HOMELAND TOWERS, LLC (HOMELAND)
NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC (AT&T)

Application to the
State of Connecticut Siting Council

For a Certificate of
Environmental Compatibility and Public Need

–NORTHWEST RIDGEFIELD FACILITY–

Docket No. ____

HOMELAND TOWERS, LLC (HOMELAND)
22 SHELTER ROCK LANE, BLDG. C
DANBURY, CONNECTICUT

NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC (AT&T)
500 ENTERPRISE DRIVE
ROCKY HILL, CT 06067

Page

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

I. Introduction

A. Purpose and Authority

Pursuant to Chapter 277a, § 16-50g et seq. of the Connecticut General Statutes (C.G.S.), as amended, and § 16-50j-1 et seq. of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies (R.C.S.A.), as amended, Homeland Towers, LLC ("Homeland") and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC ("AT&T) (together the "Applicants"), hereby submit an application and supporting documentation (collectively, the "Application") for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunications tower facility (the "Facility"). The Facility is proposed on a 3.18 acre parcel of land owned by Insite Towers (the "Parcel") with access from Old Stagecoach Road in the Town of Ridgefield, which property is currently undeveloped. Construction of the Facility will permit the Town of Ridgefield's Police, Fire and Emergency Services Departments, AT&T and other FCC licensed wireless carriers to provide reliable emergency communications and wireless services to residents, businesses, schools, municipal facilities and visitors to northwestern Ridgefield.

B. Executive Summary

The need for reliable emergency communications and wireless services in northwestern parts of the Town of Ridgefield is well known and well documented. Town emergency communications networks and all major wireless carriers lack reliable wireless services in this part of the community (parts of which are known as Ridgebury). The lack of service is fundamentally due to the absence of any existing tower infrastructure or other wireless facility siting opportunities in that part of the community which has significant changes in terrain elevation. Over the course of the past several years, numerous wireless carriers and tower companies have explored various siting options in northwestern Ridgefield, none of which have resulted in an application to the Siting Council until now.

AT&T's current site search efforts date back six or more years. Over that period of time, AT&T representatives explored various non-residential or

undeveloped parcels of land for potential development of a tower facility. Locations such as the Town's Golf Course, Tiger Hollow Field at Ridgefield High School, large undeveloped properties on West Mountain and a church steeple were all evaluated and rejected by AT&T's radio frequency engineers and/or deemed to provide insufficient coverage in northwestern Ridgefield.

As part of AT&T's site search, it engaged in several discussions with Town officials. As part of exploring potential properties, the Town itself identified some other Town owned parcels along Old Stagecoach Road and in the West Mountain area of Town for consideration. The Town in collaboration with AT&T determined that such properties were either deed restricted or would not meet technical and engineering requirements for reliable service in northwestern Ridgefield.

Thereafter, the Town explored its own acquisition of an approximately 28 acre private parcel of land with access from Old Stagecoach Road and above Ledges Road which could have been further subdivided by the property owner for residential development ("28 Acre Parcel"). The Town's objective was to acquire the privately held 28 Acre Parcel for both conservation purposes and the development of a communications tower facility to be utilized by Town agencies and commercial wireless carriers in serving northwestern Ridgefield. The 28 Acre Parcel abuts the Parcel which is the subject of this Application and shares common access from Old Stagecoach Road and the property owner was interested in selling to the Town.

The Town's initiative to acquire the 28 Acre Parcel was expected to be long-term revenue positive for the taxpayers and funded through a combination of Town Open Space funds and a long term lease for the tower portion of the parcel. Prior to proceeding to a Town vote, the Town issued a request for proposals ("RFP") for a wireless carrier or tower company to develop the tower facility and enter into a long term lease agreement with the Town. Homeland was one of three responders to the RFP. As the Council is aware, Homeland is a company that specializes in the development of tower infrastructure needed

to serve a community's communications needs and works closely with commercial wireless carriers and public safety agencies.

Homeland was ultimately selected by the Town to partner with it in furtherance of the RFP and the overall goal of acquiring the 28 Acre Parcel. Thereafter, the Town and Homeland prepared a draft lease drawings, photosimulations, propagation analyses and other information for the potential tower site to be used for Town emergency communications and FCC licensed wireless carrier services in northwestern Ridgefield. The overall project including the conservation elements were then presented to the public in a series of community meetings. Residents in the neighborhood to the north along Old Stagecoach and Aspen Ledges Roads particularly objected to the tower component of the project which included a monopine design. At a Town Meeting in 2011, the entire project failed to gain a majority of votes (362 voters with 254 against and 108 for the project). The Town subsequently acquired the 28 Acre Parcel as open space land to be managed by the Town's Conservation Commission.

Subsequent to the 2011 Town Meeting, Homeland investigated the potential to acquire the 3.18 acre Parcel of undeveloped wooded land abutting the 28 Acre Parcel of Land that had been recently acquired by the Town. The Parcel was previously foreclosed on by a bank and was offered for sale as a residential lot. As part of its due diligence, Homeland confirmed the site location would not be objectionable per se to the Town and its Conservation Commission and further that, despite a lower elevation ground elevation, the location was suitable for Town emergency communications needs and those of FCC licensed wireless carriers.

