February 23, 2012
File: 147-174582

Supervisor Feiner and Members of the Town Council
Town of Greenburgh
Town Hall
177 Hillside Avenue
Greenburgh, New York 10607

Re: NextG Networks of New York
Distributed Antenna System, Twenty Locations in Public Right-of-Way
Town of Greenburgh, New York
HDR Technical Review – Supplemental Memorandum

Dear Supervisor Feiner and Members of the Town Council,

This supplemental memorandum was prepared on behalf of the Town Board to summarize HDR’s continued review of technical information associated with the NextG Networks of New York (NextG) application. The information and data reviewed to complete this supplemental report includes NextG’s affidavit received on January 26, 2012; discussions of the February 7, 2012 Town Board meeting (continued public hearing); and NextG’s February 21, 2012 submittal that responded to HDR’s questions submitted with respect to possible alternate node locations. This memorandum is intended to supplement HDR’s Technical Review Report, dated December 14, 2011.

Background
The proposed DAS installation in Greenburgh is comprised of 20 locations, or nodes, throughout the public rights-of-way in the Town. The proposed NextG system targets wireless coverage to the Sprain Brook Parkway corridor (including secondary roadways and residential, commercial, and other land uses along the parkway); commercial and residential areas along portions of Central Avenue; parts of the NYS Thruway and Saw Mill River Parkway (northern portions of the Town); and other areas. The proposed hub site for the NextG nodes is located at 75 North Central Avenue in Elmsford, New York (commercial building that currently accommodates roof-top wireless antennas and associated equipment). MetroPCS has been identified as a primary customer for NextG’s project; however, it is
possible that additional wireless carriers may utilize NextG’s DAS system in the future should the application be approved and equipment installed.

This supplemental memorandum is organized as follows:

- Description and HDR review of NextG’s January 26, 2012 submittal;
- HDR site reconnaissance efforts;
- HDR additional information request;
- Description and HDR review of NextG’s February 21, 2012 submittal; and
- MetroPCS coverage review.

The following exhibits were developed (or enhanced from the December 2011 report) by HDR for this memorandum:

- Figure 1: Town Zoning Map, with proposed NextG node locations.
- Figure 2: Proposed node locations, coverage patterns, and MetroPCS sites.
- Table 1: Summary inventory of proposed NextG nodes and zoning information.
- Table 2: Analysis of potential alternate node locations.

January 26, 2012 NextG Affidavit and HDR Review

This affidavit provided an evaluation by NextG on the feasibility of siting proposed nodes in non-residential districts, and more specifically, focused on Nodes NYD6326, NYD6328, NYD6331, and NYD6333 (refer to Table 1 and Figures 1 and 2). This applicant submission did not provide information or figures depicting the nearest potential as-of-right locations to the proposed nodes.

The applicant provided maps of each of the 20 proposed node locations, and identified the nearest non-residential area to each node. For this exercise, the applicant assumed that the C.A. District is a residential zone, as it allows for mixed use, including residential and commercial properties. A summary of the information depicted on these maps is provided in Table 1, with HDR’s evaluation / check. Figure 1 includes the Town’s Zoning Map (based on 2007 revision), onto which HDR added the proposed NextG nodes for purposes of confirming the applicant’s affidavit and to better assess land uses in the vicinity of the proposed nodes. In general, the distances provided by the applicant from each proposed node to the nearest non-residential area were accurate. Of the 20 nodes evaluated, HDR
found only one (NYD6337) where the applicant identified a G.I. district approximately 10,500 ft to the west, but where HDR identified a L.O.B. district approximately 8,000 ft to the northeast. Regardless of this discrepancy, the distance is too great for the node to be relocated.

The locations closest to a non-residential district were identified by NextG as NYD6336 and NYD6340. NYD6336 is in the vicinity of Saw Mill River Road. It is 300 ft from an O.B. District (note that HDR estimated it to be approximately 125 ft to the southeast of an O.B. District). The applicant reported that there were no available utility poles within the nearby right-of-way in the O.B. District. NYD6340 is located at Taxter Road and is 450 ft to the southwest of an O.B. District. The applicant reported that there were no available utility poles within the nearby right-of-way in the O.B. District.

Next, the applicant evaluated four proposed node locations that were noted to be in proximity to State rights-of-way. It is understood that the Town Code does not automatically identify a State right-of-way as an “as-of-right” site. Proposed locations NYD6326, NYD6328, NYD6331, and NYD6333 were visited by the applicant in an effort to find alternate utility pole locations. RF coverage maps (proposed site and possible alternate) were also provided by NextG’s RF Engineer. Location NYD6331 was reported to be the only one of these proposed node locations that may be able to be relocated to a State right-of-way (i.e., along east side of Central Avenue, across from the Mid-Way Shopping Center and along a relatively steep embankment). It was noted in the affidavit (and previous applicant discussions) that permission from the utility, the State, and further evaluation of utility pole access at this new location would be required before node re-location can occur.

For reference, the NextG supplemental submittal of January 26, 2012 is provided in Attachment A.

**February 2012: Additional Site Reconnaissance and HDR Information Request**

On February 2, 3, and 12, 2012, HDR visited each proposed NextG node location in an effort to confirm the applicant’s statements regarding the closest non-residential area to each node, identify potential as-of-right or “preferred” sites in the vicinity of
each node, and observe the topography, neighborhood and anticipated coverage of each proposed location.\(^1\)

Prior to the site visits, HDR attempted to identify possible as-of-right or “preferred” locations / opportunities within the subject area, utilizing the zoning map developed as Figure 1 of this memorandum. The objective was to document the proximity of the proposed nodes to these locations, and to evaluate potential opportunities for a preferred node location. To evaluate potential as-of-right locations as per the Town’s wireless ordinance, both the as-of-right “Light Industrial District” (L.I.) and “General Industrial District” (G.I.) (§285-37(A)(8)(c), were color-coded on the figure. All of the non-residential districts were also color-coded, in order to identify any state or local thoroughfares with four or more lanes (§285-37(A)(8)(a) that may be near the proposed nodes. It is understood by HDR that the Town recognizes portions of the C.A. District, which borders Central Avenue, to have non-residential land uses.

The Westchester County Geographic Information Systems website was utilized to identify NYS DMV offices (§285-37(A)(8)(d), NYS employment centers (§285-37(A)(8)(d), post offices (§285-37(A)(8)(d), and fire departments (§285-37(A)(8)(b), which are identified in the Town Code as “as-of-right” sites. Each of these was also plotted on the Zoning Map. No other federal and state-owned buildings could be identified on the website (§285-37(A)(8)(d). The Town Planner confirmed that the only Town-owned property used by the DPW within 200 ft of the Sprain Brook Parkway (§285-37(A)(8)(g) is at Sprain Road. This location was also plotted.

Public utility rights-of-way containing tower-elevated high-voltage electric power transmission lines (§285-37(A)(8)(f), were identified from information obtained from the Town Planning Commission, and were also noted during the site visits. It is understood that co-location of NextG antennas and shrouds on the high-voltage transmission tower structures is not a technically feasible option because the necessary fiber optic lines do not exist in these locations.

