

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

IN RE:

APPLICATION OF NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS, LLC
and NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC (AT&T)
FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL
COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE
CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION
OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS TOWER FACILITY
AT 655 BASSET ROAD IN THE TOWN OF
WATERTOWN

DOCKET NO. 422

February 27, 2012

APPLICANTS

NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS, LLC and NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC (AT&T)
RESPONSES TO INTERVENORS
ROBERT AND CATHLEEN ALEX'S INTERROGATORIES

Q1: A balloon has been flown four times, from three different locations on the ridge (original stake, approximately 42' from original stake, and approximately 200' from original stake) at heights of both 180' and 150'. Please state the coordinates of all three balloon flight locations for the record.

A1: *The coordinates of the balloon floats are noted below:*

1/19/09: 180' AGL
41° 39' 27.63" N, 73° 8' 10.74" W

10/27/11: 150' AGL
41° 39' 27.76" N, 73° 8' 10.72" W
This location was approximately 14.25' (not 42') north of the original stake.

11/3/11: 150' AGL
41° 39' 25.48" N, 73° 8' 10.54" W

11/9/11: 150' AGL
41° 39' 25.48" N, 73° 8' 10.54" W

Also, please note that the proposed facility was redesigned per the State Historic Preservation Officer's January 31, 2012 correspondence. Accordingly, the proposed facility now consists of a 130' tall facility designed as a tree at the following coordinates: 41° 39' 26" N and 73° 08' 11" W. Drawings depicting the current proposed design are included in the Applicants' Supplemental Submission dated February 27, 2012.

Q2: The application was originally sited for Latitude N41.392763 by Longitude W73.081074 and 839' ground elevation. Considering the multiple locations on the ridge assessed to date, what coordinates are actually being applied for?

A2: *As noted in Response A1, the facility was redesigned and now consists of a 130' tall monopine at one location: 41^o 39' 26" N and 73^o 08' 11" W. The location of the facility was shifted approximately 200' to the south from the location shown in the Application, further from the intervenors' property to the north.*

Q3: Are the applicants now considering only the December 23rd Supplemental Information Site location?

A3: *Please see Response A2 above.*

Q4: The FAA determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation is approved for up to 199' at this site. Does the applicant have any future intention of increasing the height of the tower to a maximum height of 199'?

A4: *No.*

Q5: Have the applicants extended or revised the FAA determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation that expired 8/10/2011?

A5: *Please see the current FAA determination of no hazard to air navigation included in the Applicants' Supplemental Submission dated February 27, 2012.*

Q6: What assurances do we have that the tower will remain no higher than 150' as applied for?

A6: *As noted above, the facility was redesigned and now consists of a 130' monopine. In accordance with the legislative findings set forth in the Public Utility Environmental Standards Act (PUESA) which states in relevant part that the proliferation of towers in the State should be avoided, the proposed facility will be designed to accommodate collocation by other carriers. At this time, NAT has no knowledge of the required height for other carriers. It should be noted that any other carriers seeking to collocate on the facility would need approval from the Siting Council.*

Q7: Does the FAA determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation include impact on Hot Air Balloon Pilots as we have several pilots who frequent this area?

A7: *All navigation, including hot air balloons, is regulated by the FAA (see Title 14 Code of Federal Register 91 – Operating and Flight Rules). Accordingly, the FAA determination of no hazard to air navigation for the proposed facility included in the Applicants' Supplemental Submission dated February 27, 2012 applies to hot air balloons.*

Applicant Section 1 Introduction Part B Executive Summary page 2 applicant states there is a "lack of suitable structures"

Section IV Site Selection/Tower Sharing Part A Site Selection page 8 states “there are no known suitable existing structures for providing reliable service to the public”

Tab 2 Site Search Summary the applicant states “in areas with known structures of acceptable height and location that might host a transmitting facility, ...there are no such known existing towers or structures suitable for providing reliable service to the public... in a four mile search area”

Q8: Why is only one tower sharing potential in the CL&P Right of Way (ROW) noted in the applicants December 23rd supplemental information?

A8: *The propagation plot included in Attachment 4 of the Applicants' December 23, 2011 Supplemental Submission demonstrates that the CL&P utility structure closest to the area where service is needed would not provide adequate service. This analysis was done at a height of 190' AGL. The other CL&P utility poles within the right-of-way were reviewed and rejected given the results of the RF analysis of the closest CL&P structure to the area where service is needed and the location of the other utility poles, which are further south and east than the closest CL&P structure.*

Q9: Has the CL&P ROW been explored in its entirety for tower sharing as it runs both north/south as well as east/west in the coverage gap area?

A9: *Please see Response A8.*

Q10: Did the applicants specifically explore the CL&P ROW that runs north south along the easterly side of Crestbrook Park beginning at a point between the intersection of route 6 and High Meadow Road running northerly to route 109?

A10: *Please see Response A8.*

Q11: Can new freestanding monopoles be erected in the CL&P ROW? If yes, has this been considered in the in the portions of the CL&P ROW that run thru the coverage gap area?

A11: *Given that the existing CL&P structures were analyzed and rejected, new structures within the CL&P right-of-way area were not considered as they would not provide service to the area where service is needed.*

Q12: Please provide a coverage map for CL&P ROW tower at Latitude +41.627292 Longitude - 73.104044.

A12: *The request propagation map is included in Attachment 1 and demonstrates that adequate service cannot be provided at a height of 190' AGL at the coordinates noted.*

Q13: Has AT&T co-located on CL&P or United Illuminating ROW's in CT? If yes, where?

A13: *Yes. Some examples include 45 Maple Ridge Road in Farmington and 190 Olcott Street in Manchester. As demonstrated herein, co-locating a facility on the existing CL&P structures in the area will not provide adequate service.*

Q14: Please provide a composite coverage map with coordinates for Alternate Site 3 with monopole height of 160' located at Crestbrook Park that includes applicants' existing tower coverage but without proposed S1835/CT1140 coverage.

A14: *Included in the Attachment 1 is the requested propagation plot. As demonstrated in the record in this proceeding, this location, Crestbrook Park is not available and thus not a viable alternative.*

Q15: Is the applicants' Alternate Site 3 at Crestbrook Park the same location as proposed by Sprint on Infinigy Solutions Lease Exhibit Plan Site ID CT33XC272 dated 01/09/06 on file at Watertown Town Manager's office?

A15: *Yes.*

Q16: Will the Crestbrook Park alternate site 3 provide similar gap coverage to the proposed 655 Bassett Road site?

