



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

October 4, 2017

Christopher B. Fisher, Esq.
Daniel M. Laub, Esq.
Cuddy & Feder LLP
445 Hamilton Street, 14th Floor
White Plains, NY 10601

RE: **DOCKET NO. 476** - Eco-Site, Inc. and T-Mobile Northeast, LLC application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 248 Hall Hill Road, Somers, Connecticut.

Dear Attorneys Fisher and Laub:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than October 25, 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 matters 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/MP

c: Parties and Intervenors



CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Affirmative Action / Equal Opportunity Employer

Docket No. 476
Pre-Hearing Questions
October 4, 2017
Set One

Notice

1. 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, e.g. via first class mail?
2. On pages 5 and 6 of the Application, Eco-Site, Inc. (Eco-Site) and T-Mobile Northeast, LLC (T-Mobile) (collectively, the Applicant) note that, "The original affidavits of publication will be provided to the Siting Council once received from the publisher." Please provide a copy of such affidavits of publication.

Municipal Consultation

3. Referencing Tab 9 of the Application, by letter dated June 29, 2017, the Applicant provided the "final revised visual analysis report" to the Town of Somers (Town). Has the Applicant received any comments from the Town since that submittal?

Lease Agreement

4. Pursuant to CGS §16-50o, please submit a copy of the lease for the proposed site.

Tower Site

5. Referencing Drawing Z2D, what is the name of the Enfield public school located approximately 9,000 feet to the southwest of the proposed facility? Where is the nearest commercial child day care center from the proposed facility located? Provide the name of such commercial day care facility and include the distance and direction from the proposed tower.
6. How many off-site residences are located within a 1,000-foot radius of the proposed site?

Design and Construction

7. Quantify the amounts of cut and fill that would be required to develop the proposed facility.
8. Would any blasting be required to develop the site?
9. Under Attachment 5 of the Application, on page 1 of the National Resources Checklist & Exemption Review, the Applicant checked "yes" that the undertaking would involve the removal of trees. How many trees six inches diameter or greater would be removed to construct the facility?
10. On Drawing Z-2, the Applicant shows the approximate location of an existing utility pole on the opposite side of Hall Hill Road as the proposed facility. Would the proposed utilities have an overhead or underground crossing of Hall Hill Road? Has the Applicant considered underground or "trenching" utilities across Hall Hill Road (to reach the pole) to reduce the visual impact?

11. Have any other wireless carriers expressed an interest in co-locating on the proposed facility to date? To date, has the Town of Somers expressed an interest in co-locating emergency services antennas? Would Eco-Site provide space for municipal emergency services antennas, if requested?
12. Would the proposed compound fence have an anti-climb design? Are privacy slats proposed?
13. Provide the width of the tower at the top and the width of the tower at the base.
14. Provide the average or maximum percent grade of the proposed access drive.
15. Would the tower and foundation be designed to accommodate an increase in tower height? If yes, by how many feet?
16. Referencing the Connecticut Department of Transportation comments dated September 5, 2017, would the Applicant apply for a Highway Encroachment Permit for any work performed within the Route 186 right-of-way?

Agriculture

17. Has the State of Connecticut Department of Agriculture purchased any development rights for the proposed site as part of the State Program for the Preservation of Agricultural Land?
18. Is any portion of the site currently in productive agricultural use? If so, is it used by the property owner or is it leased to a third party? Could the project qualify under the Agricultural Virtual Net Metering Program or other agriculturally-friendly renewable energy program?
19. Does the proposed site contain any Connecticut Prime Farmland and/or Important Agricultural Soils? If so, what acreage of prime and important soils would the facility and associated equipment be located on?
20. What impacts, if any, would the proposed project have on the soil productivity of the site? Would the project developer be willing to discuss and/or implement any potential restoration methods to be employed at the end of the project's useful life with the property owner? If so and if applicable, could these potential restoration methods be addressed in the Project Decommissioning Plan?
21. Is there any environmental contamination on the proposed site from any previous agricultural use (ex. Soil and/or water contamination)? If so, how would the petitioner remediate the pre-existing soil and/or water contamination?
22. Is the site parcel part of the Public Act 490 Program? If so, how does the town land use code classify the parcel? For example, is the parcel classified as "Tillable D – good to fair"?