\(^1\) For purposes of this memorandum, a “preferred” site is a qualitative term with criteria that can include: greater distance from residences, schools, parks, day care facilities; less relative aesthetic impact (e.g., preferences for more highly trafficked roadways, commercial/industrial areas, or locations below or near high-voltage transmission lines, etc.).
Based on the site reconnaissance and above-described desk-top analysis work, HDR identified eight (8) of the proposed NextG nodes as having possible “preferred” locations in the general vicinity.

- NYD6320 (Highland Road)
- NYD6322 (across from 2 Sky Top Drive)
- NYD6326 (Clifton Rd and Central Avenue)
- NYD6328 (across from 644 Fort Hill Road)
- NYD6329 (across from 400 Underhill Road)
- NYD6332 (near 2 Secor Glen Road)
- NYD6333 (105 Poe Street)
- NYD6336 (Parkview Place)

HDR submitted an information request email (with photos of possible alternate utility poles) on February 15, 2012. The purpose of the information request was to obtain additional technical (and other) rationale from the applicant on whether or not the “preferred” location is a feasible alternate option. A copy of this information request is included in Attachment A.

It should be noted that the other 12 proposed nodes – in HDR’s opinion – appear to be at reasonable locations, with no apparent potential alternate or “preferred” siting opportunity in the vicinity, based on site reconnaissance, reviews of application materials, and other desk-top analysis.

February 21, 2012 NextG Submittal and HDR Review

In response to HDR’s February 15, 2012 information request, the applicant’s RF Engineer provided a response memorandum dated February 21, 2012. For reference, this NextG supplemental submittal is also provided in Attachment A. The potential alternate locations identified by HDR were evaluated by NextG, and rationales were given in support of the original proposed locations over the potential alternates. Specific notes on the eight nodes of interest are included in Table 2, including technical information provided in both the January 26 and February 21, 2012 applicant submittals.

HDR found the responses to the potential alternate locations for the eight nodes to be reasonable. Technical information (particularly in the January 26 affidavit, which contained coverage maps) and logistical reasons as to why some of the
potential alternates do not work (i.e., existing electrical equipment on a utility pole) were also given.

**MetroPCS coverage**

Figure 2 and Attachment A provide information on existing and proposed MetroPCS wireless telecommunications facilities in and around the Town of Greenburgh. HDR requested that NextG confirm the locations of MetroPCS’ “conventional” telecommunications facilities (e.g., antennas on towers or rooftops) to map out existing (on air) facilities and proposed facilities. The dark green coverage areas (with red dots) on Figure 2 depict existing or approved MetroPCS sites. The bright yellow coverage areas (with blue dots) represent MetroPCS sites that are currently proposed. As shown on Figure 2, the 20 proposed NextG nodes and coverage patterns do not coincide with the existing, approved, or currently proposed MetroPCS sites.

An inventory of MetroPCS sites follows:

**ON-AIR or APPROVED** (blue dots with green coverage areas on Figure 2)
- 253 Garth Tenants Corp., 253 Garth Road, Eastchester
- NY6043. 80 Grasslands Road, Greenburgh
- NY6045. 670 White Plains Road, Tarrytown
- NY6046. 75 N. Central LLC, 75 N. Central Avenue, Elmsford
- NY6048. 15 Fisher Lane, White Plains
- NY6049. 70 Ferris Avenue, White Plains
- NY6027. 177 East Hartsdale Avenue

**PROPOSED** (blue dots with yellow coverage areas on Figure 2)
- NY6028. 313 N. Central Avenue, Scarsdale
- NY6030. NYS Thruway, Mile Post 6, Yonkers and alternate at 460 Saw Mill River Road, Greenburgh
- NY6034. NYS Thruway, Mile Post 8.3, Ardsley and alternate rooftop site located at 690 Saw Mill River Road.
- NY6044. 75 Grasslands Road, White Plains
- NY6047. 543 Tarrytown Road, White Plains
In conclusion, the applicant has been generally responsive to Town Board and HDR technical information requests in 2012.

Please feel free to contact us should you have any questions on this transmittal.

Sincerely,
Henningson, Durham & Richardson
Architecture and Engineering, P.C.
in association with HDR Engineering Inc.

Michael P. Musso, P.E.
Senior Project Engineer

Attachments

cc: NextG Networks
    Peter Wise
    Timothy Lewis
    Thomas Madden
Proposed NextG Distributed Antenna System
Greenburgh, NY

