, please do not hesitate to contact us.
Very truly yours,


Lucia Chiocchio

Enclosures
cc: Kristen Motel, Esq.

Lucia Chiocchio
Ichiocchio@cuddyfeder.com

March 3, 2021<br>VIA CERTIFIED MAIL/<br>RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED<br>TRICIA DWYER KRUEGER<br>18 COOTE HILL ROAD<br>SHERMAN, CT 06784

## Re: Homeland Towers, LLC ("Homeland Towers") and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC ("AT\&T")

Wireless Telecommunications Tower Facility
16 Coote Hill Road, Sherman, Connecticut
Dear Ms. Krueger:
We are writing on behalf of our clients Homeland Towers, LLC ("Homeland Towers") and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC ("AT\&T") with respect to the above referenced matter and our clients' intent to file an application with the State of Connecticut Siting Council ("CSC") for approval of a proposed wireless communications tower (the "Facility") within the Town of Sherman.

State Law requires that record owners of property abutting a parcel on which a facility is proposed be sent notice of an applicant's intent to file an application with the CSC. The Facility is proposed to be constructed at 16 Coote Hill Road, identified as Map 51, Lot 28 on the Town of Sherman Tax Map. We are writing to you to provide notice as you are an abutting neighbor to 16 Coote Hill Road. The Facility is proposed within a 5,625 square-foot lease area in the southwestern portion of the parcel. The Facility consists of a new self-supporting monopole $170^{\prime}$ in height within a 2,400 square foot fenced equipment compound. AT\&T will install antennas at a centerline height of approximately $166^{\prime}$ above grade level as well as unmanned equipment and an emergency backup generator within the fenced equipment compound. Access to the Facility would be provided from Coote Hill Road over the existing paved driveway a distance of approximately 415', then along a new 12 ' wide gravel access drive approximately 1,635 ' to the tower compound. Please see the notice included with this letter.

The location, height and other features of the Facility are subject to review and potential change by the CSC under the provisions of Connecticut General Statutes §16-50g et seq.

If you have any questions concerning this application, please contact the CSC or the undersigned after March 12, 2021, the date which the application is expected to be on file.

Very truly yours,


Lucia Chiocchio
Enclosure
cc: Kristen Motel, Esq.

## NOTICE

NOTICE IS HERBY GIVEN, pursuant to Section 16-50g et seq. of the Connecticut General Statutes, as amended, and Section 16-50j-1 et seq. of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, as amended, of the intent of Homeland Towers, LLC ("Homeland Towers") and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC ("AT\&T") (together the "Applicants") to file an Application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need with the Connecticut Siting Council ("Siting Council") on or after March 12, 2021 to construct a wireless telecommunications tower facility ("Facility") at 16 Coote Hill Road in the Town of Sherman.

The Facility is proposed on a 19.87-acre parcel of land owned by Michael J. and Suzanne J. Berger identified as Map 51, Lot 28 on the Town of Sherman Tax Map and includes an approximately 5,625 square-foot lease area in the southwestern section of the parcel.

The Facility consists of a new self-supporting monopole that is $170^{\prime}$ in height located within a 2,400 square-foot fenced equipment compound within the 5,625 square- foot lease area. AT\&T's antennas would be installed at a centerline height of approximately $166^{\prime}$ above grade level. AT\&T will also install unmanned equipment and an emergency back-up generator within the equipment compound. The monopole tower and fenced equipment compound are designed to support the antennas and equipment of other FCC licensed wireless carriers as well as the municipal emergency communications equipment. The location and other features of the proposed Facility are subject to change under provisions of Connecticut General Statutes $\S 16-50 \mathrm{~g}$ et seq.

The Application explains the need, purpose and benefits of the Facility and also describes the environmental impacts of the proposed Facility.

A balloon, representative of the proposed height of the facility, will be flown at the proposed location on the first day of the Siting Council public hearing on the Application, or on such other day specified by the Siting Council at a time to be determined by the Siting Council, but anticipated to be between the hours of 12 pm and 5 pm . The Siting Council public hearing on the Application will be held in the Town of Sherman.

