

**NORTH ATLANTIC
TOWERS**

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL**

RE: APPLICATION BY FLORIDA TOWER
PARTNERS LLC D/B/A NORTH
ATLANTIC TOWERS FOR A
CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL
COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED
FOR A TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY
AT 62-64 CODFISH HILL ROAD IN THE
TOWN OF BETHEL, CONNECTICUT

DOCKET NO. _____

DATE: MARCH 19, 2015

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
I. INTRODUCTION	5
A. Authority and Purpose.....	5
B. The Applicant.....	5
C. Application Fee	6
D. Compliance with General Statute § 16-501 (c).....	6
II. SERVICE AND NOTICE REQUIRED BY C.G.S. SECTION 16-501(b)	6
III. PROPOSED FACILITY	7
A. Facility Design.....	7
B. Coverage to be Achieved.....	9
IV. STATEMENT OF NEED AND BENEFIT.....	10
A. Statement of Need	10
1. United States Policy and Law.....	10
2. United States Wireless Usage Statistics	15
3. Site Specific Need.....	16
B. Technological Alternatives	17
V. SITE SELECTION AND TOWER SHARING	18
A. Site Selection.....	18
B. Tower Sharing.....	19
VI. ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY.....	19
A. Visual Assessment.....	20
1. Site 1 Visibility.....	21
2. Site 2 Visibility.....	22
B. Solicitation of State Agency Comments	23
C. MPE Limits/Power Density Analysis	24
D. Other Environmental Factors	24
VII. CONSISTENCY WITH THE BETHEL LAND USE REGULATIONS	27
A. Bethel Plan of Development.....	28
B. Bethel Zoning Regulations.....	28
C. Planned and Existing Land Uses	31
D. Bethel Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations	32

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

	<u>Page</u>
VIII. CONSULTATIONS WITH LOCAL, STATE AND FEDERAL OFFICIALS.....	33
A. Local Consultations.....	33
B. Consultations with State Officials.....	35
C. Consultation with Federal Agencies.....	35
IX. ESTIMATED COST AND SCHEDULE	36
A. Overall Estimated Cost	36
B. Overall Scheduling.....	37
X. CONCLUSION.....	37

LIST OF EXHIBITS

- A. Connecticut Siting Council's Community Antenna Television and Telecommunication Facilities Application Guide
- B. Certification of Service on Governmental Officials Including List of the Officials Served
- C. Legal Notices and the Publisher's Certificate of Publication
- D. Certification of Service to Abutting Property Owners, Including List of Abutting Owners to Whom the Notice was Mailed, Sample Notice Letter and Attached Legal Notice
- E. Site 1 Plans and Site 1 Evaluation Report
- F. Site 2 Plans and Site 2 Evaluation Report
- G. Radio Frequency Engineering Report
- H. Site Search Summary, Map of Sites Searched and 4 Mile Tower Map
- I. Visibility Analyses and Balloon Affidavit
- J. SHPO letter and Archaeological Letter
- K. Power Density Reports
- L. National Environmental Policy Act Report
- M. Avian Report
- N. Wetlands Report

LIST OF EXHIBITS (cont.)

- O. Technical Report Filing Letter, Supplemental Filing Letter and Attachment, and Town Response with Map
- P. FAA letters
- Q. Redacted Lease(s)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Applicant Florida Tower Partners LLC d/b/a North Atlantic Towers submits an application and supporting documentation (collectively “Application”) for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need (“Certificate”) for the construction, maintenance and operation of a wireless telecommunications facility (“Facility”) at one of two locations at 62-64 Codfish Hill Road in the Town of Bethel.

North Atlantic Towers seeks to construct, maintain and operate the Facility on property known as 62-64 Codfish Hill Road in Bethel, Map 65, Block 57, Lot 122 (“Property”). The Facility would provide New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (“AT&T”) needed coverage to the eastern area of Bethel and the adjacent area of Newtown, including Codfish Hill Road, Dodgington Road, Putnam Park Road, Sugar Street, Wolfpits Road and Taunton Hill Road, Buckboard Ridge Road, Legend Drive, Plumtrees Road, Chestnut Ridge Road and the surrounding area. AT&T issued a site search ring in January 19, 2010, focused on the eastern area of Bethel. AT&T conducted a thorough site search of the area and after concluding that there were no existing structures or suitable facility locations available, AT&T agreed to pursue the investigation and development of a new tower site in this area of Bethel with North Atlantic Towers. AT&T has agreed to act as the anchor tenant for this proposed Facility.

North Atlantic Towers is a wireless infrastructure provider that uses its knowledge of the wireless carriers’ networks and/or specific information from the individual carriers to develop new wireless facilities where a need has been demonstrated. Through this collaborative process North Atlantic Towers became aware that wireless coverage in

the area of eastern Bethel and adjacent area of Newtown suffers from a lack of sufficient coverage as a result of an absence of existing wireless facilities or structures suitable for co-location in these areas of Bethel and Newtown. As a result, and in consultation with AT&T, North Atlantic Towers began a site search in this area in June, 2010

North Atlantic Towers concluded that the property options for a new wireless facility site were limited by the terrain, property size and use, and availability of interested landowners in the area. AT&T's independent site search resulted in similar conclusions. After reviewing several sites in this area, North Atlantic Towers identified a viable parcel of property in this area of Bethel and entered into a lease agreement with the owner, Claudia Stone.

The Property is an approximately 49 acre parcel of property located at 62-64 Codfish Hill Road in Bethel. A residence and garage are located on the Property, but the majority of the acreage is undeveloped land that is heavily wooded in some locations.

The first alternative site would be located in the eastern portion of the Property (Site 1"). The Facility at Site 1 would sit within a 10,000 square foot area leased by North Atlantic Towers and would consist of a 150 foot monopole structure, with AT&T's antennas mounted at a centerline of 146 feet AGL. The tower would also host the equipment of three additional wireless carriers as well as Town emergency services, if needed. AT&T's 20 foot x 16 foot equipment shelter and generator would be located within the compound area, with space reserved for the equipment of three additional carriers. An eight foot high chain link fence would secure the equipment at the Facility.

Vehicle access to Site 1 would be along approximately 1,650 feet of improved and unimproved areas of the Property; both areas would be graveled and graded. Subject to the approval of the utilities, utility connections would extend along approximately 1,650 foot route from Codfish Hill Road to the Site 1 compound.

The second alternative site would be located in the central portion of the Property (Site 2"). The Facility at Site 2 would sit within a 10,000 square foot area leased by North Atlantic Towers and would consist of a 170 foot monopole structure, with AT&T's antennas mounted at a centerline of 166 feet AGL. The tower would also host the equipment of three additional wireless carriers as well as Town emergency services, if needed. AT&T's 20 foot x 16 foot equipment shelter and generator would be located within the compound area, with space reserved for the equipment of three additional carriers. An eight foot high chain link fence would secure the equipment at the Facility. Vehicle access to Site 2 would be along an approximately 860 foot route of improved and unimproved areas of the Property; both areas would be graveled and graded. Subject to the approval of the utilities, utility connections would extend along an approximately 860 foot route from Codfish Hill Road to the Site 2 compound.

