community preferences related to tower facility siting. Overall, and based on the regulatory process set forth in state law that involves the Siting Council, the wireless industry evaluates tower site candidates and qualifies any candidates from the state's perspective, which is to balance the need for any new tower site and minimize environmental impacts where possible.

As noted below, both AT\&T and Homeland independently investigated a number of different parcels of land within northern Cheshire for construction of a new tower facility including municipally owned properties. As noted below, 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's coverage requirements in this area of need.

## Sites Investigated by AT\&T

Representatives for AT\&T also identified and investigated three (3) potential new tower sites/areas for the construction of a wireless facility. A description of each site investigated is set forth below. Where applicable, the reason for eliminating the property from further consideration is also included.

1. 1325 Cheshire Street Cheshire, Proposed Homeland Tower 170' AGL at Town of Cheshire Water Treatment Facility - AT\&T Radio Frequency Engineers approved this site.
2. 796 Greens Loop Cheshire, $80^{\prime}$ CL\&P Utility Pole - AT\&T Radio Frequency Engineers rejected this site as it did not meet the coverage objective.
3. 99 Realty Drive. 55' Rooftop at Milone and MacBroom building. AT\&T Radio Frequency Engineers rejected this site as it did not meet the coverage objective.

Map of AT\&T Search


## Homeland Site Search

Representatives for Homeland began investigating for a site for the known area of need in northern Cheshire in January of 2012. The site search began with a review of tax maps, topographic maps and satellite images. A number of properties potentially suitable for a site were identified and in April of 2012 preliminary proposals were sent to the owners of those properties. Attached included below is a map identifying the locations of the properties investigated. The sites are identified with corresponding numbers to the list below. A description of each site investigated is set forth below. Where applicable, the reason for eliminating the property from further consideration is also included.

1. Quinnipiac Treatment plant owned by the Town of Cheshire at 1325 Cheshire Street, Cheshire CT- this is the proposed candidate.
2. Broad Brook Filtration Plant Owned by the City of Meriden at 1285 South Meriden Road, Cheshire, CT - Preliminary discussions were had with representatives of the City of Meriden which owns the filtration plant at this location in Cheshire. A site visit and preliminary lease negotiations revealed concerns with the contract and the fact that a forthcoming major plant upgrade in 2014 or 2015 would limit construction activities. Follow up communication from Homeland regarding this potential site went unanswered. Unable to get a meeting scheduled or further the lease negotiations Homeland deemed this site rejected by the owner.
3. Casertano Green Houses and Farms at 1020 South Meriden Road in Cheshire CT - this property owner did not respond to Homeland's communication and was presumed not interested.
4. Michaels GreenHouses at 300 South Meriden Rd. in Cheshire CT - this property owner did not respond to Homeland's communication and was presumed not interested.
5. Hickory Hill Orchard at 351 South Meriden Road in Cheshire CT - this property is at the far southern end of the area of need near existing AT\&T sites. Notably, the possible location for a facility on this property
would have called for a lengthy access road, tree removals and close proximity to a retention pond together.
6. Norton Brothers Fruit Farm at 466 Academy Road in Cheshire, CT - this property owner did not respond to Homeland's communication and was presumed not interested.


## Existing Tower/Cell Site Listing

There are forty five (45) communications facilities located within approximately four (4) miles of the site search area for the proposed site in Cheshire. Each location is also shown on the following map. None of the existing facilities set forth below would provide adequate and reliable coverage to the target area. Indeed, many of the towers listed are currently being used or proposed for use by AT\&T to provide service outside of the area targeted for service for this proposed Cheshire Facility.


| \# | Town | Address | Latdd | Longdd | Tower Type | Owner | Height | ATT On Site |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Southington | 110 West Main Street | 41.5870278 | $72.8933889$ | Rooftop |  | 151' | carriers AT\&T, <br> Southwestern Bell Mobile |
| 2 | Southington | 1394 Meriden- <br> Waterbury Rd <br> (Route 322) | 41.5642889 | $72.8918778$ | monopole | Sprint | 150 | cing/cingular/ATT <br> @ 158' |
| 3 | Southington | 250 Meriden- <br> Waterbury <br> Turnpike | 41.5568306 | $72.8530083$ | self-supporting lattice | John Rogus | 80 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cingular/ATT @ } \\ & 78^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ |
| 4 | Southington | 440 Old Turnpike Road | 41.5828028 | $72.8831222$ | self-supporting lattice | Davidson Media Group (WNTY) | 254.5' | No |
| 5 | Southington | 72 Village Gate Drive | 41.5625583 | $72.8490694$ | Water Tank | C.H <br> Nickerson \& Co. | $54^{\prime}$ | No |
| 6 | Southington | Rahlene Drive | 41.5580444 | $72.8586694$ | power mount | CL\&P | 91 | No |
| 7 | Meriden | 1 Undercliff Road | 41.5510306 | $72.8244194$ | rooftop |  |  | No |
| 8 | Meriden | 21 West Peak Drive | 41.5628806 | $72.8445889$ | self-supporting lattice | Thomas Brothers | 135 | No |
| 9 | Meriden | 21 West Peak Dr | 41.5611528 | $72.8441278$ | self-supporting lattice | Mark Gilmore | 150 | No |
| 10 | Meriden | 21 West Peak Drive | 41.5626 | -72.8447 | self-supporting lattice | Clear <br> Channel | 160 | No |
| 11 | Meriden | 234 Sherman Avenue | 41.5480083 | $72.7845778$ | rooftop |  |  | cingular/ATT @ <br> 74' |
| 12 | Meriden | 27 Butler St | 41.537475 | $72.8062472$ | building mount | AT\&T Office Building | 77 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cingular/ATT @ } \\ & 83^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ |
| 13 | Meriden | 290 Pratt Street | 41.5422222 | $72.7906111$ | rooftop |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cingular/ATT @ } \\ & 82^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ |
| 14 | Meriden | 294 Colony St | 41.5456944 | $72.7983333$ | building mount | DPS | 53 | No |
| 15 | Meriden | 38 Elm St. | 41.5341139 | $72.7962139$ | Rooftop | Ashley Harriman | 70 | No |
| 16 | Meriden | 435 Lewis Avenue | 41.5496944 | $72.8009167$ | Rooftop |  |  | No |
| 17 | Meriden | 45 Gracey Avenue | 41.5502778 | $72.7933333$ | smokestack |  |  | No |
| 18 | Meriden | 450-478 West Main Street | 41.5400361 | $72.8190333$ | monopole | AT\&T | 100 | cing/cingular/ATT <br> @ 100' |
| 19 | Meriden | 470 Lewis Avenue | 41.5508611 | $72.8068611$ | rooftop |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cingular/ATT @ } \\ & 50^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ |
| 20 | Meriden | 495 <br> Chamberlain Highway | 41.55196 | -72.81141 | rooftop |  |  | No |
| 21 | Meriden | 500 South Broad Street | 41.5090833 | -72.81075 | smokestack |  |  | No |
| 22 | Meriden | $\begin{aligned} & 546 \text { S. Broad } \\ & \text { Street } \end{aligned}$ | 41.5081389 | $72.8093333$ | rooftop |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cingular/ATT @ } \\ & 56^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ |
| 23 | Meriden | 55 Michael Drive | 41.5572306 | $72.7897444$ | self-supporting lattice | City of Meriden | 120 | No |
| 24 | Meriden | 55 Willow Street | 41.535436 | -72.800684 | rooftop |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cingular/ATT @ } \\ & \text { 131' } \end{aligned}$ |
| 25 | Meriden | 60 Hanover Street | 41.5360278 | $72.8038611$ | Rooftop |  |  | No |