Interested parties and residents of Sherman, Connecticut are invited to review the Application during normal business hours after March 12, 2021 when the Application is anticipated to be filed, at the following offices:

| Connecticut Siting Council | Carol L. Havens, Town Clerk |
| :--- | :--- |
| 10 Franklin Square | Sherman Town Clerk |
| New Britain, CT 06051 | Mallory Town Hall |
|  | 9 Rt 39 North |
|  | P.O. Box 39 |
|  | Sherman, CT 06784 |

Or the offices of the undersigned. All inquiries should be addressed to the Connecticut Siting Council or to the undersigned:

Lucia Chiocchio, Esq.
Kristen Motel, Esq.
Cuddy \& Feder LLP
445 Hamilton Ave, $14^{\text {th }}$ Floor
White Plains, NY 10601
(914) 761-1300

## ATTACHMENT 2



## ATTACHMENT 3

## CT009 Sherman II - Homeland Towers proposed Wireless Telecommunications Facility

In response to CSC Docket No. 499 Pre-Hearing Interrogatories dated April 21, 2021, question \#7, please see maps below depicting existing wetlands on Site \#28, parcel address: 0 Route 37 South, Sherman. A proposed wireless facilty on this parcel is not feasible due to the vast amount of existing wetlands.


Map Sources:
Ortho Base Map: State of Connecticut 2019 aerial imagery CTECO

## ATTACHMENT 4



## ATTACHMENT 5

# RCC Consultants' Analysis of Cell Phone Coverage Town of Sherman 

> Board or Selectmen
> Seprember 26,2013

Presented by David Hopkins

## Summary of Contents

- South End of Town
- Coote Hill Road site (S2038)
- Mauweehoo Hill site (TOS-S1)

Center of Town

- White Silo Farm site (S2041)
- Town Center site (TOS-C2)
- North End of Town
- Happy Acres Farm site (CT5502)
$-\quad$ Evans Hill Road site (TOS-N1)
Overall Views

167' Centerline (170' Tower)

## Coote Hill (S2038) at 170 feet $17.80 \%$ of town area covered



## Coote Hill (S2038) at 120 feet 13.91\% of town area covered

## 



## Coote Hill (S2038) Plus Tower Hill 23.61\% of town area covered



## Mauweehoo Hill (TOS-S1) at 100 feet $30.85 \%$ of town area covered



## Mauweehoo Hill plus Tower Hill 38.73\% of town area covered



## South End of Town . . .

\#\# Coote Hill Road tower can be reduced substantially in height without greatly affecting coverage
\#\# Mauweehoo Hill site offers much better coverage, with less visibility
\#\# Tower Hill can help fill in coverage on the west side of town

## White Silo Farm (S2041) 19.98\% of town area covered



## Town Center site (TOS-C2) - 100 feet 23.66\% of town area covered



## Center Section of Town . . .

The Town Center site offers somewhat broader coverage than the White Silo Farm site, and . . .

The "in-building" coverage is much better

## Happy Acres Farm (CT5502) 13.60\% of town area covered



## Evans Hill Road (TOS-N1) at 80 feet 8.74\% of town area covered



## North End of Town . . .

The existing Happy Acres site provides coverage in the northern section of the central valley

## Evans Hill would provide coverage in the north end of town, including along Route 55

The two sites would complement each other well for coverage in the north end

## All AT\&T sites, existing and proposed <br> (Coote Hill, White Silo, Happy Acres) $48.24 \%$ of the town area covered



## Existing ATT sites, plus likely TOS sites 71.22\% of town area covered



## Summary

AT\&T's proposal for the South end of town can be improved substantially, both as to coverage and as to visible impact

Cell phone coverage for the whole town can be improved far more than is being proposed by AT\&T

## ATTACHMENT 6

March 15, 2021
Ms. Melanie A. Bachman, Esq.
Executive Director/Staff Attorney
Connecticut Siting Council
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, Connecticut 06051
Dear Ms. Bachman,
You have heard from members of the Sherman Telecommunications Committee (STC) at various times over the past few years as we have gathered information directly from the Connecticut Siting Council concerning past cell tower application filings and topographical information related to the provision of cell service in Southern Sherman. Today, we are writing to ask that you please consider approving the application for construction of a cell tower, filed as Docket No. 499.