North Atlantic Towers filed a Technical Report with the Town of Bethel on June 29, 2013. The Technical Report included the proposed Facility at Site 1. The Town indicated that if the Facility were to be located on this Property, it wanted the Facility to be located in a more central location on the Property. North Atlantic Towers worked with the property owner to offer Site 2, which is located more centrally on the Property.

This Application includes reports, site plans, a visibility analysis and other information detailing the proposed Facility at both locations. These reports and

supporting documentation contain the relevant site specific information required by statute and the Council's regulations. This Application also includes a copy of the Council's Community Antenna Television and Telecommunication Facilities Application Guide with references to this Application, attached as Exhibit A.

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL**

RE: APPLICATION BY FLORIDA TOWER
PARTNERS LLC D/B/A NORTH
ATLANTIC TOWERS FOR A
CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL
COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED
FOR A TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY
AT 62-64 CODFISH HILL ROAD IN THE
TOWN OF BETHEL, CONNECTICUT

DOCKET NO. _____

Date: March 19, 2015

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED**

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Authority and Purpose

Pursuant to General Statutes § 16-50g *et seq.* and § 16-50j-1 *et seq.* of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, Applicant Florida Tower Partners LLC d/b/a North Atlantic Towers submits an application and supporting documentation (collectively “Application”) for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need (“Certificate”) for the construction, maintenance and operation of a wireless telecommunications facility at one of two locations at 62-64 Codfish Hill Road in the Town of Bethel (“Facility” or “Codfish Hill Road Facility”). New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (“AT&T”) will be the anchor tenant and will intervene in this proceeding.

B. The Applicant

Florida Tower Partners LLC d/b/a North Atlantic Towers is a Delaware limited liability company with an office at 1001 3rd Avenue West, Suite 420, Bradenton Florida 34205. North Atlantic Towers will be the Certificate Holder and construct and maintain the Facility accordingly.

Communications regarding the Application should be to North Atlantic Tower's attorneys as follows:

Cohen and Wolf, P.C.
1115 Broad Street
Bridgeport, CT 06604
Telephone: (203) 368-0211
Attention: Julie D. Kohler, Esq.
jkohler@cohenandwolf.com

C. Application Fee

The estimated construction cost for the Facility at either Site 1 or Site 2 would be less than \$5,000,000. Therefore, pursuant to § 16-50v-1a (b) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, a check made payable to the Council in the amount of \$1,250.00 accompanies this Application.

D. Compliance with General Statute § 16-50/ (c)

North Atlantic Towers is not engaged in generating electric power in the State of Connecticut; thus, the proposed Facility is not subject to General Statutes § 16-50r. The proposed Facility has not been identified in any annual forecast reports and, therefore, is not subject to General Statute § 16-50/ (c).

II. SERVICE AND NOTICE REQUIRED BY GENERAL STATUTE § 16-50/ (b)

Pursuant to General Statutes § 16-50/ (b), copies of this Application have been sent 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 attached hereto as

Exhibit B. Pursuant to §16-50/ (b) notice of the Applicants' intent to file this Application was published on two occasions in the Danbury News Times which is the newspaper in which Bethel Planning and Zoning notices are published. Copies of the legal notices and the publisher's certificates of publication are attached hereto as Exhibit C. Finally, pursuant to § 16-50/ (b), notices were sent to each person appearing of record as the owner of real property abutting the Property. Certification of such notice, a sample notice letter, and the list of property owners to whom the notice was mailed are included in Exhibit D.

III. PROPOSED FACILITY

A. Facility Design

This section will provide an overview and general description of the Facility proposed to be located at Site 1 or Site 2.

The Property is an approximately 49 acre parcel of property located at 62-64 Codfish Hill Road in Bethel. A residence and garage are located on the Property, but the majority of the acreage is undeveloped land that is heavily wooded in some areas.

The first alternative site would be located in the eastern portion of the Property (Site 1"). The Facility at Site 1 would sit within a 10,000 square foot area leased by North Atlantic Towers and would consist of a 150 foot monopole structure, with AT&T's antennas mounted at a centerline of 146 feet AGL. The tower would also host the equipment of three additional wireless carriers as well as Town emergency services, if needed. AT&T's 20 foot x 16 foot equipment shelter and generator would be located within the compound area, with space reserved for the equipment of three additional

carriers. An eight foot high chain link fence would secure the equipment at the Facility. Vehicle access to Site 1 would be along an existing access road, which would be improved. (The Phase I Cultural Resources Reconnaissance describes the access route to the Site 1 compound as “(W)ith the exception of the northernmost and southern most (sic) ends, it consisted of previously disturbed surfaces along its entire length. These disturbances took the form of areas of modern dumping of concrete and asphalt and heavily eroded areas, in some cases down to bedrock.”)¹ Subject to the approval of the utilities, utility connections would extend along an approximately 1,650 foot route from Codfish Hill Road to the Site 1 compound. Exhibit E contains the overall plans, compound plans, elevation view, site layout and other relevant information for the Facility, the number of residential structures within 1000 feet of the Facility, distance to nearest off site residence, number of trees to be removed, and Site Evaluation Report for Site 1.

The second alternative site would be located in the central portion of the Property (Site 2”). The Facility at Site 2 would sit within a 10,000 square foot area leased by North Atlantic Towers and would consist of a 170 foot monopole structure, with AT&T’s antennas mounted at a centerline of 166 feet AGL. The tower would also host the equipment of three additional wireless carriers as well as Town emergency services, if needed. AT&T’s 20 foot x 16 foot equipment shelter and generator would be located within the compound area, with space reserved for the equipment of three additional carriers. An eight foot high chain link fence would secure the equipment at the Facility. Vehicle access to Site 2 would run approximately 860 feet along an existing access road, which would be improved. (The Phase I Cultural Resources Reconnaissance

¹ See Exhibit J, Phase I Cultural Resources Reconnaissance, page 12

describes the access route to the Site 2 compound as previously disturbed, ““(T)he proposed access corridor revealed that central and western areas of the proposed thoroughfare has been disturbed in the past by regular vehicular use, deep ruts, standing water, and trash dumping.)² Subject to the approval of the utilities, utility connections would extend along an approximately 860 foot route from Codfish Hill Road to the Site 2 compound. Exhibit F contains the overall plans, compound plans, elevation view, site layout and other relevant information for the Facility, the number of residential structures within 1000 feet of the Facility, distance to nearest off site residence, number of trees to be removed and Site Evaluation Report for Site 2.

B. Coverage to be Achieved

AT&T currently covers 6.236 square miles of Bethel, with inadequate or no coverage in this area of eastern Bethel.

