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
Internet: ct.gov/csc

Daniel F. Caruso
Chairman

January 11, 2011

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

RE: **DOCKET NO. 409** - 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 8 Barnes Road, Canaan (Falls Village), Connecticut.

Dear Attorneys Chiocchio and Fisher:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than January 27, 2011. To help expedite the Council's review, please file individual responses as soon as they are available.

Please forward an original and 15 copies to this office and a .pdf. 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,

Linda Roberts

Linda Roberts
Executive Director

c: Council Members
Parties and Intervenors

PRE-HEARING INTERROGATORIES
DOCKET NO. 409 – FALLS VILLAGE
NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC (AT&T)
JANUARY 11, 2011

1. Did AT&T receive return receipts for the notices sent to each abutting landowner of the host property? If not, which return receipts were not received? Did AT&T make any additional attempts to notify these landowners?

2. Please estimate the amount of cut and fill that would be necessary to develop the proposed facility?

3. Approximately how tall are the existing CL&P structures in the area? What is the distance and direction of the transmission structures from the proposed site?

4. Could AT&T construct a camouflaged tower, such as a monopine, at the proposed site? How much would costs increase for a camouflaged tower structure?

5. Does the estimated cost listed on page 25 of the application include installation of antennas and radio equipment? If not, what is the estimated cost of that equipment?

6. What do the "facility installation" costs listed on page 25 of the application consist of?

7. Does AT&T anticipate blasting to be necessary for the construction of the proposed facility?

8. What is the minimum signal level that AT&T designs its system for in this area?

9. What is the existing signal strength in the area of the proposed site?

10. Did AT&T do any drive tests to determine signal strength in the target coverage area? If so, provide the results of these tests.

11. What is the frequency used in the coverage plots behind Tab 1 of the application?

12. Would AT&T use both PCS and cellular frequencies at the proposed site? Would each frequency band have a different use in the AT&T system?

13. What would be the total area, in square miles, that AT&T could cover from the proposed site? At what signal strengths and at what frequencies?

14. What is the length of the existing AT&T coverage gaps along Route 7, Route 126 and Route 63 for both cellular and PCS frequencies?

15. What distances on Route 7, Route 126, and Route 63 could AT&T cover from the proposed site and both cellular and PCS frequencies? Please list separately.

16. Does AT&T have any statistics on dropped calls in the vicinity of the proposed facility? If so, what do they indicate? Does AT&T have any other indicators of substandard service in this area? If so, what do they indicate?

17. 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 each structure and distance and direction from the proposed tower.

18. What is the minimum height at which AT&T could achieve its coverage objectives from the proposed site?

19. Provide propagation maps showing what AT&T's coverage would be if its antennas were mounted 10 feet below the minimum required height.

20. Would the proposed backup generator require any fuel to be stored on site? How long would backup power last in the event of an emergency?

21. Several of the investigated sites listed behind Tab 2 of the application state that they were "rejected by AT&T's radio frequency engineers." Does this mean a new tower at each location would not provide adequate coverage to the target coverage area? What heights did AT&T use to investigate each of these sites?

22. What is the height of the existing private lattice tower located at 392 Under Mountain Road, listed as #5 behind Tab 2 of the application?

23. Provide a scale for the maps behind Tab 2 of the application.

24. What is the distance of each of the towers and existing cell sites listed behind Tab 2 of the application to the proposed site?

25. What is the length of the new access road, from where it would deviate from the existing road, to the proposed site?

26. The nearest property boundary as listed behind Tab 4 of the application is 104 feet to the east. Is this the property boundary shared with Patricia Ann Rovezzi?

27. Would anything be done to stabilize the gravel access road in steep slope areas?

28. What is the total length of Route 7 from which the proposed tower would be visible year-round? What is the additional length of Route 7 from which the proposed tower would be seasonally visible?