

STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

In Re:

APPLICATION OF NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS, LLC  
and NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC (AT&T)  
FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL  
COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE  
CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION  
OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS TOWER FACILITY  
AT ROUTE 198 IN THE TOWN OF WOODSTOCK

DOCKET NO. 423

February 22, 2012

APPLICANTS

NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS, LLC and NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC ("AT&T")  
RESPONSES TO SITING COUNCIL INTERROGATORIES SET II

- Q1. Please provide a radiofrequency propagation map showing potential coverage from a site at 279 Route 198, owned by the Connecticut Department of Transportation, as listed as #7 behind Tab 2 of the application.
- A1. *The requested propagation plot is included in Attachment 1 (labeled Existing and CT DOT Property Coverage). As demonstrated therein, a centerline mounting height of 197' AGL at the Connecticut Department of Transportation (DOT) property results in significant gaps to the north and along Route 198. Accordingly, the DOT property is not a viable site for providing service to this area of Woodstock.*
- Q2. Is there Town of Woodstock-owned property located on Parker Road? If so, has the Applicant contacted the Town regarding the potential for negotiation of a lease on that property? Please provide a radiofrequency propagation map showing potential coverage of that property.
- A2. *The Town of Woodstock-owned property in the area where service is needed is located on Hawkins Road. As demonstrated in the propagation plot included in Attachment 1 (labeled Existing and Hawkins Rd Town Property Coverage), a centerline mounting height of 197' at this location results in significant gaps to the north and along Route 198. Given that this Town-owned location is not a viable site for providing service to this area of Woodstock, the Town was not contacted about this location.*
- Q3. Please provide a radiofrequency propagation map showing potential coverage from the proposed site at a height of 110 feet above ground level using the same parameters as shown in the application
- A3. *Included in Attachment 1 is a propagation plot labeled Existing Coverage and Proposed at 107' AGL that depicts coverage from a 110' tall facility (with an antenna centerline mounting height of 107' AGL).*
- Q4. Please provide a wetlands report that was previously done at the proposed property.

- A4. *Please be advised that a new access drive over the parcel located at Route 171 (Map/Block/Lot 5789/37/16) and owned by Michael Farley now replaces the access drive shown in the application materials. Included in Attachment 6 are drawings depicting the new access drive. As noted at the Siting Council hearing, the potential availability of this new access was raised shortly before the January 10, 2012 Siting Council hearing. Since the January 10th hearing, North Atlantic Towers executed an access easement and designed the replacement access drive. Accordingly, this response as well as other responses regarding the access drive provides information and data related to the new access drive.*
- Included in Attachment 2 is an Inland Wetlands Delineation Report prepared by Infinigy Engineering.*
- Q5. Please provide photosimulations of other simulated tree design options and indicate the manufacturer of each.
- A5. *Please see the photosimulations included in Attachment 3, which depict a simulated tree design at a location in North Creek, New York. The manufacturer of the simulated tree depicted in the enclosed photosimulations is The Holbek Group.*
- Q6. What is the cost difference of overhead versus underground utilities to the proposed facility?
- A6. *In general, the cost of installing overhead utilities is approximately 70% of the cost of installing underground utilities. As stated at the January 10<sup>th</sup> Siting Council hearing and as shown in the updated drawings depicting the replacement drive in Attachment 6, the utilities for the proposed facility will be installed underground.*
- Q7. Please confirm the length of time that the proposed backup power generator would provide power to the proposed site.
- A7. *The proposed backup generator will provide power to the proposed site for two days. Please see the letter dated February 6, 2012 prepared by Infinigy Engineering & Surveying in Attachment 4 for details.*
- Q8. Please quantify how much of the proposed tower would be visible from each photosimulation location at 150 feet and 110 feet.
- A8. *Please see the tables and photosimulations included in Attachment 5. The tables in Attachment 5 summarize the estimated height of the proposed tower expected to be visible for each photosimulation at 150' AGL and 110' AGL for a monopole facility and a monopine facility. The photosimulations included in Attachment 5 depict both designs – monopole and monopine - and each photosimulation includes the estimated visible height. Please note that the monopine information includes the approximately 5-foot monopine “cap” at the top that is part of the monopine facility design.*
- Q9. Does the National Park Service have any prohibitions on new manmade structures within Heritage areas?
- A9. *No, the National Park Service does not impose any prohibitions on new manmade structures within Heritage Areas.*
- Q10. Please provide calculations of the sound level for the proposed generator at the nearest property boundaries to the east and south, and at the nearest residence to the proposed facility.