A Facility at Site 1 would provide coverage to an additional 2.598 square miles which equates to 15.40% of the total area of Bethel.

A Facility at Site 2 would provide coverage to an additional 3.844 square miles which equates to 22.79% of the total area of Bethel.

The proposed Facility at either site would provide coverage to significant coverage gaps in eastern Bethel and Newtown, including Codfish Hill Road, Dodginton Road, Putnam Park Road, Sugar Street, Wolfpits Road and Taunton Hill Road, Buckboard Ridge, Legend Drive, Plumtrees Road, Chestnut Ridge Road and the surrounding area. These coverage gaps exist between AT&T’s Newtown (CT5511), Bethel (CT2268) and CT5515 (Redding) sites.

² See Exhibit J, Phase I Cultural Resources Reconnaissance, page 12

Exhibit G of this Application includes a Radio Frequency ("RF") Engineering Report dated February 11, 2015 with propagation plots that depict these coverage gaps and anticipated coverage from the a Facility at Site 1 and Site 2, as well as a list of existing and approved sites.

IV. STATEMENT OF NEED AND BENEFIT

A. Statement of Need

1. United States Policy & Law

The laws and policy of the United States aim to maximize nationwide wireless access and foster wireless network growth. The United States Congress first set forth a regulatory structure for wireless telecommunications in the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the "Telecommunications Act"). Aimed at increasing market competition amongst service providers, the Telecommunications Act encouraged "the rapid deployment of new telecommunications technologies."³ The Telecommunications Act substantially increased public access to wireless services by removing barriers to provider-competition, promoting universal service at affordable rates and in all areas of the United States, and enhancing the interconnectivity of users and vendors in light of the Telecommunications Act's proposed changes. Thus, the Telecommunications Act accelerated the process of making wireless services available nationwide for nearly all individuals.

Following the regulatory changes under the Telecommunications Act, Congress passed the Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999 (the "Public Safety Act"), designating 9-1-1 as the universal emergency assistance number for both landline

³ Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996).

and wireless telephone service.⁴ The express findings of Congress as stated in the Public Safety Act emphasize the nexus between access to wireless communication and public safety:

Emerging technologies can be a critical component of the end-to-end communications infrastructure connecting the public with emergency medical service providers and emergency dispatch providers, public safety, fire service and law enforcement officials, and hospital emergency and trauma care facilities, to reduce emergency response times and provide appropriate care.⁵

The emphasis on accessibility found in the Telecommunications Act coupled with the promotion of wireless use for the purpose of enhancing public safety reflect the United States government's ongoing commitment to maximizing the vast potential of wireless services.

Continuing its efforts to utilize wireless services as a means of enhancing public safety, Congress subsequently passed the New and Emerging Technologies 911 Improvement Act of 2008 (the "NET 911 Act"). The NET 911 Act sought to accelerate a country-wide transition to a national IP-enabled emergency network and improve existing emergency services for individuals with disabilities.⁶ Thus, Congressional implementation of the Public Safety Act and the NET 911 Act represent the federal government's growing awareness of the means by which wireless telecommunications not only support economic growth, but create safer municipalities as well.

Recently, the White House and Congress continue to acknowledge the importance of maximizing access to wireless services. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (the "Recovery Act") provided \$7.2 billion to increase

⁴ Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act, Pub. L. No. 106-81, §2(a)(3), 113 Stat. 1286-87 (1999).

⁵ *Id.* at 1287.

⁶ New and Emerging Technologies 911 Improvement Act of 2008, 47 U.S.C. §615(a)-1.

broadband access throughout the United States.⁷ The Recovery Act also established the Broadband Technology Opportunities Program, awarding grants for the purposes of enhancing community broadband infrastructure, upgrading or constructing public computer centers, and increasing broadband access in areas that traditionally underutilized broadband services.⁸ In 2010, the Federal Communications Commission developed a National Broadband Plan (the “NBP,” or the “Plan”) under the direction of Congress, setting forth strategic initiatives for the purpose of maximizing broadband access for every American. The Executive Summary of the NBP states the express goal of the Plan:

[M]aximizing use of broadband to advance 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. [Internal quotation marks omitted].⁹

The NBP establishes policies for innovation, investment, and the utilization of broadband in specific areas such as health care, education, energy, and public safety. By addressing these various needs, the comprehensive framework of the NBP recognizes that as “the development of electricity, telephony, radio and television transformed the United States and, in turn, helped us transform the world [...] [b]roadband will be just as transformative.”¹⁰ In order to implement the proposals set forth in the NBP, the FCC established the Broadband Acceleration Initiative (the “Initiative”), in order to “work inside the FCC, with its partners in state and local

⁷ National Telecommunications and Information Administration, United States Dept. of Commerce. *Broadband Technology Opportunities Program (BTOP): About*, <http://www2.ntia.doc.gov/about> (last visited July 30, 2013).

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ Federal Communications Commission, *National Broadband Plan*, ix (July 20, 2013), <http://download.broadband.gov/plan/national-broadband-plan-executive-summary.pdf>,

¹⁰ *Id.* at 21.

governments, and in the private sector to reduce barriers to broadband deployment.”¹¹ Through the Initiative, the FCC committed to voting on a Notice of Inquiry for the purpose of collecting information on existing barriers to broadband access.¹² Following through on the agenda set forth in the Initiative, the FCC published a Notice of Inquiry in April 2011 in order to better understand the manner in which the FCC and local municipalities should work together to achieve uniform, nationwide, broadband access for all:

This Notice is intended to update our understanding of current rights of way and wireless facilities siting policies, assess the extent and impact of challenges related to these matters, and develop a record on potential solutions to these challenges.¹³

Echoing the charge of the FCC found in the Telecommunications Act, FCC Chairman Julius Genachowski’s concluding statements in the Notice of Inquiry stressed the ongoing duty of the FCC under the Telecommunications Act to make available broadband services for all individuals, and that “[t]he Broadband Acceleration Initiative, and our actions today, are central to carrying out that duty.”¹⁴

More recently, President Obama signed an executive order in June 2012 aimed at accelerating the deployment of broadband on federal lands and reiterating the importance of uniform access to broadband and other wireless services, recognizing the need for improved broadband access across the United States:

Broadband access is essential to the Nation’s global competitiveness in the 21st century, driving job creation, promoting innovation, and expanding markets for American businesses. Broadband access also

¹¹ Federal Communications Commission: *The FCC’s Broadband Acceleration Initiative*, (Feb. 9, 2011), http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-304571A2.doc

¹² *Id.*

¹³ Federal Communications Commission: Notice of Inquiry 11-51, WC Docket No. 11-59 (Apr. 7, 2011), 5.

