

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

IN RE:

DOCKET NO. 454

APPLICATION OF TOWER HOLDINGS,
LLC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY
AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE
CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE
AND OPERATION OF A
TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY
AT 199 BRICKYARD ROAD IN THE
TOWN OF FARMINGTON,
CONNECTICUT

January 27, 2015

**INTERROGATORY RESPONSES TO TOWN OF FARMINGTON
FROM APPLICANT TOWER HOLDINGS, LLC**

The Applicant, Tower Holdings, LLC, (“Tower Holdings”), respectfully submits the following responses to the first set of Pre-Hearing Interrogatories propounded by the Town of Farmington (“Town”), dated January 20, 2015, in connection with the above-captioned Application for Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunications facility (“Application”) at 199 Brickyard Road, Farmington, Connecticut (“Property”).

1. The Application for Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need (the “Application”) provides that “a monopole structure is insufficient for training purposes.” Application, at 7. Is it also the Applicant's contention that a monopole structure is insufficient for AT&T to achieve its coverage objectives in the alleged underserved area?

Response: No.

2. Has the Applicant considered using a monopole structure as opposed to a lattice structure at the proposed location? If not, why?

Response: No. As discussed in the Application, a monopole structure is insufficient for training purposes. This point is further buttressed by the pre-filed testimony of Ernest R. Jones, P.E., which is appended to Tower Holding's pre-hearing submission,

dated January 27, 2015, as Attachment C. Additionally, more than 80 percent of the structures Northeast Towers, Inc. ("NET") services are of a lattice design; therefore, a monopole structure would be of minimal utility to NET for training purposes. Furthermore, a lattice structure is no more visible than a monopole. The lattice design allows for light to penetrate through its infrastructure which can soften its silhouette against the sky under various light conditions.

3. Please identify the size of the search ring and explain why that radius was chosen.

Response: Providers of wireless communications services develop search areas based upon identified coverage and/or capacity needs of their networks. Please see Part IV of the Application and Attachment 9 appended thereto. Representatives of Tower Holdings collaborated with representatives of New Cingular Wireless PCS LLC ("AT&T") in connection with the selection of the Property as the site for the Facility. AT&T provided information concerning the applicable search area in response to Interrogatory 2 of the Connecticut Siting Council's interrogatories directed to AT&T.

4. What other locations on the proposed parcel were considered that would have a less significant impact on the residential area and why were they rejected?

Response: Tower Holdings considered the entire Property in determining the most appropriate location for the proposed Facility. The proposed location was dictated by the following: (1) the proportions of the Property; (2) the existing office building; (3) the existing access and parking area; the existing ground operations of Northeast Tower, Inc. ("NET"), including the room needed for storage and for ingress/egress of tractor-trailer trucks for loading and deliveries. Additionally, sufficient space is needed for training, including 360 degree access. Finally, given the size and location of the Property, a shift in the location of the proposed Facility would not have an appreciable impact on the potential views of the Facility from the surrounding areas.

5. The Application states that "only 3 percent of the Study Area would have year round views of portions of the Facility" and that "an additional 3 percent of the Study Area would have seasonal (leaf-of views of the proposed Facility." Application, at 14. Please explain how these calculations were made.

Response: As discussed in the Application, specifically Attachment 11, year round visibility is predicted to extend potentially over 210 acres, which is 2.6 percent of the 8,042 acre Study Area, roughly 3 percent rounding up. The additional 250 acres of possible seasonal visibility (when the leaves are off the trees) is another 3.1 percent of the 8,042 acre Study Area.

6. The Application, Attachment 11, page 7 provides that Winding Trails (located southeast of the proposed facility) will have year round views of the proposed facility. How will the Applicant minimize the aesthetic and environmental impacts on this location?

Response: The Application and its supporting materials demonstrate that the proposed Facility would not have a substantial adverse environmental impact. The proposed Facility is located 0.5 mile from Winding Trails, so no direct effects would occur to natural resources or wildlife on that property. There will be views of the proposed Facility from some locations at Winding Trails, at distances from 0.5 mile to one mile away (as presented in views 2 and 7 in Attachment 11 of the Application). Because the Facility will extend above the surrounding tree canopy from some perspectives at Winding Trails, there is limited screening or camouflage options to minimize those specific views. In several other locations at Winding Trails where the Facility might be visible, it would be no more of a focal point than existing industrial activities on neighboring parcels. As stated in response to Interrogatory 2, above, a lattice structure is no more visible than a monopole. The lattice design allows for light to penetrate through its infrastructure which can soften its silhouette against the sky under various light conditions.

7. How many residences (as opposed to acres) will have year round views of the proposed tower?

Response: A total of approximately twenty residential properties could have year round views of portions of the proposed Facility.

8. How many residences (as opposed to acres) will have seasonal views of the proposed tower?

Response: Seasonally, when the leaves are off the deciduous trees, over 100 residential properties could potentially have obstructed views of at least a part of the Facility (see views 5, 13, 17, 19 and 20 in Attachment 11 of the Application as examples). Field verification activities during the balloon float are restricted to publicly accessible areas, so Tower Holdings relied on the computer model to compile a comprehensive list of residential properties that could potentially have views of the Facility. These calculations tend to over predict visibility. The computer model is a conservative analysis that evaluates potential visibility from a residential property by interpreting if a property falls within shaded areas of potential visibility on the Viewshed Maps presented in Attachment 11 of the Application. It may be possible to view the Facility from within portions of shaded areas on the Viewshed Maps, but not necessarily from all locations within those shaded areas. It does not necessarily mean that views would be achieved from within residential dwellings, exterior decks, porches or patios that might be located on such properties. Therefore, although the “footprint” of visibility depicted on the Viewshed Maps covers several acres, experience dictates that views will not be achieved from all locations within that area.

Respectfully submitted by,

TOWER HOLDINGS, LLC



By: _____

Jesse A. Langer
Updike, Kelly & Spellacy, P.C.
265 Church Street
New Haven, CT 06510
(203) 786-8310
Email: jlanger@uks.com

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that on this day a copy of the foregoing was delivered by electronic mail and regular mail, postage prepaid, to all parties and intervenors of record, as follows:

Counsel for New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC ("AT&T")

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

Counsel for the Town of Farmington

Kenneth R. Slater, Jr.
Duncan F. Forsyth
Halloran & Sage, LLP
One Goodwin Square
225 Asylum Street
Hartford, CT 06106



Jesse A. Langer
Commissioner of the Superior Court