



Daniel F. Caruso
Chairman

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

Internet: ct.gov/csc

December 13, 2006

Ms. Sandy Carter
Regulatory Manager
Verizon Wireless
99 East River Drive
East Hartford, CT 06108

RE: **DOCKET NO. 325** – 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 at 111 Upper Fish Rock Road in Southbury, Connecticut.

Dear Ms. Carter:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than January 9, 2007. To help expedite the Council's review, please file individual responses as soon as they are available.

Please forward an original and 20 copies to this office. In accordance with the State Solid Waste Management Plan, 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.

Yours very truly,

S. Derek Phelps
Executive Director

SDP/cdm

c: Kenneth C. Baldwin, Esq., Robinson & Cole
Council Members
Parties and Intervenors

**Docket 325: Cellco
Southbury, Connecticut
Pre-Hearing Interrogatories, Set One**

1. What frequencies is Cellco licensed to use?
2. Would Cellco's antennas be compliant with E911 requirements?
3. With what adjacent sites would the proposed facility hand off signals? Identify by ID number and address.
4. Provide the following information: number of channels per sector for each antenna system that would be installed on the proposed tower, ERP per channel for each antenna system, and frequency at which each antenna system would operate.
5. What frequency (or frequencies) is represented on the propagation maps provided after Tab 7 of the application?
6. Provide propagation maps showing the coverage just from the proposed site at Cellco's different operating frequencies.
7. Of the letters sent to abutting property owners, how many certified mail receipts did Cellco receive? If any receipts were not returned, which owners did not receive their notice. Did Cellco make additional attempts to contact those property owners?
8. What is the total area Cellco's antennas would cover from this site?
9. What is the amount of coverage Cellco's cellular antennas at this site would achieve on I-84 at the proposed height? What is the distance Cellco's PCS antennas at this site would cover on I-84 at the proposed height?
10. What is the signal strength for which Cellco designs its system?
11. What is the existing signal strength in those areas Cellco is seeking to cover from this site? How were these signal strengths determined?
12. Did Cellco conduct any drive tests for this site? If so, provide information depicting the results of these tests.
13. Could repeaters, microcells, or distributed antenna systems provide coverage in Cellco's target area comparable to that which would be provided by the proposed tower?
14. How many trees with a diameter of 6" or greater at breast height would be removed to develop this site?
15. Quantify the amounts of cuts and fills that would be required to develop this site.
16. Which specification would the proposed tower be built to — Electronic Industries Association Standard EIA/TIA-222-E or F?

17. How many carriers would the tower be designed to accommodate?
18. When was Cellco's search ring for this area first issued? How large was the ring? Where was it centered? Submit a map showing the search ring.
19. Has Cellco contacted any other carriers about the possibility of using this site? If so, have any other carriers shown a potential interest in this site? Provide any supporting documentation.
20. Has Cellco received any comments regarding this facility's potential on threatened or endangered species from Connecticut's DEP or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? If so, provide these comments.
21. What is the lowest height at which Cellco's antennas could achieve its coverage objectives from this site? Submit propagation maps showing the coverage at ten feet below this height.
22. Would any blasting be required to develop this site?
23. Estimate the number of residences that would have a seasonal view of the tower. Estimate the number of acres that would seasonal views of the tower.
24. Is Cellco licensed to operate on both cellular and PCS frequencies in Fairfield County?
25. Summarize the proposed tower's visual impact on Kettletown State Park.
26. Comments from SHPO refer to a reconnaissance survey prepared by Heritage Consultants. Why was this reconnaissance survey done? What was its scope? Provide a copy of the survey.
27. The application refers to screening for the proposed compound, but no landscaped screening is shown on the site plans. What would be the nature of this screening?
28. Who owns the nearest residence?
29. Did any of the boards or commissions of the Towns of Southbury or Newtown conduct any meetings about this proposal or issue any statements or recommendations regarding it?
30. Would Cellco provide space for the Town of Southbury's antenna and ground equipment at no charge?
31. Is the 1.3 mile coverage gap on I-84 referred to on page 7 of the application a gap in cellular coverage?