¹⁴ *Id.* at 21.

affords public safety agencies the opportunity for greater levels of effectiveness and interoperability.¹⁵

Despite these efforts from the White House and Congress, the FCC's 8th Broadband Progress Report (the "Report") suggests that the federal and local governments must take additional steps to improve individual access to broadband and wireless services. Although the Report praises the efforts of the public and private sectors in accelerating broadband and wireless deployment throughout the United States, the report states that approximately 19 million Americans reside in areas without access to terrestrial-fixed broadband.¹⁶ Thus, the Report highlights that "broadband is not yet being deployed 'to all Americans' in a reasonable and timely fashion," and that governments and providers must take an active role in ensuring national interconnectivity.¹⁷

The FCC's Declaratory Ruling interpreting §332(c)(7)(b) of the Telecommunications Act established specific time limits for decisions on land use and zoning permit application, which supports the public need for timely deployment of wireless development.¹⁸ More recently, the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (Section 6409(a)) emphasized the critical nature of the timely deployment of wireless infrastructure to public safety and the economy by preempting a discretionary review process for eligible modifications of existing wireless towers of existing base stations.¹⁹

¹⁵ Exec. Order 13616, 77 Fed. Reg 36,903 (Jun. 20, 2012).

¹⁶ Federal Communications Commission, FCC 12-90, Eighth Broadband Progress Report, at 3 (2012).

¹⁷ Id.

¹⁸ 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 at Variance ("Declaratory Ruling").

¹⁹ 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>.

2. United States Wireless Usage Statistics

As of December 2012, an estimated 326.5 million individuals in the United States subscribed to a wireless provider, up from 315.9 million subscribers as of December of 2011.²⁰ This increase in subscribers resulted in a 69% increase in wireless data traffic from 2011 to 2012.²¹ Emphasizing the need to meet the heightened demand for wireless services, in 2012 the number of commercially-operational cell sites in the United States exceeded 300,000 for the first time in history.²² In addition to the vast number of individual wireless subscribers, United States households are increasingly dependent on wireless service, with 35.8% of households exclusively wireless compared to 15.8% five years ago.²³

The number of wireless users is exponentially increasing among the country's teenager and elderly populations as well. In a June 2012 report, Pew Research Center found that 69% of adults ages 65 and older reported owning a mobile phone, compared to 57% in May 2010.²⁴ By comparison, nearly 78% of individuals aged 12-17 years old now own a cell phone.²⁵ Clearly, statistics suggest that the number of mobile phone users is growing across demographic lines.

Wireless services not only enhance the efficiency of personal and business communications but also play a key role in enhancing public safety. Over 400,000

²⁰ CTIA, *CTIA's Semi-Annual Wireless Industry Survey Results, December 1985-December 2012*, http://www.ctia.org/media/industry_info/index.cfm/AID/10316 (last visited July 30, 2013).

²¹ *Id.*

²² *Id.*

²³ CTIA, *Wireless Quick Facts: Year-End Figures*, <http://www.ctia.org/advocacy/research/index.cfm/AID/10323> (last visited July 30, 2013).

²⁴ Kathryn Zickuhr and Mary Madden, *Report: Seniors, Social Networking, Broadband: Older Adults and Internet Use* (June 6, 2012), <http://www.pewinternet.org/Reports/2012/Older-adults-and-internet-use.aspx> (last visited Aug. 6, 2013)

²⁵ Mary Madden et al., *Teens and Technology 2013 2* (Pew Research Center Internet & American Life Project) (2013)

subscribers make E-911 or distress calls from their wireless device per day, up from 260,000 similar calls in 2007.²⁶ A June 2013 study of mobile phone activity by the Pew Research Center indicates that over a 30-day period, 19% of individuals used their mobile device to get help in an emergency situation.²⁷ Further, approximately 70% of all 911 calls made each year are made from a wireless device.²⁸ Therefore, maximizing broadband and wireless access not only promotes convenient and efficient personal communication but enhances public safety as well.

Further, wireless services serve an important function in assisting local police, fire, and first responders. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) recently established the Wireless Emergency Alerts (WEA) system, a national emergency system used for disseminating location-aware emergency text message alerts.²⁹ The messages distributed through the WEA system include Imminent Threat Alerts, such as notification of man-made or natural disasters, and Amber Alerts, which assist law enforcement in the search and identification of missing children.³⁰ Reaching nearly 97% of wireless subscribers, the WEA program reflects the manner in which wireless technology can be utilized to save lives and promote municipal safety.

3. Site Specific Public Need

The facility proposed in this Application would be an integral component of AT&T's network in its FCC licensed areas throughout the state. There are significant

²⁶ Id.

²⁷ Joanna Brenner, *Pew Internet: Mobile*, Pew Internet & American Life Project (June 6, 2013). <http://pewinternet.org/Commentary/2012/February/Pew-Internet-Mobile.aspx> (last visited Aug. 6, 2013).

²⁸ Wireless 911 Services, FCC, *available at* <http://www.fcc.gov/guides/wireless-911-services>.

²⁹ For more on the WEA program, see CTIA: *Wireless Emergency Alerts on Your Mobile Device* http://www.ctia.org/consumer_info/safety/index.cfm/AID/12082 (last visited July 30, 2013).

³⁰ Id.

deficiencies in reliable service along portions of eastern Bethel and adjacent area of Newtown, including Codfish Hill Road, Dodginton Road, Putnam Park Road, Sugar Street, Wolfpits Road and Taunton Hill Road, and the surrounding area. A deficiency in reliable service is evidenced by the inability to adequately and reliably transmit/receive quality calls and/or utilize high speed data services offered by AT&T's wireless network. The proposed Facility, in conjunction with other existing and planned facilities in and around Bethel and Newtown are needed by AT&T to reliably provide its wireless services to people living in and traveling through this area of the state. Exhibit G of this Application includes a Radio Frequency ("RF") Engineering Report with propagation plots and other information which identify and demonstrate the specific need for a new wireless facility in this area of the State to serve the public and meet its need and demand for wireless services.

C. Technological Alternatives

The FCC licenses granted to AT&T authorize it to provide wireless services in this area of the state through deployment of a network of wireless transmitting sites. Repeaters, microcell transmitters, distributed antenna systems (DAS) and other types of transmitting technologies are not a practicable or feasible means to providing service within the service area for this site. These technologies are better suited for specifically defined areas where new coverage is necessary, such as commercial buildings, shopping malls, and tunnels, or to address capacity. Closing the coverage gaps and providing reliable wireless services in eastern Bethel and adjacent area of Newtown requires a tower site that can provide reliable service over a footprint that spans several

thousand acres. There are no equally effective technological alternatives to the construction of the proposed Facility for AT&T to provide reliable personal wireless services in this area of Connecticut.

V. SITE SELECTION AND TOWER SHARING

A. Site Selection

North Atlantic Towers is a wireless infrastructure provider that uses its knowledge of the wireless carriers' networks and/or specific information from the individual carriers to develop new wireless facilities where a need has been demonstrated. It is only when it is clear that a new tower facility will be required to provide coverage and reliable service does North Atlantic Towers pursue a site search for a new tower. In performing its site search North Atlantic Towers consults with wireless carrier radiofrequency engineers to identify geographic areas where a new tower facility will be required for the provision of coverage and/or capacity in the carriers' networks. Through this collaborative process North Atlantic Towers became aware that wireless coverage in the eastern area of Bethel suffers from a lack of sufficient coverage due to the lack of existing wireless facilities or structures suitable for co-location in this area. As a result, and in consultation with AT&T, North Atlantic Towers began a site search in this area in June, 2010.

