August 01, 2014

David Martin and<br>Members of the Siting Council<br>Connecticut Siting Council<br>Ten Franklin Square<br>New Britain, CT 06051

## RE: Notice of Exempt Modification <br> 46 Meadow Road <br> Clinton, CT 06413 <br> Sprint Site \#: NV2.5_CT54XC764 <br> N $41^{\circ} 16^{\prime} 30.74^{\prime \prime}$ <br> W-72 ${ }^{\circ} 29^{\prime} 51.76^{\prime \prime}$

Dear Mr. Martin and Members of the Siting Council:

On behalf of Sprint Spectrum, SBA Communications is submitting an exempt modification application to the Connecticut Siting council for modification of existing equipment at a tower facility located at 46 Meadow Road, Clinton CT.

The 46 Meadow Road facility consists of a 199' Lattice Tower owned and operated by SBA Towers, LLC. In order to accommodate technological changes and enhance system performance in the State of Connecticut, Sprint Spectrum plans to modify the equipment configurations at many of its existing cell sites. Please accept this letter and attachments as notification, pursuant to R.C.S.A. Section 16$50 \mathrm{j}-73$, of construction which constitutes an exempt modification pursuant to R.C.S.A. Section 16-50j72(b)(2). In compliance with R.C.S.A. Section 16-50j-73, a copy of this letter and attachments is being sent to the chief elected official of the municipality in which the affected cell site is located.

As part of Sprint's Network Vision modification project, Sprint desires to upgrade their equipment to meet the new standards of 4G technology. The new equipment will allow customers to download files and browse the internet at a high rate of speed while also allowing their phones to be compatible with the latest 4G technology.

Attached is a summary of the planned modifications, including power density calculations reflecting the change in Sprint's operations at the site along with the required fee of $\$ 625$.

The changes to the facility do not constitute modifications as defined in Connecticut General Statutes ("C.G.S.") Section 16-50i(d) because the general physical characteristics of the facility will not be
significantly changed or altered. Rather, the planned changes to the facility fall squarely within those activities explicitly provided for in R.C.S.A. Section 16-50j-72(b)(2).

1. The overall height of the structure will be unaffected.
2. The proposed changes will not extend the site boundaries. There will be no effect on the site compound other than the new equipment cabinets.
3. The proposed changes will not increase the noise level at the existing facility by six decibels or more.
4. The changes in radio frequency power density will not increase the calculated "worst case" power density for the combined operations at the site to a level at or above the applicable standard for uncontrolled environments as calculated for a mixed frequency site.

For the foregoing reasons, SBA Communications on behalf of Sprint Spectrum, respectfully submits that he proposed changes at the referenced site constitute exempt modifications under R.C.S.A. Section 16-50j-72(b)(2).

Please feel free to call me at (508) $251-0720 \times 3807$ with any questions you may have concerning this matter.


SBA Communications Corporation
33 Boston Post Road West Suite 320
Marlborough, MA 01752
508-251-0720 x $3807+\mathrm{T}$
508-251-1755 + F
Pnute@sbasite.com

# Sprint Spectrum <br> Equipment Modification 

46 Meadow Road, Clinton, CT
Site number CT54XC764

Tower Owner: SBA Towers, LLC

Equipment Configuration: Lattice Tower

## Current and/or approved:

- (3) RFS APXVSPP18-C-A20
- (3) ALU 1900 MHZ RRUs
- (3) ALU 800 MHZ RRUs
- (3) ALU 800 MHZ Filters
- (4) RFS ACU-A20-N RETS
- (3) $1-1 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ Fiber


## Planned Modifications:

- (3) RFS APXVTM14-C-I20
- (3) Alcatel Lucent TD-RRH8×20-25
- (3) RFS APXVSPP18-C-A20
- (3) ALU 1900 MHZ RRUs
- (3) ALU 800 MHZ RRUs
- (3) ALU 800 MHZ Filters
- (4) RFS ACU-A20-N RETS
- (4) 1-1/4" Fiber


## Structural Information:

The attached structural analysis demonstrates that the tower and foundation will have adequate structural capacity to accommodate the proposed modifications.