A16: *As noted in the Applicants' December 23, 2011 Supplemental Submission and through the RF testimony in this proceeding, the Crestbrook Park location, noted as site 3 in the Site Search Summary of the Applicants' Application, if available, provides less coverage than the proposed facility at 655 Bassett Road. In other words, the proposed site at 655 Bassett Road provides improved coverage than the Crestbrook Park alternative.*

Q17: Would the Crestbrook Park alternate site 3 provide more coverage than the proposed S1835/CT1140 Bassett Road site to a significant gap area south east of the proposed site that includes Black Rock Road, Northfield Road, Bryant Road, Honey Hill, Smith Pond, Fern Hill, High Meadow, Old Farms Road, Butternut Lane and Joshua Hill Road?

A17: *As noted in Response A16 and shown in the propagation plots included in Attachment 1, the Crestbrook Park location provides coverage to some minor roads to the southeast, but the proposed facility at Bassett Road provides improved reliable service to the major road Rt. 109 than the Crestbrook Park location. In addition, as demonstrated in the record in this proceeding, the Crestbrook Park location is not available.*

Q18: Would Crestbrook Park alternate Site 3 eliminate the need for another tower site southeast of S1835/CT1140 Bassett Road site?

A18: *As noted in the Applicants' December 23, 2011 Supplemental Submission and through the RF testimony in this proceeding, providing reliable service in this area of Watertown requires more than one facility. The Crestbrook Park location, if available, in addition to the proposed facility at 655 Bassett Road would not provide reliable service to this area of Watertown and would not obviate the need for an additional facility to the south to provide service to this area. Included in Attachment 1 is a propagation plot that shows coverage from the Crestbrook Park location and the proposed facility at 655 Bassett Road and depicts areas where coverage is lacking. The need for an additional facility to the south is further demonstrated by the signal degradation that will result from the 20' reduction in height of the facility from AT&T's minimum height of 150' AGL. See the Applicants' Supplemental Submission dated February 27, 2012.*

Q19: Would the Crestbrook Park Site 3 along with a tower share on the CL&P ROW on the west side of route 63 provide sufficient coverage to the north end of Watertown without the need of a third tower at S1835/CT1140 Bassett Road?

A19: *No as demonstrated here in and in the record in this proceeding, a facility at the Crestbrook Park location (if available) would not provide adequate service to the north and the CL&P structures are located too far south to provide service to the coverage gap to the north, even with a facility at Crestbrook Park.*

Section III Statement of Needs and Benefits, Part C Technological Alternatives, page 7 applicants state “no other types of transmitting technology are a practical or feasible means of providing service for this site”

Q20: Aside from the Watertown coverage gap cluster of roads the applicant has listed, only Route 109 in the watershed is listed very north and outside the populated portion of the coverage gap. Could repeaters or other transmitting technology bouncing from existing towers cover Route 109?

A20: *As demonstrated in the Applicants' Application, providing reliable service to this area of Watertown requires a technology that can reach a coverage footprint that spans several thousand acres. Therefore, repeaters, microcell transmitters, distributed antenna systems (DAS) and other types of transmitting technologies are not a practicable or feasible means to providing service within the service area for this site because these technologies are better suited for specifically defined areas where new coverage is necessary, such as commercial buildings, shopping malls, and tunnels or to address highway capacity. To cover just Route 109 would not address the coverage gap in this area of Watertown.*

Q21: Could antennas and/or repeaters be used in multiple locations along the CL&P ROW to meet the applicants' entire coverage gap area avoiding the proposed Bassett Road tower and any additional tower(s) eliminating added blight to the town?

A21: *As noted in the Applicants' Application, the proposed Facility is a necessary component of AT&T's wireless network. Repeaters, microcell transmitters, distributed antenna systems (DAS) and other types of transmitting technologies are not a practicable or feasible means to providing service within the service area for this site, including multiple locations along the CL&P ROW. These technologies are better suited for specifically defined areas where new coverage is necessary, such as commercial buildings, shopping malls, and tunnels or to address highway capacity. Closing the coverage gap in northwestern Watertown requires technology that can reach a coverage footprint that spans several thousand acres. Therefore, there are no equally effective technological alternatives to the construction of the proposed Facility for providing reliable personal wireless services in this area of Connecticut. In addition, as noted herein, the CL&P structures are located too far from the area where service is needed and as such, facilities on these structures would not provide service to the coverage gap.*

The Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed facility is not a blight.

Q22: How is the public need for universal and seamless coverage determined by the applicants if satellite communication technology already exists as a viable alternative?

A22: *Satellite technology is not a viable alternative for providing service to this area of Watertown. Satellite technology cannot accommodate the demands of wireless service and is best suited for remote locations with very low demand.*

Section IV Site Selection Part A Site Selection page 9 applicants reference alternate sites “Crestbrook Park, a town owned site, is unavailable due to a deed restriction”.

The administrative notice letter dated October 14th 2011 from Cuddy & Feder to David Stygar, DEEP, Division for Land Acquisition and Management states that the Crestbrook Park site option is not possible because the Bassett Road proposal is a “viable alternative that cannot be rejected”. (A prerequisite for addressing changes to the deed restrictions at Crestbrook Park is that all viable alternatives are rejected.)

Q23: How can the applicant report that the Crestbrook Park site is “unavailable due to a deed restriction” when it is not yet known if the Bassett Road proposal is viable?

A23: *As demonstrated in the record, Crestbrook Park was acquired by the Town through the Land and Water Conservation Fund Project (the “LWCF”), a Federal program. Accordingly, utilization of Crestbrook Park, or a portion thereof, for a wireless facility site would qualify as a conversion of use from a park to a non-public outdoor recreation use and such conversion of use must comply with the terms and conditions of the LWCF grant agreement. One of the prerequisite for conversion of use under the LWCF requires that “all practical alternatives to the conversion have been evaluated and rejected on a sound basis.” The proposed wireless facility site at 655 Bassett Road in Watertown will satisfy the coverage needs of AT&T and is available, as such it is an alternative to the Crestbrook Park site. Therefore, the proposed site at 655 Bassett Road cannot be rejected for purposes of satisfying the prerequisite for conversion of use required by the LWCF grant agreement.*

Q24: How can the applicants state that the Bassett Road proposal “cannot be rejected” by the CT Siting Council?

A24: *As noted in Response A23 above, the Bassett Road location cannot be rejected for purposes of satisfying the prerequisite for conversion of use required by the LWCF grant agreement. The statement in the letter to David Stygar of the Department of Energy & Environmental Protection (DEEP), confirming the requirements of the LWCF as applied to Crestbrook Park did not state that the proposed facility cannot be rejected by the Siting Council.*

Section IV Site Selection Part B Tower Sharing page 9 applicants state proposed 150’ monopole “that can accommodate AT&T and at least five other carriers’ platforms”

Applicant Supplemental Information provided 10/20/2011 indicates that AT&T requires a minimum height requirement of 147’ to meet acceptable signal strength and that 137’ would not meet acceptable levels of reliable service.