AT&T conducted its own site search in the area and identified no existing structures or reasonable locations sites for a new tower facility. In conducting its site search, AT&T seeks to avoid the unnecessary proliferation of towers and to reduce the potential adverse environmental impacts of a new facility. In this area of Bethel and

Newtown there are no known existing structures suitable co-location and the provision of reliable service to the public. As indicated above, AT&T is already located on all of the existing towers in the adjacent geographical areas.

Only after determining that no existing suitable facilities or structures could be used to provide reliable coverage in this area, a search for tower sites was conducted. The search included independent reviews by North Atlantic Towers and AT&T, and field work conducted by consultants for both entities.

The map of facilities within a four mile radius (map date of February 4, 2015), along with the site selection narrative and map of rejected sites contained in Exhibit H, provide a thorough explanation of the Applicant's methodology for conducting site searches, the actual search for potential sites in the area, and identify the locations reviewed during the Applicant's search and the reasons for elimination from consideration of all but the Property.

B. Tower Sharing

To promote the sharing of wireless facilities in the Town, North Atlantic Towers proposes to construct a facility that can accommodate AT&T and three other wireless carriers. The Facility would also accommodate municipal emergency communications equipment at no cost to the Town. Details of the design are included in Exhibits E and F.

VI. ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY

Pursuant to General Statutes § 16-50p, the Council is required to find and to determine as part of the Application process any probable environmental 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 and the accompanying attachments and documentation, the Facility would not have a significant adverse environmental impact and/or those effects are unavoidable in this part of the State in order to provide reliable service to the public.

A. Visual Assessment

The visual impact of the Facility would vary from different locations around the Facility depending upon factors such as vegetation, topography, distance from the Facility, and the location of structures around the Facility.

North Atlantic Towers retained visibility experts, All Points Technology (“APT”), to prepare the Visibility Analysis for each site. The Visibility Analyses include a computer-based, predictive viewshed model, which has proven to depict accurately the potential impact of the Facility at either site from surrounding views.

As part of its study, on November 30, 2013, APT conducted balloon float tests at 150 feet AGL to evaluate the potential viewshed impacts, if any, associated with the Facility at Site 1. On January 17, 2014, APT conducted balloon float tests at 170 feet AGL to evaluate the potential viewshed impacts, if any, associated with the Facility at Site 2. With these balloon floats, APT sought to determine the visual impact of the Facility, accounting for local, state and federal historic and recreational sites, within a 2 mile radius of the proposed Facility (“Study Area”) at each site. Exhibit I contains Visibility Analyses for Site 1 and Site 2. Exhibit I also includes an affidavit for the balloon floats.

The topography and mature vegetation contained at the Property and within the Study Area serve to minimize the potential visual impact of the Facility. Topography within this area ranges in ground elevations from approximately 290 feet AMSL to 850 feet AMSL and is generally characterized as rolling to hilly terrain. The existing vegetation in the area of the Property is mixed deciduous hardwood species with an average estimated height of 65 feet. The tree canopy covers nearly 6,644 acres of the 8,042 acre Study Area.

1. Site 1 Visibility

The Visibility Analysis dated February 2014 provides a thorough analysis of the potential visibility impacts of a Facility at Site 1. Based on this Visibility Analysis, areas from which Site 1 would be at least partially visible year round comprise 120 acres within the 8,042 acre Study Area or less than 1.4% of the total Study Area. The combination of rolling terrain and mature forest results in minimizing the overall visibility throughout the Study Area. Areas of seasonal visibility would comprise approximately 492 additional acres.

No schools or commercial child day care centers are located within 250 feet of Site 1. The nearest school is Bethel High School, located approximately 1.25 miles to the northwest and there would be distant, year round views from portions of the high school grounds. The nearest commercial child care center is St. Mary's School, located approximately 0.87 miles to the west and no views of the Facility at Site 1 are anticipated in this area.

There are no scenic roadways located within the Study Area. Finally, no views of the Facility at Site 2 would be achieved from the trail systems at the Collis P. Huntington State Park, located approximately 0.75 miles to the southeast.

2. Site 2 Visibility

The Visibility Analysis dated March 2014 provides a thorough analysis of the potential visibility impacts of a Facility at Site 2. Based on this Visibility Analysis, areas from which Site 2 would be at least partially visible year round comprise 162 acres within the 8,042 acre Study Area or less than 2% of the total Study Area. The majority of these views would be within the immediate area of Site 2, approximately 1,000 feet of the site and select areas approximately 0.75 miles and beyond to the north and west. Areas of seasonal visibility would comprise approximately 382 additional acres.

No schools or commercial child day care centers are located within 250 feet of Site 2. The nearest school is Bethel High School, located approximately 1.25 miles to the northwest and there would be distant, year round views from portions of the high school grounds. The nearest commercial child care center is St. Mary's School, located approximately 0.85 miles to the west and no views of the Facility at Site 2 are anticipated in this area.

There are no scenic roadways located within the Study Area. Finally, no views of the Facility at Site 2 would be achieved from the trail systems at the Collis P. Huntington State Park, located approximately 0.75 miles to the southeast.

The Visibility Analyses demonstrate that a proposed Facility at either Site 1 or Site 2 would be as inconspicuous as possible, particularly beyond the immediate vicinity

of the Property. Accordingly, a Facility at Site 1 or Site 2 would not result in an unacceptable adverse visual impact.

Weather permitting, North Atlantic Towers will raise a balloon with a diameter of at least three (3) feet at Site 1 and Site 2 on the day of the Council's first hearing session on this Application, or at a time otherwise specified by the Council.

B. Solicitation of State Agency Comments

North Atlantic Towers submitted a request for review and comment for the Facility at Site 1 and Site 2 to the Office of State Archaeology and State Historic Preservation Office. It also obtained the maps from the database of the Connecticut Department of Energy & Environmental Protection ("CT DEEP").

- The Office of State Archaeology reviewed the Phase I archaeological survey (See letter dated May 29, 2014 provided in Exhibit J) and concluded that Site 1 and Site 2 "do not appear to retain any archaeological integrity." Further, they concluded that "the project will have no effect on the state's cultural resources."
- SHPO determined that no historic properties will be affected by this Application. SHPO concurred with the Office of State Archaeology and concluded that the project will have no effect on the state's cultural resources. (See letter dated September 8, 2014 provided in Exhibit J). Further, the NEPA Report identified no historic properties, sites, structures or resources listed on or determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places will affected by this project.
- CT DEEP NDDDB has records for State Special Concern species eastern box turtle and wood turtle in the vicinity of the Property. If this project is approved, North Atlantic Towers will implement protection strategies and protocols

(documented in Appendix C of the NEPA Report) during construction activities.