The Parcel was subsequently acquired by Insite, a national wireless infrastructure company that Homeland will sometimes convey its towers to. Homeland entered into a long term lease with Insite Towers, LLC for development of a new tower facility on the Parcel. AT&T has also since entered into a lease agreement with Homeland for its proposed use of the

tower Facility. Homeland has also committed space on the tower and in the compound to the Town's Police and Fire Chiefs regarding their use of the tower facility. Homeland would own, maintain and operate the tower facility subject to any Certificate the State Siting Council may issue for the project

The tower facility is proposed as a 150' monopole structure within a 4,650 square foot fenced compound. Town emergency communications antennas would be installed at the top of the tower to an overall height of 161.5' along with additional antennas lower on the tower and an equipment shelter and generator in the compound. AT&T's antennas would be installed at the 146' level of the tower with an equipment shelter and generator in the compound. The tower and fenced area are further designed to support the antennas and equipment of four other FCC licensed wireless carriers. Access and utilities to the facility will be extended from Old Stagecoach Road. The facility will be unmanned with no sanitary or water facilities and generates on average 1 vehicle trip per month by each wireless carrier consisting of a service technician in a light duty van or truck.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the public need for a tower in northwestern Ridgefield far outweighs any potential adverse environmental effects from the Facility as proposed in this Application. The Town's emergency service agencies have all documented gaps in their communications networks in this part of the community impacting response times and difficulty communicating during emergencies. Over the course of the past two years, storm events such as Hurricane Irene and Superstorm Sandy left thousands of residents without commercial power, telecommunications and the longstanding lack of reliable wireless services was all the more evident. The ridgeline along which the proposed Facility is located has been identified by both Town emergency services agencies and wireless carriers such as AT&T in providing reliable services to approximately 5,000 residents, at 5 public schools and along numerous miles of state and local roads in northwestern Ridgefield.

C. The Applicants

The Applicant, Homeland Towers LLC ("Homeland"), is a Connecticut corporation with offices at 22 Shelter Rock Lane, Danbury, Connecticut. Homeland Towers currently owns and/or operates numerous tower facilities in the state of New York and is developing tower sites in Connecticut. Homeland Towers entered into a long term lease with Insite and AT&T has since entered into a lease agreement with Homeland. Homeland Towers will construct, maintain and own the proposed Facility and would be the Certificate holder.

The Applicant, New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC ("AT&T"), is a Delaware limited liability company with an office at 500 Enterprise Drive, Rocky Hill, Connecticut 06067. The company's member corporation is licensed by the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") to construct and operate a personal wireless services system, which has been interpreted as a "cellular system", within the meaning of CGS Section 16-50i(a)(6).

Neither company conducts any other business in the State of Connecticut other than the development of tower sites and provision of personal wireless services under FCC rules and regulations. Correspondence and/or communications regarding this Application shall be addressed to the attorneys for the Applicants:

Cuddy & Feder, LLP
445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th Floor
White Plains, New York 10601
Attention: Christopher B. Fisher, Esq.
Daniel M. Laub, Esq.

A copy of all correspondence shall also be sent to:

Homeland Towers, LLC
22 Shelter Rock Lane, Bldg C.
Danbury, CT 06810
Attention: Ray Vergati

AT&T
500 Enterprise Drive
Rocky Hill, Connecticut

Attention: Michele Briggs

D. Application Fee

Pursuant to R.C.S.A. § 16-50v-1a (b), a check made payable to the Siting Council in the amount of $1,250 accompanies this Application. Included in this Application and its accompanying attachments are reports, plans and visual materials detailing the design and location for the proposed Facility and the environmental effects associated therewith. A copy of the Siting Council's Community Antennas Television and Telecommunication Facilities Application Guide with page references from this Application is also included in Attachment 10.

E. Compliance with C.G.S. §16-50/ (c)

Neither of the Applicants is engaged in generating electric power in the State of Connecticut. Therefore, the Facility is not subject to C.G.S. § 16-50r. Furthermore, the proposed Facility has not been identified in any annual forecast reports. Accordingly, the proposed Facility is not subject to § 16-50/ (c).

II. Service and Notice Required by C.G.S. § 16-50/ (b)

Pursuant to C.G.S. § 16-50/ (b), copies of this Application have been sent by certified mail, return receipt requested, to municipal, regional, state, and federal officials. A certificate of service, along with a list of the parties served with a copy of the Application is included in Attachment 9. Pursuant to C.G.S. § 16-50/ (b), notice of the Applicant's intent to submit this application was published on two occasions in The Ridgefield Press, the publication used for planning and zoning notices in the Town of Ridgefield. The text of the published legal notice is also included in Attachment 8. The original affidavits of publication will be provided to the Siting Council once received from the publisher. Furthermore, in compliance with C.G.S. § 16-50/ (b), notices were sent to each person or entity appearing of record as the owner of a property which abuts the premises on which the Facility is proposed. Certification of such notice, a sample notice letter, and the list of property owners to whom the notice was mailed are also included in Attachment 8.

III. Statements of Need and Benefits

A. Statement of Need

1. United States Policy & Law – Wireless Facilities

United States policy and laws continue to support the growth of wireless networks. In 1996, the United States Congress recognized the important public need for high quality wireless communications service throughout the United States in part through adoption of the Telecommunications Act (the "Act"). A core purpose of the Act was to "provide for a competitive, deregulatory national policy framework designed to accelerate rapidly private sector deployment of advanced telecommunications and information technologies to all Americans." H.R. Rep. No. 104-458, at 206 (1996) (Conf. Rep.). With respect to wireless communications services, the Act expressly preserved state and/or local land use authority over wireless facilities, placed several requirements and legal limitations on the exercise of such authority, and preempted state or local regulatory oversight in the area of emissions as more fully set forth in 47 U.S.C. § 332(c)(7). In essence, Congress struck a balance between legitimate areas of state and/or local regulatory control over wireless infrastructure and the public's interest in its timely deployment to meet the public need for wireless services.

