



STATE OF CONNECTICUT

CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

1 CENTRAL PARK PLAZA • NEW BRITAIN, CONN. 06051

PHONE: 827-2604

Petition No. 167
Cablevision of Connecticut
Norwalk, Connecticut
November 10, 1986
Staff Report

On March 1, 1982, the Connecticut Siting Council ruled that no certificate of environmental compatibility and public need was required for the installation of four antennas to Cablevision of Connecticut's head-end facility on Fairview Avenue in Norwalk. The four antennas included in this petition for a declaratory ruling, listed as Petition No. 78, were as follows: one four-foot diameter dish for the reception of mobile broadcast signals; one eight-foot diameter dish directed toward Manhattan; and two six-foot diameter dishes directed toward Stamford and Weston respectively. In a letter to Cablevision dated March 24, 1982, Siting Council executive director Christopher Wood stated, "This construction is to be exactly as specified in the above referenced petition (No. 78) dated February 9, 1982."

On October 16, 1986, Cablevision notified the Siting Council that it is now planning to install a 12-foot diameter dish instead of one of the two six-foot diameter dishes described in petition No. 78. This antenna would now be directed toward a proposed facility in Easton, which is the subject of a Council hearing in Docket No. 66.

In its October 16, 1986, letter, Cablevision maintains that the installation of the 12-foot diameter dish does not require Council approval because this antenna was part of the Council's March 1, 1982, ruling for which "no approval" was required, and that the addition of this dish is not a modification of an existing facility under Section 16-50j-72(b)(4) of the Council's Rules of Practice. Under this section, none of the following shall constitute a modification to an existing community antenna television tower: routine general maintenance or one-for-one replacements; changes at a tower site which do not extend the boundaries of the fenced areas or increase noise levels at the tower site boundary by six decibels or more; the addition of radio frequency sending or receiving capability that does not increase the total radio frequency electromagnetic radiation power density measured at the tower site boundary to or above .1 milliwatt/cm²; or replacement of an existing CATV tower and associated equipment with a tower that is no taller than the tower to be replaced.

In a letter to the Council dated October 24, 1986, Cablevision requested that if the Council disagrees with Cablevision's assertion that approval for a 12-foot diameter dish antenna has already been granted, or that if this antenna is an exempt facility, the Council issue a declaratory ruling that no certificate of environmental compatibility and public need is required because this antenna would have "no substantial adverse effect." This request has become has become Petition No. 167.

On November 6, 1986, Chairperson Gloria Dibble Pond, Council member Owen L. Clark, and Siting Analyst Robert K. Erling met Andrew C. Heeren, Chief Engineer for Cablevision, for a field review of the proposed antenna site. This proposed site is located atop the roof of the Sheffield Ridge Apartments which houses Cablevision's Norwalk head-end. Mr. Heeren explained that Cablevision may further change this proposal from a 12 foot antenna to a ten or eight-foot diameter antenna, based on new technology. Staff asked Mr. Heeren to formally notify the Council of any such change in size. The antenna, whatever its size, would be mounted on the outside of the building's elevator shaft, and face northeast toward Easton.

The radio frequency near-field power density from this transmit and receive antenna would be approximately one half watt, which is less than a Citizen's band radio. The total radio frequency power density at the site boundary would be no greater than 0.1 milliwatt per square centimeter. The 0.1 milliwatt per square centimeter contour would not exceed the 12-foot diameter of the proposed antenna.

Several alternative Council actions are possible in this case, including granting the petition, rejecting the petition for insufficiency, denying the petition, and acknowledging and accepting the notice of intent to construct an exempt facility.

Robert K. Erling
Siting Analyst

REE/cp