STATE OF CONNECTICUT

CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Ten Franklin Square
New Britain, Connecticut 06051
Phone: (860) 827-2935
Fax: (860) 827-2950

March 12, 2002

Christopher B. Fisher, Esq.
Cuddy & Feder & Worby LLP
90 Maple Avenue
White Plains, NY 10601-5196

RE: **EM-AT&T-015-103-135-148-020221** - AT&T Wireless notice of intent to modify existing telecommunications facilities located in Bridgeport, Norwalk, Stamford, and Wallingford, Connecticut.

Dear Attorney Fisher:

At a public meeting held on March 7, 2002, the Connecticut Siting Council (Council) acknowledged your notice to modify these existing telecommunications facilities, pursuant to Section 16-50j-73 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies.

The proposed modifications are to be implemented as specified here and in your notice dated February 19, 2002. The modifications are in compliance with the exception criteria in Section 16-50j-72 (b) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies as changes to an existing facility sites that would not increase tower heights, extend the boundaries of the tower site, increase noise levels at the tower site boundaries by six decibels, and increase the total radio frequencies electromagnetic radiation power density measured at the tower site boundaries to or above the standard adopted by the State Department of Environmental Protection pursuant to General Statutes § 22a-162. These facilities have also been carefully modeled to ensure that radio frequency emissions are conservatively below State and federal standards applicable to the frequencies now used on these towers.

This decision is under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Council. Any additional change to these facilities will require explicit notice to this agency pursuant to Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies Section 16-50j-73. Such notice shall include all relevant information regarding the proposed change with cumulative worst-case modeling of radio frequency exposure at the closest point of uncontrolled access to the tower base, consistent with Federal Communications Commission, Office of Engineering and Technology, Bulletin 65. Any deviation from this format may result in the Council implementing enforcement proceedings pursuant to General Statutes § 16-50u including, without limitation, imposition of expenses resulting from such failure and of civil penalties in an amount not less than one thousand dollars per day for each day of construction or operation in material violation.

Thank you for your attention and cooperation.

Very truly yours,

Mortimer A. Gelston
Chairman

MAG/`laf

c: Honorable Dannel P. Malloy, Mayor, City of Stamford
Robin Stein, Planning and Zoning Director, City of Stamford
William W. Dickinson, Jr., Mayor, Town of Wallingford
Linda Bush, Town Planner, Town of Wallingford
Alex A. Knopp, Mayor, City of Norwalk
Stephen Thomas, Planning Chairman, City of Norwalk
Joseph P. Ganim, Mayor, City of Bridgeport
Michael P. Nidoh, City Planner, City of Bridgeport
Melanie J. Howlett, Assistant City Attorney, City of Bridgeport

CITY OF BRIDGEPORT
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
999 Broad Street
Bridgeport, Connecticut 06604-4328

CITY ATTORNEY
Mark T. Anastasi

DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY
Salvatore C. DePiano

ASSOCIATE CITY ATTORNEYS
John H. Barton
John P. Bohannon, Jr.
Barbara Brazzel-Massaro
Russell D. Liskov
John R. Mitola
Ronald J. Pacacha

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEYS
Melanie J. Howlett
Arthur C. Laske III
R. Christopher Meyer
John J. Robacynski
Stephen J. Sedensky, Jr.

LEGAL ADMINISTRATOR
Kathleen Pacacha

Telephone (203) 576-7647
Facsimile (203) 576-8252

March 5, 2002

Via Facsimile and Overnight Mail
S. Derek Phelps
Executive Director
Connecticut Siting Council
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, Connecticut 06051

Re: EM-AT&T-105-020221 – AT&T Request to Connecticut Siting Council to Modify an Existing Telecommunications Facility at 1000 Trumbull Avenue - (Chopsey Hill)

Dear Mr. Phelps:

The City of Bridgeport ("City") is in receipt on February 22, 2002, of a copy of the Petition filed by AT&T to modify an existing telecommunications facility located at 1000 Trumbull Avenue (Chopsey Hill), as forwarded by your Agency. This Petition is also listed as Item No. 25 on the Agenda for the regularly scheduled meeting of the Siting Council for March 7, 2002.

The Petition as filed indicates that it does not address the electromagnetic radiation power density levels for all existing equipment located at the existing facility by other FCC license holders, in addition to the installation of the antennas and associated equipment proposed by AT&T. The City's records indicate that at least one other FCC license holder, Verizon Wireless, obtained Siting Council approval to place antennas and associated equipment at this location; and that at the time of that approval there were other existing FCC license holders with equipment on this facility.

Since the Petition is incomplete, we respectfully request that this matter be tabled until AT&T has provided the missing information. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Melanie J. Howlett
Assistant City Attorney

Cc: William Shaw, Clerk, Planning & Zoning Commission
Christopher Fischer, Cuddy, Feder & Worby LLP

EM-AT&T-015-103-135-148-020221

CUDDY & FEDER & WORBY LLP

90 MAPLE AVENUE
WHITE PLAINS, NEW YORK 10601-5196

(914) 761-1300
TELECOPIER (914) 761-5372/6405
www.cfwlaw.com

500 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10110
(212) 944-2841
TELECOPIER (212) 944-2843

WESTAGE BUSINESS CENTER
300 SOUTH LAKE DRIVE
FISHKILL, NEW YORK 12524
(845) 896-2229
TELECOPIER (845) 896-3672

STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT
NORWALK, CONNECTICUT

NEIL J. ALEXANDER (also CT)
CHARLES T. BAZYDLO (also NJ)
THOMAS R. BEIRNE (also DC)
THOMAS M. BLOOMER
JOSEPH P. CARLUCCI
KENNETH J. DUBROFF
ROBERT FEDER
CHRISTOPHER B. FISHER (also CT)
ANTHONY B. GIOFFRE III (also CT)
SUSAN E.H. GORDON
KAREN G. GRANIK
JOSHUA J. GRAUER
WAYNE E. HELLER (also CT)
KENNETH F. JURIST
MICHAEL L. KATZ (also NJ)
JOSHUA E. KIMERLING (also CT)
DANIEL F. LEARY (also CT)
BARRY E. LONG

CUDDY & FEDER
1971-1995

WILLIAM S. NULL
DAWN M. PORTNEY
ELISABETH N. RADOW
NEIL T. RIMSKY
RUTH E. ROTH
JENNIFER L. VAN TUYL
CHAUNCEY L. WALKER (also CA)
ROBERT L. WOLFE
DAVID E. WORBY