Seventeen years later, it remains clear that the current White House administration, The Congress and the FCC continue to take a strong stance and act in favor of the provision of wireless service to all Americans. In December 2009, President Obama issued Proclamation 8460 which included wireless facilities within his definition of the nation's critical infrastructure and declared in part:

> Critical infrastructure protection is an essential element of a resilient and secure nation. Critical infrastructure are the assets, systems, and networks, whether physical or virtual, so vital to the United States that their incapacitation or destruction would have a debilitating effect on security, national economic security, public health or safety. From water systems to computer networks, power grids to cellular phone towers, risks to critical infrastructure can result from a complex combination of threats and hazards, including terrorist attacks, accidents, and natural disasters.[1]

[1] Presidential Proclamation No. 8460, 74 C.F.R. 234 (2009).

President Obama further identified the critical role of robust mobile broadband networks in his 2011 State of the Union address.[2] In 2009, The Congress directed the FCC to develop a national broadband plan to ensure that every American would have access to "broadband capability" whether by wire or wireless. What resulted in 2010 is a document entitled "Connecting America: The National Broadband Plan" (the "Plan").[3] Although broad in scope, the Plan's goal is undeniably clear:

> [A]dvance consumer welfare, civic participation, public safety and homeland security, community development, health care delivery, energy independence and efficiency, education, employee training, private sector investment, entrepreneurial activity, job creation and economic growth, and other national purposes.[4] [internal quotes omitted]

The Plan notes that wireless broadband access is growing rapidly with "the emergence of broad new classes of connected devices and the rollout of fourth-generation (4G) wireless technologies such as Long Term Evolution (LTE) and WiMAX."[5] A specific goal of the Plan is that "[t]he United States should lead the world in mobile innovation, with the fastest and most extensive wireless networks of any nation." [6]

In April 2011, the FCC issued a Notice of Inquiry concerning the best practices available to achieve wide-reaching broadband capabilities across the nation including better wireless access for the public.[7] The public need for timely deployment of wireless infrastructure is further supported by the FCC's Declaratory Ruling interpreting § 332(c)(7)(B) of the Telecommunications Act and establishing specific time limits for

---

[2] Cong. Rec. H459 (Jan. 25, 2011), also *available at* http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2011/01/25/ remarks-president-state-union-address. Specifically the President stressed that in order "[t]o attract new businesses to our shores, we need the fastest, most reliable ways to move people, goods, and information–from high-speed rail to high-speed Internet."

[3] Connecting America: The National Broadband Plan, Federal Communications Commission (2010), *available at* http://www.broadband.gov/plan/.

[4] Id. at XI.

[5] Id. at 76.

[6] Id. at 25.

[7] FCC 11-51: Notice of Inquiry, In the Matter of Acceleration of Broadband Deployment: Expanding the Reach and Reducing the Cost of Broadband Deployment by Improving Policies Regarding Public Rights of Way and Wireless Facilities Siting, available at http://transition.fcc.gov/Daily_Releases/Daily_Business/2011/db0407/FCC-11-51A1.pdf.

decisions on land use and zoning permit applications.[8] More recently, the critical importance of timely deployment of wireless infrastructure to American safety and economy was confirmed in the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012, which included a provision, Section 6409, that preempts a discretionary review process for eligible modifications of existing wireless towers or base stations.[9]

2. United States Wireless Usage Statistics

Over the past thirty years, wireless communications have revolutionized the way Americans live, work and play.[10] The ability to connect with one another in a mobile environment has proven essential to the public's health, safety and welfare. As of June 2012, there were an estimated 321.7 million wireless subscribers in the United States.[11] Wireless network data traffic was reported at 341.2 billion megabytes, which represents a 111% increase from the prior year.[12] Other statistics provide an important sociological understanding of how critical access to wireless services has become. In 2005, 8.4% of households in the United States had cut the cord and were wireless only.[13] By December 2012, that number grew exponentially to an astonishing 38.2% of all households.[14] Connecticut in contrast lags behind in this statistic with 20.6% wireless only households.[15]

---

[8] WT Docket No. 08-165- Declaratory Ruling on Petition for Declaratory Ruling to Clarify Provisions of Section 332(c)(7)(B) to Ensure Timely Siting Review and to Preempt Under Section 253 State and Local Ordinances that Classify All Wireless Siting Proposals as Requiring a Variance ("Declaratory Ruling").

[9] Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012, Pub. L. No. 112-96, §6409 (2012), *available at* http://gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/BILLS-112hr3630enr/pdf/BILLS-112hr3630enr.pdf; see also H.R. Rep. No. 112-399 at 132-33 (2012)(Conf. Rep.), *available at* http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CRPT-112hrpt399/pdf/CRPT-112hrt399.pdf.

[10] See, generally, History of Wireless Communications, *available at* http://www.ctia.org/media/industry_info/index.cfm/AID/10388 (2011)

[11] CTIA's Wireless Industry Indices: Semi-Annual Data Survey Results, A Comprehensive Report from CTIA Analyzing the U.S. Wireless Industry, Mid-Year 2012 Results (Semi-Annual Data Survey Results). See also, "CTIA-The Wireless Association Semi-Annual Survey Reveals Historical Wireless Trend" *available at* http://www.ctia.org/media/press/body.cfm/prid/2133.

[12] Id.

