

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

IN RE:

APPLICATION OF MESSAGE CENTER MANAGEMENT,
INC. (MCM) FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL
COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE
CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION
OF A REPLACEMENT TELECOMMUNICATIONS TOWER
FACILITY AT 4 DITTMAR ROAD IN THE TOWN OF
REDDING, CONNECTICUT

DOCKET NO. 425

March 20, 2012

APPLICANT MCM RESPONSES TO TOWN OF REDDING INTERROGATORIES
DATED MARCH 2, 2012 (SET I)

Q1. Regarding noise related to the project:

Q1(a). Provide the existing baseline and peak decibel levels of the current installation, including but not limited to the air conditioning compressors, as measured at the perimeter property line of each abutting property owner. The measurement should be taken at the point along the property line closest to the current installation.

A(1)(a): The variance provided in the October 30, 2011 Noise Study indicates that the baseline noise levels experienced at the four closest property lines were between 41 and 44 dBA. The peak noise experienced would therefore be 44 dBA. The readings were taken along the northern property boundary approximately 110' from the proposed compound, the eastern property boundary approximately 62' from the proposed compound, the southern property approximately 288' from the proposed compound and the western property boundary approximately 366' from the proposed compound.

Q1(b). Provide the projected baseline and peak decibel levels of the new installation, including but not limited to the air conditioning compressors, at the points measured in response to MCM-1.a.

A(1)(b):

Q(1)(b)(i). Provide an explanation as to the methodology used to project the new decibel levels and the assumptions made with respect to noise abatement that will be installed at the new installation.

A(1)(b)(i). It is standard practice to take acoustical measurements of existing conditions at the nearest property lines. This establishes a base-line prior to any

new equipment being introduced. For these measurements, a Quest Technologies Type 1 Precision Sound Level Meter, calibrated before and after the testing period was used. A windscreen was also used during the study. Based on manufacturer's information and previous experience with the same type of equipment being proposed, projected noise levels from the new proposed equipment were corrected for existing background noise conditions, and acoustically added to existing equipment. The combined levels were then projected to the nearest property lines. A 5dBA reduction was applied due to the noise absorption of the proposed fencing and compound landscaping. This methodology as spelled out in the State of Connecticut Noise Regulations was followed.

Q(1)(b)(ii). Provide a detailed description of available options for noise abatement, including but not limited to the use of sound insulation on the air conditioning compressors and the feasibility of sound-insulating the entire equipment compound.

A(1)(b)(ii). The results of the Study indicate that no additional noise abatement options are required as the projected noise levels are at or below the State required standard. If additional noise reduction was needed, the following methods could be used: A quilted absorption / barrier material could be used on the inside of the existing or new fence (e.g., Sound Seal BBC-EXT-R-2"); silencers, if feasible; partial height barriers; acoustical louvers; or engineering controls such as reducing the fan speed of the HVAC units or the installation of Low Noise HVAC economizers.

Q(1)(b)(iii). Confirm that MCM consents to all assumptions relating to projected noise abatement listed in response to MCM-1.b.i being incorporated into the final order of the Siting Council as a condition to the siting of the new installation.

A(1)(b)(iii). As noted in the October 20, 2011 Noise Study included as Attachment 6 to the Application, the facility as proposed complies with and is within the applicable limits under the State of Connecticut Noise regulations. A post construction review of the facility will be conducted and should the facility not meet allowable limits a determination by MCM and its consultants will be made as to what abatement measures will be effective and subsequently employed to bring the facility into compliance with State regulations and any CSC Certificate and D&M Plan approvals.

Q2. Confirm that the replacement monopole will be in the same foundation area as the existing guyed tower.

A2. Yes. The location of the proposed monopole overlaps with the location of the existing guyed tower. Please see Sheet SP-2 in Attachment 3 to the Application (included here again as Attachment 1) providing details of the compound plan providing the location of both the existing and proposed towers. The centerline of the monopine is proposed to be 4' away from the centerline of the existing tower. This offset was done to permit the monopine to sit in the center

of the proposed foundation without encroaching into Nextel's shelter or AT&T equipment area and also keep the extent of the new foundation within the limits of the existing lease hold rights of MCM.

Q2(a). Provide a depiction of the current guyed tower with the projected new installation being overlayed to demonstrate the proximity of the new installation to the existing guyed tower.

A2(a) Please see Sheet SP-2 in Attachment 3 to the Application providing this overlay and callouts.

Q2(b). Provide a depiction of the current cabinets and shelters that are on the Premises for use by the wireless telecommunications companies with facilities on the tower and overlay the projected placement of cabinets and shelters expected to be on the Premises after the installation of the replacement tower.

A2(b). Please see Sheet SP-2 in Attachment 3 to the Application providing this overlay and callouts.