As recommended, this program would be incorporated as environmental notes into the construction drawings (Development and Management Plans) to ensure that protective measures are followed prior and during construction activities.

Copies of the Office of State Archaeology and SHPO correspondence regarding a Facility at Site 1 and Site 2 are attached hereto in Exhibit J. The CTDEEP documentation is provided in Exhibit L.

C. MPE Limits/Power Density Analysis

In August 1996, the FCC adopted a standard for exposure to Radio Frequency (“RF”) emissions from telecommunications facilities like the Facility proposed in this Application. To ensure compliance with applicable standards, AT&T retained SAI communications to perform maximum power density calculations for the Facility assuming that the antennas were pointed at the base of the tower and all channels were operating simultaneously. The resulting power density for AT&T’s operations would be approximately 9.97% percent of the applicable Maximum Permissible Exposure (MPE) standards at Site 1, and 7.71% of the applicable MPE at Site 2. A copy of the power density calculation reports for the Facility at Site 1 and Site 2 are attached hereto as Exhibit K.

D. Other Environmental Factors

The Facility at either site would be unmanned, requiring infrequent monthly maintenance visits by AT&T that would last approximately one hour. AT&T’s equipment would be monitored 24 hours a day, 7 days a week from a remote location. The Facility

would not require a water supply or wastewater utilities. No outdoor storage or solid waste receptacles would be needed, and the Facility would not create or emit any smoke, gas, dust or other air contaminants, noise, odors or vibrations other than the installed heating and ventilation equipment. Temporary power outages could require the limited use of emergency generators on site and provisions have been made for a permanent on-site diesel generator. The construction and operation of the proposed Facility would have no significant impact on air, water, or noise quality.

North Atlantic Towers retained APT to evaluate the Facility at both Sites in accordance with the FCC's regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 ("NEPA"). A copy of the NEPA Summary Report for Sites 1 and 2, dated January 27, 2015, is attached hereto as Exhibit L.

- The proposed Facility at Site 1 and Site 2 will not be located in an area designated as a wilderness area or a wildlife preserve. The Facility at either Site would not affect federally listed threatened or endangered species or designated critical habitats. As mentioned above, North Atlantic Towers will implement protection strategies and protocols (documented in Appendix C of the NEPA Report) during construction activities to protect State Special Concern species eastern box turtle and wood turtle.
- Additionally, the proposed Facility at either Site would not impact migratory bird species since the height would be below 200 feet, would not include guy wires and would not require lighting. Neither Site 1 nor Site 2 is proximate to an Important Bird Area and the site design for either site complies with the USFWS Guidelines for minimizing impacts on birds. A study done by APT concluded that

the proposed development would not impact migratory bird species. An Avian Resources Evaluation is attached hereto as Exhibit M.

- There are no National Parks, National Forests, National Parkways or Scenic Rivers, State Forest, State Designated Scenic Rivers or State Gamelands located in the vicinity of Sites 1 or 2.
- The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (“USFW”) confirmed that there are no federally listed threatened or endangered species or critical habitats known to occur on the Property that would be adversely affected by the proposed project.
- According to the site survey, field investigations and National Wetland Inventory, a Facility at Site 1 or 2 will not result in significant changes in surface features such as wetland fill, water diversion or deforestation at either Site. Specifically, the proposed development at either Site 1 or Site 2 will not result in either temporary or permanent direct impacts to wetland resource areas provided sedimentation and erosion controls are implemented. If this Application is approved, North Atlantic Towers will design, install, and maintain sedimentation and soil erosion controls during construction activities in accordance with the 2002 Connecticut Guidelines for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control.
- A Facility at Site 1 or 2 would not be located within a floodplain.
- Site 1 and 2 are not within an area designated by CGS § 22a-94 as being a coastal resource and therefore the proposed Facility will not result in adverse impacts to coastal resources as defined within the Coastal Management Act.
- In its May 29, 2014 letter The Office of State Archaeology concluded that Site 1 and Site 2 “do not appear to retain any archaeological integrity” and concluded

that “the project will have no effect on the state’s cultural resources.” The Facility would not affect any sites, buildings, structures or objects significant to American history, architecture, culture, archeology or engineering. On September 8, 2014 the SHPO issued a letter stating that the Facility would not impact such resources. See Exhibit J.

- APT consulted with six Native American Indian tribes – the Delaware Nation, the Mohegan Indian Tribe, the Keweenaw Bay Indian Community, the Mashantucket Pequot Tribe, the Lac Vieux Desert Chippewa Indians, and the Narragansett Indian Tribe– because they might have interests impacted by the construction, operation and maintenance of the Facility. All six Tribes confirmed that they do not believe they have any interests that would be impacted by the Facility. A copy of the Tribal Consult is included in Exhibit L.

As a result, the Facility is categorically excluded from any requirement for further environmental review by the FCC in accordance with the NEPA and no permit is required by the FCC prior to construction of the proposed Facility. See 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.1306(b) and 1.1307(a).

VII. CONSISTENCY WITH THE BETHEL LAND USE REGULATIONS

The Facility would be consistent with Bethel’s Zoning and Wetland Regulations and Plan of Conservation and Development. This section includes an analysis of the Facility under the Town’s land use regulations, as well as a description of the planned and existing uses of the Property.

A. Bethel Plan of Development

The Bethel Plan of Conservation and Development (“Plan”), a copy of which is included in the bulk filing, was adopted on October 9, 2007. The Plan addresses wireless telecommunications. According to the Plan, “Over the past several years, there has been a significant increase in the usage and availability of wireless communications. Whereas in the past, the primary concern with cellular phones and wireless services was the visibility of cell towers, *today the primary concern is the availability of service.*” (Emphasis added.) See Bulk Filing, Plan dated October 9, 2007 at page 113. The Facility would improve wireless services in the area thereby allowing for better communication for the ever increasing number of individuals who rely primarily or exclusively on wireless services for communication. It would also ensure that, in the event of an emergency, wireless customers would be able to successfully make a 9-1-1 call. Accordingly, the Facility would further some of the objectives articulated by the Plan.

B. Bethel Zoning Regulations

Section 7.3 of the Bethel Zoning Regulations (“Regulations”) addresses telecommunications facilities. See Bulk Filing, Bethel Zoning Regulations, amended to August 15, 2014, Section 7.3. The Property is zoned R-80. Any new tower not regulated by the Connecticut Siting Council would require a Special Permit. As this proposed Facility is regulated by the Connecticut Siting Council, the proposed Facility is compliant with the Regulations.