Power Density:
The anticipated Maximum Composite contributions from the Sprint facility are $1.82 \%$ of the allowable FCC established general public limit. The anticipated composite MPE value for this site assuming all carriers present is $27.22 \%$ of the allowable FCC established general public limit sampled at the ground level.

| Site Corposite MPE \% |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Carrier | MPE \% |
| Sprint | $1.82 \%$ |
| T-Mobile | $0.09 \%$ |
| Verizon Wireless | $19.40 \%$ |
| AT\&T | $5.91 \%$ |
| Total Site MPE \% | $27.22 \%$ |

William W. Fritz<br>First Selectman<br>Town of Clinton<br>Town Hall<br>54 East Main Street<br>Clinton, CT 06413

RE: Telecommunications Facility @ 46 Meadow Road, Clinton, CT

Dear Mr. Fritz,

In order to accommodate technological changes and enhance system performance in the State of Connecticut, Sprint Spectrum will be changing its equipment configuration at certain cell sites.

As required by Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies (R.C.S.A.) Section 16-50j-73, the Connecticut Siting Council has been notified of the changes and will review Sprint's proposal. Please accept this letter as notification under Section 16-50j-73 of construction which constitutes an exempt modification pursuant to R.C.S.A. Section 16-50j-72(b)(2).

The accompanying letter to the Siting Council fully describes Sprint's proposal for the referenced cell site. However, if you have any questions or require any further information on our plans or the Siting Council's procedures, please call me at (508) 251-0720 $\times 3807$.

Thank you,


Peter Nute
SBA Communications Corporation
33 Boston Post Road West Suite 320
Marlborough, MA 01752
$508-251-0720 \times 3807+T$
508-251-1755 + F
Pnute@sbasite.com

Property Owner:

Michael R. Charney
41 South Main St.
Westbrook CT 06498-1902
Robert M. Charney
205 Greens Farm Road
Brandford CT 06405-5912

RE: Telecommunications Facility @ 46 Meadow Road, Clinton, CT

Dear Mr. Charney,

In order to accommodate technological changes and enhance system performance in the State of Connecticut, Sprint Spectrum will be changing its equipment configuration at certain cell sites.

As required by Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies (R.C.S.A.) Section $16-50 j-73$, the Connecticut Siting Council has been notified of the changes and will review Sprint's proposal. Please accept this letter as notification under Section 16-50j-73 of construction which constitutes an exempt modification pursuant to R.C.S.A. Section 16-50j-72(b)(2).

The accompanying letter to the Siting Council fully describes Sprint's proposal for the referenced cell site. However, if you have any questions or require any further information on our plans or the Siting Council's procedures, please call me at (508) 251-0720 $\times 3807$.

Thank you,


## Peter Nute

SBA Communications Corporation
33 Boston Post Road West Suite 320
Marlborough, MA 01752
$508-251-0720 \times 3807+$ T
508-251-1755 + F
Pnute@sbasite.com
environmental | engineering | due diligence

# RADIO FREQUENCY FCC REGULATORY COMPLIANCE MAXIMUM PERMISSIBLE EXPOSURE (MPE) ASSESSMENT 

Sprint Existing Facility

## Site ID: CT54XC764

Clinton SBA
46 Meadow Street
Clinton, CT 06413
July 27, 2014

EBI Project Number: 62143985

July 27, 2014

Sprint
Attn: RF Engineering Manager
1 International Boulevard, Suite 800
Mahwah, NJ 07495
Re: Radio Frequency Maximum Permissible Exposure (MPE) Assessment for Site:
CT54XC764 - Clinton SBA
Site Total: $\mathbf{2 7 . 2 2 \%}$ - MPE \% in full compliance
EBI Consulting was directed to analyze the proposed upgrades to the existing Sprint facility located at 46 Meadow Street, Clinton, CT, for the purpose of determining whether the radio frequency (RF) exposure levels from the proposed Sprint equipment upgrades on this property are within specified federal limits.