Of Counsel
MICHAEL R. EDELMAN
ANDREW A. GLICKSON (also CT)
ROBERT L. OSAR (also TX)
MARYANN M. PALERMO
ROBERT C. SCHNEIDER
LOUIS R. TAFFERA

February 19, 2002



VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS
Hon. Mortimer Gelston, Chairman and Members
of the Siting Council
Connecticut Siting Council
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, Connecticut 06051

Re: AT&T Wireless Notice of Exempt Modification
173 West Rocks Road, Norwalk, Connecticut
90 North Plains Industrial Road, Wallingford, Connecticut
168 Catoonah Lane, Stamford, Connecticut
Guinea Road, Stamford, Connecticut
1000 Trumbull Road, Bridgeport, Connecticut

Hon. Mortimer Gelston, Chairman and Members of the Siting Council:

On behalf of AT&T Wireless, we respectfully enclose an original and twenty copies of its notice of exempt modification with respect to the above mentioned facilities together with a check in the amount of $500.00. We would appreciate it if these matters were placed on the next available agenda for acknowledgment by the Council. Should the Council or staff have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Very truly yours,

Linda Grant

Linda Grant

cc: Christopher B. Fisher, Esq.

C&F&W: 301150.1

CUDDY & FEDER & WORBY LLP

90 MAPLE AVENUE
WHITE PLAINS, NEW YORK 10601-5196

(914) 761-1300
TELECOPIER (914) 761-5372/6405
www.cfwlaw.com

500 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10110
(212) 944-2841
TELECOPIER (212) 944-2843

WESTAGE BUSINESS CENTER
300 SOUTH LAKE DRIVE
FISHKILL, NEW YORK 12524
(845) 896-2229
TELECOPIER (845) 896-3672

STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT
NORWALK, CONNECTICUT

NEIL J. ALEXANDER (also CT)
CHARLES T. BAZYDLO (also NJ)
THOMAS R. BEIRNE (also DC)
THOMAS M. BLOOMER
JOSEPH P. CARLUCCI
KENNETH J. DUBROFF
ROBERT FEDER
CHRISTOPHER B. FISHER (also CT)
ANTHONY B. GIOFFRE III (also CT)
SUSAN E.H. GORDON
KAREN G. GRANIK
JOSHUA J. GRAUER
WAYNE E. HELLER (also CT)
KENNETH F. JURIST
MICHAEL L. KATZ (also NJ)
JOSHUA E. KIMERLING (also CT)
DANIEL F. LEARY (also CT)
BARRY E. LONG

CUDDY & FEDER
1971-1995

WILLIAM S. NULL
DAWN M. PORTNEY
ELISABETH N. RADOW
NEIL T. RIMSKY
RUTH E. ROTH
JENNIFER L. VAN TUYL
CHAUNCEY L. WALKER (also CA)
ROBERT L. WOLFE
DAVID E. WORBY

Of Counsel
MICHAEL R. EDELMAN
ANDREW A. GLICKSON (also CT)
ROBERT L. OSAR (also TX)
MARYANN M. PALERMO
ROBERT C. SCHNEIDER
LOUIS R. TAFFERA

February 19, 2002



VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS
Hon. Mortimer Gelston, Chairman and Members
of the Siting Council
Connecticut Siting Council
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, Connecticut 06051

Re: AT&T Wireless – EM-BAM-135-990810
Guinea Road, Stamford, Connecticut
Notice of Further Exempt Modification

Hon. Mortimer Gelston, Chairman and Members of the Siting Council:

Crown Atlantic Company LLC ("Crown" formerly "BAM") holds the Siting Council certificate for the existing communications tower and related facility located off Guinea Road, Stamford, Connecticut (Docket No. 180). On August 31, 1999 Crown, on behalf of AT&T Wireless ("AT&T"), received the Council's acknowledgement of a notice to modify the existing facility pursuant to Section 16-50j-72 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies (EM-BAM-135-990810) permitting AT&T to install panel antennas at the 108' level on the existing tower, with associated equipment cabinets located on the existing monopole foundation within the fenced compound.

This notice of further exempt modification is also being provided pursuant to Section 16-50j-72 of the Council's regulations. AT&T will be replacing three existing antennas and installing an additional equipment cabinet (approximately 76"H x 76"W x 30"D) at the facility. There will be no other infrastructure changes to AT&T's facility.

The proposed replacement antennas and addition of equipment to AT&T Wireless' facility does not constitute a "modification" of an existing facility as defined in Connecticut General Statutes Section 16-50i(d). The proposed modifications to AT&T Wireless' facility will not result in an increase in the Tower's height or extend the boundaries of the existing fenced area surrounding the Tower. Further, there will be no increase in noise levels by six (6) decibels or more at the Tower site's boundary. AT&T made measurements of the existing facility to confirm compliance with MPE limits and as set forth in a report prepared by Wireless Facilities, Inc., annexed hereto, the total radio frequency electromagnetic radiation power density at the Tower site's boundary will not be increased to or above the standard adopted by the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection as set forth in Section 22a-162 of the Connecticut General Statutes. For all the foregoing reasons, the proposed modifications to AT&T Wireless' existing facility constitutes an exempt modification which will not have a substantially adverse environmental effect.

AT&T Wireless respectfully submits that the proposed replacement antennas and addition of the equipment to the Guinea Road Facility meets the Council's exemption criteria and requests an acknowledgment of same.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christopher B. Fisher, Esq.
On behalf of AT&T Wireless

cc: Mayor, City of Stamford
Darryl Hendrickson, Bechtel Telecommunications

the global leader
IN TELECOM OUTSOURCING

Wireless Facilities, Inc.
1840 Michael Faraday Drive
Suite 200
Reston, VA 20190

February 7, 2002

Mr. Mortimer A. Gelston, Chairman
Connecticut Siting Council
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051

RE: FCC Compliance Statement for AT&T Site CT-035 (Stamford-Guinea Road)

Dear Mr. Gelston:

On behalf of AT&T Wireless, Wireless Facilities Inc. has performed in-field RF measurements and office analyses for the above referenced site to determine compliance with FCC mandated Maximum Permissible Exposure (MPE) limits as defined in 47 CFR § 1.1310.

