

Steven J. Leinwand, Chm.; Stephen T. Gionfriddo, Vice-Chm.; Cos Giuffrida, COMMISSION
Sec'y, Seb J. Passanesi, Rose Sbalcio, Alternates: Paul H. Bixby, George MEMBERS
L. Augustine PRESENT

Mayor Michael J. Cubeta, Jr., Ex-Officio, Louis A. Carta, Emanuel A. ABSENT
Pattavina, Alternates: Sebastian J. Garafalo, Vincent J. Loffredo MEMBERS
Comm. Sbalcio left at 7:25 P.M. and returned at 9:15 P.M.

Alternate Paul H. Bixby acted for absent Comm. Carta; Alternate George ACTING MEMBERS
L. Augustine acted for absent Comm. Pattavina

George A. Reif, Director, Althea Rinaldi, Recorder, Hope Kasper, tran- STAFF
scriber

Phillip G. Bauer, Engr., Public Works Dept.; Robert Frank, Building OTHERS
Division; Lucas Held, reporter, Middletown Press; WCNX; also 45
members of the audience.

COMM. LEINWAND

I would like to call the March 24, 1982, Regular Meeting of the Planning and
Zoning Commission to order. We begin with Public Hearing continuation of the
the hearing of March 10th. If the Secretary would please read the hearing
notice.

SECRETARY GIUFFRIDA

Proposed Special Exception to construct a television tower 499 ft. high, PROPOSED S.E.
and an accessory building located on the easterly side of Bartholomew Rd. T.V. TOWER
near the southern municipal boundary. Applicant/Agent, Irwin J. Hausman, BARTHOLOMEW
Atty., representing Television Corporation of Hartford. RD. TELEVISIO
CORP. OF
HARTFORD

COMM. LEINWAND

Mr. Hausman, let me just note that Comm. Bixby is sitting for Comm. Carta, Comm.
Augustine is sitting in for Comm. Pattavina which gives us a full contingent of
7 Commissioners. Mr. Hausman.

IRWIN HAUSMAN

Mr. Chairman, Irwin Hausman, representing the applicant. We have with us this
evening 3 people to present some additional evidence that was not fully answered
in the last session of this meeting. We'll attempt to avoid any duplication of
testimony from the last meeting and allow you to adjourn at a reasonable hour. So
without any further introductory comments, Mr. Seman, the director of engineering,
for the Television Corp. will speak first.

JAMES SEMAN

We have a small slide presentation to present. One of the things that was very
obvious to me on the Public comments on the 10th was the fact that we failed
adequately to illustrate precisely what we intend to do with tower. I think this
slide presentation may help that. First of all, I want to point out, that try to
find a television tower that is only 500 ft. in height is a little hard to do. This
particular tower is located in Richmond, Virginia, and it is 790 ft. tall. However,
the FAA requires that you paint towers with alternating strips. The ...orange has
become more evident in some of the shots, so it is easy to mark off where 500 ft.
is going to be on this tower. This shot was taken at 200 ft. from the base of the
tower. Later on I was to try to establish at what point details such as this little
platform with a dish on it, and there's also a dish on the other side of the tower
here. These details become....they cannot be distinguished from the face of the
tower once you more than about 300 to 500 ft. away. Let's see. This point is 500 ft.

JAMES SEMAN (Continued from Page 1)

from the base of the tower, and I am 20 ft. away from a tree. The camera is about 20 feet away from a 20 ft. tree. The tower is right here. You can see the top of the tower is orange and it has a white span and other orange span. Each one of these spans is a 100 ft. So this tower is 790 ft., with approximately 700 here, 600 here, and 500 here. I will try to bring out in most of these slides is that the trees and vegetation that would generally be found, not a specific tree will usually block the view of the tower. In this next slide is out at a 1,000 ft., and I have a 40 ft. tree which is about 60 ft. away. This was the 40 ft. tree (inaudible) about 60 ft. away. You can see this particular tower; however this is the 700 ft. point, 600 ft. point will be somewhere in here. If there is any questions about details on these.....Please should I, Mr. Chairman....

CHM. LEINWAND

No, please. We'll take questions through the chair later after your presentation.

JAMES SEMAN

I have gone out 1,500 ft. here. I shot this with a telephone pole on one side and (inaudible). Once again a 500 ft. tower would be about this height. Now, I have gone out 2,000 ft. This is a rather unobstructed view at 2,000 ft., and once again you can see the painted strips, counting down, a 500 ft. tower would be about here. Now, certainly we have lost all track of detail on what's on the tower. The platform that they have off to the side supported a microwave dish, and I believe it is right here. I'm just picking out a dark spot on the tower. This is going out 2,500 ft. The tower is coming up right though here. The top of it here, and counting off 3 strips, would put a 500 ft. tower about right here. This is 3,000 ft. and the tower can be seen right next to the pole. Counting off 3 strips would be a 500 ft. tower right here. Now, I'm going out to 3,500 ft. and I have two successive shots of this. A 500 ft. tower would be (inaudible) My duplication on this (inaudible). This is 4,000 ft. and the tower can be seen.. This is a straight shot down the road, and the tower can be seen in its full length. There are 9 strips on the whole length, and (inaudible). You get out at this point and you have to physically look for where the tower is. It doesn't necessarily jump out at you. This is 4,500 ft. and the tower is visible right here. The last shot is one mile, and this is the top of the tower right here. Now this was designed to give an idea what the tower looks like every 500 ft. out to a mile. And it is my contention that it isn't going to jump out at you at all. The rest of the shots deal with what a tower looks like when other antennas are put on it. Going down the road between the first set of towers and the second set of towers I notice a good example of what a self supporting tower with a wide base on it with a large microwave dishes is opposed to a self supporting tower, excuse me, a guide tower, out here to the right. This is a radio tower here. Now, on the outskirts of Richmond is a little larger tower that supports 3 television antennas. Two up here and one down the side. This tower is twice the height of what we purpose and supports 3 times the television antenna. Our type will be somewhere in this vicinity. What I want to bring out next to this tower is a 575 ft. tower, right here, which is loaded down with (inaudible) communications equipment. This tower has been here for about 20 years. This tower is very new and they have moved their television antennas up to a greater height. This tower has 36 different communication services on it. Two-way radios, microwave (inaudible), and whatnot on it. To get an idea what this tower looks like, from various different aspects, I have some close up shots to show the detail (inaudible). This is a closer view, you can start to see some of the dark spots up at the top which will be shown in later shots that are the actual antennas themselves. Another view. That's a duplication. That's the same shot. This is my second view. You can get an idea of the fact that this tower is

JAMES SEMAN (Continued from Page 2)

about half the height of the taller tower. This is about 1,500 ft. away from the 1,000 ft. tower. These towers are very close to one another. I would say they are no more than a 100 ft. apart. Now here is a close up of that 575 ft. tower. You can start to see some of the detail of the two-way antenna. Here is one right here. These things look very much like a whip you might see, a C.B. whip you might have on the back of your car. Here's a small (inaudible). Here's a shot of the back side of the tower, and it shows the microwave dish, the type we use. The point I want to make here is the size of the dish is about the same diameter as the face of the tower. There is another small dish down here at the bottom. We'll locate our dish about half way up the tower. I would assume that if the future low power television would come on our tower, they would locate theirs in about the same way. There is also another couple of dishes here on a taller tower. (inaudible) Here you start to pick out more of the small communications antennas. I'm trying to count them up, but I couldn't. There is two right up here. (inaudible) This last shot tries to point out that this thing is really loaded down. There are....This is where I got my count from. There are 36 transmission lines going up the tower. This is a much better shot of the microwave dish. Are there any questions on any of these slides or.....

The next point I wanted to address was the concern about the microwave radiation hazards, due to the tower. I submitted an engineering statement that goes into some detail about the mathematics and the physics involved on what levels would be in the general area. Essentially the OSHA, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration has established a level of ten microwatts per sq. centimeter as a safe level for intermittent exposure, and one microwatt for continuous exposure. In my paper I noted that were the top of the tower to be bent at 90 degrees so that our main beam pointed down at the ground, the microwave intensity from our television station would be less than that of standard adopted for continuous exposure. But in fact we tried to give the same signal strength along the ground at the base of our tower as we do 20 or 30 miles out and the actual intensity that would be experienced at the property line is I believe is 1 and five hundredth thousandths of that is established as a safe level. My conclusion in the statement was, there is no hazard whatsoever from the television operation. I believe the discussion that brought this up two weeks ago had to do with the microwave dishes, and their power is 1 watt as opposed to 500,000 kilowatts that we use with the television station. I've worked for some 25 years with rf and high powered radars both in the military and the civilian communities and I've worked with radiation and radiation safety all that time and I state with much certainty backed up by the evidence that I have submitted that there is absolutely no rf radiation hazard. One of the by products from this engineering statement is it points out that there are very low levels of signal around the tower itself, and this is precisely why there would be no interference to other communication services, or reception of other television stations.