[13] CTIA Wireless Quick Facts, *available at* http://www.ctia.org/your-wireless-life/how-wireless-works/wireless-quick-facts *citing Early Release of Estimates from the National Health Interview Survey, December 2012, National Center for Health Statistics*, June 2013.

[14] CTIA Wireless Quick Facts

[15] *Early Release of Estimates from the National Health Interview Survey, December 2012, National Center for Health Statistics*, June 2013. See also, "Wireless Substitution: State-level Estimates From the National Health interview Survey, 2012", National Health Statistics Report, No. 70, December 18, 2013.

Wireless access has also provided individuals a newfound form of safety. Today, approximately 70% of *all* 9-1-1 calls made each year come from a wireless device.[16] Parents and teens have also benefited from access to wireless service. In a 2010 study conducted by Pew Internet Research, 78% of teens responded that they felt safer when they had access to their cell phone.[17] In the same study, 98% of parents of children who owned cell phones stated that the main reason they have allowed their children access to a wireless device is for the safety and protection that these devices offer.[18]

Wireless access to the internet has also grown exponentially since the advent of the truly "smartphone" device. Cisco reported in 2011 that global mobile data traffic grew in 2010 at a rate faster than anticipated and nearly tripling again for the third year in a row.[19] It was noted in 2010, mobile data traffic alone was three times greater than all global Internet traffic in 2000. Indeed, with the recent introduction of tablets and netbooks to the marketplace, this type of growth is expected to persist with Cisco projecting that mobile data traffic will grow at a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 92% from 2010 to 2015.[20]

3. Public Need For A Tower For Wireless Services

The Facility proposed in this Application will be an integral component of AT&T's network in its FCC licensed areas throughout the state. There is a significant deficiency all carrier's wireless communications service in the northwestern part of Ridgefield. The proposed facility in northwestern Ridgefield will provide reliable services in AT&T's network to an area that includes over 5,000 residents of the Town and State Route 116/North Salem Road, Ridgebury Road, Bennetts Farm Road, Old Stagecoach and other local roads in northwestern Ridgefield. The proposed Facility will also provide reliable service to several area public schools and public recreation areas including the High School, Scotts Ridge Middle School, and Barlow, Scotland and Ridgebury Elementary Schools, Tiger Hollow Fields, Seth Low Pierrepont State

[16] Wireless 911 Services, FCC, *available at* http://www.fcc.gov/guides/wireless-911-services

[17] Amanda Lenhart, *Attitudes Towards Cell Phones*, Pew Research, *available at* http://www.pewinternet.org/Reports/2010/Teens-and-Mobile-Phones/Chapter-3/Overall-assessment-of-the-role-of-cell-phones.aspx

[18] Id.

[19] Cisco Visual Networking Index: Global Mobile Data Traffic Forecast Update, 2010-2015, February 1, 2011.

[20] Id.

Park, and trails and open space areas used by the public. The facility is needed in conjunction with other existing and proposed facilities for AT&T to provide reliable wireless services to the public that are not currently provided in this part of the State. Attachment 1 is a Radio Frequency Engineering Report with coverage plots depicting the "Current Coverage" provided by AT&T's existing facilities in this area of the state and "Proposed Coverage" as predicted from the proposed facilities together with existing coverage from adjacent sites. Additional statistics regarding the overall area, population and roadway miles of expanded coverage in the community are included in AT&T's report.

4. Municipal & Town Emergency Communications Need

The Town's Police, Fire and Emergency Management Departments all support this project and plan to install emergency communications antennas and equipment at the site as evidenced in the correspondence in support included in Attachment 1. In fact, the proposed Tower Facility will be a critical element of the Town's emergency communications network. The Town currently has plans, subject to budget allocations, for a new $4 million dollar system wide upgrade to its emergency communications . infrastructure and network. Irrespective of wireless carrier services, the Town requires a new tower in northwestern Ridgefield to reliably serve residents of the Town. This project represents an opportunity for the Town to avoid its own capital costs of tower site construction and the operational costs associated with owning, leasing and maintaining a tower site needed for emergency communications.

B. Statement of Benefits

The coverage area for both emergency communications and reliable wireless services encompasses a large area of northwestern Ridgefield. The benefits to the residents of the Town from the proposed tower Facility are significant and include among others:

1) In-building emergency and wireless services at five public schools and outdoor service at numerous ball fields well utilized by Ridgefield's numerous youth sports organizations where access to emegency communications and reliable wirleess services is not readily available;
2) In-building emergency and wireless service to thousands of residents who live in the coverage area and depend on Ridgefield's police, fire and

ambulance and do not otherwise have access to reliable wireless services for mobile 911 calls;

3) In-vehicle services along several State and other arterial roads used for access to both schools in the coverage area and by residents for local and commuter trips to downtown Ridgefield, Danbury, I-84, I-684 and MTA railroad facilities in adjacent communities.

Northwestern Ridgefield is an area that unquestionably experiences significant gaps in both emergency communications and reliable wireless services.

Beyond the above noted benefits, carriers have seen the public's demand for traditional cellular telephone services in a mobile setting develop into a requirement for anytime-anywhere wireless connectivity with critical reliance placed on the ability to send and receive, voice, text, image and video. Provided that network service is available, modern devices allow for interpersonal and internet connectivity, irrespective of whether a user is mobile or stationary, which has led to an increasing percentage of the population to rely on their wireless devices as their primary form of communication for personal, business and emergency needs. The proposed facility would allow AT&T and all other carriers to provide these benefits to the public that are not offered by any other form of communication system.