Proposed & On-Air Metro PCS Sites

Proposed DAS Node Location

Proposed Metro PCS Sites With In-Vehicle Coverage Pattern

On Air or Approved MetroPCS Sites With In-Vehicle Coverage Pattern

LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE

APPROX. SCALE: 1 in. = 3,400 ft
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NextG ID #</th>
<th>Utility Pole Location</th>
<th>Nearest Address</th>
<th>Pole ID</th>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Applicant - Distance to Nearest Non-Residential Area (Feet)</th>
<th>Applicant - Direction to Nearest Non-Residential Area (Feet)</th>
<th>HDR Evaluation - Distance to Non-Residential District (Feet)</th>
<th>HDR Evaluation - Distance to Nearest Highway (Feet)</th>
<th>Within 350 ft of Child Day-care Center, School, Camp, Public Park, or Playground</th>
<th>Vicinity Map Information (as provided in application submittals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NYD 6320</td>
<td>Highland Road</td>
<td>155 Highland Road</td>
<td>W7</td>
<td>R-7.5. within Town ROW</td>
<td>7250</td>
<td>west G.I. district</td>
<td>6000 west is G.I. district</td>
<td>1250 to the west is SBP</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>50 ft from nearest residence. 700 ft to nearest occupiable structure. 653 ft to Greenville Elementary School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYD 6321</td>
<td>Sprain Brook Parkway</td>
<td>185 Jackson Avenue</td>
<td>no ID</td>
<td>R-20. within Town ROW</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>northwest G.I. District</td>
<td>3750 to northwest is G.I. district at SBP entrance</td>
<td>within 350 ft of Sprain Ridge County Park</td>
<td>545 ft from nearest residential structure. 655 ft to nearest occupiable structure. 196 ft from Sprain Ridge County Park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYD 6322</td>
<td>Fort Hill Road</td>
<td>across from 2 Skytop Drive</td>
<td>NYT S</td>
<td>R-20. within Town ROW</td>
<td>6300</td>
<td>northwest G.I. District</td>
<td>6500 to northwest is G.I. district</td>
<td>1750 to the west is SBP</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>30 ft from nearest residential structure. 775 ft from nearest occupiable structure. Not within 1,500 ft of child day-care centers, schools, camps, public parks and playgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYD 6323</td>
<td>Sprain Valley Road</td>
<td>35 Sprain Valley Road</td>
<td>NYT 16</td>
<td>R-20. within Town ROW</td>
<td>4900</td>
<td>west G.I. district</td>
<td>5500 west is G.I. district</td>
<td>250 to the west is SBP</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>90 ft from nearest residential/occupiable structure. Not within 1,500 ft of child day care center, school, camp, public park or playground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYD 6324</td>
<td>Ardsley Road</td>
<td>Ardsley Road and Sprain Brook Pkwy</td>
<td>no ID</td>
<td>R-20. within Town ROW</td>
<td>6300</td>
<td>west G.I. district</td>
<td>6250 west is G.I. district</td>
<td>125 ft to the west is SBP</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>350 ft from nearest residential structure. 700 ft from nearest occupiable structure. 1,115 ft from Greenville Elementary School. Not within 1,500 ft of child day care center, camp, public park or playground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYD 6325</td>
<td>Ardsley Road</td>
<td>404 Ardsley Road</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>R-20. within Town ROW</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>west G.I. district</td>
<td>8250 west is G.I. district</td>
<td>2500 ft to the northwest is SBP</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>50 ft from nearest residential structure. 925 ft from nearest occupiable structure. 1,357 ft from Town of Greenburgh Park. 612 ft from Greenville Elementary School. Not within 1,500 ft of a child day-care center or camp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYD 6326</td>
<td>Clifton Road</td>
<td>Clifton Road and Central Park Avenue</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>R-C.A. within Town ROW</td>
<td>8300</td>
<td>west G.I. district</td>
<td>8750 west is G.I. district</td>
<td>4000 ft to the west is SBP</td>
<td>within 350 ft of Town of Greenburgh Green Space</td>
<td>208 ft from nearest residential structure. 65 ft from nearest occupiable structure. 62 ft from Town of Greenburgh Park Land (at Central Park Ave, Inverness Rd &amp; Paxford Lane, Scarsdale).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYD 6327</td>
<td>Longview Drive</td>
<td>3 Longview Drive</td>
<td>24177</td>
<td>R-7.5. within Town ROW</td>
<td>8900</td>
<td>west G.I. district</td>
<td>9000 west is G.I. district</td>
<td>3000 ft to the west is SBP</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>75 ft from nearest residential structure. 860 ft to nearest occupiable structure. 653 ft to Greenville Elementary School. Not within 1,500 ft of child day care center, camp, public park and playground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYD 6328</td>
<td>Fort Hill Road</td>
<td>across from 644 Fort Hill Road</td>
<td>W645</td>
<td>R-C.A. within Town ROW</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>west G.I. district</td>
<td>10600 west is G.I. district</td>
<td>4000 ft to the west is SBP</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>63 ft 10 in from nearest residence. 160 ft from nearest occupiable structure. 446 ft to Edgemont High School. Not within 1,500 ft of child day care center, camp, public park and playground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYD 6329</td>
<td>Underhill Road</td>
<td>400 Underhill Road</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>R-20. within Town ROW</td>
<td>6850</td>
<td>west G.I. district</td>
<td>7250 west is G.I. district</td>
<td>600 ft to the west is SBP</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>65 ft from nearest residential structure. 435 ft from nearest occupiable structure. Not within 1,500 ft of any child day care centers, schools, camps, public parks, or playgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYD 6330</td>
<td>Sprain Road</td>
<td>37 Sprain Road</td>
<td>Scarsdale</td>
<td>W16</td>
<td>R-20. within Town ROW</td>
<td>5250</td>
<td>northwest O.B.-1</td>
<td>5000 northwest is OB-1 district</td>
<td>adjacent to SBP</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYD 6331</td>
<td>Ardsley Road</td>
<td>Ardsley Road and Westminster Road</td>
<td>Scarsdale</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>R-7.5. within Town ROW</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td>west G.I. district</td>
<td>8750 west is G.I. district</td>
<td>3250 ft to the northwest</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYD 6332</td>
<td>Secor Road</td>
<td>adjacent to 2 Secor Glen Road</td>
<td>Hartsdale</td>
<td>W-275</td>
<td>R-30. within Town ROW</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>northeast D.S.</td>
<td>3700 northeast is D.S. district</td>
<td>125 ft to the west is SBP</td>
<td>within 350 ft of Ridge Road County Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYD 6333</td>
<td>Poe Street</td>
<td>105 Poe Street</td>
<td>Hartsdale</td>
<td>W-18</td>
<td>R-7.5. within Town ROW</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>northeast D.S.</td>
<td>2250 east is D.S. district</td>
<td>adjacent to SBP</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYD 6334</td>
<td>Pomander Drive</td>
<td>101 Pomander Drive</td>
<td>White Plains</td>
<td>V2 10</td>
<td>R-7.5. within Town ROW</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>southeast D.S.</td>
<td>2000 southeast is the D.S. district</td>
<td>adjacent to SBP</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYD 6335</td>
<td>Edgewold Road</td>
<td>20 Edgewold Road</td>
<td>White Plains</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>R-10. within Town ROW</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>west O.B.-1</td>
<td>2250 west is O.B.-1 district</td>
<td>adjacent to SBP</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYD 6336</td>
<td>Parkview Place</td>
<td>1 Parkview Place</td>
<td>Elmsford</td>
<td>12185</td>
<td>R-10. within Town ROW</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>northwest O.B.</td>
<td>125 northwest is O.B. district</td>
<td>1500 ft to the northwest is the Saw Mill River Pkwy</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYD 6337</td>
<td>Old Army Road</td>
<td>111 Old Army Road</td>
<td>Scarsdale</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>R-20. within Town ROW</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>west G.I.</td>
<td>8000 northeast is L.O.B. district</td>
<td>1500 to the east is Bronx River Pkwy</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYD 6339</td>
<td>Mountain Road</td>
<td>447 Mountain Road</td>
<td>Irvington</td>
<td>W46</td>
<td>R-40. within Town ROW</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>northeast O.B.</td>
<td>1500 northeast is O.B. district</td>
<td>250 ft to the east is Saw Mill River Pkwy</td>
<td>within 350 ft of Taxter Ridge Park Preserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYD 6340</td>
<td>Taxter Road</td>
<td>493 Taxter Road</td>
<td>Elmsford</td>
<td>W2601 4</td>
<td>R-40. within Town ROW</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>northeast O.B.</td>
<td>450 northeast is O.B. district</td>
<td>1000 ft to the east is NYS Thruway</td>
<td>within 350 ft of Taxter Ridge Park Preserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Occupiable structure is assumed to be defined as any non-residential use building in the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NextG ID #</th>
<th>Utility Pole Location</th>
<th>Nearest Address</th>
<th>Potential Alternate Location Identified by HDR</th>
<th>Applicant Response</th>
<th>HDR Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NYD 6320</td>
<td>Highland Road</td>
<td>155 Highland Rd</td>
<td>Utility pole in front of 188 Longview Rd (closest to Sprain Brook Parkway - near western dead end of street). This shift is still within the same residential R-7.5 District. The coverage objective is for the residential area, not the Sprain Brook Parkway. Will not work for NextG.</td>
<td>Response appears to be reasonable, based on review of topography and node coverage objective. The ground elevation at the pole near 188 Longview is approximately 40 ft lower than at 155 Highland Rd, and could result in loss of “line-of-sight” connection between the adjacent nodes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYD 6322</td>
<td>Fort Hill Road</td>
<td>Across from 2 Skytop Drive</td>
<td>Wooden utility poles at Fort Hill Road and Jackson Avenue intersection. This shift results in an elevation loss of 52 ft and is 600 ft away. The coverage objective is for the residential area, and the shift is too far south. Will not work for NextG.</td>
<td>Response appears to be reasonable, based on review of topography and node coverage objective. The lower ground elevation near Jackson Avenue would likely result in a loss of “line of sight” coverage to areas north of the proposed node.</td>
<td>The January 26, 2012 affidavit noted a potential alternate on Central Avenue. A supplemental coverage map provided by the applicant shows losses in “line-of-sight” signal along Central Avenue to the south (as compared with the proposed location). Based on additional recon work, this potential alternate could be more proximal to residential properties than the original location. Applicant notes that wooden utility poles along west side of Central Avenue are not feasible (assumed to be due to access constraints). Original proposed node location at Clifton Road and Central Avenue thus appears to be reasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYD6326</td>
<td>Clifton Road</td>
<td>Clifton Road &amp; Central Park Avenue</td>
<td>Two potential wooden utility poles along west side of Central Avenue, near the southern entrance of the Mid-Way Shopping Center. A shift from this location was evaluated in a prior affidavit. It is still within the C.A. District. Will not work for NextG.</td>
<td></td>
<td>In the January 26, 2012 affidavit, the applicant notes two possible locations (500 ft to the north and 550 ft to the south; both map locations appear to be along the Central Avenue corridor). For the northern alternate, a loss in ground elevation as compared with the proposed utility pole was noted, which the supplemental coverage map shows a resulting loss of east-west coverage. For the southern alternative, a loss in &quot;line of sight&quot; coverage is noted to the north and west (this resulting loss on coverage was depicted by the applicant on a supplemental coverage map). No technical information was provided in response to HDR's February 2012 information request. It is assumed based on the applicant's supplemental submittals that the nearby utility poles along Central Avenue are not accessible to NextG. The applicant noted that the wooden utility pole near the Greenville Fire Dept. has equipment that effectively prevents co-location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYD6328</td>
<td>Fort Hill Road</td>
<td>Across from 664 Fort Hill Road</td>
<td>Wooden or steel utility poles. 1. West side of Central Avenue, in proximity to the two Sentry Place access driveways. 2. Southeast corner of the Greenville Fire Dept. property. 1. A shift from this location was evaluated in a prior affidavit. It is still within the C.A. District. 2. This utility pole has a riser and is not useable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYD6329</td>
<td>Underhill Road</td>
<td>400 Underhill Rd</td>
<td>Wooden utility poles located further to the west (downhill) on Underhill Road (closer to Sprain Brook Parkway). Closer to (beneath) high-voltage electrical transmission lines. A shift from this location will result in a 30+ decrease in elevation and a diminished line of sight to the Sprain Brook Parkway. It is still within a residential district. Will not work for NextG.</td>
<td>A review of topography indicates that potential alternates along Underhill Rd (~30 ft elevation) could experience diminished “line of sight” signal due to tree line, as compared with the original proposed node location. See the attached page for a topographic profile from the lower elevation utility poles. Proposed node location at near 400 Underhill Road appears reasonable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYD6332</td>
<td>Secor Road</td>
<td>Adjacent to 2 Secor Glen Road</td>
<td>Wooden utility pole on other side (west) of the Sprain Brook Parkway. The proposed location is closer to electric transmission lines than the proposed shift. This is still a residential district. The utility pole has a riser and is not useable. Will not work for NextG.</td>
<td>The applicant noted that the wooden utility pole identified on the west side of the Sprain Brook Parkway has equipment that effectively prevents co-location.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NextG ID #</td>
<td>Utility Pole Location</td>
<td>Nearest Address</td>
<td>Potential Alternate Location Identified by HDR</td>
<td>Applicant Response</td>
<td>HDR Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYDE333</td>
<td>Poe Street</td>
<td>105 Poe Street</td>
<td>Hartsdale Utility Poles along Dobbs Ferry Road (slightly to the north along Sprain Brook Parkway) 1. East side of Sprain Brook Parkway, just east of Spencer Court, on the south side of the road. 2. West side of Sprain Brook Parkway, in front of Carlson’s Greenhouses, on the south side of the road. 3. West side of Sprain Brook Parkway, across from Carlson’s Greenhouses, on the north side of the road.</td>
<td>Each proposed shift is still with a residential district. The proposed shift on the east side of highway is 1200 ft to the north, and coverage is needed to the south. Options to the west of the highway were evaluated in a prior affidavit. Will not work for NextG.</td>
<td>In the January 26, 2012 affidavit, the applicant notes one potential alternate (North side of Dobbs Ferry Road, west of the Sprain Brook Parkway). A supplemental coverage map was provided at this time, and it notes a significant loss in coverage to residential areas and secondary roadways located south and east of the Sprain Brook Parkway (as compared with the original proposed node). The alternate site coverage, however, does appear to provide good “line of sight” coverage to the Sprain Brook Parkway and parts of Dobbs Ferry Road. Technical information in support of the proposed node appears to be reasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYDE336</td>
<td>Parkview Place</td>
<td>1 Parkview Place</td>
<td>Elmsford Wooden utility poles along Saw Mill River Road or nearby L.I. District.</td>
<td>All poles on Saw Mill River Road in this area have primary power and equipment and are not useable. Will not work for NextG.</td>
<td>The applicant noted that the wooden utility poles along Saw Mill River Road have equipment that effectively prevents co-location.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total distance: 2502 feet
Ground distance: 2504 feet
Climbing: 11 feet
Descending: -68 feet
Elevation change: -56 feet
Min/Max: 241/298