Watertown Planning and Zoning Section 60.10 requires Co-utilization of facility by providers of telecommunication services to minimize the number of towers.

Q25: At the public hearing October 27th the Siting Council asked if the tower could be lower and still meet AT&T coverage objectives. The applicant responded “no”. If that is the case, then how can five other carriers meet their coverage objectives below AT&T’s height on the monopole?

A25: As noted above in Response A6, the Applicants do not have specific knowledge of the required heights of other carriers for providing service in this area of Watertown. The proposed facility is designed to accommodate collocation in accordance with the statutory intent of avoiding the proliferation of towers.

In addition, as demonstrated in the application materials and through testimony at the Siting Council hearing, AT&T’s minimum height is 150’ AGL. In accordance with the State Historic Preservation Officer’s January 31, 2012 correspondence, the facility was redesigned to a total height of 130’ AGL. This 20’ reduction represents a degradation in signal levels as shown in the propagation plots included in the Applicants’ Supplemental Submission dated February 27, 2012. The aerial maps included in the Applicants’ Supplemental Submission dated February 27, 2012 also show the specific areas where unreliable service will result from a 130’ tall facility. While the reduction in height will result in areas of unreliable service, as a business decision to balance the need for the facility and the SHPO’s determination, AT&T agreed to the 130’ facility.

Also, as noted by the Siting Council at the October 27, 2011 hearing, the TCA prohibits discrimination among providers of wireless services and as such, AT&T is only required to demonstrate its need for the proposed facility.

Q26: Applicants Tab 3 Map Z6 shows the bottom carrier well below 137’ where acceptable levels of reliable service would not be achieved. Why would any other carriers be interested in this tower if coverage objectives can’t be met at heights below AT&T? Wouldn’t this potentially lead to future applications for additional towers from other carriers to meet their coverage objectives?

A26: Please see response 25 above.

Q27: Please provide coverage map for the lowest platform location proposed at this site for additional carriers.

A27: The plot provided in Attachment 1 depicts AT&T’s network in this area and the anticipated coverage from the proposed facility. As noted above, the Applicants have no knowledge or information regarding the required heights for other carriers.

Section V Facility Design Page 11 applicant states “some clearing and grading of the compound and site for access drive will be required”

Tab 3 Site Evaluation applicants report the number of trees to be removed to be 38 @ 4 inches diameter or greater, however the applicant has proposed changes the tower coordinates.

Q28: How many additional trees will be removed as a result of the applicants’ tower coordinate changes?

A28: *Approximately 38 additional trees will be removed to accommodate the re-designed access drive depicted in the Applicants' December 23, 2011 and February 27, 2012 Supplemental Submissions.*

Q29: How close to the Gustafson open field fence line at the tower site will the trees be cut?

A29: *The open field fence is located approximately 50 feet from the proposed area of clearing.*

Q30: What impact will the additional tree loss have on the overall visibility of the tower?

A30: *None. A substantial tree buffer on all side of the proposed facility will remain.*

Section V Facility Design Page 11 applicant states "proposed facility will have no impact on water flow or water quality".

Section VII Watertown Land Use Part D WTN Inland Wetland/Watercourse Regs page 16 applicant states "wetlands delineation report included in Attachment 4 the nearest delineated wetlands course to the proposed facility is a pond located 800' directly south of the proposed site" and concludes "the proposed facility will have no impact on wetlands or watercourses"

(see also Mark Kiburz Wetlands biologist report for AT&T/North Atlantic Towers)

Q31: Were wetlands and watercourses in closer proximity on adjoining properties to the proposed facility and access drive included in the report as the wetlands biologist Mark Kiburz states that sheet water drainage will flow both to the west and east of the site?

A31: *Field visits on adjoining properties were not performed.*

Q32: How can the applicant draw "no impact on wetland and watercourses" conclusions when no storm water drainage volume statistics were provided?

A32: *Given that the closest wetland is located approximately 800' from the proposed facility, no impacts to wetlands are anticipated.*

Q33: What is the acreage of land to be cleared?

A33: *Approximately 14,000 square feet or approximately 0.32 acre will be cleared.*

Q34: Where is Fenn Brook noted in the application?

A34: *Fenn Brook is located approximately 1,100 feet down gradient from the proposed facility location and approximately 750 feet from the closest point to the existing unimproved Town road. It is shown on the aerial map in Attachment 1 of the Applicants' Supplemental Submission dated December 23, 2011 and the viewshed map in Attachment 10 of the Applicants' Supplemental Submission dated December 23, 2011.*

Q35: How will storm water drainage impact Fenn Brook? What studies were done to protect Fenn brook?

A35: *Given the distance of the facility from Fenn Brook, the proposed facility will have no impact on Fenn Brook or the associated watershed.*

Section VI Environmental Compatibility Part A Visual Assessment page 11-12 applicant states “Year round visibility is limited to approximately 2.2% of the 8042 acre study area”

Q36: What were the parameters used to determine that only 2.2% of the study area would have year round views? Is the 8042 acre study area the same as the visual field area?

A36: *Please see the Visual Resource Evaluation Report submitted with the Applicants’ Supplemental Submission dated December 23, 2011 for details regarding the estimation of visibility from 259 acres out of the 8,042 acre study area.*

Applicant also states on page 12 in their original Visual Resource Report Attachment 5 that “fewer than one dozen residential structures will have partial seasonal views of the proposed facility and that fewer than three residential structures will have year round views” of the tower. In the December 23rd Supplemental report the applicant states “year-round visibility.....is expected from a total of ten residences”

Q37: How many residences did the applicant actually visit to verify accuracy of their computer simulation of visibility?

A37: *Please see the Visual Resource Evaluation Report submitted with the Applicants Supplemental Submission dated December 23, 2011 for details regarding the visibility analysis and field reconnaissance.*

Q38: Infinigy original Visual Resource Analysis Attachment Tab 5 concludes “*The proposed facility does not interfere with or reduce the public’s enjoyment and/or appreciation of the appearance of any areas considered to be aesthetic resources. Therefore the proposed 150’ monopole will not have a significant adverse impact on the surrounding area.*” How was this conclusion made?