Moreover, AT&T will provide "Enhanced 911" services from the Facility, as required by the Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999, Pub. L. No. 106-81, 113 Stat. 1286 (codified in relevant part at 47 U.S.C. § 222) ("911 Act"). The purpose of this federal legislation was to promote public safety through the deployment of a seamless, nationwide emergency communications infrastructure that includes wireless communications services. In enacting the 911 Act, Congress recognized that networks that provide for the rapid, efficient deployment of emergency services would enable faster delivery of emergency care with reduced fatalities and severity of injuries. With each year since passage of the 911 Act, additional anecdotal evidence supports the public safety value of improved wireless communications in aiding lost, ill, or injured individuals, such as motorists and hikers. Carriers are able to help 911 public safety dispatchers identify wireless callers' geographical locations within several hundred feet, a significant benefit to the community associated with any new wireless site.

In 2009, Connecticut became the first state in the nation to establish a statewide emergency notification system. The CT Alert ENS system utilizes the state Enhanced 911 services database to allow the Connecticut Department of Homeland Security and Connecticut State Police to provide targeted alerts to the public and local emergency response personnel alike during life-threatening emergencies, including potential terrorist attacks, Amber Alerts and natural disasters. Pursuant to the Warning, Alert and Response Network Act, Pub. L. No. 109-437, 120 Stat. 1936 (2006) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 332(d)(1) (WARN), the FCC has established the Personal Localized Alerting Network (PLAN). PLAN will require wireless service providers to issue text message alerts from the President of the United States, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the National Weather Service using their networks that include facilities such as the one proposed in this Application. Telecommunications facilities like the one proposed in this Application enable the public to receive e-mails and text messages from the CT Alert ENS system on their mobile devices. The ability of the public to receive targeted alerts based on their geographic location at any given time represents the next evolution in public safety, which will adapt to unanticipated conditions to save lives.

C. Technological Alternatives

The FCC licenses granted to wireless carriers operating in Connecticut authorize them to provide wireless services in this area of the state through deployment of a network of wireless transmitting sites. Ridgefield as the name indicates is a community with varied topographic elevations, generally rural/suburban in character and surrounded by significant terrain in all directions. At this time, there are no known existing tower sites or structures in the northwestern Ridgefield area that would meet the technical requirements and/or are available for lease or acquisition for construction of a tower site could support a wireless facility or the Town's emergency communications equipment. In addition, repeaters, microcell transmitters, distributed antenna systems and other types of transmitting technologies are not a practicable or feasible means to providing such services within Ridgefield. The Applicants submit that there are no equally effective, feasible technological alternatives to a new tower for providing reliable personal wireless services and emergency communications in the northwestern Ridgefield area.

IV. Site Selection and Tower Sharing

A. Site Selection

AT&T, indeed all other licensed carrier networks, currently do not provide reliable services in most areas of northwestern Ridgefield. Carriers, including AT&T have been engaged in site searches in the Ridgefield area over a period of several years. This particular site search area in Ridgefield is predominated by significant ranges in ground elevation with ridges including Scott Ridge, West Mountain, Round Hill, Ridgebury Mountain and valleys including Lake Naraneka, Mamanasco Lake, and the Titicus River headwaters and relatively lower terrain to the north in Ridgebury. No tall structures are located at the higher elevations in this area of the Town of Ridgefield. The entire area consists principally of single family residential structures, schools, open space and parks.

AT&T, Homeland and the Town independently investigated a number of different parcels of land within northwestern Ridgefield for construction of a new tower facility. Their site searches date back several years. As part of these searches AT&T and Homeland also independently investigated several municipally owned properties in collaboration with Town officials. As provided in Attachment 2, other than the proposed candidate location these other sites were either unavailable or inappropriate for the siting of a tower facility or technically inadequate to satisfy AT&T or the Town's entire coverage requirements in this area of need.

B. Tower Sharing

The proposed Facility is designed to accommodate the antennas and equipment of the Town, AT&T and four (4) additional wireless carriers for to support police and fire department emergency communications and wireless services networks in the Town of Ridgefield.

V. Facility Design

The proposed Facility includes an approximately 75' x 75' lease area located in the north central portion of the Parcel which would be undeveloped for other purposes. The tower is proposed as a new self-supporting monopole 150' in height. The Town's antennas would be installed at the top of the tower reaching an overall height of approximately 161'-6" AGL along with other antennas located at lower elevations.

AT&T would install up to twelve (12) panel antennas and related equipment at a centerline height of 146' above grade level (AGL) on the tower. The tower would be designed for future shared use of the structure by other FCC licensed wireless carriers.

The tower compound would consist of a 62' x 75' area (4,650 sq. ft.) to accommodate AT&T's equipment and provide for future shared use of the facility by other carriers as well as the Town's own emergency communications equipment. The tower compound would be enclosed by an 8' high chain link fence. An AT&T 11.5'x 20' equipment shelter would be installed at the tower base on a concrete pad within the tower compound together with provisions for a fixed back-up power generator. The Town would install a 10' x 12' shelter on a concrete pad with provisions for a fixed back-up power generator.

Vehicle access to the facility would be provided from the intersection of Old Stagecoach Road and Aspen Ledges Road using an existing paper street and rights-of-way that benefit the parcel. The access area which is currently a dirt/gravel driveway will be graded and improved with a new surface, along the extension of the Old Stage Coach Road right of way (R.O.W.), then across the site a distance of approximately 650' to the proposed tower compound. Approximately 260' of the access drive would be bituminous asphalt. Utility connections would be routed largely underground from a new utility pole at the intersection of Old Stagecoach Road and Aspen Ledges Road. Attachment 3 contains the specifications for the proposed Facility, including an abutters map, site access maps, a compound plan, tower elevation, and other relevant details of the proposed Facility.

