



MINUTES
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS - REGULAR SESSION
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2026, 4:00 PM

The Zoning Board of Appeals convened in regular session at 4:00 PM, February 18, 2026. Board Chair Ballantini called the meeting to order.

Roll Call

Attendee Name	Title	Status
Matt Steinkoenig	Board Member	Present
Becky Welch	Board Member	Present
Melissa Woods	Board Member	Present
Victoria Harris	Board Member	Present
Nikki Williams	Board Vice Chair	Present
Terry Ballantini	Board Chair	Present
John Poling	Board Member	Present

City staff present included Jon Branham, Planner II; Marcus Ricci, Planner III; Alissa Pemberton, Planning Manager; Kelly Pfeifer, Director of Development Services; George Boyle, Assistant Corporation Counsel.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

Items listed on the Consent Agenda are approved with one motion; Items pulled from the Consent Agenda for discussion are listed and voted on separately.

Board Member Poling made a motion, seconded by Board Member Harris, to approve the Consent Agenda as submitted.

AYES: Ballantini, Harris, Williams, Poling, Woods, Welch, Steinkoenig

Motion carried (viva voce).

Item 4.A. Review and approval of the minutes of the November 19, 2025, regular meeting of the Bloomington Zoning Board of Appeals.

Regular Agenda

The following items were presented:

Item 5.A. SP-08-25 - Public hearing, review, and action on a request submitted by Vertical Bridge Development, LLC, for a Special Use Permit for a Wireless Communications Facility

in the B-1 (General Commercial) District, for the property located at 1106 Interstate Drive, PIN: 13-36-401-001.

Mr. Ricci presented the staff report with a recommendation for approval. He reviewed the surrounding zoning and land uses. He described the characteristics of the property and details of the request, including how the property would be subdivided and utilized. He also reviewed the standards and use provisions as outlined in the staff report.

Board Chair Ballantini inquired who would be responsible for extending the portion of Enterprise Drive that was mentioned. Mr. Ricci stated existing roads would be utilized for the project, and that Enterprise Drive is planned for eventual extension, but not in the immediate future.

Board Member Poling stated he had questions but would wait for the applicant's testimony.

Board Chair Ballantini opened the public hearing.

Jason Riggs (Representing Applicant, Project Consultant), provided further background on the project. He stated the key reasons for the request were for improved communication and capacity for T-Mobile. He identified current issues in the area and that there have been temporary activities to try to alleviate the issues. He stated this would allow for a more permanent solution.

Board Member Harris stated the submittal package was very extensive and informative.

Anna Ziegler, (Representing Applicant, Owner of Property) expanded on the request and stated support for the project. She stated the Board of Directors had already provided approval.

Board Chair Ballantini inquired about the length of the contract. Ms. Ziegler stated she believed it was for 25 years.

Board Member Poling inquired whether current access would support construction. Ms. Ziegler stated she believed so, as existing roads are mostly concrete, although some are gravel. She stated it would not interfere with other property operations.

Bailey Shepperd, Representing the Owner of the Wireless Communications Facility located at 2201 W. College Avenue, Normal, IL), stated she had a brief prepared and distributed copies to the Board. She stated she disagreed with staff's recommendation. She stated that all other options have not been investigated. She noted the applicant's need for a 150-foot tower. She stated her client's tower is located 0.8 miles away from the proposed tower, and that tower is 140 feet tall and could be increased in height. She stated there is comparable coverage at both sites. She stated T-Mobile had not provided a "good faith" effort to work with her client. She stated there is no basis for approval. She stated the applicant presented no evidence that they have met the standards and cannot co-locate on the existing tower. She requested the Board deny the request.

Mr. Boyle clarified that Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2 were submitted for the record. He inquired whether individuals identified in the brief were available to speak. Ms. Shepperd stated they

were not present. Mr. Boyle noted that in-person testimony provided ability to cross-examine, so the Board should keep that in mind.

Board Chair Ballantini inquired if the principal reason was to have T-Mobile co-locate on the existing tower. Ms. Shepperd stated that her client would like to have that conversation. Ms. Pemberton clarified that the applicant is Vertical Bridge.