The table below gives a brief summary of the site location, its configuration and associated technical parameters.

Summary of the site configuration and technical parameters:

Site ID	CT-035
Site Name	Stamford-Guinea
Latitude	41.10166
Longitude	-73.595
Owner of the structure	Crown Atlantic
Address of structure	78 Guinea Road Stamford, CT 06903
Type of structure	Monopole
Antenna structure owner	AT&T Wireless
Address of antenna owner	375 Douth Pointe BLVD Canonsburg, PA 15317
FCC class and Type of service	PCS TDMA (IS-136), PCS GSM
Operating frequency	D, E bands (PCS)
Azimuths	0.120,240
Elevation (ft)	108
Antenna manufacturer	Allgon
Antenna type	Panel

The mathematical equations used in evaluating the power density values are exactly as outlined in the Office of Engineering & Technology (OET) Bulletin Number 65 which contains the FCC guidelines for evaluating human exposure to radio-frequency electromagnetic fields.

In the case of a single radiating antenna, a prediction for power density in the far field of the antenna can be written as:

$$S = \frac{EIRP}{4\pi D^2} = \frac{1.64 * ERP}{4\pi D^2}$$

Where: S = Power density in W/m^2
EIRP = Effective isotropic radiated power (W)
ERP = Effective radiated power (W)
D = Distance in meters

Using the EPA's recommended factor of 1.6 for 100 % reflection, the worst case power density can be obtained by incorporating this factor into the above equation. If the distance, D, is in meters, the ERP is in Watts, then the worst case power density in $\mu W/cm^2$ is given by

$$S = \frac{33.4 * ERP}{D^2}$$ (Section 2, OET bulletin 65).

Where: S = Power density in $\mu W/cm^2$
ERP = Effective radiated power (W)
D = Distance in meters

WFI's analysis considered both the current configuration as well as the future GSM deployment AT&T is proposing. For the current configuration, both in-field measurements and a predictive analysis tool were used to determine compliance. For the future deployment, only a predictive analysis was performed. The maximum worst-case values of the power density for this analysis are outlined below:

Configuration	**Point of Worst Case Predicted Level**	**Predicted Value $\mu W/cm^2$**	**Maximum Limit for PCS Band Uncontrolled Environment Set by FCC $\mu W/cm^2$**	**% of the Standard**
Current PCS TDMA configuration	260 feet away in front of the antenna	1.02	1000	0.102
Future PCS TDMA and GSM configuration	260 feet away in front of the antenna	1.04	1000	0.104

In addition to predictive analysis, on-site data was recorded at different locations around the monopole. In all areas, less than 1.75 % of the MPE for public/uncontrolled limits was recorded. The reason the actual measurements are higher than the predicted values is because the actual measurements include emissions from the other carriers at that site while the theoretical study focused on the level of emissions contributed by AT&T only.

On-site measuring point	**Worst Case Measured Value μW/cm²**	**Maximum Limit for PCS Band Uncontrolled Environment Set by FCC μW/cm²**	**% of the Standard**
30 meters in front of sector 1	6.5	1000	0.65
30 meters in front of sector 2	17.5	1000	1.75
30 meters in front of sector 3	9	1000	0.9

The results of these analyses indicate that output power levels for the AT&T owned equipment deployed at the above referenced facility meets FCC approved exposure limits for all uncontrolled areas where general population exposure may exist. Thus, the maximum level of RF radiation in all uncontrolled areas (Assuming a worst case scenario and a 100 % duty cycle for all the transmitters.) is less than 1.75 % of the maximum permissible exposure limit mandated by the FCC and endorsed by the NCRP and ANSI/IEEE.

To the best of my knowledge, the statements made and information disclosed in this study are complete and accurate.

Sincerely,
Wireless Facilities, Inc.

Dan Hardiman
Senior Engineer II
Fixed Network Engineering

CUDDY & FEDER & WORBY LLP

90 MAPLE AVENUE
WHITE PLAINS, NEW YORK 10601-5196

(914) 761-1300
TELECOPIER (914) 761-5372/6405
www.cfwlaw.com

500 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10110
(212) 944-2841
TELECOPIER (212) 944-2843

WESTAGE BUSINESS CENTER
300 SOUTH LAKE DRIVE
FISHKILL, NEW YORK 12524
(845) 896-2229
TELECOPIER (845) 896-3672

STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT
NORWALK, CONNECTICUT

NEIL J. ALEXANDER (also CT)
CHARLES T. BAZYDLO (also NJ)
THOMAS R. BEIRNE (also DC)
THOMAS M. BLOOMER
JOSEPH P. CARLUCCI
KENNETH J. DUBROFF
ROBERT FEDER
CHRISTOPHER B. FISHER (also CT)
ANTHONY B. GIOFFRE III (also CT)
SUSAN E.H. GORDON
KAREN G. GRANIK
JOSHUA J. GRAUER
WAYNE E. HELLER (also CT)
KENNETH F. JURIST
MICHAEL L. KATZ (also NJ)
JOSHUA E. KIMERLING (also CT)
DANIEL F. LEARY (also CT)
BARRY E. LONG

CUDDY & FEDER
1971-1995

WILLIAM S. NULL
DAWN M. PORTNEY
ELISABETH N. RADOW
NEIL T. RIMSKY
RUTH E. ROTH
JENNIFER L. VAN TUYL
CHAUNCEY L. WALKER (also CA)
ROBERT L. WOLFE
DAVID E. WORBY

Of Counsel
MICHAEL R. EDELMAN
ANDREW A. GLICKSON (also CT)
ROBERT L. OSAR (also TX)
MARYANN M. PALERMO
ROBERT C. SCHNEIDER
LOUIS R. TAFFERA

February 19, 2002

VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS
Hon. Mortimer Gelston, Chairman and Members
of the Siting Council
Connecticut Siting Council
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, Connecticut 06051

Re: AT&T Wireless - TS-AT&T-148-991213
90 North Plains Industrial Road, Wallingford, Connecticut
Notice of Exempt Modification

Hon. Mortimer Gelston, Chairman and Members of the Siting Council:

On December 20, 1999 the Council ruled that AT&T's proposed shared use of the existing SpectraSite facility complied with Section 16-50aa of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies (TS-AT&T-148-991213) permitting AT&T to install up to twelve (12) panel antennas at the 160' level on the existing tower, with an associated equipment shelter located within the fenced compound.