A38: *Please see the Visual Resource Evaluation Report submitted with the Applicants Supplemental Submission dated December 23, 2011 for details regarding the anticipated visibility of the proposed facility. In addition, the reduction in height to 130’ and change in design to a “monopine” style tower will reduce, or in some cases eliminate, visibility of the structure from the areas/locations evaluated during the November 2011 balloon floats. Photosimulations of a 130’ monopine tower, as viewed from five locations along Bassett Road and Linkfield Road, were provided in the Applicants’ Supplemental Submission dated February 27, 2012. These simulations were provided to the Connecticut State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) for review on January 19, 2012. The five locations for which simulations were produced were selected based on comments from the SHPO in its December 23, 2011 correspondence, indicating specific concerns with respect to properties along Bassett Road and Linkfield Road. Based on the reduction in height and redesign of the proposed facility, the SHPO determined that the facility will have no adverse effect. (See the January 31, 2012 SHPO no adverse effect determination).*

Q39: The council has on file our visitor petition and many individual letters in opposition to the tower as it relates to the degradation of their enjoyment/appreciation of the area surrounding the tower site. Where is the applicant's documentation from the public that the tower is acceptable in appearance and location and does not reduce their enjoyment/appreciation of the aesthetic resources of the area?

A39: *Please see Section 16-50p of the Connecticut General Statutes for the legal criteria the Siting Council must consider in a certificate proceeding.*

Tab 5 Appendix C View Shed Maps/ Field Verification Viewshed Map in original application

Q40: How was the Acreage Determination Map made? How were the six areas identified as visible? How were they chosen?

A40: *Please see the Visual Resource Evaluation Report submitted with the Applicants Supplemental Submission dated December 23, 2011 for details regarding visibility evaluation.*

Q41: Was the Army Corps of Engineers Federal Recreational Area visited to determine visibility?

A41: *Yes. The proposed facility is not expected to be visible from this area.*

Q42: Was the Thomaston Elementary School playground located at the Route 109 and Route 6 intersection visited to determine visibility?

A42: *Yes. The parking lot adjacent to the Thomaston Elementary School (Black Rock School) playground was visited. The proposed tower is not expected to be visible from the playground.*

Q43: Please provide copies of missing photos for locations 2,5,6,9,11,14,17 and 20 sited on Photographic Location Map located in Appendix D Photographs and Simulations in original application

A43: *Please see the Visual Resource Evaluation Report submitted with the Applicants' Supplemental Submission dated December 23, 2011, which replaces the visual information provided in the Application.*

Q44: Simulation Photos are un-numbered in original application, Please provide key to correspond to locations: 1,4,13,15(duplicated),16, and 18

A44. *Please see the Visual Resource Evaluation Report submitted with the Applicants' Supplemental Submission dated December 23, 2011, which replaces the visual information provided in the Application.*

Section V Facility Design page 11 applicant states "SHPO issued a 'no adverse effect' determination for the proposed facility" (1966 Section 106 State Historic Preservation Act must consider homes that are included or eligible to be on national register of historic places)

Q45: Why were the following 5 historic homes noted on the 1853 Richard Clark map of Watertown located at Watertown Town Hall (3 on Linkfield and 2 on Bassett) not noted?

Eligible homes:

Hiram French House @ now Barbara Scott at 405 Bassett Road

Daniel Upson House @ now Frank Gustafson at 655 Bassett Road

S Bryan(t) House @ now Steve and Katherine Barnosky at 936 Linkfield Road

E Bryan(t) House @ now Sue and Ed Budris at 858 Linkfield Road

Federally Listed home on National Register of Historic Places:

R Bryan(t) House @ now Mrs. Ruth Getsinger at 867 Linkfield Road

A45: The SHPO issued a no adverse effect determination for the proposed facility on March 25, 2010 (see Attachment 6 of the Applicants' Application). This no adverse effect determination was issued as a result of a properly completed consultation process required by Section 106 of the National Preservation Act of 1966 (the "Section 106 Process"). The submission of this no adverse effect determination by the SHPO completed the Section 106 Process for the proposed facility.

As demonstrated in the Applicants' Supplemental Submission dated December 23, 2011, the Roderick Bryant House, a resource listed on the National Register of Historic Places, is located outside of the Area of Potential Effect (APE) as defined in the Section 106 procedures. Accordingly, the Section 106 consultation process did not require the identification of this resource. (It should be noted that the coordinates for the Roderick Bryant House included in the National Register of Historic Places database are incorrect and the site is actually located approximately 3/4 mile from the proposed facility site, or outside the 1/2 mile APE). Nevertheless, a visual evaluation from this resources was conducted and as demonstrated in the Visual Resource Evaluation Report included in the Applicants' Supplemental Submission dated December 23, 2011, the proposed facility at 150' AGL is not expected to be visible from this resource.

The other locations indicated above were identified by the SHPO as eligible for the formation of a National Register of Historic Places District from a field visit that took place one and a half years after the completion of the Section 106 Process for the proposed facility. Accordingly, these other locations were not previously identified in any resource materials or local, State or Federal registers and could not have been evaluated during the Section 106 Process for the proposed facility. Indeed, the Applicants were not notified by the SHPO of the SHPO's post Section 106 Process field visit. Despite the fact that these locations were only recently identified as eligible properties that might form the basis of a National Register of Historic Places District, the Applicants' conducted an evaluation from this area and proposed the reduction in height of the proposed facility to 130' and design of the proposed facility as a monopine. (See the photosimulations included in the Applicants' Supplemental Submission dated February 27, 2012). Upon review of the redesigned facility, the SHPO determined that the redesigned facility would have no adverse effect to the locations listed above. A copy of the SHPO's no adverse effect determination dated January 31, 2012 is included in the Applicants' Supplemental Submission dated February 27, 2012.

Section VI Environmental Compatibility Part C Power Density page 13 applicant states "maximum power density report 'attachment 4' concludes that the calculated worst case emissions from the proposed facility are 7.3% of the MPE standard"

With reference to Attachment Tab 3 Facilities and Equipment Specifications:

Q46: What power wave model antenna will be used?

A46: *As noted in the Applicants' Application (Exhibit 1) in Tab 3, the antenna model is Powerwave P65-15-XLH-RR or P90-14-XLH-RR or equivalent panel antenna.*

Q47: What is the planned azimuth (angle from 0 degrees north) of the alpha (north facing) antenna?

A47: *The propagation plots were conducted at 70⁰-190⁰-330⁰ for the three sectors with a 2⁰ electrical tilt. These parameters will be further optimized if needed after the site is operational.*

Q48: What is the planned angle of tilt for the alpha antenna?

A48: *Please see response A47.*

Pertaining to Lightning:

Q49: Do the applicants obtain lightning strike data for areas surrounding potential tower sites? If yes, what is the frequency of lightning strikes at the proposed tower site relative to the rest of Litchfield County?

