



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

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

September 12, 2013

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

RE: **DOCKET NO. 440** – New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T) application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 522 Colebrook Road, Colebrook, Connecticut.

Dear Attorneys Chiocchio and Fisher:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than September 26, 2013. 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, as well as send a copy via electronic mail. In accordance with the State Solid Waste Management Plan and in accordance with Section 16-50j-12 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies 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.

Copies of your responses shall be provided to all parties and intervenors listed on the service list, which can be found on the Council's pending proceedings website.

Yours very truly,

Melanie Bachman
Executive Director

MB/MP

c: Parties and Intervenors

Docket No. 440
Pre-Hearing Questions
Set One

1. Of the letters sent to abutting property owners, how many certified mail receipts were received? If any receipts were not returned, which owners did not receive their notice? Were any additional attempts made to contact those property owners?
2. Is the Republican American a daily publication?
3. Which frequencies are New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T) licensed to utilize in Litchfield County?
4. When was AT&T's search ring first initiated for a tower in this area? Provide the size, shape, and location of the center of the search ring.
5. What is the existing signal strength in the areas AT&T is seeking to cover from the proposed tower site?
6. What is the signal strength for which AT&T designs its system? For in-vehicle coverage? For in-building coverage?
7. Would AT&T provide both cellular and PCS service initially or cellular first and PCS in the future? When would LTE service be provided, if applicable? Explain.
8. Would all frequencies be used to transmit voice and data?
9. Does AT&T have any statistics on dropped calls in the vicinity of the proposed site? If so, what do they indicate? Does AT&T have any other indicators of substandard service in this area?
10. Would this tower be needed for coverage, capacity, or both? Explain.
11. What is the minimum antenna centerline height required to meet AT&T's coverage objective?
12. Provide the lengths of the existing coverage gaps on any roads that AT&T seeks to provide coverage to.
13. Provide the lengths of the proposed coverage of any roads that AT&T seeks to provide coverage to based on the tower's proposed height, as well as ten and twenty feet shorter.
14. Provide estimated average daily traffic counts for those portions of Routes 182, 182A, and 183 that would be covered from the proposed facility.
15. Provide the areas to be covered (in square miles) assuming the tower is at the proposed height and also ten and twenty feet shorter.
16. Using the same scale as the coverage plots in the Radio Frequency Analysis Report, provide separate coverage plots assuming the tower is ten and twenty feet shorter.

17. Provide the distance and direction from the proposed site to the existing (or proposed) sites that the proposed tower would interact with. Also include the addresses, tower heights, antenna heights and tower types (e.g. monopole). Alternatively, if these sites are already included in the table on page 8 of the Radio Frequency Analysis, indicate which sites they are.
18. Provide the tower/structure heights for the facilities listed on page 8 of the Radio Frequency Analysis Report in the Application.
19. Does AT&T plan to co-locate on the Norfolk Road, Winchester tower (S1175)? If yes, does AT&T plan to submit a tower share application to the Council for this site?
20. What is the status of AT&T's co-location on the Greenwoods Road East, Norfolk tower (S1176)?
21. Would the battery backup provide "seamless" uninterrupted power until the generator starts?
22. How long would the battery backup last in the event that the backup generator fails to start?
23. What is the fuel type for the backup generator? What is the approximate run time of the generator based on its fuel tank size?
24. Has AT&T considered using a fuel cell as a backup power source for the proposed site? Explain.
25. Does AT&T anticipate the use of the backup generator as a temporary power source until permanent electrical service is provided?
26. What is the expected cumulative noise level at the nearest property line from the proposed facility assuming the backup generator and air conditioning unit(s) are running at the same time?
27. Identify the safety standards and/or codes by which equipment, machinery, or technology would be used or operated at the proposed facility.
28. What is the tower design wind speed for this area (Litchfield County)?
29. Under Tab 3, page 2, Section II. F of the Site Evaluation Report of the Application, the general land uses surrounding the subject property are listed. Provide general (N/S/E/W) directions for each use listed, e.g. rural residential to the east, etc.
30. Would any blasting be required to develop this site?
31. Quantify the amounts of cut and fill that would be required to develop the proposed facility.
32. Is the proposed site located within a 100-year or 500-year flood zone?

33. Has AT&T considered co-locating on one of the approved BNE Colebrook North or Colebrook South wind turbines?
34. Would the proposed antennas be mounted on a low-profile platform?
35. Would flush-mounted antennas or antennas attached to the tower at the proposed height via T-arms provide the required coverage? Would either configuration result in reduced coverage and/or necessitate greater antenna height with multiple levels of antennas? Explain.
36. What, if any, stealth tower design options would be feasible to employ at this site? For example, has AT&T considered a tree tower design (e.g. monopine)? Explain.
37. Provide a map or drawing depicting the wetland locations on the subject property.
38. The proposed access from Smith Hill Road is 1,337 feet long and would result in a total of approximately 170 trees to be removed for the project. The earlier access proposal from Colebrook Road is longer at 1,805 feet but only requires the removal of 97 trees for the project. Does access from Colebrook Road have less tree removal due to the use of an existing (already cleared) access onto the subject property?
39. How many homes are located on the subject property? What is the existing access on the subject property (from Colebrook Road) currently used for?
40. Are there any hiking trails in the vicinity of the proposal tower site?