| 26 | Meriden | 64-80 S. Vine Street | 41.5380333 | $72.8196944$ | smokestack/rooftop |  |  | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 27 | Meriden | 85 Tremont St. | 41.5511111 | $72.7866111$ | rooftop | T-Mobile |  | No |
| 28 | Meriden | 90 Hanover Street | 41.5360278 | $72.8038889$ | rooftop |  |  | No |
| 29 | Meriden | West Peak | 41.5623333 | $72.8442389$ | self-supporting lattice | Thomas Brothers | 150 | No |
| 30 | Meriden | West Peak Dr | 41.5625667 | $72.8442861$ | self-supporting lattice | AT\&T/SCLP | 125 | cingular/ATT @ $131^{\prime}$ |
| 31 | Cheshire | 1119 Summit Road | 41.5363889 | -72.9578333 | Monopole | Crown | 170 | No |
| 32 | Cheshire | 1125 South <br> Main Street | 41.4741167 | -72.9074333 | rooftop | Town of Cheshire | $35^{\prime}$ | No |
| 33 | Cheshire | 1338 Highland Avenue | 41.5368778 | -72.8932972 | silo | Tower Farms Garden Center | 64' | cingular/ATT @ $49^{\circ}$ |
| 34 | Cheshire | 1511 Byam Road | 41.5468444 | -72.9588167 | rooftop |  | $20^{\prime}$ | No |
| 35 | Cheshire | $250 \text { Maple }$ <br> Avenue | 41.5055139 | -72.9030194 | tower |  | 121' | No |
| 36 | Cheshire | 500 Highland Avenue | 41.5111944 | -72.8984722 | Monopole | Town of Cheshire | 160 | No |
| 37 | Cheshire | 677 Mixville <br> Road | 41.5231222 | -72.9353083 | smokestack |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cingular/ATT@ } \\ & \text { 91' } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 38 | Cheshire | 705 West <br> Johnson Road | 41.5560444 | -72.917425 | self-supporting lattice | CL\&P | 140 | cingular/ATT @ $98^{\prime}$ |
| 39 | Cheshire | 751 Higgins <br> Road | 41.4872222 | -72.9297222 | self-supporting lattice | AT\&T | 269 | cingular/ATT @ $260 / 242^{\prime}$ |
| 40 | Cheshire | Cheshire <br> Larsens Pond | 41.5477778 | -72.9388889 | Monopole |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cingular/ATT @ } \\ & 89^{\prime} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 41 | Wallingford | 20 Alexander Dr. | 41.4793056 | -72.8008639 | building mount | Verizon | 35 | No |
| 42 | Wallingford | 50 Barnes Park North | 41.49064 | -72.79594 | in-building IP access |  |  | No |
| 43 | Wallingford | 56 Gaylord Farm Road | 41.4728028 | -72.8594556 | watertank | Gaylord Hospital |  | No |
| 44 | Wallingford | 80 Gaylord Farm Road | 41.474833 | -72.861358 | water tank | Sprint | 147' | No |
| 45 | Wallingford | 90 North Plains Industrial Road | 41.4807556 | -72.8177222 | monopole | American <br> Tower | 180 | cingular/ATT @ $160^{\prime}$ |

## ATTACHMENT 4

## Site Evaluation Report

## SITE EVALUATION REPORT

## CHESHIRE

## I. LOCATION

A. COORDINATES: $\quad 41^{\circ} 31^{\prime} 57.32^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{N}$
$72^{\circ} 52^{\prime} 13.70^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W}$
B. GROUND ELEVATION: 116' $\pm$ AMSL
C. USGS MAP: USGS 7.5 quadrangle for Meriden, CT
D. SITE ADDRESS: 1325 Cheshire Street

Cheshire, CT 06410
E. ZONING WITHIN $1 / 4$ MILE OF SITE: Abutting areas are zoned Residential (R-40) to the north, south, and east. To the west the abutting areas are zoned Residential (R-40 and R-20).

## II. DESCRIPTION

A. SITE SIZE: 59.0 Ac (Vol 150, Page 376)

LEASE AREA/COMPOUND AREA: 5,625 SF/4,650 SF
B. TOWER TYPE/HEIGHT: A 170' Monopole with top of antennas at 180' AGL.
C. SITE TOPOGRAPHY AND SURFACE: Subject site is located within a parcel owned by the Town of Cheshire and used as the Water Pollution Control Plant.
D. SURROUNDING TERRAIN, VEGETATION, WETLANDS, OR WATER: The proposed compound is located in the center of a $59 \pm$ acre parcel which is currently used as the municipal water pollution control plant and municipal recreation fields. To the north and west are undisturbed brush/wooded areas. To the south is the existing Water Pollution Control Plant. To the east are municipal athletic fields and associated parking. There are wetlands on-site to the west ( $\pm 127$ ').
E. LAND USE WITHIN $1 / 4$ MILE OF SITE: Residential land to the north, south, east, and west.

## III. FACILITIES

A. POWER COMPANY: Northeast Utilities Service Company
B. POWER PROXIMITY TO SITE: $385^{\prime} \pm$
C. TELEPHONE COMPANY: AT\&T
D. PHONE SERVICE PROXIMITY: $385^{\prime} \pm$
E. VEHICLE ACCESS TO SITE: Access to the proposed telecommunication facility will be along the existing bituminous driveway to the Water Pollution Control Plant to an existing gate north of the existing plant (1,360'+/-). The access from the existing gate to the proposed telecommunication facility will be along a proposed gravel driveway (140'+/-).
F. OBSTRUCTION: 100 Year Flood Line to the west and south of the proposed telecommunication facility.
G. CLEARING AND FILL REQUIRED: Total area of disturbance is 13,500 sf.; No trees will need to be removed. The site improvements shall produce a balanced site and will require approximately 250 CY of cut for utility trenching and approximately 160 CY of broken stone for the compound and driveway construction.
IV. LEGAL
A. PURCHASE [ ] LEASE [X]
B. OWNER: TOWN OF CHESHIRE
C. ADDRESS: Cheshire, CT 06410
D. DEED ON FILE AT: Volume 150, Page 376

Site Impact Statement

## Site: Cheshire

## Site Address: 1325 Cheshire Street Cheshire, CT 410

## Access distances:

Distance of new access driveway: $140 \pm$ feet
Distance to Nearest Wetlands
127'+/- west of the proposed facility

## Distance to Property Lines:

721 ' + - to the northern property boundary from the tower $960^{\prime}+/-$ to the southern property boundary from the tower $433+/-$ to the northwestern property boundary from the tower 851 ' $+/$ - to the southeastern property boundary from the tower

682 ' + - to the northern property boundary from the compound $917^{\prime}+/$ - to the southern property boundary from the compound 384 '+/- to the northwestern property boundary from the compound $806^{\prime}+/$ - to the southeastern property boundary from the compound

## Residence Information:

There are 12 single family residences within 1,000 ' feet of the compound. The closest off site residence is 781' to the north and is located at Parcel 29-114 (11 Marks Place).