We established the STC in 2018 to act as a clearinghouse of information related to cell service in Sherman. We have explored options for the provision of cell service where it was lacking, brought findings and recommendations to the Board of Selectmen, and assisted in raising awareness of safety issues as they relate to the lack of cell service in our town. You can find meeting agendas and minutes posted on the Sherman Town Website under community organizations.

The core of our concern always has been the safety of our residents and those who travel through Sherman, especially southern Sherman. The lack of cell service along southern routes 37 and 39 poses a particularly high level of risk, as evidenced by thousands of DOT accident reports and the personal accounts of residents and travelers. In fact, our group first met in 2015 as Residents for Reliable Cell Service in Sherman (RRCSS) to actively find a solution for the provision of cell service. We worked to mobilize residents, town officials and stakeholders, such as the Sherman Volunteer Fire Department, which is currently without a home for its emergency communications equipment.

Our personal experiences and difficulties living without cell service, and our efforts to bring together the parties who could help facilitate cell service in Sherman, go back further than 2015. Yet today, a year into the global pandemic without the single most effective communication tool available in the 21st century, we continue to find ourselves at risk. With your approval of the application filed as Docket No. 499, however, we finally will have a real solution.

Sincerely,

Sherman Telecommunications Committee<br>Terri Hahn and Zoe Sochor, Co-Chairs<br>Don Lowe, First Selectman<br>Gail Maletz<br>Al Zeisler

## ATTACHMENT 7

| From: | Restrepo, Alejandro [alejandro.restrepo@verizonwireless.com](mailto:alejandro.restrepo@verizonwireless.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, May $7,20216: 44$ AM |
| To: | Ray Vergati |
| Cc: | Parks, Timothy; Baldwin, Kenneth |
| Subject: | Re: [E] Homeland Towers Docket 499-16 Coote Hill Rd, Sherman CT - inquiry on VZW |
|  | interest |

Ray,
Verizon would be interested in a future spot preferably at 156 ' on this proposed facility. At this time Verizon make no guarantee of when we would co-locate here, but we are very much interested.

Thanks

## verizon ${ }^{\vee}$

Alejandro Restrepo
Sr. Manager - RF Design \& Traffic
Verizon Wireless
20 Alexander Drive, 2nd Floor
Wallingford, CT 06492
O 203.741.7256 | M 860.874.3646
alejandro.restrepo@verizonwireless.com

On Mon, May 3, 2021 at 3:25 PM Ray Vergati [rv@homelandtowers.us](mailto:rv@homelandtowers.us) wrote:
Hello gentlemen.

We are in the process of answering CSC interrogatory questions for a recent $170^{\prime}$ monopole tower application we filed in Sherman, CT to be located at 16 Coote Hill Road. One of the questions asks:
"Besides AT\&T, have any other wireless carriers expressed an interest in co-locating on the proposed facility? If so, provide documentation of their request."

Should VZW have an interest in co-locating on the proposed facility in the future, the 156 ' ACL would be available. The certified 1 A lat/long is: 41-32-2.50/73-29-34.34

Please respond back by this Wednesday if there is interest on behalf of VZW.

Best,

Ray

## Raymond Vergati

Regional Manager

Homeland Towers, LLC
9 Harmony Street, $2^{\text {nd }}$ Floor

Danbury, CT 06810

Cell: (203) 605-9646
Office: (203) 297-6345
Email: rv@homelandtowers.us

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message originates from the firm of Homeland Towers, LLC. The information contained in this e-mail and any files transmitted with product doctrine. If the reader of this message, regardless of the address or routing, is not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this trans received this message in error, please delete this e-mail and all files transmitted with it from your system and immediately notify Homeland Towers, LLC by sending a ref
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## ATTACHMENT 9