All information used in this report was analyzed as a percentage of current Maximum Permissible Exposure (\% MPE) as listed in the FCC OET Bulletin 65 Edition 97-01and ANSI/IEEE Std C95.1. The FCC regulates Maximum Permissible Exposure in units of microwatts per square centimeter ( $\mu \mathrm{W} / \mathrm{cm} 2$ ). The number of $\mu \mathrm{W} / \mathrm{cm} 2$ calculated at each sample point is called the power density. The exposure limit for power density varies depending upon the frequencies being utilized. Wireless Carriers and Paging Services use different frequency bands each with different exposure limits, therefore it is necessary to report results and limits in terms of percent MPE rather than power density.

All results were compared to the FCC (Federal Communications Commission) radio frequency exposure rules, 47 CFR $1.1307(b)(1)-(b)(3)$, to determine compliance with the Maximum Permissible Exposure (MPE) limits for General Population/Uncontrolled environments as defined below.

General population/uncontrolled exposure limits apply to situations in which the general public may be exposed or in which persons who are exposed as a consequence of their employment may not be made fully aware of the potential for exposure or cannot exercise control over their exposure. Therefore, members of the general public would always be considered under this category when exposure is not employment related, for example, in the case of a telecommunications tower that exposes persons in a nearby residential area.

Public exposure to radio frequencies is regulated and enforced in units of microwatts per square centimeter ( $\mu \mathrm{W} / \mathrm{cm}^{2}$ ). The general population exposure limit for the cellular band ( 850 MHz Band) is approximately $567 \mu \mathrm{~W} / \mathrm{cm}^{2}$, and the general population exposure limit for the 1900 MHz and 2500 MHz bands is $1000 \mu \mathrm{~W} / \mathrm{cm}^{2}$. Because each carrier will be using different frequency bands, and each frequency band has different exposure limits, it is necessary to report percent of MPE rather than power density.

Occupational/controlled exposure limits apply to situations in which persons are exposed as a consequence of their employment and in which those persons who are exposed have been made fully aware of the potential for exposure and can exercise control over their exposure. Occupational/controlled exposure limits also apply where exposure is of a transient nature as a result of incidental passage through a location where exposure levels may be above general population/uncontrolled limits (see below), as long as the exposed person has been made fully aware of the potential for exposure and can exercise control over his or her exposure by leaving the area or by some other appropriate means.

Additional details can be found in FCC OET 65.

## CALCULATIONS

Calculations were done for the proposed upgrades to the existing Sprint Wireless antenna facility located at 46 Meadow Street, Clinton, CT, using the equipment information listed below. All calculations were performed per the specifications under FCC OET 65. All calculations were performed assuming a lobe representing the maximum gain of the antenna per the antenna manufactures supplied specifications, minus 10 dB , was focused at the base of the tower. For this report the sample point is the top of a 6 foot person standing at the base of the tower.

For all calculations, all emissions were calculated using the following assumptions:

1) 3 channels in the 1900 MHz Band were considered for each sector of the proposed installation.
2) 1 channel in the 800 MHz Band was considered for each sector of the proposed installation
3) 2 channels in the 2500 MHz Band were considered for each sector of the proposed installation.
4) All radios at the proposed installation were considered to be running at full power and were uncombined in their RF transmissions paths per carrier prescribed configuration. Per FCC OET Bulletin No. 65 - Edition 97-01 recommendations to achieve the maximum anticipated value at each sample point, all power levels emitting from the proposed antenna installation are increased by a factor of 2.56 to account for possible in-phase reflections from the surrounding environment. This is rarely the case, and if so, is never continuous.
5) For the following calculations the sample point was the top of a six foot person standing at the base of the tower. The maximum gain of the antenna per the antenna manufactures supplied specifications minus 10 dB was used in this direction. This value is a very conservative estimate as gain reductions for these particular antennas are typically much higher in this direction.
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6) The antennas used in this modeling are the RFS APXVSPP18-C-A20 and the RFS APXVTM14-C-I20. This is based on feedback from the carrier with regards to anticipated antenna selection. The RFS APXVSPP18-C-A20 has a 15.9 dBd gain value at its main lobe at 1900 MHz and 13.4 dBd at its main lobe for 850 MHz . The RFS APXVTM14-C-I20 has a 15.9 dBd gain value at its main lobe at 2500 MHz . The maximum gain of the antenna per the antenna manufactures supplied specifications, minus 10 dB , was used for all calculations This value is a very conservative estimate as gain reductions for these particular antennas are typically much higher in this direction.
7) The antenna mounting height centerline for the proposed antennas is $\mathbf{1 8 2}$ feet above ground level (AGL).
8) Emissions values for additional carriers were taken from the Connecticut Siting Council active database. Values in this database are provided by the individual carriers themselves.

