

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 IN ROXBURY, CONNECTICUT

DOCKET NO. 428

September 11, 2012

RESPONSES TO INTERVENOR BRONSON MOUNTAIN FARM
HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCIATION PRE-HEARING QUESTIONS SET ONE

- Q1. The Application for Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need ("Application") provides that [Certain new] technologies are better suited for specifically defined areas where new coverage is necessary....The Applicant submits that there are no effective technological alternatives to construction of a new cell site facility for providing reliable personal wireless services in this area of Connecticut." Application at 11. Acknowledging that the listed technologies may be better suited in other contexts, please provide evidence why these technologies may be better suited in other contexts, please provide evidence why these technologies are entirely ill-suited for providing the desired coverage.
- A1. *The area of the State where service is needed and which this application seeks to serve is a wide area of poor or no service. Microcells or repeaters are better suited to small areas for fill in use and/or commercial in building service. Repeaters offer no added capacity in the network, and require a line of site donor facility which can be difficult in the defining terrain of the area.*
- With respect to distributed antennas systems ("DAS"), we note that these are generally lower power, low gain systems used in high traffic areas (i.e. capacity demand) which rely on a combination of fiber optics, transmitting antenna sites and a base station facility. The service requirements in this area relate to coverage on a macro level as opposed to a discrete system such as a DAS network.*
- Given the foregoing, alternate technologies are not deemed suitable to serve the area of required coverage improvement.*
- Q2. Please describe why T-arms cannot be utilized for the proposed facility at either Candidate A or Candidate B.
- A2. *T-arm mounts can be utilized.*
- Q3. Has the stream crossing and access drive for which C.N. Builders, the owner of Candidate A, received wetland approval been constructed? See Application at 13.
- A3. *The crossing has not yet been constructed. That would be coordinated with the property owner who obtained that approval.*

- Q4. The Applicant provides that “[t]he proposed location of the Candidate A Facility is an approximately 91 acre undeveloped parcel. The parcel is larger than most other parcels in the area.” Application at 22. The Application also provides that the “closest property boundary to Candidate A is approximately 132’ from the tower.” Application at 21. Given the extremely large size of the undeveloped Candidate A parcel, what other locations on the parcel were considered that would have a less significant impact on the residential area to the south and why were they rejected? Please respond with reference to Response A13 to the CSC Pre-Hearing Questions Set One which indicates that 20’ lower antenna height (presumably by reason of lower ground elevation or lower tower height) would have no appreciable impact to the coverage on nearby roads.
- A4. *Negotiations with the land owner indicated the proposed location as an acceptable location for leasing and use of a wireless facility. Additional locations on the parcel were not available to AT&T for leasing and as such were not reviewed for radio frequency performance. As a general matter a facility on this parcel at same or similar elevation may perform similarly to the proposed Candidate A. However, given existing terrain and tree cover any location would have to be analyzed specifically to determine its ability to provide adequate service to the proposed coverage area.*
- Q5. The Application provides that “[a]ccess to the [Candidate A] facility would be provided initially over a planned subdivision access driveway for a distance of approximately 1,300 feet. From there, AT&T proposes a new 12’ wide gravel access drive will [sic] extend approximately 210’ to the site.” Application, Attachment 3, third page. Please provide a copy of the subdivision approval for the Candidate A parcel that is referenced.
- A5. *The crossing and associated drive which were reviewed locally and are not yet part of an approved subdivision but are for the owner’s access to the parcel and future development.*
- Q6. The Application provides that a total of 122 trees with a diameter of 6” or greater will need to be removed in order to construct the Candidate A access road, compound and utilities. Application, Attachment 3, Tab A, Letter of CHA (“CHA Letter”). The plans included in Tab A depict approximately 122 shaded trees that must be removed, but the CHA Letter does not include the other trees (non-shaded) that must be removed in order to construct the access drive. Assuming that the access road has not been constructed, and assuming that no subdivision approval has been sought or obtained, and in light of the fact that the wetland approval for the access road was for the purpose of “a possible cell tower site” and not a subdivision; Application, Attachment 5, Letter of Roxbury Wetland Commission; please provide (i) an accurate listing of the number of trees that must be removed in order to construct the entire proposed 1,510’ access drive categorized by diameter; (ii) the total amount of cut and fill required to develop the proposed tower site and the proposed 1,510’ access drive including the amount of material that must be brought to and from Candidate A; (iii) details regarding the proposed erosion and sedimentation controls that will be utilized during construction of the 1,510’ access drive; (iv) the proposed surface of the completed access drive other than the gravel portion directly adjacent to the proposed facility; (v) the average and greatest proposed slope of the 1,510’ access drive; (vi) details regarding stormwater management for the 1,510’ access drive; (vii) whether the installation of catch basins or other structures to collect storm water from the access drive will require the removal of

additional trees; (viii) details of any proposed snow or ice treatment for the access drive other than plowing.

- A6. *The wetland crossing and associated drive will provide general access to the parcel which currently has no access to or from Route 67. This local approval/review was obtained by the property owners independent of AT&T. The area of the drive to serve the parcel is under the control of and would be developed by the owners of the parcel. AT&T does not have control over the development of that road and has not developed plans for the access drive that would serve the parcel in its entirety. AT&T's development proposal is limited to the compound and access connecting to the main drive which will serve the parcel. Accordingly, AT&T's project engineers do not have the data or information requested. Please note that for purposes of the site visit scheduled for September 18, 2012, AT&T's engineers will be able to flag the route of that road for the purposes of field review.*

It is important to note that while the property owners apparently made reference to the prospect of this access being for a "cell tower site" in their appearances to obtain local approvals, AT&T was not party to that application. The owners, of their own volition and independent of AT&T, undertook to obtain local approvals to obtain access to the parcel. Lease negotiations were not commenced until after that approval was obtained.