# Connecticutr 

Department of Economic and Community Development

State Historic Preservation Office

April 12, 2021
Mr. David R. George
Heritage Consultants
PO Box 310249
Newington, CT 06131

Subject: Phase IB Cultural Resources Reconnaissance Survey Proposed Wireless Telecommunications Facility<br>16 Coote Hill Road<br>Sherman, CT<br>Homeland Towers, LLC<br>ENV-21-0250

Dear Mr. George:
The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has reviewed the Cultural Resources
Reconnaissance Survey prepared by Heritage Consultants, LLC (Heritage), dated March 2021, as part of the larger submittal for a proposed telecommunications facility. The proposed activities are subject to review by this office pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act and in accordance with Federal Communications Commission regulations. SHPO understands that the proposed undertaking includes the installation of a 170 foot tall monopole within a 50 foot by 53 foot chain-link equipment compound, located in the southeast portion of the Subject Property. Future telecommunications arrays are proposed to be installed on the monopole at intervals of 136 feet above ground level (AGL), 146 feet AGL, 156 feet AGL, and 166 feet AGL, respectively. Access is to be through a new approximately 1,765 foot long gravel access road, originating from an existing paved driveway.

One previously identified archaeological site is located within 1 mile of the project area; however, it will not be impacted by the proposed undertaking. No properties listed or formally determined to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or State Register of Historic Places are located within 1 mile of the project area.

Phase IB of the reconnaissance survey consisted of subsurface testing of areas deemed to have moderate to high archaeological sensitivity, and that would be subject to ground disturbing impacts as part of the proposed undertaking. A total of 32 of 32 planned shovel tests were excavated successfully throughout the proposed work area. No prehistoric or historic period cultural artifacts or features were identified during the survey. Additionally, shovel tests also

State Historic Preservation Office
450 Columbus Boulevard, Suite 5 | Hartford, CT 06103 | P: 860.500.2300 | ct.gov/historic-preservation
An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer An Equal Opportunity Lender

## Connecticurt

Department of Economic and Community Development

State Historic Preservation Office
revealed that portions of both the proposed access road and lease area contained a combination of poorly drained soils, and gravely/stony soils, conditions typically inhospitable to retaining intact archaeological deposits.

As a result of the information submitted, SHPO concurs with the findings of the report that additional archeological investigations of the project area are not warranted and that no historic properties will be affected by the proposed activities. However, please be advised that if construction plans change to include previously uninvestigated/undisturbed areas, this office should be contacted for additional consultation.

The State Historic Preservation Office appreciates the opportunity to review and comment upon this project. These comments are provided in accordance with the Connecticut Environmental Policy Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. For further information please contact Marena Wisniewski, Environmental Reviewer, at (860) 500-2357 or marena.wisniewski@ct.gov.

Sincerely,


Jonathan Kinney
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

State Historic Preservation Office

## ATTACHMENT 10

Department of Economic and Community Development

August 5, 2013
Ms. Coreen Kelsey
Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc
54 Tuttle Place
Middletown, CT 06457-1847

Subject: Proposed New Tower Project 16 Coote Hill Road<br>Sherman, CT<br>Motorola Solutions

Dear Ms. Kelsey:
The State Historic Preservation Office is in receipt of the proposal for the abovereferenced project, submitted for review and comment pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act and in accordance with Federal Communications Commission regulations.

After completing review, VHB has in their professional opinion stated that there will be no historic properties affected by the new $170^{\prime}$ monopole tower with an accompanying $75^{\prime}$ x 75 ' compound. Furthermore, Heritage Consultant's archeological review stated that "No evidence of cultural features was identified within the excavated shovel tests, and no cultural material, either prehistoric or historic in origin, was recovered. Since no cultural material was identified during this comprehensive survey and no impacts to cultural resources are anticipated, no additional fieldwork is recommended."

Based on the information provided to this office, SHPO concurs that no historic properties will be affected by this project.

The State Historic Preservation Office appreciates the opportunity to review and comment upon this project. These comments are provided in accordance with the Connecticut Environmental Policy Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. For further information please contact Todd Levine, Environmental Reviewer, at (860) 256-2759 or todd.levine@ct.gov.