Board Chair Ballantini inquired if they had reached out to Vertical Bridge. Ms. Shepperd stated they had not reached out to the competitor.

Ms. Pemberton stated the Board should give the applicant an opportunity to review the comments.

Mr. Riggs stated they had reviewed the existing sites and map area. He noted the existing tower being referenced is too close to another tower on which T-Mobile has active service. He outlined how they conducted their search and restated the coverage issues in the area for T-Mobile.

Board Member Harris inquired about the feasibility of adding height to an existing tower. Mr. Riggs stated it could be difficult and costly.

Board Member Woods inquired about the ability for additional services on the proposed tower. Mr. Ricci confirmed additional services could be allowed at the new tower without requiring additional Board approval.

Board Member Woods inquired if there were any concerns about the subdivision aspect of the application. Ms. Pemberton stated it was a simple plat, and she did not expect any issues.

Board Member Poling inquired about the delay in the public hearing. Mr. Ricci stated there were delays due to plat clarification and noticing / affidavit timing requirements.

Board Chair Ballantini closed the public hearing.

Board Member Poling stated he was comfortable making a motion based on the staff recommendation.

Board Member Poling made a motion, seconded by Board Member Harris, to recommend approval of the item as presented.

Roll call

AYES: Ballantini, Williams, Poling, Woods, Harris, Welch, Steinkoenig

Motion passed.

Mr. Ricci stated the item would proceed to City Council on March 9th.

New Business

There was no new business reported.

Adjournment

Board Member Harris made a motion, seconded by Board Member Williams, to adjourn the meeting.

AYES: Ballantini, Harris, Williams, Poling, Woods, Welch, Steinkoenig

Motion passed (viva voce).

The meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m.

CITY OF BLOOMINGTON

Terry Ballantini

Terry Ballantini, Board Chair

Jon Branham

Jon Branham, Staff Liaison

Exhibits

- Exhibit A – Petition Against Cell Tower Special Use Permit
- Exhibit B – Proposed Tower / Existing Tower Site Map
- Exhibit C – PowerPoint Presentation

II.

ISSUE PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

Does the Petitioner's Application comply with the requirements outlined in Section 44-1037 of the Code for the placement of a WCF at or near 1106 Interstate Drive, Bloomington, Illinois and should the Petitioner's Application and SUP be granted by the ZBA?

III.

LEGAL AUTHORITY

The Code that is authorized by the City pursuant to 65 ILCS 5/11-13- to exercise zoning authority and the Telecommunications Act of 1996, 47 U.S.C.A. 332(c)(7).

IV.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On September 24, 2025, Petitioner submitted a Special Use Permit Application to the Zoning Board of Appeals for review regarding the construction of a WCF at 1106 Interstate Drive in Bloomington, Illinois. The proposed WCF would be 155' in height. There is an existing WCF located at 2201 W. College Avenue in Normal, Illinois, which is approximately 0.8 miles from the proposed WCF site. The Petitioner's Application does not make reference to this existing WCF.

V.

ARGUMENT

The Petitioner's Application is not in conformance with the requirements set forth under Section 44-1037 of the Code and the SUP should be denied for the following reasons:

1. Petitioner has failed to demonstrate investigation of all possible avenues of co-location required under Section 44-1037(E)(2) of the Code.

Section 44-1037(E)(2) of the Code requires that **“Applicants for new wireless towers shall demonstrate that *all possible avenues* for co-location of antennas on existing towers or base stations have been investigated. (emphasis added)”**

The Staff Report states that Petitioner has met the (E)(2) requirement, however, we respectfully disagree. To this date, the Petitioner has offered *no* evidence that they have investigated *all possible avenues* for co-location. Staff supports its position by pointing to a statement from Petitioner's T-Mobile radio frequency engineer (“Petitioner's Engineer”) who states that there “are no existing tower structures or feasible building structures with a suitable height of 150' within the desired area of coverage need.” However, this statement is insufficient to evidence that all possible avenues for co-location have been investigated.