This notice of exempt modification is being provided pursuant to Section 16-50j-72 of the Council's regulations. AT&T will be installing additional equipment within the existing shelter at the facility. There will be no other infrastructure changes to AT&T's facility.

The proposed addition of equipment to AT&T Wireless' facility does not constitute a "modification" of an existing facility as defined in Connecticut General Statutes Section 16-50i(d). The proposed addition to AT&T Wireless' facility will not result in an increase in the Tower's height or extend the boundaries of the existing fenced area surrounding the Tower.

Further, there will be no increase in noise levels by six (6) decibels or more at the Tower site's boundary. AT&T made measurements of the existing facility to confirm compliance with MPE limits and as set forth in a report prepared by Wireless Facilities, Inc., annexed hereto, the total radio frequency electromagnetic radiation power density at the Tower site's boundary will not be increased to or above the standard adopted by the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection as set forth in Section 22a-162 of the Connecticut General Statutes. For all the foregoing reasons, the proposed modifications to AT&T Wireless' existing facility constitutes an exempt modification which will not have a substantially adverse environmental effect.

AT&T Wireless respectfully submits that the addition of the equipment to the North Plains Industrial Road Facility meets the Council's exemption criteria and requests an acknowledgment of same.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christopher B. Fisher, Esq.
On behalf of AT&T Wireless

cc: Mayor, Town of Wallingford
Darryl Hendrickson, Bechtel Telecommunications

the global leader
IN TELECOM OUTSOURCING

Wireless Facilities, Inc.
1840 Michael Faraday Drive
Suite 200
Reston, VA 20190

February 7, 2002

Mr. Mortimer A. Gelston, Chairman
Connecticut Siting Council
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051

RE: FCC Compliance Statement for AT&T Site CT-173 (Wallingford West)

Dear Mr. Gelston:

On behalf of AT&T Wireless, Wireless Facilities Inc. has performed in-field RF measurements and office analyses for the above referenced site to determine compliance with FCC mandated Maximum Permissible Exposure (MPE) limits as defined in 47 CFR § 1.1310.

The table below gives a brief summary of the site location, its configuration and associated technical parameters.

Summary of the site configuration and technical parameters:

Site ID	CT-173
Site Name	Wallingford West
Latitude	41.48111
Longitude	-72.81916
Address of structure	90 North Plain Road Wallingford, CT
Type of structure	Monopole
Antenna structure owner	AT&T wireless
Address of antenna owner	15 East Midland AVE Paramus, NJ 07652
FCC class and Type of service	PCS TDMA (IS-136), PCS GSM
Operating frequency	D, E bands (PCS)
Azimuths	15,135,255
Elevation (ft)	160
Antenna manufacturer	EMS, Allgon
Antenna type	Panel

The mathematical equations used in evaluating the power density values are exactly as outlined in the Office of Engineering & Technology (OET) Bulletin Number 65 which contains the FCC guidelines for evaluating human exposure to radio-frequency electromagnetic fields.

In the case of a single radiating antenna, a prediction for power density in the far field of the antenna can be written as:

$$S = \frac{EIRP}{4\pi D^2} = \frac{1.64 * ERP}{4\pi D^2}$$

Where: S = Power density in W/m^2
EIRP = Effective isotropic radiated power (W)
ERP = Effective radiated power (W)
D = Distance in meters

Using the EPA's recommended factor of 1.6 for 100 % reflection, the worst case power density can be obtained by incorporating this factor into the above equation. If the distance, D, is in meters, the ERP is in Watts, then the worst case power density in $\mu W/cm^2$ is given by

$$S = \frac{33.4 * ERP}{D^2}$$ (Section 2, OET bulletin 65).

Where: S = Power density in $\mu W/cm^2$
ERP = Effective radiated power (W)
D = Distance in meters

WFI's analysis considered both the current configuration as well as the future GSM deployment AT&T is proposing. For the current configuration, both in-field measurements and a predictive analysis tool were used to determine compliance. For the future deployment, only a predictive analysis was performed. The maximum worst-case values of the power density for this analysis are outlined below:

Configuration	**Point of Worst Case Predicted Level**	**Predicted Value $\mu W/cm^2$**	**Maximum Limit for PCS Band Uncontrolled Environment Set by FCC $\mu W/cm^2$**	**% of the Standard**
Current PCS TDMA configuration	360 feet away in front of the antenna	0.53	1000	0.053
Future PCS TDMA and GSM configuration	340 feet away in front of the antenna	0.58	1000	0.058

In addition to predictive analysis, on-site data was recorded at different locations around the monopole. In all areas, less than or equal to 3.75 % of the MPE for public/uncontrolled limits was recorded. The reason the actual measurements are higher than the predicted values is because the actual measurements include emissions from the other carriers at that site while the theoretical study focused on the level of emissions contributed by AT&T only.

On-site measuring point	Worst Case Measured Value μW/cm²	Maximum Limit for PCS Band Uncontrolled Environment Set by FCC μW/cm²	% of the Standard
15 meters in front of sector 1	37.5	1000	3.75
10 meters in front of sector 2	20.5	1000	2.05
10 meters in front of sector 3	28	1000	2.8

The results of these analyses indicate that output power levels for the AT&T owned equipment deployed at the above referenced facility meets FCC approved exposure limits for all uncontrolled areas where general population exposure may exist. Thus, the maximum level of RF radiation in all uncontrolled areas (Assuming a worst case scenario and a 100 % duty cycle for all the transmitters.) is less than or equal to 3.75 % of the maximum permissible exposure limit mandated by the FCC and endorsed by the NCRP and ANSI/IEEE.

To the best of my knowledge, the statements made and information disclosed in this study are complete and accurate.

Sincerely,
Wireless Facilities, Inc.