A49: *Per the Supplemental Submission dated December 23, 2011, this data is not required given that the entire facility is grounded.*

Q50: Do the applicants keep lightning strike data on their facilities and towers? If yes, is it known if lightning strikes increase in the vicinity of a tower compared to pre tower data?

A50: *This information is not tracked. Please see Response A49.*

Q51: What are the current building codes for grounding communication towers in CT?

A51: *The industry standard is the Motorola R56 Standards & Guidelines for Communications Sites. Please see the Supplemental Submission dated December 23, 2011 for details regarding the grounding design of the facility.*

Q52: Has a geological survey been performed on the site by the applicant to identify if lightning strikes would be made more serious than they already are?

A52: *The Applicants reviewed the soils and evidence of bed rock for the design of the proposed facility. Each site is designed to a grounding standard of less than 5 ohms resistance. Varied methods are used to obtain such a standard. In a situation where high bed rock is encountered, if traditional 10-ft copper rods are not able to penetrate vertically, then an alternate design with XIT rods (copper rods encased in bentonite, drilled into bedrock) is used. In each case, the number of rods is determined in the field with actual measurements being taken as construction occurs. More rods are added as necessary.*

Q53: How does the applicant plan to mitigate lightning strikes on a site with shallow, restrictive, non-conductive soil conditions (ledge, dry soils) where proper grounding is difficult?

A53: *Please see the Supplemental Submission dated December 23, 2011 for details regarding the grounding design of the facility and Response A52.*

Q54: When the tower experiences a direct lightning strike and sends a shock wave thru the bedrock will any of this energy impact the integrity of the City of Waterbury Aqueduct, the main water source for a population of over 110,000 in Waterbury alone?

A54: *No. As noted in the Supplemental Submission dated December 23, 2011, if lightning should strike the tower, the grounding system will ensure that it will dissipate harmlessly and as such, a shockwave will not occur.*

Pertaining to Bird Abatement Falcons:

Q56: The proposed tower impacts our falcon's airspace and habitat. Will the RF emissions in any way affect our bird abatement falcons either during their daily flight or if they perch on the structure for short or extended periods of time?

A56: *As stated by the Siting Council, it is preempted by Telecommunications Act of 1996 (TCA) from considering the environmental effects of radio frequency emissions as long as the applicant(s) demonstrate(s) compliance with the Federal Communication Commissions' (FCC) guidelines for radio frequency emissions. 47 USC §332(c)(7)(B). Moreover, the United States District Court held that the Siting Council is preempted under the TCA from rendering a siting decision on the basis of any purported health effects from radio frequency emissions on wildlife. See: Jaeger v. Cellco Partnership, et al., 2010 WL 965730 (D. Conn. 2010), affirmed Jaeger v. Cellco Partnership, et al., 10-1347-cv (2nd Cir. 2010). (See also Bornemann, et al v. Connecticut Siting Council, et al., 287 Conn. 177 (2008), where the Connecticut Supreme Court held that the Siting Council does not have jurisdiction to consider the "biological effects of high frequency radio wave emissions on wildlife").*

In fact, the Siting Council has taken administrative notice of the TCA and its preemption provisions with respect to environmental effects of radio frequency energy and the holdings in the Jaeger v. Cellco Partnership and Bornemann v. Siting Council cases in this proceeding. In addition, with respect to the siting of telecommunication towers and migratory birds, the Siting Council has taken administrative notice of the Service Interim Guidelines for Recommendations On Communications Tower Siting, Construction, Operation and Decommissioning by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Division of Migratory Bird Management. Please see the Applicants' Responses to Siting Council Interrogatories (Applicants' Exhibit 2) Response A10 demonstrating compliance with the USFWS Guidelines.

Given that the Siting Council is preempted from consideration of environmental effects of radio frequency energy on both humans and wildlife and has taken administrative notice of the USFWS guidelines on communication tower siting, any information regarding RF emissions should not be considered.

Pertaining to Pollinators:

Q57: Will the proposed cell tower present an RF emission safety hazard to honeybee and native pollinators that fly routinely between our farm and Gustafson Apple Orchard?

A57: *Please see Response A56.*

Q58: What studies have the applicants done to show no adverse effect from RF emissions on native pollinators or honeybees?

A58: *Please see Response A56.*

Pertaining to local zoning regulations Watertown Article VI Section 60 Telecommunications Facilities: Section 60.3.4d surrounding topography within 1,000 feet at interval not exceeding five feet based on town datum

Q59: Why are applicant topographic maps (applicant tab 3, 1st topography map) at 20' contour when local zoning Section 60.3.4d requires 5' contour topography maps of the area within 1000' of tower site?

A59: *Pursuant to Section 16-50x(a) of Connecticut General Statutes ("CGS"), the Siting Council has exclusive jurisdiction over wireless telecommunications facilities. Review and approval by the Siting Council of the Applicants' proposed Facility in this proceeding are "in lieu of all certifications, approvals, and other requirements of state and municipal agencies...." CGS Section 16-50x(a). As such, no local land use, zoning, wetland or other permits are required for the Applicants' proposed Facility and such regulations are merely guidance. Nevertheless, updated topographic and aerial maps were provided in the Supplemental Submission dated December 23, 2011 and full sized site plan drawings were bulk filed on December 23, 2011.*

Section 60.3.4e design of the tower, with particular reference to design characteristics that have the effect of reducing or eliminating visual obtrusiveness

Q60: What effort has the applicant made to reduce the visual obtrusiveness of the tower?

A60: *As noted herein, the facility was redesigned and now consists of a 130' tall monopine. Please see the drawings and the photosimulations included in the Applicants' Supplemental Submission dated February 27, 2012, which depict the redesigned 130' monopine facility.*

Q61: Would a mid-slope rather than ridge-top location meet the applicants' coverage objective?

A61: *Assuming the mid-slope location referred to in the question is a location within the Apple Orchard, a significantly taller tower would be required to meet the coverage objective because the ground elevation at the Apple Orchard is approximately 109' lower than the elevation at the proposed located.*

Q62: Please provide a mid-slope coverage map.

A62: *A specific location is required for the preparation of a propagation plot. In addition, as noted in response A61, a lower elevation location will require a taller facility.*

Q63: What would be the total visual mass area covered by the planned standard monopole and antenna platforms in the original proposal when all six carriers are on board? How does this compare to a 3' diameter balloon?

A63: *Please see the photosimulations in the Applicants' Supplemental Submission dated February 27, 2012 for a depiction of the redesigned 130' tall monopine.*

Q64: What would be the reduction of the total visual mass area if a low profile monopole as suggested in the December 23rd Supplement was implemented?