All calculation were done with respect to uncontrolled / general public threshold limits


| Site Composite MPE \% |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Carrier | MPE \% |
| Sprint | $1.82 \%$ |
| T-Mobile | $0.09 \%$ |
| Verizon Wireless | $19.40 \%$ |
| AT\&T | $5.91 \%$ |
| Total Site MPE \% | $\mathbf{2 7 . 2 2 \%}$ |

environmental | engineering | due diligence

## Summary

All calculations performed for this analysis yielded results that were well within the allowable limits for general public Maximum Permissible Exposure (MPE) to radio frequency energy.

The anticipated Maximum Composite contributions from the Sprint facility are $\mathbf{1 . 8 2 \%}$ ( $\mathbf{0 . 6 1 \%}$ from sector $\mathbf{1 , 0 . 6 1 \%}$ from sector 2 and $\mathbf{0 . 6 1 \%}$ from sector 3) of the allowable FCC established general public limit considering all three sectors simultaneously sampled at the ground level.

The anticipated composite MPE value for this site assuming all carriers present is $\mathbf{2 7 . 2 2 \%}$ of the allowable FCC established general public limit sampled at 6 feet above ground level. This total composite site value is based upon MPE values listed in the Connecticut Siting Council database for existing carrier emissions.

FCC guidelines state that if a site is found to be out of compliance (over allowable thresholds), that carriers over a $5 \%$ contribution to the composite value will require measures to bring the site into compliance. For this facility, the composite values calculated were well within the allowable $100 \%$ threshold standard per the federal government.


## Scott Heffernan

RF Engineering Director

EBI Consulting
21 B Street
Burlington, MA 01803

FDH Engineering, Inc., 6521 Meridien Drive Raleigh, NC 27616, Ph. 919.755.1012

Structural Analysis for SBA Network Services, Inc.

195' Self-Support Tower

SBA Site Name: Clinton 4 CT
SBA Site ID: CT01879-S-03
Sprint Site ID: CT54XC764
FDH Project Number 1465YH1400
Analysis Results

| Tower Components | $98.2 \%$ | Sufficient |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Foundation | $98.8 \%$ | Sufficient |



Reviewed By:


Sean M. O'Sullivan, EI
Bradley R. Newman, PE
Project Engineer II

Senior Project Engineer CT PE License No. 29630

FDH Engineering, Inc.
6521 Meridien Drive
Raleigh, NC 27616
(919) 755-1012
info@fdh-inc.com


June 3, 2014
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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the request of SBA Network Services, Inc., FDH Engineering, Inc. performed a structural analysis of the existing selfsupported tower located in Clinton, CT to determine whether the tower is structurally adequate to support both the existing and proposed loads pursuant to the Structural Standards for Steel Antenna Towers and Antenna Supporting Structures, TIA/EIA-222-F and the 2005 Connecticut State Building Code (CSBC). Information pertaining to the existing/proposed antenna loading, current tower geometry, geotechnical data, the member sizes, and foundation dimensions was obtained from:

- Sabre Communications Corporation (Job No. 00-10101) Structural Design Report dated November 19, 1999
- Jaworski Geotech, Inc. (Job No. 99500G) Field Soil Screening dated December 13, 1999
- FDH Engineering, Inc. (Project No. 1465YH1400) Modification Drawings for a $195^{\prime}$ Self-Support Tower dated June 3, 2014
- SBA Network Services, Inc.

The basic design wind speed per the TIA/EIA-222-F standards and the 2005 CSBC is 85 mph without ice and 38 mph with $3 / 4$ " radial ice. Ice is considered to increase in thickness with height.

