

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

March 23, 2017

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

RE: **DOCKET NO. 471** - Cellco 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 Hamden Tax Assessor's Map 2826, Block 24, 208 Kirk Road (a/k/a 1075 Paradise Avenue), Hamden, Connecticut.

Dear Attorney Baldwin:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than April 6, 2017. 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.

Any request for an extension of time to submit responses to interrogatories shall be submitted to the Council in writing pursuant to §16-50j-22a of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies.

Yours very truly,

Melanie Bachman Executive Director

MB/RM

c: Parties and Intervenors Council Members



Docket No. 471 - Hamden

Pre-Hearing Questions Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless March 22, 2017

- 1. Which frequencies would Cellco initially install at the proposed site? What is the determining factor for the deployment of additional frequencies within the proposed service area?
- 2. How do the different frequencies interact? Are all frequencies used to transmit voice and data services? Are all frequencies LTE capable? Please explain.
- 3. What is Cellco's service design threshold for each frequency?
- 4. Page 7 of the application describes existing "coverage gaps" in the proposed service area. Please provide the area, in square miles, of existing inadequate service for each frequency within the proposed service area. Would any "coverage gaps" remain in the proposed service area after deployment of the Hamden 8 facility? If so, indicate their location and size.
- 5. Page 7 of the application describes significant capacity relief to existing adjacent Cellco sites. Please indicate what frequencies are at or near exhaustion for each listed adjacent site. Please include a projected exhaustion date for each of these sectors. Would the deployment of Hamden 8 facility be sufficient to address these capacity concerns or would an additional facility be required in the near term to off-load traffic?
- 6. Can the proposed facility support text-to-911 service? Is additional equipment required for this purpose? Is Cellco aware of any Public Safety Answering Points in the area of the proposed site that are able to accept text-to-911?
- 7. Would Cellco's installation comply with the intent of the Warning, Alert and Response Network Act of 2006?
- 8. When was the search area for this proposed facility issued?
- 9. The list of sites and attached site diagram in the Site Search Summary (Application Tab 8) do not match. Please clarify.
- 10. Did Cellco consider the undeveloped parcels north of the host property for a telecommunications facility? If not, why not?
- 11. Was the industrial area east of Sherman Avenue considered for a telecommunications facility?
- 12. Did the Town indicate why the potential site at the Laurel View Country Club was no longer available to Cellco?
- 13. The scale on Site Plan Sheet C-1 is not correct, please clarify.

- 14. Does Paradise Avenue continue south as a public right-of-way between the Laurel View Country Club and the west side of the site property?
- 15. What measures are proposed to ensure site security?
- 16. Identify the safety standards and/or codes by which equipment, machinery, or technology would be used or operated at the proposed facility.
- 17. An emergency power battery and diesel powered generator are proposed. Which system offers primary backup power to the cell site? What is the estimated run time of the emergency power system before recharging/refueling is required? What is the capacity of the diesel fuel tank?
- 18. Is it feasible to install a single generator within the compound capable of supplying emergency power to multiple carriers? Please explain.
- 19. What is the distance/direction to the nearest National Audubon Society designated Important Bird Area?
- 20. Would the proposed facility comply with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service recommended guidelines for reducing impacts to migratory birds?
- 21. Application Tab 1, p. 4 lists surrounding land uses within ¼ mile. What is the land use to the east of the site property?
- 22. Application Tab 10 indicates consultation with the DEEP NDDB program. Has DEEP responded to Cellco's request for information? If so, please provide related documentation.
- 23. Application p. 16 indicates consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office. Has SHPO made a final determination on Cellco's submittal?
- 24. Is the site within the coastal resource boundary, as defined by the Connecticut Coastal Management Act?
- 25. The lease exhibit in Application Tab 17 depicts a faux tree monopole. Was a tree tower originally contemplated? If so, why was this design not pursued in this application?
- 26. Submit photo simulations of a faux tree monopole from the surrounding area.
- 27. 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.