A10. Please see the February 6, 2012 letter prepared by Infinigy Engineering & Surveying included in Attachment 4 for calculations of the expected sound level for the proposed generator at the nearest property boundaries to the east and south and the nearest residence to the proposed facility. As demonstrated in the attached calculations, the expected sound level at the nearest property boundaries located approximately 150' from the proposed facility is 54.71 dB and the expected sound level at the closest residence approximately 1,800' from the proposed facility is 33.13 dB. For an understanding of these calculated sound levels, it is helpful to note that a whisper is approximately 30dB and a normal conversation is approximately 60-70 dB.

Q11. What is the status of AT&T's antenna on the existing 87 West Quassett Road tower? What is the type and height of the antenna? Does AT&T expect that this tower will be removed in the near future?

A11. AT&T does not maintain a facility on the existing tower located at 87 West Quassett Road in Woodstock. (The site number notation for the existing tower at 87 West Quassett Road in the Existing Tower List Included in Attachment 2 of the Applicants' Application (ATT #272711) refers to the American Tower number for the existing facility). AT&T's existing surrounding sites are depicted on the "Map of Distance to Neighbor Sites" included in Attachment 1 of the Applicants' Application.

Q12. Would AT&T co-locate on the recently approved Verizon tower to be located at 87 West Quassett Road? If so, at what height?

A12. Yes, AT&T expects to co-locate on the recently approved Verizon tower at some future date not yet determine to provide service outside of the area targeted for reliable service by the proposed facility. AT&T will evaluate the height at which it will co-locate on the Verizon facility when it proceeds with its plans to co-locate.

Q13. Does NAT have an alternate access road for the proposed site? If so, please provide detailed site drawings of the alternate access road.

A13. Yes. As noted in response number 4 above, a new access drive is proposed and replaces the access drive shown in the application materials. Updated drawings depicting the replacement access drive are included in Attachment 6. As shown in the enclosed drawings, access will now be provided from Route 171/198 or Eastford Road by an easement over the adjacent parcel to the southeast of the proposed facility, owned by Michael Farley. The replacement access drive will follow an existing woods trail on the property. The table below includes a comparison of some aspects of the replacement access drive and the originally proposed, or former, access drive.

	<i>Replacement Access Drive</i>	<i>Former Access Drive</i>
<i>Length</i>	2,550'	4,275'
<i>No. of trees 6" &gt; removed</i>	156	466
<i>Disturbance</i>	2.12 acres	5.1 acres

Q14. Did the Applicant or its representatives correspond with the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) regarding potential for Endangered, Threatened or Special

Concern Species located on the host property? Please provide DEEP's response to such correspondence.

- A14. *Yes, please see the Inland Wetlands Report included in Attachment 2 for copies of the correspondence submitted to the DEEP and the DEEP response dated February 14, 2012. The February 14, 2012 DEEP response states that "there are no extant populations of Federal or State Endangered, Threatened or Special Concern Special that occur on this property" (the proposed site and access drive).*
- Q15. Please confirm the balloon flight information provided at the day of the hearing for the balloon that was to be located at the proposed site. Including where it was located, what height it reached, how long the balloon was at the intended height, weather conditions, etc.
- A15. *At 7:45am on January 10, 2012, a 3-foot diameter, red-colored, helium-filled balloon was raised, on a single tether, to a height of 150 feet above ground level, and the tether was anchored to the ground at a location 21.5' to the east of the staked proposed tower location. (The balloon was not anchored at the staked location due to restrictive tree canopy). The balloon remained in the air until approximately 2:00pm, when the tether became entangled in surrounding trees due to wind gusts. A second balloon was raised during the Siting Council field review and that balloon popped immediately. At 2:45pm, a third balloon was raised, which popped in the trees at 2:58pm. A fourth balloon was raised at 3:13pm, which popped in the trees at 3:37pm. A fifth balloon was raised at 3:44pm, which popped at 4:02pm. At that point, the balloon float was concluded due to wind conditions. Throughout the course of the balloon float, temperatures ranged from approximately 24 to 45 degrees Fahrenheit. Winds were generally out of the west-southwest, ranging from 5 to 10 mph during the morning. During the afternoon, the winds became gusty and were generally out of the west-northwest between 10 and 20 mph.*