## Special Building Information:

The 100 Year Flood Line (Elev. 112) is located on site, west of the proposed facility and the 100 Year Flood Line (Elev. 112.7) is located on site, south of the proposed facility.

## Tree Removal Count:

No trees need to be removed to construct the equipment areas.

| $6 "-10 " d b h$ | 0 trees |
| :---: | :--- |
| $10^{\prime \prime}-14 " d b h$ | 0 trees |
| $14 "$ or greater dbh | 0 trees |

Cut/Fill: The site improvements shall produce a balanced site and will require approximately 250 CY of cut for utility trenching and approximately 160 CY of broken stone for the compound and driveway construction.

Clearing/Grading Necessary: Total area of disturbance $=13,500$ SF

## Tree Inventory

January 15, 2014
Cuddy \& Feder, LLP
Attn: Christopher Fisher, Esq.
445 Hamilton Avenue
$14^{\text {th }}$ Floor
White Plains, NY 10601
RE: Tree Inventory
Site: CT005 Cheshire
1325 Cheshire Street
Cheshire, CT 06410
Dear Mr. Fisher:
A Tree Inventory was completed at the subject site on October 10, 2013 to determine the size and quantity of existing trees that will need to be removed for the installation of the proposed facility. The proposed site has suitable access, but clearing and earthwork will be required to improve the access route and to construct the compound area. Installation of the proposed compound area improvements will not require the removal of any trees.

The area to be disturbed for construction of the compound area will be approximately 5,625 square feet of existing brush/wooded area. The area to be cleared is located on the interior of the site and should not be visible to abutters. An existing access road exists on site and will require an extension to connect to the proposed compound. The total combined area of disturbance for compound, access drive, and utility improvements is $13 ; 500$ sf .

Sincerely,

## ALL-POINTS TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION, P.C.

 Principal


|  | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{HO} \\ 1000 \end{array}$ | TOWERS CT 00 HESHIRE <br> NTIAL BUILDING |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PARCEL ID | STREET ADDRESS | BUILDING TYPE | DISTANCE FROM COMPOUND* (ft) |
| 30-3 | 1339 CHESHIRE STREET | Single Family | 947+/- |
| 30-4 | 1355 CHESHIRE STREET | Single Family | 917+/- |
| 29-111 | 5 MARKS PLACE | Single Family | 952+/- |
| 29-112 | 7 MARKS PLACE | Single Family | 907+/- |
| 29-113 | 9 MARKS PLACE | Single Family | 909+/- |
| 29-114 | 11 MARKS PLACE | Single Family | 781+/- |
| 29-115 | 13 MARKS PLACE | Single Family | 999+/- |
| 29-40 | 540 OAKRIDGE DRIVE | Single Family | 802+/- |
| 29-32 | 532 OAKRIDGE DRIVE | Single Family | 880+/- |
| 29-33 | 94 VISTA TERRACE | Single Family | 946+/- |
| 39-68 | 13 WORDEN CIRCLE | Single Family | 891+/- |
| 39-67 | 15 WORDEN CIRCLE | Single Family | 893+/- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| *Information gathered from Cheshire Assessor Maps 29, 30 \& 39 and Bing Digiglobe 2012 Aerial Images (1-ft resolution) |  |  |  |
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## FAA 2C SURVEY CERTIFICATION

| Applicant: | Homeland Towers <br> 22 Shelter Rock Lane <br> Building C <br> Danbury, CT 06810 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Site Name: | CT005 CHESHIRE |
| Address | 1325 Cheshire Street <br> Cheshire, Connecticut 06410 |
| Horizontal Datum: | NAD 83 |
| Vertical Datum: | N.A.V.D. 88 |
| Structure Type: | Proposed Monopole |
| Latitude: | $41^{\circ}-31^{\prime}-57.329^{\prime \prime}$ N NAD 83 |
| Longitude: | $72^{\circ}-52^{\prime}-13.708^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W}$ NAD 83 |
| Existing Ground Elevation: | $116.0^{\prime} \pm$ feet N.A.V.D. 88 |
| Top of Proposed Structure: | 170.0 ' $\pm$ feet A.G.L. (286.0' $\pm$ N.A.V.D. 88$)$ |

## Certification:

## Company:

## Signature:

Surveyor/seal:
Date:
I certify that the Latitude and Longitude noted hereon are accurate to within $\pm 50$ feet horizontally and that the site elevation is accurate to within $\pm 20$ feet vertically. With a proposed top of structure of $170.0^{\prime} \pm$ AGL, the overall height will be 286.0 ' $\pm$ N.A.V.D. 88 . The horizontal datum (coordinates) are in terms of the North American Datum of 1983 (NAD 83) and are expressed in degrees minutes and seconds to the nearest thousandth of a second. The vertical datum (heights) are in terms of the North American Vertical Datum of 1988 and expressed to the nearest foot.


October 10, 2013


## TOWAIR Determination Results

A routine check of the coordinates, heights, and structure type you provided indicates that this structure does not require registration.

## *** NOTICE ***

TOWAIR's findings are not definitive or binding, and we cannot guarantee that the data in TOWAIR are fully current and accurate. In some instances, TOWAIR may yield results that differ from application of the criteria set out in 47 C.F.R. Section 17.7 and 14 C.F.R. Section 77.13. A positive finding by TOW AIR recommending notification should be given considerable weight. On the other hand, a finding by TOW AIR recommending either for or against notification is not conclusive. It is the responsibility of each ASR participant to exercise due diligence to determine if it must coordinate its structure with the FAA. TOW AIR is only one tool designed to assist ASR participants in exercising this due diligence, and further investigation may be necessary to determine if FAA coordination is appropriate.

DETERMINATION Results
PASS SLOPE(50:1): NO FAA REQ-RWY 10499 MTRS OR LESS \& 3933.74 MTRS (3.9337) KM AWAY

|  |  |  | Lowest <br> Elevation |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Type C/R | Latitude Longitude | Name | Address | (m) | Runway Length (m) |  |
| AIRP | R | $41-30-$ | $072-49-$ | MERIDEN | NEW HAVEN 30.0 | 944.89999999999998 |
|  | 46.00 N | 53.00 W | MARKHAM | MERIDEN, |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | MUNI | CT |  |


| Type | C/R | Latitude | Longitude | Name | Address | Lowest Elevation (m) | Runway Length (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HELI | C | $\begin{aligned} & 41-29- \\ & 31.00 \mathrm{~N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 072-48- \\ & 40.00 \mathrm{~W} \end{aligned}$ | Yalesville | NEW HAVEN YALESVILLE, CT | 19.8 | 19.800000000000001 |

Your Specifications

## NAD83 Coordinates

| Latitude | 41-31-57.3 north |
| :--- | :--- |
| Longitude | $072-52-13.7$ west |
| Measurements (Meters) | 53.3 |
| Overall Structure Height (AGL) | 51.8 |
| Support Structure Height (AGL) | 35.4 |
| Site Elevation (AMSL) |  |
| Structure Type |  |
| MTOWER - Monopole |  |

## ATTACHMENT 6

## Environmental Assessment

## I. PHYSICAL IMPACT

## A. WATER FLOW AND QUALITY

No significant water flow and/or water quality changes are anticipated as a result of the construction or operation of the proposed facility. One wetland was delineated within the study area consisting of a forested floodplain wetland associated with the nearby Quinnipiac River approximately 150 feet west from the proposed facility. A very poorly drained depressional wetland feature dominated by buttonbrush is located approximately 150' wets to the proposed Facility and could potentially provide "cryptic style" vernal pool habitat potential supportive of breeding amphibians. While further review of this wetland is being completed no impact is anticipated with the provision of proper protection measures and construction protocols. Best Management Practices to control storm water and soil erosion during construction will be implemented.

