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MEETING START

The meeting started at approximately 7:00pm

AT&T Presentation
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AT&T

Proposed Cellular Tower Facility
1 Waterview Drive
Shelton
April 24, 2014
Application Process


- City Technical Consultation – Commenced 2/26/14

- Technical Report & Contents
  - Site Need to Serve the Public
  - Alternatives
  - Environmental Effects
Tonight’s Community Meeting

• Applicant’s overview of the project and review of information presented in the Technical Report

• Q&A after the Presentation

• Discuss any follow up with City Officials
Importance and Benefits of Wireless Services

- Ability to connect in a mobile environment is essential to public’s health, safety and welfare

- By 2012, 35.8% of all households cut the cord\(^1\)

- Mobile data traffic is expected to grow at an annual rate of 66% from 2012 to 2017\(^2\)


Importance and Benefits of Wireless Services

- Newfound form of safety - approximately 70% of all 9-1-1 calls are wireless

- Enhanced 911 services – help 911 public safety dispatchers identify caller’s location

Importance and Benefits of Wireless Services

• Personal Localized Alerting Network (PLAN) – carriers will issue text message alerts from the President, the US Dept of Homeland Security, FEMA and National Weather Service

• CT Alert ENS System – uses State Enhanced 911 services database to allow CT Dept of Homeland Security and CT State Police to provide targeted alerts to the public and local emergency services personnel during life threatening emergencies
Applicant’s Presentation

• An explanation of the need for the proposed Facility
  – SAI - RF Engineer

• An explanation of the site selection process
  – Centerline - Site Acquisition

• A review of the design for the proposed Facility
  – Hudson Design Group LLC

• A summary of the Environmental Review to Date
  – EBI

• A summary of the results of the Visual Analysis
  – Caron & Associates
AT&T’s Need for the Proposed Facility

- Wireless propagation is a line-of-sight technology and signals are impacted by terrain, physical obstructions, and foliage

- A continuous series of sites in close proximity are needed to allow overlap to maintain effective reliable wireless service

- Reliable service is needed in the southern portion of the City including Constitution Blvd, Waterview Drive, Plakson Drive and businesses and residents in the area

- This proposed Facility is needed in conjunction with AT&T’s proposed Facility at the Highland Golf Course
Existing Coverage

AT&T Current Coverage at Shelton, CT
Composite Coverage
CT2371- Proposed Facility
Topo Map
Site Selection Summary

- Site Search Area is established where a coverage need has been identified

- Investigate existing towers and structures with RF Engineers to determine the feasibility of collocation

- If no existing towers or structures are feasible, investigate parcels where the public need for service and environmental impacts can be appropriately balanced
Site Selection Summary

- Existing towers and facilities within 4 miles of the Site Search Area were investigated

- Existing towers were either too far away to reliably serve the area where service is needed or already in use by AT&T to serve other areas
Existing Towers/Cell Sites
Site Selection Summary

• A search for tower sites was conducted only after determining that no existing facilities could be used to provide needed service

• Other sites that were investigated did not meet AT&T’s coverage needs or were not suitable for a facility
Sites Evaluated

1. 1 Waterview Dr. - proposed site
2. Constitution Park
3. 20 Ivy Brook Road – Ivy Brook Medical Center
4. 2 Mountain View Dr.
5. 35 Waterview Dr.
6. 27 Waterview Dr.
7. Rivendell Dr.
General Facility Description

1 Waterview Drive
Map 79, Lot 16
9.36 acres

- 75’ x 75’ lease area in the northern portion
- 120’ tall facility design as a flagpole
- 50’ x 50’ equipment compound for equipment shelter and back-up power generator
- Compound enclosed by an 8’ tall stockade fence
- Access from Waterview Drive, over existing paved driveway/parking area, then along a new gravel driveway 12’ wide and approximately 70’ to the equipment compound
- Designed to accommodate future collocation by other carriers
Tower Elevation
Environmental Effects

Cumulative worst-case calculation of power density demonstrates compliance with the applicable standards

At the request of AT&T Wireless, SAI Communications has performed an assessment of the RF Power Density at the proposed site located at 1 Waterview Drive, Shelton, CT. Calculations were done in compliance with FCC OET Bulletin 65. This report provides an FCC compliance assessment based on a “worst-case” analysis that all transmitters are simultaneously operating at full power and pointing directly at the ground.

