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

April 9, 2015

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

RE: **DOCKET NO. 457** – 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 Monroe Tax Assessor's Map 107, Parcel 8.02, 30 Cobblers Hill Court, Monroe, Connecticut.

Dear Attorney Chiocchio:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than April 23, 2015. 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
Acting Executive Director

MB/MP

c: Parties and Intervenors
Council Members

Docket No. 457
Pre-Hearing Questions
April 9, 2015
Set One

1. When was the search ring for New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T) established? Provide the approximate radius of AT&T's search ring for this area. Provide the longitude and latitude coordinates of the center of the search ring.

2. In the Site Search Summary of the Application, is site alternative number 30 (End of Timothy Hill Road) the same or a similar location to the 36 Timothy Hill Road site suggested in an email dated September 25, 2013 and attached under Tab 11 of the Application?

3. 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?

4. What is the grade of the proposed access road? (Average grade, maximum grade or range of grades is acceptable.)

5. What type of light fixture would be attached to the outside of AT&T's equipment shelter (and depicted on Sheet D-1)? When would the light be on?

6. Re-run TOWAIR at the specific longitude/latitude coordinates specified in the 1-A Certification (rounded to the nearest tenth of a second) and provide a copy of the printout.

7. Estimate the number of homes with seasonal visibility and year-round visibility of the proposed tower?

8. For how long is State Historic Preservation Office determination (dated October 1, 2013) valid for?

9. Quantify the amounts of cut and fill that would be required to develop the proposed facility.

10. Would any blasting be required to develop the site?

11. Is the proposed site located within a 100-year or 500-year flood zone?

12. What measures are proposed for the site to ensure security and deter vandalism? (This would cover alarms, gates, locks, etc.)

13. Resolve discrepancies between the CSC Dimensions Table and distances on the Partial Plot Plan found on Sheet A-1 of Tab 4 of the Application.

14. Is AT&T proposing to install an emergency backup generator (herein after referred to as "generator") only large enough for AT&T's needs at this time? If yes, would AT&T consider reserving space in the fenced compound for a future shared generator should additional carriers co-locate on the tower?

15. What is the fuel source for the proposed generator? What is the size of the generator in kilowatts? Provide the estimated run time for the generator based on its fuel tank capacity. Would the fuel tank have a double wall or other containment measure(s) to protect against fuel leakage?

16. Would there be any interruption in service between the time power goes out and the generator comes online? For example, would AT&T provide battery backup to prevent a reboot condition and provide seamless power until the generator starts? If AT&T has a battery backup system, how many hours could it supply power in the event that the generator fails to start?

17. What size generator fuel tank would be necessary to satisfy a potential need for a minimum of 48 hours of runtime for AT&T? What size generator and fuel tank would be needed if two carriers were to share the generator and both required 48 hours of runtime? What if the generator were also shared with Town/emergency equipment?

18. What size concrete pad or equivalent would be needed to accommodate a generator for AT&T approximately 50 kW in capacity? What size concrete pad or equivalent would be needed to accommodate a generator approximately 200 kW in capacity?

19. Please provide the cost of a 50 kW generator. Please provide the cost of a 200 kW shared generator.

20. Has AT&T considered using a fuel cell as an emergency backup power source for the proposed site? Explain.

21. Identify the safety standards and/or codes by which equipment, machinery, or technology would be used or operated at the proposed facility.

22. Is the proposed site near an "Important Bird Area" as designated by the National Audubon Society?

23. Would AT&T's 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?

24. Sheets C-2 through C-5 show a "trail." Is that a recreational hiking trail? If yes, describe the visibility of the proposed tower from such trail.

25. What is the cumulative noise level that the AT&T expects at the nearest property line from the proposed facility taking into account AT&T's two air conditioning units attached to its equipment shelter? Would the expected noise levels comply with applicable standards? If no, indicate which noise mitigation measure(s) may be employed to ensure compliance.

26. Is the site located within an aquifer protection area?

27. Is EIA/TIA-222 version F (EIA version F) the current mandatory (minimum) standard in Connecticut because the Connecticut State Building Code currently adopts the 2003 International Building Code (2003 IBC) and the 2003 IBC adopts EIA version F? Is Version G (as proposed) more conservative than Version F for this tower such that the proposed tower would comply with both Version G and Version F standards?

28. What is the tower design wind speed for this area (Fairfield County)?

29. Would the tower be designed to be expandable in height beyond the originally proposed height?

30. What type of antenna mounts would be used for AT&T's proposed antennas, e.g. low-profile platform mount?

31. Drawing D-1 depicts remote radio heads, surge suppressors, and A2 units. What are the A2 units (e.g. diplexers, tower mounted amplifiers, etc.)? How many surge suppressors would be installed on the tower?

