



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

July 30, 2021

Kristen Motel, Esq.
Lucia Chiocchio, Esq.
Cuddy & Feder LLP
445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th Floor
White Plains, New York 10601

RE: **DOCKET NO. 504** - Arx Wireless Infrastructure, LLC application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a telecommunications facility located at Lot N-4, Sequin Drive, Glastonbury, Connecticut.

Dear Attorneys Motel and Chiocchio:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than August 12, 2021. To help expedite the Council's review, please file individual responses as soon as they are available.

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 August 12, 2021, deadline.

Copies of your responses shall 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,

s/Melanie A. Bachman

Executive Director

MB/IN/lm

c: Service List dated July 15, 2021



Docket No. 504
New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC
Pre-Hearing Interrogatories
July 30, 2021
Set One

General

1. What is the estimated cost of AT&T's equipment, including installation? Break down the total cost into categories that AT&T deems appropriate.
2. How would the cost of AT&T's installation/colocation at the proposed site be recovered?
3. Provide the number of remote radio heads that would be installed at this site. Would any RRH's be installed at ground level?

Site Search

4. What was the approximate size of AT&T's search area in the vicinity of the proposed site? Provide a map depicting the search area.

Site/Tower

5. What type of antenna mount will be used for the proposed antennas? What is the structural design standard applicable to such antenna mount?
6. Pursuant to CGS §16-50p(a)(3)(G), identify the safety standards and/or codes by which equipment, machinery or technology that would be used or operated at the proposed facility by AT&T.

Coverage/Capacity

7. Would the proposed site be needed for coverage, capacity, or both? Explain.
8. Tab E of the application depicts AT&T's existing and proposed coverage using the 700 MHz frequency. Would any other frequencies be installed on the proposed facility? Provide coverage maps for each frequency used showing existing coverage and existing and proposed coverage.
9. Are all frequencies used to transmit voice and data?
10. Could the required coverage and capacity upgrade needs be met by a series of small cell facilities or a distributed antenna system, or by a combination of small cells and rooftop installations, rather than the proposed macro tower facility? Please respond to the following:

- a) How many small cells would be required?
- b) Would the small cell multi-site solution be able to offer the same services as the proposed tower?
- c) What would be the impact to AT&T's FirstNet services for emergency responders?
- d) Would the cost be more or less than with the proposed site? Approximately how much would a small cell multi-site solution cost?
- e) Would the small cell Radio Frequency emissions be greater due to the lower height of the installations? Please explain.

11. What is the signal strength for which AT&T designs its system? For in-vehicle coverage? For in-building coverage?

12. What is the existing signal strength within the area AT&T is seeking to cover from this site?

13. Provide existing coverage gaps in miles for the proposed frequencies for the nearby portion of the Route 2, Hebron Avenue and the surrounding local roads, the overall existing coverage footprints in square miles and the proposed coverage mileage and square miles as represented in the example below:

Street Name	700 MHz Coverage	850 MHz Coverage	1900 MHz Coverage	2100 MHz Coverage
Route 2	3.5 miles	3.5 miles	2.0 miles	2.0 miles
Route 32	2.0 miles	2.0 miles	0.5 mile	0.5 mile

14. Would flush-mounted antennas provide the required coverage? Would the flush-mount configuration result in reduced coverage and/or necessitate greater antenna height with multiple levels of antennas? Explain.

15. With reference to Application Attachment F, No. 7, 311 Oakwood Drive, Glastonbury, CT, please provide more information on the radio frequency constraints/challenges that led to its rejection.

Public Safety

16. Will the proposed facility support text-to-911 service? Is additional equipment required for this purpose?

17. Would AT&T's antennas comply with federal E911 requirements?

18. Would AT&T's installation comply with the intent of the Warning, Alert and Response Network Act of 2006?