CHM. LEINWAND

I don't understand that.

JAMES SEMAN

O.k.

CHM. LEINWAND

Why would there not be interference?

JAMES SEMAN

Because the signal intensity at say the property line is no greater than that at 20 miles. That's how I designed the antenna. It would be a waste of the signal I

JAMES SEMAN (Continued from Page 3)

generate to do otherwise. I need more signal to cover Hartford and New Haven, not Middletown. I think I concluded in the engineering statement that there was something like a 160 watts directed at the immediate vicinity. Answer your question?

CHM. LEINWAND

Yes.

JAMES SEMAN

Any other questions regarding the radiation aspect? There was some comment about the structural safety of the tower. I have here an excerpt which is the E.I.A. standard for towers. This is the wind velocity and corresponding wind pressure on towers. Now towers are rated by how much pressure they can withstand per square foot. The specification for the tower that we intend to build is 50 pounds per sq. ft. on the tower. In other words, throughout its length it could withstand the pressure of 50 pounds. I have highlighted the line that shows on the third line from the left that a 50 pound wind pressure will be caused by an actual wind velocity of 111.8 or 112 miles an hour. Now this is the velocity that the tower is designed to withstand with no damage whatsoever, such as twisting it, or tearing an antenna off, or what have you. The estimated survival velocity is over to the right is 144 miles per hour. Dave Mylchreest will address later that the highest wind velocity ever experienced in history of Middletown was just in excess of a hundred miles an hour. So never in history has this site experienced enough wind to damage the tower, let alone bring it down. I also might point out that if some adverse circumstance were to cause it to fall, its going to fall on our property, and should create no hazard to any residents. There was a question made about disturbing the environment on the 26 acres which we are purchasing from Mr. Salonia. I estimate that the road into the site which was shown on the plat. This road for its entire length and I estimated that all those roads designed would be about 30 foot wide, and wind up having to be cleared to about 50, plus having to clear out the guide paths, plus a little room for the tower. It would equate to about 10 percent of the total acreage. And I submit that is very little disturbance for developing property. In the package of exhibits that came with the engineering statement, there were some details on the FAA and FCC requirements for lighting the tower. Essentially it is suppose to be lit at its 1/4 points, at 125 ft., 250 ft., 500 ft. (you're right-in a minute) (multiple speakers) 375, and 500. And these on the 250 ft. point and the top are beacons which flash on and off and at the intermediate points they're study lights and I believe those were 60 watt, 60 watt bulbs at the intermediate points. They are visible but I think there are plenty of examples in the immediate vicinity on what red lights on structures look like. Are there any questions that I might expand on before I ask Mr. Mylchreest to address the tower height in relation to others in the area, plus a gentlemen who will address the impact on real estate values.

CHM. LEINWAND

Paul

COMM. BIXBY

Excuse me. The road...bituminous concrete or gravel.

JAMES SEMAN

Gravel

COMM. BIXBY

You did say they were going to have a gate across the top of it.

JAMES SEMAN

Yes sir.

DAVID MYLCHREEST

I'm David Mylchreest, consulting engineer, of Laurel Grove Rd. in Middletown. If I could distribute on either side a copy of a letter dated March 22, from my office concerning the two points that I will be discussing. One had to do with the relative height of this tower as opposed to the AT&T's tower which is located some half mile away. The actual difference in the top of the towers as indicated there is 87 ft. And although the AT&T tower is under 400 ft. in height, the elevation of the ground where it is located is higher than where this proposed tower is going to be. The second point that letter addresses concerns the wind velocity that has been experienced in Conn. since the keeping of records. The source of this information is "Climate of Connecticut" published by the State of Conn. dated 1965 and is considered in my opinion and I think by most people that this is the authority within the State. I have given the page number there and it refers to the wind velocities that could be expected in the State, ranging from the northwest corner of the State to the southeast corner of the State, and that ranges from 80 to 90 mph. It also makes reference to the fact that in the so called "Great Atlantic Hurricane of 1944", the highest recorded velocity within the State was a gust of 109 mph recorded at the Hartford Weather Bureau at the old (inaudible). Any questions? I can proceed from there. That's the end of my testimony.

EUGENE DEPROTO

Gene DeProto. I'm a Real Estate Broker associated with Coughlin & Coughlin here in Middletown. As was indicated my segment here was to talk a little bit about the impact on the real estate values that tower could possibly have if any. I have a copy of a report that we did. The first thing that I did was to take a general inspection of the Assessor's records of Middletown, and those records show that the majority of the area that we are talking about was developed after the construction of the now existing AT&T tower. I thought that point demonstrated that the tower did not have any noticeable impact on the desirability of the area. The Bartholomew Rd. area is well developed and the majority of the houses being in the upper price range. The second thing I did was to take...go out and inspect the neighborhood, the neighborhood that we are talking about, and also other neighborhoods surrounding this site and similar sites. It was noted that its...the density of the woods is quite...the area is heavily wooded and the....So what I did was take a...other locations, other sites where antennae are, or other towers and the fact is that when you get closer to these towers, the closer you get to them, the less visible they become because of the density of the woods. In that the farther away you get from the tower, the more visible it becomes, but the impact is alot less on you psychologically because you're not anywhere near it and you rarely see it. Back to the Assessor's records, I tried to ...We took the sales data accumulated from the Bartholomew Rd. area and compared it with sales data accumulated from similar areas but outside of the tower area, and these compared quite favorably. This would indicate that the vacant lot sales and improved lot sales started at a point 15 years ago, as far back as I went, and up to present time pretty much paralleled in both instances....were parallel. That the appreciation of property was the same, in either case. That would indicate that the tower, the existence of the tower had little impact on the market values of those areas. After reviewing all the data that I accumulated I came to the conclusion that the construction of that tower would not impair or prove detrimental to the area now or in the future. in the development or market values in anyway.

CHM. LEINWAND

Are you saying if you were to do an appraisal of one of those houses on Bartholomew Rd. that can clearly see that tower, in other words, not one of the abutting land owners, but perhaps up the road a little bit, that in no way shape or form would you take or have to take that towers presents into the appraisal for that house?

EUGENE DEPROTO

Not from the information that I have. I will repeat what I said. The closer that you get to it....

CHM. LEINWAND

That's why I went up Bartholomew Rd. a ways.

EUGENE DEPROTO

The farther away you get, I think the slides demonstrated how it disappears where you really....You would have to look up and actually look for the tower in order to locate it.

CHM. LEINWAND

In the day.

EUGENE DEPROTO

The records would indicate that there was no discounting of values in that area. Any other questions? Just as a side point, I didn't introduce it in the letter but that is a rural area out there and one of the benefits is the fact that you have a 26 acre parcel that will remain as woodland. I didn't put that in the report because it would not have been substantiated by other sites similar to that, but it would seem that 26 acres of woodland in ... would be a benefit to the immediate property owners anyway.

CHM. LEINWAND

Thank you.

IRWIN HAUSMAN

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, that's all the new evidence that we have and if you just give me one moment to summarize what I think we have established or pointed out to this Commission last time and this time. We have shown and we have described the nature of the programming and the nature of the television operation that would be available in Middletown and the surrounding area. We have described in some detail the nature of the tower and its relationship to its immediate environment. We have had testimony as to the safety aspects of the tower both from the radiation point of view, from a tower strength point of view, and as we pointed out last time, the tower itself will be surrounded by a fence so that even intruders are protected we hope from any danger. We also pointed out at the last meeting that there would be a fence constructed so that at least to the extend possible, there would not be trespassers who will go along that road with motorcycles or whatever else. I'd like to point out that the use to which this property is to be put if we are given this special exception is a permitted use with a special exception. It's not something that is based upon hardship or any other reasons such as that. It is specifically a permitted use given the fact the health, safety, environment, and property values are protected. I think the evidence has shown that will be the case. As far as the projections on the tower for other two-way radio receivers or other television stations, or radio stations, we're aware of the fact that Channel 6 would like to come onto this tower. We're amenable to Channel 6 coming onto this tower. As far as any other television stations, I don't think there are any, but certainly we are not....we're really not

IRWIN HAUSMAN (Continued from Page 6)

available if this Commission would like to impose that restriction to any other television stations. As a service to the community we approach this from the point of view that one tower can accommodate other uses so that the community can have the two-way types of communications, businesses, and conveniences. If this Commission would take the position that they would not want that, that's fine with the Television Corp. of Hartford. We think it is a benefit not a detriment and that's what we thought those pictures could show that really you don't see those things, but the only thing we know about right now and would be available to, if this Commission would permit it, is the low-power station for Middletown. We would be happy to answer any other questions if they arise in the course of this meeting. Thank you.

