



# 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](mailto:siting.council@ct.gov)

[www.ct.gov/csc](http://www.ct.gov/csc)

### VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

March 22, 2018

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

RE: **DOCKET NO. 481** - 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 667, 665, 663 and 663R Main Street, Cromwell, Connecticut.

Dear Attorney Baldwin:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than April 12, 2018. 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.

Sincerely,

Melanie Bachman  
Executive Director

MB/MP

c: Parties and Intervenors



CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL  
Affirmative Action / Equal Opportunity Employer

**Docket No. 481**  
**Pre-Hearing Questions**  
**March 22, 2018**  
**Set One**

**General**

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. Referencing Sheet R-1 of Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless' (Cellco) Application, the proposed facility would be located in the northwestern corner of the 667 Main Street property. Given the area of the subject properties on 667, 665, 663 and 663R Main Street, how was the proposed tower location selected?

**Site Tower**

3. Could the tower be designed with a yield point to ensure that the tower setback radius remains within the boundaries of the subject property?
4. Quantify the amounts of cut and fill that would be required to develop the proposed facility.
5. Would any blasting be required to develop the site?
6. What is the structural design standard applicable to the proposed square antenna platform mount?
7. Would the tower have a galvanized gray finish?
8. What measures are proposed for the site to ensure security and deter vandalism? (Including alarms, gates, locks, anti-climb fence design, etc.)
9. Identify the safety standards and/or codes by which equipment, machinery or technology that would be used or operated at the proposed facility.
10. Has the State of Connecticut Department of Agriculture purchased any development rights for the proposed site as part of the State Farmland Preservation Program?
11. Is any portion of the proposed site, including the lease area and access road, currently in productive agricultural use?
12. Referencing the Farmland Soils Map under Tab 13 of the Application, is it correct to say that the proposed project would have a negligible impact on Statewide Important Farmland Soils and no impact on Prime Farmland Soils?
13. Is the site parcel part of the Public Act 490 Program? If so, how does the town land use code classify the parcel?
14. 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 a site search summary map with the search ring.

15. Did Cellco consider the Cromwell Fire District property north of the proposed site as a possible tower site? Explain.

### Coverage/Capacity

16. Would the proposed site be needed for coverage, capacity, or both? Explain.
17. Would both the 700 MHz and 2100 MHz frequencies be used to transmit voice and data?
18. What is the lowest height at which Cellco's antennas could achieve its wireless service objectives?
19. 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? Explain.
20. What is the signal strength for which Cellco designs its system? For in-vehicle coverage? For in-building coverage?
21. What is the existing signal strength within the area Cellco is seeking to cover from this site?
22. 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?
23. On page 8 of the Application, Cellco provided the individual coverage distances for the proposed facility for Route 99 based on 700 MHz and 2100 MHz. Provide the lengths of the respective existing coverage gaps for Route 99 (based on 700 MHz and 2100 MHz) that would be covered by the proposed facility.
24. Page 7 of the Application references capacity relief for the existing Cellco sites: Cromwell North (Alpha sector) and Rocky Hill 2 (Beta sector). At which frequencies? Please include the projected exhaustion dates for these sectors. Would the deployment of the Cromwell North 2 facility be sufficient to address these capacity concerns, or would an additional facility be required in the near term to off-load traffic?
25. Are any other adjacent sectors nearing exhaustion? If yes, identify the sectors, frequencies and estimated exhaustion dates.
26. 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.
27. Identify the containment measures to protect against possible fluid leakage from the backup generator?
28. What would be the respective run time for Cellco's proposed diesel generator before it would need to be refueled, assuming it is running at full load under normal conditions?
29. 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?

30. Would the battery backup be used to provide uninterrupted power (such as during the backup generator startup delay period) and prevent a reboot condition? How long could the battery backup alone supply power to the facility in the event that the generator fails to start?

#### **Public Safety**

31. Will the proposed facility support text-to-911 service? Is additional equipment required for this purpose?
32. Would Cellco's proposed facility comply with federal E911 requirements?
33. Would Cellco's installation comply with the intent of the Warning Alert and Response Network Act of 2006?

#### **Environment/Cultural**

34. Referencing the Viewshed Map under Tab 9 of the Application, identify the trail system in Rocky Hill, located north of the proposed facility. Also identify the trail system in Cromwell, located southeast of the proposed facility.
35. What, if any, stealth tower design options would be feasible to employ at this site? Please provide costs related to each stealth tower design.
36. Would the proposed facility comply with Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) noise control standards at the property boundaries?
37. Is the proposed facility within a DEEP-designated Aquifer Protection Area?
38. Referencing Tab 10 of the Application, while no State-listed species are currently identified on the DEEP Natural Diversity Database maps for the proposed site, the Applicant consulted with DEEP for final confirmation. Has Cellco received a response from DEEP? If yes, provide a copy of such response.
39. Has Cellco received a response from the State Historic Preservation Office regarding the proposed project? If yes, provide a copy of such response.