



March 19, 2018

Mr. Jonathan N. Edwards, P.E.
City Scape Consultants, Inc.
7050 W. Palmetto Park Road #15-652
Boca Raton, FL 33433-3483

Re: CUP No. 02396 – AT&T Tower in the Town of Rutland, Dane County

Dear Mr. Edwards:

I am writing to follow up on the conference call we had on March 9, 2018, where we reviewed your report dated February 27, 2018 and discussed various technical aspects of the proposed tower. In addition to myself, the AT&T representatives on the call included John McCann, Area Mgr -RAN Engineering; Andrew Flowers, Senior Real Estate Manager; Dan Sobczak, Professional RAN Engineer; and Michael Iacopetti, Site Development Specialist with SAC Wireless. On behalf of our team, thank you for taking the time to speak with us. Following is a summary of the items we discussed.

Mobile coverage need

One of the primary reasons AT&T has proposed this tower is to provide improved mobility coverage in the Oregon vicinity. Setting aside the fact that demonstrating a need for improved service is not one of the criteria Dane County uses for CUPs, AT&T has nonetheless provided significant documentation of the need for additional coverage. The preliminary report you issued to the County last September acknowledged this need, which is why we were confused by the contrary conclusion summarized in your February 27th report. After discussing the situation during our recent conference call, you agreed there is indeed a mobile coverage need and there are no existing towers that can serve this need. You offered to update your report to the County to make this point clear.

SBA Hwy 138 collocation analysis

In your February 27th report you state “[t]he Applicant has not commented on whether collocation on the existing SBA-owned tower located on State Highway 138 (shown in Figure 3 as WIL05625) would meet the requirements and not require constructing this proposed new tower.” Per our discussion on March 9th, AT&T did perform an analysis on the SBA-owned tower located on State Highway 138 and determined this tower will not meet the coverage requirements. This information was shared with Dane County staff during a meeting on February 5th and was also shared with CityScape on March 7th in preparation for our call on March 9th. Per our discussion, you offered to update your report to reflect the fact that AT&T did perform a collocation analysis on this site.

CAF II analysis

In your February 27th report you state “[t]he Applicant has been unable to demonstrate how many, if any, households within the CAF II target area will be eligible for WLL broadband service as a result of the proposed new tower.” As discussed during our March 9th call, AT&T did provide an estimate of the households within the CAF II target area that will be eligible for WLL broadband

service as a result of the proposed new tower. This information was shared with Dane County staff in a letter dated February 19th. This letter was also shared with CityScape on March 7th in preparation for our conference call. As discussed during our call, you offered to update your report to reflect the fact that AT&T estimates 35-40 households within the CAF II target area will be eligible for WLL broadband service as a result of the proposed new tower.

Martinson Site analysis

In your February 27th report you state “[t]he viability of an alternative location on the Martinson property could also be investigated.” At the request of the Dane County staff, AT&T did analyze the possibility of relocating the tower to an alternate location on the Martinson property. This information was shared with Dane County staff in a letter dated February 19th. This letter was also shared with CityScape on March 7th in preparation for our conference call. As discussed during our call, AT&T asks that CityScape update its report to reflect this analysis was performed by AT&T.

Discussion of alternate locations on the Reindahl Quarry

As discussed above, AT&T has long been seeking to provide additional coverage in the Oregon area. AT&T received a permit from Dane County in 2013 to build a new tower on the Reindahl Quarry. However, due to poor soil conditions, we were unable to build that tower. Since then, AT&T developed a plan to provide rural broadband access to residents of the Town of Dunn, as part of the CAF II program. We are now proposing to build a new tower on a site (the Martinson property) that falls within the very same search ring that we targeted in 2013. By selecting a site on the eastern edge of the 2013 search ring (whereas the 2013 approval was for a site on the western edge), we will be able to serve the mobility need in the Village of Oregon and we will be able to serve 35-40 rural broadband customers in the Town of Dunn, as part of our larger CAF II buildout. We think this is a win-win because we will be able to serve both needs with a single tower.

During our call, AT&T was asked to revisit the feasibility of the Reindahl Quarry. Notwithstanding the fact that Wisconsin’s Mobile Tower Siting Law does not allow a local unit of government to require an applicant to consider alternate locations, we are nonetheless willing to respond to this inquiry. As noted above, one of the primary reasons for selecting the Martinson property is that its location—situated between the mobility need to the west and the CAF II need to the east—will allow us to serve both areas from a single tower. At your request, our engineers took another look at the Reindahl Quarry and confirmed that (assuming we were able to locate a spot with appropriate soil conditions) the site is too far west to adequately serve the CAF II coverage need to the east.

I trust that the information summarized above will provide you with the information you need in order to update your report to Dane County. Thanks again for taking the time to speak with me and my team. We understand the County is planning to consider AT&T’s application during its March 27th meeting. I am confident the County will appreciate the opportunity to review an updated report from CityScape reflecting the items we discussed during our March 9th conference call. We feel very strongly that the application we have put forward satisfies each of the legal and technical criteria that must be met in order for Dane County to issue a conditional use permit and we look forward to that ultimate conclusion.

Sincerely,

James F. Jermain
Regional Vice President – External Affairs
AT&T Wisconsin

cc: Mary Kolar, Chair, Dane County ZLR
Roger Lane, Dane County Zoning Administrator
Majid Allan, Senior Planner, Dane County