CHM. LEINWAND

Before we go to the Public, are there questions from any Commissioners?

COMM. AUGUSTINE

I have a question.

CHM. LEINWAND

George.

COMM. AUGUSTINE

You said that your dish would be 250 ft. off from the ground, from the antenna, yet you propose a 499 ft. antenna. What are you going to do with the other 250 ft.?

JAMES SEMAN

The antenna that would broadcast to the Public on would be at the top of the tower. The dish that we are talking about locating approximately midway up the tower would receive the programming. This is an unmanned site which is simply... basically used to relay or programming from a private microwave loop from our studio. We have not located that site yet. And broadcast it up.

CHM. LEINWAND

Comm. Passanesi

COMM. PASSANESI

In addition to the provisions that you said that you were going to provide (inaudible) Do you have any other covenants, or deeds, or restrictions in the deeds, your purchase of them based on purchase price?

IRWIN HAUSMAN

I don't think so. No. I'm not sure I fully understand the question.

COMM. PASSANESI

Suppose you purchase the site and two years passes and you don't build a tower. What will happen with the land?

IRWIN HAUSMAN

It will remain vacant. Just as it is now. I.....

COMM. PASSANESI

Do you have other restrictions in the deeds, or the deed, other than what you mentioned?

JAMES SEMAN

The only restrictions in the agreement that we have or that we obtain all local and federal permits, and the only one that I'm aware of that we have not received is from the Commission.

IRWIN HAUSMAN

Does the FCC impose a requirement of timing on you?

JAMES SEMAN

Yes, they do. The construction permit is normally timed for 6 months. It is not unusual to ask for extensions for that, but no the Commission will not let you....they make you prove that your capable and have the financial wherewithal to build it and they want you to get on with it.

CHM. LEINWAND

O.k. Mr. Hausman I think there are some things that may be necessary evils. I mean we all want television, we all need electricity. This City stands to gain some \$250,000, because wethe settlement is going to let Helco put wires across the river. Have you given any thought to whether there's some kind of arrangement that might be similarly arranged if a tower like this goes up in Middletown?

IRWIN HAUSMAN

Well, of course the tower, the cost of the tower will add about \$2,000,000 in tax base for tax purposes for the City of Middletown. I think the Television Corp. will be a good neighbor and will certainly take part in both civic activities, ecological activities, whatever, could be a desirable thing as far as the City of Middletown is concerned. I can conceive of opportunities of maybe....since we're cutting down some trees or something like that to maybe compensate the City of Middletown for that loss. If that's something that is desired we certainly would be amenable to doing that.

CHM. LEINWAND

O.K. It's something that we could talk about.

IRWIN HAUSMAN

Absolutely.

CHM. LEINWAND

O.K. Any other questions? O.k., thank you, Mr. Hausman. Let me explain to the members of the Public that what we will do is open the Public Hearing for those of you who would like to speak for this proposal and when everyone who wishes to speak for it has had a chance, we will then turn to those who wish to speak against it. Now, we have one small problem tonight and that is we are operating at quorum number namely six. One of the Commissioners needs to run out, and I'm going to let him run for 10 minutes, and we will be taking a 10 minute or 12 minute recess at five minutes of 8. I'm simply going to do that, so when we get to five of, be warned that we will take a recess. Having said that, members of the Public wishing to speak on behalf of this proposal. O.K. Members of the Public wishing to speak against the proposal. Please come forward and give your name.

WILLIAM MILARDO

I'm William Milardo and I own property on Bartholomew Rd.

CHM. LEINWAND

Excuse me.

WILLIAM MILARDO

William Milardo. I also own property in Haddam. This is the first I have been to this meeting. The pictures are fine but not from the windows of a house. Also the property I have out there is undeveloped which means if I bring a client out there, I have to show them that tower. The other towers that were put in which is about 10 or 12 years ago, you could buy a lot for \$7,500, the tower comes with the lot. You bring a client out there now you sell a lot for \$25,000, they don't want no tower. So it automatically means those lots are down. Now as far as real estate value goes if you went back 12 years ago, and appraised that property and developed it, it would probably only cost you \$2,000 a lot. If you do that now it will cost you \$20,000 a lot. This is a difference of 10 years, and your talking to a Public that is aware of what's going on. They do not want a tower when they're paying \$25,000 a lot. But for \$7,000, they will take the tower with it.

CHM. LEINWAND

Sir. I would suggest that you address the Commission.

WILLIAM MILARDO

I'm sorry. The only thing.....

CHM. LEINWAND

We make the decision. He's made his case.

WILLIAM MILARDO

I was unable to question him as they were talking about it because I feel that you should question the person who is talking about it, this way you get more of a different relation instead of a cross examination.

CHM. LEINWAND

If there are questions that you raised that you would like us to ask, we can do that.

WILLIAM MILARDO

O.k. Sorry about that. So that is about all I have to say.

CHM. LEINWAND

Thank you.

WILLIAM MILARDO

Thank you.

CHM. LEINWAND

Anybody else. Sir. Joe, could you take the microphone so that people can hear. Thank you. Please have a seat. There is no reason to stand.

JOE STEPANSKI

First I want to approach the Chairman and give him a copy since I suspect the Board is going to vote on this tonight. I have 12 copies here so I would like to have everyone have a copy at this meeting. My name is Joe Stepanski. I have lived in Middletown for about 30 years and I think I would like to express myself to the Board. First of all I would like to thank the Board for not voting a week or two ago on the issue, because I was not prepared to say what I have to say tonight and it came as a complete shock to me. And I think the people that are here tonight will attest to the fact that you were very well justified in having another hearing. This tower is going to effect alot of people in alot of ways. I had time to prepare

JOE STEPANSKI (Continued from Page 9)

a little outline here, and I will go over it quickly so that I don't waste too much of your time and because of the pictures that were shown here, the comments that were made, I would like to take a few minutes after this presentation and leave you with some thoughts in your mind. Does everyone have a copy of this up there? This is addressed to the Planning & Zoning Commission from Joe Stepanski. Subject: Exception for Tower in Residential Zone. Zoning laws were passed to partition land in towns and cities into zones reserved for different purposes. This is my interruption of zoning laws. The question before the Planning & Zoning Board is: Does a 499 ft. structure warrant special exception status so that it may become part of an established residential neighborhood? That is the question that I see before the Board. Not what program is going to be and so forth. Get down to the nitty gritty. This question is: Does a 499 ft. structure warrant special exception status so that it could become part of an established residential neighborhood? The answer to this question is an emphatic, unequivocal no. And I state that and these are the following reasons that I take this stand so strongly. I would like to take a few minutes to acquaint you with some facts. The tower for which a special exception zoning is requested is as tall as a 50 story building. I think I brought that to your attention the last time I was here but I didn't have time to sufficiently prepare to counter the people who had been prepared for this. It was just brought as a shock to me. This tower would stand out of the landscape in the forested Eastern hills of Middletown. Middletown is a forest city. And become the number one eyesore. The 50 story high structure would be much higher than the AT&T towers and twice as high as the natural landscape. When I say twice as high as the natural landscape, I mean approximately where it is sitting. There was a site they were contemplating to build this on is roughly 600 ft. 5 something it varies. It's on 26 acres. That's measured from sea level. If you let this tower go up, it's going to be twice that height measured from sea level. If there were 2 people on this structure and one was at the bottom and the other on the top, one person could be exposed to rain and the other to snow on numerous occasions. To give you an idea, just to give some terms some idea of what your talking about. On certain days, I'll address....Excuse me I'll have to address the Board and I'm getting carried away because there are so many people here tonight that weren't here last time. On certain, you have two people on that tower, one could be exposed to rain, and the other one on snow. Since there is a degree of l variation for approximately every 500 ft. No. 4. Adjacent home and land owners would suffer property devaluations. At the end of this period I think I'm going to take a little bit more time than the 5 of. I would like to counter Mr. Coughlin's approach and his statistics with some other statistics. I'm sorry I will have to start all over on that one because I lost my place. No. 4 Adjacent home and land owners would suffer property devaluations. In a neighboring state, citizens dynamited a similar structure after its erection. Now, if you want to know where it was, I will tell you where it was. Those people probably didn't attend that meeting and didn't have the time so they were forced to take it in their own hands. I'm asking you not to force the citizenry of Middletown to take it in their own hands. The potential monetary gain in this venture is measurable. You can measure how much money this venture is going to make. It's going to bring you \$2,000,000 more tax base. Alright beautiful, your taxes won't go up 2 or 3 mills, whatever it is, but you will have a tower. The proposed tower site property sale is contingent upon the applicant being able to secure a special exception. Every... hinges of you people here. You grant them a special exception and they're going to have it. I would like to know what criteria or justification there could possibly be for granting a special exception for an eyesore, a watershed destroyer, a property devaluator, and a landscape polluter. I skipped over No. 3 and I have to go back. Excuse me for skipping over...There is no sequence here, these.... (inaudible) along the river there that you see the emission coming out on occasions, located next to the Connecticut River, is recorded to be 499 feet and 6 inches.