Dan Hardiman
Senior Engineer II
Fixed Network Engineering

CUDDY & FEDER & WORBY LLP

90 MAPLE AVENUE
WHITE PLAINS, NEW YORK 10601-5196

(914) 761-1300
TELECOPIER (914) 761-5372/6405
www.cfwlaw.com

500 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10110
(212) 944-2841
TELECOPIER (212) 944-2843

WESTAGE BUSINESS CENTER
300 SOUTH LAKE DRIVE
FISHKILL, NEW YORK 12524
(845) 896-2229
TELECOPIER (845) 896-3672

STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT
NORWALK, CONNECTICUT

NEIL J. ALEXANDER (also CT)
CHARLES T. BAZYDLO (also NJ)
THOMAS R. BEIRNE (also DC)
THOMAS M. BLOOMER
JOSEPH P. CARLUCCI
KENNETH J. DUBROFF
ROBERT FEDER
CHRISTOPHER B. FISHER (also CT)
ANTHONY B. GIOFFRE III (also CT)
SUSAN E.H. GORDON
KAREN G. GRANIK
JOSHUA J. GRAUER
WAYNE E. HELLER (also CT)
KENNETH F. JURIST
MICHAEL L. KATZ (also NJ)
JOSHUA E. KIMERLING (also CT)
DANIEL F. LEARY (also CT)
BARRY E. LONG

CUDDY & FEDER
1971-1995

WILLIAM S. NULL
DAWN M. PORTNEY
ELISABETH N. RADOW
NEIL T. RIMSKY
RUTH E. ROTH
JENNIFER L. VAN TUYL
CHAUNCEY L. WALKER (also CA)
ROBERT L. WOLFE
DAVID E. WORBY

Of Counsel
MICHAEL R. EDELMAN
ANDREW A. GLICKSON (also CT)
ROBERT L. OSAR (also TX)
MARYANN M. PALERMO
ROBERT C. SCHNEIDER
LOUIS R. TAFFERA



February 19, 2002

VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS
Hon. Mortimer Gelston, Chairman and Members
of the Siting Council
Connecticut Siting Council
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, Connecticut 06051

Re: AT&T Wireless - TS-AT&T/Nextel-103-991022
173 West Rocks Road, Norwalk, Connecticut
Notice of Exempt Modification

Hon. Mortimer Gelston, Chairman and Members of the Siting Council:

On January 5, 2000 the Council ruled that AT&T's proposed shared use of the existing water tank serving as a communications facility complied with Section 16-50aa of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies (TS-AT&T/Nextel-103-991022) permitting AT&T to install panel antennas at the 128' level on the existing tower, with an associated equipment shelter located within the fenced compound.

This notice of exempt modification is being provided pursuant to Section 16-50j-72 of the Council's regulations. AT&T will be installing additional equipment within the existing shelter at the facility. There will be no other infrastructure changes to AT&T's facility.

The proposed addition of equipment to AT&T Wireless' facility does not constitute a "modification" of an existing facility as defined in Connecticut General Statutes Section 16-50i(d). The proposed addition to AT&T Wireless' facility will not result in an increase in the Tower's height or extend the boundaries of the existing fenced area surrounding the Tower.

Further, there will be no increase in noise levels by six (6) decibels or more at the Tower site's boundary. AT&T made measurements of the existing facility to confirm compliance with MPE limits and as set forth in a report prepared by Wireless Facilities, Inc., annexed hereto, the total radio frequency electromagnetic radiation power density at the Tower site's boundary will not be increased to or above the standard adopted by the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection as set forth in Section 22a-162 of the Connecticut General Statutes. For all the foregoing reasons, the proposed modifications to AT&T Wireless' existing facility constitutes an exempt modification which will not have a substantially adverse environmental effect.

AT&T Wireless respectfully submits that the addition of the equipment to the West Rocks Road Facility meets the Council's exemption criteria and requests an acknowledgment of same.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christopher B. Fisher, Esq.
On behalf of AT&T Wireless

cc: Mayor, City of Norwalk
Darryl Hendrickson, Bechtel Telecommunications

the global leader
IN TELECOM OUTSOURCING

Wireless Facilities, Inc.
1840 Michael Faraday Drive
Suite 200
Reston, VA 20190

February 7, 2002

Mr. Mortimer A. Gelston, Chairman
Connecticut Siting Council
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051

RE: FCC Compliance Statement for AT&T Site CT-076 (Norwalk water tank-Winnipauk)

Dear Mr. Gelston:

On behalf of AT&T Wireless, Wireless Facilities Inc. has performed in-field RF measurements and office analyses for the above referenced site to determine compliance with FCC mandated Maximum Permissible Exposure (MPE) limits as defined in 47 CFR § 1.1310.

The table below gives a brief summary of the site location, its configuration and associated technical parameters.

Summary of the site configuration and technical parameters:

Site ID	CT-076
Site Name	Water Tank-Winnipauk
Latitude	14.14333
Longitude	-73.41972
Address of structure	173 West Rocks Road Norwalk, CT 06850
Type of structure	Water Tank
Antenna structure owner	AT&T Wireless services
Address of antenna owner	15 East Midland Ave Paramus, NJ 07652
FCC class and Type of service	PCS TDMA (IS-136)
Operating frequency	D, E bands (PCS)
Azimuths	30,150,270
Elevation (ft)	128
Antenna manufacturer	Allgon
Antenna type	Panel

The mathematical equations used in evaluating the power density values are exactly as outlined in the Office of Engineering & Technology (OET) Bulletin Number 65 which contains the FCC guidelines for evaluating human exposure to radio-frequency electromagnetic fields.

In the case of a single radiating antenna, a prediction for power density in the far field of the antenna can be written as:

$$S = \frac{EIRP}{4\pi D^2} = \frac{1.64 * ERP}{4\pi D^2}$$

Where: S = Power density in W/m^2
EIRP = Effective isotropic radiated power (W)
ERP = Effective radiated power (W)
D = Distance in meters

Using the EPA's recommended factor of 1.6 for 100 % reflection, the worst case power density can be obtained by incorporating this factor into the above equation. If the distance, D, is in meters, the ERP is in Watts, then the worst case power density in $\mu W/cm^2$ is given by

$$S = \frac{33.4 * ERP}{D^2}$$ (Section 2, OET bulletin 65).

