## 1280 Route 46 West, Suite 9, Parsippany NJ, 07054

Connecticut Siting Council
Ten Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051
Attn: Ms. Melanie Bachman, Executive Director
Re: Notice of Exempt Modification Application
Hamden Fish \& Game Protective Assoc. Tower
150 Willow Avenue
Hamden, CT 06010
September 12, 2017
Dear Ms. Bachman:

On behalf of Sprint Spectrum Realty Company, L.P. ("Sprint"), enclosed for filing are an original and two (2) copies of Sprint's Notice of Exempt Modification for Proposed Modifications to an Existing Telecommunications Facility located at the above-referenced site. A soft copy will also be forwarded.

I also enclose herewith a check in the amount of $\$ 625.00$ representing the fee for the Notice of Exempt Modification.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.
Thank you,

## By: PaulF. Sagristano

Paul F. Sagristano
Cherundolo Consulting
4 Davis Road West, Suite 5
Old Lyme, CT 06371
917.841.0247
psagristano@lrivassoc.com

# 1280 Route 46 West, Suite 9, Parsippany NJ, 07054 

Ms. Melanie Bachman
Executive Director
CT Siting Council
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051
September 6, 2017

Re: Notice of Exempt Modification -
Existing Sprint Telecommunication Facility
150 Willow Street, Hamden, CT 06518
Latitude: N41.44944
Longitude: W72.9047
Dear Ms. Bachman:
Sprint currently maintains three (3) existing telecommunications antennas, 3 tower mounted amplifiers and associated equipment at the $157.5^{\prime}$ level of an existing $157.5^{\prime}$ multicarrier telecommunications tower at 150 Willow Street in Hamden, Connecticut. Sprint intends to add three (3) new antennas to a new pipe mounts as well as (3) new tower mounted amplifiers. Sprint is performing a new high-performance air interface upgrade for cellular mobile communications. It is designed to increase the capacity and speed of mobile telephone networks.

The facility noted above was approved by CT Siting Council on May 1, 2007 and via building permit issuance by the Town of Hamden on August 21, 2007. A copy of this approval is attached.

Please accept this letter as notification to the Council, pursuant to R.C.S.A. Section 16-50j-73, for construction which constitutes an exempt modification pursuant to R.C.S.A. Section 16-50j-72(b)(2). In compliance with R.C.S.A. Section 16-50j-73, a copy of this letter is also being sent toMr. Kurt Leng, Mayor of the Town of Hamden and to Mr. Lew Lagervall, Treasurer of the Hamden Fish \& Game Protective Association, the property owner

Attached is a summary of the planned modifications, including power density calculations reflecting the change in Sprint's operations at the site. Also included is documentation of the structural sufficiency of the tower with proposed modifications to accommodate the revised antenna configuration.

## Existing Facility

The Hamden facility is located at 150 Willow Street, the Site coordinates are: 41. 44944 N, -72. 9047 W. The facility is owned by The Hamden Fish \& Game Protective Association, Hamden, CT 06518.

The existing facility consists of a $157.5^{\prime}$ Monopole tower. Sprint currently operates wireless communications equipment on s steel platform at the facility and has three antennas mounted on the tower at a centerline of 157.5' feet.

## Statutory Considerations

The planned modifications to the facility fall within the activities explicitly provided for in R.C.S.A. 16-50j72(b)(2)

1. The height of the overall structure will be unaffected.
2. The proposed changes will not require an extension of the property boundaries.
3. The proposed additions will not increase the noise level at the existing facility by
six decibels or more, or to levels that exceed state and/or local criteria
4. The changes will not increase the calculated "worst case" power density for the combined operations at the site to a level at or above the Federal Communications Commission safety standard.
5. The proposed modifications will not cause a change or alteration in the physical or environmental characteristics of the site.
6. The existing structure and its foundation can support the proposed loading.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Paul F. Sagristano
Charles Cherundolo Consulting
917-841-0247
psagristano@lrivassoc.com

Additional Recipients:
Town of Hamden Mayor, Mr. Kurt Leng
Property Owner, Mr. Lew Lagervall, Treasurer of the Hamden Fish \& Game Protective Association
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## Detailed Parcel Information

## Parcel No

3430-001-00-0000
Unique ID
18077
Account
Owner
HAMDEN FISH \& GAME PROTECTIVE AS

Location
150 WILLOW ST
MAILING ADDRESS
P O BOX 5619
HAMDEN CT 06518-0619


3430-001-00-0000 04/23/2015

Scroll Down For Complete Property Detail

(GoMan data ©2017 Google Imagery ©2017, CNES / Airbus, DigitalGlobe, U.S. Geological
Click on the Google logo to go to Google Maps

Parcel Documents

## Full Size Assessor Maps

Full Assessor Map

Interactive GIS Maps of Property

GO TO VIRTUAL EARTH BIRDS EYE!

GO TO INTERACTIVE MAP!
Once in Interactive Map, Select Parcel and enter Abutters distance.

## PARCEL VALUATIONS

|  | Appraised Value | Assessed Value |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Buildings | 164900 | 115430 |
| Outbuildings | 17000 | 11900 |
| Improvements | 187200 | 131040 |
| Extra Features | 5300 | 3710 |
| Land | 1172000 | 288530 |
| TOTAL: | 1359200 | 419570 |

## PROPERTY INFORMATION

| Land Acres | 85.58 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Land Use | FISH\&GAME |
| Land Class | C |
| Zoning | T1 |
| Neighborhood | 130 |
| Lot Description | Level |
| Lot Setting | Suburban |
| Lot Utilities | Public Water,Public Sewer,Gas/Electric |
| Street Description | Paved |

## SALE INFORMATION

| Sale Date | $10 / 10 / 1945$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Sale Price | 0 |
| Book / Page | $232 / 49$ |

## BUILDING AREA

Gross Building Area ..... 5759
Total Living Area ..... 3081

## CONSTRUCTION DETAILS

| Building Use | Comm/Ind |
| :--- | :---: |
| Number of Rooms |  |
| Number of Bedrooms |  |
| Number of Bathrooms |  |
| Number of Half Bathrooms <br> Kitchen Style |  |
| Stories | Gable/Hip |
| Roof Style | Asphalt |
| Roof Cover | Vinyl Siding |
| Primary Exterior Wall Type | K PINE/A WD |
| Secondary Exterior Wall Type |  |
| Primary Interior Wall Type | Vinyl/Asphalt |
| Secondary Interior Wall Type |  |
| Primary Floor Type | Forced Air-Duc |
| Secondary Floor Type | Oil |
| Heating Type |  |
| Heating Fuel |  |
| Air Conditioning Type |  |

Copyright® 2007 Town of Hamden, Connecticut, U.S.A. All rights reserved.
All information is intended for your general knowledge only and is not a substitute for contacting the Town Hall or other departments listed at this web site.

You should promptly consult the specific office or department with any questions. Use of this web site and any information you find through it is subject to the Disclaimer.

September 12,2017

Dear Customer:
The following is the proof-of-delivery for tracking number 770193508695.

## Delivery Information:

| Status: | Delivered | Delivered to: | Receptionist/Front Desk |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Signed for by: | M.RAMPERSAUD | Delivery location: | 2750 DIXWELL AVENUE |
| Service type: | FedEx Express Saver | Delivery date: | HAMDEN, CT 06518 |
| Special Handling: | Deliver Weekday |  | Sep 11, 2017 13:01 |
|  | Direct Signature Required |  |  |



Shipping Information:

| Tracking number: | 770193508695 | Ship date: | Sep 6,2017 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Weight: | $0.5 \mathrm{lbs} / 0.2 \mathrm{~kg}$ |

## Recipient:

Kurt Leng, Mayor
Town of Hamden
2750 Dixwell Avenue
HAMDEN, CT 06518 US

## Reference

## Shipper:

Paul Sagristano
Charles Cherundolo Consulting
4 Davis Road West
Suite 5
OLD LYME, CT 06371 US
CT54XC773 - Notice to Mayor

Thank you for choosing FedEx.

September 11,2017

Dear Customer:
The following is the proof-of-delivery for tracking number 770193748179.

## Delivery Information:

| Status: | Delivered | Delivered to: |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Signed for by: | J.RUGGIERO | Delivery location: | Residence <br> 150 WILLOW STRET <br> HAMDEN, CT 06518 |
| Service type: | FedEx Express Saver | Delivery date: | Sep 8, 2017 17:53 |
| Special Handling: | Deliver Weekday |  |  |
|  | Residential Delivery |  |  |
|  | Direct Signature Required |  |  |



## Shipping Information:

| Tracking number: | 770193748179 | Ship date: | Sep 6,2017 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Weight: | $0.5 \mathrm{lbs} / 0.2 \mathrm{~kg}$ |

## Recipient:

Mr. Lew Lagervall, Treasurer
Hamden Fish and Game Association
150 Willow Stret
HAMDEN, CT 06518 US

## Reference

## Shipper:

Paul Sagristano
Charles Cherundolo Consulting
4 Davis Road West
Suite 5
OLD LYME, CT 06371 US
CT54XC773 CSC Notice to Owner

Thank you for choosing FedEx.

# STATE OF CONNECTICUT <br> CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL 

Ten Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051
Phone: (860) 827-2935 Fax: (860) 827-2950
E-Mail: siting.council@ct.gov
Internet: ct.gov/esc

May 10, 2007
Thomas J. Regin, Esq.
Brown Nudnick Berlack Israels LLP
CityPlace I, 185 Asylum Street
Hartford, CT 06103

RE: DOCKET NO. 324 - Sprint Nextel Corporation application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a wireless telecommunications facility at 150 Willow Street, Hampden, Connecticut.

## Dear Attorney Regan:

By its Decision and Order dated May 1, 2007, the Connecticut Siting Council (Council) granted a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need (Certificate) for the construction, maintenance and operation of a wireless telecommunications facility at 150 Willow Street, Hampden, Connecticut.

Enclosed are the Council's Certificate, Findings of Fact, Opinion, and Decision and Order.
Very truly yours,

S. Derek Phelps

Executive Director
SDP/MP/laf
Enclosures (4)

STATE OF CONNECTICUT<br>CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL<br>Ten Franklin Square. New Britain, CT 06051<br>Phone: (860) 827-2935 Fax: (860) 827-2950<br>EMail: siting.council (euct.gov Internet: ct.gov/csc

## CERTIFICATE <br> OF <br> ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBLLTY AND PUBLIC NEED

DOCKET NO. 324

Pursuant to General Statutes $\S 16-50 \mathrm{k}$, as amended, the Connecticut Siting Council hereby issues a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need to Sprint Nextel Corporation application for the construction, maintenance and operation of a wireless telecommunications facility at 150 Willow Street, Hampden, Connecticut. This Certificate is issued in accordance with and subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the Decision and Order of the Council on May 1, 2007

By order of the Council,

May 1.2007


STATE OF CONNECTICUT<br>CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL<br>Ten Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 0605 I<br>Phone: (860) 827-2935 Fax: (860) 827-2950<br>E-Mail: siting.councii@ct.gov<br>Internet: ct.gov/csc

May 10, 2007
TO: Parties and Intervenors
FROM:
RE: DOCKET NO. 324 - Sprint Nextel Corporation application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a wireless telecommunications facility at 150 Willow Street, Hamden, Connecticut.

By its Decision and Order dated May 1, 2007, the Connecticut Siting Council granted a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need (Certificate) for the construction, maintenance and operation of a wireless telecommunications facility at 150 Willow Street, Hamden, Connecticut.

Enclosed are the Council's Findings of Fact, Opinion, and Decision and Order.
SDP/MP/laf
Enclosures (3)
c: State Documents Librarian

## STATE OF CONNECTICUT )

ss. New Britain, Connecticut : COUNTY OF HARTFORD )

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the Findings of Fact, Opinion, and Decision and Order issued by the Connecticut Siting Council, State of Connecticut.

## ATTEST:



I certify that a copy of the Findings of Fact, Opinion, and Decision and Order in Docket No. 324 has been forwarded by Certified First Class Return Receipt Requested mail on May 10, 2007, to all parties and intervenors of record as listed on the attached service list, dated November 3, 2006.

## ATTEST:



Administrative Assistant
Connecticut Siting Council

Date: November 3, 2006
Docket No. 324
Page 1 of 1
LIST OF PARTIES AND INTERVENORS
SERVICE LIST

| Status Granted | Status Holder <br> (name, address \& phone number) | Representative <br> (name, address \& phone number) |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | Sprint Nextel Corporation | Thomas J. Regan, Esq. <br> Brown Rudnick Berlack Israels LLP <br> CityPlace I, 185 Asylum Street <br> Hartford, CT 06103 <br> (860) 509-6522 <br> (860) 509-6501 fax <br> tregan@brownrudnick.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

DOCKET NO. 324 - Sprint Nextel Corporation application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a wireless telecommunications facility at 150 Willow Street, Hamden, Connecticut.

