



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

August 21, 2015

Kenneth C. Baldwin, Esq.
Robinson & Cole LLP
280 Trumbull Street
Hartford, CT 06103-3597

RE: **DOCKET NO. 462** – Celco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a telecommunications facility located at Danbury Tax Assessor's Map L16, Lot 5, 15 Great Pasture Road, Danbury, Connecticut.

Dear Attorney Baldwin:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than September 8, 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

Docket No. 462
Pre-Hearing Questions
August 21, 2015
Set One

1. When was Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless' (Cellco) search ring first initiated? Provide the approximate diameter and longitude/latitude coordinates of the center of the search ring. Would any existing structures within a four-mile radius of the center of the search ring meet Cellco's coverage objectives?
2. Of the letters sent to abutting property owners, how many certified mail receipts were received? If any receipts were not returned, which owner(s) did not receive their notice(s)? Were any additional attempts made to contact those property owners?
3. Has Cellco received any comments from the Town of Bethel to date regarding the proposed facility?
4. Characterize the land uses to the north, south, east and west of the subject property.
5. At the pre-hearing conference held on August 19, 2015, it was noted that abutter Gloria B. Putnam at 13 Great Pasture Road has expressed an interest in offering her property as a potential tower site. Has Cellco evaluated such site? Provide the approximate lot size in acres and comment on the feasibility of such site from radio frequency, lot size and access, and environmental perspectives.
6. Would the tower be designed for EIA/TIA-222 structural standards version F, G, or both? What is the tower design wind speed for Fairfield County?
7. Provide the approximate width of the monopole at the top and at the bottom.
8. What color of the monopole is being proposed, i.e. galvanized gray? If requested by the Council, could the monopole have a brown finish instead?
9. Is any landscaping around the outside of the fenced compound proposed?
10. Sheet C-2 notes that utility service would run underground from the existing pole #1979. Is this Eversource pole located on the same side of Great Pasture Road as the subject property, or is it located on the opposite side? If the pole is located on the opposite side of the road, would Cellco trench under the road rather than run overhead to cross Great Pasture Road?
11. What type of antenna mounts would be used for Cellco's proposed antennas, e.g. low-profile platform mount?
12. 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.
13. Could the required coverage and capacity upgrade needs be met by a series of small cell facilities or a distributed antenna system instead of the proposed macro tower facility?
14. Would there be any modifications or improvements to existing access or would existing access remain essentially the same?

15. Quantify the amounts of cut and fill that would be required to develop the proposed facility.
16. Would all of the proposed frequencies (i.e. 700 MHz, 850 MHz, 1900 MHz, and 2100 MHz) be provided initially, or would some be provided initially and others deployed in the future at this particular site? Explain.
17. Provide an estimate of the residential population living within the area that would be covered by the proposed facility.
18. Provide an estimated traffic count for those portions of Route 53 and Route 302 that would be covered by the proposed facility.
19. Provide the worst-case power density analysis table (i.e. identical to what is provided in a Cellco exempt modification filing) to provide a breakdown of the percent maximum permissible exposure. Include the watts ERP per channel and number of channels for each frequency, as well as frequencies and antenna centerline heights. Are such power density analyses typically based on one sector of antennas or all three?
20. Of the existing sites (within a two-mile radius) noted on pages 8 and 9 of the Application, indicate which ones that the proposed site would interact with to hand off signals. If Cellco's proposed antennas would interact with any other sites not listed, include those also. Also include the tower/structure heights and antenna centerline heights of such facilities if not already provided.
21. Would any blasting be required to develop the site?
22. Does the proposed project avoid any impacts to the existing DEEP Dig Restricted Area?
23. Would the proposed project comply with the *2002 Connecticut Guidelines for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control*?
24. Would Cellco's equipment shelter have a light fixture installed on the outside wall? What type of lighting would be utilized? When would the light be on?
25. Would the proposed compound fence have barbed wire? If requested by the Council, could Cellco install a chain link fence with a mesh size of less than two inches as an anti-climbing measure?
26. Would the proposed compound security fence have a locked gate for security purposes?
27. Would Cellco's proposed facility comply with federal E911 requirements?
28. Will the proposed facility support text-to-911 service? Is additional equipment required for this purpose?
29. Are you aware of any Public Safety Answering Points in the area of the proposed site that are able to accept text-to-911?
30. Are all frequencies used to transmit voice and data?

