



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

December 8, 2017

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

RE: **DOCKET NO. 479** - Tarpon Towers II, LLC and 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 380 Horace Street, Bridgeport, Connecticut.

Dear Attorney Baldwin:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than December 29, 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 website under the "Pending Matters" link.

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

Docket No. 479
Pre-Hearing Questions
December 8, 2017
Set One

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?
2. Could the proposed tower be designed with a yield point to ensure that the tower setback radius remains within the boundaries of the subject property?
3. Quantify the amounts of cut and fill that would be required to develop the proposed facility.
4. Would any blasting be required to develop the site?
5. Referencing Page 19 of Tarpon Towers II, LLC (Tarpon) and Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless' (Cellco) (collectively, the Applicants) Application (Application), it notes that, "[T]he proposed facility would be located in Flood Zone X, an area outside the 500 year flood zone." Specifically, is this the "unshaded" Zone X, an area located outside of both the 500-year and 100-year flood zones?
6. Would the proposed tower be designed per Connecticut Building Code and EIA-TIA-222-G?
7. What type of antenna mount will be used for the proposed antennas, e.g. low-profile platform?
8. Would the tower have a galvanized gray steel finish?
9. Would the proposed compound fence have an anti-climb design? Are privacy slats proposed?
10. Would the existing paved driveway require any upgrades such as additional asphalt in order to provide access to the proposed facility?
11. Referencing Tab 1, Sheet A-1 of the Application, would the proposed Mirafi fabric and the 3-inches of crushed stone prevent weed growth inside the fenced compound area?
12. Why is the proposed equipment platform elevated above grade?
13. Would the tower and foundation be designed to accommodate an increase in tower height? If yes, by how many feet (or percent of original height) could the tower be extended per such design?
14. The most recent No Hazard Determination letter from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) dated September 28, 2017 appears to be based on a structure 199 feet above ground level (agl). While the proposed facility would have a maximum height of approximately 94 feet agl per Sheet A-1, was 199 feet used in the FAA review to be conservative?
15. Per the September 28, 2017 No Hazard Determination, would the Applicants provide notice (i.e. 7460-2 Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration) to FAA within five days after construction reaches its greatest height?
16. 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?

17. Identify the safety standards and/or codes by which equipment, machinery, or technology would be used or operated at the proposed facility.
18. Would Cellco's installation comply with the intent of the Warning Alert and Responses Network Act of 2006?
19. Would the compound fence gate be locked as a security measure?
20. 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?
21. 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?
22. Does the proposed site contain any Connecticut Prime Farmland Soils? If so, what acreage of Connecticut Prime Farmland Soils would the facility and associated equipment be located on? As a comparison, how many acres of Connecticut Prime Farmland soils are located on the subject property?
23. 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?
24. 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 Applicants remediate the pre-existing soil and/or water contamination?
25. 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"?
26. Provide Cellco's antenna centerline heights at the five existing wireless telecommunications facilities identified on page 9 of the Application that Cellco's proposed facility would interact with.
27. Referencing Tab 8 of the Application, when was the search ring first established for this area? What was the approximate radius of Cellco's search ring for this area? Provide the approximate longitude and latitude coordinates of the center of the search ring for this area. Provide an updated site search summary map with the search ring.
28. Would the proposed site be needed for coverage, capacity, or both? Explain.
29. Are all frequencies used to transmit voice and data?
30. Does Cellco seek to deploy all four frequency bands (e.g. 700 MHz, 850 MHz, 1900 MHz and 2100 MHz) at the proposed facility? If yes, would all of those frequency bands be deployed initially, or would some of these frequency bands be deployed first and others in the future? Explain.
31. Is 90 feet the lowest centerline height at which Cellco's antennas could achieve its wireless service objectives for the proposed site?
32. Could the required coverage and capacity upgrade needs be met by a series of small cell facilities or a distributed antenna system rather than the proposed macro tower facility?