Connecticut
Siting
Council
May 1, 2007

## Findings of Fact

## Introduction

1. Sprint Nextel Corporation (Sprint) in accordance with provisions of Connecticut General Statutes (CGS) § $16-50 \mathrm{~g}$ through $16-50 \mathrm{aa}$, applied to the Connecticut Siting Council (Council) on October 27, 2006 for the construction, operation, and maintenance of a wireless telecommunications facility at 150 Willow Street, Hamden, Connecticut. (Sprint 1, p.4)
2. Sprint Nextel Corporation is a Delaware corporation. Sprint's principal business offices are located in Mahwah, New Jersey. Sprint is licensed by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) in many major trading areas in the United States, including Connecticut. (Sprint 1, p. 4)
3. The party in this proceeding is the applicant. (Transcript 1, March 8, 2007, 3:00 p.m. [Tr. 1], p. 4)
4. The purpose of the proposed facility is to provide service to coverage gaps identified by Spriat on Route 10 and surrounding areas in Cheshire and Hamden. (Sprint 1, pp. 3, 6)
5. Pursuant to General Statutes § $16-50 \mathrm{~m}$, the Council, after giving due notice thereof, held a public hearing on March 8, 2007, beginning at 3:00 p.m. and continuing at 7:00 p.m. at the Miller Library Complex, Thornton Wilder Hall, 2901 Dixwell Avenue, Hamden, Connecticut. (Council's Hearing Notice dated January 25, 2007; Tr. 1, p. 2; Transcript 2, March 8, 2007, 7:00 p.m. [Tr. 2], p. 2)
6. The Council and its staff conducted an inspection of the proposed site on March 8, 2007, beginning at 2:00 p.m. During the field inspection, the applicant flew a red balloon at the proposed site to simulate the height of the proposed tower. Weather conditions included winds of 15 to 20 miles per hour and were not conducive to a proper balloon flight. Sprint lost three balloons between approximately $12: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ and $2: 10 \mathrm{pm}$. The balloon reached its proposed height of 160 feet above ground level for approximately two minutes during the Council's inspection. (Council's Hearing Notice dated January 25, 2007,Tr. 1, pp. 12-13)
7. Pursuant to CGS § 16-501 (b), public notice of the application was published in The New Haven Register on October 17 and 19, 2006. (Sprint 1, p. 5)
8. Pursuant to General Statute § $16-501(\mathrm{~b})$, notice of the application was provided to all abutting property owners by certified mail. Notice was unclaimed by four abutters: George L. Parente, Linus L. Darley, John Candella and Salvatore Hoo, and the State of Connecticut Nature Preserve. Sprint re-sent letters to these four abutters by first class mail. The first class letter to the State of Connecticut Nature Preserve was returned and then re-sent a final time to a different address. (Sprint 1, p. 5; Tr. 1, pp. 13-14)
9. Pursuant to CGS § $16-501$ (b), Sprint provided notice to all federal, state and local officials and agencies listed therein. (Sprint 1, Tab 5)

## State Agency Comment

10. Pursuant to General Statutes § 16-50j (h), on January 25, 2007 and March 9, 2007, the following State agencies were solicited by the Council to submit written comments regarding the proposed facility; Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), Department of Public Health (DPH), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), Department of Public Utility Control (DPUC), Office of Policy and Management (OPM), Department of Economic and Community Development (DECD), and the Department of Transportation (DOT). (Record)
11. The Council received a response from the DOT's Bureau of Engineering and Highway Operations on March 1, 2007 with no comments on this proposal. (DOT Comments dated March 1, 2007)
i2. DPH responded with comments that are reflected in Finding of Fact \#61. (DPH Comments dated March 26, 2007 and March 29, 2007)
12. The following agencies did not respond with comment on the application: $\mathrm{DEP}, \mathrm{CEQ}$, DPUC, OPM, and the DECD. (Record)

## Municipal Consultation

14. Sprint notified the Town of Hamden (Town) of the proposal on July 27, 2006 by sending a technical report to the Mayor, Craig Henrici. Sprint contacted the Town by telephone on several occasions to discuss the proposal and to inquire as to whether the Town wanted to set up a meeting or provide comments on the proposal. The Town did not respond to Sprint's offer and did not provide Sprint with any comments. (Sprint 1, p. 10)
15. Due to the proposed tower site's close proximity to the Cheshire town line, Sprint also notified the Town of Cheshire of the proposal on July 27, 2006 by sending a technical report to the Chairman of the Cheshire Town Council, Matt Hall. The Cheshire Town Planner, William S. Voelker, contacted Sprint to indicate that the Town of Cheshire did not have any comments on Sprint's notice. (Sprint 1, p. 10)
16. By letter dated August 2, 2007, the Hamden Town Planner submitted a letter to the Council recommending that the tower be disguised as a silo. (Administrative Notice Item No. 16)
17. Sprint would provide space on the tower for the Town and any emergency response system for no compensation. The Hamden Police Department expressed an interest in co-locating at the top of the tower in the future. (Sprint 1, p. 7; Tr. I, p. 65)

## Public Need for Service

18. In 1996, the United States Congress recognized a nationwide need for high quality wireless telecommunications services, including cellular telephone service. Through the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996, Congress seeks to promote competition, encourage technical innovations, and foster lower prices for telecommunications services. (Council Administrative Notice Item No. 7)
19. In issuing cellular licenses, the Federal government has preempted the determination of public need for cellular service by the states, and has established design standards to ensure technical integrity and nationwide compatibility among all systems. Sprint is licensed by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to provide personal wireless communication service to New Haven County, Connecticut. (Council Administrative Notice Item No. 7; Sprint 1, p. 4)
20. The Telecommunications Act of 1996 prohibits local and state entities from discriminating among providers of functionally equivalent services. (Council Administrative Notice Item No. 7)
21. The Telecommunications Act of 1996, a Federal law passed by the United States Congress, prohibits any state or local entity from regulating telecommunications towers on the basis of the environmental effects of radio frequency emissions to the extent that such towers and equipment comply with FCC's regulations concerning such emissions. This Act also blocks the Council from prohibiting or acting with the effect of prohibiting the provision of personal wireless service. (Council Administrative Notice Item No. 7)
22. In an effort to ensure the benefits of wireless technologies to all Americans, Congress enacted the Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999 (the 911 Act). The purpose of this legislation was to promote public safety through the deployment of a seamless, nationwide emergency communications infrastructure that includes wireless communications services. (Sprint 1, p. 7)
23. Sprint's facility would be in compliance with the requirements of the 911 Act. (Sprint $1, \ldots$ p. 7)

## Site Selection

24. Sprint established a search ring in northern Hamden roughly centered on CL\&P's easement and located to the east of Route 10 . The search ring consisted of a six-sided area, approximately 0.5 miles wide at the widest point. The area is mostly residential with rolling hills that range in elevation from approximately 150 feet above mean sea level (amsl) to over 700 feet amsl. (Sprint 1, Tab 7; Sprint 1, p. 11)
25. Prior to selecting the proposed site, Sprint considered 15 existing structures in the Hamden, Cheshire, and Wallingford area. The sites consisted of electric transmission structures, a silo, a building, a flagpole tower, and one existing tower. All of the sites were rejected due to inadequate coverage to the target service area. (Sprint 1, p. 9)
26. Twelve existing towers are located within two miles of the search area. Sprint is not located on any of these twelve existing towers. None of these sites met Sprint's coverage objectives. The locations of the twelve existing towers are as follows:
a) NU Power Mount at 150 Willow Street, Hamden
b) NU Power Mount \#2466 at 450 Tuttle Avenue, Hamden
c) NU Power Mount \#2465 at 450 Tuttle Avenue, Hamden
d) NU Pole at Old Lane Road, Cheshire
e) Fire Department Whip at King Road, Cheshire
f).NU Pole \#1 at Brooksvale Avenue, Hamden
g)NU Pole \#3 at Cook Hill Road, Cheshire
h)NU Pole \#4 at Mansion Road, Wallingford
i) Golf Range Pole at Brooksvale Avenue, Hamden
j) NU Pole \#5 at Turte Avenue, Wallingford
k) Quinnipiac University Building at Hogan Road, Hamden
1) Cingular Flagpole at Quinnipiac University at New Road, Hamden (Sprint 1, pp. 9-10; Sprint 1, Tab 6)
27. The 120 -foot CL\&P transmission structure \#5215 was also considered by Sprint, but structurally, it can only support two carriers. New Cingular Wireless and T-Mobile already plan to locate on the pole. (Sprint 2, response 16)
28. Sprint also considered utilizing the existing CL\&P structures on the subject property with height extensions in order to meet its coverage objectives. However, CL\&P's right of way in this area does not permit the installation of telephone and telecommunications equipment within the easement area. (Tr. 1, pp. 24-25)
29. Microcells and repeaters are not viable technological alternatives for providing coverage to the identified coverage gap. Microcells and repeaters are low power sites that are limited in coverage and capacity. The coverage gap in the Hamden area is significant. Therefore, technologies such as repeaters and microcells are not viable options to cover the portions of Route 10 and the surrounding areas of Hamden and Cheshire that Sprint seeks to cover. (Sprint 1, pp. 8-9)

## Site Description

30. The proposed site is located on an 87 -acre parcel at 150 Willow Street in Hamden. The parcel, owned by Hamden Fish and Game Protective Association, Inc., contains mainly undeveloped, forested land with a firing range. The proposed site is depicted on Figure 1. (Sprint 1, p. 11; Tr. 1, p. 14)
31. The property is zoned residential, R-1. The Town's zoning regulations permit telecommunication towers in R-1 Zone districts, subject to issuance of a Special Permit and Site Plan Approval. (Sprint la, Town of Hamden Zoning Regulations)
32. Land use in the surrounding area is medium-density residential development, undeveloped forested lands, and overhead electric utility infrastructure and associated rights of way. (Sprint 1, p. 11)
33. The tower site is located in the western half of the property just north of CL\&P's easement, at an elevation of approximately 126 feet amsl. The wooded site is dominated by sugar maple, Norway maple, black oak, and red cedar. (Sprint 1, p. 19; Sprint 3, drawings Z2 and Z3A)
34. The proposed facility would consist of a 160 -foot monopole within a 100 -foot by 100 foot leased area. The tower would be designed to support a total of five levels of antennas with a 10 -foot vertical separation between antenna centers. The tower would be constructed of galvanized steel that would weather to a non-reflective gray finish. (Sprint 1, pp. 3, 12, 18-19; Sprint 1, Tab 9, drawing Z5 )
35. Sprint would install twelve antennas on a triangular platform at a centerline height of 157 feet agl. The total height of the facility with antennas would be 160 feet agl. (Sprint 1, p. 12; Sprint 1, Tab 9, drawing 25)
36. The tower would be designed and constructed in accordance with the American National Standards Institute TIA/EIA-222-F "Structural Standards for Steel Antenna Towers and Antenna Support Structures". (Sprint I, p. 12)
37. A silo tower design is feasible from both a structural and RF standpoint, but visually may be a large, cumbersome structure. (Tr. 1, pp. 17-1.9)
38. A monopine design is possible, but visually may not blend in effectively due to the existing utility corridor. (Tr. 1, pp. 21-22)
39. A narrow "stick" tower design is possible, but the sector orientation would have to be changed in order for the antennas to fit, thereby resulting in more dropped calls. (Tr. 1, p. 37)
40. A "one-antenna-per-sector" configuration would degrade coverage similar to a decrease in height. (Tr. 1, p. 66)
41. It would be difficult for Sprint to flush-mount its antennas because the cluster of antennas = is already very close together due to the sector orientation. (Tr. 1, pp. 16, 39-41)
42. T-bars could be used to mount the antennas. (Tr. l, pp. 38-39)
43. Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless did not participate in this proceeding, but informed the Council of its interest in co-locating at this facility in the future by letter dated March 16, 2007. No other carriers have expressed an interest in co-locating at this facility at this time. (Cellco Letter dated March 20, 2007; Tr. 1, p. 14)
44. A 50 -foot by 50 -foot equipment compound enclosed by a six-foot high chain link fence would be established at the base of the tower. Sprint would install an equipment cabinet and a battery backup cabinet on a concrete pad within the compound. (Sprint l, pp. 1213; Sprint 1, Tab 9, drawing Z3)
45. Development of the site would require approximately 500 cubic yards of cut and 400 cubic yards of fill. (Sprint 2, response 12)
46. Access to the tower site begins at Willow Street and follows the existing access for approximately 180 feet. The access would turm to the northeast and continue along an abandoned access way for approximately 500 feet to the compound. This access way would be improved to a width of 12 feet and covered with gravel. (Sprint 3, drawings $Z 2$ and Z3A; Tr. l, pp. 19-20)
47. The new access could be shifted an additional 20 feet to save several large white pines. (Tr. 1, p 20)
48. Utilities would be installed underground and leave the compound in a southeasterly direction to reach an existing pole on the property. (Spriat 3, drawing Z2)
49. Development of the site would not require blasting. (Sprint 2, response 13)
50. The tower setback radius would not extend beyond the boundaries of the Hamden Fish and Game Protective Association, Inc. property but would overlap CL\&P's easement by 27.5 feet. (Sprint 2 , response 15 ; Sprint 3, drawing Z2)
51. Sprint is willing to engineer a break point on the monopole so that the tower setback radius would stay outside of the CL\&P easement. Alternatively, Sprint could shift the monopole and lease area slightly north to keep the tower setback radius off of the CL\&P easement. However, Sprint would prefer the break point method rather than shifting the monopole and lease area. (Sprint 2 , response 15 )
52. The nearest property boundary from the proposed tower is approximately 340 feet to the north (Rubin/Corrine property). The tower setback radius would not extend onto the Rubin/Corrine property. (Sprint 3, drawing Z2)
53. There are 27 residences within 1,000 feet of the proposed tower site. The nearest residence is approximately 406 feet north of the tower site (Rubin/Corrine residence). (Sprint 2, responses 10 and 11)
54. The estimated construction cost of the proposed facility is:

| Site Work | $\$ 30,500$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Monopole | $\$ 30,000$ |
| Electrical \& Telephone | $\$ 17,500$ |
| Foundation | $\$ 31,800$ |
| Landscaping | $\$ 3,000$ |
| Road | $\$ 4,000$ |
| Total | $\$ 116,800$ (Sprint 1, Tab 10) |

