

STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

IN RE: :  
 :  
APPLICATION OF CELLCO PARTNERSHIP : DOCKET NO. 389  
D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS AND MESSAGE :  
CENTER MANAGEMENT, INC. FOR A :  
CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL :  
COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR :  
THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND :  
OPERATION OF A WIRELESS :  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY AT ONE :  
OF TWO LOCATIONS OFF DAYTON ROAD IN :  
SOUTH GLASTONBURY, CONNECTICUT : DECEMBER 23, 2009

RESPONSES OF CELLCO PARTNERSHIP  
D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS AND MESSAGE CENTER MANAGEMENT, INC.  
TO CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL PRE-HEARING INTERROGATORIES

On December 7, 2009, the Connecticut Siting Council (“Council”) issued Pre-Hearing Interrogatories to Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless (“Cellco”) and Message Center Management, Inc. (“MCM”) (collectively, the “Applicant”), relating to the above-captioned docket. Below are Cellco’s and MCM’s responses.

Question No. 1

Did Cellco/MCM receive return receipts for all adjacent landowners listed in Application Attachment 6? If not, list the abutters that did not receive notice and describe any additional effort to serve notice.

Response

Yes.

Question No. 2

Depict the location of the Nye property and the Wieda/McQuillan property on the abutters

map.

Response

A revised Site 1 Abutters Map, Sheet C-1 is included behind Tab 1. This plan identifies the location of the Nye and Wieda/McQuillan properties.

Question No. 3

In December 2003, MCM filed an application with the Council for a telecommunications facility located on the Cassella property in Glastonbury (Docket 280) which was subsequently denied by the Council for lack of development of the record. What is the status of MCM's lease with this property? Was this property considered by either Cellco or MCM in this application? If not, why not? Include supporting documents/data, if applicable.

Response

The MCM lease for the Cassella property was terminated on December 14, 2004 after AT&T withdrew its request to intervene and T-Mobile filed a request to intervene opposing the proposed facility. Copies of the AT&T and T-Mobile filings are included behind Tab 2. Since 2004, the Cassella parcel was approved for development of a multi-lot residential subdivision which is currently under construction. As such, the Cassella parcel is no longer considered a viable alternative for purposes of this application.

Question No. 4

What tower height was considered at the rejected Beckett and Triblets properties?

Response

Both the Beckett and Triblets parcels were investigated by Cellco as alternatives to the Site 1 location. At the Triblets property, Cellco ran coverage scenarios up to an antenna height

of 199 feet above ground level and could not provide coverage at PCS frequencies comparable to that achieved at 110 feet at Site 1 location or 160 feet at the Site 2 location.

The Beckett property is located approximately one mile east of Route 17 in South Glastonbury. Even with antennas at a height of 199 feet, Cellco could not provide coverage at PCS frequencies comparable to that at 110 feet at Site 1 or 160 feet at Site 2.

MCM did not evaluate the Beckett property. The tower height considered by MCM on the Triblets property was 170'.

Question No. 5

What site conditions precluded site development at the Eldergill property?

Response

Although the property is a 4.7 acre parcel, its dimensions are 98' x 1820'; a very long and narrow parcel. This particular parcel did not present MCM with a viable alternative to the larger Site 1 and Site 2 parcels described in the application. (The Eldergill parcel is labeled #5 on the tax map included behind Tab 10 of the Application).

Question No. 6

Did Double I, LLC indicate that the Eldergill property was the only property they would consider leasing to MCM for a tower site?

Response

Yes.

Question No. 7

Would blasting be required for the construction of either proposed site? Provide estimates of cut and fill for each site.

Response

The Applicant does not anticipate a need for blasting to construct the proposed facility at either Site 1 or Site 2. A geotechnical survey will be completed and submitted to the Council for the approved cell site location as a part of the D&M Plan.

Site 1

Cut – 370 c.y.

Fill – 890 c.y.

Site 2

Cut – 30 c.y.

Fill – 38 c.y.

Question No. 8

Page 23 states that Site 2 was adjusted to avoid wetlands – does the current road design in the application reflect this change? What was the change? Did the Town approve of the proposed road design? If not, is the proposed road design consistent with Town regulations?

