



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

August 1, 2012

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

RE: **DOCKET NO. 428** – New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T) application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a telecommunications facility located at one of two sites: Roxbury Tax Assessor Parcel ID #32-008 off of Route 67, Roxbury, Connecticut, or 126 Transylvania Road, Roxbury, Connecticut.

Dear Attorneys Laub and Fisher:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than August 15, 2012. 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 and a PDF version to be filed electronically. 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,

Linda Roberts
Executive Director

LR/MP

c: Council Members
Parties and Intervenors

Docket No. 428
Pre-Hearing Questions
Set One

General Questions for both Sites

1. Which frequencies are New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T) licensed to utilize in Litchfield County?
2. What is the signal strength for which AT&T designs its system? For in-vehicle coverage? For in-building coverage?
3. When was the search ring first initiated for a tower in this area? Provide the size, shape, and location of the center of the search ring.
4. 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?
5. Would AT&T provide both cellular and PCS service initially or cellular first and PCS in the future? When would LTE service be provided, if applicable? Explain.
6. Would AT&T's proposed facility comply with E911 requirements?
7. Identify the safety standards and/or codes by which equipment, machinery, or technology would be used or operated at the proposed facility.
8. Would the tower (at either site) be designed for EIA/TIA-222 structural standards version F, G, or both? What is the tower design wind speed for this area (Litchfield County)?

Site A: Tax Assessor Parcel ID #32-008, off Route 67

9. What is the existing signal strength in those areas AT&T is seeking to cover from this site?
10. Does AT&T have any statistics on dropped calls in the vicinity of the proposed facility? If so, what do they indicate? Does AT&T have any other indicators of substandard service in this area?
11. Would this site be needed for coverage, capacity, or both? Explain.
12. Provide the lengths of the existing coverage gaps on any roads that AT&T seeks to provide coverage to.
13. Provide the lengths of the proposed coverage of any roads that AT&T seeks to provide coverage to based on the tower's proposed height, as well as ten and twenty feet shorter.
14. Provide the areas to be covered (in square miles) assuming the tower is at the proposed height and also ten and twenty feet shorter.

15. Provide separate coverage plots using the same scale provided in the Application assuming the tower is ten and twenty feet shorter.
16. What is the minimum antenna centerline height required to meet AT&T's coverage objectives?
17. Would flush-mounted antennas or antennas attached to the tower at the proposed height via T-arms provide the required coverage? Would either configuration result in reduced coverage and/or necessitate greater antenna height with multiple levels of antennas? Explain.
18. Provide the distance and direction from the proposed tower site to the existing sites that the proposed tower would interact with. Also include the addresses, tower heights, antenna heights and tower types (e.g. monopole).
19. Describe the land uses abutting this site.
20. Where is the nearest school and the nearest commercial child day care center? Provide the distances and directions from the proposed tower.
21. Under Tab 3B of the Application, the surveyor's report certifies that the ground elevation at the base of the proposed monopole is 723 feet above mean sea level (AMSL). However, the Federal Communications Commission TOWAIR determination results page uses a site elevation of 52.7 meters or about 173 feet AMSL. Provide a revised TOWAIR determination results page with the correct site elevation.
22. Could the tower be designed with a yield point to ensure that the setback radius remains within the boundaries of the subject property?
23. Calculate the amounts of cut and fill required to develop the proposed tower site and access drive.
24. What is the fuel source for the backup generator? How many hours of run time would the generator have based on its fuel tank capacity? Has AT&T considered using a fuel cell as a backup power source for the proposed facility? Explain.
25. Does AT&T anticipate the use of the backup generator as a temporary power source until permanent electrical service is provided?
26. Would any blasting be required to develop the site?
27. Is the proposed site within an "Important Bird Area" as designated by the National Audubon Society?
28. Would the 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?
29. What, if any, stealth tower design options would be feasible to employ at this site?

Site B: 126 Transylvania Road

30. What is the existing signal strength in those areas AT&T is seeking to cover from this site?
31. Does AT&T have any statistics on dropped calls in the vicinity of the proposed facility? If so, what do they indicate? Does AT&T have any other indicators of substandard service in this area?
32. Would this site be needed for coverage, capacity, or both? Explain.
33. Provide the lengths of the existing coverage gaps on any roads that AT&T seeks to provide coverage to.
34. Provide the lengths of the proposed coverage of any roads that AT&T seeks to provide coverage to based on the tower's proposed height, as well as ten and twenty feet shorter.
35. Provide the areas to be covered (in square miles) assuming the tower is at the proposed height and also ten and twenty feet shorter.
36. Provide separate coverage plots using the same scale provided in the Application assuming the tower is ten and twenty feet shorter.
37. What is the minimum antenna centerline height required to meet AT&T's coverage objectives?
38. Would flush-mounted antennas or antennas attached to the tower at the proposed height via T-arms provide the required coverage? Would either configuration result in reduced coverage and/or necessitate greater antenna height with multiple levels of antennas? Explain.
39. Provide the distance and direction from the proposed tower site to the existing sites that the proposed tower would interact with. Also include the addresses, tower heights, antenna heights and tower types (e.g. monopole).
40. Describe the land uses abutting this site.
41. Where is the nearest school and the nearest commercial child day care center? Provide the distances and directions from the proposed tower.
42. Calculate the amounts of cut and fill required to develop the proposed tower site and access drive.
43. What is the fuel source for the backup generator? How many hours of run time would the generator have based on its fuel tank capacity? Has AT&T considered using a fuel cell as a backup power source for the proposed facility? Explain.
44. Does AT&T anticipate the use of the backup generator as a temporary power source until permanent electrical service is provided?

45. Would any blasting be required to develop the site?
46. Is the proposed site within an "Important Bird Area" as designated by the National Audubon Society?
47. Would the 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?
48. What, if any, stealth tower design options would be feasible to employ at this site?