Where: S = Power density in $\mu W/cm^2$
ERP = Effective radiated power (W)
D = Distance in meters

WFI's analysis considered both the current configuration as well as the future GSM deployment AT&T is proposing. For the current configuration, both in-field measurements and a predictive analysis tool were used to determine compliance. For the future deployment, only a predictive analysis was performed. The maximum worst-case values of the power density for this analysis are outlined below:

Configuration	**Point of Worst Case Predicted Level**	**Predicted Value $\mu W/cm^2$**	**Maximum Limit for PCS Band Uncontrolled Environment Set by FCC $\mu W/cm^2$**	**% of the Standard**
Current PCS TDMA configuration	270 feet away in front of the antenna	0.83	1000	0.083
Future PCS TDMA and GSM configuration	270 feet away in front of the antenna	1.11	1000	0.11

In addition to predictive analysis, on-site data was recorded at different locations around the Water tank. In all areas, less than 5 % of the MPE for public/uncontrolled limits was recorded. The reason the actual measurements are higher than the predicted values is because the actual measurements include emissions from all the existing carriers at that site while the theoretical study focused on the level of emissions contributed by AT&T only.

On-site measuring point	**Worst Case Measured Value μW/cm²**	**Maximum Limit for PCS Band Uncontrolled Environment Set by FCC μW/cm²**	**% of the Standard**
30 meters in front of sector 1	49.5	1000	4.95
75 meters in front of sector 2	4.65	1000	0.465
25 meters in front of sector 3	11	1000	1.1

The results of these analyses indicate that output power levels for the AT&T owned equipment deployed at the above referenced facility meets FCC approved exposure limits for all uncontrolled areas where general population exposure may exist. Thus, the maximum level of RF radiation in all uncontrolled areas (Assuming a worst case scenario and a 100 % duty cycle for all the transmitters.) is less than 5 % of the maximum permissible exposure limit mandated by the FCC and endorsed by the NCRP and ANSI/IEEE.

To the best of my knowledge, the statements made and information disclosed in this study are complete and accurate.

Sincerely,
Wireless Facilities, Inc.

Dan Hardiman
Senior Engineer II
Fixed Network Engineering

CUDDY & FEDER & WORBY LLP

90 MAPLE AVENUE
WHITE PLAINS, NEW YORK 10601-5196

(914) 761-1300
TELECOPIER (914) 761-5372/6405
www.cfwlaw.com

500 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10110
(212) 944-2841
TELECOPIER (212) 944-2843

WESTAGE BUSINESS CENTER
300 SOUTH LAKE DRIVE
FISHKILL, NEW YORK 12524
(845) 896-2229
TELECOPIER (845) 896-3672

STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT
NORWALK, CONNECTICUT

NEIL J. ALEXANDER (also CT)
CHARLES T. BAZYDLO (also NJ)
THOMAS R. BEIRNE (also DC)
THOMAS M. BLOOMER
JOSEPH P. CARLUCCI
KENNETH J. DUBROFF
ROBERT FEDER
CHRISTOPHER B. FISHER (also CT)
ANTHONY B. GIOFFRE III (also CT)
SUSAN E.H. GORDON
KAREN G. GRANIK
JOSHUA J. GRAUER
WAYNE E. HELLER (also CT)
KENNETH F. JURIST
MICHAEL L. KATZ (also NJ)
JOSHUA E. KIMERLING (also CT)
DANIEL F. LEARY (also CT)
BARRY E. LONG

CUDDY & FEDER
1971-1995

WILLIAM S. NULL
DAWN M. PORTNEY
ELISABETH N. RADOW
NEIL T. RIMSKY
RUTH E. ROTH
JENNIFER L. VAN TUYL
CHAUNCEY L. WALKER (also CA)
ROBERT L. WOLFE
DAVID E. WORBY

Of Counsel
MICHAEL R. EDELMAN
ANDREW A. GLICKSON (also CT)
ROBERT L. OSAR (also TX)
MARYANN M. PALERMO
ROBERT C. SCHNEIDER
LOUIS R. TAFFERA

February 19, 2002

VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS
Hon. Mortimer Gelston, Chairman and Members
of the Siting Council
Connecticut Siting Council
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, Connecticut 06051

Re: AT&T Wireless - EM-AT&T-135-990721
168 Catoonah Lane, Stamford, Connecticut
Notice of Further Exempt Modification

Hon. Mortimer Gelston, Chairman and Members of the Siting Council:

On August 16, 1999 the Council acknowledged AT&T's notice to modify the existing facility pursuant to Section 16-50j-72 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies (EM-AT&T-135-990721) permitting AT&T to install panel antennas on the existing tower, with associated equipment located within the existing equipment building.

This notice of further exempt modification is also being provided pursuant to Section 16-50j-72 of the Council's regulations. AT&T will be replacing three existing antennas and installing additional equipment within the existing equipment building at the facility. There will be no other infrastructure changes to AT&T's facility.

The proposed replacement antennas and addition of equipment to AT&T Wireless' facility does not constitute a "modification" of an existing facility as defined in Connecticut General Statutes Section 16-50i(d). The proposed modifications to AT&T Wireless' facility will not result in an increase in the Tower's height or extend the boundaries of the existing fenced area

surrounding the Tower. Further, there will be no increase in noise levels by six (6) decibels or more at the Tower site's boundary. AT&T made measurements of the existing facility to confirm compliance with MPE limits and as set forth in a report prepared by Wireless Facilities, Inc., annexed hereto, the total radio frequency electromagnetic radiation power density at the Tower site's boundary will not be increased to or above the standard adopted by the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection as set forth in Section 22a-162 of the Connecticut General Statutes. For all the foregoing reasons, the proposed modifications to AT&T Wireless' existing facility constitutes an exempt modification which will not have a substantially adverse environmental effect.

AT&T Wireless respectfully submits that the proposed replacement antennas and addition of the equipment to the Catoonah Lane Facility meets the Council's exemption criteria and requests an acknowledgment of same.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christopher B. Fisher, Esq.
On behalf of AT&T Wireless

cc: Mayor, City of Stamford
Darryl Hendrickson, Bechtel Telecommunications

the global leader
IN TELECOM OUTSOURCING

Wireless Facilities, Inc.
1840 Michael Faraday Drive
Suite 200
Reston, VA 20190

February 7, 2002

Mr. Mortimer A. Gelston, Chairman
Connecticut Siting Council
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051

RE: FCC Compliance Statement for AT&T Site CT-008 (Stamford Catoona Lane)

Dear Mr. Gelston:

On behalf of AT&T Wireless, Wireless Facilities Inc. has performed in-field RF measurements and office analyses for the above referenced site to determine compliance with FCC mandated Maximum Permissible Exposure (MPE) limits as defined in 47 CFR § 1.1310.

The table below gives a brief summary of the site location, its configuration and associated technical parameters.