Latitude: 041° 00' 32.68" N
Longitude: 073° 49' 39.15" W
Elevation: 298 feet
Grade: 0%

Possible Alternate
Southern Cross-section
- 30 feet in elevation
Attachment A
January 26, 2012

By Hand Delivery

Supervisor Paul Feiner  
Members of the Town Board  
Town of Greenburgh  
177 Hillside Avenue  
Greenburgh, New York 10607

Re: Application of NextG Networks of New York, Inc. for Special Permit Approval of a Distributed Antenna System at Twenty Locations in the Town Public Right-of-Way

Dear Supervisor Feiner and Members of the Town Board:

At the Town Board work session on January 17, 2012, we informed the Board that NextG would prepare an affidavit that addresses Town Code Section 285-37.A(9)(d), which requires that NextG prove to the Town Board that “adequate coverage cannot be achieved by siting or collocating the facility on one or more... sites in a nonresidential district.” The enclosed January 26, 2012 affidavit of Amir Ahtabi, the radio frequency engineer who designed the proposed DAS, is respectfully submitted for that purpose, and specifically to demonstrate that “technical... limitations prevent location or collocation” of the proposed DAS in a non-residential district.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Peter J. Wise

Enc.  
cc: Timothy W. Lewis, Esq., Town Attorney (by e-mail)  
Peter D. Heimdahl, Esq., NextG Senior Director of Government Relations  
Mark P. Weingarten, Esq.  
Scott Thompson, Esq.
State of Pennsylvania       }   SS.:  
County of Montgomery      }

I, Amir Abtahi, Radio Frequency Engineer for NextG Networks of NY, Inc., being duly sworn, depose and state the following under penalty of perjury:

1. I affirm my prior certifications in this matter, which verified the facts and opinions in NextG’s application to the best of my knowledge and belief.