Section 3.4 of the Regulations sets forth the dimensional standards and setback distances for development in the R-80 Zone. The Property is approximately 49 acres

and greatly exceeds the minimum lot requirements. The side yard setback for non-residential use in the R-80 Zone is a “minimum setback of 100 feet from the nearest lot line of any residential lot and such area, unless modified by the Commission, be landscaped, planted as a buffer, or preserved in its natural state as needed for the protection of adjacent properties.” Regulations § 3.4 C(1) Note 2. Both Site 1 and Site 2 are well over 100 feet away from the nearest residential lot line. Site 1 is 330 feet from the closest residential lot line and Site 2 is 633 feet from the closest residential lot line. North Atlantic Towers does not intend to impact the natural state of the setback areas. The Regulations provide height exceptions for telecommunications towers (as they are allowed by Special Exception) but the Regulations do not specifically identify height parameters. Regulations § 3.5.C.8 and § 7.3 E.4. Finally, the criteria outlined in the Special Permit Considerations, Visual Considerations and Equipment Considerations are all issues that the Council usually takes into consideration during the Certificate proceeding or the Applicant would be willing to discuss with the Town during the D&M process.

§ 7.3 of Bethel Zoning Regulations	Proposed Facility Compliance
F. Requirements for Special Permit Applications	
1. Application Requirements a. Each application shall include documentation that a licensed carrier or an authorized emergency services organization is either an applicant or a co-applicant on the application.	The Application reflects the fact that AT&T is the proposed anchor tenant for the Facility and that AT&T will intervene in this proceeding.
b. Each application shall include documentation that the proposed facility will not cause any interference with any emergency or public safety radio system.	North Atlantic Towers will provide this information if requested by the Council.
c. Each application shall include	A Facility at either Site will provide the

<p>documentation showing how the proposed facility will accommodate emergency service communications for police, fire and ambulance services or a statement from each organization that such accommodation is not desired.</p>	<p>opportunity for Bethel municipal emergency services to co-locate on the facility at no cost.</p>
<p>d. Each application shall include documents indicating that:</p> <p>e. all towers, antennas, and/or equipment to be installed meet or exceed current standards and regulations of the FAA, the FCC, and any other agency of the state or federal government with the authority to regulate towers and antennas.</p> <p>f. if such standards and regulations are changed, then the owners of the towers and antennas governed by this regulation shall bring such towers and antennas into compliance.</p>	<p>North Atlantic Towers has provided information regarding its FAA compliance and compliance with State building codes. AT&T will provide information regarding its antennas and equipment to be installed.</p>
<p>g. Each application shall include documentation regarding noise emission from equipment and identify appropriate steps to provide soundproofing so that any noise above ambient levels is inaudible at the property line.</p>	<p>North Atlantic Towers will provide this information if requested by the Council.</p>
<p>h. Each application shall include a written maintenance plan for the site, including, but not limited to, all facilities including landscaping at the site.</p>	<p>North Atlantic Towers will provide this information if requested by the Council. The Applicant suggests that this is an aspect of the proposal that would be best dealt with in the D&M Phase.</p>
<p>2. Visual Considerations</p> <p>a. Towers and antenna and appurtenances shall be painted a neutral color or other such finish as determined by the Commission so as to minimize visual obtrusiveness.</p>	<p>North Atlantic Towers defers to the Council as to the color of the proposed Facility.</p>
<p>b. The design of the equipment, buildings and related structures shall, to the extent possible, use materials, colors, textures, screening, and landscaping that will blend them into the natural setting and surrounding buildings.</p>	<p>Site 1 and Site 2 are located on a 49 acres parcel that has substantial mature vegetation. North Atlantic Towers notes that screening and landscaping would not necessarily be useful for either of these Sites.</p>

c. If an antenna is installed on a structure other than a tower, the antenna and supporting equipment must be of a neutral color that is identical to, or closely compatible with, the color of the supporting structure to make the antenna and related equipment as visually unobtrusive as possible.	Not Applicable
d. Towers shall not be artificially lighted, unless required by the FAA or other applicable authority and specifically authorized by the Commission.	A tower at either Site 1 or Site 2 would not be lit.
e. No signs shall be allowed on any antenna, facility, or tower unless required by an overriding legal authority, except that a 2 square foot sign is required to be posted showing the emergency contact and telephone number.	No signs greater than 2 feet are proposed. A sign providing emergency contact information will be posted.
3. Equipment Considerations a. Any equipment cabinets or other appurtenances used in association with the tower or antenna shall be clearly shown as part of the application including how such equipment is designed to blend with the surrounding landscape or be obscured from adjacent properties and streets	The proposed AT&T equipment shelter is shown on Sheet C-2 of the plans provided in Exhibits E and F. The equipment shelter will be located behind the proposed 8 foot tall chain link fence. Further, Site 1 and Site 2 are both located on a large (49 acre parcel of land) which benefits from the presence of significant mature vegetation, rendering any additional landscaping unnecessary.
b. Security fencing, no more than six feet in height, may be required by the Commission around the antenna, tower, and equipment depending on the nature of the installation.	North Atlantic Towers proposes a chain link fence at a height of 8 feet, which will provide the greatest degree of security at the Facility.
c. Landscaping, including buffering, may be required by the Commission around the antenna, tower, and equipment depending on the nature of the installation.	The Applicant suggests that landscaping is unnecessary, given the presence of mature vegetation. It also notes that this aspect of the proposal that would be best dealt with in the D&M Phase.

C. Planned and Existing Land Uses

The Property is approximately 49 acres and is currently improved with a residence and a garage. The landowner has had various plans to develop the Property,

none of which have come to fruition. North Atlantic Towers is not aware of any confirmed future development plans regarding the Property. Properties immediately surrounding the property are primarily residential with two open space parcels to the northeast that were created as the result of the Settlers Road and Hillside Court subdivisions.

D. Bethel Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations

The Bethel Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations (“Wetlands Regulations”) regulate certain activities conducted in or adjacent to wetlands or watercourses as defined therein. See Bulk Filing, Wetlands and Watercourses, Chapter 115, printed June 2012. The Wetlands Regulations provide an upland review area of 100 feet.

North Atlantic Towers retained APT to determine whether there are any wetlands located near Site 1 or Site 2. APT prepared the Wetland Investigation attached provided herein as Exhibit N, and delineated wetland areas on the Property. (Exhibit N contains the Wetland Investigation for both Site 1 and Site 2.)

A Facility at Site 1 - The northeast compound corner is approximately 200 feet from Wetland 2 (the edge of the level spreader #1 would be approximately 180 feet away from the wetland). A portion of the access for Site 1 would be located in an area that is approximately 85 feet from Wetland 3, which is a man-made eroded channel and appears to have formed due to the erosion of an old farm road. APT concluded that no direct impacts to wetland are associated with the

proposed development of this Site. Further, APT concluded that Site 1 was the preferred site from a wetlands perspective. See Exhibit N.