## B. AIR QUALITY

Under ordinary operating conditions, the equipment that would be used at the proposed facility would emit no air pollutants of any kind. An emergency diesel fuel generator with secondary containment systems will comply with Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection ("CTDEEP") air standards for such facilities.

## C. LAND

Some grading will be required for the facility. The remaining land of the lessor would remain unchanged by the construction and operation of the facility.

## D. NOISE

The equipment to be in operation at the facility would not emit noise other than that provided by the operation of the installed heating, air-conditioning and
ventilation system. Some construction related noise would be anticipated during facility construction, which is expected to take approximately four to six weeks. Temporary power outages could involve sound from the emergency generator.

## F. VISIBILITY

The attached Viewshed Analysis includes a computer modeled evaluation of the anticipated potential visual impact of a proposed monopole. The potential visibility was assessed within an approximately two (2) mile radius (study area) using a computer-based, predictive viewshed model. A balloon float, in-field review and development of photo simulations are planned. No schools or licensed child day care centers are located within 250' of the site.
II. SCENIC, NATURAL, HISTORIC \& RECREATIONAL VALUES

The site is under evaluation in accordance with the FCC's regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 ("NEPA"). Evaluation including consultation with the Connecticut State Historic Preservation Officer ("SHPO"). By letter dated May 30, 2014 the SHPO determined that the Facility would have no adverse effect on contributing resources eligible for listing on the National register of historic Places in a potential district in Cheshire so long as the design is as "non-visible as possible" and if not used for 6 consecutive months that the Facility should be removed. Please see Attachment 11. The Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection ("CTDEEP") was consulted regarding the location of the proposed Facility and determined that while wood turtles and eastern box turtles are present in the area, protection measures similar to those used at approved wireless facilities in the state will ensure the protection of these turtles.

## ATTACHMENT 7

## WETLAND INVESTIGATION

November 19, 2013

Homeland Towers<br>22 Shelter Rock Road, Bld. C<br>Danbury, CT 06810

## APT Project No.: CT283250

Re: Proposed Cheshire Facility - CT-005<br>1325 Cheshire Street Cheshire, Connecticut

All-Points Technology Corporation, P.C. ("APT") understands that a wireless telecommunications facility ("Facility") is proposed by Homeland Towers at 1325 Cheshire Street in Cheshire, Connecticut ("Subject Property"). At your request, Dean Gustafson, a Connecticut registered Professional Soil Scientist with APT conducted an inspection of the Subject Property on October 18, 2013 to determine the presence or absence of wetlands and watercourses within approximately 200 feet of proposed development activities ("Study Area"). The delineation methodology followed was consistent with both the Connecticut Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Act ("IWWA") and the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual (1987) and the Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Northcentral and Northeast Region, Version 2.0 (January 2012). The results of this wetland investigation are provided below.

## Site and Project Description:

The Subject Property consists of an approximately 59-acre municipally developed parcel. The area proposed for the wireless communications Facility is located centrally on the Subject Property north of the Cheshire Water Pollution Control Plant ("CWPCP") and west of the Cheshire Quinnipiac Recreation Area within a cleared and graded upland area used as a storage yard. Access is proposed to follow an existing paved drive serving the recreation fields and CWPCP to a point just south of the development area where a new $140 \pm$ linear foot gravel extension would be required to enter the Facility. The Study Area is dominated by the CWPCP development, athletic fields and undeveloped forest. The surrounding land-use generally consists of developed residential properties.

One wetland area was delineated within the Study Area consisting of a forested floodplain wetland associated with the nearby Quinnipiac River approximately 150 feet west of the proposed Facility. Please refer to the enclosed Wetland Delineation Map for the approximate location of the identified wetland resource area. Wetlands were marked with pink and blue plastic flagging tape numbered with the following sequence: WF 1-01 to 1-12. General weather conditions encountered during the above-referenced inspection included low $60^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ temperatures with sunny skies.

## Regulation of Wetlands:

Wetlands and watercourses are regulated by local, state and federal regulations, with each regulatory agency differing slightly in their definition and regulatory authority of resource areas, as discussed below. The proposed Facility is under the exclusive jurisdiction of the State of Connecticut Siting Council and therefore exempt from local regulation, although local wetland regulations are considered by the Siting Council. If wetlands are identified on the Subject Property and direct impact is proposed, those wetlands may be considered Waters of the United States and therefore the activity may also be subject to jurisdiction by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ("ACOE") New England District.

Town of Cheshire: The Town of Cheshire regulates activities within wetlands and watercourses and within 50 feet of wetlands and watercourses through administration of the Connecticut IWWA.

## State of Connecticut:

Freshwater Wetlands: The IWWA requires the regulation of activities affecting or having the potential to affect wetlands under Sec. 22a-36 through 22a-45 of the Connecticut General Statutes. The IWWA is administered through local municipalities. The IWWA defines wetlands as areas of poorly drained, very poorly drained, floodplain, and alluvial soils, as delineated by a soil scientist. Watercourses are defined as bogs, swamps, or marshes, as well as lakes, ponds, rivers, streams, etc., whether natural or man-made, permanent or intermittent. Intermittent watercourse determinations are based on the presence of a defined permanent channel and bank, and two of the following characteristics: (1) evidence of scour or deposits of recent alluvium or detritus; (2) the presence of standing or flowing water for a duration longer than a particular storm incident; and (3) the presence of hydrophytic vegetation.

ACOE:
The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers regulates the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Waters of the United States are navigable waters, tributaries to navigable waters, wetlands adjacent to those waters, and/or isolated wetlands that have a demonstrated interstate commerce connection. The ACOE Wetlands Delineation Manual defines wetlands as "[t]hose areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas."

Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 U.S.C. 403) prohibits the unauthorized obstruction or alteration of any navigable water of the United States. This section provides that the construction of any structure in or over any navigable water of the United States, or the accomplishment of any other work affecting the course, location, condition, or physical capacity of such waters is unlawful unless the work has been approved by the ACOE.

## Soil Description:

Soil types encountered throughout the Study Area were generally consistent with digitally available soil survey information obtained from the Natural Resources Conservation Service ("NRCS") ${ }^{1}$. Wetland soils field identified consist of the following alluvial (floodplain) soils: Occum fine sandy loam, Pootatuck fine sandy loam, Rippowam fine sandy loam and Saco silt loam. The non-wetland soils were examined along the wetland boundary and more distant upland areas during the delineation, including the proposed Facility location. They are dominated by Penwood loamy sand, Branford silt loam and Udorthents-Urban land complex. Detailed descriptions of wetland and upland soil types are provided below.