Daniel T. Forrest
State Historic Preservation Officer

## ATTACHMENT 11



Response to Interrogatory 32 Slimy Salamander Conservation Zones Proposed Sherman II Wireless Telecommunications Facility 16 Coote Hill Road Sherman, Connecticut

T
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## ATTACHMENT 12

## CSC Docket No. 499 - Interrogatory \#33

| Photo | Location | Orientation | Distance to Site | Visibility | Height Visible above Trees* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11 | Route 39 | Southwest | $\pm 0.84$ Mile | Year Round | $20^{\prime}-40^{\prime}$ |
| 12 | Route 39 | Southwest | $\pm 0.93$ Mile | Year Round | $40^{\prime}-60^{\prime}$ |
| 13 | Route 39 | Southwest | $\pm 0.98$ Mile | Seasonal | $1^{\prime}-20^{\prime}$ |
| 18 | Coote Hill Road | Southeast | $\pm 0.32$ Mile | Seasonal | $1^{\prime}-20^{\prime}$ |
| 25 | Route 37 | Southeast | $\pm 0.61$ Mile | Year Round | $20^{\prime}-40^{\prime}$ |
| 26 | Route 37 | Southeast | $\pm 0.62$ Mile | Seasonal | $20^{\prime}-40^{\prime}$ |
| 27 | Route 37 | Southeast | $\pm 0.63$ Mile | Seasonal | $11^{\prime}-2 \prime^{\prime}$ |
| 28 | Lake Mauweehoo Club | Southeast | $\pm 0.61$ Mile | Seasonal | At Treeline |
| 29 | Route 37 at Leach Hollow Road | $\pm 0.64$ Mile | Year Round | $40^{\prime}-60^{\prime}$ |  |
| 30 | Leach Hollow Road | Southeast | $\pm 0.62$ Mile | Seasonal | $1^{\prime}-20^{\prime}$ |
| 31 | Leach Hollow Road | Southeast | $\pm 0.62$ Mile | Year Round | $20^{\prime}-40^{\prime}$ |
| 33 | Leach Hollow Road | Southeast | $\pm 0.65$ Mile | Seasonal | At Treeline |
| 36 | Coburn Road East | Southeast | $\pm 0.77$ Mile | Year Round | $20^{\prime}-40^{\prime}$ |
| 37 | Coburn Road East | Southeast | $\pm 0.78$ Mile | Seasonal | $1^{\prime}-20^{\prime}$ |
| 38 | Coburn Road East | Southeast | $\pm 0.77$ Mile | Seasonal | $1^{\prime}-20^{\prime}$ |
| 39 | Coburn Road East | Southeast | $\pm 0.76$ Mile | Seasonal | $1^{\prime}-20^{\prime}$ |
| 40 | Coburn Road East | Southeast | $\pm 0.78$ Mile | Seasonal | $20^{\prime}-40^{\prime}$ |

* A range of potential visibility is provided to characterize the estimated height in the vicinity of the photograph. Please note that the height estimate only pertains to the tower structure and does not include the proposed 20' whip antenna.


## ATTACHMENT 13

# REMOTE FIELD REVIEW 



CT SITING COUNCIL DOCKET NO. 499 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY 33

SHERMAN II
16 COOTE HILL ROAD
SHERMAN, CT 06784

PREPARED FOR:
HOMELAND TOWERS, LLC
9 Harmony Street - 2nd Floor
Danbury, Ct 06810

PREPARED BY:
ALL-POINTS TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION, P.C. 567 Vauxhall Street Extension - Suite 311 Waterford, CT 06385
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EAST OF PROPOSED ACCESS ROAD LOOKING NORTHWEST
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EAST OF PROPOSED ACCESS ROAD LOOKING NORTHWEST
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DESCRIPTION
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EAST OF PROPOSED ACCESS ROAD LOOKING NORTHWEST






PROPOSED ACCESS ROAD LOOKING SOUTHEAST TOWARDS WETLAND CROSSING
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