- Q7. What is the total size and function of the wetland area located approximately 97' from the nearest grading for the proposed facility? How will the functions of this wetland area be protected during and after construction?

- A7. *The wetland area located approximately 97 feet east of the nearest grading for the proposed Facility is associated with a braided forested hillside seep wetland. This wetland system is comprised of three relatively narrow wetland areas associated with high gradient intermittent watercourse channels that drain to the east into an unnamed perennial stream that parallels the west side of Southbury Road (State Route 67). This ±2 acre wetland system is best characterized as a headwater wetland area. As with other high gradient headwater wetland systems, wetland functions supported by this wetland area include groundwater recharge/discharge, nutrient removal/retention/transformation (water quality improvement), production export and wildlife habitat. These functions will be protected since the proposed project will not result in any direct alteration to this wetland area. In addition, an undisturbed buffer of ±97 feet will be maintained during construction, which will further provide long term protection to this wetland area and its functions. Also, since the facility is unmanned and generates minimal traffic (i.e., once per month inspection by service personnel) the long term operation of the facility will not result in a likely adverse impact to this wetland area. In order to protect this nearby wetland area during construction from possible short term impacts, appropriate sediment and erosion control measures will be designed and employed in accordance with the 2002 Connecticut Guidelines For Soil Erosion and Sediment Control. Additional details of these protective measures are provided below in the response to Question 8.*

- Q8. Provide details of the proposed erosion and sedimentation controls that will be utilized to protect this wetland area.
- A8. *To protect nearby wetlands during construction, all appropriate sediment and erosion control measures will be designed and employed in accordance with the 2002 Connecticut Guidelines For Soil Erosion and Sediment Control. Soil erosion control measures and other best management practices will be established and maintained throughout the construction of the proposed facility. The Contractor shall be responsible for the proper installation and daily inspection of erosion and sedimentation (E&S) controls throughout the duration of the construction project and until disturbed areas are permanently stabilized with vegetation or engineering controls. In addition to the Contractor being responsible for the proper installation and daily inspection of erosion and sedimentation controls, an independent Project Erosion and Sedimentation Control Monitor will inspect E&S controls and document their condition and recommend any actions necessary to bring the controls back into compliance. The Project Erosion and Sedimentation Control Monitor shall inspect erosion and sedimentation controls once per 7 days and after significant rainfall events of greater than one half inch over a 24-hour period to ensure that proper precautions are taken to avoid the release of sediment into nearby resource areas. The Contractor shall implement any recommendations or corrective actions within 24 hours of receipt of the notice.*
- Q9. Will the Applicant flag the proposed location of the entirety of the 1,510' access drive in the field for the benefit of the Council, the intervenors, and the public during its public field review prior to the public hearing?
- A9. *AT&T has made arrangements to flag the length of the access drive for the field review.*
- Q10. Please provide any geotechnical studies regarding the area for the proposed facility and the proposed 1,510' access drive and whether any blasting will be required.
- A10. *Geotechnical studies of an approved tower location would be conducted after final approval and incorporated in any Development and Management Plan. If ledge is encountered removal by mechanical means would be the preferred method of removal.*
- Q11. What multiple-facility scenarios has the Applicant investigated to provide similar or better coverage, including scenarios that utilize town-owned properties as directed by the Roxbury Zoning Regulations?
- A11. *AT&T has not investigated the use of a "multiple-facility scenario" to service the particular area AT&T seeks to serve in this Application. Overall, AT&T requires a macro solution and in general seeks to minimize the proliferation of towers. AT&T was never advised of any availability of Town property for a wireless facility from the time the original technical report for the Candidate B Facility was filed in August of 2009.*
- Q12. The Town of Roxbury owns property on Squire Road. Can the Applicant provide the desired coverage from that property assuming a tower height of 170' either on its own or in conjunction with facilities located on other Town-owned properties or on existing structures, such as church steeples?

- A12. *AT&T has just today been provided information regarding the location of the Town owned parcel on Squire Road and AT&T's RF consultants are still analyzing the location. Of note, however, this parcel appears to be an existing graveyard.*
- Q13. The propagation map depicting the proposed coverage from Candidate A includes a gap in coverage on Route 67 (Southbury Road). How does the Applicant propose to provide coverage to this state arterial road in the future?
- A13. *The Candidate A Facility will provide a significant amount of coverage along the coverage gap on Route 67. It is unlikely AT&T would seek to fill this remaining area with service from an additional facility.*
- Q14. The Application, Attachment 2, references a "site search area," but this area is not depicted on a map and is not described in any way. Please provide a map of the "Site search area."
- A14. *The center of the search ring is depicted in the map included Application Attachment 2 (see green circle marked "SR" denoting the center of the search area. The original search ring was two (2) miles in diameter.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this day, a copy of the foregoing was sent electronically and by overnight mail to the Connecticut Siting Council with copy to:


John W. Knuff, Esq.
Hurwitz, Zagarin, Slossberg & Knuff, LLC
P.O. Box 112
Milford, CT 06460
203 877 8000
JKnuff@hssklaw.com

Barbara Henry
First Selectman
29 North Street
P.O. Box 203
Roxbury, CT 06783
860 354 9938
bhenry@roxburyct.com

Paul R. Jessel, Esq.
Slavin, Stauffacher & Scott, LLC
27 Siemon Company Drive, Suite 300W
Watertown, CT 06795
(860)-274-2511
pjessell@sssattorneys.com

Gerald Stomski
First Selectman
Town of Woodbury
281 Main Street South
PO Box 369
Woodbury, CT 06798
wdbysel@woodburyct.org

Dated: September 11, 2012


Daniel M. Laub