A64: *Please see Response A63.*

Q65: What is the total visual width, including all three sectors, of a standard AT&T antenna array on a monopole?

A65: *The total visual width of a standard AT&T antenna array on a monopole is approximately 12'. Given the redesign of the facility to a monopine style tower, the visual width of the branching at the height of the antennas is expected to be slightly greater than 12'. Please see the photosimulations included in the Applicants' Supplemental Submission dated February 27, 2012 which depict the redesigned 130' tall monopine.*

Section 60.3.5 In all cases in which the Commission feels that a peer review of the applicant's service area, tower sharing, or other technical issues is warranted, the applicant shall be required to reimburse the Town for the cost of the peer review. This payment shall be made to the Town prior to the decision by the commission on the application.

Q66: Has Watertown requested an unbiased peer review of the technical aspects of the proposed tower?

A66: *Please see Response A59 regarding the applicability of the Town of Watertown's zoning regulations to the proposed facility.*

Q67: Have any unbiased studies to confirm coverage need for this area been made?

A67: *It is respectfully submitted that the record in this proceeding demonstrates through empirical evidence AT&T's need for a proposed facility in this area of Watertown. Please see Response A59 regarding the applicability of the Town of Watertown's zoning regulations to the proposed facility.*

Section 60.7.1 Towers with equipment buildings/structures shall be permitted by special permit as provided by for in Sections 51 and 52

Q68: Have the applicants, commercial entities with a proposed site in a residential zone, obtained a special permit pursuant to Section 60.7.1?

A68: *Please see Response A59 regarding the applicability of the Town of Watertown's zoning regulations to the proposed facility.*

Section 60.7c. tower shall be located a minimum of five hundred (500) feet from any residential structure located within a residential district. Distance shall be measured from the base of the tower to the foundation.

Q69: Applicants' original Abutters Map, Tab 3, Map Z1 provided by Infinigy and noted as "prepared from a site walk 9/23/09 and a survey 11/16/09" has mislabeled landowners Robert and Cathleen Alex's equipment barn as their residence and Frank Gustafson's barn is also mislabeled as his residence resulting in inaccurate notation of distances from their actual residences. This continues to be noted as such in the December 23rd Supplement Abutter's Map Z1 and the Overall Site plan Z2. The Alex home is very near the minimum 500 feet from the original balloon flight stake. The Alex berry barn is also noted as residence on original Map Z2.

If indeed a site walk was performed by the applicant on 9/23/09 how were three barns noted as residences on the applicants abutters map?

A69: *Please see the aerial map and drawings included in Attachment 1 of the Supplemental Submission dated December 23, 2011 and the drawings included in the Supplemental Submission dated February 27, 2012.*

Q70: Will the applicants be submitting a corrected map with actual surveyed distances from the proposed tower to the closest homes?

A70: *Please see the aerial map and drawings included in Attachment 1 of the Supplemental Submission dated December 23, 2011.*

Q71: What class of map will be provided by the applicants?

A71: *Please see the aerial map and drawings included in Attachment 1 of the Supplemental Submission dated December 23, 2011 and the drawings included in the Supplemental Submission dated February 27, 2012.*

Watertown Zoning regulations bulk filing to the commission section 60.8.2c states the nature of uses of adjacent property should be considered by the commission.

Q72: Is Evergreen Berry Farm noted in the application as an adjacent property with significant public access?

A72: *Please see Response A59 regarding the applicability of the Town of Watertown's zoning regulations to the proposed facility. Please see the Visual Resource Evaluation Report included in the Supplemental Submission dated December 23, 2011 regarding visibility from the Evergreen Berry Farm. As noted therein, visibility of a 150' tall facility from the farm areas is not anticipated.*

Section 60.8.3 The commission will require that applicants provide simulations of tower locations and impacts as part of the review of a Special Permit application. Such simulations may entail the erection of balloons or other devices, necessary to visualize the proposed facility.

Q73: Were adjoining landowners notified of original balloon flight on January 19, 2010?

A73: *No. Please see Response A59 regarding the applicability of the Town of Watertown's zoning regulations to the proposed facility. It should be noted that three balloon floats were noticed. The Siting Council provided notice of the balloon float that was conducted on the day of the first Siting Council hearing in this proceeding and the Applicants provided courtesy notice of the two balloon floats that were conducted in November.*

Q74: Were photos taken from Evergreen Berry Farm view shed on January 19, 2010?

A74: *No. Please note that the Visual Resource Evaluation Report included in the Supplemental Submission dated December 23, 2011 includes views from the Evergreen Berry Farm and replaces the visual materials included in the Application.*

Section 60.9 Removal of Abandoned Towers and Antennas

A telecommunications site not in use for six (6) months shall be removed by the facility owner. This removal shall occur within ninety (90) days of the end of such six (6) month period. Upon removal, the site shall be restored to its previous appearance and where appropriate, re-vegetated.

Q75: Have the applicants made provisions for the Removal of Abandoned Towers and Antennas as per Section 60.9?

A75: *Please see Response A59 regarding the applicability of the Town of Watertown's zoning regulations to the proposed facility. It should be noted that the Siting Council, when issuing a Certificate, includes a condition requiring removal of abandoned or unused facilities.*

Q76: Will the applicant meet the bonding requirement for Watertown Planning and Zoning Section 60.11 regarding tower removal and restoration of site with sufficient cash bond to cover inflation?

A76: *Please see Response A75.*

Reference Town of Watertown ARTICLE V - SITE PLANS AND SPECIAL PERMITS

SECTION 51- Site PLANS

Section 51.5.1 Site plan shall include an accurate up to date class A-2 survey of the property

Q77: Has the applicant submitted a class A-2 survey of the proposed site pursuant to Town of Watertown Site Plans Section 51.5.1?

A77: *Please see Response A59 regarding the applicability of the Town of Watertown's zoning regulations to the proposed facility.*

Section 51.6.21 Design of any proposed development shall include a storm water management plan

Q78: Has the applicant submitted a storm water management plan pursuant to Section 51.6.21?

A78: *Please see Response A59 regarding the applicability of the Town of Watertown's zoning regulations to the proposed facility.*

Q79: How will the storm water management plan minimize runoff from either the access road or the tower lease area from flowing onto a street or adjacent property?

A79. *Please see Response A59 regarding the applicability of the Town of Watertown's zoning regulations to the proposed facility.*

In addition it should be noted that this site, as designed, will not generate any concentrated stormwater runoff. Any runoff that will occur will be sheet flow easterly from the new access road into the landowner's woods, or southeasterly from the tower compound into the landowner's agricultural field. Culverts will be placed along the access road every 100' on the existing woods road, to control the runoff from the uphill wooded areas to control the existing runoff such that it does not erode or soften the access driveway. Where the discharge from these cross culverts occurs, rip rap outlets have been designed to dissipate any volume of runoff. Surfacing on the road areas is crushed stone with sheet flow across it. The tower compound is un-compacted crushed stone which has the same characteristics as the current woods floor.

