## STATE OF CONNECTICUT CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

IN RE:

APPLICATION OF NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC (AT&T) FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS TOWER FACILITY AT 85 PAPER MILL ROAD IN THE TOWN OF WOODBURY

DOCKET NO. 375

April 20, 2009

## NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC PRE-HEARING INTERROGATORIES, SET ONE

- Q1. Did AT&T receive return receipts for all adjacent landowners listed in Application Attachment 9? If not, list the landowners who have not received notice and describe any additional effort to serve notice. Why were additional landowners included in the mailing that are not shown as abutters?
- A1 Return receipts for all adjacent landowners have been received. Attached as Exhibit A please find return receipts for all adjacent landowners and all but one of the nearby property owners noticed.
  - As for additional notices sent, for purposes of generating notice lists the Town of Woodbury Tax Assessor's office employs a software program which provides the names and contact information for owners within a certain distance of a particular property. For purposes of creating this notice list a 200' wide perimeter was used. The map and property owners list received from the Tax Assessor's office is also included in Exhibit A. Given that some of the nearby properties are in close proximity to the proposed site, but not technically abutting, they were included in the list of property owners who received notice in due excess of caution and in the interest of consistency with the information provided by the Town.
- Q2. Who was contacted in regards to potential use of the Green, Siemon, Graham, and Good properties?
- A2. Attached for the Council's review in Exhibit B are letters and return receipts of the noted property owners contacted to determine their interest in hosting a wireless telecommunications facility. The individuals contacted were as follows:
  - 1. Green: Mr. Kenneth Green, 1697 Main Street, Woodbury, CT 06798
  - 2. Siemon: Mr. & Mrs. John Siemon, 200 Quassuk Road, Woodbury, CT 06798

- Graham: Mrs. Eileen Graham, 1158 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10029
  Mrs. Eileen Graham, 214 Quassuk Road, Woodbury, CT 06798
- 4. Good: Mrs. Majorie L. Good, 216 Westwood Road, Woodbury, CT 06798
- Q3. Is the site parcel 34 or 35 acres in size?
- A3. The site parcel is approximately 34 acres. Please see attached letter from Clough Harbour and Associates and a copy of the Town of Woodbury Property Card for the site parcel indicating that the site is 34.18 acres.
- Q4. What is the distance and direction from the tower site to the nearest residential dwelling not owned by the lessor? Identify the property owner.
- A4. The nearest off site residence is 670 feet to the Northeast and is owned by Vincent & Catherine Montalbano.
- Q5. Application Exhibit 3 states 15 residences are within 1,000 feet of the site. Does this include the residence on the site parcel?
- A5. As indicated in Exhibit C, the count of 15 residences includes the residence on the site parcel.
- Q6. Application Exhibit 4, p. 1, states "a private trail is located on Flanders Road". Please elaborate.
- A6. As noted by the project engineers in their letter included in Exhibit C, the Town of Woodbury's parks and recreation department indicated there is a small privately owned trail on Flanders Road however no mapping of the trail is available. The location of such a trail could not be seen from a distance and could not be otherwise field verified as it is located on private property. Nevertheless, the tower cannot be seen from the indicated location of the trail due to topography.
- Q7. Please provide an 11"x17" copy of the Visual Impact Assessment map.
- A7. An 11"x17" copy of the Visual Impact Assessment Map is included as Exhibit D.
- Q8. Please resubmit a legible copy of Application Exhibit 5, Attachment 5 Public Involvement.
- A8. Included in Exhibit E is a the text submitted for the notice included in Application Exhibit 5, Attachment 5 Public Involvement. In addition, enlarged copies of Attachment 5 and the public notice statement itself are also provided.
- Q9. Please confirm if the closest tower within the Hotchkissville Historic District is 0.5 miles away from the tower, as stated in Application Exhibit 5. It appears several residences within district are within 0.2 miles of the tower.

- A9. As per the letter included in Exhibit F from the Ottery Group, who prepared the FCC Form 620 included in Application Exhibit 5, there are residences within 0.2 miles of the proposed tower site. These residences abut Paper Mill Road. It should be noted that as per the Viewshed Analysis Map included as Application Exhibit 4 and attached here as Exhibit D, the proposed tower would not be visible from properties along Paper Mill Road and the tower would be minimally visible from the Hotchkissville Historic District generally.
- Q10. The July 22, 2008 US Department of Interior letter contained within Application Exhibit 5 has an expiration date of January 1, 2009. Please submit an updated letter.
- A10. Attached as Exhibit G is an updated US Department of Interior letter dated January 2, 2009 which is valid until January 1, 2010.
- Q11. Was any correspondence submitted to the SHPO prior to July 14, 2008? If so, please provide. Was any response received from SHPO?
- A11. No correspondence regarding AT&T's proposed tower was submitted to SHPO prior to the July 14, 2008 correspondence. SHPO has issued a letter indicating that the proposed facility will have no adverse effect on cultural resources on the condition that if not in use for six (6) consecutive months, the antennas and equipment must be removed by the facility owner within 90 days of the six month period. See Exhibit H for correspondence with SHPO beginning in July of 2008.
- Q12. Would blasting be required to develop the site?
- A12. It is not anticipated that blasting will be required. As noted in the letter from the project engineers and included as Exhibit C, the presence of ledge will be determined upon completion of a geotechnical analysis. If ledge is encountered, chipping is preferred to blasting.
- Q13. Resubmit the coverage models provided in Application Exhibit 1, at a scale of 1:40,000. Depict and label major roads on the model. What is the transmit frequency of the coverage plots? What percent capacity is assumed in producing the coverage models?
- A13. Attached in Exhibit I are the requested coverage models demonstrating existing and proposed coverage. The transmit frequencies are identified in the legend. Sites with 1900 MHz only are shown in blue and sites with both frequencies (850 MHz and 1900MHz) are shown in orange. The proposed coverage for this site is represented at 850MHZ (GSM). Unlike UMTS, GSM power is not related to the number of voice paths. As a result, capacity is not included as part of the coverage models generated and accordingly none was assumed.
- Q14. Provide a multi-signal level propagation models, at a scale of 1:40,000, depicting coverage from existing sites and the proposed site at tower heights of 140 feet and 130 feet. Depict and label major roads on the models.
- A14. Included in Exhibit I are the requested coverage models at 140 feet and 130 feet with major roads depicted.

- Q15. Provide the affidavit of publication for Notice pursuant to CGS Section 16-50*l*(b).
- A15. Notice of the application was published in the Waterbury Republican, the newspaper used for Planning and Zoning announcements in the Town of Woodbury. Attached as Exhibit J is the affidavit of publication.

## **CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this day, an original and fifteen copies of the foregoing was served on the Connecticut Siting Council via electronic and overnight mail.

Dated: April 20, 2009

Daniel M. Laub

Cuddy & Feder LLP

445 Hamilton Avenue, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor White Plains, New York 10601

Attorneys for:

AT&T

cc: John Blevins

Michele Briggs

Kevin Dey

Paul Lusitani, P.E.

Christopher B. Fisher, Esq.