10-25-2011

To:

CT Siting Council

10 Franklin Street

New Britian CT

Re: Dockett 422

From:

Robert and Cathleen Alex

Evergreen Berry Farm

435 Bassett Road

Watertown CT 06795

On October 24th, 2011 the Applicants New Cingular Wireless, PCS, LLC and North Atlantic Towers pre-filed its Objection to Admission by the Siting Council of Certain Exhibits of Robert and Cathleen Alex. We respectfully respond and oppose the applicant’s objections. Applicants’ objections to these documents if granted would effect prejudice on our right to free speech and our ability to substantiate our comments with supporting references.

Attachment 1: “Where are you visiting from?”

Object to reference as “irrelevant and immaterial”.

The poster substantiates our claim that visitors come from many CT towns, states and indeed from around the world to harvest their own berries in a recreational and scenic landscape.

Attachment 2: “Petition”

Object to removing petition from exhibit.

Petition exhibits and substantiates our claim that our visitors strongly desire to preserve a scenic and recreational landscape, part of the specific charge to the Siting Council to consider “environmental, scenic, historical and recreational values” impacted by the tower site.

Attachment 4: “Watertown Plan of Development”

Object to applicant reference of attachment as “unduly repetitious”.

It is a simple point of reference for farmland disappearance in Watertown to correlate with 2011 town assessor data revealing alarming loss of agricultural landscapes in Watertown.

Attachment 5: *Biological effects from exposure to electromagnetic radiation emitted by cell tower base stations and other antenna arrays”*

Object to reference that all attachments related to health and/or environmental effects of RF emissions should be excluded.

Articleby Blake Levitt and Henry Lai was submitted to solely represent just one example of many that literature abounds to shape negative public perception of health and safety near cell towers. The public’s failure to return due to health/safety fears would negatively impact our livelihood, regardless of FCC compliance to thermal radio frequency emissions. It is a situation of “negative public perception” impacting our ability to market our berries as a pick-your-own, regardless of FCC compliance of applicant to emissions.

Attachment 6: “Berry Nutrition”

We object to applicant’s position that information is “irrelevant and immaterial”.

Information was included to substantiate our claim of public awareness that berries are a healthful food choice with positive health consequences in contradiction to their perception of negative health consequences of being near a cell tower. Again, positive public perception of a visit to our farm is vital to the success of our business and impacts our livelihood. We have a right to protect our livelihood.

Attachment 7: Multi Agency Recommendations for Lightning Safety,

Attachment 8: Connecticut Climate,

and Attachment 9: Lightning protection for Telecommunications Facilities

We object to applicants’ position that information in attachments 7, 8 & 9 is “irrelevant and immaterial”.

How can the safety of visitors, staff and landowners be considered irrelevant? Cuddy & Feder site Section 15-50p of PUESA in their own objections that charge the Council to “consider potential adverse effects from a tower facility on the natural environment, ecological balance, public health and safety, scenic, historic and recreational values, forests and parks, air and water purity and fish, aquaculture and wildlife”…

Attachment 10: Falcons for Bird Abatement

We object to applicant’s position that information is “irrelevant and immaterial”.

This reference substantiates the income protection falcons provide through berry crop protection.

Attachment 11: Briefing Paper on the Need for Research into the Cumulative Impacts of Communication Towers on Migratory Birds on Other Wildlife in the US

Object to applicants’ reference that all attachments related to health and/or environmental effects of RF emissions should be excluded.

This reference highlights collision mortality with towers despite USFW guidelines on communication tower siting. Our hybrid falcons are not migratory, but rather daily flyers in the vicinity of the proposed tower that puts them at a much higher risk of injury or death, resulting in both bird investment loss and income loss to the farm without just compensation. Although the reference also sites concerns for RF emissions that the 1996 Telecom act preempts the CT Siting council from considering, it should not take away consideration for the safety of the falcon as it directly relates to our crop protection capability and ultimate impact on our income.

Attachment 12: Property Devaluation

We object to applicant’s position that information is “irrelevant and immaterial”.

First Amendment rights as well as Title 47 Chapter V Subchapter III Part 1 332 (7) (v)give us the right to petition the government for a redress of grievances for adverse effects of loss of property and business value should proposed site be approved.

Attachment 13: Mobile Phone-induced honeybee worker piping by Daniel Favre

Attachment 14: Can Electromagnetic Exposure Cause a Change in Behavior? Studying Possible Non-Thermal Influences on Honeybees by Harst, Kuhn & Stever

Attachment 15: Changes in Honeybee behavior and biology under the influence of cellphone emissions by Sharma & Kumar

Object to applicants’ reference that all attachments (eg: attachments 13,14 &15) related to health and/or environmental effects of RF emissions should be excluded.

We understand the charge to the Siting Council preventing consideration of health effects on wildlife from RF emissions that are within maximum permissible exposure limits.

However it is our 1st Amendment Right to Free Speech that allows us to express our concerns regarding RF emissions from this tower site and its potential impact on the pollinators we depend on for our livelihood. It is our right to be able to inform the Siting Council of emerging research that substantiates our concerns.

Attachment 16: Excerpt from Audubon Connecticut Protecting Connecticut’s Grassland Heritage

We object to applicant’s position that information is “irrelevant and immaterial”.

Bureau of Natural Resources Wildlife Division has identified the following species on or within the vicinity of the tower site:

American Kestral as a Threatened Species,

Bobolink and Eastern Meadowlark as Species of Special Concern

The Kestral has been observed on our farm as well as recorded as nesting on Gustafson property.

Attachment 17: Natural Diversity Database Area Map for Watertown

Object to applicants’ reference of attachment as “unduly repetitious”. It was certainly not deliberate.

Attachment 18: Birds, Bees, and Mankind Destroying Nature by Electrosmog by Ulrich Warnke

Object to applicants’ reference that all attachments related to health and/or environmental effects of RF emissions should be excluded.

The Warnke reference was preceded by our acknowledgement that the 1996 Telecom act prevents the Siting Council from considering RF health effects in its determination.

However it is our 1st Amendment Right to Free Speech that allows us to express our concerns regarding RF emissions from this tower site and its potential impact on our health and the ecosystem we depend on for our lives and livelihood. It is our right to be able to provide the Siting Council of emerging research that substantiates our concerns.

Finally, with reference to our local planning and zoning regulations; we understand from federal statute Title 47 Chapter 5 subchapter III Part 1 -332 Mobile Services (7) Preservation of Local Zoning Authority allows the Siting Council to be aware of local zoning regulations and to be cognizant of non-conformities in their determination. It is those non-conformities that we bring to light with questions and comments.

We respectfully request that all exhibits be allowed.

Cathleen Alex and Robert Alex

CC to service list by both e-mail and postal mail:

Paul Jessell, Esq. @ Slavin Stauffacher &Scott LLC, 27 Siemen Company Drive Suite 300W Watertown CT 06795

Charles Frigon, Town Manager @Watertown Town Hall, 424 Main Street, Watertown, CT 06795

Lucia Chiocchio @Cuddy & Feder, 445 Hamilton Ave, 14th Floor, White Plains NY 10601