Q80: How will the access road and adjoining City of Waterbury watershed including Fenn Brook be protected from storm water runoff and erosion?

A80: *The construction design of the Town's unimproved road will include erosion control measures to ensure no erosion occurs. Typical measures such as silt fence protecting all undisturbed down-gradient areas, stone check dams on steeper road areas and requirements to mulch and stabilize all disturbed areas are some of the methods used. Post construction, the entire site will be permanently stabilized such that continued erosion cannot occur. Please see Response A79 for longer-term stormwater runoff control.*

In addition as noted in Response A35, no impacts to Fenn Brook are expected. Also, please see the December 19, 2011 correspondence from the Connecticut Department of Public Health approving the proposed watershed protection measures.

Watertown zoning regulations Section 63.83 limit road grades to 7% with up to 10% with special permit

Q81: What are the steepest slopes proposed for the access road?

A81: *Please see Response A59 regarding the applicability of the Town of Watertown's zoning regulations to the proposed facility.*

In addition, it should be noted that the steepest portions of the access drive have been identified specifically on the drawing provided in the Applicants' Supplemental Submission dated December 23, 2011 as "Areas of access driveway with sloped between 15% and 20%". The total length of these portions is 370'. Of this total length, 210' is on an existing woods road that is only being surface improved. There is no portion of the unimproved Town road with slopes greater than 7%.

The Town Emergency Services were contacted through the Town Engineer and they have stated they have no issue with the driveway grades as long as it is accessible via a four wheel drive vehicle. The driveway will be accessible via a four wheel drive vehicle.

Of special design note, all noted steeper areas have been designed with stone-lined rip rap swales to ensure erosion does not occur.

Q82: How will the particularly steep areas of the access road be maintained?

A82: Please see Response A59 regarding the applicability of the Town of Watertown's zoning regulations to the proposed facility.

The applicant is required to maintain the driveway in a suitable manner to ensure access by the wireless tenants.

Q83: How will the road be maintained during winter conditions?

A83: Please see Response A59 regarding the applicability of the Town of Watertown's zoning regulations to the proposed facility. The access driveway will be plowed to allow access by technicians. Typically, a local snow plowing firm is retained.

Q84: How will diesel be delivered in winter on a >20% grade?

A84. Please see Response A59 regarding the applicability of the Town of Watertown's zoning regulations to the proposed facility.

In addition, it should be noted that the design of the access drive does not include any slopes greater than 20%. A fuel truck can access this site as designed. A special turnaround area in the vicinity of the sharp bend was designed to accommodate such a delivery truck. Please see the Applicants' Supplemental Submission dated December 23, 2011.

Section 51.10.6 The adequacy of the storm drainage system to minimize soil erosion and sedimentation and to accommodate a designed 25-year stormwater run-off as of (1) existing prior to the Site Plan application, and (2) resulting from the Site Plan application completed work

Q85: Has the applicant provided a 25-year stormwater run-off plan pursuant to Watertown Siting Plan Section 51.10.6?

A85: Please see Response A59 regarding the applicability of the Town of Watertown's zoning regulations to the proposed facility.

51.12 Environmental and Historic Features

The development of the site shall conserve as much of the natural terrain and existing vegetation as possible, shall preserve sensitive environmental land features such as steep slopes, wetlands and large rock outcroppings, and shall preserve public scenic views and historically significant buildings and site features.

Q86: Why is the access road crossing steep slopes in excess of 20% and associated fragile and highly erodible soils?

A86: Please see Response A59 regarding the applicability of the Town of Watertown's zoning regulations to the proposed facility. Please see Responses A79, A80, A81 and A84 regarding soil and erosion control measures.

Q87: Northerly travel on Linkfield Road towards the tower site includes a view of three historic homes and a significant 4 ½ mile view of undeveloped forest and farmland stretching to Route 254 in Litchfield. Where in the application is this public scenic and historic view heading in a northerly direction on Linkfield Road being considered by the applicants?

A87: Please see Response A59 regarding the applicability of the Town of Watertown's zoning regulations to the proposed facility. Please see the SHPO's January 31, 2012 no adverse effect determination included in the Applicants' Supplemental Submission dated February 27, 2012.

SECTION 52 - SPECIAL PERMITS

Section 52.5 Environmental Impact Statement All applications for Special Permits shall include environmental information for the purpose of compiling a complete environmental impact analysis. The statement shall address at least the following; however, upon written request from the applicant, the Commission may waive or modify any of the required information.

Section 52.5.3 The extent to which any sensitive environmental features on the site may be disturbed and what measures shall be taken to mitigate these impacts.

On the applicants' Section VI Environmental Compatibility Part D Other Environmental Factors page 14 the applicant states "according to ...the site survey and field investigations, no federally regulated wetlands or watercourses or threatened or endangered species will be impacted by the proposed facility."

Q88: Can the applicant confirm that an on-site field investigation was carried out for threatened or endangered species?

A88: Please see Response A59 regarding the applicability of the Town of Watertown's zoning regulations to the proposed facility.

In addition, it should be noted that an on-site field investigation was carried out to evaluate habitat characteristics in the vicinity of the proposed tower location relative to known local threatened and endangered species. Note that both the original proposed tower location and the current proposed tower location (approximately 200 feet south of the original location) exhibit the same habitat characteristics.

The Applicants submitted a Request for Natural Diversity Data Base (NDDDB) State Listed Species Review to the Connecticut Department of Energy & Environmental Protection (DEEP) on January 3, 2012. The request (inadvertently dated January 3, 2011) and supporting documentation that was submitted to DEEP are provided in the Applicants' Supplemental Submission dated February 27, 2012. In response to this request, the DEEP determined that the proposed facility will not impact the grassland bird species identified therein. A copy of the DEEP's January 6, 2012 determination is included in the Applicants' Supplemental Submission dated February 27, 2012.

Q89: On what day and by whom was the on-site field investigation performed?

A89: *The on-site field investigation was performed on March 1, 2010 by Mr. Mark Kiburz, staff biologist with Infinigy.*

Q90: If no, why was there no on-site visit to confirm evidence of listed species?

A90: *Please see Response A88.*

Q91: Did the applicants use only the US Fish and Wildlife Service Data for Federal Listed Species Map and the CT DEEP Natural Diversity Data Base Area Map for Watertown to determine sensitive environmental impact?

