

Mulcahy, Carriann

From: Mark Reinders <markreinders980@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2015 4:05 PM
To: Bachman, Melanie; Cunliffe, Fred; Fontaine, Lisa; Mathews, Lisa A; Mercier, Robert; Mulcahy, Carriann; Perrone, Michael; Walsh, Christina
Subject: Docket 458 - Codfish Hill Road in Bethel, CT is the Wrong Place for a Cell Tower

Dear Members of the CSC:

I am writing about the proposed cell tower on 62-64 Codfish Hill Road, Bethel, CT – Docket #458.

North Atlantic Towers' proposed tower is not designed to benefit voice or data connections in the immediate area, and will compromise the beauty of our rural town, expose our children to unnecessary radiation, and decrease our home prices. This is completely unacceptable to me.

The proposal is for a site in the middle of a rural, family neighborhood. Placing a cell tower and equipment in this area will drastically change the skyline, pose a public safety hazard, and be a local disturbance to the nearby single-family homes, some of which are historic and/or surrounded by wetlands.

A 150-170 foot tower on Codfish Hill will be visible throughout our community. This tower will be blight on our town. Importantly and interestingly, we who live out here do NOT have a record of dropped calls or poor service. AT&T's own current coverage map shows us having solid service throughout the area. During the two prolonged storm related power outage weeks in the last three years the ONLY reliable source of communication was our cell phones. I consider it appalling that we are just TOLD we need the tower instead of hearing anyone ask us, even once, whether we need or want it. This is not about us needing or wanting the tower and service-it is entirely about North Atlantic and all its future tenants wanting more money regardless of the immense damage it does to all of us. In the case of AT&T who realize, worldwide, approximately 45 million dollars a day profit, how much is enough? Seriously. How much more do they need? Do you, the members of the council, ever genuinely STOP and ask yourselves whether or not it is fair to simply assume that they are right and entitled and it is incumbent upon us to work to demonstrate what we already know-that we do not need or want this thing? Why are we placed in a similar position of someone being presumed guilty and having to work to prove their innocence?

The tower emits radiation. While I understand there are safety regulations governing towers, there have been few long-term studies and there is a widespread lack of confidence that close proximity to cell towers is "safe." Any additional radiation in my neighborhood, near my children, and near our schools, is unacceptable. I am also aware that the CSC process prohibits discussing health concerns during the hearings. I do wish to mention that the standards that the telecommunications giants hide behind date back to 1996-a time when the industry was in its infancy and the mobile phones more closely resembled shoe boxes. This is comparable to how people originally were in the dark about asbestos, cigarettes, etc. only to tragically learn the error of their ways many years later. Trying to gag people is not the same as making the problem go away.

This unsightly tower and the radiation it emits will have a direct impact on the property values of those who live in the neighborhood. This is not a small consideration, since there are people here whose homes constitute their greatest asset, one gained from many years of hard work and frugal living. Our homes have already lost value from the recession, and no one can say that building this ugly and potentially dangerous cell tower in our neighborhood will not depreciate our property even further.

Because AT&T has changed its role in this to that of an intervenor, North Atlantic is, in reality, seeking to construct a "spec" tower as it were in much the same fashion that a builder builds a house hoping to attract a buyer. North Atlantic

is building this monstrosity in the hopes of attracting multiple carriers. It is an INVESTMENT-NOT A GENUINE NEED.
PLEASE, PLEASE stop to consider this.

To approve North Atlantic Towers' proposal for a cell tower at 62-64 Codfish Hill Road is unconscionable when there are other locations where a cell tower would neither affect property values nor present health risks. Another site should be found.

Sincerely,

Mark Reinders
86 Codfish Hill Rd.
Bethel, CT 06801

Sent from my iPad