32. If requested by the Council, could the tower be designed with a yield point to ensure that the setback radius remains within the boundaries of the 36-acre Quarry Ridge Associates parcel?

33. Given the taper of the faux tree material, would the top antenna platform (i.e. AT&T's platform) still be sufficiently covered by the faux tree branches? Specifically, how long are the tree branches at the approximately 151-foot level of the tower, and, as a comparison, how far away from the tower do AT&T's antennas and antenna mounts extend?

34. Could the antennas and antenna mounts be painted to blend in with the color of the faux tree branch material?

35. What color options exist for the monopole or "tree trunk?" Is the monopole proposed as a galvanized gray color?

36. What other, if any, stealth tower design options would be feasible to employ at this site?

37. Would flush-mounted antennas provide the required coverage? Would such configuration result in reduced coverage and/or necessitate greater antenna height with multiple levels of antennas? Explain.

38. Provide a list of frequencies that AT&T is licensed to utilize in Fairfield County?

39. Of the existing sites noted on page 9 of the Radio Frequency Analysis Report (RF Report), indicate which ones that the proposed site would interact with to hand off signals. If AT&T's proposed antennas would interact with any other sites not listed, include those also. Also include the tower/structure heights of such facilities.

40. Which frequency band services would AT&T install at the proposed site, e.g. 700 MHz, 850 MHz, 1900 MHz, 2100 MHz, etc.? Would all of these frequencies be provided initially, or would some be provided initially and others deployed in the future at this particular site? Explain.

41. Would the proposed site be needed for coverage, capacity, or both? Explain. If the proposed facility would also provide capacity relief, provide data to support the current capacity issue and demonstrate how the proposed facility would improve capacity in the area.

42. Are all frequencies used to transmit voice and data? Explain.

43. What is the lowest height at which AT&T's antennas could achieve its coverage objectives from the proposed sites?

44. What are the signal strengths for which AT&T designs its system for the frequency bands that AT&T seeks to utilize at the proposed site? For in-vehicle coverage? For in-building coverage?

45. What are the existing signal strengths within the area AT&T is seeking to cover for this site for the frequency bands that AT&T would utilize?

46. Does AT&T have any statistics on dropped calls and/or ineffective attempts in the vicinity of the proposed facility? If so, what do they indicate? Does AT&T have any other indicators of substandard service in this area?

47. Provide the lengths of the existing coverage gaps on major roads that AT&T is seeking to cover from the proposed site at each frequency band used by AT&T. Break this down by street name and include the town(s) that the streets are located in.

48. Provide the lengths of the existing coverage gaps on secondary roads that AT&T is seeking to cover from the proposed site at each frequency band used by AT&T. Break this down by street name and include the town(s) that the streets are located in.

49. What is the total (not incremental) predicted coverage footprint from the proposed site (in square miles), at each frequency band used by AT&T? Provide such data for the proposed antenna height and ten feet shorter.

50. In the RF Report under Tab 1 of the Application, AT&T included an existing coverage plot and an existing and proposed coverage plot for 700 MHz and 1900 MHz. Provide similar plots for 850 MHz or 2100 MHz or other frequencies that AT&T would utilize, as applicable.

51. Provide propagation maps showing existing plus proposed coverage at an antenna height that is ten feet shorter than proposed for 700 MHz, 850 MHz, 1900 MHz, 2100 MHz, or as applicable.

52. Provide the lengths of the coverage that AT&T would provide along primary roads from the proposed site at the proposed frequencies, e.g. 700 MHz, 850 MHz, 1900 MHz, 2100 MHz, or as applicable. Also provide such data assuming that the tower is ten feet shorter. Break this data down by street name and include the town(s) that the streets are located in.

53. Provide the lengths of the coverage that AT&T would provide along secondary roads from the proposed site at the proposed frequencies, e.g. 700 MHz, 850 MHz, 1900 MHz, 2100 MHz, or as applicable. Also provide such data assuming that the tower is ten feet shorter. Break this data down by street name and include the town(s) that the streets are located in.

54. If the worst-case power density analysis under Tab 7 of the Application was performed <u>without</u> the nominal 10 dB off-beam pattern loss, would the total percent maximum permissible exposure be approximately 10 times the 2.89 percent or 28.9 percent?

55. The RF Report provides the population living within the existing and incremental coverage area for 700 MHz and 1900 MHz. Provide similar data for 850 MHz or other frequencies if applicable.

56. Will the proposed facility support text-to-911 service? Is additional equipment required for this purpose?

57. Are you aware of any Public Safety Answering Points in the area of the proposed site that are able to accept text-to-911?