Petitioner has failed to include any reference to the existing 140' WCF, which can potentially accommodate the suitable height of 150' cited by Petitioner's Engineer, and which is located approximately 0.8 miles away from the proposed site (the "Existing WCF").

While Petitioner and Petitioner's Engineer make no mention of the Existing WCF, an independent study by a radio frequency engineer (the "Independent Engineer") concluded that the Existing WCF, if reasonably modified, would provide comparable coverage to the same geographical area that Petitioner would receive from a new 155' WCF at the proposed site. The Independent Engineer also states that installation of an additional WCF in such close proximity to the Existing WCF would be considered an "overbuild" or impractical given the coverage overlap. (*see Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference*).

To further showcase that Petitioner has not investigated all possible avenues for co-location, Petitioner has not contacted the owner of the Existing WCF (that being SBA Towers IX, LLC, hereinafter referred to as "SBA") to discuss co-location. In fact, SBA has reached out to Petitioner's carrier, T-Mobile, on several occasions regarding T-Mobile's purported coverage needs near the Existing WCF and has received no good-faith response. (*see Exhibit B, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference*). SBA's Site Marketing Manager, Charles Hiltz, states that he has made multiple attempts to communicate with T-Mobile and any response from T-Mobile has seemingly been in an effort to further delay conversations with SBA. Mr. Hiltz affirms that SBA welcomes a discussion with Petitioner and T-Mobile to better understand their coverage needs near the Existing WCF.

The Existing WCF has the capability to be modified to accommodate T-Mobile's equipment. Petitioner and Petitioner's Engineer searched the area near the proposed site for WCFs 150' in height. In doing so, they have missed the Existing WCF which can be modified up to a height of 160'. Licensed Structural Engineer, John N. Kabak, ("SBA's Engineer") finds that the Existing WCF can be extended 20' and remain compliant with industry standards. (*see Exhibit C, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference*). SBA's Engineer also confirms that the Existing WCF can accommodate additional equipment for T-Mobile and other carriers.

SBA remains ready and willing to discuss co-location at the Existing WCF with Petitioner and/or T-Mobile.

2. Under Section 44-1037(E)(7)(c) of the Code, there is no basis to approve Petitioner's Application.

Petitioner must meet one of the factors provided in Section 44-1037(E)(7)(c) of the Code, which would allow the Zoning Board of Appeals to find a new WCF cannot be co-located. Petitioner has not met any of the factors.

Section 44-1037(E)(7)(c) of the Code requires that the Zoning Board of Appeals find that a new WCF cannot be co-located within the coverage area of the proposed WCF if any one of four factors is met. The first of which reads, "**The planned antenna or transmission equipment**

would exceed the structural capacity of all existing or approved towers or buildings, as documented by a qualified and licensed professional engineer, and all of the existing or approved towers cannot be reinforced, modified, or replaced to accommodate the planned or equivalent antennas or transmission equipment at a reasonable cost.” Petitioner has provided that there are no existing towers or structures of sufficient height available for co-location. However, Petitioner has made no mention of the Existing WCF or a potential modification to the Existing WCF. As set forth in Exhibit C, SBA’s Engineer has established that the Existing WCF can be modified and is suitable for a 20’ extension and T-Mobile’s equipment needed to load T-Mobile on the Existing WCF as a carrier. This 20’ extension would bring the Existing WCF to a height of 160’. Therefore, this factor has not been met.

The second factor reads, “**The planned antenna would cause interference materially impacting the usability of other existing or planned antenna at a tower or building as documented by a qualified and licensed engineer and such interference cannot be prevented at a reasonable cost.**” Petitioner has again only provided that there are no existing towers or structures of sufficient height in the area. Petitioner has provided no evidence that a modification to the Existing WCF would cause interference with any other towers or antennas. Petitioner’s Engineer, SBA’s Engineer, and the Independent Engineer do not raise any interference issues. Therefore, this factor has not been met.