Q2(c). Provide a depiction of the current fencing, installed noise abatement features and visual impact reducing features at the guyed tower and overlay the projected fencing, installed noise abatement features and visual impact reducing features at the new installation.

A2(c) Existing compound conditions including the existing fence are depicted on Sheet SP-2 in Attachment 3. A depiction of the proposed facility elevation view showing the extent of the fence and landscaping screens proposed has also been provided in Attachment 1. Other than some acoustical absorption of noise by the existing stockade fence there are no noise abatement features in place.

Q2(d). Confirm that MCM consents to all assumptions relating to projected fencing, noise abatement and visual impact reducing features listed in response to MCM-2.a through MCM-2.c. being incorporated into the final order of the Siting Council as a condition to the siting of the new installation.

A2(d). The facility details included in the application is the proposal of record which MCM assumes will be included in the any findings of fact developed by the Siting Council. It is understood that during the hearing process certain alterations or changes may be made or requested as a result of the Siting Council's site visit, testimony, cross examination or other information of record and requires as a modification. Any modifications or conditions which the Siting Council deems necessary and pertinent to the issuance of a Certificate would be incorporated as conditions of any final decision and order of the Siting Council.

Q3. Confirm that the proposed monopine tower is the same model and will be installed by the same company as the tower shown by MCM in Windsor, Connecticut, to the abutting property owners.

A3. MCM is working with Valmont Industries, Inc. ("Valmont") which is a trusted vendor of MCM and the Industry as a whole for many years. Valmont is an international corporation specializing in the design and manufacture of poles, towers and structures for communications as well as lighting, traffic and utility. With that MCM and Valmont have incorporated into the project Larson Camouflage, LLC to procure a durable and high quality product similar to the example in Windsor. A review of the existing monopine in Windsor in comparison to existing similar Valmont products is included in the March 19, 2012 memorandum of Mike Libertine, Director of Siting and Permitting at All-Points Technology Corp., P.C. included as Attachment 2.

Q4. Regarding expansion of the monopole:

Q4(a). Confirm that before expanding the monopole beyond 127 feet, MCM will file either for a Certificate or a Petition with the Siting Council for approval of such expansion.

A4(a). As a Certificate holder, MCM will comply with any approval and the law. At this time an expansion of an approved monopole above any height approved by the Siting Council in a Certificate is typically the subject of either a Petition for Declaratory Ruling or an amended Certificate proceeding. MCM and/or any tenant would likely have to file such requests with the Siting Council to expand the monopole above 127' unless approved by the Council as part of this Certificate application.

Q4(b). Provide a detailed description of what circumstances would cause MCM to expand the monopole beyond 127 feet.

A4(b). As noted in the Application, the proposed monopole would be expandable to 147' AGL and the proposed foundation is designed to accommodate that extension if needed. Such need would arise if a telecommunications carrier or even a government agency required a height above any available space on the proposed tower. Connecticut General Statutes 16-50aa requires the sharing of existing facilities to the maximum extent practicable in an effort to limit proliferation of unnecessary towers. A facility capable of expansion provides flexibility in keeping with this provision.

Q4(c). If the tower is expandable beyond 147 feet, then provide a detailed description of what circumstances would cause MCM to expand the monopole beyond 147 feet.

A4(c). The tower and foundation as designed would not be capable of expansion beyond 147' AGL. Any expansion above that height would like require a tower replacement.

Q4(d). Confirm that MCM consents to a maximum height of 147 feet being incorporated into the final order of the Siting Council as a condition to the

siting of the new installation.

A4(d). MCM defers to the Siting Council on whether a condition limiting the Tower to 147' AGL is warranted or necessary. While future expansion above 147' is not forecasted, the Siting Council would have to evaluate any such condition and the per se bar on future tower height in this location and its potential impacts on facility siting.

Q5. Confirm that before filing any exempt modification filings or tower sharing filings with the Siting Council with respect to the new installation, MCM will provide notice of such filing to the Town of Redding.

A5. MCM will comply with the law as it exists or will exist. A notice of intent to modify a telecommunications facility pursuant to the Public Utility Environmental Standards Act, Connecticut General Statutes § 16-50g et. seq. ("PUESA"), and Sections 16-50j-72(b) and 16-50j-73 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies adopted pursuant to the PUESA currently requires it to be copied to the chief elected official of the municipality in which the facility is located.

Q6. Refer to MCM's Application for Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (Application), Section VIII, p. 17.

Q6(a). There, in reference to abutting property owners' requests, it states that "MCM's Application largely incorporates these requests...". Provide a list of which requests were incorporated into the Application.

A6(a). During the consultation process neighbors, through the town, requested the inclusion of various items in the final application. They were as follows.