## Environmental Considerations

55. The proposed facility would have no effect upon historic, architectural, or archaeological resources listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places or upon properties of traditional cultural importance to Connecticut's Native American community. (Sprint 1, Tab 14)
56. There are no known existing populations of federal or state endangered or threatened species or state special concern species occurring at the proposed site, based on a review of the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection Natural Diversity Database. (Sprint 1, Tab 14)
57. Vegetation at the site consists of sugar maple, Norway maple, black oak, and red cedar ranging in size from 6 to 12 inches diameter at breast height (dbh). Approximately 15 trees six inches dbh or greater would be removed to develop the site. (Sprint 1, p. 19; Sprint 2, response 9; Tr. 1, p. 20)
58. Wetlands are located to the east of the pavilion, approximately 200 feet from the proposed compound. Wetland vegetation consists of red maple, green ash, spicebush, skunk cabbage, and sensitive fern. Wetland vegetation inside the CL\&P right of way consists of multiflora rose, brambles, grape, silky dogwood, and goldenrod. (Sprint 1, Tab 14)
59. No work would be conducted within wetland resource areas. Some construction activities associated with the underground utility trench would be located within the Town's 200 -foot upland review area. These activities would be located within existing disturbed areas and are not expected to adversely impact the nearby wetlands. (Tr. 1, p. 15)
60. There are no airports within two nautical miles of the site. Lighting of the tower would not be required. (Sprint 1, Tabs 12 and 14)
61. The proposed construction is located within the Watershed Area for the Mill River System and the Level A Aquifer Protection Area of the North Sleeping Giant Well Field, sources of drinking water for the South Central Connecticut Regional Water Authority (RWA). The DPH Drinking Water Section recommends that the RWA be contacted prior to any construction and that the following Best Management Practices be followed to ensure the safety of the drinking water supply:
a) Coordinate any construction activities with the RWA.
b) Write an emergency response plan for actions to be taken in the event of an accidental fuel or chemical spill that may occur during construction.
c) Have spill response equipment available on-site at all times along with personnel trained in the proper use of such equipment.
d) Designate a person or persons for emergency response coordination on a $24 / 7$ basis.
e) Contact the RWA immediately in the event of an accidental spill.
f) Avoid the cleaning of equipment on the locations of construction due to possible contamination from equipment chemicals.
g) Avoid any storage of fuel or refueling within the watershed and acquifer protection areas.
h) Designate one area (off of the source areas) for auto parking, vehicle refueling and routine equipment maintenance. This area should be well away from exposed surfaces or storm drains.
i) Perform all major equipment repairs off site.
j) Keep pollutants off of exposed surfaces.
k) Do not bury stumps or construction debris on the job site.
1) Place sediment fences and hay bales strategically and inspect and maintain them to prevent sedimentation and erosion.
m) Inspect and maintain temporary storm water ponds and basins routinely.
n) Have additional sediment fences and hay bales available for use as needed to prevent runoff in the event that unexpected conditions occur.
o) Protect exposed stockpiles of soil to prevent runoff.
p) Use as little water as possible for dust control.
q) Clean up leaks, drips and other spills immediately to prevent or minimize soil contamination.
r) Never hose down "dirty" pavement or surfaces where materials have spilled. Use dry cleanup methods whenever possible.
s) Perform any blasting only with careful consideration to impacts to the area, including possible effects to ground water which could affect drinking water quality and quantity.
t) Remove paints, paint products and other hazardous materials from the site during non-work hours or otherwise store these materials in a secure area to prevent vandalism.
u) Place covered trashcans and recycling receptacles around the site. Cover and maintain dumpsters, check frequently for leaks, and never clean a dumpster by hosing it down on site.
v) Avoid development of slopes at 15 percent or greater. If they cannot be avoided in this project, a separate environmental consultant should be on site to ensure proper erosion and sedimentation controls are in place. This consultant would be
responsible to report to the RWA so water quality issues are avoided. (DPH Comments dated March 23 and 26, 2007)
62. The maximum power density from the radio frequency emissions of Sprint's proposed antennas would be $0.0482 \mathrm{~mW} / \mathrm{cm}^{2}$, or $4.82 \%$ of the standard for Maximum Permissible Exposure, as adopted by the FCC, at the base of the proposed tower. This calculation was based on methodology prescribed by the FCC Office of Engineering and Technology Bulletin No. 65E, Edition 97-01 (August 1997) that assumes all antennas would be pointed at the base of the tower and all channels would be operating simultaneously. (Sprint 1, p. 23)

## Visibility

63. The proposed tower would be visible year-round from approximately 59 acres within a two-mile radius of the site (refer to Figure 6). The tower would be seasonally visible from approximately 97 acres within a two-mile radius of the site. (Sprint 1, Tab 12, pp. 4-5; Tr. 1, pp. 45-46)
64. Visibility of the proposed tower from roads within a two-mile radius of the site is presented in the table below:

| Road | Length of Road <br> Visibility (Seasonal) | Length of Road Visibility <br> (Year-round) | Nearest <br> Distance <br> with <br> Visibility <br> to Site A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route 10 | 0.1 miles | 0.2 miles | 0.3 miles <br> west |
| Bittersweet Lane | 0.1 miles | - | 0.3 miles <br> northwest |
| Still Hill Road | 0.3 miles | - | 0.6 miles <br> southwest |
| Brooksvale Avenue | 0.1 miles | 0.1 miles | 0.6 miles <br> southwest |
| Knoll Drive | 0.1 miles | - | 0.1 miles <br> north |
| Willow Street | 0.1 miles | 0.03 miles | 0.1 miles <br> southwest |

(Sprint 1, Tab 12)
65. Visibility of the proposed tower from specific locations within a two-mile radius of the site is presented in the table below:

| Location | Visible | Approx. Portion of <br> Tower Visible | Approx. <br> Distance to <br> Tower |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route 10 - north of Brooksvalle |  |  |  |
| Avenue |  |  |  |$\quad$ Yes $\quad 20$ feet - above trees $\left.\quad$| 0.6 miles |
| :---: |
| northeast | \right\rvert\,

(Sprint, Tab 12)
66. A significant amount of the total visibility of the proposed facility falls on the host property and the existing utility right of way that traverses the study area. Other areas of visibility include a roadside commercial development along Route 10 located within the general vicinity, an adjacent open field located to the southwest of the site, and portions of Knoll Drive approximately 1,000 feet to the northeast. (Sprint 1, p. 21)
67. The proposed site would be visible year-round from four residences along Knoll Drive and two residences along Route 10 . There are also several small areas of potential visibility located over one mile to the northwest and approximately 900 feet northeast of the proposed facility. These areas on are private property and the views could not be verified by Sprint's visual resource consultant. However, views from these areas are expected to be limited to tree-line views and/or views of the upper 25 percent of the proposed facility. (Sprint 1, p. 22)
68. The proposed site would be seasonally visible from five properties along Knoll Drive and three properties along Willow Street. (Sprint 1, p. 22)
69. The nearest state or local recreational area is the Sleeping Giant State Park, which is approximately 0.3 miles east of the tower site at its closest point. The proposed tower may be visible from the Naugutuck Trail in Sleeping Giant State Park, but the viewer would have to pick it out from the existing trees and utility infrastructure. The proposed tower may be visible from other trails in the Sleeping Giant State Park, but the viewer would be looking down on the tower and the view would be largely lost because it would blend in with the valley. (Sprint 1, Tab 12; Tr. 1, pp. 30-32)
70. The proposed tower is not expected to be visible from the Quinnipiac Trail. (Sprint 1, Tab 12)
71. The proposed tower would be seasonally visible from a 0.2 mile long section of the Farmington Canal Linear State Park Trail, which is located approximately 0.5 miles to the west of the proposed site at its nearest point. (Sprint I, Tab 12)
72. The proposed tower may be visible from the Naugatuck State Forest but the view would be limited to a tree-top view and would also be mitigated by the distance of roughly two miles. (Tr. 1, pp. 33-34)
73. The proposed tower is not expected to be visible from Brooksvale Recreation Park. (Tr. 2, pp. 13-14; Sprint 1, Tab 12)
74. There are no state or local scenic roads within two miles of the proposed tower site. (Tr. 1, p. 15)
75. There are no historic districts within a two-mile radius of the proposed site. (Sprint 1, Tab 12)

## Existing and Proposed Wireless Coverage

76. Sprint transmits in the 1950-1965 MHz frequency bands and has a signal-level service design of -92 dBm for this area, sufficient for in-vehicle coverage. The signal-level threshold for in-building coverage is -87 dBm . (Sprint 2 , response 4 ; Sprint 1, Tab 7 )
77. Sprint's existing signal strength in the majority of the area to be covered by this proposed facility is below -92 dBm . (Sprint 2, response 3)
78. Sprint's customers are currently experiencing a high number of dropped calls (over 2 percent) in the area to be covered by the proposed facility. (Sprint 1, p. 6)
79. Sprint's existing coverage gap along Route 10 is approximately 2.8 miles. The proposed site would fill this gap. Refer to Figure 2. (Sprint 2, response 8)
80. Sprint's minimum height to meet coverage design objectives is 157 feet. Refer to Figure 3. (Sprint 1, response 2)
81. Installing the antennas at lower heights, such as 147 feet or 137 feet, would cause the coverage gap on Route 10 north of Cook Hill Road to increase in size. Refer to Figures 4 and 5. (Tr. 1, pp. 50-51)
82. The proposed tower would provide approximately 4.5 square miles of improved coverage. (Sprint 2, response 7)

Figure 1: Location Map

(Sprint 1, p. Tab 1)

Figure 2: Existing Coverage
(Sprint 1, Tab 11)

Figure 3: Coverage with Proposed Antennas at 157 feet

(Sprint 2, response 1)

Figure 4: Coverage with Proposed Antennas at 147 feet

(Sprint 2, response 1)

Figure 5: Coverage with Proposed Antennas at 137 feet

(Sprint 2, response 1)

Figure 6: Viewshed Map


Figure 6: Viewshed Map Legend

| Legend <br> Proposed Site Location (includes areas of limited visibility approximatehy 500 feet around Facility) <br> Photographs - July 24, 2006 <br> - Eallopn visible above trees <br> Cxy Seesonal Visibilty (Approximately 97 acres) <br> Approx \% of Tower Visible (Year-Round) Tree Line View - 14 Actes <br> LTper 25\%-18 Acres: $50 \%-31$ Acres 75\%-3 Acres Eitiri Facify Velble - 3 Acres <br> Yearorund Visiblity is Approxinately 59 acres <br> Priptected Properties Muinicipal Cemetery Preservation Conservation Existing Preserved Open Space Recreation General Recreation $\square$ Scheol $\square$ Unczlegorized | Protecfed Properties (CT DEP) State Forest $\square$ State Park $\square$ DEP Owned Wateibody State Fark Scenic Reserve Histonio Presenve Natural Area Prieserve Fish Hatehery: Flocid Contral Oher State Park Traii Water Access Wholife Area Milolife Sanctuary <br> DEP Boat Launcties <br> Scenic Road (State and Local) <br> - Quinniplac Trail (CT Blue Blaze) <br> Town Line |
| :---: | :---: |
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## Opinion

On October 27, 2006, Sprint Nextel Corporation (Sprint) applied to the Connecticut Siting Council (Council) for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need (Certificate) for the construction, maintenance and operation of a wireless telecommunications facility to be located at 150 Willow Street, Hamden, Connecticut. Sprint is seeking to develop a facility on property owned by the Hamden Fish and Game Protective Association, Inc. (Hamden Fish and Game). Sprint's objective in locating a facility at this location is to provide service on Route 10 and surrounding areas in Cheshire and Hamden.

Sprint proposes to construct a 160 -foot monopole and associated compound on an 87 -acre parcel owned by Hamden Fish and Game and consisting of mainly undeveloped, forested land with a firing range. The tower and the 50 -foot by 50 -foot compound area will be located in the western half of the property just north of The Connecticut Light and Power Company's (CL\&P) easement. The tower would be designed to support the antennas of four additional carriers.

Utilities will be installed underground to reach an existing pole on the subject property. Access to the tower site begins at Willow Street and follows the existing access for approximately 180 feet. The access would turn to the northeast and continue along an abandoned access way for approximately 500 feet to the compound. This access way would be improved to a width of 12 feet and covered with gravel.

The tower setback radius would not extend beyond the boundaries of Hamden Fish and Game property, but would overlap The Connecticut Light and Power Company's (CL\&P) easement by 27.5 feet. Sprint is willing to engineer a break point on the monopole so that the tower setback radius would stay outside of the CL\&P easement. Accordingly, the Council will order the design of the monopole to include a break point to prevent the tower from extending onto CL\&P's transmission line easement in the event of a tower failure.

The tower will be visible year-round from approximately 59 acres within a two-mile radius of the site. The tower will be seasonally visible from approximately 97 acres within a two-mile radius of the site. The proposed site would be visible year-round from four residences along Knoll Drive and two residences along Route 10 . There are also several small areas of potential visibility located over one mile to the northwest and approximately 900 feet northeast of the proposed facility. However, views from these areas are expected to be limited to tree-line views and/or views of the upper 25 percent of the proposed facility. The proposed site would be seasonally visible from five properties along Knoll Drive and three properties along Willow Street.

