

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

IN RE:

APPLICATION OF HOMELAND TOWERS, LLC DOCKET NO. 451
(HOMELAND) AND NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS
PCS, LLC (AT&T) FOR A CERTIFICATE OF
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC OCTOBER 23, 2014
NEED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION,
MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF A
TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY LOCATED
AT THE CHESHIRE WASTEWATER
TREATMENT PLANT

**HOMELAND TOWERS, LLC (HOMELAND) and NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS,
PCS LLC (AT&T)
RESPONSES TO WASSMER
PRE-HEARING INTERROGATORIES - SET ONE**

Q1. Can you please explain the difference between the 700MHz and 1900 Mhz, it appears that the 700 MHz is for data transfer and 1900 Mhz is for cellular phone service? Can you please explain the difference between the green and orange. Db levels? [Pages 10-13 of the Radio Frequency Analysis]

A1. Both 700 MHz and 1900 MHz will be deployed as Long Term Evolution (LTE). The green and orange levels correspond roughly to more reliable service levels where areas in green can expect robust service in buildings where areas in orange will have acceptable reliable service in buildings but will certainly be robust and reliable in outdoor or in-vehicle settings.

Q2. If yes, would you say that the green area for the majority of the post-construction coverage is the Quinnipiac Park and a farm on South Meriden Road. If the orange areas are ones of limited coverage, residents that live less than 1000' away from the tower would receive limited coverage. How limited is limited?

A2. Orange indicates areas of service which may be less reliable or slower inside built environments (inside homes etc). For an area in orange, reliable service will be more readily and consistently experienced outdoors or in vehicles.

Q3. Is it logical to locate the cell tower where it is proposed given that this location is one of, if not the lowest elevation in the north-eastern part of the town, requiring the tower to be unusually high and coverage to be so limited? Your testimony at the public hearing stated that the topography of the area makes getting coverage difficult, so wouldn't other locations be better - maybe much better than this location?

A3. The location of the tower is being driven by the needs of both the Town of Cheshire and AT&T. For purposes of serving this area, moving to a higher elevation would move AT&T away from the area of need. While sometimes elevation is a benefit to providing service, placing this facility at a higher elevation and moving to the edges of the area of need would encounter a shadowing effect where the elevated topography would actually block radio frequency signals from serving portions of the area of lower elevation.

Q4. On pages 13 of the Radio Frequency Analysis Report of the application to the Siting Council, the coverage with Proposed Site map shows still a significant amount of areas with no coverage, some within ½ mile of the 180' tower, can you please explain why there are so many apparent "dead zones"?

Will this require a significant amount of additional towers? I count at least 10 (ten) locations in the north-eastern part of Cheshire where additional service will be required, will this mean 10 (ten) more towers in these areas? What about the rest of Cheshire? How many towers would be required to provide adequate cellular service to the entire town?

A4. The noted remaining gaps in coverage are due to the topography in the area which limits the area any given site can cover. As such not all of those identified areas may be reliably served but in some instances new facilities on existing buildings, existing infrastructure or towers will be needed. AT&T's evaluation of the need for new sites is ongoing.

Q5. Is there newer technology being researched or tested that makes it possible to enhance other towers with stronger signals? Is the tower in the silo at Tower Farms? Or any of the ones at the top of the ridge in Meriden? The tower in Southington across from Superior products?

A5. This site, like existing sites in this area, is being built with state of the art equipment. No technology exists to increase their coverage. Personal wireless services are a two-way system, so increasing the power from the base station does not increase the overall service area because the areas where the mobile devices can reach back to the base station are not increased.

Q6. Section IV, Page 12, Site selection: "No tall structures in this area of the Town of Cheshire were deemed suitable to provide the service needed by AT&T". Can you specify which structures were evaluated?

A6. To clarify, no tall structures were identified in this area of the town of Cheshire which could provide the service needed by AT&T.

Q7. The State's philosophy is to have as many providers on one tower as possible but AT&T is only on 17 of the 45 towers. Why isn't AT&T on the other towers? Wouldn't this be a first step to improved coverage before a new tower is built?

A7. AT&T looks first to use existing infrastructure such as existing towers, water tanks or rooftops in order to provide reliable service to areas of need. AT&T does not co-locate on a facility in an area where it does not have a need for reliable service (i.e. where service is already provided). It should be first noted that there are not 45 towers identified on the existing sites list. These are instead locations of existing wireless facilities; not all of which are towers. Approximately 25 of the sites identified in Attachment 3 of the Application or non-tower siting solutions including rooftops, water tanks, and attachments to electric transmission towers. While it is not uncommon to see different carriers to co-locate on the same non-tower structure, there are many instances when carriers for technical, lease, structural or other reasons do not co-locate on the same structure. The existing tower/ cell site listing and provided map make clear that carriers, as well as other entities, are deploying at different non-tower sites. Many of these sites are in very close proximity to one another (see e.g. along Interstate 691). In an area such as this, it is not uncommon for carriers such as AT&T to have only a few facilities in the area which are adequate to provide the reliable service needed. As noted AT&T would not seek to co-locate at another existing site if it does not have a need for reliable service.

Q8. Can Homeland give us an idea of the terms of the lease with the town? Years? Money? What is the typical dollar amount for lease agreements with carriers?

A8. *A copy of the lease with the town of Cheshire is provided as attachment X to the applicants responses to siting Council interrogatories set I. Financial terms with carriers are not disclosed.*

Q9. At 70 East Johnson Road, Algonquin Gas owns a parcel of over 60 Acres in size, 3 of which are in I-2 zone with an elevation around 200, was this site considered? If no why not?

A9. *That location is very near AT&T's existing site identified in its radiofrequency report as CT1033. A facility at that location would be largely duplicative with the coverage from CT1033 and as such is not a good candidate location for such facility.*

Q10. 330 Blacks Road is owned by SCCRWA, was this site considered? Low lying but still in Zone I-2. SCCRWA owns 2 parcels totaling over 65 acres in an industrial zone.

A10. *That location is also very near an existing AT&T site and would be largely duplicative with existing coverage.*

Q11. Air Navigation, page 16: Per FAA and TOWAIR analysis, the tower will not need to be marked or lighted, can you guarantee that for an extended period of time? 10-15-20 years?

A11. *Lighting requirements are determined by the FAA and are not under control of the Applicants. While no guarantee can be provided, a post construction lighting requirement would be unusual and would necessarily be precipitated by a change in flight patterns, controlling regulations or, under current regulations, extension of the height of the tower to 200' or greater.*

Q12. From a noise perspective, would a dense row or three of arborvitae provide a noise cancelling buffer around the proposed generators?

A12. Notwithstanding the mechanical controls built into any generators to be deployed, the location is already benefitted by significant, mature surrounding vegetation which will also absorb (not cancel) sound. The site will meet applicable noise standards.

Q13. Visual Assessment, page 14: What consideration was given to add screening around the entire property? Perhaps a double layer of pine trees could help hide the view for the abutting residents.

A13. The site location provides significant screening from surrounding views ~~given the mature vegetation and trees surrounding this portion of the Host~~ Property. Additional landscaping was not considered given the limited views of the compound from surrounding areas.