Included as Attachments 4, 5 and 6 are various documents obtained or created as part of the Applicants' environmental review including a comparative Visual Resource Evaluation Report (Attachment 5). Some of the relevant information included in Attachments 3, 4 and 5 reveals that:

- Grading and clearing of the compound and access driveway would require the importation of 4,500 cubic yards of fill for the construction of the proposed Facility;

- On-site management of stormwater and erosion controls are required during and after construction due to ledge, steep slopes and on-site wetlands; with the proposed mitigation measures and controls, the proposed Facility will have little to no impact on water flow or water quality as is will maintain or reduce the peak rates of runoff from the property.

The Applicants submit that construction on the Parcel will involve similar or relatively fewer environmental effects as compared with its development as a single family residence which would require a similar accessway in addition to clearing for subsurface disposal systems and other features associated with a structure for human habitation.

VI. Environmental Compatibility

Pursuant to C.G.S. §16-50p (a) (3) (B), the Siting Council is required to find and determine as part of the Application process any probable impact of the Facility on the natural environment, ecological balance, public health and safety, scenic, historic and recreational values, forest and parks, air and water purity, and fish and wildlife. As demonstrated in this Application, the Facility will be constructed in compliance with applicable regulations and guidelines, and best practices will be followed to ensure that the construction of the proposed Facility will not have a significant adverse environmental impact. In addition, the regular operation and monthly maintenance of the Facility will not have a significant environmental impact.

A. Visual Assessment

Included in Attachment 5 is a visual assessment which contains a view shed map and photo simulations of off-site views. It is anticipated that approximately 141 acres of the 8,042-acre study area will have visibility of the proposed Facility, and only 199+/- additional acres of visibility is expected year-round. Topography, vegetation and the relative height of the tower would obscure, partially or totally, views of the tower from most locations in the study area during leaf on conditions. The shoulder of the ridge on which the Parcel lies is prominent generally to locations to the west and south and as a result it is from locations within this viewshed where a majority of views would occur. The principal resource associated with a scenic quality in the viewshed area is the boat launch within Seth Low Pierrepont Park where views of the tower are

unavoidable. Views are otherwise limited to schools and residences generally in or across the valley from the proposed tower site location and a small area well north of the tower near the Town's McKeon Farm open space. Of note, the neighborhood along Old Stagecoach Road and Aspen Ledges Road will not have significant views of the tower as compared with the proposal pursued with the Town in 2010/2011 on the adjacent 28 Acre Parcel. A monopine option is available if such a condition is imposed by the Council, but we note the Town's Conservation Commission prefers a monopole design. Weather permitting, the Applicants will raise a balloon with a diameter of at least three (3) feet at the proposed site on the day of the Siting Council's first hearing session on this Application, or at a time otherwise specified by the Siting Council.

B. CT DEEP, SHPO and Other State and Federal Agency Comments

Various consultations and analyses for potential environmental impacts are summarized and included in Attachment 4. Representatives of the Applicants submitted requests for review from federal and state entities including the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (CTDEEP) and the Connecticut State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). Review of the CTDEEP Natural Diversity Database Maps indicated no federal or state threatened, endangered or special concern species occur within the project area or vicinity; the nearest NDDB buffer area is located approximately 1,000' to the south. See materials in Attachment 6. Subsequently CTDEEP indicated that there is a potential for the presence of the bog turtle and eastern box turtle in the area and requested a site specific survey to determine if they are present. In lieu of same, Homeland asked its consultants to assume the presence of such species and develop a turtle protection plan with construction protocols similar to measures approved in other Dockets and by CTDEEP. The turtle protection plan was submitted to CTDEEP and is included in Attachment 6 of this Application. SHPO review is pending and research by the project consultants to date indicates no potential adverse effect on any historic resources eligible for or listed on the National Register of Historic Places. As required by statute, this Application is being served on state and local agencies, which may choose to comment on the Application prior to the close of the Siting Council's public hearing.

C. Power Density

In August of 1996, the FCC adopted a standard for Maximum Permissible Exposure (MPE) for RF emissions from telecommunications facilities like the one proposed in this Application. The tower site will fully comply with federal and state MPE standards. The cumulative worst-case calculation of power density from AT&T's operations in addition to those belonging to Town emergency services at the facility would be 16.73% of the MPE standard. A maximum power density report is included in Attachment 4.

D. Wetlands, Drainage & Other Environmental Factors

The proposed Facility would be unmanned, requiring monthly maintenance visits approximately one hour long. Carriers that maintain antennas and equipment at an approved Facility monitor same 24 hours a day, seven days a week from a remote location. The proposed Facility does not require a water supply or wastewater utilities. No outdoor storage or solid waste receptacles will be needed. Furthermore, the proposed Facility will neither create nor emit any smoke, gas, dust, other air contaminants, noise, odors, nor vibrations other than those created by any heating and ventilation equipment or generators installed by carriers and the Town. During power outages and weekly equipment cycling an emergency generator would be utilized with air emissions in compliance with State of Connecticut requirements.

