



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

Web Site: portal.ct.gov/csc

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

January 25, 2023

Kenneth C. Baldwin, Esq.
Robinson & Cole LLP
280 Trumbull Street
Hartford, CT 06103-3597
kbaldwin@rc.com

RE: **PETITION NO. 1552** – Crown Castle and Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless petition for a declaratory ruling, pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §4-176 and §16-50k, for the proposed replacement and extension of an existing telecommunications facility located at 845 Ethan Allen Highway, Ridgefield, Connecticut.

Dear Attorney Baldwin:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than February 15, 2023. Please submit an original and 15 copies to the Council's office and an electronic copy to siting.council@ct.gov. 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 requests 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.

Please be advised that the original and 15 copies are required to be submitted to the Council's office on or before the February 15, 2023 deadline.

Copies of your responses are required to be provided to all parties and intervenors listed in the service list, which can be found on the Council's website under the "Pending Matters" link.

Any request for an extension of time to submit responses to interrogatories shall be submitted to the Council in writing pursuant to §16-50j-22a of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies.

Sincerely,

Melanie Bachman
Executive Director

MB/MP

Petition No. 1552
Crown Castle and Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless
845 Ethan Allen Highway
Ridgefield, Connecticut
Interrogatories

Notice

1. Referencing page 8 and Attachment 8 of the Petition, has the Town of Ridgefield, the host property owner and/or abutters provided comments to Crown Castle (Crown) and Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless (Cellco) (collectively, the Petitioner) since the Petition filing? If so, please summarize the comments.

Project Development

2. What is the estimated cost of the proposed project?
3. Is the project, or any portion of the project, proposed to be undertaken by state departments, institutions or agencies, or to be funded in whole or in part by the state through any contract or grant?
4. Provide typical construction workdays and hours, and the anticipated duration of construction.
5. Page 2 of the Petition references Sprint antennas. Have those antennas been decommissioned or repurposed since the merger with T-Mobile?
6. Would AT&T, T-Mobile and Sprint, as applicable, cutover their existing antennas and equipment from the existing facility to the proposed replacement facility?
7. Would a temporary tower facility be required to maintain services provided by AT&T, T-Mobile and Sprint, as applicable, during the cutover of carrier equipment to the replacement facility?
8. When would AT&T, T-Mobile and Sprint, as applicable, relocate their antennas to the replacement facility? How long will it take to switch the equipment? Would customers experience service outages?
9. When would the existing tower be removed?

Existing Facility Site

10. Provide the number of residences within 1,000 feet of the existing site.
11. When did Crown acquire the existing facility from Omnipoint Communications?
12. Provide photographs of the existing facility and the proposed compound expansion area. Use stakes to show the limits of the expansion area.
13. If the replacement facility were to be of the same flagpole design as the existing facility, what height would be required for Verizon to meet its service objectives and approximately how much would it cost?
14. When the existing facility is decommissioned and removed, would the existing tower foundation remain? Explain.

Proposed Replacement Facility

15. Provide the distance and direction from the proposed replacement facility expansion area to the nearest residential property line.
16. Referencing Petition page 3, would Cellco's collocation on the proposed replacement facility provide 5G service on the 3600 MHz band only or also on other frequencies?
17. Approximately when was the search ring established for the Cellco installation?
18. Were other potential sites considered for the proposed Cellco installation? If so, please identify the other potential sites and why they were rejected.
19. Referencing Petition page 2, could the proposed replacement facility accommodate the current concealment configuration of the antennas behind a RF transparent screening shroud? What type of antenna mounts would AT&T, T-Mobile and Sprint, if applicable, utilize on the proposed replacement facility, if known at this time?
20. What is the maximum number of tenants the replacement tower can support?
21. Have any other carriers, emergency service providers or the Town expressed an interest in locating at the replacement facility?

Public Safety

22. Provide a rigorous cumulative far-field radio frequency analysis for the facility that accounts for Cellco's and all other entities equipment on the tower, accounting for a 6-foot tall person at ground level and the actual antenna patterns for the facility with a cumulative %MPE at or below 100%. Identify the distance from the tower with the highest cumulative %MPE.
23. Could the construction or operation of the proposed facility impact or interfere with any existing utilities or infrastructure within the development area? If so, identify any measures that would be employed to protect existing utilities or infrastructure from impact or interference.
24. Does AT&T offer FirstNet services from the existing facility? Could the replacement facility accommodate any additional equipment that might be required to provide FirstNet services?
25. Would Cellco's, proposed co-location(s) at the replacement tower support text-to-911 service? Is additional equipment required for this purpose?
26. Would Cellco's antennas comply with federal E911 requirements?
27. Would Cellco's installation(s) comply with the intent of the Warning, Alert and Response Network Act of 2006?
28. Would the replacement facility, including Cellco's proposed equipment, comply with Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) noise control standards at the property boundaries?
29. What measures are proposed for the site to ensure security and deter vandalism? (Including alarms, gates, locks, anti-climb fence design, etc.)

30. Referencing Attachment 3 of the Petition, Sheet R-1, could the tower be designed with a yield point to ensure that the tower setback radius remains within the boundaries of the subject property? If yes, at what height would the yield point be located, and what would the incremental cost the yield point be?
31. Referencing the DEEP National Flood Insurance Program letter dated December 5, 2022, paragraph two, would the proposed replacement tower and proposed equipment platform be designed to resist collapse, lateral movement and buoyancy affect associated with the 2 feet/sec velocity flow for this location?
32. Identify the safety standards and/or codes by which equipment, machinery or technology that would be used or operated at the proposed facility.

Backup Power

33. Referencing Attachment 3 of the Petition, Sheet C-2, please respond to the following regarding Cellco's proposed propane-fueled emergency backup generator:
 - a. At what duration would the backup generator run weekly for maintenance purposes (e.g. 20 to 30 minutes per week)?
 - b. Would the backup generator have containment measures to protect against fluid leakage?
 - c. Based on the 360 gallons of propane tank capacity, how long could the proposed generator operate at full load before refueling would refueling be required?
34. Would a battery backup be used to provide uninterrupted power for Cellco. How long could the battery backup alone supply power to the facility?

Environmental

35. Quantify the total amounts of cut and fill that would be required to develop the proposed facility and the compensatory flood storage area. Would any net cut material need to be removed from the site, or would all net cut material be reused on the host property?
36. How would Petitioner maintain the proposed compensatory flood storage area?
37. Referencing Attachment 5 of the Petition, Viewshed Map, describe the change in visibility, if any, of the proposed facility versus the existing facility from Martin Park. Provide the distance and direction from the proposed replacement facility to Martin Park.
38. What, if any, stealth tower design options would be feasible to employ at this site? Please provide costs related to each stealth tower design.
39. Would visibility of the proposed replacement tower be reduced if it was painted? If so, what colors are available that may reduce visibility? Would Crown be willing to paint the replacement tower and wireless carrier panel antennas/mounting equipment?
40. Identify the nearest "Important Bird Area" as designated by the National Audubon Society?
41. Would the proposed replacement tower comply with the USFWS Recommended Best Practices for Communication Tower Design, Siting, Construction, Operation, Maintenance and Decommissioning? (available at <https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/usfws-communication-tower-guidance.pdf>)