1. Type of Tower: Neighbors requested that the proposed tower be a 127' Monopine design exactly the same as the Monopine in Windsor, Connecticut. near I-91 which MCM suggested was a good example when asked for an existing facility to view. MCM proposes a 127' monopine tower with similar bark cladding and "tree branch" taper provided by Valmont Industries which, though a different vendor than that example, is MCM's preferred vendor.
2. Location: Preliminary planning for the replacement facility included two potential locations for a new tower within the facility compound. Neighbors requested that a monopine tower be placed in the same location as the existing tower (then noted as alternative 2) to satisfy the concerns of an adjoining property owner located at 15 Bartram Drive regarding the fall zone of the tower. In order to meet this request MCM worked with Valmont Industries regarding the foundation needed for the monopine and obtained a geotechnical analysis, steps typically only completed after a site is approved and prior to construction. This investigation and due diligence by MCM and their consulting engineer assured that existing site conditions at the location of the existing tower could accommodate the foundation for the monopine,

and MCM thereby incorporated the existing location as the only proposed location for the tower.

3. Surroundings: Neighbors requested that the new tower be surrounded by fencing and several pine trees of significant size to minimize visibility of the tower compound from adjoining residences. As proposed, the compound will be surrounded by an 8' wood stockade fence and a row of arborvitae around the compound and the entrance to the compound will be a wood slat access gate.
4. Noise Abatement: Neighbors indicted their belief that noise levels emanating from the existing equipment at the site were unacceptable and requested that noise abatement measures be incorporated. It was further suggested that the "acceptability" of noise would be determined by neighbors upon completion of the project and some form of process implemented to address same. In response MCM evaluated existing conditions and commissioned a noise study of the site which was completed in October of 2011. This study in fact confirmed that the noise levels of the existing facility, as well as the projected noise levels of the proposed equipment, would be within the allowable limits for residential properties under the State of Connecticut Noise regulations. MCM further designed the compound with a wood fence and landscaping to further attenuate any noise coming from within the compound. Additionally, MCM has agreed to a post installation evaluation of noise at the facility and if noise is not within allowable limits appropriate noise abatement measures will be implemented by MCM and/or its tenants.
5. Screening: Neighbors requested that MCM meet individually with each abutting neighbor and agreed to planting fast growing trees of substantial size near the property lines to provide further visual screening. As the proposed tower is a camouflaged monopine and the compound is surrounded by a wood slat stockade fence on all sides as well as vegetative screening, MCM does not believe additional plantings are required as a visual mitigation and such proposals were not included in its application to the Siting Council. Please see "Description of the Proposed Screening Plan" in the March 19, 2012 memorandum of Mike Libertine, Director of Siting and Permitting at All-Points Technology Corp., P.C. included as Attachment 5.

Q6(b). There, in reference to abutting property owners' requests, it states that "MCM's Application largely incorporates these requests...". Provide a list of which requests were not incorporated into the Application and why MCM chose not to incorporate them.

A6(b). Please see A(6)(a) above.

Q7. Refer to MCM's Application, Section VIII, p. 18. There, it refers to "other details as requested by abutting property owners...". Provide a list of these "other details" and explain in detail the actions MCM plans to take regarding abutting property owners.

A7. Please see A(6)(a) above.

Q8. Provide a list of backup electric generation equipment currently installed at the tower or projected to be installed at the tower and whether it is expected that any of the current or future tenants of the tower are expected to use the backup electric generation while new or replacement electric service is installed at the tower. If backup electric generation is expected to be required, then provide the expected timeframe for its use.

A8. Currently, there are no fixed emergency backup power generators occupying the site. Each carrier provides back up power to their equipment via battery backup located within or immediately next to their radio cabinets. Sprint/Nextel has an existing concrete slab situated along the northern portion of the facility for use of a mobile back up power generator staging area. A typical 200A single phase service would be temporarily supplied power from a 50kVA generator. The noise emitted from said generator is what was included in APT's October 30, 2011 Noise Study.

The existing electrical feeders and transformer servicing the subject facility are proposed to be upgraded from 400A single phase, 120/240V to a 800A, single phase, 120/240V service. In order to complete a transformer swap and upgrade the service to 800 amps without having to use an overnight generator, the following sequence of construction should be followed:

1. Build a new meter mod-bank next to the existing multi-gang meter;
2. Run two 4" PVC conduits up to but not into the existing electrical NU vault;
3. Schedule the outage with NU to power down the transformer so the new conductors can be pulled and punched into the existing vault;
4. If time allows, energize the new service and terminate the old service;
5. Temporary power can be obtained from running wire from the old main Circuit Breaker (CB) to the new main CB. If this cannot be completed in one (1) day, the wire can be pulled and a second outage scheduled;
6. Intercept the two existing load conduits and install a new underground Quazite box to extend the wires to the new meter mod-bank; and
7. The change out is completed and the old meter mod-bank could then be removed.

