



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

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

November 15, 2013

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

RE: **DOCKET NO. 443** – 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 257 Perkins Road, Southbury, Connecticut.

Dear Attorney Laub:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than December 19, 2013. 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/cdm

c: Parties and Intervenors
Michele Briggs

**Docket 443:
New Cingular Wireless (AT&T)
Southbury, Connecticut
Pre-Hearing Interrogatories, Set One**

1. Of the letters sent to abutting property owners, how many certified mail receipts did AT&T receive? If any receipts were not returned, which owners did not receive their notice? Did AT&T make additional attempts to contact those property owners?
2. Would any blasting be required for this site?
3. What are the frequencies AT&T is licensed to use in the area covered from the proposed facility?
4. Identify the adjacent sites with which the proposed facility would hand off signals. Include addresses of these sites.
5. What is the signal strength for which AT&T designs its system? For in-vehicle coverage? For in-building coverage? Does this signal strength differ according to the different frequencies AT&T is licensed to use?
6. What is the existing signal strength in those areas AT&T is seeking to cover from this facility? At what frequencies?
7. Does AT&T have any statistics on dropped calls or other indicators of substandard service in the vicinity of the proposed facility? If so, what do they indicate?
8. What are lengths of the respective coverage gaps on the roads that would be covered from the proposed site? What are the distances that would be covered along these roads from the proposed site?

South Street, Southbury
West Purchase Road, Southbury
Perkins Road, Southbury
Brown Brook Road, Southbury
Gilbert Road, Southbury
South Street, Roxbury
Lower River Road, Roxbury
Berry Road, Roxbury
Lower Falls Road, Roxbury
New Road, Roxbury
Turrill Brook Drive, Southbury

9. Does AT&T have any traffic count information on the above listed roads?
10. Do the areas on the coverage maps included with the application depict a particular frequency licensed by AT&T?

11. What is the lowest feasible height at which AT&T's antennas could fulfill the coverage objectives from the proposed facility? What problems would result if AT&T were to install antennas at a lower height? Submit a propagation map showing the coverage at ten feet below this height.
12. What kind of backup generator would AT&T install at this facility? How many hours of service would the generator be able to provide before it needs to be refueled?
13. What is the distance of the existing driveway that AT&T would use for access? What is the distance of the new gravel drive that AT&T would install for access?
14. How would utilities be brought to the proposed facility?
15. How much cut and how much fill would be required to develop this facility?
16. Would a yield point be designed into the tower as the setback radius would extend onto two adjacent properties?
17. How many residences are located within 1,000 feet of the proposed facility?
18. What is the closest residence to the facility's proposed location that is not on the host property? What is the address and who is the owner of this property?
19. How many trees with a diameter of six inches or greater at breast height would be cut down for the proposed facility?
20. Is the proposed site near an "Important Bird Area" as designated by the Audubon Society?
21. 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?
22. The RF power density report in Attachment 5 indicates the total % MPE would be 11.48%. On page 13, under Section D -- Power Density, the total MPE is indicated to be 7.71%. Which is correct?
23. How would the coverage from this proposed site compare to the coverage that would have been achieved from the site at 316 Perkins Road approved under Docket 383?
24. Would the proposed tower hand off to Council-approved sites at: Wewaka Brook in Bridgewater (Docket 412), Second Hill Road in Bridgewater (Docket 437), and Route 67 in Roxbury (Docket 428)?