The third factor reads, “**Existing or approved towers and buildings within such the coverage or capacity area cannot accommodate the planned antenna or transmission equipment at a height necessary to function according to the documented coverage or capacity needs as determined by a qualified and licensed professional engineer.**” Petitioner has again only provided that there are no existing towers or structures of sufficient height in the area. Petitioner has provided no evidence that the Existing WCF cannot accommodate T-Mobile’s equipment at a height necessary to achieve their coverage and capacity needs. As set forth in Exhibit A, Independent Engineer found that the modification of the Existing WCF would provide coverage comparable to the coverage of the proposed WCF. Therefore, this factor has not been met.

The last of which reads, “**Other unforeseen reasons that make it unfeasible to locate the planned antenna or transmission equipment upon an existing or approved tower or building.**” Petitioner has again only provided that there are no existing towers or structures of sufficient height in the area. Petitioner has provided no evidence that it is unfeasible to co-locate on an existing tower. Co-location is feasible. As set forth in Exhibit C, SBA’s Engineer finds that the Existing WCF can be extended 20’ and accommodate T-Mobile while still remaining compliant with industry standards. Therefore, this factor has not been met.

Nothing in Petitioner’s Application or the evidence submitted to date has shown that any of the four factors has been met. In the absence of clear and convincing evidence satisfying at least

one of these factors, the ZBA cannot lawfully conclude that the proposed WCF cannot be accommodated on an existing tower, particularly the Existing WCF.


VI.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the City has taken time and used careful planning for the placement of WCFs within its jurisdiction by drafting and enacting the current Code. The Code has been used and depended on as the authority for WCF placement throughout the City. Petitioner's Application does not comply with the purpose of the Code in that it would construct another WCF less than a mile from the Existing WCF without significant benefit to the citizens or the future of the City. Additionally, Petitioner's Application does not comply with Section 44-1037(E)(2) of the Code in that no evidence has been presented that all possible avenues for co-location on existing towers or base stations have been investigated nor did the Petitioner make good-faith efforts to maintain open communications with the Existing WCF owner to co-locate on the Existing WCF, hence, eliminating the need for another WCF only 0.8 miles away, approximately. Petitioner clearly has not met the purpose or standards set forth under the Code; and therefore, Petitioner's Application should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Meyer Capel, A Professional Corporation

By:  _____

Jenny H. Park, One of Its Attorneys

Meyer Capel,
A Professional Corporation
306 West Church Street
Champaign, IL 61820
(217) 352-1800 Telephone
(217) 352-1083 Facsimile

EXHIBIT A
Independent Radio Frequency Engineer Letter

TO: SBA

Subject: RF Coverage Plot Analysis: City of Bloomington, IL

Date: February 17, 2026

1. **METHODOLOGY.** The attached plots depict broadcast radio frequency (RF) coverage from the existing site to City of Bloomington, IL and a proposed site approximately 0.8013 miles to the south. At each location, cellular industry typical LTE operating parameters were considered for omnidirectional antennas mounted at 155 feet above ground level at the existing site, and at 155 feet above ground level for the proposed site. Ground elevations are 776 and 809 feet above mean sea level, respectively.

The provided predictive coverage plots were created using established radiowave propagation models with terrain and clutter data, implemented by qualified engineers specializing in this discipline and having years of US Industry experience.

Plots for both locations were generated for 700, 850, 1900 and 2100 MHz operations. The signal levels depicted are associated with LTE service reliability where the strong coverage levels in green and blue occur near the towers and decrease with distance from the sites and intervening terrain obstructions. Signal levels greater than -70 dBm shown as blue are associated with feasible coverage within buildings. Marginal coverage is provided in the regions depicted in yellow between -90 dBm and -80 dBm and signal levels between -100 dBm and -90 dBm shown as red represent poor coverage associated with call failures.

A comparison of coverage performance for each site is based on low band (700 and 850 MHz) and high band (1900 and 2100 MHz) prediction results. Radiowave propagation conditions between these bands differ because of terrain and ground clutter (e.g. vegetation) effects at different frequencies. Generally, low band operations provide greater area coverage. Therefore, high band operations provide additional customer traffic capacity closer to the cellular site.