The nearest state or local recreational area is the Sleeping Giant State Park, which is approximately 0.3 miles east from the tower site at its closest point. The proposed tower may be visible from the Naugutuck Trail in Sleeping Giant State Park, but the viewer would have to pick
it out from the existing trees and utility infrastructure. The proposed tower may be visible from other trails in the Sleeping Giant State Park, but the viewer would be looking down on the tower, and the view would be largely lost because it would blend in with the valley. The proposed tower is not expected to be visible from the Quinnipiac Trail.

Sprint transmits in the 1950-1965 MHz frequency bands and has a signal-level service design of -92 dBm for this area, sufficient for in-vehicle coverage. The signal-level threshold for inbuilding coverage is -87 dBm . Sprint's existing signal strength in the majority of the area to be covered by this proposed facility is below -92 dBm . Sprint's customers are currently experiencing a high number of dropped calls (over 2 percent), which decreases Sprint's reliability. Sprint's existing coverage gap along Route 10 is approximately 2.8 miles. The proposed site would fill this gap. Sprint's minimum height to meet coverage design objectives is 157 feet. Installing the antennas at lower heights, such as 147 feet or 137 feet, would cause the coverage gap on Route 10 north of Cook Hill Road to increase in size. The proposed tower would provide approximately 4.5 square miles of improved coverage.

The site is wooded and is dominated by sugar maple, Norway maple, black oak, and red cedar. Development of the proposed site will require clearing of approximately 15 trees of six inches in diameter or greater at breast height (dbh). No work will be conducted within wetland resource areas. Some construction activities associated with the underground utility trenct will be located within the Town's 200 -foot upland review area. These activities will be located within existing disturbed areas and are not expected to adversely impact the nearby wetlands. Therefore, the Council will order erosion and sedimentation controls consistent with the Connecticut Guidelines for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control, May 2002, as amended.

There are no known existing populations of federal or state endangered or threatened species or state special concern species occurring at the proposed site, based on a review of the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection Natural Diversity Database. The proposed facility will have no effect on archaeological or historic resources.

The Council is concerned, however, that the proposed tower is located within the Watershed Area for the Mill River System and the Level A Aquifer Protection Area of the North Sleeping Giant Well Field, sources of drinking water for the South Central Connecticut Regional Water Authority. To minimize the risk of contamination of drinking water during construction, the Council will order Sprint to comply with the Connecticut Department of Public Health's Best Management Practices to the extent applicable.

According to a methodology prescribed by the FCC Office of Engineering and Technology Bulletin No. 65E, Edition 97-01 (August 1997), the combined radio frequency power density levels of the antennas proposed to be installed on the tower have been calculated by Council staff to amount to $4.82 \%$ of the FCC's Maximum Permissible Exposure, as measured at the base of the tower. This percentage is well below federal and state standards established for the frequencies used by wireless companies. If federal or state standards change, the Council will require that the tower be brought into compliance with such standards. The Council will require that the power densities be recalculated in the event other carriers add antennas to the tower. The Telecommunications Act of 1996 prohibits any state or local agency from regulating telecommunications towers on the basis of the environmental effects of radio frequency emissions to the extent that such towers and equipment comply with FCC's regulations concerning such emissions.
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Based on the record in this proceeding, the Council finds that the effects associated with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the telecommunications facility at the proposed site, including effects on the natural environment; ecological integrity and balance; public health and safety; scenic, historic, and recreational values; forests and parks; air and water purity; and fish and wildlife are not disproportionate either alone or cumulatively with other effects when compared to need, are not in conflict with policies of the State concerning such effects, and are not sufficient reason to deny this application. Therefore, the Council will issue a Certificate for the construction, operation, and maintenance of a 160 -foot monopole telecommunications facility at the proposed site at 150 Willow Street, Hamden, Connecticut.
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## Decision and Order

Pursuant to the foregoing Findings of Fact and Opinion, the Connecticut Siting Council (Council) finds that the effects associated with the construction, operation, and maintenance of a telecommunications facility, including effects on the natural environment; ecological integrity and balance; public health and safety; scenic, historic, and recreational values; forests and parks; air and water purity; and fish and wildife are not disproportionate, either alone or cumulatively with other effects, when compared to need, are not in conflict with the policies of the State concerning such effects, and are not sufficient reason to deny the application, and therefore directs that a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need, as provided by General Statutes $\S 16-50 \mathrm{k}$, be issued to Sprint Nextel Corporation, hereinafter referred to as the Certificate Holder, for a telecommunications facility at 150 Willow Street, Hamden, Connecticut.

The facility shall be constructed, operated, and maintained substantially as specified in the Council's record in this matter, and subject to the following conditions:

1. The tower shall be constructed as a monopole, no taller than necessary to provide the proposed telecommunications services, sufficient to accommodate the antemnas of Sprint Nextel Corporation and other entities, both public and private, but such tower shall not exceed a height of 160 feet above ground level. The height at the top of the antennas shall not exceed 160 feet above ground level.
2. The Certificate Holder shall prepare a Development and Management (D\&M) Plan for this site in compliance with Sections $16-50 \mathrm{j}-75$ through $16-50 \mathrm{j}-77$ of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies. The D\&M Plan shall be served on the Town of Hamden for comment, and all parties and intervenors as listed in the service list, and submitted to and approved by the Council prior to the commencement of facility construction and shall include:
a) a final site plan(s) of site development to include specifications for the tower, tower foundation, antennas, equipment compound, radio equipment, access road, utility line, and landscaping; and
b) construction plans for site clearing, water drainage, and erosion and sedimentation control consistent with the 2002 Comnecticut Guidelines for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control, as amended.
3. The Certificate Holder shall, prior to the commencement of operation, provide the Council worst-case modeling of electromagnetic radio frequency power density of all proposed entities' antennas at the closest point of uncontrolled access to the tower base, consistent with Federal Communications Commission, Office of Engineering and Technology, Bulletin No. 65, August 1997. The Certificate Holder shall ensure a recalculated report of electromagnetic radio frequency power density is submitted to the Council if and when circumstances in operation cause a change in power density above the levels calculated and provided pursuant to this Decision and Order.
4. Upon the establishment of any new State or federal radio frequency standards applicable to frequencies of this facility, the facility granted herein shall be brought into compliance with such standards.
5. The Certificate Holder shall permit public or private entities to share space on the proposed tower for fair consideration, or shall provide any requesting entity with specific legal, technical, environmental, or economic reasons precluding such tower sharing.
6. The Certificate Holder shall provide reasonable space on the tower for no compensation for any Town of public safety services (police, fire and medical services), provided such use can be accommodated and is compatible with the structural integrity of the tower.
7. The Certificate Holder shall engineer a break point on the monopole to ensure that the tower setback radius remains outside of The Connecticut Light and Power Company easement.
8. The Certificate Holder shall comply with the Connecticut Department of Public Health's Best Management Practices to the extent applicable, to protect the drinking water supply.
9. Unless otherwise approved by the Council, if the facility authorized herein is not fully constructed and providing wireless services within eighteen months from the date of the mailing of the Council's Findings of Fact, Opinion, and Decision and Order (collectively called "Final Decision"), this Decision and Order shall be void, and the Certificate Holder shall dismantle the tower and remove all associated equipment or reapply for any continued or new use to the Council before any such use is made. The time between the filing and resolution of any appeals of the Council's Final Decision shall not be counted in calculating this deadline.
10. Any request for extension of the time period referred to in Condition 9 shall be filed with the Council not later than 60 days prior to the expiration date of this Certificate and shall be served on all parties and intervenors, as listed in the service list, and the Town of Hamden. Any proposed modifications to this Decision and Order shall likewise be so served.
11. If the facility ceases to provide wireless services for a period of one year, this Decision and Order shall be void, and the Certificate Holder shall dismantle the tower and remove all associated equipment or reapply for any continued or new use to the Council before any such use is made.
12. The Certificate Holder shall remove any nonfunctioning antenna, and associated antenna mounting equipment, within 60 days of the date the antenna ceased to function.
13. In accordance with Section 16-50j-77 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, the Certificate Holder shall provide the Council with written notice two weeks prior to the commencement of site construction activities. In addition, the Certificate Holder shall provide the Council with written notice of the completion of site construction and the commencement of site operation.

Pursuant to General Statutes $\S 16-50$ p, the Council hereby directs that a copy of the Findings of Fact, Opinion, and Decision and Order be served on each person listed below, and notice of issuance shall be published in The New Haven Register.
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By this Decision and Order, the Council disposes of the legal rights, duties, and privileges of each party named or admitted to the proceeding in accordance with Section 16-50j-17 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies.
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The parties and intervenors to this proceeding are:

## Applicant

Sprint Nextel Corporation

## Its Representative

Thomas J. Regan, Esq.
Brown Rudnick Berlack Israels LLP
CityPlace I, $38^{\text {th }}$ Floor
185 Asylum Street
Hartford, CT 06103-3402
Phone: 860-509-6522
Fax: 860-509-6501
Email: tregan@brownrudnick.com

## CERTIFICATION

The undersigned members of the Connecticut Siting Council (Council) hereby certify that they have heard this case, or read the record thereof, in DOCKET NO. 324 - Sprint Nextel Corporation application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a wireless telecommunications facility at 150 Willow Street, Hampden, Connecticut, and voted as follows to approve the proposed site, located at 150 Willow Street, Harden, Connecticut:


Colin C. Tais, Vice Chairman


Commissioner Donald W. De wines
Designee: Gerald J. Heffernap


Commissioner Tina McCarthy
Designee: Brian J. Emerick


Dr. Barbara Currier Bell


Dated at New Britain, Connecticut, May 1, 2007.

EBI Consulting
environmental | engineering | due diligence

# RADIO FREQUENCY EMISSIONS ANALYSIS REPORT EVALUATION OF HUMAN EXPOSURE POTENTIAL TO NON-IONIZING EMISSIONS 

SPRINT Existing Facility

Site ID: CT54XC773
Hamden Fish \& Game Club 150 Willow Street
Hamden, CT 06518
September 5, 2017
EBI Project Number: 6217003654

| Site Compliance Summary |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Compliance Status: | COMPLIANT |
| Site total MPE\% of <br> FCC general <br> population <br> allowable limit: | $\mathbf{7 . 9 1 \%}$ |
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September 5, 2017
SPRINT
Attn: RF Engineering Manager
1 International Boulevard, Suite 800
Mahwah, NJ 07495

## Emissions Analysis for Site: CT54XC773 - Hamden Fish \& Game Club

EBI Consulting was directed to analyze the proposed SPRINT facility located at $\mathbf{1 5 0}$ Willow Street, Hamden, CT, for the purpose of determining whether the emissions from the Proposed SPRINT Antenna Installation located 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 population 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 population 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.

Population exposure to radio frequencies is regulated and enforced in units of microwatts per square centimeter $\left(\mu \mathrm{W} / \mathrm{cm}^{2}\right)$. The general population exposure limits for the 850 MHz Band is approximately $567 \mu \mathrm{~W} / \mathrm{cm}^{2}$. The general population exposure limit for the 1900 MHz (PCS) and 2500 MHz (BRS) 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.
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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 SPRINT Wireless antenna facility located at $\mathbf{1 5 0}$ Willow Street, Hamden, CT, using the equipment information listed below. All calculations were performed per the specifications under FCC OET 65. Since SPRINT is proposing highly focused directional panel antennas, which project most of the emitted energy out toward the horizon, 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 equipment was calculated using the following assumptions:

1) 1 CDMA channels ( 850 MHz ) were considered for each sector of the proposed installation. These Channels have a transmit power of 20 Watts per Channel.
2) 2 LTE channels ( 850 MHz ) were considered for each sector of the proposed installation. These Channels have a transmit power of 20 Watts per Channel.
3) 5 CDMA channels ( $1900 \mathrm{MHz}(\mathrm{PCS})$ ) were considered for each sector of the proposed installation. These Channels have a transmit power of 16 Watts per Channel.
4) 2 LTE channels ( $1900 \mathrm{MHz}(\mathrm{PCS})$ ) were considered for each sector of the proposed installation. These Channels have a transmit power of 40 Watts per Channel.
5) 8 LTE channels ( $2500 \mathrm{MHz}(\mathrm{BRS})$ ) were considered for each sector of the proposed installation. These Channels have a transmit power of 20 Watts per Channel.

EBI Consulting
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6) 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.
7) For the following calculations, the sample point was the top of a 6 -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.
8) The antennas used in this modeling are the RFS APXV9ERR18-C-A20 and RFS APXVTM14-C-I20 for transmission in the $850 \mathrm{MHz}, 1900 \mathrm{MHz}$ (PCS) and 2500 MHz (BRS) frequency bands. This is based on feedback from the carrier with regards to anticipated antenna selection. Maximum gain values for all antennas are listed in the Inventory and Power Data table below. 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.
9) The antenna mounting height centerlines of the proposed antennas are $\mathbf{1 3 6 . 5}$ feet above ground level (AGL) for Sector A, 136.5 feet above ground level (AGL) for Sector B and 136.5 feet above ground level (AGL) for Sector C.
10) 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 calculations were done with respect to uncontrolled / general population threshold limits.

