



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

November 5, 2013

Daniel M. Laub, Esq.
Cuddy & Feder LLP
445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th Floor
White Plains, NY 10601

RE: **DOCKET NO. 442** – 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 284 New Canaan Avenue, Norwalk, Connecticut.

Dear Attorney Laub:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than November 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, and a .pdf copy via e-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
Acting Executive Director

c: Council Members
Parties and Intervenors

Docket No. 442

**New Cingular Wireless PCS LLC
Pre-Hearing Questions – Set One**

1. Were return receipts received for each abutting landowner identified in the application? If not, list the abutters that did not receive notice and describe any additional effort to serve notice. When was the abutter list compiled?
2. What is the fuel source and run time of AT&T's emergency generator? Would AT&T be willing to install a generator of sufficient size to accommodate three or more carriers?
3. During construction, does AT&T anticipate the use a mobile generator as a temporary power source until permanent electrical service is provided?
4. Identify the nearest licensed day care facility and school to the proposed site.
5. Would the proposed facility comply with recommended guidelines of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for minimizing the potential for telecommunications towers to impact bird species? Please explain.
6. Identify the safety standards and/or codes by which equipment, machinery, or technology would be used or operated at the proposed facility.
7. Identify the non-emergency operational equipment and associated noise levels produced by such equipment that would generate noise outside of the compound area. Would the operation of this equipment have a cumulative noise level that exceeds Connecticut or City of Norwalk noise control regulations?
8. What is the existing signal strength within the proposed service area? How is service affected by this level of coverage?
9. Referring to Application Tab 2,
 - a) For Site 2, when was the lease rejected? What height was needed at the water tank?
 - b) For Site 3, what height was examined and rejected?
10. Referring to the Site Plans in Application Tab 3, Sheet T-1 states six antennas will be located at both the 137 and 127-foot levels of the tower. Sheet S4a depicts AT&T antennas at the 137, 127 and 117-foot levels of the tower. Please clarify.
11. How will the unipole design affect performance and maintenance of the cell site? What is the current trend in antenna design and given the current trend, would the unipole design be able to accommodate potential technological antenna advancements?
12. What is the minimum tower height AT&T would require if the site were designed as a traditional monopole with platform mounted antennas?
13. Application page 17 states that the Connecticut SHPO must concur with any tower design change or if there was a change, the FCC would have to override SHPO. What specific legal authority does Connecticut SHPO have in determining the final design of a tower facility?

14. Is the tower site located in a 500-year flood zone?
15. Application page 15 states five residences would have year-round views of the site whereas the visibility report in Tab 5 states four residences. Please clarify.
16. Estimate the length of year-round visibility of the site along the Merritt Parkway. Would visibility include one or both towers? Is visibility of the tower(s) directly in front of the viewer or off to the side?
17. How was the location of each tower determined in the photo-simulations?