2. **COMPARISON.** The sites considered in these coverage plots provide service to the depicted locations and roads leading to City of Bloomington, IL. For low band operations for antennas mounted at 155 feet, the existing site provides strong coverage to non-contiguous areas from 1 to 3 miles from the site. This includes 1 miles of Highway 55. The proposed site also provides strong coverage to non-contiguous areas from 1 to 3 miles from the site. This includes 0.5 miles of Highway 55. Coverage differences may be attributed to the separation distance between tower locations.

For high band operations, the existing site provides strong coverage to non-contiguous areas from 1 to 2 miles in all directions. The proposed site provides strong coverage to non-contiguous areas from 1 to 2 miles in all directions.

3. **CONCLUSION.** Based on the coverage comparison presented above, the proposed site provides comparable coverage to City of Bloomington, IL due to its close proximity to the existing site. For wireless operators with antennas mounted on the existing site, the installation of additional antennas on the proposed site would be considered to be an "overbuild" or impractical given the coverage overlap.



City of Bloomington
Zoning Board of Appeals
February 18, 2026





CITY OF BLOOMINGTON
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
FEBRUARY 18, 2026

Regular Agenda


Item	Case Number	Description
5.A.	SP-08-25	Public hearing, review, and action on a request submitted by Vertical Bridge Development, LLC, for a Special Use Permit for a Wireless Communication Facility in the B-1 (General Commercial) District, for the property located at 1106 Interstate Drive (PIN: 13-36-401-001)

SP-08-25 WIRELESS COMMUNICATION FACILITY



SED COMMSCOPE
15C-R2N23 ANTENNA
1 PER SECTOR, 3 TOTAL)

1 NOKIA - AHLOB RRH
ER SECTOR, 3 TOTAL)



1 ELEVATION
SCALE: N.T.S.
SCALE BASED ON 11/17/17 ONLY



SP-08-25

Public hearing, review, and action on a request submitted Vertical Bridge Development, LLC, for a Special Use Permit for a Wireless Communication Facility in the B-1 (General Commercial) District, for the property located at 1106 Interstate Drive (PIN: 13-36-401-001

LOCATION MAP



SP-08-25

Public hearing, review, and action on a request submitted Vertical Bridge Development, LLC, for a Special Use Permit for a Wireless Communication Facility in the B-1 (General Commercial) District, for the property located at 1106 Interstate Drive (PIN: 13-36-401-001

SITE PHOTOS



SP-08-25

Public hearing, review, and action on a request submitted Vertical Bridge Development, LLC, for a Special Use Permit for a Wireless Communication Facility in the B-1 (General Commercial) District, for the property located at 1106 Interstate Drive (PIN: 13-36-401-001


SITE PHOTOS



SP-08-25

Public hearing, review, and action on a request submitted Vertical Bridge Development, LLC, for a Special Use Permit for a Wireless Communication Facility in the B-1 (General Commercial) District, for the property located at 1106 Interstate Drive (PIN: 13-36-401-001

ZONING MAP



Findings of Fact - Special Use

Standard	Finding
1. The establishment, maintenance, or operation of the Special Use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, comfort, or general welfare.	<i>Standard is met.</i>
2. The Special Use will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood.	<i>Standard is met.</i>
3. The establishment of the Special Use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the zoning district.	<i>Standard is met.</i>
4. Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and/or necessary facilities have been or will be provided.	<i>Standard is met.</i>
5. Adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.	<i>Standard is met.</i>
6. The Special Use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located, except as such regulations may be modified by the Council pursuant to the recommendations of the Board of Zoning Appeals.	<i>Standard is met.</i>

Use Provisions - Wireless Communications Facilities

Standard - § 44-1037.