2. NextG Networks of NY, Inc. (“NextG”) has received copies of letters from the Greenburgh Antenna Review Board (“ARB”) to the Town Board dated January 5 and January 9, 2012 from Ms. Michelle McNally and Ms. Catherine Lederer-Plaskett, respectively, requesting that NextG’s application under Town Code §285-37 (the “Antenna Law”) currently before the Town Board for special permit approval be referred back to the ARB to determine whether NextG has satisfactorily demonstrated that it cannot locate any of its planned communications facilities within right-of-way under the jurisdiction of the State of New York. NextG’s understanding is that the Town considers State right-of-way to be an “as-of-right” site under the Antenna Law, meaning it is a preferred location from the Town’s standpoint and does not require a special permit or variance.

3. Despite repeated and consistent attempts over the last three years, to date, NextG has been unable to secure any permission from the State to access its rights-of-way in any municipality on an equal and non-discriminatory basis. Based on this experience, NextG reasonably concluded that it could not feasibly locate its facilities in the State right-of-way in Greenburgh, and so informed the ARB of this constraint consistently throughout its application process. Given the Town’s assertion that installation in the right-of-way is permissible without special permit approval, it stands to reason that NextG would have chosen this less burdensome path wherever possible for its network design if it was feasible.

4. Notwithstanding, and without regard to the validity of the Town’s assertion that wireless facilities placed within the State public right-of-way are “as-of-right” as a matter of law, on January 13, 2012, I visited four (4) of the twenty (20) currently proposed NextG equipment locations which are proximal to State right-of-way and conducted a preliminary analysis to determine whether NextG could reasonably relocate its equipment to the right-of-way, assuming available utility infrastructure and also assuming permission from the State. My findings and analysis as to the feasibility of these locations are as follows:

I conducted field observations and radio frequency testing of NextG locations NYD6326, NYD6328, NYD6331, and NYD6333. Please see attached reports and maps labeled “Exhibit A” to this affidavit. Although there are existing utility poles within the State right-of-way proximate to all of these locations, only location NYD6331 has an existing alternate pole available for NextG equipment installation that is located within a distance that is technically feasible to include in NextG’s network design; the poles proximate to the other locations are not feasible due to the presence on the pole of
primary electric lines and/or existing utility equipment, which precludes NextG's poletop installation in accordance with ConEdison standards and requirements.

5. I have already thoroughly demonstrated in the extensive applications to the ARB through my coverage gap analysis that NextG's proposed equipment locations are necessary to provide the requisite level of coverage in those areas to NextG's customer. With respect to the assertion that under §285-37.A(9)(d) of the Antenna Law, NextG must demonstrate that location of any of the nodes to a non-residential zoning district is prevented by "technical limitations," I have attached sections of the official zoning map of the Town of Greenburgh as "Exhibit B" to this affidavit showing each of NextG's currently proposed equipment locations along with an arrow with the distance pointing to the nearest non-residentially zoned area. In all cases relocation to a non-residential district would prevent network functionality due to the technical limitations of the DAS system. NextG's transmitters are low power, having small coverage footprints and must be carefully designed and placed to take into account buildings, vegetation and topography. The average distance from the proposed locations to a non-residential district is over 5000 feet. Each node, or equipment location, on average, covers about 1000 feet in each direction. An equipment location shift of just a few hundred feet will therefore open up unacceptable gaps in reliable coverage and also result in excessive overlapping of coverage in other areas causing the current network design not to function properly. Two of the twenty currently proposed equipment locations, NYD6340 and NYD6336, are situated a relative shorter distance from a non-residential district as compared with other proposed NextG equipment locations, at 450 feet and 300 feet respectively. However, in addition to the distances still being too great to work for NextG's design coverage, there were also no available existing utility poles found for NextG equipment installation within the right-of-ways in those non-residential districts.

Amir Abtahi, Radio Frequency Engineer

Sworn to me this 86th day of January, 2012

Signature of Notary Public

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Notarial Seal
Nilam Shahzad, Notary Public
Lower Providence Twp., Montgomery County
My Commission Expires May 27, 2012
Member, Pennsylvania Association of Notaries
Exhibit A
State Right-of-Way Analysis
NYD6326 – The current proposed equipment location is at the southeast corner of Clifton Road and Central Park Avenue, adjacent to a Shell Gas Station and is within close proximity to State Highway 100. The current proposed equipment location is situated at a higher relative ground elevation than Central Park Avenue and has excellent line of sight both to the north and south. This clear line of sight results in reliable in-vehicle and in-building coverage along Central Park Avenue.

On Tuesday 1/17, NextG visited the area and surveyed/searched for the nearest available existing pole within the State right-of-way. One pole location was identified.

The alternate pole location along Central Park Avenue is approximately 650 feet north of the current proposed equipment location. There were no other usable existing poles to the south for at least one mile, well beyond the coverage range of a NextG’s equipment. NextG conducted a radio frequency analysis of this location on Wednesday the 18th of January.

The alternate pole location does not provide adequate coverage as compared with the current proposed equipment location. The alternate location is lower in elevation and is too far to the north, resulting in excessive coverage overlap with the network design to the north. Also, this alternate pole does not provide coverage to other areas east, west and south of the site (see attached map illustrating the degradation in coverage).
The original proposed equipment location is near 644 Fort Hill Rd and is within close proximity to Central Park Avenue, also known as “State Highway 100”. This location was designed to provide continuous in-vehicle coverage to the commuters on Central Park Avenue and also to provide reliable in-building coverage along Central Park Avenue. In addition, the proposed equipment location provides reliable-in-building coverage to the residential neighborhoods both east and west of Central Park Avenue around Edgemont Circle east of Central Park Ave and Fort Hill and Under Hill road to the west.

On Tuesday 1/17, NextG visited the area and surveyed/searched for the nearest available existing pole within the State right-of-way. Two pole locations were identified.

The first pole location is a distance of 500 feet to the north of the current proposed equipment. NextG conducted a radio frequency analysis of this location on Wednesday the 18th of January. The results of the analysis show acceptable coverage along Central Park Avenue. However, due to loss in ground elevation resulting from the shift as compared with the original proposed location, reliable in-building-coverage to the residential neighborhoods both east and west of the site has diminished (see attached map illustrating the degradation in coverage) and is therefore not an acceptable alternative.