In addition, please respond to the following questions:

- Q16. When was a wetland delineation of the host property performed?
- A16. *A wetland delineation of the lease area was performed on August 5, 2010. The wetlands delineation of the new access drive was performed on January 21, 2012.*
- Q17. Why were no numbered wetland flags in place during the January 10, 2012 field review?
- A17. *The numbered wetland flags were in place for the November 29, 2011 noticed balloon float and remained in place for the January 10, 2012 field review. As shown in the video of the site walk, the flagging numbers were faded but legible.*
- Q18. Please provide the names and qualifications of the individuals that performed the wetland delineation.
- A18. *Mark Kiburz, PWS CPESC of Infinigy Engineering performed all wetlands delineations. His resume is provided in Attachment 7 and was included with the Applicants' Hearing Information.*
- Q19. Was the wetland delineation performed in accordance with both Connecticut and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers accepted methodologies?
- A19. *Initially, both the Connecticut and Army Corp of Engineers (ACOE) accepted methodologies were used. The new access drive is located within previously disturbed agricultural land. Therefore, the appropriate ACOE method was used for this area: the ACOE Interim Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Northcentral and Northeast*

*Region and 1987 Wetland Delineation Methodology for atypical situations. Please see the Inland Wetlands Delineation Report in Attachment 2 for more details.*

- Q20. Do any intermittent watercourses exist on host property?
- A20. *A field review was conducted for the lease area and new access drive as well areas approximately 20 feet beyond the lease area and access drive. An intermittent watercourse is located within the lease area and new access drive area as shown in the drawings included in Attachment 2.*
- Q21. Were soil maps, vegetation surveys, or hydrology investigations generated to perform the wetland delineations? If so, could they be provided?
- A21. *Soil maps, USGS topographic maps and on-site ACOE wetland data forms were used to investigate upland and wetland areas. Please see the Inland Wetlands Delineation Report in Attachment 2 for more information and copies of the maps and data sources utilized.*
- Q22. Was any wildlife habitat, wetland functions and values analysis or wetland impact assessments performed at the site?
- A22. *Please see the Inland Wetlands Delineation Report in Attachment 2 for the wetlands assessment.*
- Q23. What type and quality of aquatic resources does the watercourse associated with the wetland at the site sustain?
- A23. *The aquatic resources such as wildlife habitat, surface and groundwater protection, erosion control, flood storage, nutrient cycle and aesthetics are present. The aquatic resource quality within the lease area is considered to be moderate since there are no recent agricultural disturbances. The water quality of the property on which the new access drive will be located will be enhanced upon the installation of culverts to access the property. Please see the Inland Wetlands Delineation Report in Attachment 2 for more information.*
- Q24. Are any vernal pools or amphibian breeding areas located within the wetland corridor at the site?
- A24. *Vernal pools were not observed within the lease area or new access drive area. The wetlands may provide amphibian breeding areas. Please see the Inland Wetlands Delineation Report in Attachment 2 for more information.*
- Q25. What is the square footage of inland wetland and watercourses that will be impacted temporarily or permanently by the proposed access road crossing?
- A25. *The new access drive will disturb approximately 2,500 square feet of wetland and watercourse area. It should be noted that this area of disturbance is approximately half of the area of disturbance anticipated with the original access drive.*
- Q26. What construction activities would occur within the inland wetland and watercourses at the site?
- A26. *The construction activities include the installation of an elliptical culvert and roadway base. Please see the Inland Wetlands Delineation Report included in Attachment 2 and the drawings included in Attachment 6 for more details.*
- Q27. Would there be any seasonal restrictions on construction activities associated with construction of the proposed project?
- A27. *It is anticipated that no seasonal restrictions on construction activities will be required.*