## Wetland Soils:

The Occum series consists of very deep, well drained loamy soils formed in alluvial sediments. They are nearly level soils on flood plains, subject to common flooding. Slope ranges from 0 to 3 percent. Permeability is moderate or moderately rapid in the loamy upper horizons and rapid or very rapid in the sandy substratum layers.

The Pootatuck series consists of very deep, moderately well drained loamy soils formed in alluvial sediments. They are nearly level soils on floodplains subject to common flooding. Slope ranges from 0 to 3 percent. Permeability is moderate or moderately rapid in the loamy upper horizons and rapid or very rapid in the sandy substratum layers.

The Rippowam series consists of very deep, poorly drained loamy soils formed in alluvial sediments. They are nearly level soils on flood plains subject to frequent flooding. Slope ranges from 0 to 3 percent. Permeability is moderate or moderately rapid in the loamy layers and rapid or very rapid in the underlying sandy materials.

The Saco series consists of very deep, very poorly drained soils formed in silty alluvial deposits derived mostly from granite, gneiss, schist, shale and sandstone. They are nearly level soils on floodplains along rivers and streams subject to frequent flooding. The thickness and number of horizons below the A horizon is variable and corresponds to the thickness and variability of the alluvial deposits.

## Upland Soils:

The Penwood series consists of excessively drained sandy soils formed in glaciofluvial (outwash) deposits. The soils are very deep to bedrock and located on nearly level outwash plains and terraces. Permeability is rapid to very rapid with the depth to seasonal water table greater than 6 feet.

The Branford series consists of very deep, well drained soils formed in loamy over sandy and gravelly outwash. They are nearly level to strongly sloping soils on outwash plains and terraces. Permeability of the Branford soils is moderate or moderately rapid in the surface layer and subsoil and rapid or very rapid in the substratum. Slope ranges from 0 to 15 percent.

Udorthents is a miscellaneous land type used to denote moderately well to excessively drained earthen material which has been so disturbed by cutting, filling, or grading that the original soil profile can no longer be discerned.

Urban land is a miscellaneous land type consisting mostly of buildings, paved roads and parking lots. Typically included with this unit are small, intermingled areas disturbed by cutting, filling, or grading such that the original soil profile can no longer be discerned.

[^0]
## Wetlands Discussion:

## Wetland 1 Classification Summary:

| Wetland 1 ${ }^{2}$ | System | Subsystem <br> Lower | Class | Subclass <br> Broad-leaved <br> Deciduous | Water Regime <br> Seasonally <br> Flooded | Special Modifier <br> (WF 1-01 to 1-12) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Palustrine | Perennial | Forested | Diked |  |  |  |
| Watercourse Type | Perennial | Intermittent | Tidal | Special Aquatic <br> Habitat | Vernal Pool | Other |
| (Quinnipiac River) | $\boxtimes$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |  |
| (Potential) | $\square$ |  |  |  |  |  |

## Wetland 1 Description:

Wetland 1 is a forested floodplain wetland system consisting of a variety of soil drainage classifications from excessively drained to very poorly drained. The Quinnipiac River floodplain dominates the wetland habitat that surrounds the CWPCP facility and is west of the Quinnipiac Recreation Area. An earthen dike surrounds the CWPCP to the north, west and south to separate the plant from the river's active floodplain. A very poorly drained depressional wetland feature dominated by buttonbush is located approximately 150 feet west of the proposed Homeland Tower's Facility. This wetland feature potentially provides "cryptic style" vernal pool habitat as it appears that the area supports seasonal inundation of sufficient depth and duration to provide breeding habitat for amphibians. Shallow inundation of generally less than 6 inches was observed in the central portion of this potentially special aquatic habitat feature at the time of the inspection.

## Wetland 1 Dominant Vegetation:

| Dominant Wetland Species <br> Common Name (Latin Name) | Dominant Adjacent Upland Species <br> Common Name (Latin Name) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Red Maple (Acer rubrum) | Sugar Maple (Acer saccharum) |
| American Elm (Ulmus americana) | Northern Red Oak (Quercus rubra) |
| American Beech (Fagus grandifolia) | White Oak (Quercus alba) |
| Pin Oak (Quercus palustris) | Pin Oak (Quercus palustris) |
| Specked Alder (Alnus rugosa) | Black Cherry (Prunus serotina) |
| Black Cherry (Prunus serotina) | American Beech (Fagus grandifolia) |
| Autumn Olive* (Elaeagnus umbellate) | Sassafras (Sassafras albidum) |
| Multiflora Rose* (Rosa multiflora) | Maple-leaved Viburnum (Viburnum acerifolium) |
| Winterberry (Ilex verticillata) | Autumn Olive* (Elaeagnus umbellate) |
| Buttonbush (Cephalanthus occidentalis) | Multiflora Rose* (Rosa multiflora) |
| Silky Dogwood (Cornus amomum) | Smooth Sumac (Rhus glabra) |
| Winged Euonymus* (Euonymus alata) | Mugwort* (Artemisia vulgaris) |
| Spicebush (Lindera benzoin) | maintained lawn species |
| Common Reed* (Phragmites australis) |  |
| Bebb Willow (Salix bebbiana) |  |
| Mugwort* (Artemisia vulgaris) |  |
| Swallow-wort* (Cynanchum spp.) |  |
| Asiatic Bittersweet* (Celastrus orbiculatus) |  |

* denotes Connecticut Invasive Plants Council invasive species

[^1]
## Summary:

Based on APT's understanding of the proposed Homeland Towers development, no direct impact to wetlands or watercourses will result from the proposed activity. However, the proposed Facility and access drive will be in proximity to Wetland 1, a portion of which may provide vernal pool habitat. APT will provide an evaluation of the project's potential wetland and vernal pool impacts under separate cover following a detailed review of the project's site plans.

If you have any questions regarding the above-referenced information, please feel free to contact me by telephone at (860) 984-9515 or via email at dgustafson@allpointstech.com.

Sincerely,

All-Points Technology Corporation, P.C.


Dean Gustafson
Professional Soil Scientist

Enclosure

## Wetland Delineation Map
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## ATTACHMENT 8

Dan.Goulet@csquaredsystems.com

June 16, 2014

## Connecticut Siting Council

Subject: New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC ("AT\&T") - S3459A - 1325 Cheshire Street, Cheshire, CT

## Dear Connecticut Siting Council:

C Squared Systems has been retained by New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC ("AT\&T") to investigate RF Power Density levels for the AT\&T antenna arrays, to be installed on the proposed monopole tower, to be located at 1325 Cheshire Street in Cheshire, CT.

Calculations were done in accordance with FCC OET Bulletin 65. These worst-case calculations assume that all transmitters are simultaneously operating at full power and that there is 0 dB of cable loss. The calculation point is 6 feet above ground level to model the RF power density at the head of a person standing at the base of the tower.