FCC OET Bulletin 65 formula:

\[ S = \frac{2.56 \times 1.64 \times ERP}{4 \times \pi \times R^2} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transmission Mode</th>
<th>Antenna Centerline AGL (ft)</th>
<th>Frequency (MHz)</th>
<th>Number of Channels</th>
<th>Effective Radiated Power per Channel (Watts)</th>
<th>Power Density (mW/cm²)</th>
<th>Standard Limits (mW/cm²)</th>
<th>% MPE (Uncontrolled/General Public)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT&amp;TUMTS</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>0.0325</td>
<td>0.3667</td>
<td>5.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT&amp;TUMTS</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>0.0325</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT&amp;T LTE</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>0.0325</td>
<td>0.4667</td>
<td>6.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT&amp;T LTE</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>0.0325</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion:** AT&T’s proposed antenna installation is calculated to be within 19.27% of FCC Standard for General Public/Uncontrolled Maximum Permissible Exposure (MPE).
Environmental Effects

- No direct impacts to wetlands anticipated

- Currently consulting with State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) - no national register historic resources are located within ½ mile of the proposed site

- Consultation with the Department of Energy & Environmental Protection (DEEP) Natural Diversity Database (NDDB) Map indicates that no impacts to State-listed species are anticipated
Viewshed Map

Waterview Drive ~ CT2371
Predective Viewshed Mapping based upon terrain with and without tree cover
1 Mile Radius ~ 12/26/2014

For visual reference only. Actual visibility is dependent upon weather conditions, season, sunlight, and viewer location.
The visibility study includes an analysis of visibility on the property shown in the map, which was taken on 9/21/2015. Visibility was observed by driving from the proposed location without the aid of a magnification device. Several factors play a role in visibility, including weather, distance, and time of day. The map shows the locations of visibility, which are marked.

For visual reference only. Actual visibility is dependent upon weather conditions, season, sunlight, and viewer's location.
Photosimulation
Photosimulation
Photosimulation
Conclusion

• State Siting Council Application - formal filing at conclusion of municipal consultation

• Siting Council will hold a public hearing in Shelton

• Documents and information about participation will be available through the Siting Council website: http://www.ct.gov/csc

• Q&A
Discussion

John Anglace, President of the Board of Alderman stated, I’m disappointed that anybody would entertain your request to put in a cell tower up in that area. Be that as it may, you submitted information into the City back on February 28th. You submitted a technical report plus a letter. Based on that information, I went through it all and initially your 48 page report resulted in a 38-page question and answers from me. Which I have subsequently, reduced and tonight you have answered a lot of questions. My initial concern is how the views of the public will be communicated to the Siting Counsel. Since they are the ultimate decision makers, the lack of their presence tonight is understandable. If they are going to hold a public hearing here that will give the public the opportunity to be heard. I’m pleased to hear that the Siting Counsel is coming down and I applaud that.

I question the timing, you may have answered that tonight but the law requires submission of recommendation’s within 60 days of the initial applicant’s consultation. That is what I read in your letter but I think you said tonight that it is 90 days. That is important to us, because as I understand the regulations under the law, that the municipality can hold a public hearing or hearings of its own. In addition, to anything that you do or the Siting Counsel does. The purpose of that is for us to hear what the public has to say and for us to communicate back information to the Siting Counsel. This is a public information session and it is good give and take on an informal basis it is very helpful.

Turning our attention to the technical report and I am not a very technical person. I looked through it and I felt it was lacking in sufficient detail which raises many
unanswered questions in my mind. The proposed flag pole approach eliminates other provider’s use, which I think is important, in minimizing the number of cell towers required in our community. If nothing else, it disturbs us immensely that every time a provider comes up with a new idea, we end up with five more cell towers in our town. We have cell towers next to cell towers, we have cell towers within 200 feet of each other, it is ridiculous and out of control. I am not blaming you, I blame the Siting Council and I will tell them. You state the existent of other AT&T cell towers in Shelton do exist and that reliable service levels only serve ¼ of Shelton’s land mass and population. But you have failed to address what efforts you have made to consolidate with other existing providers with cell towers already in Shelton. This to me seems like the biggest void in this whole process, who is watching over the whole operation? In my view it is totally out of control. We do not need 900 cell towers in the City of Shelton; we need enough to get the job done. I feel it’s the responsibility of the Siting Council seeing that they have full control and can overrule our Zoning Commission, Inland Wetland and Conversation Commissions. The Siting Council is not producing and they are giving us too many cell towers and we are tired of it. Shelton’s best interest is served when the number of cell tower sights is minimized through such coordination. If you and the others would get together and work this out with the Siting Counsel, we could have a smaller amount of these types of hearings. Tonight, I had another meeting but I had to come here to listen and learn because I have to represent people in this town. I missed my other meeting and I didn’t learn about this public hearing until a few days ago. You can imagine I came here very upset to begin with.
I think your technical report lists other areas and locations considered for the installation of this cell tower but they were merely dismissed as unavailable for one reason or another. That is what the report says, that is not a technical answer that is just avoiding the issue. I think you should take a closer look at that because I want to see the answer to each one of them and why they were not found acceptable.