- Q28. Would there be any significant long term adverse impacts to the inland wetland and watercourses at the site?
- A28. *No. The proposed installation of a culvert at grade does not pose any long term adverse impact to inland wetlands or watercourses on the site.*
- Q29. What is the total acreage of new land disturbance (including temporary and permanent) that would be required for the construction of the access road and compound?
- A29. *The total approximate acreage of disturbance for the access drive and compound is 2.12 acres.*
- Q30. Would installing utilities underground to the proposed site increase or decrease land disturbance at the site?
- A39. *Installing utilities underground should not result in any significant additional land disturbance as the underground utilities will be routed within the cleared access drive right-of-way.*
- Q31. The site plans in the application show runoff from the access road would be directed to stone berm level spreaders. Would runoff be directed to swales along the road prior to being discharged at the level spreaders? If so, please show locations and channel lining on appropriate plan sheets. Would the swale design conform to the details on page Z9 of the current plans? Would the swales impact any historic stone walls?
- A31. *The stormwater design concept for the replacement access drive is the same as the design for the former access drive. The design includes roadside swales to direct water to the stone berm level spreaders. The swale design will be stone-lined only in those areas where the slope exceeds 10%. In other areas, the velocity of the runoff can be appropriately handled by the grass lined swales without concern for erosion.*
- Q32. Would the proposed compound, access road and associated stormwater management features alter local drainage patterns? Would peak runoff rates increase at design storm flows at the property line?
- A32. *Local drainage patterns will not be altered by the construction and installation of the proposed facility. In every instance along the access drive where an existing natural drainage ditch exists, a culvert was added to ensure drainage patterns remain the same. The stormwater management plan will ensure that pre and post runoff rates remain the same. Please see the drawings included in Attachment 6 for more details.*
- Q33. Would emergency vehicles be able to traverse the proposed access road?
- A33. *The replacement access drive is designed to adequately accommodate emergency access in terms of turn radii and road slope.*
- Q34. Please provide a Viewshed Analysis map showing year-round and seasons visibility areas for both a 150-foot tower and a 110-foot tower at the proposed site. Please estimate the number of acres within the 2-mile study area from which the proposed 150-foot and 110-foot tower would be visible year-round and seasonally.
- A34. *Included in Attachment 8 is a Viewshed Analysis map that depicts visibility areas for both a 150' tall and 110' tall facility.*
- The estimated acreage within the 2-mile study area from which the proposed 150-foot tower is anticipated to be visible during leaf-on conditions is 134 acres, based on predictive computer*

mapping. More than half of that area lies over open water of Lake Bungee and Witches Woods Lake. Based on the predictive mapping in conjunction with field observations during the 12/02/11 balloon float, it is estimated that the proposed 150-foot tower would be visible from approximately 139 acres within the 2-mile study area during leaf-off conditions. Additional areas of anticipated obstructed visibility through the trees during leaf-off conditions include limited sections along the following roads: Indian Spring Road (along the east side of Witches Woods Lake); Shaw Road (in the vicinity of 15 Shaw Road); Route 171 (south of the intersection with Route 198); Route 198 (between Route 171 and Shaw Road); and Barber Road (just southeast of 15 Barber Road).

The estimated acreage within the 2-mile study area from which a 110-foot tower is anticipated to be visible during leaf-on conditions is 92 acres, based on predictive computer mapping. More than half of that area lies over open water of Lake Bungee and Witches Woods Lake. Based on the predictive mapping in conjunction with field observations, it is estimated that a proposed 110-foot tower would be visible from approximately 95 acres within the 2-mile study area during leaf-off conditions. Additional areas of anticipated obstructed visibility through the trees during leaf-off conditions include the areas noted above, though visibility from some locations in these areas would be eliminated altogether.

Q35. Would the proposed tower, at 110 feet and 150 feet, visually affect any important cultural and environmental resources located within the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor?

A35. Based on review of available resources, the proposed project is not expected to result in any significant visual impacts to important cultural or environmental resources within the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor. A National Scenic Byway (CT Route 169) runs north-south and is approximately 6.35 miles to the east of the proposed tower, well beyond any areas of visibility. A State Scenic Byway specifically identified within the Corridor is CT Route 49, which ends near Plainfield, CT, approximately 21.2 miles to the southeast of the proposed tower. The nearest state park, Bigelow Hollow State Park, is approximately 4 miles to the north-northwest of the proposed tower, beyond any areas of visibility. The nearest bodies of water are Witches Woods Lake and Upper Bungee Lake. The proposed tower would be visible from certain areas of both lakes, however, the anticipated visibility from these bodies of water will be limited.