## Conclusions

With the existing and proposed antennas from Sprint in place at 182 ft , the tower meets the requirements of the TIA/EIA-222$F$ standards and the 2005 CSBC provided the Recommendations listed below are satisfied. Furthermore, provided the foundations were designed and constructed to support the original design reactions (see Sabre Job No. 00-10101), the foundations should have the necessary capacity to support both the proposed and existing loading. For a more detailed description of the analysis of the tower, see the Results section of this report.

Our structural analysis has been performed assuming all information provided to FDH Engineering, Inc. is accurate (i.e., the steel data, tower layout, existing antenna loading, and proposed antenna loading) and that the tower has been properly erected and maintained per the original design drawings.

## Recommendations

To ensure the requirements of the TIA/EIA-222-F standards and the 2005 CSBC are met with the existing and proposed loading in place, we have the following recommendations:

1. Feed lines must be installed as shown in Figure 1.
2. RRH/RRU Stipulation: The proposed equipment may be installed in any arrangement as determined by the client.
3. Modifications must be installed per FDH Engineering, Inc. (Project No. 1465YH1400) Modification Drawings for a 195' Self-Support Tower dated June 3, 2014 in order for this analysis to be valid.

## APPURTENANCE LISTING

The proposed and existing antennas with their corresponding cables/coax lines are shown in Table 1. If the actual layout determined in the field deviates from the layout, FDH Engineering, Inc. should be contacted to perform a revised analysis.

Table 1 - Appurtenance Loading
Existing Loading:

| Antenna Elevation (ft) | Description | Feed Lines | Carrier | Mount Elevation (ft) | Mount Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 192.5 | (3) Ericsson AIR B2A B4P <br> (3) Ericsson AIR B4A B2P <br> (3) Ericsson KRY 112 144-1 Double TMAs | (12) $1-5 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ <br> (1) $1-5 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ Fiber | T-Mobile | 192 | (3) T-Frames |
| 191.8 | (1) Celwave PD1151 Omni | (1) $7 / 8$ " | Town of Clinton | 184 | (1) Standoff |
| 182 | (3) RFS APXVSPP18-C-A20 <br> (3) ALU 1900 MHZ RRUs <br> (3) ALU 800 MHZ RRUs <br> (3) ALU 800 MHZ Filters <br> (4) RFS ACU-A20-N RETs | (3) 1-1/4" Fiber | Sprint | 182 | (3) T-Frames |
| 162 | (3) Antel BXA-70063/6CF <br> (4) Antel LPA-80063/4CF <br> (2) Antel BXA-171063/8BF <br> (1) Antel BXA-171063/12CF <br> (2) Antel LPA-80063/6CF <br> (6) RFS FD9R6004/2C-3L Diplexers | (12) $1-5 / 8$ " | Verizon | 162 | (3) T-Frames |
| 152 | (9) KMW AM-X-CD-14-65-00T <br> (3) Powerwave 7770 <br> (6) Powerwave TT19-08BP111-001 TMAs <br> (3) Powerwave LGP13519 Diplexers <br> (3) CSS DBC-750 Combiners <br> (6) Ericsson RRUS-11 RRHs <br> (1) Raycap DC6-48-60-18-8F Surge Arrestor | (12) $1-5 / 8$ " <br> (1) 3" Rigid Conduit | AT\&T | 152 | (3) T-Frames |
| 143.5 | (3) Sinclair SD312HL Dipoles | (3) $7 / 8$ " | Town of Clinton | 140 | (3) Standoffs |
| 100 | (1) Radiowaves RDH4518A Dish | (2) CAT 5e |  | 100 | (1) Pipe Mount |

Proposed Loading:

| Antenna <br> Elevation <br> (ft) | Description | Feed Lines | Carrier | Mount <br> Elevation <br> (ft) | Mount Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (3) RFS APXVTM14-C-I20 <br> 182 | (3) Alcatel Lucent TD-RRH8x20-25 <br> (3) RFS APXVSPP18-C-A20 <br> (3) ALU 1900 MHZ RRUs <br> (3) ALU 800 MHZ RRUs <br> (3) ALU 800 MHZ Filters <br> (4) RFS ACU-A20-N RETs | (4) 1-1/4" Fiber | Sprint | 182 |



Figure 1 - Feed Line Layout

## RESULTS

The following yield strength of steel for individual members was used for analysis:
Table 2 - Material Strength


Table 3 displays the summary of the ratio (as a percentage) of force in the member to their capacities. Values greater than $100 \%$ indicate locations where the maximum force in the member exceeds its capacity. Note: Capacities up to $100 \%$ are considered acceptable. Table 4 displays the maximum foundation reactions. Table 5 displays the maximum antenna rotations at service wind speeds (dishes only).