33. What is the signal strength for which Cellco designs its system? For in-vehicle coverage? For in-building coverage?
34. What is the existing signal strength within the area Cellco is seeking to cover from this site?
35. Will the proposed facility support text-to-911 service? Is additional equipment required for this purpose?
36. Would Cellco's facility comply with federal E911 requirements?
37. 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?
38. On page 8 of the Application, Cellco provided the proposed coverage distances for Route 1 and Route 127 for 700 MHz, 1900 MHz and 2100 MHz. Would the proposed facility provide any coverage to Route 1 and Route 127 for 850 MHz? If yes, provide the proposed coverage distances for 850 MHz on these two roads and the proposed coverage area for 850 MHz (in square miles).
39. Provide the individual existing coverage gaps for Route 1 and Route 127 based on each of the four frequency bands (i.e. 700 MHz, 850 MHz, 1900 MHz, and 2100 MHz) or as applicable.
40. What are the existing coverage footprints in the vicinity of the proposed site (in square miles) at each frequency used by Cellco that would be initially installed?
41. Under Tab 8 of the Application, page 2, Cellco notes that capacity relief would be provided to the following existing cell sites: East Relo (Alpha and Gamma sectors); Bridgeport Washington Park (Alpha sector); and North Bridgeport 2 (Gamma sector). Provide the projected exhaustion dates for each of these identified sectors. Would the deployment of the proposed Bridgeport East facility be sufficient to address all of these capacity concerns, or would an additional facility be required in the near term to off-load traffic?
42. What is the specific purpose of the 700 MHz and 2100 MHz systems? For example, are certain frequency bands used for data versus voice?
43. Since the filing of the Application on September 25, 2017, have any other wireless carriers expressed an interest in co-locating on the proposed facility to date? Has the host municipality expressed an interest in co-locating emergency services antennas? Would Tarpon provide space for municipal emergency services antennas, if requested?
44. Would the backup generator have containment measures to protect against oil or coolant leakage?
45. Barring a mechanical breakdown, required maintenance shut-down, natural gas service interruption, or DEEP restrictions on annual runtime hours, in the event of a commercial power outage, would the natural gas-fueled generator have essentially an unlimited run time because the fuel is pipeline supplied?
46. Did Tarpon consider installing a generator sized to be shared by tower tenants? Explain.
47. Would Cellco consider using a shared generator if one were provided? Explain.

48. Would a battery backup (if applicable) be used to provide uninterrupted power and prevent a reboot condition? For approximately how many hours could the battery backup alone provide service in the event that the backup generator fails to start?
49. Would the backup generator run periodically for maintenance purposes? If so, at what frequency and duration? Would this be scheduled for daytime hours?
50. Would the natural gas line to supply the generator run underground generally following the access drive, subject to the final determination by the natural gas utility? Explain.
51. Identify the nearest "Important Bird Area" (IBA) as designated by the National Audubon Society, and provide the distance and direction from the proposed facility. Would the proposed facility adversely impact such IBA?
52. 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?
53. What, if any, stealth tower design options would be feasible to employ at this site?
54. 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.
55. What is the expected cumulative noise level at the nearest property line from the proposed facility assuming the generator and other (e.g. radio) equipment are running at the same time? Would the proposed project comply with DEEP Noise Control Standards at the property boundaries?
56. Is the proposed site within a Coastal Boundary? Provide a map. If yes, would the proposed project adversely impact the Coastal Boundary? Explain.
57. Under Tab 10 of the Application, a letter from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) was provided regarding the northern long-eared bat. Are there any other known federally-listed species that occur at the proposed site?
58. Is the proposed facility within a Department of Energy and Environmental Protection-designated Aquifer Protection Area (APA)? If yes, would the proposed project adversely impact such APA?
59. Referencing the November 24, 2015 letter from the State Historic Preservation Office under Tab 13 of the Application, in accordance with Condition No. 1, has the Applicant sought to minimize the visibility of the tower, antennas and associated equipment?