## EBI Consulting
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SPRINT Site Inventory and Power Data by Antenna

| Sector: |  | A | Sector: | B | Sector: | C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Antenna \#: |  | 1 | Antenna \#: | 1 | Antenna \#: | 1 |
| Make / Model: | APXV | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RFS } \\ & 9 \mathrm{ERR} 18-\mathrm{C}- \\ & \text { A20 } \end{aligned}$ | Make / Model: | RFS APXV9ERR18-C- A20 | Make / Model: | RFS APXV9ERR18-C- A20 |
| Gain: | 11.9 | 14.9 dBd | Gain: | 11.9 / 14.9 dBd | Gain: | 11.9 / 14.9 dBd |
| Height (AGL): |  | 6.5 feet | Height (AGL): | 136.5 feet | Height (AGL): | 136.5 feet |
| Frequency Bands |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0 \mathrm{MHz} / \\ & \mathrm{MHz} \text { (PCS) } \end{aligned}$ | Frequency Bands | $\begin{gathered} 850 \mathrm{MHz} / \\ 1900 \mathrm{MHz}(\mathrm{PCS}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Frequency Bands | $\begin{gathered} 850 \mathrm{MHz} / \\ 1900 \mathrm{MHz} \text { (PCS) } \end{gathered}$ |
| Channel Count |  | 10 | Channel Count | 10 | Channel Count | 10 |
| Total TX Power(W): |  | Watts | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Total TX } \\ \text { Power(W): } \end{array}$ | 220 Watts | Total TX <br> Power(W): | 220 Watts |
| ERP (W): |  | 873.76 | ERP (W): | 5,873.76 | ERP (W): | 5,873.76 |
| Antenna A1 MPE\% |  | 39 \% | Antenna B1 MPE\% | 1.39 \% | Antenna C1 MPE\% | 1.39 \% |
| Antenna \#: |  | 2 | Antenna \#: | 2 | Antenna \#: | 2 |
| Make / Model: | APXV | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { RFS } \\ & \text { CM14-C-I20 } \end{aligned}$ | Make / Model: | RFS APXVTM14-C-I20 | Make / Model: | RFS APXVTM14-C-I20 |
| Gain: |  | . 9 dBd | Gain: | 15.9 dBd | Gain: | 15.9 dBd |
| Height (AGL): |  | 6.5 feet | Height (AGL) : | 136.5 feet | Height (AGL): | 136.5 feet |
| Frequency Bands | 2500 | MHz (BRS) | Frequency Bands | 2500 MHz (BRS) | Frequency Bands | 2500 MHz (BRS) |
| Channel Count |  | 8 | Channel Count | 8 | Channel Count | 8 |
| Total TX Power(W): |  | Watts | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total TX } \\ & \text { Power(W): } \end{aligned}$ | 160 Watts | Total TX Power(W): | 160 Watts |
| ERP (W): |  | 224.72 | ERP (W): | 6,224.72 | ERP (W): | 6,224.72 |
| Antenna A2 MPE\% |  | 31 \% | Antenna B2 MPE\% | 1.31 \% | Antenna C2 MPE\% | 1.31 \% |
| Site Composite MPE\% |  |  |  | SPRINT Sector A Total: |  | 2.70 \% |
| Carrier |  | MPE \% |  | SPRINT Sector B Total: |  | 2.70 \% |
| SPRINT - Max per sector |  | 2.70 \% |  | SPRINT Sector C Total: |  | 2.70 \% |
| T-Mobile |  | 2.68 \% |  |  |  |  |
| MetroPCS |  | 0.40 \% |  |  | Site Total: | 7.91 \% |


| SPRINT_Max Values per Frequency Band / Technology Per Sector | \# <br> Channels | Watts ERP (Per Channel) | Height (feet) | Total Power Density $\left(\mu \mathrm{W} / \mathrm{cm}^{2}\right)$ | Frequency ( MHz ) | Allowable MPE $\left(\mu \mathrm{W} / \mathrm{cm}^{2}\right)$ | Calculated \% MPE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sprint 850 MHz CDMA | 1 | 309.76 | 136.5 | 0.65 | 850 MHz | 567 | 0.12\% |
| Sprint 850 MHz LTE | 2 | 309.76 | 136.5 | 1.31 | 850 MHz | 567 | 0.23\% |
| Sprint 1900 MHz (PCS) CDMA | 5 | 494.45 | 136.5 | 5.22 | 1900 MHz (PCS) | 1000 | 0.52\% |
| Sprint 1900 MHz (PCS) LTE | 2 | 1,236.12 | 136.5 | 5.22 | 1900 MHz (PCS) | 1000 | 0.52\% |
| Sprint 2500 MHz (BRS) LTE | 8 | 778.09 | 136.5 | 13.14 | 2500 MHz (BRS) | 1000 | 1.31\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Total: | 2.70\% |

EBI Consulting
environmental | engineering | due diligence

## Summary

All calculations performed for this analysis yielded results that were within the allowable limits for general population exposure to RF Emissions.

The anticipated maximum composite contributions from the SPRINT facility as well as the site composite emissions value with regards to compliance with FCC's allowable limits for general population exposure to RF Emissions are shown here:

| SPRINT Sector | Power Density Value (\%) |
| ---: | :--- |
| Sector A: | $2.70 \%$ |
| Sector B: | $2.70 \%$ |
| Sector C: | $2.70 \%$ |
| SPRINT Maximum | $2.70 \%$ |
| Total (per sector): |  |
| Site Total: | $7.91 \%$ |
|  |  |
| Site Compliance Status: | COMPLIANT |

The anticipated composite MPE value for this site assuming all carriers present is $\mathbf{7 . 9 1 \%}$ of the allowable FCC established general population limit sampled at the ground level. This is based upon 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.

## Structural Analysis Report

August 1, 2017

| Sprint Site Name | Hamden Fish \& Game Club |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sprint Site Number | CT54XC773 |
| Infinigy Job Number | $526-102$ |
| Client | Sprint |
| Proposed Carrier | Sprint |
|  | 150 Willow St, Hamden, CT 06518 |
| Site Location | New Haven County |
|  | $41^{\circ} 26^{\prime} 57.81^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{N}$ |
|  | $72^{\circ} 54^{\prime} 16.46^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W}$ |
| Structure Type | $158^{\prime}$ EEI Monopole |
| Structural Usage Ratio | $\mathbf{7 3 . 0 \%}$ |
| Overall Result | Pass |

Upon reviewing the results of this analysis, it is our opinion that the structure meets the specified TIA code requirements. The tower and foundation are therefore deemed adequate to support the existing and proposed loading as listed in this report.


Matt A. Nichols, P.E.
Senior Structural Engineer
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## Introduction

Infinigy Engineering has been requested to perform a structural analysis on the existing 158' EEI Monopole Tower. All supporting documents have been obtained from the client and are assumed to be accurate and applicable to this site. The tower was analyzed using tnxTower version 7.0.7.0 tower analysis software.

## Supporting Documentation

| Tower Drawings | EEI Project No. 14977, dated July 17, 2007 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Construction Drawings | Infinigy Engineering Job \# 526-102, dated May 19, 2017 |
| Previous Analysis | Infinigy Engineering Job \# 333-000, dated June 27, 2014 |
| Geotechnical Report | JGI Geotechnical Evaluation \#J2075344, dated June 29, 2007 |

## Analysis Code Requirements

| Wind Speed | 97 mph (3-Second Gust, VASD)/ 125 mph (3-Second Gust, VULT) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Wind Speed w/ ice | 50 mph (3-Second Gust) w/ $0.75 "$ ice |
| TIA Revision | ANSI/TIA-222-G |
| Adopted IBC | $2012 \mathrm{IBC} / 2016$ Connecticut State Building Code |
| Structure Class | II |
| Exposure Category | B |
| Topographic Category | 1 |
| Calculated Crest Height | 0 |

## Conclusion

Upon reviewing the results of this analysis, it is our opinion that the structure meets the specified TIA code requirements. The tower and foundation are therefore deemed adequate to support the existing and proposed loading as listed in this report.

If you have any questions, require additional information, or actual conditions differ from those as detailed in this report please contact me via the information below:

Matt A. Nichols, P.E.
Senior Structural Engineer | Infinigy
1033 Watervliet Shaker Road, Albany, NY 12205
(O) (518) 690-0790
mnichols@infinigy.com | www.infinigy.com

August 1, 2017

## Existing and Reserved Loading

| Mount Height (ft) | Qty. | Appurtenance | Mount Type | Coax\& Lines | Carrier |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 157.5 | 3 | RFS APXV9ERR18-C-A20 | Platform w/ <br> Handrails | (3) $1-5 / 8 "$ <br> Hyrbriflex | Sprint |
|  | 3 | Sprint Legacy Antennas |  |  |  |
|  | 3 | Alcatel Lucent 800 MHz RRH |  |  |  |
|  | 3 | Alcatel Lucent 1900 MHz RRH |  |  |  |
| 147.0 | 12 | Panel Antennas | Platform | *(12) 1-5/8" | Verizon |
| 137.0 | 3 | Panel Antennas | Pipe | *(12) 1-5/8" | - |

*Assumed (12) 1-5/8" Coax at 137' and 147' for analysis

## To Be Removed Loading

| Mount <br> Height <br> $(\mathrm{ft})$ | Qty. | Appurtenance | Mount Type | Coax\& Lines | Carrier |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 157.5 | 3 | Sprint Legacy Antennas | - | - | Sprint |

## Proposed Loading

| Mount <br> Height <br> $(\mathrm{ft})$ | Qty. | Appurtenance | Mount Type | Coax\& Lines | Carrier |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 157.5 | 3 | RFS APXVTM14-C-120 | - | $(1) 1-1 / 4 "$ <br> Fiber | Sprint |
|  | 3 | Alcatel Lucent TD-RRH8x20 | - |  |  |

## Final Configuration

| Mount Height <br> (ft) | Qty. | Appurtenance | Mount Type | Coax\& Lines | Carrier |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 157.5 | 3 | RFS APXV9ERR18-C-A20 | Platform w/ Handrails | (3) $1-5 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ <br> Hyrbriflex <br> (1) 1-1/4" <br> Fiber | Sprint |
|  | 3 | RFS APXVTM14-C-120 |  |  |  |
|  | 3 | Alcatel Lucent 800 MHz RRH |  |  |  |
|  | 3 | Alcatel Lucent 1900 MHz RRH |  |  |  |
|  | 3 | Alcatel Lucent TD-RRH8x20 |  |  |  |
| 147.0 | 12 | Panel Antennas | Platform | *(12) 1-5/8" | Verizon |
| 137.0 | 3 | Panel Antennas | Pipe | *(12) 1-5/8" | - |

*Assumed (12) 1-5/8" Coax at 137’ and $147^{\prime}$ for analysis

## Structure Usages

| Pole (L1) | 38.0 | Pass |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Pole (L2) | 26.5 | Pass |
| Pole (L3) | 26.1 | Pass |
| Pole (L4) | 29.4 | Pass |
| Base Plate | 17.6 | Pass |
| Anchor Bolts | 16.3 | Pass |
| RATING | $\mathbf{3 8 . 0}$ | Pass |

## Foundation Reactions

| Reaction Data | Design <br> Reactions | Analysis <br> Reactions | Result |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Moment (kip-ft) | $7,151.4$ | $2,332.5$ | $32.6 \%$ |
| Shear (kip) | 61.2 | 22.3 | $36.4 \%$ |
| Axial (kip) | 68.8 | 50.2 | $73.0 \%$ |

Tower base reactions are acceptable when compared to the original design reactions.

## Deflection, Twist, and Sway

| Antenna Elevation (ft) | Deflection (in) | Twist $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | Sway $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 157.5 | 8.424 | 0.000 | 0.558 |

*Per ANSI/TIA-222-G Section 2.8.2 maximum serviceability structural deflection limit is $3 \%$ of structure height.
*Per ANSI/TIA-222-G Section 2.8.2 maximum serviceability structural twist and sway limit is 4 degrees.
*Per ANSI/TIA-222-G Section 2.8.3 deflection, Twist, and sway values were calculated using a basic 3-second gust wind speed of 60 mph .
*It is the responsibility of the client to ensure their proposed and/or existing equipment will meet ANSI/TIA-222-G Annex D or other appropriate microwave signal degradation limits based on the provided values above.

## Assumptions and Limitations

Our structural calculations are completed assuming all information provided to Infinigy Engineering is accurate and applicable to this site. For the purposes of calculations, we assume an overall structure condition of "like new" and all members and connections to be free of corrosion and/or structural defects. The structure owner and/or contractor shall verify the structure's condition prior to installation of any proposed equipment. If actual conditions differ from those described in this report Infinigy Engineering should be notified immediately to complete a revised evaluation.

Our evaluation is completed using standard TIA, AISC, ACI, and ASCE methods and procedures. Our structural results are proprietary and should not be used by others as their own. Infinigy Engineering is not responsible for decisions made by others that are or are not based on our supplied assumptions and conclusions.

This report is an evaluation of the tower structure only and does not reflect adequacy of any existing antenna mounts, mount connections, or cable mounting attachments. These elements are assumed to be adequate for the purposes of this analysis and are assumed to have been installed per their manufacturer requirements.