If the assumptions outlined in this report differ from actual field conditions, FDH Engineering, Inc. should be contacted to perform a revised analysis. Furthermore, as no information pertaining to the allowable twist and sway requirements for the existing or proposed appurtenances was provided, deflection and rotation were not taken into consideration when performing this analysis.

See the Appendix for detailed modeling information.
Table 3 - Summary of Working Percentage of Structural Components

| Section No. | Elevation ft | Component Type | Size | \% Capacity* | Pass Fail |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T1 | 195-180 | Leg | P2x. 154 (2.38 OD) | 34.5 | Pass |
|  |  | Diagonal | L1 3/4x1 3/4x3/16 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 26.7 \\ 35.4(\mathrm{~b}) \end{gathered}$ | Pass |
|  |  | Top Girt | L1 3/4x1 3/4x3/16 | $\begin{gathered} 2.5 \\ 2.7 \text { (b) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Pass |
| T2 | 180-160 | Leg | P3x. 216 (3.5 OD) | 53.6 | Pass |
|  |  | Diagonal | L1 3/4x1 3/4x3/16 | 58.2 | Pass |
|  |  | Top Girt | L1 3/4x1 3/4x3/16 | 7.7 | Pass |
| T3 | 160-140 | Leg | P3x. 300 (3.50 OD) | 79.0 | Pass |
|  |  | Diagonal | L2x2x3/16 | 81.0 | Pass |
| T4 | 140-120 | Leg | P4x. 337 (4.50 OD) | 78.8 | Pass |
|  |  | Diagonal | L2 1/2x2 1/2x3/16 | 71.8 | Pass |
| T5 | 120-100 | Leg | P5x. 375 (5.5625 OD) | 68.7 | Pass |
|  |  | Diagonal | L2 1/2x2 1/2x3/16 | 96.9 | Pass |
| T6 | 100-80 | Leg | P6x. 28 (6.625 OD) | 87.6 | Pass |
|  |  | Diagonal | L3x3x3/16 | 75.5 | Pass |
| T7 | 80-70 | Leg | P6x. 432 (6.625 OD) | 69.8 | Pass |
|  |  | Diagonal | L3x3x1/4 | 89.8 | Pass |
| T8 | 70-60 | Leg | P6x. 432 (6.625 OD) | 75.5 | Pass |
|  |  | Diagonal | L3x3x3/8 | 70.6 | Pass |
| T9 | 60-50 | Leg | P8x. 322 (8.625 OD) | 74.3 | Pass |
|  |  | Diagonal | L3x3 1/2x1/4 | 89.1 | Pass |
| T10 | 50-40 | Leg | P8x. 322 (8.625 OD) | 79.3 | Pass |
|  |  | Diagonal | L3x3x3/8 | 88.7 | Pass |
| T11 | 40-20 | Leg | P8x. 322 (8.625 OD) | 89.0 | Pass |
|  |  | Diagonal | L3 1/2x3 1/2x1/4 | 98.2 | Pass |
| T12 | 20-10 | Leg | P8x. 5 (8.625 OD) | 62.2 | Pass |
|  |  | Diagonal | L3 1/2x4x1/4 | 88.8 | Pass |
| T13 | 10-0 | Leg | P8x. 5 (8.625 OD) | 65.2 | Pass |


| Section <br> No. | Elevation <br> ft | Component <br> Type | Size | \% Capacity* | Pass <br> Fail |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Diagonal | L4x4x1/4 | 81.2 | Pass |

*Capacities include $1 / 3$ allowable stress increase for wind per TIA/EIA-222-F standards.