31. What is the lowest height at which Cellco's antennas could achieve its coverage objectives from the proposed tower?
32. What is the signal strength for which Cellco designs its system? For in-vehicle coverage? For in-building coverage?
33. What is the existing signal strength within the area Cellco is seeking to cover from this site?
34. Does Cellco have any statistics on dropped calls and/or ineffective attempts in the vicinity of the proposed facility? If so, what do they indicate? Does Cellco have any other indicators of substandard service in this area?
35. In the Application, Cellco included an existing coverage plot and an existing and proposed coverage plot for each of the following frequencies: 700 MHz, 850 MHz, 1900 MHz, and 2100 MHz. Provide similar proposed coverage plots for those frequencies assuming that the tower (and thus the antenna centerline height) is ten feet shorter/lower.
36. Cellco provided the lengths of the coverage that it would provide along primary roads from the proposed site at the proposed frequencies, e.g. 700 MHz, 850 MHz, 1900 MHz, and 2100 MHz on page 7 of the application. If Cellco would provide coverage to any other primary roads not included, provide such coverage lengths also. Also provide individual coverage lengths for primary roads assuming that the tower is ten feet shorter. (Cellco may consider "primary roads" to be State of Connecticut routes i.e. roads that have a route number.)
37. Provide the lengths of the coverage that Cellco would provide along secondary roads (or Town roads) from the proposed site at the proposed frequencies, e.g. 700 MHz, 850 MHz, 1900 MHz, and 2100 MHz, or as applicable. Also provide such data assuming that the tower is ten feet shorter.
38. Cellco provided the proposed coverage areas (in square miles) for each applicable frequency on page 7 of the Application. Provide similar data assuming that the tower is ten feet shorter.
39. Is Cellco proposing to install a backup generator only large enough for Cellco's needs at this time? If yes, and if requested by the Council, could Cellco reserve space in the fenced compound for a future shared generator should additional carriers co-locate on the tower?
40. Barring any necessary repairs or maintenance work, do natural gas-fueled generators have, for all intents and purposes, an unlimited run time? Would the generator have an exerciser where it would start-up on a regular basis (such as weekly) to maintain it in operating condition?
41. Would the generator or equipment shelter floor have any sort of containment for any potential engine oil or coolant leakage?
42. Would there be any interruption in service between the time power goes out and the generator comes online? For example, would Cellco provide battery backup to prevent a reboot condition and provide seamless power until the generator starts? If Cellco has a battery backup system, how many hours could it supply power in the event that the generator fails to start?
43. Has Cellco considered using a fuel cell as a backup power source for the proposed site? Explain.
44. Identify the safety standards and/or codes by which equipment, machinery, or technology would be used or operated at the proposed facility.

45. Is the proposed site near an "Important Bird Area" as designated by the National Audubon Society?
46. Would Cellco'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?
47. The Preliminary USFWS & CTDEEP Compliance Determination dated June 24, 2015 noted that, "A response from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS) is forthcoming and will be provided to the Connecticut Siting Council upon receipt." Did Cellco receive any further response or correspondence from USFWS? If yes, provide such information.
48. Are any construction activities proposed within a 0.25 mile radius of a known, occupied bat hibernacula?
49. What, if any, stealth tower design options would be feasible to employ at this site?
50. Are there any state or locally-designed scenic roads within the two-mile visual analysis study area? Are any hiking trails located within the same study area?
51. Approximately how many residences would have seasonal and year-round visibility of the proposed tower? Provide the streets names if available.
52. What is the cumulative noise level that the Applicant expects at the nearest property line from the proposed facility taking into account Cellco'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.