



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

April 8, 2014

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

RE: **DOCKET NO. 447** – New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a telecommunications facility located at Stamford Tax Assessor Map 1, Parcel 1379, 560 West Hill Road, Stamford, Connecticut.

Dear Attorneys Laub and Fisher:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than April 24, 2014. 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 pending proceedings website.

Yours very truly,

Melanie Bachman  
Acting Executive Director

MB/MP

c: Parties and Intervenors

**Docket No. 447**  
**Pre-Hearing Questions**  
**April 8, 2014**  
**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. Provide an affidavit of publication from the *Stamford Advocate* to certify the publication date(s) of AT&T's notice. Is the *Stamford Advocate* a daily or weekly publication?
3. Provide the status of the Connecticut State Historic Preservation Office review.
4. Pursuant to CGS §16-50o, please submit a copy of the lease for the proposed site.
5. Provide the size and shape of the search ring. Also provide the longitude and latitude coordinates of the center of the search ring.
6. Would the tower setback radius encroach on any adjoining properties? If so, state the distance of the encroachment and who owns these properties? 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?
7. Quantify the amounts of cut and fill (in cubic yards) that would be required to develop the proposed facility.
8. Would any blasting be required to develop the site?
9. Is the proposed site located within a 100-year or 500-year flood zone?
10. What is the tower design wind speed for this area (Fairfield County)?
11. Would the tower be designed to be expandable in height? If yes, indicate how much taller the tower could be expanded in height.
12. Would the monopole or "tree trunk" have a galvanized gray finish? If approved, could the monopole have a brown finish if requested?
13. Would the tree branch material extend above the top of 120-foot tower or would it be a "flat top" tree design with the tree branch material approximately flush with the top of the tower? If the tree branch material is expected to extend above the top of the tower, indicate by how much in feet.
14. What type of antenna mount will be used for the proposed antennas, e.g. low-profile platform? Would there be three sectors or four?
15. Are all of the proposed panel antennas approximately eight feet tall?

16. 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.
17. Under a maintenance or equipment swap scenario, describe the accessibility to antennas that are flush-mounted or T-arm mounted compared to a platform mount design.
18. Identify distances and directions to the adjacent sites with which the proposed facility would hand off signals. Include addresses of these sites, tower/structure types (e.g. monopole or building), AT&T's antenna centerline heights, and tower/structure heights.
19. Would the proposed site be needed for coverage, capacity, or both? Explain.
20. Are all frequencies used to transmit voice and data?
21. Would AT&T provide both cellular and PCS services initially or cellular first and PCS in the future? When would LTE service be provided, if applicable? Explain.
22. What is the lowest height at which AT&T's antennas could achieve its coverage objectives from either of the proposed sites? Submit propagation maps showing the coverage at ten and twenty feet below these heights for cellular, PCS, and LTE, as applicable, based on the same scale already provided.
23. What is the signal strength for which AT&T designs its system? For in-vehicle coverage? For in-building coverage? If in-building coverage and in-vehicle coverage are not applicable to certain frequency bands, include other signal strength objectives.
24. What is the existing signal strength within the area AT&T is seeking to cover from this site?
25. Does AT&T have any statistics on dropped calls and/or ineffective attempts in the vicinity of the proposed facility? If so, provide this data. What does it indicate? Does AT&T have any other indicators of substandard service in this area?
26. List the major roads and the lengths of the individual coverage gaps on these roads that AT&T is seeking to cover from the proposed site at cellular frequencies? At PCS frequencies? At LTE frequencies?
27. Provide similar data as requested in question 26 for secondary roads. However, the total sum of the gaps on secondary roads may be provided in lieu of the individual gaps by road.
28. Provide the lengths of the proposed coverage of any major roads that AT&T seeks to provide coverage to based on the tower's proposed height, as well as ten and twenty feet shorter for cellular, PCS, and LTE frequencies as applicable. Provide similar data for secondary roads; however, the total sum of the coverage lengths of secondary roads may be provided in lieu of individual coverage lengths by road.
29. What are the predicted coverage footprints from the proposed site (in square miles), for cellular, PCS, and LTE as applicable? Also, provide this data for antenna heights ten and twenty feet shorter.

30. Using the same scale as the LTE coverage plots submitted in the Application, provide existing coverage plots for cellular and PCS, as applicable. Also include cellular and PCS coverage plots depicting the existing and proposed coverage.
31. Identify the safety standards and/or codes by which equipment, machinery, or technology would be used or operated at the proposed facility.
32. What measures are proposed for the site to ensure security and deter vandalism?
33. What type(s) of outdoor lighting would be installed on the equipment shelter, if any? When would the lighting operate?
34. What is the fuel source for the backup generator? What is the size of the generator in kilowatts? What would be the approximate run time for the backup generator before it would need to be refueled, assuming that it is operating at full load? If the proposed generator is diesel, include the estimated full-load run time for a propane generator or vice versa.
35. Explain the air emissions permit process for emergency backup generators.
36. 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?
37. Would there be any interruption in service between the time power goes out and the generator comes online? For example, would AT&T provide battery backup to prevent a reboot condition and provide seamless power until the generator starts? If AT&T has a battery backup system, how many hours could it supply power in the event that the generator fails to start?
38. Has AT&T considered using a fuel cell as a backup power source for the proposed site? Explain.
39. Would a shared approximately 200 kW backup generator fit within the proposed equipment shelter? If no, what size concrete pad or equivalent would be needed to accommodate an approximately 200 kW shared backup generator?
40. Please provide the cost of a 50 kW backup generator or the proposed size generator if different. Please provide the cost of an approximately 200 kW shared backup generator.
41. Is the proposed site near an "Important Bird Area" as designated by the National Audubon Society?
42. Would AT&T'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?
43. Is the site located within the shaded area of the State of Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Natural Diversity Database? Explain.

44. Would the tower be visible from any hiking trails within the two-mile radius area used for the visibility analysis? If yes, identify the location and distance and direction from the proposed tower, and indicate if such views would be seasonal or year-round.
45. Estimate the number of homes with year-round visibility of the tower and seasonal visibility of the tower.
46. What, if any, stealth tower design options besides the proposed tree tower would be feasible to employ at this site?
47. What is the expected cumulative noise level at the nearest property line from the proposed facility assuming the generator and air conditioning units are running at the same time? Provide a similar analysis only taking into account the air conditioning units.
48. Provide Functions and Values assessments of Wetland 1 and Wetland 2.