



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

April 21, 2021

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

RE **DOCKET NO. 499** – Homeland Towers, LLC and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC d/b/a AT&T application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 16 Coote Hill Road, Sherman, Connecticut.

Dear Attorneys Fisher and Chiocchio:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than May 12, 2021. To help expedite the Council's review, please file individual responses as soon as they are available. At this time, consistent with the Council's policy to prevent the spread of Coronavirus, please submit an electronic copy only to siting.council@ct.gov. However, please be advised that the Council may later request one or more hard copies for records retention purposes.

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

Melanie Bachman
Executive Director

c: Service List dated March 15, 2021

Docket No. 499
Pre-Hearing Interrogatories
April 21, 2021

General

1. Referring to Application pp. 7-8 and Attachment 13, 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. Referring to Application pp. 26-27, how is the construction cost of the facility recovered for both Homeland and AT&T?
3. Referring to Application p. 25, how many residences attended the November 21, 2020, public video conference? What concerns were raised by residents and town officials and how were these concerns addressed?

Site Search

4. Identify the approximate center and radius of the site search area.
5. Application Attachment 2, p. 2 AT&T obtained a lease for a property at 32 Leach Hollow Road in 2009. Is this property still a viable candidate for a tower facility? Who objected to a tower in this location?
6. Application Attachment 2, p. 2 states 7 of 9 possible candidate sites were rejected by AT&T's RF engineers. What heights were modeled in these locations?
7. The summary for Site #28 (0 Route 37 South, Sherman) states the site was rejected due to extensive wetlands on the site property. What is the estimated impact to wetlands to develop a tower facility?
8. Referring to Application p. 22, did the Sherman Telecommunications Committee determine there was a need for reliable town-wide communications coverage or wireless carrier coverage?

Site/tower

9. Would any blasting be required to develop the site?
10. What measures are proposed for the site to ensure security and deter vandalism? (Including alarms, gates, locks, anti-climb fence design, etc.)
11. Would the tower have a galvanized gray finish?
12. 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.

Coverage/Capacity

13. Application Attachment 7 indicates other frequencies will be installed in addition to the 700 MHz frequency. Does the 700 MHz frequency act as the “base frequency” of the network where most of the wireless traffic occurs? How do the other frequencies interact in AT&T’s wireless system?
14. Would the proposed antennas be capable of offering 5G services or would new antenna be required to transmit 5G once this service is deployed in this area?
15. Referring to Attachment 1, p. 5, how many miles of new coverage would the facility provide to State Route 37 and State Route 39?
16. Can coverage objectives be met by installing antennas at a lower tower height? Identify the lowest possible antenna height and describe how this height would affect coverage needs and/or capacity relief within the service area.
17. Can flush-mounted antennas be installed at the site to provide the required coverage? Describe any antenna/tower modifications that would be required to achieve coverage objectives.
18. The application states the tower site was relocated to the west to avoid impacts to State-listed species. How would lowering the tower elevation from 902 feet above mean sea level to 878 feet above mean sea level affect AT&T’s coverage objectives?
19. How would the tower relocation to a lower elevation affect emergency communication services provided by Litchfield County Dispatch?
20. Were any studies conducted on the Town’s wireless service requirements? Is it necessary to install the municipal antennas at the top of the tower?
21. Referring to Application p. 4, provide a copy of the Radio Communications System Analysis & Recommendation Report prepared by RCC Consultants, Inc. dated January 15, 2013.
22. Referring to Application p. 22, provide documentation from the Sherman Telecommunications Committee that confirmed the need for reliable wireless service in the Town.
23. Besides AT&T, have any other wireless carriers expressed an interest in co-locating on the proposed facility? If so, provide documentation of their request.

Backup Power

24. The Application narrative and sound study describe a propane fueled generator; however, the site plans depict a diesel-fueled generator. Please clarify and submit revised site plans, if necessary.
25. What would be the respective run time for the proposed generator before it would need to be refueled, assuming it is running at full load under normal conditions?

Public Safety

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

27. Describe the additional equipment necessary to operate FirstNet services.
28. Why was the proposed site selected for FirstNet deployment?

Environment

29. Referring to Application p. 19, was a response received from the State Historic Preservation Office? If so, please provide.
30. Referring to Attachment 5, Environmental Assessment Statement, p. 3 states, "It is noteworthy that when a 170 foot tall facility was previously proposed on the parcel in 2013, the SHPO determined that there would be no historic properties affected." Please submit the SHPO determination letter.
31. Was a preliminary assessment and/or determination letter from DEEP NDDB received when a 170 foot tall facility was previously proposed on the parcel in 2013? If so, please submit the letter(s).
32. Referring to Application Attachment 10, provide a map or aerial image that shows the slimy salamander conservation zones and the proposed limits of disturbance.
33. Referring to Application Attachment 8 - Visibility Assessment, revise Table 1 on pp. 5-6 to include a column that estimates how much of the tower is visible in each photograph (in feet).
34. Referring to Application Attachment 8 - Visibility Assessment, estimate the number of homes that would have seasonal and/or year-round views within 0.5 miles of the proposed facility.
35. Referring to Application Attachment 8 - Visibility Assessment, how many residences are in the area of Photo 29 that would have a similar view as shown in the photo?
36. Would the proposed facility be visible from any Town-designated scenic roads within two-miles of the site?
37. Would the project require a DEEP Stormwater Permit? If so, do the proposed stormwater controls conform to the requirements of the Stormwater Permit?
38. Please submit photographic site documentation with notations linked to the site plans or a detailed aerial image that identifies locations of site-specific and representative site features. The submission should include photographs of the site from public road(s) or publicly accessible area(s) as well as Site-specific locations depicting site features including, but not necessarily limited to, the following locations as applicable:

For each photo, please indicate the photo viewpoint direction and stake or flag the locations of site-specific and representative site features. Site-specific and representative site features include, but are not limited to, as applicable:

1. wetlands, watercourses and vernal pools;
2. forest/forest edge areas;
3. agricultural soil areas;
4. sloping terrain;
5. proposed stormwater control features;
6. nearest residences;
7. Site access and interior access road(s);
8. tower location/compound;

9. clearing limits/property lines;
10. mitigation areas; and
11. any other noteworthy features relative to the Project.

A photolog graphic must accompany the submission, using a site plan or a detailed aerial image, depicting each numbered photograph for reference. For each photo, indicate the photo location number and viewpoint direction, and clearly identify the locations of site specific and representative site features shown (e.g., physical staking/flagging or other means of marking the subject area).

The submission shall be delivered electronically in a legible portable document format (PDF) with a maximum file size of <20MB. If necessary, multiple files may be submitted and clearly marked in terms of sequence.