Table 4 - Maximum Base Reactions

| Load Type | Direction | Current Analysis <br> (TIAEIA-222-F) | Original Design <br> (TIAEIA-222-F) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Individual Foundation | Horizontal* | 30 k | 29 k |

*Per our experience with foundations of similar type, the shear loading should not control the foundation analysis.
Table 5 - Maximum Antenna Rotations at Service Wind Speed (Dishes Only)

| Centerline Elevation (ft) | Antenna | Tilt (deg) $^{*}$ | Twist (deg)* $^{*}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100 | (1) Radiowaves RDH4518A Dish | 0.1651 | 0.0072 |

*Allowable tilt and twist values to be reviewed by the carrier.

## GENERAL COMMENTS

This engineering analysis is based upon the theoretical capacity of the structure. It is not a condition assessment of the tower and its foundation. It is the responsibility of SBA Network Services, Inc. to verify that the tower modeled and analyzed is the correct structure (with accurate antenna loading information) modeled. If there are substantial modifications to be made or the assumptions made in this analysis are not accurate, FDH Engineering, Inc. should be notified immediately to perform a revised analysis.

## LIMITATIONS

All opinions and conclusions are considered accurate to a reasonable degree of engineering certainty based upon the evidence available at the time of this report. All opinions and conclusions are subject to revision based upon receipt of new or additional/updated information. All services are provided exercising a level of care and diligence equivalent to the standard and care of our profession. No other warranty or guarantee, expressed or implied, is offered. Our services are confidential in nature and we will not release this report to any other party without the client's consent. The use of this engineering work is limited to the express purpose for which it was commissioned and it may not be reused, copied, or distributed for any other purpose without the written consent of FDH Engineering, Inc.

## APPENDIX

195.0 ft $\stackrel{8}{\circ}$ 0.5 180.0 ft HHH

| TYPE | ELEVATION | TYPE | ELEVATION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lightning Rod | 195 | (2) LPA-80063/4CF w/ Mount Pipe | 162 |
| AIR 21 B2A/B4P w/Mount Pipe | 192 | LPA-80063/4CF w/ Mount Pipe | 162 |
| AIR 21 B2A/B4P w/Mount Pipe | 192 | LPA-80063/4CF w/ Mount Pipe | 162 |
| AIR 21 B2A/B4P w/Mount Pipe | 192 | BXA-171063/8BF w/ Mount Pipe | 162 |
| AIR 21 B4A/B2P w/Mount Pipe | 192 | BXA-171063/8BF w/ Mount Pipe | 162 |
| AIR 21 B4A/B2P w/Mount Pipe | 192 | BXA-171063/12CF w/ Mount Pipe | 162 |
| AIR 21 B4A/B2P w/Mount Pipe | 192 | LPA-80063/6CF w/ Mount Pipe | 162 |
| KRY 112 144/1 | 192 | LPA-80063/6CF w/ Mount Pipe | 162 |
| KRY 112 144/1 | 192 | (2) RFS FD9R6004/2C-3L Diplexer | 162 |
| KRY 112 144/1 | 192 | (2) RFS FD9R6004/2C-3L Diplexer | 162 |
| (3) T-Frames | 192 | (2) RFS FD9R6004/2C-3L Diplexer | 162 |
| PD1151 | 184 | (3) T-Frames | 162 |
| Standoff | 184 | (2) RRUS-11 | 152 |
| APXVTM14-C-I20 w/Mount Pipe | 182 | (2) RRUS-11 | 152 |
| APXVTM14-C-I20 w/Mount Pipe | 182 | (2) RRUS-11 | 152 |
| APXVTM14-C-I20 w/Mount Pipe | 182 | Raycap DC6-48-60-18-8F | 152 |
| TD-RRH8x20-25 | 182 | (3) T-Frames | 152 |
| TD-RRH8x20-25 | 182 | (3) AM-X-CD-14-65-00T w/ Mount Pipe | 152 |
| TD-RRH8x20-25 | 182 | (3) AM-X-CD-14-65-00T w/ Mount Pipe | 152 |
| APXVSPP18-C-A20 w/Mount Pipe | 182 | (3) AM-X-CD-14-65-00T w/ Mount Pipe | 152 |
| APXVSPP18-C-A20 w/Mount Pipe | 182 | 7770 w/ Mount Pipe | 152 |
| APXVSPP18-C-A20 w/Mount Pipe | 182 | 7770 w/ Mount Pipe | 152 |
| RRU-ALU 1900MHZ | 182 | 7770 w/ Mount Pipe | 152 |
| RRU-ALU 1900MHZ | 182 | (2) TT19-08BP111-001 TMA | 152 |
| RRU-ALU 1900MHZ | 182 | (2) TT19-08BP111-001 TMA | 152 |
| RRU-ALU 800MHZ | 182 | (2) TT19-08BP111-001 TMA | 152 |
| RRU-ALU 800MHZ | 182 | TMA - LGP13519 | 152 |
| RRU-ALU 800MHZ | 182 | TMA - LGP13519 | 152 |
| Filter- ALU 800MHZ | 182 | TMA - LGP13519 | 152 |
| Filter- ALU 800MHZ | 182 | Combiner - CSS DBC-750 | 152 |
| Filter- ALU 800MHZ | 182 | Combiner - CSS DBC-750 | 152 |
| (2) ACU-A20-N RET | 182 | Combiner - CSS DBC-750 | 152 |
| ACU-A20-N RET | 182 | Sinclair SD312HL | 140 |
| ACU-A20-N RET | 182 | Sinclair SD312HL | 140 |
| (3) T-Frames | 182 | Sinclair SD312HL | 140 |
| BXA-70063/6CF w/ Mount Pipe | 162 | (3) Standoffs | 140 |
| BXA-70063/6CF w/ Mount Pipe | 162 | Pipe Mount | 100 |
| BXA-70063/6CF w/ Mount Pipe | 162 | RDH4518A | 100 |