158.0 ft


DESIGNED APPURTENANCE LOADING

| TYPE | ELEVATION | TYPE | ELEVATION |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Angle Platform w/ Handrails (Sprint) | 157.5 | TD-RRH8X20 (Sprint) | 157.5 |
| APXV9ERR18-C-A20 (Sprint) | 157.5 | TD-RRH8X20 (Sprint) | 157.5 |
| APXV9ERR18-C-A20 (Sprint) | 157.5 | TD-RRH8X20 (Sprint) | 157.5 |
| APXV9ERR18-C-A20 (Sprint) | 157.5 | Angle Low Profile Platform (Verizon) | 147 |
| APXVTM14-C-120 (Sprint) | 157.5 | (4) 72" $\times 12^{\prime \prime}$ Panel (Verizon) | 147 |
| APXVTM14-C-120 (Sprint) | 157.5 | (4) $72^{\prime \prime} \times 12^{\prime \prime}$ Panel (Verizon) | 147 |
| APXVTM14-C-120 (Sprint) | 157.5 | (4) 72" $\times 12^{\prime \prime}$ Panel (Verizon) | 147 |
| $800 \mathrm{MHz} \mathrm{RRH} \mathrm{(Sprint)}$ | 157.5 | Antenna Pipe Mount | 137 |
| $800 \mathrm{MHz} \mathrm{RRH} \mathrm{(Sprint)}$ | 157.5 | Antenna Pipe Mount | 137 |
| $800 \mathrm{MHz} \mathrm{RRH} \mathrm{(Sprint)}$ | 157.5 | Antenna Pipe Mount | 137 |
| $1900 \mathrm{MHz} \mathrm{RRH} \mathrm{(Sprint)}$ | 157.5 | $72^{\prime \prime} \times 12^{\prime \prime}$ Panel | 137 |
| $1900 \mathrm{MHz} \mathrm{RRH} \mathrm{(Sprint)}$ | 157.5 | $72^{\prime \prime} \times 12^{\prime \prime}$ Panel | 137 |
| $1900 \mathrm{MHz} \mathrm{RRH} \mathrm{(Sprint)}$ | 157.5 | $72^{\prime \prime} \times 12^{\prime \prime}$ Panel | 137 |

## MATERIAL STRENGTH

| GRADE | Fy | Fu | GRADE | Fy | Fu |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A572-65 | 65 ksi | 80 ksi |  |  |  |

## TOWER DESIGN NOTES

1. Tower is located in New Haven County, Connecticut.
2. Tower designed for Exposure B to the TIA-222-G Standard.
3. Tower designed for a 97 mph basic wind in accordance with the TIA-222-G Standard.
4. Tower is also designed for a 50 mph basic wind with 0.75 in ice. Ice is considered to increase in thickness with height.
5. Deflections are based upon a 60 mph wind.
6. Tower Structure Class II.
7. Topographic Category 1 with Crest Height of 0.00 ft
8. TOWER RATING: 38\%


TORQUE $1203 \mathrm{lb}-\mathrm{ft}$


TORQUE 653 lb -ft
REACTIONS - 97 mph WIND


| tnxTower <br> Infinigy Engineering PLLC <br> 1033 Watervliet Shaker Road <br> Albany, NY 12205 <br> Phone: (518) 690-0790 <br> FAX: (518) 690-0793 | Job | 526-102 | $\text { Page } \quad 1 \text { of } 9$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Project | CT54XC773 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Date } \\ \text { 12:33:00 08/01/17 } \end{array}$ |
|  | Client | Sprint | Designed by Matt Nichols, P.E. |

## Tower Input Data

There is a pole section.
This tower is designed using the TIA-222-G standard.
The following design criteria apply:
Tower is located in New Haven County, Connecticut.
Basic wind speed of 97 mph .
Structure Class II.
Exposure Category B.
Topographic Category 1.
Crest Height 0.00 ft .
Nominal ice thickness of 0.750 in.
Ice thickness is considered to increase with height.
Ice density of 56 pcf .
A wind speed of 50 mph is used in combination with ice.
Temperature drop of $50^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$.
Deflections calculated using a wind speed of 60 mph .
A non-linear (P-delta) analysis was used.
Pressures are calculated at each section.
Stress ratio used in pole design is 1 .
Local bending stresses due to climbing loads, feed line supports, and appurtenance mounts are not considered.

## Options

| Consider Moments - Legs | Distribute Leg Loads As Uniform | Use ASCE 10 X-Brace Ly Rules |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consider Moments - Horizontals | Assume Legs Pinned | Calculate Redundant Bracing Forces |
| Consider Moments - Diagonals | Assume Rigid Index Plate | Ignore Redundant Members in FEA |
| Use Moment Magnification | Use Clear Spans For Wind Area | SR Leg Bolts Resist Compression |
| $\sqrt{ }$ Use Code Stress Ratios | Use Clear Spans For KL/r | $\sqrt{ }$ All Leg Panels Have Same Allowable |
| $\sqrt{ }$ Use Code Safety Factors - Guys | Retension Guys To Initial Tension | Offset Girt At Foundation |
| Escalate Ice | Bypass Mast Stability Checks | $\checkmark$ Consider Feed Line Torque |
| Always Use Max Kz | $\sqrt{ }$ Use Azimuth Dish Coefficients | Include Angle Block Shear Check |
| Use Special Wind Profile | $\sqrt{ }$ Project Wind Area of Appurt. | Use TIA-222-G Bracing Resist. Exemption |
| $\sqrt{ }$ Include Bolts In Member Capacity | Autocalc Torque Arm Areas | Use TIA-222-G Tension Splice Exemption |
| Leg Bolts Are At Top Of Section | Add IBC .6D+W Combination | Poles |
| Secondary Horizontal Braces Leg | Sort Capacity Reports By Component | $\sqrt{ }$ Include Shear-Torsion Interaction |
| Use Diamond Inner Bracing (4 Sided) | Triangulate Diamond Inner Bracing | Always Use Sub-Critical Flow |
| SR Members Have Cut Ends | Treat Feed Line Bundles As Cylinder | Use Top Mounted Sockets |
| SR Members Are Concentric |  |  |

## Tapered Pole Section Geometry

$\left.\left.\begin{array}{cccccccccc}\hline \text { Section } & \text { Elevation } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Section } \\ \text { Length }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Splice } \\ \text { Length } \\ \\ \end{array} & f t & f t & \begin{array}{c}\text { Number } \\ \text { of }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Top } \\ \text { Diameter } \\ \text { in }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Bottom } \\ \text { Diameter } \\ \text { in }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Wall } \\ \text { Thickness } \\ \text { in }\end{array}\end{array} \begin{array}{c}\text { Bend } \\ \text { Radius }\end{array}\right] \begin{array}{c}\text { Pole Grade } \\ \text { in }\end{array}\right]$

| tnXTOWer | Job | Page |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Project | 526-102 | 2 of 9 |
|  | CT54XC773 | Client | Sprint |


| Section | Elevation | Section <br> Length | $f t$ | Splice <br> Length <br> $f$ | Number <br> of <br> Sides | Top <br> Diameter <br> in | Bottom <br> Diameter <br> in | Wall <br> Thickness <br> in | Bend <br> Radius |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L3 | $93.25-46.33$ | 52.42 | 7.33 | 18 | 36.840 | 54.020 | 0.438 | 1.750 | A572-65 |
| L4 | $46.33-1.00$ | 52.66 |  |  | 18 | 50.742 | 68.000 | 0.438 | 1.750 |

## Tapered Pole Properties

| Section | Tip Dia. <br> in | Area <br> $i n^{2}$ | $I$ <br> $i n^{4}$ | $r$ <br> in | $C$ <br> in | $I / C$ <br> $i n^{3}$ | $J$ <br> $i n^{4}$ | $I t / Q$ <br> $i n^{2}$ | $w$ <br> in |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L1 | 18.785 | 10.898 | 461.730 | 6.501 | 9.398 | 49.131 | 924.069 | 5.450 | 2.926 | 15.605 |
|  | 27.843 | 16.207 | 1518.477 | 9.668 | 13.929 | 109.013 | 3038.952 | 8.105 | 4.496 | 23.978 |
| L2 | 27.450 | 30.171 | 2449.252 | 8.999 | 13.068 | 187.430 | 4901.726 | 15.088 | 3.867 | 10.313 |
|  | 39.998 | 46.438 | 8930.391 | 13.850 | 20.010 | 446.294 | 17872.533 | 23.223 | 6.273 | 16.727 |
| L3 | 39.238 | 50.549 | 8462.577 | 12.923 | 18.715 | 452.193 | 16936.290 | 25.279 | 5.714 | 13.06 |
|  | 54.853 | 74.406 | 26989.283 | 19.022 | 27.442 | 983.497 | 54014.079 | 37.210 | 8.738 | 19.971 |
| L4 | 53.965 | 69.853 | 22332.174 | 17.858 | 25.777 | 866.371 | 44693.734 | 34.933 | 8.161 | 18.653 |
|  | 69.049 | 93.819 | 54105.269 | 23.985 | 34.544 | 1566.271 | 108281.732 | 46.918 | 11.198 | 25.595 |


| Tower Elevation <br> ft | Gusset <br> Area (per face) | Gusset Thickness in | Gusset Grade | Adjust. Factor $A_{f}$ | Adjust. <br> Factor <br> $A_{r}$ | Weight Mult. | Double Angle Stitch Bolt Spacing Diagonals in | Double Angle Stitch Bolt Spacing Horizontals in | Double Angle Stitch Bolt Spacing Redundants in |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L1 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| 158.00-131.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L2 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| 131.00-93.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L3 93.25-46.33 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| L4 46.33-1.00 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |

## Feed Line/Linear Appurtenances - Entered As Area

| Description | $\begin{gathered} \text { Face } \\ \text { or } \\ \text { Leg } \end{gathered}$ | Allow <br> Shield | Component Type | Placement <br> ft | Total Number |  | $\begin{aligned} & C_{A} A_{A} \\ & {f t^{2} / f t}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | Weight <br> plf |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Step Pegs 5/8" SR, 7"w, 15 "s <br> (Ladder) | A | No | $\begin{gathered} \text { CaAa (Out Of } \\ \text { Face) } \end{gathered}$ | 158.00-1.00 | 1 | No Ice $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ Ice 1" Ice | $\begin{aligned} & 0.03 \\ & 0.13 \\ & 0.23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.49 \\ & 0.97 \\ & 2.07 \end{aligned}$ |
| Safety Line 3/8 (Ladder) | A | No | CaAa (Out Of Face) | 158.00-1.00 | 1 | No Ice 1/2" Ice <br> 1" Ice | $\begin{aligned} & 0.04 \\ & 0.14 \\ & 0.24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.22 \\ & 0.75 \\ & 1.28 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 15 / 8 \\ \text { (Sprint) } \end{gathered}$ | A | No | Inside Pole | 157.50-1.00 | 3 | No Ice $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ Ice 1" Ice | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \\ & 0.00 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.04 \\ & 1.04 \\ & 1.04 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 11 / 4 \\ \text { (Sprint) } \end{gathered}$ | A | No | Inside Pole | 157.50-1.00 | 1 | No Ice $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ Ice 1" Ice | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \\ & 0.00 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.66 \\ & 0.66 \\ & 0.66 \end{aligned}$ |
| $15 / 8$ <br> (Verizon) | A | No | Inside Pole | 147.00-1.00 | 12 | No Ice 1/2" Ice 1" Ice | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \\ & 0.00 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.04 \\ & 1.04 \\ & 1.04 \end{aligned}$ |
| $15 / 8$ | A | No | Inside Pole | 137.00-1.00 | 12 | No Ice 1/2" Ice | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.04 \\ & 1.04 \end{aligned}$ |


| tnxTower <br> Infinigy Engineering PLLC <br> 1033 Watervliet Shaker Road <br> Albany, NY 12205 <br> Phone: (518) 690-0790 <br> FAX: (518) 690-0793 | Job  <br>  $526-102$ |  | $\text { Page } \quad 3 \text { of } 9$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Project | CT54XC773 | Date 12:33:00 08/01/17 |
|  | Client | Sprint | Designed by <br> Matt Nichols, P.E. |



Feed Line/Linear Appurtenances Section Areas

| Tower Section | Tower Elevation ft | Face | $A_{R}$ $f t^{2}$ | $A_{F}$ $f t^{2}$ | $C_{A} A_{A}$ In Face $f t^{2}$ | $\begin{gathered} C_{A} A_{A} \\ \text { Out Face } \\ f t^{2} \end{gathered}$ | Weight lb |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L1 | 158.00-131.00 | A | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 1.800 | 393.82 |
|  |  | B | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 |
|  |  | C | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 |
| L2 | 131.00-93.25 | A | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 2.517 | 1111.63 |
|  |  | B | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 |
|  |  | C | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 |
| L3 | 93.25-46.33 | A | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 3.128 | 1381.66 |
|  |  | B | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 |
|  |  | C | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 |
| L4 | 46.33-1.00 | A | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 3.022 | 1334.84 |
|  |  | B | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 |
|  |  | C | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 |

Feed Line/Linear Appurtenances Section Areas - With Ice

| Tower Section | Tower <br> Elevation <br> ft | Face or Leg | Ice Thickness in | $A_{R}$ $f t^{2}$ | $A_{F}$ $f t^{2}$ | $C_{A} A_{A}$ In Face $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $C_{A} A_{A}$ <br> Out Face $f t^{2}$ | Weight <br> $l b$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L1 | 158.00-131.00 | A | 1.738 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 20.567 | 566.26 |
|  |  | B |  | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 |
|  |  | C |  | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 |
| L2 | 131.00-93.25 | A | 1.694 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 28.755 | 1352.72 |
|  |  | B |  | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 |
|  |  | C |  | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 |
| L3 | 93.25-46.33 | A | 1.615 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 34.916 | 1670.84 |
|  |  | B |  | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 |
|  |  | C |  | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 |
| L4 | 46.33-1.00 | A | 1.447 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 32.304 | 1596.08 |
|  |  | B |  | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 |
|  |  | C |  | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 |