Site Search

23. When was the search ring first established for this area? What is the approximate radius of the search ring for this area? Provide the approximate longitude and latitude coordinates of the center of the search ring for this area.

24. In Site Search Summary under Attachment 2 of the Application, the Applicant notes that the Young Property at 163 Bilton Road, Somers was rejected by T-Mobile due to the lack of coverage in the target area. Does this mean that there is insufficient existing coverage to hand off to an adjacent tower, or this location would not meet T-Mobile's coverage objectives? Explain.
25. Page 14 of the Application notes that, "No tall structures in this area of the Town were found suitable to provide the service needed by AT&T." Did the Applicant mean "T-Mobile" instead of "AT&T"?
26. Could the required coverage and/or capacity needs, as applicable, be met by a series of small cell facilities rather than the proposed macro tower facility?

Radio Frequency Issues

27. Would the proposed site be needed for coverage, capacity, or both? Explain.
28. Does T-Mobile seek to deploy both 700 MHz and 2100 MHz at the proposed facility? If yes, would both frequency bands be deployed initially, or would one be deployed first and the other in the future? Does T-Mobile seek to deploy 850 MHz or 1900 MHz service at the proposed facility at this time?
29. Would all frequencies be used to transmit voice and data?
30. The Applicant listed five existing T-Mobile sites under Attachment 1. Would the proposed facility interact with all five of these facilities to hand off traffic? What are the heights of these five facilities? Is the 196 Pioneer Heights, Somers facility a self-supporting lattice tower?
31. What is the lowest centerline height at which T-Mobile's antennas could achieve its coverage objectives from the proposed site?
32. What is the signal strength for which T-Mobile designs its system? For in-vehicle coverage? For in-building coverage?
33. What are the existing signal strengths within the area T-Mobile is seeking to cover from this site based on 700 MHz, 2100 MHz, or as applicable?
34. Does T-Mobile have any statistics on dropped calls and/or ineffective attempts in the vicinity of the proposed facility? If so, what do they indicate? Does T-Mobile have any other indicators of substandard service in this area?
35. If the proposed facility would provide capacity relief, which nearby wireless facilities (or sectors) are nearing capacity limits? At what frequencies? Please include a projected exhaustion date for each of these sectors. Would the deployment of the proposed facility be sufficient to address these capacity concerns or would an additional facility be required in the near term to off-load traffic?
36. Are T-Mobile's radio frequency propagation maps of existing and existing and proposed coverage based on 700 MHz or 2100 MHz? If the radio frequency propagation maps are based on 700 MHz, provide similar maps for 2100 MHz or vice versa.

37. Provide the proposed coverage distances along State roads for 700 MHz and 2100 MHz (or as applicable) based on the tower's proposed height of 180 feet. A State road can be considered a road that has a route number.
38. Provide the proposed coverage areas in square miles for 700 MHz and 2100 MHz (or as applicable) based on the tower's proposed height of 180 feet.
39. Is it correct to say that the proposed microwave dish would have a negligible effect on power density on the ground, and as such, was omitted from the Radio Frequency Emissions Report dated February 2, 2017? Explain.

Federal Aviation Administration

40. Where is the nearest airport and/or airfield to the proposed facility? Provide the distance and direction from the proposed tower.
41. Per the Applicant's review via the Federal Aviation Administration's Notice Criteria Tool, notice to the FAA is required for the proposed tower. Is it correct to say that, even conservatively using 185 feet of height to take into account the lightning rod, the conclusion would still be the same? If the tower is approved, would simply providing notice to the FAA be sufficient, or would the Applicant have to seek a "No Hazard Determination" from FAA?
42. Would notice to the FAA be required for any temporary structures such as a crane to be used to set the tower sections in place?