JOE STEPANSKI (Continued from Page 10)

Well it strikes me as a little peculiar that tower is 499 ft. 6 inches and here we have an applicant that wants a tower put up 499 ft., just 6 inches short of that one. Why? Because any structure 500 feet or more would be subject to Federal regulations and require considerable financial outlay to comply with these regulations. I strongly urge the Planning & Zoning Board members to bring this to a vote this evening, and I also respectfully request that the Board vote against the granting of this exception. Thank you for your time and indulgence. Joe Stepanski. Now if I may, Mr. Chairman, it might take me more than 5 minutes, but I think I can narrow it down. I will just go over it quickly. Some other considerations that you should take into consideration before you cast your vote tonight. Lights, how many? The gentlemen said we are all used to red lights, but I'm not used to seeing red lights up in the sky unless it is a UFO, and then I'm not so sure. I think there are enough of them up there now. Disks, how many? Last week there wasn't one single picture brought to your attention in presenting a tower. Not one. This week we come loaded. I didn't see one residence in the background of those pictures of the tower. Not one. I saw pictures from 200 ft., 400 ft., 5,000 ft. There's a diagram up here that shows you what you see when you stand along side of a 50 ft. tree. How about telling me what I can see from the top of that tower. I also would like to bring to your attention they're talking about making sacrifices if they cut down the trees in the watershed. What temporary and permanent erosion control measures are planned in that plan. How will the watershed be changed and where will the water be channelled? How many trees are on that site? Is it wooded? They called it woodland. Will it be woodland when they get through? I drove down Route 9 the other day to Saybrook. The 2 towers that Saybrook put up up there along side of Route 9, the people are apparently happy in Saybrook with those towers, but I wouldn't be happy if that tower was erected here. Looking there I couldn't believe what was going on. I said, boy, they are really hard up for lumber. They must have got a permit to go from Route 9 and go into that lot. They cleared every single tree off there and erected 2 towers with guide wires coming down. There isn't one tree left standing in there. What provisions have you got here? I'm interested in covenants, Mr. Passanesi, just as you are and restrictions. I'm not satisfied with the answers that I get...that I see coming out. Is there a hardship here? Hardship on who? Now I'll get back to Mr. Coughlin, who presented the realty report. That tower that is proposed here, he said the homes are worth more money and so forth out there. They're not going to be devalued. I got news for you. My experience comes from owning land near towers, being exposed to high tension towers, being a woodworking teacher and so forth. That AT&T tower is on land or adjoining land that belongs to the Hartford Electric Power Co. and the total acreage on there on the map is 187 ft., the actual acreage on that piece of land is 225 ft., 225 acres. Adjacent to that 225 acres is a 510 acre state forest which gives you well over 700 ft., 700 acres of woodland. I like that. I like woodland. That's ample protection. Naturally nobody is going to complain. There are 700 acres of woodland around the area, and that tower is smaller in height than the one they are anticipating here and putting it only on 26 acres. What's 26 over 700 and something. What, one fourth, one twenty-eighth? They're contemplating a tower on one twenty-eighth the amount of land. They're making comparisons there. Naturally the house prices didn't devalue out there around that AT&T tower. There aren't any homes out there very close to it. Thank you for your time.

CHM. LEINWAND

Thank you. I'm going to take the prerogative to declare what will hopefully be no more than a 12 minute recess. I thank you for your indulgence.

The meeting recessed for 20 minutes.

CHM. LEINWAND

If I could reconvene the Public Hearing. Commissioner Gionfriddo.

COMM. GIONFRIDDO

I just would like to apologize to everybody in the audience for having to run out for a few minutes, and I appreciate your indulgence in allowing me to run out to a second meeting I had, and I'm sorry for the delay.

CHM. LEINWAND

Thank you. We're back to other members of the Public wishing to speak to the Commission against the proposal.

ROBERT BILAFER

My name is Mr. Robert Bilafer, Brainard Hill Rd., and I would like to present the Board with a petition, 61 signatures. This petition also has a majority of the adjoining property owners who are against the tower.

COMM. AUGUSTINE

Is that in Middletown or Higganum?

ROBERT BILAFER

This is in Middletown and Higganum.

COMM. AUGUSTINE

Where do you live?

ROBERT BILAFER

I live in Higganum. That list there, the majority of those people are Brainard Hill....or South Bartholomew.

CHM. LEINWAND

There are a significant number of people without any addresses.

ROBERT BILAFER

Well those are all on Brainard Hill Rd.

CHM. LEINWAND

O.K.

ROBERT BILAFER

I think it was pointed out at the last meeting the majority of the people that were contacted originally by these people were in favor of it. This is....I don't believe....that's no longer we can say that. I would also like to point out that it has been pointed out that they claim there will be no interference from the tower. Maybe there will be no interference from their piece of equipment, but what about all the other garbage that they intend to put up there. That's all I have to say.

CHM. LEINWAND

Excuse me, Mr. Bilafer. You said that this petition was signed by more than half of the abutting land owners. Could you be somewhat more specific? That map shows us, Fields, and Pagano, and Mills, and people, those are some of the names that come to mind. I don't see any of those names on this list.

ROBERT BILAFER

O.k., Mr. Mills or Mrs. Mills, right here.....That's one.

CHM. LEINWAND

O.k., those are the people who.....We didn't have addresses.

ROBERT BILAFER

O.k., also Mr. Wilson on this one here. Also Mr. Biega, Dr. Bernstein....

CHM. LEINWAND

He's across the street.

ROBERT BILAFER

He's across the street and Mr. Tirone.

CHM. LEINWAND

O.k., we will put the petition into the record. Anyone else wishing to speak?
Sir.

TOM BENNETT

My name is Tom Bennett and I live on Byrd Rd. which is adjacent to Chamberlain Hill, or part of Chamberlain Hill Rd., at the corner of Bartholomew. And I am here to speak.....

CHM. LEINWAND

In Middletown or in Higganum?

TOM BENNETT

In Middletown. My name is not on that petition. Before you put it away I will sign it.

CHM. LEINWAND

I'm not passing it around.

TOM BENNETT

I'm here opposed to it because of several reasons. But the major reason is that I moved up there 13 years ago, and the AT&T second tower wasn't there. But had it been there and there is only four or five of us on Chamberlain Hill Rd., I would have fought like to stop that one. I'm here to fight the third tower on that hill because I don't want it to become tower city up there. I have seen these structures before in New Jersey and they're ugly, as ugly as AT&T towers. Environmentally I don't like the idea of fencing in 26 acres of my land and changing my deer patterns, and my animals patterns which I moved up there for. And adjacent land owners are large land owners, and I can't see where they're willing to sell this land which I'm sure they could do very easily, is that hill is one height, the whole hill. They have been sitting back on it on land that is very hard to build on, for building lots, and including home structures which I'm sure most of my neighbors up there don't want to see a development built on top of the hill. That is why we moved out there. They have been sitting back and they haven't approached anybody to build up there on that prospect. Why should we take another tower? We moved up there not to look at them. Unfortunately we got 2 to look at and listen to. And they do hum. And I live a good 800 to a 1000 yards from the AT&T towers and I can hear they hum, and I don't like it. I can't hear my birds when I hear the hum. And that's why I am in the woods. And several years ago we had a former City Official that told me that I moved out there when I was complaining about the road conditions and he said you knew what you moved into when you went out there. So live with it. And I'm living with it. And I don't want any City structures out there. Thank you very much for your time.