Shelton wants technical difficulties addressed by those who provide cell phone service but we want it done in an efficient and economical manner where the environment is not threatened and conversation is held paramount. The proposed facility will bring new reliable AT&T wireless service to approximately 21,790 residents in Shelton. That is a claim to me and I spent a lot of time and I could not support that information. I think AT&T can achieve its objectives for far better service without adding new cell towers and I do not think the effort has been put in. The claim that environmental effects principally involve visibility of the flag pole seems to have merit on the surface but it does not address the added height to the flag pole. The flag pole is not in our best interest if it cannot provide for use by other providers and is taller than necessary.

The statement that the combination of rolling terrain and mature standing trees serve to minimize the visibility of the facility in the surrounding neighborhood which is contradictory to the technical report which shows the removal of trees on several sights of their plan. This not only makes the facility more noticeable but contradicts initial Zoning Requirements for a vegetation buffer to accommodate the joining residential neighborhoods. Thank you, you have just taken our Zoning and made it worthless. You just made this visible to all the neighbors after we said 15 years ago when we set
the structure up to have a buffer zone between the light industrial and the neighborhoods, you just destroyed that and we just can’t accept that.

The statement that any environmental impact is not significant is subject to debate. One must consider that the public and municipal officials have not been permitted to walk the site for the proposed facility and the technical report provides no studies to prove such a statement. We also want to call to the attention of the Connecticut Siting Counsel that cell tower growth in Shelton needs to be better coordinated. We expect the Counsel to coordinate multiple uses of existing towers verses arbitrary implementation of more cell towers which do not enhance our landscape. Better coverage can be achieved through the use of existing towers... it may require a little more work but it can be done.

Another issue that begs discussion is that of technology obsolescence, we can all relate to the rapid technology changes in our lifetime and the evolution of one technology to another. We all have DVD’s cluttering our shelves and we all have seen TV’s go through roof top signals to cable. Have we learned nothing from this obsolescence? What will become of these towers when cell phone technology moves to the next level? Will they remain on our landscape as a continuing eye sore? There is no mention of obsolescence in this application. The City of Shelton certainly does not want these towers to remain on our landscape any longer than necessary. Not only do we want them all removed when they become obsolete but we want the number of them minimized now. Since the State sees fit to create this law and override all local Zoning we believe it is the responsibility of the State to address the issue of consolidation and obsolescence. We have gone too long without such consideration to these important
issues and I intend to bring it to the attention of our State Legislators to get moving on it. Thank you.

Ruth Parkins stated, many of my comments echo Alderman John Anglance. I am glad to hear that the Siting Counsel will be here because I think it is very important for them to hear this as well and actually most of my comments will be directed at them. There are currently, 16 sights in Shelton plus the 3 you have proposed plus the 1 that Verizon has proposed. As Planning and Zoning member we are seeing a proliferation of requests for cell phone sites not only towers but roof top mounts are now becoming the new trend. It is really littering our landscape. I understand the importance of cell phones and making emergency calls, I also understand competition. I know that there is fierce competition between AT&T and Verizon to be the first to get the poles up. When you mention co-location it just does not seem to be happening with the amount of poles that are already here. You have a location right on River Road, a flag pole as a matter of fact, which is not far from this current sight. I do not understand why that is not covering unless it was not really thought out well when you placed that. I understand it is not just the coverage it is also the usage the people are using it now for the internet, texting and all that sort of stuff is increasing. So my question is how far is this going to go? Are we going to end up seeing cell phone towers and roof top mounting boxes on every roof top in Shelton and a cell phone tower in every neighborhood? We need to know when it is going to end. Thank you.

More discussion held on tape on file in the Town Clerk’s office.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:00pm.
Respectfully submitted,

Melissa Camerato
Clerk