Feed Line Center of Pressure

| Section | Elevation | $C P_{X}$ | $C P_{Z}$ | $C P_{X}$ <br> $I c e$ | $C P_{Z}$ <br> $I c e$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | in | in |
| in | in | in |  |  |  |
| L1 | $158.00-131.00$ | 0.000 | -0.095 | 0.000 | -0.730 |
| L2 | $131.00-93.25$ | 0.000 | -0.096 | 0.000 | -0.819 |
| L3 | $93.25-46.33$ | 0.000 | -0.097 | 0.000 | -0.871 |
| L4 | $46.33-1.00$ | 0.000 | -0.097 | 0.000 | -0.883 |
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## Shielding Factor Ka

| Tower <br> Section | Feed Line <br> Record No. | Description | Feed Line <br> Segment Elev. | $K_{a}$ <br> No Ice | $K_{a}$ <br> Ice |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## Discrete Tower Loads

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Description \& \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Face } \\
\text { or } \\
\text { Leg }
\end{gathered}
\] \& \begin{tabular}{l}
Offset \\
Type
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{l}
Offsets: \\
Horz \\
Lateral \\
Vert \\
ft \\
ft \\
ft
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{l}
Azimuth Adjustment \\
。
\end{tabular} \& Placement

$f t$ \& \& | $C_{A} A_{A}$ |
| :--- |
| Front |
| $f t^{2}$ | \& | $C_{A} A_{A}$ |
| :--- |
| Side |
| $f t^{2}$ | \& Weight <br>

\hline Angle Platform w/ Handrails (Sprint) \& C \& None \& \& 0.000 \& 157.50 \& No Ice 1/2" Ice 1" Ice \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 42.40 \\
& 48.40 \\
& 54.40
\end{aligned}
$$ \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 42.40 \\
& 48.40 \\
& 54.40
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 2000.00 \\
& 2450.00 \\
& 2900.00
\end{aligned}
$$
\] <br>

\hline APXV9ERR18-C-A20 (Sprint) \& A \& From Leg \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 4.00 \\
& 0.00 \\
& 0.00
\end{aligned}
$$ \& 0.000 \& 157.50 \& No Ice 1/2" Ice 1" Ice \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 5.28 \\
& 5.74 \\
& 6.20
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 8.02 \\
& 8.48 \\
& 8.94
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
60.00 \\
106.52 \\
162.12
\end{gathered}
$$
\] <br>

\hline | APXV9ERR18-C-A20 |
| :--- |
| (Sprint) | \& B \& From Leg \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 4.00 \\
& 0.00 \\
& 0.00
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& 0.000 \& 157.50 \& No Ice 1/2" Ice 1" Ice \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 5.28 \\
& 5.74 \\
& 6.20
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 8.02 \\
& 8.48 \\
& 8.94
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
60.00 \\
106.52 \\
162.12
\end{gathered}
$$
\] <br>

\hline APXV9ERR18-C-A20 (Sprint) \& C \& From Leg \& \[
$$
\begin{aligned}
& 4.00 \\
& 0.00 \\
& 0.00
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& 0.000 \& 157.50 \& | No Ice 1/2" Ice |
| :--- |
| 1" Ice | \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 5.28 \\
& 5.74 \\
& 6.20
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 8.02 \\
& 8.48 \\
& 8.94
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
60.00 \\
106.52 \\
162.12
\end{gathered}
$$
\] <br>

\hline | APXVTM14-C-120 |
| :--- |
| (Sprint) | \& A \& From Leg \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 4.00 \\
& 0.00 \\
& 0.00
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& 0.000 \& 157.50 \& No Ice 1/2" Ice 1" Ice \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 5.96 \\
& 6.31 \\
& 6.68
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 3.38 \\
& 3.72 \\
& 4.07
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
50.00 \\
90.49 \\
132.96
\end{gathered}
$$
\] <br>

\hline | APXVTM14-C-120 |
| :--- |
| (Sprint) | \& B \& From Leg \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 4.00 \\
& 0.00 \\
& 0.00
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& 0.000 \& 157.50 \& No Ice $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ Ice 1" Ice \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 5.96 \\
& 6.31 \\
& 6.68
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 3.38 \\
& 3.72 \\
& 4.07
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
50.00 \\
90.49 \\
132.96
\end{gathered}
$$
\] <br>

\hline | APXVTM14-C-120 |
| :--- |
| (Sprint) | \& C \& From Leg \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 4.00 \\
& 0.00 \\
& 0.00
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& 0.000 \& 157.50 \& No Ice 1/2" Ice 1" Ice \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 5.96 \\
& 6.31 \\
& 6.68
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 3.38 \\
& 3.72 \\
& 4.07
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
50.00 \\
90.49 \\
132.96
\end{gathered}
$$
\] <br>

\hline 800 MHz RRH (Sprint) \& A \& From Leg \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 4.00 \\
& 0.00 \\
& 0.00
\end{aligned}
$$ \& 0.000 \& 157.50 \& No Ice 1/2" Ice 1" Ice \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 1.93 \\
& 2.11 \\
& 2.29
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 2.06 \\
& 2.24 \\
& 2.43
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
60.00 \\
86.12 \\
111.30
\end{gathered}
$$
\] <br>

\hline 800 MHz RRH (Sprint) \& B \& From Leg \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 4.00 \\
& 0.00 \\
& 0.00
\end{aligned}
$$ \& 0.000 \& 157.50 \& No Ice $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ Ice 1" Ice \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 1.93 \\
& 2.11 \\
& 2.29
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 2.06 \\
& 2.24 \\
& 2.43
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
60.00 \\
86.12 \\
111.30
\end{gathered}
$$
\] <br>

\hline | 800 MHz RRH |
| :--- |
| (Sprint) | \& C \& From Leg \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 4.00 \\
& 0.00 \\
& 0.00
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& 0.000 \& 157.50 \& | No Ice $1 / 2$ " Ice |
| :--- |
| 1" Ice | \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 1.93 \\
& 2.11 \\
& 2.29
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 2.06 \\
& 2.24 \\
& 2.43
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
60.00 \\
86.12 \\
111.30
\end{gathered}
$$
\] <br>

\hline 1900 MHz RRH (Sprint) \& A \& From Leg \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 4.00 \\
& 0.00 \\
& 0.00
\end{aligned}
$$ \& 0.000 \& 157.50 \& No Ice 1/2" Ice 1" Ice \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 2.73 \\
& 2.96 \\
& 3.20
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 1.45 \\
& 1.64 \\
& 1.84
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 44.09 \\
& 62.32 \\
& 83.43
\end{aligned}
$$
\] <br>

\hline | 1900 MHz RRH |
| :--- |
| (Sprint) | \& B \& From Leg \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 4.00 \\
& 0.00 \\
& 0.00
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& 0.000 \& 157.50 \& No Ice 1/2" Ice 1" Ice \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 2.73 \\
& 2.96 \\
& 3.20
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 1.45 \\
& 1.64 \\
& 1.84
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 44.09 \\
& 62.32 \\
& 83.43
\end{aligned}
$$
\] <br>

\hline 1900 MHz RRH (Sprint) \& C \& From Leg \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 4.00 \\
& 0.00 \\
& 0.00
\end{aligned}
$$ \& 0.000 \& 157.50 \& No Ice $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ Ice 1" Ice \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 2.73 \\
& 2.96 \\
& 3.20
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 1.45 \\
& 1.64 \\
& 1.84
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 44.09 \\
& 62.32 \\
& 83.43
\end{aligned}
$$
\] <br>

\hline $$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { TD-RRH8X20 } \\
& \text { (Sprint) }
\end{aligned}
$$ \& A \& From Leg \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 4.00 \\
& 0.00 \\
& 0.00
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& 0.000 \& 157.50 \& No Ice 1/2" Ice 1" Ice \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 3.70 \\
& 3.95 \\
& 4.20
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 1.29 \\
& 1.46 \\
& 1.64
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
70.00 \\
90.08 \\
117.36
\end{gathered}
$$
\] <br>

\hline TD-RRH8X20 (Sprint) \& B \& From Leg \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 4.00 \\
& 0.00 \\
& 0.00
\end{aligned}
$$ \& 0.000 \& 157.50 \& No Ice $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ Ice 1" Ice \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 3.70 \\
& 3.95 \\
& 4.20
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 1.29 \\
& 1.46 \\
& 1.64
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
70.00 \\
90.08 \\
117.36
\end{gathered}
$$
\] <br>

\hline TD-RRH8X20 \& C \& From Leg \& 4.00 \& 0.000 \& 157.50 \& No Ice \& 3.70 \& 1.29 \& 70.00 <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Description \& Face or Leg \& \begin{tabular}{l}
Offset \\
Type
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{l}
Offsets: \\
Horz \\
Lateral \\
Vert \\
\(f t\) \\
\(f t\) \\
ft
\end{tabular} \& Azimuth Adjustment \& Placement

$f t$ \& \& | $C_{A} A_{A}$ Front |
| :--- |
| $f t^{2}$ | \& $C_{A} A_{A}$ Side

$$
f t^{2}
$$ \& Weight

lb <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{(Sprint)} \& \& \& 0.00 \& \& \& 1/2" Ice \& 3.95 \& 1.46 \& 90.08 <br>
\hline \& \& \& 0.00 \& \& \& $1{ }^{1 \prime}$ Ice \& 4.20 \& 1.64 \& 117.36 <br>
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{***} <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Angle Low Profile Platform (Verizon)} \& C \& None \& \& 0.000 \& 147.00 \& No Ice \& 26.10 \& 26.10 \& 1500.00 <br>
\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& 1/2" Ice \& 31.60 \& 31.60 \& 1700.00 <br>
\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& 1" Ice \& 37.10 \& 37.10 \& 1900.00 <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{(4) $72^{\prime \prime}$ x 12" Panel (Verizon)} \& A \& From Leg \& 4.00 \& 0.000 \& 147.00 \& No Ice \& 8.13 \& 4.70 \& 50.00 <br>

\hline \& \& \& 0.00 \& \& \& $$
1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \text { Ice }
$$ \& 8.59 \& 5.15 \& 92.28 <br>

\hline \& \& \& 0.00 \& \& \& 1" Ice \& 9.05 \& 5.60 \& 145.59 <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{(4) 72 " x 12" Panel (Verizon)} \& B \& From Leg \& 4.00 \& 0.000 \& 147.00 \& No Ice \& 8.13 \& 4.70 \& 50.00 <br>
\hline \& \& \& 0.00 \& \& \& 1/2" Ice \& 8.59 \& 5.15 \& 92.28 <br>
\hline \& \& \& 0.00 \& \& \& $1{ }^{1 \prime}$ Ice \& 9.05 \& 5.60 \& 145.59 <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{(4) $72^{\prime \prime}$ x 12" Panel (Verizon)} \& C \& From Leg \& 4.00 \& 0.000 \& 147.00 \& No Ice \& 8.13 \& 4.70 \& 50.00 <br>
\hline \& \& \& 0.00 \& \& \& 1/2" Ice \& 8.59 \& 5.15 \& 92.28 <br>
\hline \& \& \& 0.00 \& \& \& $1{ }^{\prime \prime}$ Ice \& 9.05 \& 5.60 \& 145.59 <br>
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{***} <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Antenna Pipe Mount} \& A \& From Leg \& 1.00 \& 0.000 \& 137.00 \& No Ice \& 0.87 \& 0.87 \& 14.60 <br>

\hline \& \& \& 0.00 \& \& \& $$
1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \text { Ice }
$$ \& 1.12 \& 1.12 \& 25.30 <br>

\hline \& \& \& 0.00 \& \& \& $1{ }^{\prime \prime}$ Ice \& 1.39 \& 1.39 \& 37.43 <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Antenna Pipe Mount} \& B \& From Leg \& 1.00 \& 0.000 \& 137.00 \& No Ice \& 0.87 \& 0.87 \& 14.60 <br>
\hline \& \& \& 0.00 \& \& \& 1/2" Ice \& 1.12 \& 1.12 \& 25.30 <br>
\hline \& \& \& 0.00 \& \& \& $1^{\prime \prime}$ Ice \& 1.39 \& 1.39 \& 37.43 <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Antenna Pipe Mount} \& C \& From Leg \& 1.00 \& 0.000 \& 137.00 \& No Ice \& 0.87 \& 0.87 \& 14.60 <br>
\hline \& \& \& 0.00 \& \& \& 1/2" Ice \& 1.12 \& 1.12 \& 25.30 <br>
\hline \& \& \& 0.00 \& \& \& 1" Ice \& 1.39 \& 1.39 \& 37.43 <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{$72^{\prime \prime}$ x 12" Panel} \& A \& From Leg \& 1.00 \& 0.000 \& 137.00 \& No Ice \& 8.13 \& 4.70 \& 50.00 <br>
\hline \& \& \& 0.00 \& \& \& 1/2" Ice \& 8.59 \& 5.15 \& 92.28 <br>
\hline \& \& \& 0.00 \& \& \& $1{ }^{\prime \prime}$ Ice \& 9.05 \& 5.60 \& 145.59 <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{72 x x 12" Panel} \& B \& From Leg \& 1.00 \& 0.000 \& 137.00 \& No Ice \& 8.13 \& 4.70 \& 50.00 <br>
\hline \& \& \& 0.00 \& \& \& 1/2" Ice \& 8.59 \& 5.15 \& 92.28 <br>
\hline \& \& \& 0.00 \& \& \& $1{ }^{\prime \prime}$ Ice \& 9.05 \& 5.60 \& 145.59 <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{72 x x 12" Panel} \& C \& From Leg \& 1.00 \& 0.000 \& 137.00 \& No Ice \& 8.13 \& 4.70 \& 50.00 <br>
\hline \& \& \& 0.00 \& \& \& 1/2" Ice \& 8.59 \& 5.15 \& 92.28 <br>
\hline \& \& \& 0.00 \& \& \& 1" Ice \& 9.05 \& 5.60 \& 145.59 <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