CHM. LEINWAND

Thank you. Anyone else? Please you don't have to be called upon. Just come on up. Beat the person behind you.

STEVEN JOHNSON

My name is Steve Johnson, and I'm from 1771 Bartholomew Rd.....

CHM. LEINWAND

Could you speak into the microphone so that the transcriber.....

STEVEN JOHNSON

O.k., I'm from 1771 Bartholomew Rd. in Middletown. My major concern is the fact that once we get these towers up and if there is interference with our t.v. sets from whatever they put on there, we don't have cable or any thing. We're stuck with it. If cable was there, that might be a little bit different. The only way we can get our messages from the outside world is through the airways, and if they are messed up, there they go. That's it. Thank you very much.

CHM. LEINWAND

Thank you. Anyone else?

OWEN IRVINE

I have a couple of handouts. My name is Owen Irvine and I spoke to you last time. I want to speak on the economic and health issues. I have 7 copies of this economic article which I would like to refer to and 3 copies of a GA, General Office Accounting Report. Maybe (inaudible) I live on Brainard Hill Rd. about 200 ft. from the Middletown line and I am a property owner therefore, and also speak to you as a economist knowledgeable of urban related matters. I teach at Wesleyan and I have a Phd in economics from M.I.T. and I want to go on record against this tower and as I said I would like to address the economic property value aspects first and then the health aspects. The last time I stated that the construction of this tower would lower property values 5 to 10 percent. I want to present scientific evidence tonight to support that statement. There are a number of studies in the economic and assessors literature relating to how much properties sell for, based on their characteristics. I have chosen one of them to present to you tonight, and I think it is one of the most revelant ones. It's done by a Professor at the State University of New York at Stony Brook, Mr. Li and Mr. Brown who teaches at Harvard Dept. of City and Regional Planning, and is sponsored by the National Science Foundation. The...it is a statistical study, its based on, which is pg. 126, the second page of the article, is based on sales data for 781 single family houses in 15 surburan towns located in the southeast sector of the Boston Metropolitan area. This area is about 25 miles from Boston. The ...it was based on sales transactions not assessor's record in 1971 sales, and the study is done in a considerable amount of detail about the geography in the area. Mainly the area was divided up into tracts of about 2 1/2 acres in each tract, and there are about 75,000 of these tracts. The idea about the study is to explain the sales price of the house is the function of the characteristics of the physical structure of the house, the neighborhood of the house, local Public services provided, and also environmental impacts on the house. If you look for example at table 1 which is on pg. 130 gives you a sense of the data in detail used here. The mean sales price used there was \$30,000, this is 71 data, the mean number of rooms, 6.7, number of bathrooms, 1 1/2, quite a bit of data on the structure, data on the residential density, immediate family income, note that the average land area was 31,000 sq. ft. which is about 3/4 of an acre. So that the area that we are talking about is similar to the area on Bartholomew Rd. and the lots there are probably an acre or acre and half, in terms of which the house is built on. So it is a similar

OWEN IRVINE (Continued from Page 14)

area of the country. They're a similar neighborhood. Their one thing that they collected information on was the visual quality of each house that sold. They went to the house that sold and looked at it and categorized whether the view was poor, mediocre, or fair, or good. It is a scale of 1 to 5. That's described on page 129 and I underlined it on each one of the copies. Aesthetic characteristics of a site and its view are obtained from a model that determines an index on the basis of what is seen and people's ranking of the views. The index is from one to five. One being the lowest, and five being the highest. I could go into more detail on how that's constructed but...What did they find? Well, to summarize on table 2 which is pg. 132. They found the things like having more rooms added to house value, more bathrooms added to house value, older houses sold for less, worth more if it had a basement, worth more if it was in a better school district, noise, if it was a noisy area it decreased the house value. If you look as to what it found in respect to this visual quality, the basis of their finding was the higher the index, the higher the sales price. On pg. 135 in the article which I have handed out, I underlined it for you, they are translating the statistics into English here. They say, "The coefficient for onsite visual quality indicates that, other things equal, a house with the highest visual index commands a premium of \$2,520 over a similar house with the lowest visual index." So what they are trying to do, is say control all the other things affecting the value of the house and what is the value of a good view verses a poor view verses the 1 verses the 5 of the scale and it is \$2,500. \$2,500 over mean house price of \$30,000 is 8 1/2 or 8.4 percent. So my estimates of 5 to 10 percent of house value was on the mark two weeks ago. Our neighborhood is a area of high, good, visual quality. Driving up a hill, one of the highest areas in the neighborhood, it is treed, there are good views from the elevations that have trees. The only obstruction that we have there is when you look at the existing towers. Building this tower, if it was right next to the other towers, maybe it wouldn't affect the visual quality in the neighborhood very much. But given it is a mile or so away, maybe a half mile or so away, it's going to decrease the visual quality of the neighborhood. It's going to be an eyesore, and it is going to lower property values. The average house in the neighborhood is probably worth about a \$100,000, I would say. Bill Milardo said the lots were selling for \$25,000. I think the average house is probably a \$100,000 or so. I expect it would decrease the average house by 5 or 10 percent, or a minimum of \$5,000 per house. And that's a lot of money for each homeowner and also there are 35 to 40 houses built in the neighborhood of this tower. Plus there is all the vacant land that will be built upon. So building a tower is going to effect property values, and aside I would like to dispute the real estate agent's argument about property values. He said that basically that the land appreciated at the same rate as similar land elsewhere. That's after the towers were already constructed, the existing towers. Once the land price has been brought down by the construction of the existing towers, then you would expect appreciation to continue at about the same rate. There is nothing that changes. You would sort of have to look at the rate it changed before and after the tower. Before the AT&T towers were built, it was undeveloped land basically. So that the argument made I think by the real estate agent is not accurate. We would have to have observations before and after the tower was built. But as he stated the land is basically undeveloped. In fact, Bartholomew Rd. was a dirt road before those AT&T towers were built. O.k. That's the economics of the issue which I feel confident to speak about and could bring you a number of other studies that I think would support the point that house values are affected by...or affected by what's around them. Any questions from that before I go on to the health?

CHM. LEINWAND

Yea. I'd be real curious, if you honestly as an economist, believe that you would have paid more for your house when you came to Higganum if those AT&T towers weren't

CHM. LEINWAND (Continued from Page 15)
there?

OWEN IRVINE

I look out my back windows and I see the towers, and I think that....

CHM. LEINWAND

If they weren't there....

OWEN IRVINE

If they weren't there, I would appreciate it alot more. I have a good view.... I have a study which is the third floor of my house and I get up there and I can see about a mile. The only real obstruction of the view are the AT&T towers. I object to them being there. I particular, object to them.....

CHM. LEINWAND

We are talking about market value. I mean I haven't heard you answer my question specifically as to whether or not you think you would have paid more for that house when you bought when the tower wasn't there.

OWEN IRVINE

I think so. Just like...I would have paid more....I mean...I can say that. It's my opinion. Statistically you have to take the average of what the average person would pay, look at the tower, it's not pretty unless you are really in love with erector sets. I could remember an experience, a personal experience, on a skyline drive, driving on and getting off at one of these views, and going off expecting a nice site, and I see a power plant down in the valley. And that greatly diminished myThey shouldn't have put the view point there. And I think the same thing is true up in our neighborhood. It's not like were talking about a neighborhood that's something other than trees. I don't think the tower is.....

CHM. LEINWAND

Would you agree that perhaps there is a diminishing returns argument that if one wants to use stimulus criteria and judge visual whatever quality on a bases of 1 to 5 the fact the AT&T towers are already there and already impairs that, an additional tower may not change that very much?

OWEN IRVINE

For a house that faced directly on the AT&T towers....

CHM. LEINWAND

Front or back. It doesn't make too much difference from what I'm hearing people say.