The Parcel currently supports an on-site wetland that is a hillside seep forested area associated with an intermittent watercourse. Additionally, the Parcel has areas of steep slopes. As such, the Applicants have designed and engineered various erosion and stormwater controls for the site to ensure no significant adverse impacts to wetlands or adjacent parcels including the Town's 28 Acre Parcel maintained as open space. A comprehensive report is included in Exhibit 4 as prepared by the Applicants' professional engineers and certified soil scientists. As set forth therein, the Facility and associated development of the Parcel will maintain or reduce the overall volume of runoff from the site and peak discharges will be the same or less than existing conditions. The closest disturbance is approximately 40' from the edge of the delineated wetland and 89' from the compound edge. Overall, the construction and operation of the proposed Facility will not have a significant impact on wetlands or water quality and drainage will be appropriately managed on-site.

E. National Environmental Policy Act Review

The Applicants have evaluated the project in accordance with the FCC's regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, Pub. L. No. 91-190, 83 Stat. 852(codified in relevant part at 42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.) ("NEPA"). The parcel was not identified as a wilderness area, wildlife preserve, National Park, National Forest, National Parkway, Scenic River, State Forest, State Designated Scenic River or State Gameland. Furthermore, according to the site survey and field investigations, no federally regulated wetlands or watercourses will be impacted by the proposed Facility.

F. Air Navigation

The proposed Facility was analyzed for potential impacts to air navigation. The Applicants obtained an FAA 1-A Survey as well as an independent FAA Aeronautical Evaluation conducted by Site Safe. Both indicate no marking or lighting of the tower for air navigation safety is required and that the tower will not be an obstruction to aviation. See materials included in Attachment 4.

VII. Consistency with the Town of Ridgefield's Land Use Regulations

Pursuant to the Siting Council's Application Guide, a narrative summary of the consistency of the project with the Town's zoning and wetland regulations and plan of conservation and development is included in this section. A description of the zoning classification of the site and the planned and existing uses of the proposed site location are also detailed in this section.

A. Ridgefield's Plan of Conservation and Development

The Ridgefield Plan of Conservation & Development ("POCD"), effective August 16, 2010 is included in the Bulk Filing. The POCD notes that the plan is "a statement of policies, goals and standards for the physical and economic development of the community" Plan Section 2-4 of the Executive Summary outlines Major Infrastructure Strategies which includes to "improve telecommunications". The Plan also addresses specifically in Chapter 14 Utilities, two specific communications-related issues: gaps in wireless coverage and the perceived lack of a fiber-optic network. This section of the POCD further outlines ways in which the Town should continue to work with providers to find solutions to balance resident's concerns and having a modern communications network. The two infrastructure strategies provided to improve telecommunications are: work with telecommunications providers to address wireless gaps in way that have

minimal impact on character and work with communication providers to find suitable options for installing fiber optic/high speed and capacity communications infrastructure. The Applicants submit the project is generally consistent with the Town's POCD.

B. Ridgefield's Zoning Regulations and Zoning Classification

The Town of Ridgefield Zoning Regulations set forth general requirements for communications tower siting in Section 8.2. The Facility site is classified in the RAAA (residential) zoning district where wireless communications facilities are permitted by Special Use Permit. The table below provides a review of general requirements of tower facilities under the Town of Ridgefield Zoning Regulations accompanied by compliance of the Facility with those requirements.

Section from the Zoning Regulations	Standard or Preference	Proposed Facility
8.2.G.3.B	Application shall include documentation on how the proposed facility will not interfere with emergency services	Interference with public safety communications equipment is not expected and the site will in fact be used for such services
8.2.G.3.C	Application shall include documentation on how the proposed facility will accommodate emergency services	The Town's Police, Fire and Emergency Management Departments all support this project and plan to install emergency communications antennas and equipment at the site as evidenced in the correspondence in support included in Attachment 1.
8.2.G.3.D	Application shall comply with FAA and FCC regulations	The proposed facility will comply with the FCC promulgated MPE standards as it will be only 16.73% of the regulatory limit. The site would not affect any FAA air

		navigational aids or transmitters, nor any military airspace.
8.2.G.3.E	Application shall include documentation regarding noise emissions, and steps to provide soundproofing so noise is inaudible at the property lines	Equipment at the facility would not emit noise other than that provided by the operation of the installed heating, air-conditioning and ventilation system and will comply with local noise standards. Construction noises would be probable during facility construction which is expected for about 4-6 weeks. A generator would be used only in emergencies and is exempt from noise regulations.
8.2.G.3.F	Application should include a written maintenance plan for the site including landscaping	The site plans do not currently incorporate landscaping given the proposed location on the property and surrounding wooded area, which will remain, and lack of any views into the compound from residences. Pursuant to Town Conservation Commission comments, landscaping will be incorporated into any D&M Plan for the Facility as requested as a buffer along the access to the Town's 28 Acre Parcel that is open space and open to public use.
8.2.G.3.G	Application shall include a map showing the extent of planned coverage within the Town of Ridgefield, location and service area of proposed facility.	See Attachment 1.
8.2.G.4	Towers shall be painted a	The proposed monopole will be a

	neutral color to minimize visual obtrusiveness, shall not be artificially lighted unless required by the FAA, and no signs are permitted other than a required 2 square foot sign with emergency contact information	galvanized steel which will present a matte gray finish. No illumination is required by the FAA and none is proposed. No advertising signs are proposed and any other signage would be minimal in scale and nature and be limited to no trespassing, warning, FCC registration and associated signs on the compound fencing.
8.2.G.5	Equipment cabinets and other appurtenances associated with the tower or antenna shall be clearly shown as part of the application along with how it will blend with the surrounding landscape or be obscured from adjacent properties/streets. Security fencing, no more than 6' tall may be required by the Commission around the antenna, tower, and equipment	Drawings with details of the proposed Facility are included in Attachment 3. Vegetation and topography will limit visibility of the tower base and equipment. No special design is proposed given the location on the property. An 8' chain link fence is proposed and will be treated with a black vinyl coating as requested by the Conservation Commission as part of any D&M Plan submission.