Due to the directional nature of the proposed AT\&T antennas, the majority of the RF power is focused out towards the horizon. As a result, there will be less RF power directed below the antennas relative to the horizon, and consequently lower power density levels around the base of the tower. Please refer to the Attachment for the vertical patterns of the proposed AT\&T antennas. The calculated results below include a nominal 10 dB off-beam pattern loss to account for the lower relative gain directly below the antennas.

| Location | Carrier | Vertical Distance to Antenna (Ft.) | Operating Frequency (MHz) | Number of Trans. | Effective <br> Radiated <br> Power <br> (ERP) Per <br> Transmitter <br> (Watts) | Power Density (mw/cm ${ }^{2}$ ) | Limit | \%MPE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ground Level | AT\&T UMTS | 155 | 880 | 1 | 1028 | 0.0017 | 0.5867 | 0.28\% |
|  | AT\&T UMTS | 155 | 1900 | 1 | 1265 | 0.0020 | 1.0000 | 0.20\% |
|  | AT\&T LTE | 155 | 710 | 2 | 1254 | 0.0041 | 0.4733 | 0.86\% |
|  | AT\&TLTE | 155 | 880 | 1 | 1543 | 0.0025 | 0.5867 | 0.43\% |
|  | AT\&T LTE | 155 | 1900 | 2 | 1897 | 0.0061 | 1.0000 | 0.61\% |
|  | AT\&TLTE | 155 | 2300 | 1 | 2179 | 0.0035 | 1.0000 | 0.35\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | 2.74\% |

Summary: Under worst-case assumptions, RF Power Density levels for the proposed AT\&T antenna arrays will not exceed $\mathbf{2 . 7 4}{ }^{1}{ }^{1}$ of the FCC MPE limit for General Public/Uncontrolled Environments.

Sincerely,


Daniel L. Goulet
C Squared Systems, LLC

[^2]
## Attachment: AT\&T's Antenna Data Sheets and Electrical Patterns

| 750 MHz |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Manufacturer: | CCI Products |
| Model \#: | HPA-65R-BUU-H8 |
| Frequency Band: | $698-806 \mathrm{MHz}$ |
| Gain: | 13.2 dBd |
| Vertical Beamwidth: | $10.1^{\circ}$ |
| Horizontal Beamwidth: | $65^{\circ}$ |
| Polarization: | Dual Pol $\pm 45^{\circ}$ |
| Size L x W x D: | $92.4^{\prime \prime} \times 14.8^{\prime \prime} \times 7.4 "$ |



## ATTACHMENT 9

# Visibility Analysis 

## 1325 Cheshire Street <br> Cheshire, Connecticut

Prepared For:<br>Homeland Towers LLC<br>22 Shelter Rock Lane<br>Building C<br>Danbury, CT 06810

Prepared By:<br>All-Points TECHNOLOGY Corporation, P.C.<br>3 Saddlebrook Drive<br>Killingworth, CT 06141

## Project Introduction

Homeland Towers is pursuing a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need from the Connecticut Siting Council ("Council") for the construction, maintenance and operation of a wireless communications facility ("Facility") on property located at 1325 Cheshire Street in Cheshire, Connecticut ("Host Property"). At the request of Homeland Towers, All-Points Technology Corporation, P.C. ("APT") prepared this Visibility Analysis to evaluate the potential visual impacts associated with the proposed Facility from within a two-mile radius ("Study Area"). In addition to the Town of Cheshire, small portions of the neighboring Towns of Southington (to the north), Meriden (east) and Wallingford (southeast) are also included within the Study Area.

## Site Description and Setting

The 59-acre Host Property is located at 1325 Cheshire Street in Cheshire, New Haven County, Connecticut. The Cheshire Assessor's Office identifies the Host Property as Parcel ID 38-180. The Host Property is developed with various municipal buildings and infrastructure supporting the Town of Cheshire wastewater treatment plant and the Town of Cheshire Quinnipiac Recreation Area that includes soccer and lacrosse fields, pavilion, picnic area, and in-line skating rink.

Homeland Towers proposes to install a 170-foot tall steel monopole designed to accommodate up to six commercial service providers and municipal/regional emergency services equipment. The Facility would be enclosed within a 62 -foot by 75 -foot fenced, gravel-base compound. The proposed Facility would be located in the west central portion of the Host Property ("Site") at an approximate ground elevation of 116 feet Above Mean Sea Level ("AMSL"). The Facility has been designed to accommodate antenna platforms for multiple commercial service providers as well as the Town's equipment.

The Host Property is surrounded on three sides by woods; the Quinnipiac River runs along the western property boundary. Land use within the general vicinity is primarily residential. The two-mile Study Area includes a total of approximately 8,042 acres. The tree canopy within the Study Area consists mainly of mixed deciduous hardwood species interspersed with scattered stands of conifers, and occupies approximately 5,841 acres (representing about $73 \%$ of the Study Area). Topography within the Study Area ranges in ground elevations from approximately 110 feet AMSL to 480 feet AMSL.

## Methodology

APT used the combination of a predictive computer model and in-field analysis to evaluate the visibility associated with the proposed Facility on both a quantitative and qualitative basis. The predictive model provides a measurable assessment of potential visibility throughout the entire Study Area including private properties and other areas inaccessible for direct observations. The in-field analyses included a reconnaissance of the Study Area to record existing conditions, verify results of the model, inventory visible and nonvisible locations, and provide photographic documentation from publicly accessible areas. A description of the procedures used in the analysis is provided below.

## Preliminary Computer Modeling

Two computer modeling tools are used to calculate those areas from which at least the top of the proposed Facility is estimated to be visible: IDRISI image analysis program (developed by Clark Labs, Clark University) and ArcGIS ${ }^{\circledR}$, developed by Environmental Systems Research Institute, Inc. Project- and Study Area-specific data were incorporated into the computer model, including the Facility's location, height, and ground elevation, as well as the surrounding topography and existing vegetation which are two primary features that can block direct lines of sight. Information used in the model included LiDAR ${ }^{1}$-based digital elevation data and customized land use data layers developed specifically for this analysis. The LiDARbased Digital Elevation Model ("DEM") represents topographic information for the state of Connecticut that was derived through the spatial interpolation of airborne LiDAR-based data collected in the year 2000 and has a horizontal resolution of ten (10) feet. In addition, multiple land use data layers were created from National Agricultural Imagery Program (USDA) aerial photography (1-foot resolution, flown in 2011) using IDRISI image processing tools. The IDRISI tools develop light reflective classes defined by statistical analysis of individual pixels, which are then grouped based on common reflective values such that distinctions can be made automatically between deciduous and coniferous tree species, as well as grassland, impervious surface areas, water and other distinct land use features. This information is manually cross-checked with the recent USGS topographic land characteristics to quality assure the imaging analysis.

Once the data layers were entered, image processing tools were applied and overlaid onto USGS topographic base maps and aerial photographs to achieve an estimate of locations where the Facility might be visible. First, only the topography data layer (DEM) was incorporated to evaluate potential visibility with no intervening vegetative screening. The model is queried to determine where the top of the Facility can be seen from any point(s) within the Study Area, given the intervening existing topography. The initial omission of the forest cover data layer results in an excessive over-prediction, but provides an opportunity to identify and evaluate those areas with potentially direct sight lines toward the Facility.

[^3]Eliminating the tree canopy altogether, as performed in the preliminary analysis exaggerates areas of visibility because it assumes unobstructed sight lines everywhere but in those locations where intervening topography rises above the height of the proposed Facility. However, using this technique not only allows for an initial identification of direct sight lines, but also to gain some insight regarding seasonal views when the leaves are not on the trees. This preliminary mapping is especially useful during the in-field activities (described below) to further evaluate "leaf-off" scenarios.