OWEN IRVINE

It's bascially I would say it would have already affected the visual index. But we are talking....If these towers...if this tower was right next to the AT&T towers on 700 acres of land, I think the objection would be considerably less than putting it where they are putting it now which is basically on the other side of the neighborhood, where other people are going to be able to see it. I'm going to see it out both my windows instead of the back windows. Other questions..... O.k. In respect to the health issues, there was some other testimony in respect to this. What I submittted to you here is a Government Accounting Office study entitled, "Efforts by the Environmental Protection Agency to Protect the Public from Environmental Non-ionizing Radiation Exposures". This is, if you look at it, it's really in response to Congresswoman, Elizabeth Holtzman, request of the GAO to find out what's happening

OWEN IRVINE (Continued from Page 16)

about 4 years ago. It's a 1978 study. But what it is doing is sort of summarizing what EPA has been doing about nonionizing radiation. Nonionizing radiation according to the first page of the study comes from radio and television broadcast antennas which we have, which is proposed. It comes from point to point of microwave communication systems which we already have which is the AT&T towers. And it also points out that this nonionizing radiation comes from extra high voltage power lines which we also have extra high voltage power lines crossing perhaps a half mile or 3/4 of a mile from the site of this tower. So we already have a number of these nonionizing radiation which includes microwaves and t.v. tower waves floating around there and the evidence is that it is cumulative. The existence of one tower, the existence of another tower will add onto the amount of stuff floating around up there already. To quote what the health effects are: "Nonionizing radiation energy gets absorbed by human tissue and does interact with biological systems." I'm just going to read here since you all don't have copies of this. "Human exposure at high levels---above 10,000 microwatts/square centimeter---increases body temperature and results in such problems as heat stress, cataract formation, cardiovascular effects, testicular effects, and brainwave pattern changes." That's documented in lots of different places. In fact, what's under debate to continue quoting, "The effects of exposure at low levels is a subject of controversy. Effects of exposure of 1,000 microwatts or less have not been well documented, and U.S. scientists do not all agree that such effects exist. On the basis of animal research and statistical studies of workers' exposure histories and medical records, some Russian, Polish, and Czech scientists believe that exposure to low levels have effects on the human body. Considered mainly temporary central nervous system effects, symptoms attributed to low-level exposure include headache, weariness, dizziness, irritability, emotional instability, partial loss of memory, loss of appetite, cardiovascular effects, electroencephalogram changes, blood chemistry changes, changes in respiration, and possible genetic effects." Continue quoting, "There are also some nonionizing radiation effects that result in interference with the operation of electronic equipment. Such effects can cause physical injury when they involve disruption of cardiac pacemakers, telemetering devices in hospitals; and critical communications." Going on in this report, it points out this was really not a problem prior to 1945 when we had very little of this nonionizing radiation around. The EPA estimates that this radiofrequency microwave sources alone to be increasing at 15% annually, and therefore they are becoming concerned about this increased radiological presence in our environment. Now what has been the response? The response by the Soviets who believe there are low levels effects is to set an environmental standards at 1 microwatt per square centimeter. And to set occupational standards which is when you are working around the stuff, at 10 microwatts per square centimeter. This is given in the report here. The U.S. has no environmental standards, and has an occupational standard of 10,000 microwatts per square centimeter which is a 1,000 times the Soviet standard, per occupational exposure. That's the standard that was quoted to you by the engineer. The U.S. is studying the situation according to the report, according to this report here. What have they found? Quoting from page 7, "Whether low-level environmental exposures constitute significant health risks remains an open question. EPA is finding preliminary results that such exposures may affect the immune system; create anomalies in mouse litters, such as hernias of the brain; and produce a trend toward lowered behavioral performance. Although the significance of these preliminary results is still being evaluated, EPA officials agree that to dismiss the Soviet observations of low-level effects would be a mistake." So EPA in their preliminary research four years ago is saying there is something to the Soviet claim that there is low-level effects, but aren't sure exactly what they are but we shouldn't dismiss the Soviet claims. What we understand from talking to people at EPA on telephone this last week or so, is that EPA is about to propose a drastic lowering of the U.S.

OWEN IRVINE (Continued from Page 17)

standards allowed from this type of emission. Presumably reenforcing, or presumably they're confirming there are low-level health effects. How much will this new tower add? We had some engineering testimony. I'm not quite sure I got all the gist of the testimony. I'm not an electrical engineer. Something about the tower whether it was aiming down or aiming this way or whatever, but on page 7 of this report EPA does give an example. They say measurements approached 2,000 microwatts at the base of an FM antenna on Mt. Wilson, California. That was at the base of the tower... of the tower that you got 2,000 microwatts. Up on the tower, they say in this thing, it was 180,000 microwatts, which suggests at least in this FM antenna which is not the same thing as the t.v. antenna, that there was pretty high levels at the base of the tower. We also gathered the information that in response to such doubts about the health effects or evidence of health effects, depending on how you read all these studies, is that other towns are banning the construction of further of these towers. For example, the town outside of Syracuse, New York named Onondaga, which has recently imposed a ban on any further construction of these towers. They already have several of them but I guess they'rea high location. I was looking over...Any questions that I can answer or try to answer in the health, in reading this article? I was looking over in terms of the Code of Middletown, Section 44 under Special Exceptions, and basically in my reading of the Code says, that special exceptions are granted when the proposed use will not "adversely effect the health and safety of residents in the area and will not tend to depreciate property values and the character and extent of development of adjoining property" values. I think the evidence that I have offered to you tonight suggested it will definitely decrease property values and probably has health effects. I think the proposal really deserves to be turned down. And finally I would like to mention I think to allow this tower would go against the conservation and sort of aesthetic values that the City has been promoting recently. I understand we wanted Northeast Utilities to put those electric lines across the river, underground, and there is some sort of settlement that to have them put on a tower that doesn't look as bad as the electric towers look today. Those electric towers that those lines are on are alot shorter than this tower. And probably less of an eyesore. And I would suggest to you that if electric towers are an eyesore than this tower is an eyesore, and I would request that you try to look over this material and contemplate it. But ultimately I think you will come to the conclusion that we don't need this tower. Thank you.

CHM. LEINWAND

Thank you.

DAVID SIERPINSKI

My name is Dave Sierpinski. My address is on Brainard Hill Rd. in Higganum. I also own property on Byrd Rd. in Middletown so that makes me a taxpayer in the City of Middletown. I kind of get the impression that you feel if we don't live in Middletown we don't have too much of a say here. Now I could be wrong, but that's the feeling I get standing in the back of the room. Now I would like to take exception to Mr. DeProto's comments on property values. My occupation is a building contractor, primarily custom built houses and a land developer. Now any piece of property that has power lines or a tower or any such thing, there is no question that the property value is not worth as much as a piece of property that does not have these things. We have the tower, across the way, the AT&T tower, that has been there for years. It has been there like Mr. Milardo pointed out when people were not as ecology minded as they are now. People who come out to look at property today, they don't want any obstructions, right-of-ways, or anything when they look at a piece of property. So besides the health reasons, the possible health reasons, that Mr. Irvine pointed out, I'm in objection to it because of the property devaluations. I feel that I'm qualified

DAVID SIERPINSKI (Continued from Page 19)

to speak on this and there is no question in my mind that the properties will be devalued. Thank you.

JIM QUADON

I'm Jim Quadon, a resident of Brainard Hill Rd. in Higganum. I'm also an elected official with the Town of Haddam. And I'm simply here to make my opposition to the structure known and I would grant you the same courtesy if you had a problem in the Town of Middletown and came to Haddam for such. Thank you very much.

BILL KING

My name is Bill King and I live on Brainard Hill Rd. in Higganum. I'm here to express my opposition to the tower. I spent a good deal of time in the last 2 weeks trying to get a feel for the potential radiation hazard. I might add that I'm an engineer by education and profession. I have some familiarity with the radiation. My master's thesis involved neutron activation analysis and gamma rays (inaudible), which is ionizing radiation we are talking about now and nonionizing radiation. But in pursuing this I talked with the State Environmental Protection people, I've talked with the State (inaudible) Council, I've talked with the Federal EPA both in Boston and New York, I've read the same article Owen had with the GAO watching the EPA, and I've got friends at work that have access to some of the Department of Defense radiation hazard manuals. I work at Hamilton Standard and I've talked with our double Es involved in electromagnetic interference. I also at the end of the day to day talk with the Manager of Industrial Hygiene and Safety at United Technology Research Center. I spent a good deal of time in the library too in the last 2 weeks, I hope it doesn't catch up with me. Basically we are concerned about nonionizing radiation and the current thinking and the basis for the standard that is sighted is based on the idea that the nonionizing radiation works like a microwave and produces hyperthermia and it causes damage to the parts of the body that can't dispel heat, and I think Owen sighted a good number of those. At this time we have a standard of 10 milliwatts per centimeter squared which is different than was quoted to you, I think it is just a switch in the units. That standard dates back to about World War II from what I am told. At this point the American National Standard Institute who has the only really informal or has one informal standard out that everybody adheres to which is the 10 milliwatts. I'm told is..revising their standard, proposing a revised standard by a factor of 10. The reason for that is that studies have shown that the human body is a pretty good antenna and it in certain frequencies and those actually close to the...I think this t.v. is going to broadcast about 500 mhz. About a 100 mhz is...we resonate pretty well at. So on that basis there dropping...proposing to drop their standards by a factor of 10. I talked to the Boston office, the regional office of the EPA, and talked with Mr. Byron Keene. He indicated that in this situation he would anticipate lowering the standard by a factor of a 100 so we are down to....He's proposing down to .1 milliwatts per centimeter squared. The problem I think involved with the towers is a different one and a harder one to get a hold of. As Owen indicated the Eastern Europeans for a long time have been afraid of non-thermal effects which are harder to test and harder to document. They occur at lower energy levels. Eastern European standard now is about one two thousandths of ours. In reading the most recent compendium that I could get a hold of which was I Triple E proceedings in January of 1980. The consensus seems to be that they don't know for sure what the health effects are. They do all agree that it would be worth finding out more about it. I think the bottom line as far as this issue goes is that you can't say for sure that low-levels involved with the tower that is proposed or the towers that might be added to are safe. Clearly the trend is toward a more conservative standard. I personally think if they haven't already done it, it would be a great topic for 60 Minutes.