The second pole location is a distance of 550 feet to the south of the current proposed equipment installation. NextG conducted a radio frequency analysis of this location on Wednesday the 18th of January. The results of the analysis show this location is also not suitable as a possible replacement for the current proposed equipment location. The line of sight from this location to the north on Central Park Avenue is limited and would effectively result in a loss of over 2000 feet of reliable in-building coverage specific to that area north along Central Park Avenue. In addition, a gap in reliable in-building coverage towards the west would result as compared with the coverage from the original proposed location (see attached map illustrating the degradation in coverage).
The current proposed equipment location is near 111 Old Army Road across from a shopping center and is within close proximity to State Highway 100. This current proposed location already represents a shift from NextG’s initially proposed location due to a requested move by the Greenburgh ARB in March of 2011 during field visits with the Town. That shift resulted in undesired excessive overlap in coverage with current proposed equipment location NYD6325. NextG agreed to the shift as an accommodation to the ARB, believing that the shift to the alternate location proposed by ARB would foster good-will and assist with the approval process.

On Tuesday 1/17, NextG visited the area and surveyed/searched for the nearest available existing pole within the State right-of-way. One pole location was identified.

The alternate pole location is a distance of approximately 550 feet away from the current proposed equipment location. NextG conducted a radio frequency analysis of this location on Wednesday the 18th of January. The results of the analysis show that the shift provides similar coverage to the current proposed equipment and would serve as a suitable location assuming NextG is successful in gaining permission from the underlying utility, the State, and its customer. NextG does have concerns with regard to safe access to this alternate pole as it is situated about 20 feet east of Central Park Ave on a steep embankment. See attached map illustrating the coverage afforded by the potential alternate location.
NextG Networks
Greenburgh Plots

- DAS Node Original Proposed Location
- DAS Node Alternate Location
- Predicted Reliable Coverage for Original Proposed Location
- Predicted Reliable Coverage for Alt Location

Area of "Loss in Coverage" Due to Shift to Alt Location
- The current proposed equipment location is near 105 Poe Street, and is within close proximity to State Highway 100B. The current proposed location was designed to provide continuous, reliable in-vehicle coverage along Sprain Brook Highway and also to provide reliable-in-building coverage to residential neighborhoods around Poe Street and Lytton Avenue.

On Tuesday 1/17, NextG visited the area and surveyed/searched for the nearest available existing pole within the State right-of-way. One pole location was identified.

The second pole west of Sprain Brook Parkway, on the north side of Dobbs Ferry Road approximately 720 feet away from the current proposed location, was identified as a potential alternate option for NextG’s equipment placement. NextG conducted a radio frequency analysis of this location on Wednesday the 18th of January.

The alternate pole location covers Sprain Brook Parkway with good signal providing continuous in-vehicular coverage along the Parkway. However, due to the significant shift in distance from the original location it does not adequately cover the residential neighborhood near Poe Street and Lytton Avenue as compared with the current proposed equipment location and is therefore not an acceptable alternative (see attached map illustrating the degradation in coverage).
Exhibit B
Distance to Nearest Non-residential Zone Analysis
Amir:

HDR has conducted additional site visits to further evaluate proposed node locations and environs. We have developed a few questions related to possible alternate locations for some of the nodes (i.e., locations that may be considered as preferred locations to proposed poles).

We understand the potential use of these locations may have been discussed/addressed prior with the Town; however, any clarification you can provide to us would be appreciated. These questions are being asked by HDR as part of the “due diligence” being conducted on behalf of the Town for the proposed nodes. If technical information relating to these possible alternates has been provided by NextG prior (which it may have been), HDR is not in possession of that information.

I will re-forward duplicates of this email due to size of some of the photos being attached.

**NYD6320 (Highland Road)** – Can NextG locate on the wooden utility pole along Longview that is closest to the Sprain Brook Pkwy (near western dead end of street) ?? Photos of the pole in front of 188 Longview are attached for your references. This alternate is approximately 400-500 ft from the proposed Highland Road pole.

**NYD6322 (across from 2 Sky Top Drive)** - Can NextG potentially use wooden poles at the Fort Hill Rd / Jackson Ave intersection (approximately 500 ft to the south ?)

**NYD6326 (Central Ave / Clifton Rd)** – Can NextG utilize wooden poles along the west side of Central Ave, near the southern end entrance of Mid-Way Shopping Center ? (reference photos of 2 poles are attached)

**NYD6328 (across from 644 Fort Hill Rd)** – Can NextG use wooden or steel poles along the west side of Central Ave, in proximity to the two Sentry Place access drives to the apartment building ? (reference photos are attached).

- There is also a wooden pole at the SE corner of the Greenville Fire District property, further south along Central Ave. Can this pole possibly be used by NextG ? (see photo for reference)
NYD6329 (across from 400 Underhill Rd) – Can NextG utilize 1 of the two wooden poles located further to the west (down) Underhill Road ?? These poles (see photos) exist beneath or close to high power transmission lines, and closer to the Sprain Brook Parkway.

NYD6332 (near 2 Secor Glen Rd) – Is it feasible for NextG to utilize a wooden pole on the other side (west side) of the Sprain Brook Parkway ? See attached photo. This alternate location is closer to high power transmission lines, and a “commercial” land use (nursery).

NYD6333 (Poe St.) – Can wooden poles along Dobbs Ferry Road (slightly to the north along the Sprain Brook Parkway) be utilized by NextG ? The attached photos provide 3 examples that are in immediate proximity to the SBP, and are at similar elevation to the Poe St. node.

- East side of SBP (wooden pole just east of Spencer Ct, along south side of Dobbs Ferry Rd)
- West side of SBP (wooden pole in front of Carlson’s Greenhouses, on south side of Dobbs Ferry Rd)
- West side of SBP (wooden pole across from Carlson’s, on north side of Dobbs Ferry Rd)

NYD6336 (Parkview Place). This location is in close proximity to Saw Mill River Road and an O.B. district (see attached photo – note utility pole in front of Westchester County Archives and Recor
Pole at bottom of Longview Road (in front of 188) - possible alternate to Highland Road.
Utility pole at 188 Longview Drive.
Central Avenue – utility pole at southern entrance to Mid-Way (possible alternate to Clifton Road).
Central Avenue – northern Sentry Place entrance.

Central Avenue – pole near northern Sentry Place entrance.
Central Avenue – southern Sentry Place entrance.

Central Avenue – southern Sentry Place poles.
Central Avenue – Greenville Fire Department.

Central Avenue – Greenville Fire Department.
Possible alternate to 400 Underhill Road.
Possible alternate to 400 Underhill Road.
Utility pole on north side of Secor Road (west of SBP) – possible alternate to Secor Glen Road.

South side of Dobbs Ferry Road (east of SBP, near Spencer) – possible alternate to Poe Street.
North and South side of Dobbs Ferry Road (west of SBP) – possible alternate to Poe Street.

2199 Saw Mill River Road in background – possible alternate to Parkview Place.
February 21, 2012

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Mr. Michael P. Musso, P.E., M.S., MPTI
HDR, Inc.
One Blue Hill Plaza
PO Box 1509
Pearl River, NY 10965

Re: Special Permit Application for NextG Networks of NY, Inc.

