



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Ten Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051

Phone: (860) 827-2935 Fax: (860) 827-2950

E-Mail: siting.council@ct.gov

www.ct.gov/csc

August 31, 2009

Christopher B. Fisher, Esq.
Daniel M. Laub, Esq.
Cuddy & Feder, LLP
445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th Floor
White Plains, NY 10601

RE: **DOCKET NO. 383** – New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 316 Perkins Road, Southbury, Connecticut.

Dear Attorneys Fisher and Laub:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than September 22, 2009. To help expedite the Council's review, please file individual responses as soon as they are available.

Please forward an original and 20 copies to this office. In accordance with the State Solid Waste Management Plan, the Council is requesting that all filings be submitted on recyclable paper, primarily regular weight white office paper. Please avoid using heavy stock paper, colored paper, and metal or plastic binders and separators. Fewer copies of bulk material may be provided as appropriate.

Yours very truly,



S. Derek Phelps
Executive Director

SDP/cdm

c: Council Members
Michele Briggs, AT&T
Parties and Intervenors

**Docket 383: AT&T
Southbury, Connecticut
Pre-Hearing Interrogatories, Set One**

1. How many of the return receipts for the notices sent to abutting landowners did AT&T receive? If some return receipts were not received, did AT&T make other attempts to notify the landowners? If yes, explain.
2. Has the Town of Southbury, through any of its boards or commissions, issued any statements regarding AT&T's application?
3. Has the Town of Southbury indicated any interest in placing antennas on the proposed tower?
4. When did this site search begin?
5. In addition to sending letters, did AT&T make any other efforts to contact the owners of properties at 84 Perkins Road (both listed properties) and 78 Garnet Road to ask if they might be interested in leasing their properties?
6. The site search summary in Attachment 2 lists two properties with the address of 84 Perkins Road with different owners and map references. Is this the same property? If not, what should the respective addresses be?
7. The Ludorf property identified as Block 87 Lot 14 is listed twice in the site search summary in Attachment 2, once under #14 and once as #19. Are these listings of the same property?
8. Why are the Ludorf properties listed in the site search summary considered to be conservation land/open space?
9. Would the R&M Associates property at 67 Garnet Road meet AT&T's radiofrequency engineering criteria?
10. What is the nature of the deed restrictions that make the Southbury Land Trust's properties Open Space and unavailable for development?
11. Does the property listed as #17 in the site search summary have any address other than the map-block reference? Why is this property considered to be reserved Open Space? Who owns this property?
12. Provide a map showing the locations of all of the different properties listed in the Attachment 2 site search summary.
13. How much cut and fill would be required to develop the proposed site?
14. Would any blasting be required to develop the site?
15. What would AT&T use for back up power?

16. What are AT&T's licensed operating frequencies in this part of the state?
17. What is AT&T's design signal strength for in-vehicle coverage? For in-building coverage?
18. What is AT&T's existing signal strength in the area that would be served from this proposed site?
19. Does AT&T have any drive test results indicating signal strengths. If so, provide the pertinent results.
20. What would be the total area in square miles that AT&T could cover from the proposed site?
21. What are the lengths of the existing coverage gaps on the roads AT&T is seeking to cover from this site?
22. What distances on these roads could AT&T cover from the proposed site?
23. Does AT&T have any statistics on dropped calls or ineffective attempts in the area that would be covered from the proposed site? If so, provide the relevant statistics.
24. Identify, by address, sites with which AT&T's antennas at the proposed site would hand off signals – include type and height of structure and height of AT&T's antennas on structure.
25. What is the minimum height at which AT&T could achieve its coverage objectives from the proposed site?
26. Provide a propagation map, at the same scale as the maps provided in the application, showing what AT&T's coverage would be at 10 feet below its minimum acceptable height.
27. What is the approximate cost of the antennas and related equipment that AT&T would install at the proposed facility?
28. Provide a description of the vegetation in the immediate vicinity of the proposed site.
29. The Visual Resource Evaluation Report in Attachment 4 states that two residences located along Brown Brook would have seasonal views of the tower. Should this be Brown Brook Road or simply Brown Brook as stated?
30. The viewshed map shows a scenic road near the proposed sight. Is this a state or municipally designated scenic road? Would the proposed tower be visible from this road? For what direction and distance?