Summary of the site configuration and technical parameters:

Site ID	CT-008
Site Name	Stamford – Catoona Lane
Latitude	41.05333
Longitude	-73.56111
Address of structure	168 Catoona Lane, Stamford, CT
Type of structure	Lattice Tower
Antenna structure owner	AT&T Wireless services
Address of antenna owner	15 East Midland Ave, Paramus, NJ 07652
FCC class and Type of service	PCS TDMA (IS-136) PCS GSM
Operating frequency	D, E bands (PCS)
Azimuths	15,135,255
Elevation (ft)	242, 222
Antenna manufacturer	DAPA
Antenna type	Panel

The mathematical equations used in evaluating the power density values are exactly as outlined in the Office of Engineering & Technology (OET) Bulletin Number 65 which contains the FCC guidelines for evaluating human exposure to radio-frequency electromagnetic fields.

In the case of a single radiating antenna, a prediction for power density in the far field of the antenna can be written as:

$$S = \frac{EIRP}{4\pi D^2} = \frac{1.64 * ERP}{4\pi D^2}$$

Where: S = Power density in W/m^2
EIRP = Effective isotropic radiated power (W)
ERP = Effective radiated power (W)
D = Distance in meters

Using the EPA's recommended factor of 1.6 for 100 % reflection, the worst case power density can be obtained by incorporating this factor into the above equation. If the distance, D, is in meters, the ERP is in Watts, then the worst case power density in $\mu W/cm^2$ is given by

$$S = \frac{33.4 * ERP}{D^2}$$ (Section 2, OET bulletin 65).

Where: S = Power density in $\mu W/cm^2$
ERP = Effective radiated power (W)
D = Distance in meters

WFI's analysis considered both the current configuration as well as the future GSM deployment AT&T is proposing. For the current configuration, both in-field measurements and a predictive analysis tool were used to determine compliance. For the future deployment, only a predictive analysis was performed. The maximum worst-case values of the power density for this analysis are outlined below:

Configuration	**Point of Worst Case Predicted Level**	**Predicted Value $\mu W/cm^2$**	**Maximum Limit for PCS Band Uncontrolled Environment Set by FCC $\mu W/cm^2$**	**% of the Standard**
Current PCS TDMA configuration	110 feet away in front of the antenna	0.77	1000	0.077
Future PCS TDMA and GSM configuration	110 feet away in front of the antenna	0.77	1000	0.077

In addition to predictive analysis, on-site data was recorded at different locations around the Lattice Tower. In all areas, less than 2.8 % of the MPE for public/uncontrolled limits was recorded. The reason the actual measurements are higher than the predicted values is because the actual measurements include emissions from all the existing carriers at that site while the theoretical study focused on the level of emissions contributed by AT&T only.

On-site measuring point	Worst Case Measured Value μW/cm²	Maximum Limit for PCS Band Uncontrolled Environment Set by FCC μW/cm²	% of the Standard
10 meters in front of sector 1	9.0	1000	0.90
30 meters in front of sector 2	18.5	1000	1.85
30 meters in front of sector 3	28	1000	2.8

The results of these analyses indicate that output power levels for the AT&T owned equipment deployed at the above referenced facility meets FCC approved exposure limits for all uncontrolled areas where general population exposure may exist. Thus, the maximum level of RF radiation in all uncontrolled areas (Assuming a worst case scenario and a 100 % duty cycle for all the transmitters.) is less than 2.8 % of the maximum permissible exposure limit mandated by the FCC and endorsed by the NCRP and ANSI/IEEE.

To the best of my knowledge, the statements made and information disclosed in this study are complete and accurate.

Sincerely,
Wireless Facilities, Inc.

Dan Hardiman
Senior Engineer II
Fixed Network Engineering

CUDDY & FEDER & WORBY LLP

90 MAPLE AVENUE
WHITE PLAINS, NEW YORK 10601-5196

(914) 761-1300
TELECOPIER (914) 761-5372/6405
www.cfwlaw.com

500 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10110
(212) 944-2841
TELECOPIER (212) 944-2843

WESTAGE BUSINESS CENTER
300 SOUTH LAKE DRIVE
FISHKILL, NEW YORK 12524
(845) 896-2229
TELECOPIER (845) 896-3672

STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT
NORWALK, CONNECTICUT

NEIL J. ALEXANDER (also CT)
CHARLES T. BAZYDLO (also NJ)
THOMAS R. BEIRNE (also DC)
THOMAS M. BLOOMER
JOSEPH P. CARLUCCI
KENNETH J. DUBROFF
ROBERT FEDER
CHRISTOPHER B. FISHER (also CT)
ANTHONY B. GIOFFRE III (also CT)
SUSAN E.H. GORDON
KAREN G. GRANIK
JOSHUA J. GRAUER
WAYNE E. HELLER (also CT)
KENNETH F. JURIST
MICHAEL L. KATZ (also NJ)
JOSHUA E. KIMERLING (also CT)
DANIEL F. LEARY (also CT)
BARRY E. LONG

CUDDY & FEDER
1971-1995

WILLIAM S. NULL
DAWN M. PORTNEY
ELISABETH N. RADOW
NEIL T. RIMSKY
RUTH E. ROTH
JENNIFER L. VAN TUYL
CHAUNCEY L. WALKER (also CA)
ROBERT L. WOLFE
DAVID E. WORBY

Of Counsel
MICHAEL R. EDELMAN
ANDREW A. GLICKSON (also CT)
ROBERT L. OSAR (also TX)
MARYANN M. PALERMO
ROBERT C. SCHNEIDER
LOUIS R. TAFFERA

March 6, 2002

VIA FAX
Hon. Mortimer Gelston, Chairman and Members
of the Siting Council
Connecticut Siting Council
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, Connecticut 06051

Re: AT&T Wireless - TS-AT&T-015-990913
1000 Trumbull Avenue (the "Chopsey Hill Facility"),
Bridgeport, Connecticut
Notice of Exempt Modification

Hon. Mortimer Gelston, Chairman and Members of the Siting Council:

This letter and its enclosures are submitted in further support of AT&T's February 19th "notice of exempt modification" with respect to the above referenced facility. We are in receipt of a March 5, 2002 letter from Melanie Howlett, Esq., submitted on behalf of the City with respect to the above referenced matter requesting that the Council table this matter at its March 7, 2002 meeting because the City believes AT&T's filing is "incomplete". We respectfully disagree and request that the Council consider this matter at its March 7, 2002 meeting and acknowledge AT&T's notice of exempt modification based on the information contained therein and this letter which is simultaneously being provided to the City's representatives.