Dear Mr. Musso:

Enclosed you will find NextG’s responses (in red) authored by NextG’s Regional Director of RF Engineering, Amir Abtahi, to your email communication dated February 15, 2012 which proposed NextG equipment location shifts for the following eight NextG equipment identifiers:

NYD6320
NYD6322
NYD6326
NYD6328
NYD6329
NYD6332
NYD6333
NYD6336

As you can determine from Mr. Abtahi’s responses, the alternate equipment locations you have proposed do not meet the coverage objectives for NextG’s network design. Moreover, the locations for which you have requested an alternative analysis for are not part of NextG’s current application before the Town and therefore, assuming
they were suitable to NextG, (they are not) would require de novo special permit application and review (noting also that the alternate locations you suggest are not within areas designated "as of right" by the Greenburgh Code) by the Town’s Antenna Review Board and Town Board. Respectfully, I had stated for the record on February 7th, 2012 that NextG is not amenable to going back through the Town’s process, again, which has now taken us over two years without resolution.

Finally, in response to Councilman Sheehan’s query with regard to whether there can be alternate equipment shroud configurations, NextG is constrained by the standards set by the Telcordia “Blue Book - Manual of Construction Procedures” for distance/separation from the top of equipment to the lowest communication cable (which is 2’ 7””) and, even more importantly, by ConEdison’s specifications for third-party equipment installation which reflect the Telcordia standard. ConEd standards also require the bottom of NextG’s meter pan to be a minimum of 8’ 6” from the ground. Therefore, stacking the equipment in a slimmer, more vertical configuration would not conform to either Telcordia standards or ConEd standards for NextG equipment separation from the lowest cable. Nevertheless, in good faith, we approached ConEd about the possibility of a temporary installation consisting only of a single Intelligent Optical Network unit (“ION”) to each pole (the currently proposed shroud cover is sized to accommodate 2 IONs). ConEd has responded that since this configuration is not the standard approved by ConEd and Verizon for NextG equipment attachments to their poles, they are unlikely to approve a separate standard (i.e. neither one ION, nor two IONs stacked) for deployment only in Greenburgh. Respectfully, I remind you that the currently proposed, ConEd approved NextG shroud configuration is designed to accommodate more than one carrier and fulfills the intent of the Town’s wireless law which is to maximize the potential for collocation opportunities.

Very truly yours,

NEXTG NETWORKS OF NY, INC.

[Signature]

Peter D. Heimdahl
Senior Director of Government Relations

Copies: Mr. Timothy Lewis, Esq., Town Attorney
Robert Delsman, Esq., NextG SVP Government Relations & Regulatory Affairs
Peter Wise, Esq., Delbello Donnellan Weingarten Wise & Wiederkehr LLP
Mark Weingarten, Esq., Delbello Donnellan Weingarten Wise & Wiederkehr LLP

Enclosures: NextG Networks (Amir Abtahi) response to Mike Musso due diligence request of February 15, 2012
Telcordia Blue Book Standard, Figure 14-2, December 2007
Amir:

HDR has conducted additional site visits to further evaluate proposed node locations and environs. We have developed a few questions related to possible alternate locations for some of the nodes (i.e., locations that may be considered as preferred locations to proposed poles).

We understand the potential use of these locations may have been discussed/addressed prior with the Town; however, any clarification you can provide to us would be appreciated. These questions are being asked by HDR as part of the “due diligence” being conducted on behalf of the Town for the proposed nodes. If technical information relating to these possible alternates has been provided by NextG prior (which it may have been), HDR is not in possession of that information.

I will re-forward duplicates of this email due to size of some of the photos being attached.

NYD6320 (Highland Road) – Can NextG locate on the wooden utility pole along Longview that is closest to the Sprain Brook Pkwy (near western dead end of street)? Photos of the pole in front of 188 Longview are attached for your references. This alternate is approximately 400-500 ft from the proposed Highland Road pole.

This proposed shift is still within the same zoning classification, R-7.5. In addition, this particular node’s coverage objective is not the Sprain Brook Parkway but the actual surrounding residential area. The current proposed location is most suitable for the current network design. The suggested shift in location will not work for NextG.
NYD6322 (across from 2 Sky Top Drive) - Can NextG potentially use wooden poles at the Fort Hill Rd / Jackson Ave intersection (approximately 500 ft to the south?)

This shift will result in ground elevation loss of 50ft+, from ~302ft down to 250ft. Also, the proposed shift is about 600ft which is around the coverage radius of a DAS installation around this area. This shift will not work as the NextG intention is to cover the residential in this area to the north – the proposed shift is towards south.

NYD6326 (Central Ave / Clifton Rd) - Can NextG utilize wooden poles along the west side of Central Ave, near the southern end entrance of Mid-Way Shopping Center? (reference photos of 2 poles are attached)

I had already reviewed this option and provided comments on the closest available utility pole on Central Park Ave for this proposed Node in my affidavit. Please refer to my previous submittal. In addition, the proposed shift is still within the CA zoning district.

NYD6328 (across from 644 Fort Hill Rd) - Can NextG use wooden or steel poles along the west side of Central Ave, in proximity to the two Sentry Place access drives to the apartment building? (reference photos are attached).

- There is also a wooden pole at the SE corner of the Greenville Fire District property, further south along Central Ave. Can this pole possibly be used by NextG? (see photo for reference) – This wooden utility pole is not usable as it has a riser.

Please refer to my evaluation of the closest available poles to this location in my prior affidavit. In addition, the proposed shift is still within the CA zoning district.

NYD6329 (across from 400 Underhill Rd) - Can NextG utilize 1 of the two wooden poles located further to the west (down) Underhill Road? These poles (see photos) exist beneath or close to high power transmission lines, and closer to the Sprain Brook Parkway.
Both locations you have proposed as shifts are still within the residential districts. Below, I believe are both your suggestions. They are congested and lower in ground elevation compared to our current proposed location. The current proposal is at 340ft vs. 310ft and lower. The shift will diminish the line of sight to SBP. The proposed shifts are not suitable for NextG’s coverage objectives.

NYD6332 (near 2 Secor Glen Rd) – Is it feasible for NextG to utilize a wooden pole on the other side (west side) of the Sprain Brook Parkway? See attached photo. This alternate location is closer to high power transmission lines, and a “commercial” land use (nursery).

The current NextG proposed location is closer to power lines than your suggested location:
This entire area is residential, and the shift you propose is in a residential zoned district (R-20). I don’t see this “commercial” district!

Also, it appears that this pole has a riser and is not useable.

NYD6333 (Poe St.) – Can wooden poles along Dobbs Ferry Road (slightly to the north along the Sprain Brook Parkway) be utilized by NextG? The attached photos provide 3 examples that are in immediate proximity to the SBP, and are at similar elevation to the Poe St. node.

- East side of SBP (wooden pole just east of Spencer Ct, along south side of Dobbs Ferry Rd)
- West side of SBP (wooden pole in front of Carlson’s Greenhouses, on south side of Dobbs Ferry Rd)

- West side of SBP (wooden pole across from Carlson’s, on north side of Dobbs Ferry Rd)

The proposed shifts are all still within residential zoned districts. For the west side of the highway, I already tested the best option immediately west of the highway. Please refer to my affidavit.

