

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Ten Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051

Phone: (860) 827-2935 Fax: (860) 827-2950

E-Mail: siting.council@po.state.ct.us

Web Site: www.state.ct.us/csc/index.htm

February 20, 2002

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

RE: **EM-AT&T-015-034-083-084-097-103-107-135-167-020131** - AT&T Wireless notice of intent to modify existing telecommunications facilities located in Bridgeport, Stamford, Milford, Danbury, Middletown, Orange, Newtown, Norwalk, and Woodbridge, Connecticut.

Dear Attorney Fisher:


At a public meeting held on February 14, 2002, the Connecticut Siting Council (Council) acknowledged your notice to modify eleven of the twelve existing telecommunications facilities, pursuant to Section 16-50j-73 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies. The 38 Kaechele Place, Bridgeport site will be presented at a future Council meeting after requested information is received. Although no conditions have been placed on this approval, I am attaching a letter from the Town of Newtown, dated February 14, 2002, for your review and consideration.

The proposed modifications are to be implemented as specified here and in your notice dated January 29, 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 height, extend the boundaries of the tower sites, increase noise levels at any tower site boundary by six decibels, and increase the total radio frequencies electromagnetic radiation power density measured at the tower site boundary to or above the standard adopted by the State Department of Environmental Protection pursuant to General Statutes § 22a-162. These facilities has 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/RM/laf

Enclosure

c: See attached list.

Honorable Joseph P. Ganim, Mayor, City of Bridgeport
Honorable Michael P. Nidoh, City Planner, City of Bridgeport
Melanie J. Howlett, Assistant City Attorney, City of Bridgeport
Honorable Mark D. Boughton, Mayor, City of Danbury
Dennis Elpern, City Planner, City of Danbury
Honorable Herbert C. Rosenthal, First Selectman, Town of Newtown
Gary Frenette, Zoning Enforcement Officer, Town of Newtown
Honorable Domenique S. Thornton, Mayor, City of Middletown
Planning and Zoning Official, City of Middletown
Honorable James L. Richetelli, Jr., Mayor, City of Milford
Wade Pierce, City Planner, City of Milford
Honorable Alex A. Knopp, Mayor, City of Norwalk
Stephen Thomas, Planning Chairman, City of Norwalk
Honorable Mitchell R. Goldblatt, First Selectman, Town of Orange
Paul Dinice, Zoning Enforcement Officer, Town of Orange
Honorable Dannel P. Malloy, Mayor, City of Stamford
Robin Stein, Planning and Zoning Director, City of Stamford
Honorable Amey Marrella, First Selectman, Town of Woodbridge
Samuel Spielvogel, Town Planner, Town of Woodbridge

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

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


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

January 29, 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
38 Kaechele Place, Bridgeport, Connecticut
1590 Newfield Avenue, Stamford, Connecticut
111 School House Road, Milford, Connecticut
36 Sugar Hollow Road, Danbury, Connecticut
90 Industrial Park, Middletown, Connecticut
525 Orange Center Road, Orange, Connecticut
Berkshire Road, Newtown, Connecticut
10 Willard Road, Norwalk, Connecticut
1027 Racebrook Road, Woodbridge, 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

cc: Christopher B. Fisher, Esq.

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

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


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

January 28, 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-034-000518
36 Sugar Hollow Road, Danbury, Connecticut
Notice of Exempt Modification



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

On June 7, 2000 the Council ruled that AT&T's proposed shared use of the existing VoiceStream facility complied with Section 16-50aa of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies (TS-AT&T-034-000518) permitting AT&T to install up to nine (9) panel antennas at the 98' level on the existing tower, with associated equipment cabinets located on a 10' x 16' concrete pad 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 an additional equipment cabinet (approximately 76"H x 76"W x 30"D) on AT&T's existing concrete pad at the facility. There will be no other infrastructure changes to AT&T's facility.

The proposed addition of an equipment cabinet 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

CUDDY & FEDER & WORBY LLP


January 28, 2002

Page 2

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, addition of AT&T Wireless' cabinet to its existing facility constitutes an exempt modification which will not have a substantially adverse environmental effect.

AT&T Wireless respectfully submits that the proposed addition of the cabinet to the Sugar Hollow 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 Danbury
Darryl Hendrickson, Bechtel Telecommunications
Brendan Sharkey, VoiceStream



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

January 2, 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-070 (Danbury South-Wooster mountain)

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-070
Site Name	Danbury South-Wooster Mountain
Latitude	41.34972
Longitude	-73.46833
Address of structure	35 sugar hollow rd Danbury, CT
Type of structure	Monopole
Antenna structure owner	AT&T
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	90,190,340
Elevation (ft)	98
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/m²
 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 μW/cm² is given by

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

Where: S = Power density in μW/cm²
 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 μW/cm ²	Maximum Limit for PCS Band Uncontrolled Environment Set by FCC μW/cm ²	% of the Standard
Current PCS TDMA configuration	220 feet away in front of the antenna	1.43	1000	0.143
Future PCS TDMA and GSM configuration	220 feet away in front of the antenna	1.93	1000	0.193

In addition to predictive analysis, on-site data was recorded at different locations around the monopole. In all areas, less than or equal to 2.9 % 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 $\mu\text{W}/\text{cm}^2$	Maximum Limit for PCS Band Uncontrolled Environment Set by FCC $\mu\text{W}/\text{cm}^2$	% of the Standard
10 meters in front of sector 1	28	1000	2.8
5 meters in front of sector 2	28	1000	2.8
10 meters in front of sector 3	29	1000	2.9

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 or equal to 2.9 % 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