## Load Combinations

| Comb. <br> No. |  | Description |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Dead Only |  |
| 2 | 1.2 Dead+1.6 Wind 0 deg - No Ice |  |
| 3 | 0.9 Dead+1.6 Wind 0 deg - No Ice |  |
| 4 | 1.2 Dead+1.6 Wind 30 deg - No Ice |  |
| 5 | 0.9 Dead+1.6 Wind 30 deg - No Ice |  |
| 6 | 1.2 Dead+1.6 Wind 60 deg - No Ice |  |
| 7 | 0.9 Dead+1.6 Wind 60 deg - No Ice |  |
| 8 | 1.2 Dead+1.6 Wind 90 deg - No Ice |  |
| 9 | 0.9 Dead+1.6 Wind 90 deg - No Ice |  |
| 10 | 1.2 Dead+1.6 Wind 120 deg - No Ice |  |
| 11 | 0.9 Dead+1.6 Wind 120 deg - No Ice |  |
| 12 | 1.2 Dead+1.6 Wind 150 deg - No Ice |  |
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| Comb. No. | Description |
| :---: | :---: |
| 13 | 0.9 Dead+1.6 Wind 150 deg - No Ice |
| 14 | 1.2 Dead+1.6 Wind 180 deg - No Ice |
| 15 | 0.9 Dead+1.6 Wind 180 deg - No Ice |
| 16 | 1.2 Dead+1.6 Wind 210 deg - No Ice |
| 17 | 0.9 Dead+1.6 Wind 210 deg - No Ice |
| 18 | 1.2 Dead+1.6 Wind 240 deg - No Ice |
| 19 | 0.9 Dead+1.6 Wind 240 deg - No Ice |
| 20 | 1.2 Dead+1.6 Wind 270 deg - No Ice |
| 21 | 0.9 Dead+1.6 Wind 270 deg - No Ice |
| 22 | 1.2 Dead+1.6 Wind 300 deg - No Ice |
| 23 | 0.9 Dead+1.6 Wind 300 deg - No Ice |
| 24 | 1.2 Dead+1.6 Wind 330 deg - No Ice |
| 25 | 0.9 Dead+1.6 Wind 330 deg - No Ice |
| 26 | 1.2 Dead+1.0 Ice+1.0 Temp |
| 27 | 1.2 Dead+1.0 Wind 0 deg+1.0 Ice+1.0 Temp |
| 28 | 1.2 Dead+1.0 Wind $30 \mathrm{deg}+$ 1.0 Ice+1.0 Temp |
| 29 | 1.2 Dead+1.0 Wind 60 deg+1.0 Ice+1.0 Temp |
| 30 | 1.2 Dead+1.0 Wind 90 deg+1.0 Ice+1.0 Temp |
| 31 | 1.2 Dead+1.0 Wind 120 deg+1.0 Ice+1.0 Temp |
| 32 | 1.2 Dead+1.0 Wind 150 deg+1.0 Ice+1.0 Temp |
| 33 | 1.2 Dead+1.0 Wind 180 deg+1.0 Ice+1.0 Temp |
| 34 | 1.2 Dead+1.0 Wind 210 deg+1.0 Ice+1.0 Temp |
| 35 | 1.2 Dead+1.0 Wind 240 deg+1.0 Ice+1.0 Temp |
| 36 | 1.2 Dead+1.0 Wind 270 deg+1.0 Ice+1.0 Temp |
| 37 | 1.2 Dead+1.0 Wind $300 \mathrm{deg}+1.0$ Ice+1.0 Temp |
| 38 | 1.2 Dead+1.0 Wind 330 deg+1.0 Ice+1.0 Temp |
| 39 | Dead+Wind 0 deg - Service |
| 40 | Dead+Wind 30 deg - Service |
| 41 | Dead+Wind 60 deg - Service |
| 42 | Dead+Wind 90 deg - Service |
| 43 | Dead+Wind 120 deg - Service |
| 44 | Dead+Wind 150 deg - Service |
| 45 | Dead+Wind 180 deg - Service |
| 46 | Dead+Wind 210 deg - Service |
| 47 | Dead+Wind 240 deg - Service |
| 48 | Dead+Wind 270 deg - Service |
| 49 | Dead+Wind 300 deg - Service |
| 50 | Dead+Wind 330 deg - Service |

## Maximum Tower Deflections - Service Wind

| Section <br> No. | Elevation | Horz. <br> Deflection <br> in | Gov. <br> Load <br> Comb. | Tilt | Twist |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $f t$ | $158-131$ | 8.482 | 39 | 0.560 |
| L1 | $135-93.25$ | 5.936 | 39 | 0.468 | 0 |
| L2 | $98.75-46.33$ | 2.970 | 39 | 0.305 | 0.000 |
| L3 | $53.6633-1$ | 0.825 | 39 | 0.146 | 0.000 |
| L4 |  |  |  | 0.000 |  |

## Critical Deflections and Radius of Curvature - Service Wind

| Elevation | Appurtenance | Gov. | Deflection | Tilt | Twist | Radius of <br> Curvature |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $f t$ |  | Load |  |  |  |  |
| 157.50 |  | Comb. | in | $\circ$ | $\circ$ |  |
|  | Angle Platform w/ Handrails | 39 | 8.424 | 0.558 | 0.000 | 44924 |



## Maximum Tower Deflections - Design Wind

| Section <br> No. | Elevation | Horz. <br> Deflection <br> in | Gov. <br> Load <br> Comb. | Tilt | $\circ$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## Critical Deflections and Radius of Curvature - Design Wind

| Elevation | Appurtenance | Gov. | Deflection | Tilt | Twist | Radius of <br> Curvature |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $f t$ |  | Load |  | in | $\circ$ | $\circ$ |
| 157.50 | Angle Platform w/ Handrails | 2 | 39.522 | 2.621 | 0.002 | 9603 |
| 147.00 | Angle Low Profile Platform | 2 | 33.892 | 2.427 | 0.002 | 4365 |
| 137.00 | Antenna Pipe Mount | 2 | 28.807 | 2.235 | 0.002 | 2310 |

## Compression Checks

| Pole Design Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section No. | Elevation | Size | $L$ | $L_{u}$ | Kl/r | $A$ | $P_{u}$ | $\phi P_{n}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Ratio } \\ P_{u} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | $f t$ |  | $f t$ | $f t$ |  | in ${ }^{2}$ | $l b$ | $l b$ | $\phi P_{n}$ |
| L1 | 158-131 (1) | TP27.42x18.5x0.188 | 27.00 | 157.00 | 204.8 | 15.420 | -7410.72 | 83041.70 | 0.089 |
| L2 | 131-93.25 (2) | TP39.39x25.724x0.375 | 41.75 | 157.00 | 142.6 | 44.295 | -14458.90 | 492055.00 | 0.029 |
| L3 | $93.25-46.33$ <br> (3) | TP54.02x36.84x0.438 | 52.42 | 157.00 | 103.7 | 71.068 | -28388.10 | 1493120.00 | 0.019 |
| L4 | 46.33-1 (4) | TP68x50.742x0.438 | 52.66 | 157.00 | 78.6 | 93.819 | -50231.70 | 3163880.00 | 0.016 |

## Pole Bending Design Data

| Section No. | Elevation | Size | $M_{u x}$ | $\phi M_{n x}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Ratio } \\ M_{u x} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $M_{u y}$ | $\phi M_{n y}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Ratio } \\ M_{u y} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $f t$ |  | $l b-f t$ | $l b-f t$ | $\phi M_{n x}$ | $l b-f t$ | $l b-f t$ | $\phi M_{n y}$ |
| L1 | 158-131 (1) | TP27.42x18.5x0.188 | 160640.83 | 552396.67 | 0.291 | 0.00 | 552396.67 | 0.000 |


| tnxTower <br> Infinigy Engineering PLLC <br> 1033 Watervliet Shaker Road <br> Albany, NY 12205 <br> Phone: (518) 690-0790 <br> FAX: (518) 690-0793 | Job | 526-102 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Page } \\ & \\ & 8 \text { of } 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Project | CT54XC773 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Date } \\ \text { 12:33:00 08/01/17 } \end{array}$ |
|  | Client | Sprint | Designed by <br> Matt Nichols, P.E. |


| Section No. | Elevation | Size | $M_{u x}$ | $\phi M_{n x}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Ratio } \\ M_{u x} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $M_{u y}$ | $\phi M_{n y}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Ratio } \\ M_{u y} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $f t$ |  |  | $l b-f t$ | $l b-f t$ | $\phi M_{n x}$ | $l b-f t$ | $l b-f t$ | $\phi M_{n y}$ |
| L2 | 131-93.25 (2) | TP39.39x25.724x0.375 | 592602.50 | 2512833.33 | 0.236 | 0.00 | 2512833.33 | 0.000 |
| L3 | $93.25-46.33$ <br> (3) | TP54.02x36.84x0.438 | 1286291.67 | 5317375.00 | 0.242 | 0.00 | 5317375.00 | 0.000 |
| L4 | 46.33-1(4) | TP68x50.742x0.438 | 2332500.00 | 8375166.67 | 0.279 | 0.00 | 8375166.67 | 0.000 |

## Pole Shear Design Data

| Section No. | Elevation | Size | Actual $V_{u}$ | $\phi V_{n}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ratio } \\ & V_{u} \end{aligned}$ | Actual $T_{u}$ | $\phi T_{n}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ratio } \\ & T_{u} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $f t$ |  |  | $l b$ | lb | $\phi V_{n}$ | $l b-f t$ | $l b-f t$ | $\phi T_{n}$ |
| L1 | 158-131 (1) | TP27.42x18.5x0.188 | 10565.50 | 518055.00 | 0.020 | 0.00 | 1106141.67 | 0.000 |
| L2 | 131-93.25 (2) | TP39.39x25.724x0.375 | 13362.30 | 1645440.00 | 0.008 | 0.00 | 5031808.33 | 0.000 |
| L3 | $93.25-46.33$ <br> (3) | TP54.02x36.84x0.438 | 17455.50 | 2528010.00 | 0.007 | 0.00 | 10647750.00 | 0.000 |
| L4 | 46.33-1 (4) | TP68x50.742x0.438 | 22287.60 | 3010010.00 | 0.007 | 0.00 | 16770833.33 | 0.000 |

## Pole Interaction Design Data

| Section No. | Elevation | Ratio $P_{u}$ | Ratio $M_{u x}$ | Ratio $M_{u y}$ | Ratio $V_{u}$ | Ratio $T_{u}$ | Comb. Stress | Allow. <br> Stress | Criteria |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $f t$ | $\phi P_{n}$ | $\phi M_{n X}$ | $\phi M_{n y}$ | $\phi V_{n}$ | $\phi T_{n}$ | Ratio | Ratio |  |
| L1 | 158-131 (1) | 0.089 | 0.291 | 0.000 | 0.020 | 0.000 | $0.380$ | 1.000 | 4.8.2 |
| L2 | 131-93.25 (2) | 0.029 | 0.236 | 0.000 | 0.008 | 0.000 | $0.265$ | 1.000 | $4.8 .2$ |
| L3 | $93.25-46.33$ <br> (3) | 0.019 | 0.242 | 0.000 | 0.007 | 0.000 | $0.261$ | 1.000 | 4.8.2 |
| L4 | 46.33-1 (4) | 0.016 | 0.279 | 0.000 | 0.007 | 0.000 | $0.294$ | 1.000 | 4.8.2 |

## Section Capacity Table

| Section No. | Elevation $f t$ | Component Type | Size | Critical Element | $\begin{aligned} & P \\ & l b \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} ø P_{\text {allow }} \\ l b \end{gathered}$ | \% <br> Capacity | Pass <br> Fail |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L1 | 158-131 | Pole | TP27.42x18.5x0.188 | 1 | -7410.72 | 83041.70 | 38.0 | Pass |
| L2 | 131-93.25 | Pole | TP39.39x25.724x0.375 | 2 | -14458.90 | 492055.00 | 26.5 | Pass |
| L3 | 93.25-46.33 | Pole | TP54.02x36.84x0.438 | 3 | -28388.10 | 1493120.00 | 26.1 | Pass |
| L4 | 46.33-1 | Pole | TP68x50.742x0.438 | 4 | -50231.70 | 3163880.00 | 29.4 | Pass |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Pole (L1) RATING = | $\begin{gathered} \text { Summary } \\ 38.0 \\ \mathbf{3 8 . 0} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pass } \\ & \text { Pass } \end{aligned}$ |
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| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
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