The proposed shift to the east side of the highway, please see attached zoning map. The shift is still in residential district. The proposed shift is also over 1200ft towards north and will not work for NextG’s coverage objective. The bulk of coverage need is to the south.

NYD6336 (Parkview Place). This location is in close proximity to Saw Mill River Road and an O.B. district (see attached photo – note utility pole in front of Westchester County Archives and Records Center). Can proposed node be re-located to a nearby Saw Mill River Road utility pole (on the west side of the street, so to abut an O.B. district [or perhaps in an As-of-Right L.I. District a bit more to the north])?

This one was visited. Your pictures show our current proposed location. I am not sure if you are proposing an alternate option that is already our selection? However, the current proposed node is the closest useable utility pole to Saw Mill River Road. All poles on Saw Mill near this location have primary power and equipment, not useable.

Councilman Sheehan has inquired about possible alternate configurations for pole-mounted utility boxes. Can the shrouds be smaller, or can they be fabricated to be taller and narrower, so to better match the diameter of the wooden utility poles? Findings relating to aesthetics from HDR’s December 2011 report are included below:
• Painting of the proposed antenna, cables, mounts, equipment shrouds and all other associated equipment shall conform to the colors of the existing utility poles or as directed by the Town of Greenburgh. If the application is approved, it is understood that final colors and other aesthetic aspects of all proposed equipment is subject to Town comment and approval.

• The applicant will provide a statement on the possibility of using smaller equipment shrouds. It is understood that the feasibility / availability of equipment boxes that are smaller than the 15.5” x 35” shrouds proposed may be limited based on space requirements.

Any feedback you can provide would be great.
Where the licensee cable or terminal is installed on the same side of the pole as the telephone company cable and terminal, locate the power supply as shown in Figure 14-2. Locating the power supply on the opposite side of the pole from the terminal will cause the least inconvenience for the craftsperson performing a work operation at the terminal. If there is no terminal on the pole, the power supply may be installed on either side of the pole.

**Figure 14-2** Clearance and Grounding Methods for Power Supply Cabinet - Telephone Cable and Licensee Cable on Same Side of Pole
Mike,
Hope all is well.

Here is the response:

For item 1 from metro:

According to the NextG application materials, MetroPCS currently has “on air”, operating wireless facilities at the following locations:

- 253 Garth Tenants Corp., 253 Garth Road, Eastchester; and Correct
- 75 N. Central LLC, 75 N. Central Avenue, Elmsford (NY6046; location of proposed NextG DAS hub). Correct

One MetroPCS location has recently been approved at 670 White Plains Road, Tarrytown (Marriott Hotel; Site # NY6045) Correct, site is now on the Air. According to the NextG application, the following four MetroPCS locations have been proposed:

- 313 S. Central Avenue, Scarsdale This address should have been 313 N. Central Avenue, Scarsdale (site NY6028), we do not have sites on 313 S. Central Avenue, Scarsdale.
- 543 Tarrytown Road, White Plains (NY6047 on Figure 2) Correct
- NYS Thruway, Mile Post 6, Yonkers Correct, (this is site NY6030), We are also looking at an alternative tower site located at 460 Saw Mill River Road, Greenburgh since the Thruway authority is to slow to respond.
- NYS Thruway, Mile Post 8.3, Ardsley Correct (this is site NY6034), We are also looking at an alternative roof top site located at 690 Saw Mill River Road since the Thruway authority is to slow to respond.

It should be noted that HDR conducted a review of a MetroPCS rooftop application from October 2010 (rooftop facility approved by the Town ZBA at 177 East Hartsdale Avenue; NY6027). Those application materials were re-visited for the NextG review to further evaluate MetroPCS sites and existing coverage. The following additional on-air MetroPCS sites were identified in those application materials:

- 80 Grasslands Road, Greenburgh (NY6043) Correct.
- 15 Fisher Lane, White Plains (NY6048) Correct.
- 70 Ferris Avenue, White Plains (NY6049) Correct.

Additional proposed MetroPCS wireless facilities noted in the October 2010 application included:

- 75 Grasslands Road, White Plains (NY6044) Correct.

HDR reviewed the available MetroPCS coverage maps for the on-air and proposed locations and confirmed there is currently a gap in MetroPCS service within the NextG project area.
For your second item, our business is to install and only use right of way pole, we are a regulated utility company. We are not in the business of private leases and other infrastructure outside of ROW/Utility poles.

Third item, a street light fixture is Ok and does not prohibit a DAS equipment installation.

Fourth item, as stated in my submittal, the alternate location is on State Right of Way, that is Central Park Ave. We looked for alternates, close to the current proposed location and the closest one we found is the one stated in my submittal. It is the 3rd Pole from SE corner of Central Park Ave and Ardsley Rd, Next to train sign. Pole ID NYT175.

Also, once again, the current proposed location was a shift specifically requested by Town’s representatives, the ARB group. It is in front of the entrance to the shopping center!

The last item, as stated you are correct. An update to the address in my affidavit is required.

Thank you,

Amir R Abtahi
518-331-7649

From: Musso, Michael P.  
[mailto:Michael.Musso@hdrinc.com]
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2012 9:36 AM
To: Amir Abtahi
Cc: Peter Heimdahl; Peter J. Wise (PJW@ddw-law.com); Timothy Lewis; Zurlo, Carol
Subject: Greenburgh - NextG (due diligence questions)

Amir:

A few questions / clarification needs follow. Can you please provide brief comments?

- Can your main customer (Metro) please confirm if there are any other MetroPCS cell sites (roof top or tower panel antennas) in the Town that were NOT identified in our Dec 2011 report? I would like to confirm the On Air and proposed/approved conventional Metro cell sites in the DAS project area.

- I understand the proposed DAS in terms of height limitations and antenna power… but can you please comment further on the technical feasibility of installing a typical node antenna on highrise rooftops, high-power electric towers/lines, cell towers, or other tall structures? Your response can be framed in light of the omnidirectional antennas vs. panel antennas.

- Proposed Node NYD6327 now has a street light installed on this utility pole. Is it still usable as a DAS location?
For Proposed NYD6331 (Ardsley Rd / Westminster), did you look for potential alternate locations on Central Park Avenue (to the north of the Ardsley Road intersection), within the CA district? Your supplemental application identifies an alternate node (6331C), but we are not sure where this alternate is. We can forward some photos later on for your reference, too.

Note that the Supplemental affidavit appears to incorrectly identify NYD6331 as being located on 111 Old Army Road; it is actually located at Ardsley & Westminster. I think it is just a typo, but can you look at the paragraph and email a revision for our files?

If you have any questions on the above, note my cell # below…I will be in the field most of today.

Regards,

Mike

Michael P. Musso
P.E., M.S., MPH
HDR
Senior Project Manager
Professional Associate

One Blue Hill Plaza, PO Box 1509, Pearl River, NY 10965-3104
☎ 845.735.8300 Ext. 261 | fax: 845.735.7466 | mobile: 845.304.9639
michael.musso@hdrinc.com | hdrinc.com
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