C. Planned and Existing Land Uses

The Facility is proposed on an undeveloped/vacant parcel of land adjacent to parcels of Town owned open space and in proximity to single family residences. Consultation with municipal officials did not indicate any other planned changes to the existing or surrounding land uses. Copies of the Town of Ridgefield Zoning Code, Inland Wetlands Regulations, Zoning Map and Plan of Conservation and Development are included in the Bulk Filing.

D. Ridgefield's Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations

The Ridgefield Inland Wetlands Regulations ("Local Wetlands Regulations") regulate certain activities conducted in "Wetlands" and "Watercourses" as defined therein. The Town has established various upland review areas for wetlands and watercourses of 25' to 100' for various activities and land uses. One such category is a 50' upland review area for the limit of fill, cut, grading and other alterations while another is a 75' upland review area for commercial structures. In this case, one wetland area located approximately 89' west of the proposed facility (outside of even the 75' upland review area for commercial structures) was identified consisting of a hillside seep forested wetland system associated with a seasonal intermittent watercourse that generally flow west. See Wetland Delineation Report included in Attachment 4. The limit of grading is approximately 40' from the wetland at its closest point. As such the project would constitute a regulated activity under Local Wetlands Regulations.

Due to the size of the Parcel, sloped areas, location of access easements, and functional areas where a tower compound can be developed without the need for retaining walls, the Applicant submits there is no practical or feasible alternative on-site location for the Facility and related disturbance to upland areas. Additionally, a comprehensive stormwater management system has been designed for the Facility that will create de minimus alterations to the runoff characteristics that will have no effect on the wetlands value or function. Further, all appropriate sediment and erosion control measures will be designed and employed in accordance with the Connecticut Soil Erosion Control Guidelines, as established by the Connecticut Council of Soil and Water Conservation and DEP (2002). Soil erosion control measures and other best management practices will be established and maintained throughout the construction of the proposed Facility. The Applicants do not anticipate an adverse impact on any wetland or water resources as part of construction or longer term operation of the Facility and respectfully submit any indirect impacts would be less than those associated with development of the Parcel for a use as a single family residence.

VIII. Consultations with Town Officials

C.G.S. § 16-50/ generally requires an applicant to consult with the municipality in which a new tower facility may be located for a period of ninety days prior to filing any application with the Siting Council. In this matter, the Applicants have individually

and collectively consulted with the Town for a period of over six years. With respect to the Facility as proposed in this Application, a Technical Report was filed with the Town of Ridgefield on October 31, 2013. A site walk was held by the Town's combined Planning & Zoning Commission and Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency and Town Planning Director with the Applicants' representative. Representatives of the Applicants also met with the Town's First Selectman, Town Planning Director, Chairman of the Conservation Commission and the Town's Deputy Director of Emergency Management. Additionally, a publicly noticed information session was held at Town Hall in December of 2013, and a copy of the Applicants' presentation placed on the Town's website. Written comments were received from both the Planning and Zoning Commission/Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency as well as the Conservation Commission copies of which are included in Exhibit 7.

As requested by the Town's agencies a detailed stormwater system has been designed and engineered to avoid impacts to wetlands and off-site properties, a copy of which is included in Exhibit 4. The Applicants are also prepared to consider the recommendations of the Conservation Commission as it relates to the fencing and use of a monopole structure as proposed in the Application. Further, some plantings can be incorporated as part of the final D&M design in order to screen potential views from the planned pedestrian trail. Additionally, the project incorporates the specifications of the Town's emergency communications antennas and equipment which have been coordinated through the Town's Department of Emergency Management.

IX. Estimated Cost and Schedule

A. Overall Estimated Cost

The total estimated cost of construction for the proposed Facility is represented in the table below.

Requisite Component:	Cost (USD)
Tower & Foundation	$105,000
Site Development	$130,000
Utility Installation	$25,000
Facility Installation	$45,000

Subtotal Homeland Towers Cost	**$305,000**
Antennas and Equipment	**$250,000**
Subtotal AT&T Cost	**$250,000**
Total Estimated Costs	**$555,000**

B. Overall Scheduling

Site preparation work would commence following Siting Council approval of a Development and Management ("D&M") Plan and the issuance of a Building Permit by the Town of Ridgefield. The site preparation phase is expected to be completed in 4-5 weeks. Installation of the monopole, antennas and associated equipment is expected to take an additional three weeks. The duration of the total construction schedule is approximately 8 weeks. Facility integration and system testing for carrier equipment is expected to require an additional 2 weeks after construction is completed.

X. Conclusion

This Application and the accompanying materials and documentation clearly demonstrate that a public need for a new tower in northwestern Ridgefield exists to provide both emergency communications and wireless services to the public. The Town, AT&T and all other wireless carriers have gaps in reliable communications in and around this area of the state. The Applicants respectfully submit that the public need for the proposed Facility outweighs any potential environmental effects from development of the tower, none of which have been identified as substantial or significant. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the Siting Council grant a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need to Homeland Towers for a new wireless telecommunications Facility in northwestern Ridgefield.

Respectfully Submitted,

By:_____

Christopher B. Fisher, Esq.
Daniel M. Laub, Esq.
Cuddy & Feder LLP
445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th Floor

White Plains, New York 10601
(914) 761-1300
Attorneys for the Applicant