A91: *Please see Response A88.*

Q92: Without an onsite field review, how can it be determined from an office desk if other endangered species of plants and animals exist around the proposed site and are potentially at risk?

A92: *Please see Response A88.*

Q93: What impact will the tower have on kestrel habitat, a threatened species, as well as the Bobolink and Meadowlark, both species of special concern, identified by the CT DEEP as present on the lease property now that the new co-ordinates proposed are closer to the woodland edges?

A93: *Please see Response A88 and the DEEP January 6, 2012 determination that the proposed facility will not impact the species identified.*

Q94: Where are the nearest Bald Eagle and Common Nighthawk nesting areas to the proposed site?

A94: *The proposed project does not fall within a shaded area on the DEEP Natural Diversity Data Base maps. As such, DEEP will not divulge the nesting locations of either Bald Eagles or Common Nighthawks in an effort to protect their nesting habitats.*

Q95: Does the adjoining city of Waterbury watershed property contain any Bald Eagle nests?

A95: *Please see Response A94 above.*

Q96: How will this proposed tower affect the hundreds of crows who travel through the site twice daily during the winter months?

A96: *Please see the Applicants' Responses to Siting Council Interrogatories (Applicants' Exhibit 2), Responses A10 and A11 demonstrating compliance with the guidelines of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) for minimizing impacts to bird species and demonstrating that the proposed facility will not impact any Important Bird Areas identified by the Audubon Society. It should also be noted that the common crow is a highly adaptable species that can live in the wild or within urban settings. Manmade structures do not represent a deterrent. As such, the installation of a 130 tower, without guy wires (as recommended by the USFWS) poses a minimal threat to winter crow movements.*

Q97: What Environmental Impact Studies (EIS) have the applicants done to prove that the EMR from cell towers at the frequencies and power densities proposed will not adversely affect nearby wildlife and plants?

A97: *Please see Response A56 above.*

Q98: Will this tower displace predators from my berry fields like hawks, owls, turkey vultures, coyotes, and fox that would then lead to increased populations of mice and voles that damage my crops? Please provide documentation.

A98: *Please see Response A88 above.*

In addition, it is important to note the general hunting techniques used by avian and mammalian species:

- *Hawks hunt one of three ways: by perching at an elevated point, then swooping down; taking birds from the air; or flying low to the ground which causes prey to flee.*
- *Owls are a perch and wait predator; once they see the prey they swoop down and grab it.*
- *Falcons such as the American kestrel either perch high above the ground or hover above the ground swooping down to capture the prey.*
- *Turkey Vultures are a species that eats primarily carrion. However, recent reports indicate turkey vultures follow farming practices (brush hogging, hay production) and feed on rodents.*
- *Foxes and coyotes are not displaced by development. In fact, one of the largest coyote populations in the US is located in Los Angeles. Both foxes and coyotes can be observed in fields after farming activities, consuming rodents as well as hunting during the evening hours with little regard to human activities.*

The proposed tower will be placed within a wooded parcel of land, approximately 700 feet from the edge of the Berry Farm property. Since the proposed project is not removing perching locations along the wood line edge, no hawk, falcon or owl hunting perch impacts are anticipated. Additionally, turkey vultures, coyotes and foxes are not generally threatened by manmade structures or activities.

Q99: Has North Atlantic Towers contacted other wireless providers to determine their coverage gaps and potential desire to co-locate on this tower?

A99: *Yes. NAT is aware of Sprint's need for a facility in this area and contacted Verizon. In addition, the Siting Council provided notice of the Application to all other carriers dated September 9, 2011.*

Q100: Will other wireless providers be able to share a 130' tower and still meet their coverage gaps or will multiple towers be needed to fulfill the needs of multiple carriers?

A100: *Please see Responses A6 and A25.*

Q101: Please provide a Signal Degradation Coverage Map for an ATT antenna array located at 127' on a 130' tower (as you proposed to SHPO in letter from SHPO dated January 31, 2012) compared to

the original proposal of 147' antenna array on 150' tower. Please also provide a signal degradation coverage map for the lowest platform location proposed at this site for the additional carriers on a 130' tower. Please note the height that lowest carrier antenna array would sit at.

A101: Please see the propagation plots and information regarding the signal degradation that will result at the lower height of 130' AGL included in Attachment 1 and the drawings included in the Applicants' Supplemental Submission dated February 27, 2012.

Q102: Do the applicants intend to erect a 130' monopine or a low profile antenna array at the proposed site as indicated in the recent photo simulations the applicants provided to SHPO?

A102: As noted above in Responses A1, A2 and A45, the proposed facility was redesigned after a post Section 106 consultation with the SHPO to include a 130' monopine facility.

Q103: Was a southern approach access road considered from the Linkfield Road Extension through the Gustafson hayfield and pasture that would meet town codes for road grades?

A103: The tower is located as close to the Gustafson's filed as possible, right outside an area characterized by much steeper slopes. Access from the southern approach would be much steeper than the proposed access drive.

Q104: How many trees would be removed for an access road if a southern approach through the hayfield/pasture was made in comparison to the applicant's current proposal?

A104: A southern access was not evaluated for tree removal given the steepness of that area.

Q105: Is the proposed access road designed to keep construction costs at a minimum? Is this sacrifice of safety and disregard for Watertown Regulation to provide higher profit margins for the Applicants?

A105: Please see Response A81 and A103.

Q106: Why was visibility from homes and roads in Thomaston omitted in your Visual Resource Analysis?

A106: Please see the viewshed analysis map included in the Applicants Supplemental Submission dated December 23, 2011, which includes an approximately 2-mile radius visual study area, incorporating parts of the Town of Thomaston.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this day, a copy of the foregoing was sent by electronic mail and overnight mail to the Connecticut Siting Council and:

Charles Frigon
Town Manager
Town of Watertown
424 Main Street
Watertown, CT 06795
(860) 945-5255
frigon@watertownct.org

Paul R. Jessel, Esq.
Slavin, Stauffacher & Scott, LLC
27 Siemon Company Drive, Suite 300W
Watertown, CT 06795
(860)-274-2511
pjessell@sssattorneys.com

Robert and Cathleen Alex
435 Bassett Road
Watertown, CT 06795
(860) 274-7920
Bobcat230@gmail.com

Dated: February 27, 2012


Lucia Chiochio

cc: John Stevens, North Atlantic Towers, LLC
Michele Briggs, AT&T
Randy Howse, North Atlantic Towers, LLC
John Favreau, Infinigy Engineering
Mark Kiburz, Infinigy Engineering
Mike Doiron, SAI
David Vivian, SAI