- | | |
|--|--|
| A. Applicability of regulations: proposed facility is not exempt. | <i>Standard is met.</i> |
| B. Application: submitted application provided all of the required information. | <i>Standard is met.</i> |
| C. & D. Residential facilities & Non-Substantial changes: not applicable. | <i>Standard is met.</i> |
| E. New wireless towers. | <i>Standard is met.</i> |
| 1) Location: the proposed cell tower complies with the allowance as a special use in the B-1 district. | <i>Standard is met.</i> |
| 2) Co-location. The applicant has demonstrated that all possible avenues for co-location of antennas on existing towers or base stations have been investigated. | |
| 3) Bulk standards. The proposed cell tower meets requirements for lot size, setbacks, and separation requirements from other towers over a 70-foot height. | |
| 4) Capacity. The proposed cell tower provides space for two additional service providers. | <i>Standard is met.</i>
<i>Standard is met.</i> |
| 5) Concealment: the proposed cell tower would be located away from residential zones, would be an off-gray finish, and be shielded by evergreen hedges. | |
| 6) Review period: the City must approve or deny the application within 150 days of submission. | <i>Standard is met.</i>
<i>Standard is met.</i> |
| 7) Review findings: the Planning Commission's decision must be made in writing and based upon substantial evidence. Conditions may be based on the following: | |
| a) RF emissions: City may NOT impose conditions based on RF emissions. | |
| b) Property values: Findings related to property values must be documented by expert testimony of a qualified professional. | <i>Standard is met.</i> |
| c) Need for a new tower: the need cannot be accommodated on an existing structure, as no towers of the minimum 150' height are in the search area. | |
| F. The proposed sell tower must be all requirements of the Bloomington Building Code. | <i>Standard is met.</i> |
| G. The proposed cell tower will have only site identification signage, emergency contact information, and "No Trespassing" and safety signage. | <i>Standard is met.</i> |
| H. The Applicant will remove the proposed cell tower at their own cost if it is unused for one year. | <i>Standard is met.</i> |



Staff Recommendation

CASE SP-08-26

Staff finds that the application meets all the standards for a Special Use Permit and meets all of the Use Provisions for a Wireless Communications Facility.

Recommended Action(s)

Motion to establish findings of fact that all standards for approval of a Special Use Permit are met and to recommend approval of the request for a Special Use Permit for a Wireless Communications Facility, as presented, in the B-1 (General Commercial) District, on a one-third-acre (0.33 ac) parcel to be known as Lot 3 Interstate Center Subdivision Lot 1, 2nd Resubdivision, subject to minor modifications and technical corrections required for plat approval.



Next ZBA Meeting: March 18, 2026

EXHIBIT B
Affidavit of Charles Hiltz, Site Marketing Manager

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
)
COUNTY OF McLean) SS

AFFIDAVIT OF CHARLES HILTZ

The undersigned affiant, being first duly sworn, for himself on oath deposes and says that he is of legal age, under no legal disability, and resides in the County of Oakland in the State of Michigan

CHARLES HILTZ (the "Affiant"), states as follows:

The Affiant states that he is employed by SBA Towers IX, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company ("SBA") as a Site Marketing Manager.

The Affiant further states that as part of his duties as Site Marketing Manager, he routinely interacts with carriers, such as T-Mobile, who have located, or are interested in locating, onto an SBA cell tower.

The Affiant further states that he maintains open lines of communication with carriers to discuss tenancy on SBA towers, including but not limited to collocation, new equipment, centerline placement of equipment, and other matters related to SBA towers.

The Affiant further states that such communications with carriers include communications regarding the cell tower SBA has owned, operated, and maintained since December 2015 on real property commonly known as 2201 W. College, Normal, IL 61761 (the "Existing Cell Tower").

The Affiant further states that an application for a Special Use Permit to construct a new 155-foot monopole with T-Mobile as the named carrier (the "Application") requests said monopole be constructed only 0.8 miles (4,224 feet) from the Existing Cell Tower.

The Affiant further states that in the course of his duties as Site Marketing Manager, he regularly communicates with T-Mobile, and he has not been contacted by T-Mobile regarding T-Mobile possibly collocating on the Existing Cell Tower nor whether the Existing Cell Tower could accommodate T-Mobile equipment.

The Affiant further states that in the course of his duties as Site Marketing Manager, he contacted T-Mobile to discuss equipment needs in the Bloomington area and collocation opportunities on October 9, 2025, November 3, 2025, November 12, 2025, November 17, 2025, December 8, 2025, and February 16, 2026.