Backup power

43. What is the fuel source for the proposed backup generator? What is the size of the proposed generator in kilowatts?
44. If the proposed backup generator is diesel, would it have containment measures to protect against fuel leakage, e.g. a double-walled fuel tank? What containment measures would it have for oil or coolant leakage?
45. What would be the run time for T-Mobile's backup generator before it would need to be refueled, assuming it is running under normal load conditions?
46. Could the proposed generator be shared by other carriers that may locate at the proposed facility? What effect would a shared generator have on the run time of the generator if at full load? Or alternatively, could the Applicant reserve space for a future, larger shared generator to accommodate additional carriers?
47. Would a battery backup be used to provide uninterrupted power and prevent a reboot condition during the generator startup delay period (or in the event that the generator fails to start)? If yes, how long could the battery backup system alone supply the proposed facility under normal load conditions?

Public Safety

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

49. Is the Applicant aware of any Public Safety Answering Points in the area of the proposed site that are able to accept text-to-911?
50. What measures are proposed for the site to ensure security and deter vandalism? (This would cover alarms, gates, locks, etc.)

Wildlife

51. Identify the nearest "Important Bird Area" (IBA) as designated by the National Audubon Society?
52. Under Attachment 5 of the Application, on page 3 of the National Resources Checklist & Exemption Review, the Applicant notes that, "[T]he undertaking meets many of the recommendations set forth in the United States Fish & Wildlife Service's (USFWS) Revised Guidelines (for Communication Tower Design, Siting, Construction, Operation, Retrofitting, and Decommissioning)." Are there any recommendations that would not be met? Explain.
53. A form was submitted to USFWS on December 20, 2016 regarding the proposed project's possible impacts to the northern long-eared bat (NLEB). The form notes that, "If the USFWS does not respond within 30 days from the submittal of this form, the action agency may presume that its determination is informed by the best available information and its project responsibilities...are fulfilled..." Did the Applicant receive a response from USFWS within the 30-day timeframe? If yes, provide a copy of such correspondence.
54. Do any known federally-listed species (other than the NLEB) potentially occur at the site?
55. Are any vernal pools located within the vicinity of the proposed project?

Noise

56. Under Section I D. of the Environmental Assessment Statement portion of the Application, the Applicant notes that, "The equipment to be in operation at the facility would emit no noise other than that provided by the operation of the installed heating, air-conditioning and ventilation (HVAC) system." Since no enclosed equipment shelter is proposed, is it correct to say that there would not be an HVAC system in the equipment compound? What is the expected cumulative noise level in dBA at the nearest property line from the proposed facility assuming the backup generator and radio equipment are operating at the same time?

Water Resources

57. Approximately how far away (distance and direction) is the nearest (off-site) wetland from the proposed facility? National Wetland Inventory or other resource may be consulted.
58. Is the proposed facility located within a Department of Energy and Environmental Protection designated Aquifer Protection Area (APA)? If yes, how would the proposed project impact such APA?
59. Page 16 of the Application notes that, "The location of the proposed Facility is just outside of the 100-year flood zone located on the lot." Is the proposed facility located within the 500-year flood zone?

Historic Resources

60. Under Section II of the Environmental Assessment Statement portion of the Application, the Applicant notes that, "Eco-Site is currently consulting with the CT State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to obtain confirmation that the project will have no adverse effect on listed or eligible historic resources." To date, has the Applicant received a response from the SHPO regarding the proposed project? If yes, provide a copy of such correspondence.

Visibility

61. Is it correct to say that there are no hiking trails located within the two mile radius area used for the visibility analysis?
62. What, if any, stealth tower design options would be feasible to employ at this site?
63. Would flush-mounted antennas provide the required coverage? Would the flush-mount configuration result in reduced coverage and/or necessitate greater antenna height with multiple levels of antennas? Explain.
64. Referencing the viewshed map, approximately how many residences would have views of the proposed tower based on the dark red "Land Cover Viewshed Area" and a two-mile radius study area?