This schedule would limit the amount of any daytime outages requiring the use of a generator for back power and eliminate the need to run said generator(s) at night.

Q9. Regarding safety issues:

Q9(a). Explain how MCM expects to address the fall zone of the replacement tower extending on to the land of abutting property owners.

A9(a). The 127' tower radius extends 5 feet onto the 15 Bartram drive property. While it is highly unlikely for a tower to fall over from the base, a designed yield point in the tower allowing for a "fall zone" radius less than the full height can be incorporated into the final design if requested by the Siting Council.

Q9(b). Provide any engineering studies or testing data relating to how wind affects a monopine tower, including what wind velocities cause failure of the tower.

A9(b). As a general matter this question is overbroad as to content. The proposed facility will comply with the governing codes noted in Attachment 3 of the Application which include the 2005 Connecticut Building Code (2003 IBC BASIS) and EIA/TIA 222-F (the structural standard for antenna supporting structures and antennas) which is Administrative Notice item number 31 in this Docket. Additionally, information from Valmont included in Attachment 3 addresses wind loading.

Q9(c). Provide any engineering studies or testing data relating to the breakpoints of a monopine tower, including a description of how the tower will fall if it breaks.

A9(c). Again, this question is overbroad as to content. As noted in A9(a) at the direction of the Siting Council MCM can work with its vendor to include a designed yield point in the tower to allow for a "fall zone" radius of diameter less than the full height of the tower. In such an instance, the manufacturer would be directed to provide a yield point so that in the highly unlikely event of a structural failure of the tower, such failure would occur similar to a hinge along the shaft of the tower and not a toppling from the base.

Q10. Regarding visual screening of the project:

Q10(a). Provide a detailed description of MCM's plan for installing screening, whether vegetative or other, along the perimeter property line of each abutting property owner.

A10(a). As depicted in Application Attachment 3, the proposed tower is a camouflaged monopine surrounded by a wood stockade fence and vegetative landscaping. No specific landscaping proposals along property lines are proposed to screen these proposed screening features. Please see "Description of the Proposed Screening Plan" in the March 19, 2012 memorandum of Mike Libertine, Director of Siting and Permitting at All-Points Technology Corp., P.C. included as Attachment 2.

Q10(b). If abutting property owners grant MCM access onto their land, then would MCM install screening on abutters' property in order to prevent the tower property owner, Mr. Paradise, from removing the screening?

A10(b). If abutting property owners sought landscape screening on their property for whatever reason, as opposed to such screening on the Paradise property, MCM would discuss that privately with each property owner if and only if such screening on the Paradise property could be required by the CSC for mitigation and any such agreements would not be part of the CSC's decision and order or Certificate.

Q11. When did T-Mobile first sign a lease for locating an antenna at the proposed tower? Provide a copy of the lease. Explain what caused the delay in placing

antennae on the guyed tower or in MCM erecting a new tower from the date of the lease until the current Certificate filing.

A11. As noted in Application Section IV(B), T-Mobile began negotiations for a co-location at this site in 2008 and signed a lease agreement in 2009. Review and analysis of the existing facility revealed the inability of the existing tower to accommodate the T-Mobile facility. Subsequent coordination between T-Mobile and MCM as well as capital expenditure planning in 2009-2010 was followed by a "pre-technical report" consultation period with the Town of Redding and interested neighbors in early 2011. This consultation included the provision of preliminary plans for the facility site as well as visual analyses. Subsequent design changes in response to neighbor comments required among other things a geotechnical analysis and investigation of monopine products. Once revised materials responding to pre-technical report consultations were developed an official technical report was prepared and submitted on August 2, 2011. The technical consultation process included meetings with neighbors and discussions with the Town.

Respectfully submitted,
Message Center Management, Inc.

By its attorneys:



Daniel M. Laub
Christopher B. Fisher
445 Hamilton Avenue
14th Floor
White Plains, NY 10601
T: 914.761.1300
F: 914.761.5372
dlaub@cuddyfeder.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this day an original and copies of the foregoing were sent by electronic mail and overnight delivery to the Connecticut Siting Council with copy by electronic mail and first class mail to:

T-Mobile Northeast LLC
Julie D. Kohler, Esq.
Cohen and Wolf, P.C.
1115 Broad Street
Bridgeport, CT
jkohler@cohenandwolf.com

Town of Redding
Brad N. Mondschein, Esq.
Pullman & Comley, LLC
90 State House Square
Hartford, CT 06103
bmondschein@pullcom.com

Dated: March 20, 2012


Daniel M. Laub

cc: Maria Scotti, MCM
Virginia King, MCM
Hans Fiedler, T-Mobile
Christopher B. Fisher, Esq.