Q36. From how many photograph locations provided in the supplemental visibility analysis that show at 150-foot tower visible at the proposed site, would a 110-foot tower not be visible. Please provide a list with the photograph location numbers and addresses.

A36. For a monopole design, a 110-foot tower will not be visible from eleven (11) locations provided in the supplementary visibility analysis where a 150-foot tower is anticipated to be visible. These eleven locations include:

PH-1 - East Side of Route 171

PH-2 – Adjacent to the driveway entrance at 15 Shaw Road)

PH-3 – From the driveway at 3 Shaw Road

PH-6 - In front of 15 Shaw Road

PH-11- South side of Barber Road

PH-15 - Route 198, between intersections of Route 171 and Shaw Road

PH-20 - Boat launch at northern end of Witches Woods Lake

PH-25 - Crooked Trail Extension  
 PH-26 - 91 Indian Spring Road  
 PH-27- Indian Spring Road  
 PH-28- Route 171

For a monopine design, a 110-foot tower will not be visible from six (6) locations provided in the supplementary visibility analysis where a 150-foot tower is anticipated to be visible. These six locations include:

PH-6 - In front of 15 Shaw Road  
 PH-15 - Route 198, between intersections of Route 171 and Shaw Road  
 PH-20 - Boat launch at northern end of Witches Woods Lake  
 PH-25 - Crooked Trail Extension  
 PH-26 - 91 Indian Spring Road  
 PH-27- Indian Spring Road

Photosimulations depicting 110' and 150' monopole designed facilities and 110' and 150' monopine designed facilities are included in Attachment 5 along with tables detailing the difference in visibility between a 110-foot tower and a 150-foot tower for both a monopole facility and a monopine facility.

Please note that there is an approximately 5-foot height difference between a monopole design and a monopine design due to the approximately 5-foot cap required for monopine facilities.

Q37. Please confirm which sites listed in the Existing Tower List behind Tab 2 of the application AT&T is currently located on. What is the height of AT&T's antennas at each of these sites?

A37. Please see the table below.

No	OWNER/OPERATOR	TOWER/CELL SITE LOCATION	HEIGHT	SOURCE	COORDINATES	DISTANCE (MI)	AT&T Centerline
1	Tele-Media	Perrin Rd Woodstock	75'	CSC Database	Lat 41.94588 Long -72.04396	2.00	Not on tower
2	Verizon (AT&T CT1043)	40 Sherman Rd Woodstock	140'	Verizon (ATT)	Lat 41.97863 Long -72.09441	2.78	127'
3	Sprint Nextel	71 Ashford Rd Eastford	180'	ATT	Lat 41.90458 Long -72.12379	3.17	Not on tower
4	MCF (AT&T CT1246)	215 Coatney Hill Rd, Woodstock	190'	ATT	Lat 41.96203 Long -72.01805	3.64	150'
5	SBA (AT&T CT5702)	229-231 Ashford Center Rd, Ashford	180'	SBA #CT 13611-A	Lat 41.880444 Long -72 128499	4.71	167'
6	Cordless Data Transfer (AT&T CT1262)	38 Old Route 44, Eastford	150'	ATT	Lat 41.87119 Long -71.06477	4.78	150'



No	OWNER/OPERATOR	TOWER/CELL SITE LOCATION	HEIGHT	SOURCE	COORDINATES	DISTANCE (MI)	AT&T Centerline
7	American Tower	87 West Quassett Road, Woodstock	150'	AmTower #272711	Lat 41.92877 Long -71.98702	4.87	Not on tower
8	Verizon Wireless	87 West Quassett Road, Woodstock (Docket #415)	150'	CSC Database	Lat 41.92973 Long -71.98931	4.90	Not on tower
9	TowerCo	97 Chaplin Road, Eastford	150'	TowerCo #CT2022	Lat 41.8644 Long -72.0962	5.08	Not on tower