Response

MCM originally proposed two alternative access roads to the Site 2 compound; one road to the west of the vernal pool (Alternative A), and one road to the east of the vernal pool (Alternative B). MCM consulted with the Town’s Environmental Planner on several occasions regarding the driveway alternatives. The Glastonbury Conservation Commission, at their regular meeting held on January 29, 2009, recommended the use of the Alternative B driveway location, as the better of the two alternatives. The Environmental Planner supported the Conservation Commission’s recommendation. Copies of the Conservation Commission’s meeting minutes from January 29, 2009, are included behind Tab 14 of the Application. The approved driveway configuration was incorporated into the Site 2 project plans.

Question No. 9

Are minutes and/or a resolution from the September 24, 2009 Conservation Commission meeting available? If so, please provide.

Response

Attached behind Tab 3 of these responses are the minutes from the Conservation Commission's September 24, 2009 meeting and a September 29, 2009 letter from the Conservation Commission to the Town Council regarding the Site 1 and Site 2 cell sites.

Question No. 10

Were any documents provided to the DEP for their determination that the timber rattlesnake would not be affected at either site? If so, please provide these documents.

Response

The documents submitted to DEP in support of Site 1 and Site 2 are included behind Tab 4.

Question No. 11

Were other driveway configurations considered to access Site 2, besides the two presented behind Tab 14? If not, what factors preclude an alternative access?

Response

Other access routes were evaluated and reviewed by MCM and the Town's Environmental Planner. Due to the existing topography along the west side of Dayton Road, no other viable alternatives for access to Site 2 were presented to the Glastonbury Conservation Commission.

Question No. 12

In the Conservation Commission minutes behind Tab 14, the possibility of establishing a conservation easement around the wetlands adjacent to Site 2 is discussed. What is the status of this request?

Response

MCM remains committed to establishing a conservation easement over portion of the Site 2 parcel. The precise location and limits of the easement area would be finalized if the Site 2 location is approved by the Council.

Question No. 13

What is Cellco's minimum signal level threshold for in-building and in-vehicle use?

Response

Cellco's minimum signal level threshold is -85 dBm for in-vehicle and -75 dBm for in-building coverage.

Question No. 14

Did Cellco perform a site drive test or base line drive test for the area? If yes, please provide.

Response

Cellco did not perform a drive test from either the Site 1 or Site 2 locations due to limited site accessibility. Cellco did rely on base line drive data to evaluate the need for the Glastonbury South 2 cell site and to fine tune coverage and capacity data from adjacent cell sites in Glastonbury and the surrounding towns.

Question No. 15

Provide coverage plots (PCS and cellular), using the scale and thresholds in Application Attachment 7, that depicts coverage from existing/approved Cellco sites and proposed Site 1 at tower heights of 100 and 90 feet, and at Site 2 at a tower heights of 150 and 140 feet.

Response

The plots requested for Site 1 are attached behind Tab 5.

The plots requested for Site 2 are attached behind Tab 6.

The table below quantifies the differences in overall coverage and along Route 17 at the antenna height proposed in the Application and those 10 and 20 feet below the proposed height.

Site 1	Total Coverage Cellular (Sq. Miles)	Total Coverage PCS (Sq. Miles)	Route 17 Coverage Cellular (Miles)	Route 17 Coverage PCS (Miles)
110'*	18.5	9.8	2.48	2.51
100'	16.9	9.1	2.20	2.30
90'	15.2	8.6	1.97	1.95

\*Proposed Antenna height in Docket No. 389 Application

Site 2	Total Coverage Cellular (Sq. Miles)	Total Coverage PCS (Sq. Miles)	Route 17 Coverage Cellular (Miles)	Route 17 Coverage PCS (Miles)
160'*	18.6	9.7	2.53	2.25
150'	16.95	8.9	2.25	2.05
140'	15.64	7.95	1.99	1.77

\*Proposed Antenna height in Docket No. 389 Application

Question No. 16

Provide the power density worksheet that includes the methodology and input parameters (EIRP, # of channels, etc) used to obtain the power density figure presented on page 20 of the Application.

Response


The General Power Density worksheets for Site 1 and Site 2 are included behind Tab 7.



CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of December, 2009, a copy of the foregoing was mailed, postage prepaid, to the following:

Richard J. Johnson  
Town Manager  
Town of Glastonbury  
2155 Main Street  
Glastonbury, CT 06033

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kenneth C. Baldwin, Esq.