Visibility varies through the year as the leaves drop from deciduous trees. During "leaf on" conditions, individual trees that are grouped proximate to one another form a near opaque wall of vegetation that, once beyond a certain distance, cannot be seen through. Conversely, visibility increases seasonally with obstructed, views occurring during "leaf-off" conditions. Thus two forest data layers are created to represent both year-round ("leaf-on") and seasonal (leafless or "leaf-off") conditions. These data layers are incorporated into the model, analyzed separately and then merged to produce the visibility maps. Calculations resulting from the leaf-on forest data layer depict areas where at least the top of the Facility may be present above the intervening tree canopy. Similarly, computations from the "leaf-off" data layer also depict areas where the top of the Facility is predicted to be visible but it accounts for the increased transparency due to lack of vegetative screening. The Study Area includes mature vegetation with a unique composition and density of woodlands, with mast or pole timber and branching providing the majority of screening in leafless conditions. Beyond the density of woodlands found within the Study Area, each individual tree has its own unique trunk, pole timber and branching pattern characteristics that provide varying degrees of screening in leafless conditions which cannot be precisely modeled. Because tree spacing, dimensions and branching patterns as well as the understory differ greatly over even small areas, the Study Area has its own discrete forest characteristics. To approximate seasonal visibility, a conservative set of values was incorporated into the model, including the assumptions that each deciduous tree is simply a vertical pole with no distinct branching pattern. Given these conservative assumptions, the resultant modeling still over-predicts visibility in "leaf-off" conditions but does provide a better representation than the initial map using topography only.

A purposely low average tree canopy height of 50 feet was then incorporated into the forest data layers and added to the DEM for a second iteration of the visibility map. The model was queried again to determine where the top of the Facility may be seen from any point(s) within the Study Area, given both the intervening existing topography and forest data layers. The results of the preliminary analysis provide a representation of those areas where portions of the Facility could potentially be visible to the human eye without the aid of magnification, based on a viewer eye-height of 5 feet above the ground and the combination of intervening topography and tree canopy (year-round) and tree trunks (seasonally, when the leaves are off the deciduous trees) using an average tree height of 50 feet. This iteration provides a conservative assessment of intervening vegetation for use during the in-field activities to compare the outcomes of the initial computer modeling with direct observations of the balloon float.

As a final step, the forested areas were extracted from the areas of visibility, using a conservative assumption that a person standing within the forest will not be able to view the proposed Facility beyond a distance of approximately 500 feet. Depending on the density of the intervening tree canopy and understory of the surrounding woodlands, it is assumed that some locations within this distance could provide visibility of at least portions of the proposed Facility at any time of the year. In "leaf-on" conditions, this distance may be overly conservative for most locations. However, for purposes of this analysis, it was reasoned that forested land beyond 500 feet of the proposed Facility would consist of light-impenetrable trees of a uniform height.

Additional data was reviewed and incorporated into the visibility analysis, including protected private and public open space, parks, recreational facilities, hiking trails, schools, and historic districts. The Town of Cheshire maintains open space made available to the public which have walking trails. The nearest of these trails, the Quinnipiac Park Trail, wraps around three sides of the Host Property. Additional trails within the Study Area include those at Ives Farm ( $0.70 \pm$ mile to the northeast) and Cheshire Park ( $1.27 \pm$ miles southwest), as well as the Hanover Pond Trails which extend within $0.80 \pm$ mile of the Site. Based on a review of publicly-available information, no State or locally designated scenic roadways are present within the Study Area.

## In-Field Activities

To supplement and fine tune the results of the computer modeling efforts, APT completed in-field verification activities consisting of a balloon float, vehicular and pedestrian reconnaissance, and photodocumentation.

## Balloon Float and Field Reconnaissance

A balloon float and field reconnaissance were conducted on April 2, 2014 to obtain photographs for use in this report. The balloon float consisted of raising an approximately four-foot diameter, red helium-filled balloon tethered to a string height of 170 feet above ground level ("AGL") at the proposed Facility location. Weather conditions were favorable for the in-field activities, with calm winds (less than 4 miles per hour) and partly cloudy skies. Once the balloon was secured, APT conducted a Study Area reconnaissance by driving along the local and State roads and other publicly accessible locations to document and inventory where the balloon could be seen above/through the tree canopy. Visual observations from the reconnaissance were also used to evaluate the results of the preliminary visibility mapping and identify any discrepancies in the initial modeling.

During the balloon float and in-field activities, several trees were randomly surveyed using a handheld infrared laser range finder and a Suunto Tandem clinometer to ascertain their heights. The heights of trees adjacent to the site were field measured to document the surrounding canopy elevation. Numerous offsite locations were also selected to obtain tree canopy heights, including along roadways, wooded lots, and high- and low-lying areas to provide for the irregularities associated with different land characteristics and uses found within the Study Area. The average canopy height was developed based on measurements and comparative observations, in this case approximately 65 feet AGL. Throughout Connecticut, the tree canopy height varies from about 55 feet to in excess of 80 feet (where eastern white pine becomes a dominant component of the forest type, average tree heights may be even slightly higher). This general uniformity is most likely the result of historic state-wide clear cutting of forests for charcoal production in the late 1800s and early 1900s. Approximately $69 \%$ of Connecticut's forests are characterized as mature ${ }^{2}$.

[^4]
## Photographic Documentation

During the balloon float and field reconnaissance, APT drove the public roads within the Study Area and recorded observations, including photo-documentation, of those areas where the balloon was and was not visible. Photographs were obtained from several vantage points to document the views of a proposed Facility. The geographic coordinates of the camera's position at each photo location were logged using global positioning system ("GPS") technology. Photographs were taken with a Canon EOS 6D digital camera body and Canon EF 24 to 105 millimeter ("mm") zoom lens, with lens set to 50 mm .
"The lens that most closely approximates the view of the unaided human eye is known as the normal focal-length lens. For the 35 mm camera format, which gives a $24 \times 36 \mathrm{~mm}$ image, the normal focal length is about $50 \mathrm{~mm} .^{3 "}$

## Final Visibility Mapping

Information obtained during the field reconnaissance was incorporated into the mapping data layers, including observations of the balloon float, the photo locations, areas that experienced recent land use changes and those places where the initial model was found to over-predict visibility. The revised average tree canopy height data ( 65 feet AGL) was merged with the DEM and added to the base ground elevations of the forested areas data layer. Once the additional data was integrated into the model, APT re-calculated the visibility of the proposed Facility from within the Study Area to assist in producing the final viewshed map.

[^5]
## Photographic Simulations

Photographic simulations were generated to portray scaled renderings of the proposed Facility from 20 representative locations where the proposed Facility would be visible either on a year-round or seasonal basis. Using field data, site plan information and 3-dimension (3D) modeling software, spatially referenced models of the site area and Facility were generated and merged. The geographic coordinates obtained in the field for the photograph locations were incorporated into the model to produce virtual camera positions within the spatial 3D model. Photo simulations were then created using a combination of renderings generated in the 3D model and photo-rendering software programs ${ }^{4}$.