- Q38. What is the threshold at which the Applicant would need an air permit from DEEP for the operation of the proposed backup generator? Why would the proposed generator not require an air permit? Would this be in accordance with the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies §22a-174-3?
- A38. *Please see the February 6, 2012 letter prepared by Infinigy Engineering & Surveying included in Attachment 4, which provides an explanation of the reasons that the proposed backup generator complies with Section 22a-174-42 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies and is exempt from the new source review general permitting requirements. This exemption is in accordance with Section 22a-174-3a(2)(B)(iv) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies which sets forth an exemption from permitting for stationary sources that comply with Section 22a-174-42.*
- Q39. Does AT&T have statistics about the existing dropped call rate in the area for which coverage would be provided by the proposed site? What dropped call rate would trigger the need for an establishment of a new facility?
- A39. *The overall dropped call rate in this area is 0.83%, but these statistics often don't tell the whole story. It should be noted that dropped call data may not be a reliable indicator of an inadequate network for various reasons:*
- Many users become familiar with areas of poor coverage or no service and stop making calls in these areas;*
  - Since mobile communication is a two-way connection, if a cell site cannot hear a mobile unit, it will not register as a failure if that link is problematic; and*
  - Dropped calls are a partial indicator of quality - sometimes you can hold a call but the person on the other end cannot hear you.*

*The type of spotty and unreliable coverage currently in this area is not acceptable for users of the AT&T network. Overall, reliable coverage relates directly to the customer experience and AT&T customers are highly mobile, making calls from their vehicles, their places of business and their homes. In addition, many customers are now substituting cell phones for their landline phone service as their only means of voice communications. To properly serve these customers, the service must be reliable, particularly since the service carries 911 calls.*

A40. What is the length of the existing coverage gaps along the main roads in the project area assuming that AT&T antennas are located on all facilities for which it has approval?

A40. *The length of the existing coverage gaps along the main roads within the area where service is needed is provided in the table below:*

<b>Main Road Gaps in miles</b>	
<b>Street Name</b>	<b>Gap</b>
Route 198	1.96
Route 171	1.94
Eastford Rd	1.09
Boston Tpke	1.03
State Hwy 197	0.24
<b>Total</b>	<b>6.26</b>

Q41. What is the coverage footprint in square miles the proposed site would provide at 147 feet at each frequency AT&T would use in the area of the proposed site? At 107 feet?

A41. *The coverage footprint in square miles for the proposed site at 147' and 107' for each of AT&T's frequencies is shown in the tables below. The columns labeled "Area Lost" and "% Area Lost" include the difference between 147' and 107'.*

**PCS**

Signal Level	147 feet AGL (mi2)	107 feet AGL (mi2)	Area Lost (mi2)	% Area Lost
In-Building	7.52	6.37	1.15	15.2%
In-Vehicle	9.70	8.58	1.12	11.5%

**Cellular**

Signal Level	147 feet AGL (mi2)	107 feet AGL (mi2)	Area Lost (mi2)	% Area Lost
In-Building	5.90	2.95	2.95	50.0%
In-Vehicle	6.04	3.82	2.22	36.8%

**700 MHz**

Signal Level	SR2067 @ 147 feet AGL (mi2)	SR2067 @ 107 feet AGL (mi2)	Area Lost (mi2)	% Area Lost
In-Building	7.11	3.36	3.75	52.7%
In-Vehicle	5.58	3.34	2.24	40.1%

- Q42. Please provide a radiofrequency propagation map showing potential coverage from the proposed site at a height of 100 feet above ground level using the same parameters as shown in the application.
- A42. *Included in Attachment 1 is a propagation plot labeled Existing Coverage and Proposed at 97' AGL that shows coverage from a 100' tall facility, or antenna centerline mounting height of 97' AGL. A comparison of the plot at AT&T's minimum antenna centerline mounting height of 107' AGL (also provided in Attachment 1) and the plot at an antenna centerline mounting height of 97' AGL, shows that at 97' AGL a coverage gap opens up on Route 198 southeast of the proposed site.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this day, an original and copies of the foregoing were sent by electronic mail and overnight mail to the Connecticut Siting Council.

Dated: February 22, 2012

  
Lucia Chiochio

cc: Allan D. Walker, First Selectman, Town of Woodstock  
Mr. Jeffrey A. Gordon, M.D., Chairman, Town of Woodstock Telecommunications Task Force  
John Stevens, North Atlantic Towers, LLC  
Michele Briggs, AT&T  
Randy Howse, North Atlantic Towers  
John Favreau, Infinigy Engineering  
John-Marcus Pinard, Centerline Communications  
Scott Pollister, C Squared