The Affiant further states that T-Mobile provided on December 8, 2025 that T-Mobile was unsure if equipment was still going to be added near the Existing Cell Tower and to anticipate a response from T-Mobile in early January 2026 after year's end budget determinations.

The Affiant further states that his last communication from T-Mobile was on February 16, 2026 stating that T-Mobile could provide more information in March 2026.

The Affiant further states that he requested an expedited response from T-Mobile prior to the public hearing to be held on February 18, 2026.

The Affiant further states that SBA's corporate records confirm the Existing Cell Tower can accommodate T-Mobile as an additional carrier, including T-Mobile's 5G equipment, at a height of up to 160 feet to provide the same or better coverage as the cell tower proposed in the Application.

The Affiant further states that the Existing Cell Tower was initially constructed to house multiple tenant carriers at one time.

The Affiant further states that T-Mobile is currently a tenant on over 11,000 SBA cell towers across the nation.

The Affiant further states that T-Mobile is a current tenant on 257 cell towers in Illinois, with T-Mobile being a current tenant on a cell tower only 4.98 miles from the Existing Cell Tower.


The Affiant further states that SBA currently has pre-negotiated rates in place with T-Mobile for cell tower tenancy.

The Affiant further states that SBA is willing to work with T-Mobile to allow for collocation on the Existing Cell Tower to prevent unnecessary proliferation of cell towers in the area.

The Affiant further states the purpose of making this affidavit is to provide a record of outreach and information for consideration in connection with the Zoning Board of Appeals' review of the Special Use Permit Application.

Dated this 17th day of February, 2026.

Further Affiant Sayeth Not.



CHARLES HILTZ

STATE OF ~~ILLINOIS~~ ^{Michigan})
)
COUNTY OF Oakland) SS

THERESE NAST
NOTARY PUBLIC - STATE OF MICHIGAN
COUNTY OF OAKLAND
My Commission Expires January 03, 2029
Acting in the County of Oakland

I, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for said County and State aforesaid, DO HEREBY CERTIFY, that CHARLES HILTZ, personally known to me to be the same person whose name is subscribed to the foregoing instrument, appeared before me this day in person and acknowledged that he signed, sealed and delivered the said instrument as his free and voluntary act, for the uses and purposes therein set forth.

Given under my hand and Notarial Seal this 17th day of February, 2026.

Exhibit C
Structural Opinion Letter of Engineer John N. Kabak

140' Self Support Tower w/ 20' Proposed Extension

February 18, 2026

2201 W. College Ave
Normal, IL 61761
40.5050 N, 89.0378 W

SBA Site Name: I-74 & Rte 9
SBA Site ID: IL17530-A

GPD Project Number: 2026778.17530.02

GPD is pleased to submit this **"Structural Opinion Letter"** for the structural integrity of the aforementioned tower. The purpose of the opinion letter is to determine the suitability of the tower with the proposed 20-foot tower extension and proposed T-Mobile loading as specified below. This opinion is consistent with the standards and guidelines of TIA-222-H and the 2021 International Building Code based on a 3-second gust wind speed of 108 mph c with no ice and a 40 MPH 3-second gust wind speed with 2 inches of radial ice, Risk Category II, Exposure Category C, and Topographic Category 1.


Proposed T-Mobile Loading:

Elevation (ft)	Equipment Descriptions
145	Cellular Antenna Array 150 sqft Equivalent Project Area 2500 lb plus Weight


The addition of the proposed 20-foot tower extension and proposed T-Mobile loading will require structural upgrades. However, once the required structural upgrades are installed, the tower shall be compliant with the TIA-222-H standard and adequate to support the proposed tower extension and T-Mobile loading.

We at GPD appreciate the opportunity of providing our continuing professional services to you. If you have any questions or need further assistance on this or any other projects, please contact us.

Respectfully submitted by:



John N. Kabak, SE
Illinois #: 081-007456
184-007100



Signature
2/18/2026

Date
11/30/2026

Exp. Date

Speaker's Exhibit B