BILL KING (Continued from Page 19)

As a footnote, one of the EPA persons that I talked to in New York City, who was looking at radiation effects on the World Trade towers, said that one of the consequences of all of this might be that there is a perceived hazard which might have... be more damaging to property values than an actual hazard. In other words, as people here are reporting...if it comes out in a news letter this year that the standard has been dropped by a factor of 10, everybody is going to mentally register that, gee I don't want to live near one of those antennas. The other issue I would like to address is the impact on the community. And I think we have seen slides tonight and pictures and stuff and try to get a physical feel for what that involved, I made a scale model of the neighborhood. (inaudible) I drew up the neighborhood as one inch equals 100 feet. This is Wilson's house. Fields over there, Mills, Goodrich, Tyler, Tirone, and so forth. Bartholomew Road comes right down here and Chamberlain Hill (inaudible) I took the ten foot elevation levels and traced them and cut them out. The vertical scale is practically right on (inaudible) This is what the tower looks like in relation to the community. Those pictures of the towers I found kind of hard to see, because I found them a little over exposed, out of focus, and the lighting throughout was in favor of the tower. As you can see there is no question that the tower dominates the whole mass here. It's very hard to believe even with trees, the tower isn't going to be very visible. I think that will be equally as true at night with the flashing lights on. One of the issues we raised last week was the problem that we had with the AT&T towers which is the problem with the noise from the cooling **and that hasn't been answered** tonight and I think that is a potential source of annoyance. It certainly is a fact right now for those of us who are exposed to the AT&T towers. There also is the question of potential interference...talking with different people I think ...with certain weather conditions you can pick up interference ...probably...also the kind of equipment that they are going to add to the...may add to the tower may actually be a greater sense... a greater potential problem. I understand at this point that you have prohibitions against further towers in the Middletown area. I think our neighborhood certainly agrees with your wisdom and the majority of them are opposed to the tower. We don't want it. We think it will damage the quality of our environment and common sense says it will affect property values. And I think the bottom line as far as the radiation exposure goes is that you really don't know that it is safe. Thank you.

CHM. LEINWAND

Can I ask you a question? I'm somewhat confused about all these milliwatts and microwatts. Right now there is or there isn't a standard of 10 milliwatts? You keep talking about 10.

BILL KING

My understanding is that there is a standard...I know the military has a standard of 10 milliwatts per square centimeter.

CHM. LEINWAND

O.k. Now there is a proposal that may change that standard to 1 which is the same thing that Owen said the Soviet Union has looked at.

BILL KING

No. Owen...The Soviet Union is on the microwatt scale.

CHM. LEINWAND

It's the same thing.

BILL KING

No, a milliwatt is a thousandths. A microwatt is.....

CHM. LEINWAND

I mean it is factor of.....1/3 but one milliwatt is the same as a 1,000 micro-watts which is whatis speaking to here.

BILL KING

Oh, o.k.

CHM. LEINWAND

That is what I'm trying to get a handle on. And if I could, Mr. Seman, your report is talking in terms of milliwatts and your calculations are that this particular thing at the base of the tower would generate .89 milliwatts. Do I read that right.

JAMES SEMAN

If the antenna were pointed straight down you divide that by a factor of 5 hundred thousandths for the (inaudible)

CHM. LEINWAND

I still don't have an answer. I can't for basis of comparsion rectify what these two gentlemen are saying to the Commission about 1 milliwatt or one tenth of a milliwatt verses what your report says.

JAMES SEMAN

If the antenna at the top of the tower were to be bent down so the beam pointed straight to ground, at the base of the tower there would exist .89 milliwatts.

CHM. LEINWAND

But since the tower is not going to be pointed straight down but is going to be in some upright operating position, is there someway of calculating what the maximum milliwattage would be on the site?

JAMES SEMAN

Yes sir. You would multiply .89 milliwatts by .00002.

CHM. LEINWAND

Which in your calculations would be so insignificant compared to the thousand microwatts..... The Commission has to deal with that sort of stuff and I don't think it has to become more technical than it need be. But I think we all know and I'm speaking to everyone, I think...(inaudible) generating one, one millionth of that than we got problems absorbing that sort of testimony. So if you can elaborate on that it would help me.

BILL KING

Well I can't elaborate on his calculation. I do know the other articles that I have read indicate that a F.M. antenna for instance would be a considerably higher....

CHM. LEINWAND

Yes. Understood, but we are not talking about a F.M. thing.

BILL KING

But we do have to consider whatelse they may put on the tower.

CHM. LEINWAND

We have addressed that issue of provisions for or against other kinds of things. We understand.

BILL KING
I think...

CHM. LEINWAND
O.k. Thank you. Anyone else?

RUDY HOLMBERG
Rudy Holmberg, 1114 Bartholomew Rd. O.k., this area out there we do have the AT&T towers. That was almost 20 years ago on an old dirt road and very few residents. Now after going through quite a few of your Zoning Board meetings and what have you, you got a nice residential zoning out there, alot of people moved out, we got new roads. Now what good is the zoning evidently? Alot of people bought it for the fact it was residential, wooded area, nice quiet area. Now you want to change it. O.k., it's one tower now, a year from now, another meeting here, something else. I think myself you ought to stick to your own Zoning regulations 100 percent. And I think everybody would be happy.

CHM. LEINWAND
You do understand that we changed the regulations after this proposal came in. By law they have a right to be heard, and that's why it is being considered.

RUDY HOLMBERG
O.k.

CHM. LEINWAND
Anyone else?

ARLENE SIERPINSKI
I am Arlene Sierpinski and I live on Brainard Hill Rd. in Higganum. I want to go on record as being against having the tower in our area. My husband and I have owned property, considerable acreage in Middletown, and on Brainard Hill Rd. for probably 15 years. I can attest that I have sold between my husband and myself many parcels of property and building, as far as Dave building houses, I would say that out of every 10 people that I have shown property to, I have had two that wasn't interested on account of the AT&T towers. I feel that we do not need another tower in our area. It does not help to valuate our property at all. And I can speak from just this particular area, with having 15 years of experience behind me. I would also like to say that for all of my friends and neighbors that are here, if they would just get up and say that they are against it, I would certainly appreciate it. Because I am certainly against it. And I hope that you will find it in our favor not to have these people put this tower up. Thank you.

JOAN SERRA
My name is Joan Serra and I live on Brainard Hill Rd. in Higganum, and I am against it for health reasons.

CHM. LEINWAND
Thank you.

BILL KUEHN
I'm Bill Kuehn, 1773 Bartholomew Rd. I addressed you people before in writing. I just wanted to underscore the content of that previous correspondence by saying that I object to tower largely on aesthetic reasons. I feel if this were approved it would compromise the advances that the City has made over the past decade in improving the quality of living and the aesthetics of the City. The only useful purpose of a tower like that would serve is to be a land mark and I can direct people

BILL KUEHN (Continued from Page 22)

to my house, but I already have two towers to do that with. Thank you.

