



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

May 25, 2007

Sandy Carter
Regulatory Manager
Verizon Wireless
99 East River Drive
East Hartford, Connecticut 06108

RE: **DOCKET NO. 332** – 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 6 Mountain Road or 167 New Milford Turnpike, Washington, Connecticut.

Dear Ms Carter:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than June 8, 2007. To help expedite the Council's review, please file individual responses as soon as they are available.

Please forward an original and 15 copies and a .pdf file on compact disc 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

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



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

PRE-HEARING INTERROGATORIES

DOCKET NO. 332 – WASHINGTON

CELLCO PARTNERSHIP d/b/a VERIZON WIRELESS

MAY 25, 2007

1. Page 2 of the Application states the 6 Mountain Road parcel is used for residential purposes by the landowner. Is there a residence on parcel? If so, provide a site plan showing the location of the residence, the tower site and associated access road.
2. Sheet C-2A of the site plans depicts two options for each site, a standard monopole and a “monopine”. Is Cellco formally presenting two options or is the tree tower the only proposed design?
3. Page 12 of the application states Cellco would offer space on the tower for town public safety entities. Is this offer at no cost to the town, provided such use can be accommodated and is compatible with the structural integrity of the tower?
4. Estimate the number of trees that would be removed to develop each site. (Sheet C-1 is illegible)
5. Page 14 of the application states there are no residences within 1,000 feet of the Site 1 tower; however, Sheet C-1 shows a residence within 840 feet. Please review and revise this information.
6. Provide the Site 1 diagram submitted to the DEP for the Natural Diversity Data Base review.
7. The application states the simulated branches would extend to 157 feet above ground level (agl). What is the lowest branch installation height on the tower? Is this height accurately reflected in the photo simulations for both sites?
8. Provide the following coverage plots at a scale of 1:40,000 using multiple signal levels (in-building, in-vehicle, on-street):
 - a. From Site 1 at 150 feet agl.
 - b. From Site 1 at 140 feet agl
 - c. From Site 1 at 130 feet agl
 - d. From Site 2 at 150 feet agl
 - e. From Site 2 at 130 feet agl
 - f. From the rejected Sunset Lane location (Attachment 9, p. 3) at the height considered.