As noted in AT&T's February 2002 Notice, AT&T has an existing wireless facility at the Chopsey Hill Facility in Bridgeport. AT&T will be deploying additional telecommunications equipment in its existing on site shelter. AT&T's February 19th filing contained an MPE report which, by field measurement, included power density information for all transmitters currently

operating at the site including those of AT&T, Verizon and numerous other carriers, paging entities and others. By virtue of the measurement protocol, all existing users of the tower were included in the MPE analysis.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that in 1999 AT&T "mapped" the tower and all users then transmitting from the facility in order to prepare MPE calculations for the Council as part of its original tower sharing application (TS-AT&T-015-990913). A detailed report was prepared by Lucent and is on file with the Council as part of AT&T's 1999 tower sharing approval. Moreover, it is our understanding, that AT&T's report has been utilized by subsequent carriers as a "base line" to prepare their MPE analysis for purposes of the Council's review and tower sharing proposals.

Indeed, it is our understanding that the Council recently approved a tower sharing request by Northcoast (TS-Northcoast-015-011220) at the Chopsey Hill Facility. Included in Northcoast's filing was an MPE report by LCC, a copy of which is enclosed for the Council and City's convenience. In its report, LCC concluded that the existing worst case calculated power density at the site was 25.2% and together with Northcoast's proposed facility, no more than 26% of the FCC's Uncontrolled Standards. Moreover, we know that AT&T's additional equipment will only contribute an additional .011% of the standard utilizing FCC OET Bulletin 65 worst case assumptions. See Report by WFI accompanying AT&T's notice of exempt modification (existing AT&T facility is .057% and existing and proposed AT&T facility is .068%). As such, AT&T's modifications at the Chopsey Hill Facility that are associated with this exempt modification will nominally contribute to the overall power density at the site, (i.e., cumulative site power density is calculated at no more than 27% of the FCC's standard). Of note, the field measurements taken by WFI confirm that calculations are truly conservative (i.e. compare % of standards).

Accordingly, and regardless of how it is calculated or measured, the site is in compliance with FCC Standards in its existing configuration, as approved for modification by other carriers and as proposed to be further modified by AT&T.

Given all of the foregoing, AT&T Wireless respectfully submits that the proposed addition of equipment to the Chopsey Hill Facility meets the Council's exemption criteria and requests an acknowledgment of same.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christopher B. Fisher, Esq.
On behalf of AT&T Wireless

cc: Robert Mercier, CSC
Melanie J. Howlett, Esq. (w/enc)(By fax)
Darryl Hendrickson, Bechtel Telecommunications

This report provides information regarding Northcoast Communications' compliance with the FCC Guidelines for Human Exposure to RF Electromagnetic Fields at the proposed site located at 1330 Chopsey Hill Road, Bridgeport.

The Federal Communications Commission has provided guidelines regarding human exposure to the radio frequency electromagnetic fields. These guidelines are defined in FCC's OET Bulletin No. 65. In this bulletin, the FCC has set the limits for maximum permissible exposure (MPE) limits for both the occupational and general population. These limits for maximum permissible exposure are shown below on Table 1.

Table 1. LIMITS FOR MAXIMUM PERMISSIBLE EXPOSURE (MPE)

(A) Limits for Occupational/Controlled Exposure

Frequency Range (MHz)	Electric Field Strength (E) (V/m)	Magnetic Field Strength (H) (A/m)	Power Density (S) (mW/cm^2)	Averaging Time $\|E\|^2$, $\|H\|^2$ or S (minutes)
0.3-3.0	614	1.63	(100)*	6
3.0-30	1842/f	4.89/f	($900/f^2$)*	6
30-300	61.4	0.163	1.0	6
300-1500	--	--	f/300	6
1500-100,000	--	--	5	6

(B) Limits for General Population/Uncontrolled Exposure

Frequency Range (MHz)	Electric Field Strength (E) (V/m)	Magnetic Field Strength (H) (A/m)	Power Density (S) (mW/cm^2)	Averaging Time $\|E\|^2$, $\|H\|^2$ or S (minutes)
0.3-1.34	614	1.63	(100)*	30
1.34-30	824/f	2.19/f	($180/f^2$)*	30
30-300	27.5	0.073	0.2	30
300-1500	--	--	f/1500	30
1500-100,000	--	--	1.0	30

f = frequency in MHz *Plane-wave equivalent power density

Northcoast's transmit frequencies are in the range of 1970 to 1975 MHz. Based on Table 1, the limit for the occupational exposure at these frequencies is 5 mW/cm^2 and the limit for the general population is 1 mW/cm^2.

Below are calculations showing Northcoast power density levels at the base of the tower. These calculations were done using the maximum gain of the antennas and assuming that all channels are operating concurrently, to provide a "worst case" scenario.

Power Density Parameters		
Transmit Power (3 Channels)	*48*	*W*
Transmit Power (dBm)	*46.81*	*dBm*
Cable Type	*VXL7-50 (1 5/8")*	
Cable Length (ft)	*120*	*ft*
Cable Loss/100ft	*1.13*	*dB/100ft*
Main Feeder Loss	*1.36*	*dB*
Jumper	*VXL5-50 (7/8")*	
Jumper Loss	*0.2412*	*dB*
Connectors' Loss	*0.6*	*dB*
Splitter Loss	*0*	*dB*
Power Into Antenna	*28.94*	*W*
Antenna Gain	*15*	*dBd*
EIRP (dBm)	*61.82*	*dBm*
EIRP (3 Channels)	*1518.87*	*W*

Calculations	**Distance (feet)**	**Distance (meters)**	**Angle of Radiation**	**Vertical Gain (dB)**	**EIRP (dBm)**	**EIRP (W)**	**Power Density (mW/cm2)**
Northcoast calculations at the bottom of the tower.	80	24.392	89.20	15	61.82	1518.87	0.052005609
Total %MPE of all carriers at the bottom of the tower.	25.2%						

The resulting power density from the above calculations is 0.052005609 mW/cm^2. These results indicate calculation levels not exceeding 6% for Northcoast and 26% total for the MPE limit of 1 mW/cm^2 for the general population.