A Facility at Site 2 – The compound would be located approximately 60 feet from Wetland 3 (the manmade wetland) and approximately 148 feet from Wetland 4. The edge of grading would be located approximately 48 feet from the closest Wetland 3 and the edge of the level spreader would be approximately 50 feet away from Wetland 4. A portion of the access for Site 2 would be located in an area that is approximately 80 feet from Wetlands 4 and 5. APT concluded that no direct impacts to wetland are associated with the proposed development of this Site. See Exhibit N.

No temporary impacts to nearby wetland resources are anticipated as North Atlantic Towers will implement sedimentation and erosion controls that are designed, installed and maintained during construction activities in accordance with the *2002 Connecticut Guidelines for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control*. Further, stormwater generated by the proposed development will be properly handled and treated in accordance with the *2004 Connecticut Stormwater Quality Manual*. With these two recommendations, APT concluded that the development of either Site 1 or 2 would not result in a likely adverse impact to wetland resources.

VIII. CONSULTATIONS WITH LOCAL, STATE AND FEDERAL OFFICIALS

A. Local Consultations

General Statutes § 16-50/ (e) requires an applicant to consult with the local municipality in which a proposed facility may be located and with any adjoining

municipality having a boundary of 2,500 feet from the proposed facility concerning the proposed and alternate sites of the facility. On June 28, 2013, North Atlantic Towers submitted a technical report to the First Selectman, the Honorable Matt Knickerbocker, regarding the Facility which proposed a Facility at Site 1. The technical report, a copy of which is being bulk filed with this Application, included specifics about the Property, the Facility, the site selection process and the environmental effects, if any, of the proposed Facility. A copy of the cover letter submitted with the technical report is attached as Exhibit O.

On July 25, 2013 representatives of North Atlantic Tower and AT&T met with First Selectman Knickerbocker, Land Use Director Steven Palmer, and Assistant Zoning Official and Inland/Wetlands Agent Beth Cavagna to engage in the municipal consultation meeting. At that time supplemental site search information was provided. A copy of that information and cover letter is also included in Exhibit O. During that meeting, Mr. Palmer requested that the access road be relocated from its proposed location and the Applicant agreed to do so.

The Town requested a public information meeting which was held on December 5, 2013. After that meeting, Mr. Palmer sent a letter dated December 16, 2013 indicating that if the Facility was to be located on this Property the Town wanted it to be more centrally located on the Property.³¹ Specifically, Mr. Palmer indicated that the “Town strongly recommends a centralized location on the subject property such as the one shown on the plan entitled ‘Bethel CT1155 . . . dated April 12, 2011’ ” Mr. Palmer included a plan in his correspondence. A copy of the letter and plan are provided in

³¹ “Given that the property is 49 acres in area and generally round in shape, it provides the opportunity to locate a proposed facility in a centralized location that doesn’t disproportionately affect any one or a small group of residential neighbors and therefore the alternative must be considered.”

Exhibit O.³² As a result of the Town's recommendation, the Applicants are filing Site 2 in this Application in the approximate location desired by the Town.

Finally, counsel for Applicant North Atlantic Towers met with Mr. Palmer and Ms. Cavagna on January 22, 2015 to inform the Town regarding the status of the proposed filing of the Application, update the Town on the inclusion of Site 2 in the Application (as a direct result of the Town's request for a more centrally located site on the Property), and provide plans that reflected this new location. Mr. Palmer was pleased with the location of Site 2, and indicated that if the Facility were to be located on this Property he would support the approval of Site 2.

B. Consultations with State Officials

As noted in Section VII.B of this Application, North Atlantic Towers consulted with the SHPO and the Office of State Archaeology and obtained CTDEEP mapping from the CTDEEP's database in the course of its NEPA survey. Copies of the correspondence with SHPO and the Office of State Archaeology are attached as Exhibit J and the CTDEEP map is included in Exhibit L.

C. Consultation with Federal Agencies

North Atlantic Towers received a report from Federal Aviation Administration ("FAA") for the Facility at Sites 1 and 2, which are attached hereto as Exhibit P. The results indicate that the Facility would not require FAA registration, let alone FAA review

³² The letter also requested that the Applicant reconsider the two sites raised at the Public Information Meeting. These two sites are the Rock Ridge Country Club located at 214 Sugar Street, Newtown and a Connecticut Light & Power pole located on 131 Taunton Hill Road, Newtown. The Applicant reviewed these sites again, and concluded that neither site was a viable alternative to a Facility at either Site 1 or Site 2. The two sites, and reason for rejections, are included in the Site Search Summary, attached as Exhibit H.

as a potential air navigation obstruction or hazard. Therefore, no FAA lighting or marking would be required for the Facility proposed in this Application.

North Atlantic Towers evaluated the project to determine whether it fell within any of the “listed” categories requiring review under NEPA. The “listed” categories, included in 47 C.F.R § 1.1307, are activities that may affect wilderness areas, wilderness preserves, endangered or threatened species, critical habitats, National Register historic districts, sites, buildings, structures or objects, Indian religious sites, flood plains and federal wetlands. The resulting report, attached hereto as Exhibit L, confirm that the Property does not fall under any of the NEPA “listed” categories of 47 C.F.R. §1.1307. Therefore, the proposed Facility does not require review by the FCC pursuant to NEPA.

IX. ESTIMATED COST AND SCHEDULE

A. Overall Estimated Cost

Site 1

The total estimated cost of construction for the Facility at Site 1 is \$290,000.00.

This estimate includes:

- (1) Tower (cost of tower) and foundation costs (including installation) of approximately \$85,000.00;
- (2) Site development costs of approximately \$160,000.00; and
- (3) Utility installation costs of approximately \$45,000.00.

Site 2

The total estimated cost of construction for the Facility at Site 2 is \$255,000.00.

This estimate includes:

- (1) Tower (cost of tower) and foundation costs (including installation) of approximately \$95,000.00;
- (2) Site development costs of approximately \$125,000.00; and
- (3) Utility installation costs of approximately \$35,000.00.

B. Overall Scheduling

Site preparation and engineering would commence immediately following Council approval of North Atlantic Tower's Development and Management ("D&M") Plan and is expected to be completed within four (4) to five (5) weeks. Installation of the monopole structure, antennas and associated equipment is expected to take an additional eight (8) weeks. The duration of the total construction schedule is approximately fifteen (15) weeks. Facility integration and system testing is expected to require an additional two (2) weeks after the construction is completed.

X. CONCLUSION

This Application and the accompanying materials and documentation demonstrate that a significant public need exists in the Town for improved wireless services and that the Facility would not have any substantial adverse environmental effects. North Atlantic Towers, therefore, respectfully submits that the public need for the Facility far outweighs any potential environmental effects resulting from the construction of the Facility at either Site.

The Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Council grant a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for a Facility at either Site 1 or Site 2.

Respectfully Submitted,

By:



Julie D. Kohler, Esq.
jkohler@cohenandwolf.com
Cohen and Wolf, P.C.
1115 Broad Street
Bridgeport, CT 06604
Tel. (203) 368-0211
Fax (203) 394-9901