JOSEPH BIEGA

My name is Joseph Biega and own property to the east of this, rear land, timberland. I personally can't see how a 500 ft. tower is going to enhance the value of our property out there. Presently during the evenings in the summertime and late spring, you can hear the noises from the cooling...towers, the telephone towers there. I presume this broadcasting area with the equipment inside is going to have to have cooling also which will have to generate a noise factor. I haven't heard them say anything about the cooling of the broadcasting area. Also in regard to the other people there, some of them don't know what to do because it was presented so nicely that it was better than a condominium and we know that they can't put a condominium up in this area. So this is the way some of the neighbors were told, and they felt that this is better than a condominium. So that's all I have to say and thank you. And I am a guest.

CHM. LEINWAND

Thank you. Mr. Seman, could I ask you to take 30 seconds and tell the Commission about noise. It wasn't addressed and it has come up two or three times. Is the tower going to produce noise? Is there going to be cooling stuff?

JAMES SEMAN

I believe I have heard on occasion the guide wires on a tower hum in a stiff wind but that is a very rare occurrence. I have dealt with....I have to... for that comment. I would more likely like to say that I never heard a noise from a tower. But from the air conditioning standpoint, that's quite correct, I do have to cool my equipment. How much of a problem that is, I think that would be a subjective rather than objective thing. The area where I live almost every house, for instance, every house has a heat pump or an air conditioner out back and you live with that. My equipment is not much noisier and I think the distances involved are much greater. There is some amount of noise generated by cooling.

CHM. LEINWAND

But the building on the site will be air conditioned. That was my question.

JAMES SEMAN

Yes

CHM. LEINWAND

O.k. Thank you.

A voice. Can I ask a question.

CHM. LEINWAND

Wait. I would rather not.

A voice. What about generating equipment in case of a power failure?

CHM. LEINWAND

There won't be any, he implies. Anyone else wishing to speak against this proposal? Joe, I would rather not. You spoke already, unless you can....

JOE STEPANSKI

By law I should be granted the opportunity to speak.

CHM. LEINWAND

The chair has the prerogative to say that you had the chance. I will grant you a minute if you can bring forth new material.

JOE STEPANSKI

If you will allow me to speak from here, I will.

CHM. LEINWAND

I will.

I took the time last week to attend this meeting and I was a little ill when I attended and wasn't prepared and so forth, so that was my fault. I spent time here tonight, and my ears has witnessed no one speaking in favor of this proposal except people who are professionally paid to present it. Thank you.

CHM. LEINWAND

O.K.

JOE WOLAK

My name is Joe Wolak from Brainard Hill Rd. in Higganum. I would like to go on record against the towers. We're from Higganum and we don't have \$2,000,000 to help you people out with your taxes.

CHM. LEINWAND

The temptation to talk about powers plants and what you get from AT&T towers is so great that I sit here sharing all the comments with Comm. Gionfriddo rather than commenting on each thing pro or con. But point is made. I knew I shouldn't have said anything.

DIANE WOLAK

I am Diane Wolak and I am in opposition also and I would like to welcome Mr. Seman anytime during the summer to come to our house and listen to the noise the AT&T tower makes.

CAROL TIRONE

My name is Carol Tirone and we live right out there where this tower is going to be going in. And I would like to state that I am definitely opposed to it. I also agree with the neighbors with the noise from the other towers. We are way up on the hill and I do not have an air conditioner in my home because we get the cool summer breeze, but we sure do have the hum from the towers. And I want it noted that I am opposed to the tower.

CHM. LEINWAND

Thank you, Carol. Again, you have had a chance, unless it is new.

OWEN IRVINE

I just wanted...you asked a question about the standards. There are two Soviet standards. One environmental standard of 1 microwatt which is one thousandths....

CHM. LEINWAND

Understood.

OWEN IRVINE

O.k. There is an occupational exposure standard of ten thousandths...Soviet standard of 10 microwatts, ours is 10,000 microwatts. So our occupational standard

OWEN IRVINE (Continued from Page 24)

is one-one thousandths of the Soviets. We have ...environmental standard, but the environmental standard of the Soviets is another 10, factor of 10, down from their occupational standard. I think that (inaudible)

CHM. LEINWAND

Despite the fact that the microwave oven in my kitchen may be producing a 1,000 microwatts every time I turn it on. But that's why I don't have one. O.k. Yes.

TOM BENNETT

Just 30 seconds of your time because I already spoke too. But this geographical location, there are very few Middletown residents in that particular area, myself is one of them, but I feel that our friends from Higganum who have to live with the same geographical location have taken the time to come up here and protect their environment as well as Middletowns. And I appreciate them coming up here and spending their time and I hope someday we don't have to fight the same battle in Higganum, because that mountain that we share up there, we could have 10 towers up there if Higganum decided to let them go through. I would like to see (inaudible)

CHM. LEINWAND

Thank you. Seeing no one else. One more.

CORT SIERPINSKI

My name is Cort Sierpinski and I live on Brainard Hill Rd. and I would just like to go on record as strongly opposed to this tower. I would also like to say that I think the arguments brought up in favor of this tower is very misleading. As far as their first visit with the adjoining property owners where they were talking about condominiums, saying this could be better than anything else they could have up there. And the slide show which we saw if it was animated could have been a cartoon as far as I'm concerned, showing someone standing up against a tree and then saying you can't see the tower. Well if you're standing up next to a tree, of course you're not going to see it. And another photo which they had the tower in back which half of it was blocked by a telephone pole, and they seemed to be trying to avoid anything that...any of the bad points of this tower, as far as radiation. And at the last meeting nothing was brought up as far as the lights that had to be on the tower, which they had to bring it up tonight because of people asking about it as far as beacons. I just think it should not be allowed and further more as far as a zoning change I thought there had to be some proof of a hardship. And there is no hardship here. It's going to be a hardship thrust upon us if this tower goes through. So I'm just strongly opposed to this. Thank you.

CHM. LEINWAND

Thank you.

TERRY BIEGA

My name is Terry Biega and I am a resident of Brainard Hill Rd., Higganum. If this is such a good idea why don't you let it go into some other R zone in Middletown.

CHM. LEINWAND

Anyone else?

KEN HAWES

My name is Ken Hawes and I live on Brainard Hill Rd. in Higganum. My property is

KEN HAWES (Continued from Page 25)

border line of Middletown. One thing that nobody mentioned is when they start cutting stuff out for the towers and stuff, alot of these people use defoliant agents, defoliated to keep it down, which has been proven to be a health hazard.

CHM. LEINWAND

O.k., if there is no one else who wishes to speak then I will take the prerogative of reading into the record one letter that I received on this matter. I will give this to you and if copies could be made available to the Commission. "Mr. Steven Leinwand, Chairman Planning and Zoning Commission, Footit Drive, Middletown. Dear Steve: As you know the Middletown Press is an applicant for a low-power television station which will upon action by the Federal Communication Commission require it to secure a tower site in Middletown. By its nature, a hilltop site is required, and for that reason, the Middletown Press supports the application tower site on the Bartholomew Road site which it has applied for under a special exception in an R-1 zone. I understand that this is the last R-1 parcel that could be considered for a special exception. The Middletown Press has verified reason to believe that it will be able to locate its antenna on the TCH (Channel 18) tower, and for that reason expresses the hope that the Planning Commission will see fit to grant this special exception. The new television transmissions of Channel 18 will widen the opportunity of the people in the area to receive another television outlet, in this case a 25 percent gain in viewing listenership for most residents of the area. For that reason alone, I would argue that the people of Middletown as a whole would welcome such a development. Should the Middletown Press be licensed, and should engineering and other aspects of television operation permit, as we expect, the Middletown Press to seek a location on the Channel 18 tower, it would reduce the general tower clutter in the community. As you perhaps realize, a low-power TV station has a permitted broadcast radius of some 15 miles, hence our own Channel 6 has a real requirement for a Middletown tower location. Many thanks for your consideration. Sincerely, Dery D'Oench, Editor." With that I will close the Public Hearing on this matter and do two things. I would like to thank all of you for coming out. I only speak for myself in saying that I walked in here tonight thinking I was ready to vote and thinking I knew everything I needed to know. I don't believe I can do that now. My informal discussions with my fellow Commissioners suggests the consensus that we not vote tonight. People would like to exercise the option that we generally do of not voting on the same night of the Public Hearing, unless there is a request to do so by the proponent. I know that I would like to read the material presented tonight. One of the Commissioners who had to leave needs to have access to the transcript and so you will not be seeing a vote and I thank you again for coming out. We will be making a decision either at our April 14th meeting or at our April 28th meeting.

Adjournment 9:15 P.M.

ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,

Hope Kasper
Hope Kasper
Transcriber

Steven J. Leinwand, Chairman
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

RECEIVED AT THE MEETING OF _____