## MATERIAL STRENGTH

| GRADE | Fy | Fu | GRADE | Fy | Fu |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A572-50 | 50 ksi | 65 ksi | A36 | 36 ksi | 58 ksi |

## TOWER DESIGN NOTES

1. Tower is located in Middlesex County, Connecticut.
2. Tower designed for a 85 mph basic wind in accordance with the TIA/EIA-222-F Standard.
3. Tower is also designed for a 38 mph basic wind with 0.75 in ice. Ice is considered to

MAX. C
DOI. Detiections are based upon a. 50 mph wind.
DO15. TOPORR RATING: $98.2 \%$
SHEAR: 30 K
UPLIFT: -255 K
SHEAR: 27 K


TORQUE 5 kip-ft
38 mph WIND - 0.7500 in ICE
SHEAR

TORQUE 17 kip-ft
REACTIONS - 85 mph WIND

| FDH | H Engineering, In |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | 6521 Meridien Drive |
|  | Raleigh, NC |
| Tower Analysis | Phone: 919-755-1012 |
|  | FAX: 919-755-1031 |




## MATERIAL STRENGTH

| GRADE | Fy | Fu | GRADE | Fy | Fu |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A572-50 | 50 ksi | 65 ksi | A36 | 36 ksi | 58 ksi |

## TOWER DESIGN NOTES

1. Tower is located in Middlesex County, Connecticut.
. Tower designed for a 85 mph basic wind in accordance with the TIA/EIA-222-F Standard.
2. Tower is also designed for a 38 mph basic wind with 0.75 in ice. Ice is considered to increase in thickness with height
3. Deflections are based upon a 50 mph wind.
4. TOWER RATING: 98.2\%

MAX. CORNER REACTIONS AT BASE:
DOWN: 290 K
SHEAR: 30 K
UPLIFT: -255 K
SHEAR: 27 K


TORQUE 5 kip-ft
38 mph WIND - 0.7500 in ICE


TORQUE 17 kip-ft
REACTIONS - 85 mph WIND

| FDH | gineering, | ${ }^{\text {Lob: }}$ Clinton 4, CT01879-S-03 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 6521 Meridien Drive | Project: 1465 YH 1400 |  |  |
|  | Raleigh, NC | ${ }^{\text {Client: }}$ SBA Network Services, Inc. Drawn by: Sean O'Sullivan ${ }^{\text {App'd: }}$ |  |  |
| Tower Analysis | Phone: 919-755-1012 | Code: TIA/EIA-222-F | Date: 06/03/14 | Scale: NTS |
|  | FAX: 919-755-1031 | Path: |  | Dwg No. E-1 |