As stated earlier, APT has elected to use a 50 mm focal length whenever possible; however, there are occasions when the use of a wider-angle lens setting is preferred. For presentation purposes in this report, all but one of the photographs were taken with a 50 mm focal length and produced in an approximate 7 -inch by 10.5 -inch format. When viewing in this format size, we believe it is important to provide the largest representational image while maintaining an accurate relation of sizes between objects within the frame of the photograph.

Photo-documentation of the balloon float and photo-simulations of the proposed Facility are presented in the attachment at the end of this report. The balloon float photos provide visual reference points for the approximate height and location of the proposed Facility relative to the scene. The photo-simulations are intended to provide the reader with a general understanding of the different views that might be achieved of the Facility. For illustrative purposes, the Facility is depicted with four antenna platforms and the Town's emergency services whip antennas. It is important to consider that the publicly-accessible locations selected are typically representative of a "worst case" scenario. They were chosen to present unobstructed view lines (wherever possible), are static in nature and do not necessarily fairly characterize the prevailing views from all locations within a given area. From several locations, moving a few feet in any direction will result in a far different perspective of the Facility than what is presented in the photographs. In several cases, a view of the Facility may be limited to the immediate area of the specific photo location.

[^6]
## Photograph Locations

The table below summarizes characteristics of the photographs and simulations presented in the attachment to this report including a description of each location, view orientation, the distance from where the photo was taken relative to the proposed Facility and the general characteristics of that view. The photo locations are depicted on the visibility analysis maps provided as attachments to this report.

| View | Location | Orientation | Distance <br> to Site | View <br> Characteristics |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | East Ridge Court | Southwest | $\pm 0.84$ Mile | Seasonal |
| 2 | Cheshire Street Cemetery | Southwest | $\pm 0.49$ Mile | Year-round |
| 3 | River View Court | South | $\pm 0.39$ Mile | Seasonal |
| 4 | North Pond Road | Southwest | $\pm 0.70$ Mile | Seasonal |
| 5 | Trout Brook Road | Southwest | $\pm 0.59$ Mile | Seasonal |
| 6 | Cheshire Street | Southwest | $\pm 0.30$ Mile | Year-round |
| 7 | Sandstone Circle | Southeast | $\pm 0.34$ Mile | Year-round |
| 8 | Adjacent to \#9 Marks Place | Easth | $\pm 0.20$ Mile | Year-round |
| 9 | Oak Ridge Drive at Cul-de-Sac | $\pm 0.17$ Mile | Seasonal |  |
| 10 | Vista Terrace | West | $\pm 0.20$ Mile | Seasonal |
| 11 | Smith Place | West | $\pm 0.26$ Mile | Seasonal |
| 12 | Host Property | West | $\pm 0.29$ Mile | Seas-round |
| 13 | Allen Avenue | West | $\pm 0.28$ Mile | Year-round |
| 14 | Allen Avenue | West | $\pm 0.51$ Mile | Seasonal |
| 15 | Allen Avenue | Northwest | $\pm 0.22$ Mile | Seasonal |
| 16 | Wooden Circle | Northeast | $\pm 0.33$ Mile | Seasonal |
| 17 | Riverside Drive | North | $\pm 0.25$ Mile | Seasonal |
| 18 | Riverside Drive | Northwest | $\pm 0.41$ Mile | Year-round |
| 19 | Cheshire Street | Northwest | $\pm 0.51$ Mile | Seasonal |
| 20 | Sindall Road |  |  |  |

## Visibility Analysis Results

Results of this analysis are graphically displayed on the viewshed maps provided in the attachment at the end of this report. Areas from where the proposed Facility would be visible above the tree canopy yearround comprise a total of approximately 53 acres. When the leaves are off the trees, seasonal views through intervening tree trunks and branches are anticipated to occur over some locations within an area of $735 \pm$ acres.

In general, year-round views of large portions of the Facility appear limited to the Host Property and its immediate vicinity ( 0.25 mile or less) as can be seen in photos 12,8 and 14 , for example. Beyond this distance, year-round views become very sporadic and would offer less of a profile of the Facility (see photos 2,7 and 19). The relatively restricted areas of year-round visibility are a result of the Host Property's setting within an area characterized by large stands of trees, including within and around residential neighborhoods.

Seasonal views, when the leaves are off the deciduous trees, could extend out to distances of approximately one mile northward and perhaps a bit more to the south. Approaching these distances, most views would be intermittent and substantially obscured by intervening trees and structures. Although photos $4,5,17$ and 20 are all from locations less than one mile away, they provide representative examples of potential seasonal views from within the outer areas of seasonal visibility depicted on the viewshed maps. Please note that seasonal visibility over all non-accessible areas for field confirmation (i.e., private properties) is reliant on computer modeling and, as introduced above results in an over-prediction of the seasonal viewshed. The Facility would not be visible from all locations within the shaded areas depicted on the maps. Beyond the limitations previously discussed, the computer model cannot account for mass density, the height, diameter and branching variability of the trees, or the degradation of views that occur with distance. In addition, each point - or pixel - represents about one meter ( 3.28 feet) in area, and thus is not predicting visibility from all viewpoints through all possible obstacles. Although large portions of the predicted viewshed may theoretically offer visibility of the Facility, because of these unavoidable limitations the quality of those views may not be sufficient for the human eye to recognize the tower or discriminate it from other surrounding objects.

Year-round views of the Facility would be achieved from the northern portion of the Quinnipiac River Trail. Seasonal views are anticipated from the southern portion of this trail, as well as some locations within the Ives Farm trails system. No views are predicted to extend to the Hanover Pond Trails or Cheshire Park.

## Proximity to Schools And Commercial Child Day Care Centers

No schools or commercial child day care centers are located within 250 feet of the Host Property. The nearest school is the Chapman School, located approximately 1.5 miles to the southwest of the Host Property at 38 Country Club Road. The nearest commercial child day care center is the Stork Club of Cheshire, located at 1311 Highland Avenue approximately 1.25 miles to the west. Note that the Chapman School also operates a day care (Chapman Y - Latch Key Center). No views of the Facility are anticipated from either of these locations.

## LIMITATIONS

The viewshed maps presented in the attachment to this report depict areas where the proposed Facility may potentially be visible to the human eye without the aid of magnification based on a viewer eyeheight of 5 feet above the ground and intervening topography and an assumed tree canopy height of 65 feet. This analysis may not necessarily account for all visible locations, as it is based on the combination of computer modeling, incorporating 2012 aerial photographs, and in-field observations from publicly-accessible locations. No access to private properties was provided to APT personnel. This analysis does not claim to depict the only areas, or all locations, where visibility may occur; it is intended to provide a representation of those areas where the Facility is likely to be seen.

The simulations provide a representation of the Facility under similar settings as those encountered during the balloon floats and reconnaissance. Views of the Facility can change throughout the seasons and the time of day, and are dependent on weather and other atmospheric conditions (e.g., haze, fog, clouds); the location, angle and intensity of the sun; and the specific viewer location. Weather conditions on the day of the balloon floats included partly cloudy skies and, combined with the leaf-off conditions, the photo-simulations presented in this report provide an accurate portrayal of the Facility during comparable conditions.

## ATTACHMENTS
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ NRCS Web Soil Survey, http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/, accessed on October 14, 2013.
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