



Daniel F. Caruso
Chairman

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

Internet: ct.gov/csc

May 2, 2008

Kenneth C. Baldwin, Esq.
Robinson & Cole LLP
280 Trumbull Street
Hartford, CT 06103

RE: **DOCKET NO. 358** – MCF Communications bg, Inc. and Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon
Wireless application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the
construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunications facility at one of two locations
located at 347 Riverside Drive (Route 12)- Site A, and 407 Riverside Drive (Route 12)- Site B,
Thompson, Connecticut.

Dear Mr. Baldwin:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than
May 16, 2008. 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 and a .pdf file on a compact disc. In accordance
with the State Solid Waste Management Plan, 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.

Yours very truly,

S. Derek Phelps
Executive Director

c: Council Members
Parties and Intervenors
Sandy Carter, Verizon



CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL
Affirmative Action / Equal Opportunity Employer

**LIST OF PARTIES AND INTERVENORS
SERVICE LIST**

Status Granted	Status Holder (name, address & phone number)	Representative (name, address & phone number)
Applicant	MCF Communications bg, Inc. and Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless	<p>Kenneth C. Baldwin, Esq. Robinson & Cole LLP 280 Trumbull Street Hartford, Connecticut 06103-3597 (860) 275-8200</p> <p>Brad Gannon MCF Communications bg, Inc. 733 Turnpike Street, Suite 105 North Andover, MA 01845</p> <p>Sandy Carter, Regulatory Manager Verizon Wireless 99 East River Drive East Hartford, CT 06108</p>
Intervenor (Approved on 04/24/08)	Thompson Hills West Condominium Association	<p>Richard W. Thunberg Jr. Board President Thompson Hills West Condominium Association Board of Trustee's 13 Westside Drive, Suite 92 North Grosvenordale, CT 06255</p>

PRE-HEARING INTERROGATORIES
DOCKET NO. 358 –
MCF COMMUNICATIONS BG, INC. AND CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS
MAY 2, 2008

1. Did the Applicants receive return receipts for all adjacent landowners listed behind Tab 5 of the application? If not, was any additional effort made to make sure that notice was received by these property owners?
2. Discuss the Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999 (the 911 Act) and the Enhanced 911 Act. How does the proposed site comply with these Acts?
3. When did Cellco first establish a search ring in the area of the proposed sites?
4. Provide a map with a scale including size (area), shape and location of Cellco's search ring for the proposed sites.
5. Has Cellco investigated the potential use of microcells, repeaters or distributed antenna systems to provide coverage to the existing gaps in Thompson? Please describe the reason each of these technologies were rejected.
6. Could the proposed Site A compound be moved farther east or west to avoid the need for significant grading in the apparent steep slope area of the parcel?
7. Would MCF design the proposed Site A tower with a yield point to allow the tower to remain on the host property in the event of a tower failure? If so, at what height above ground level would the yield point be located?
8. Would the Applicants be willing to reexamine the potential use of the Thompson Hills West Condominium as an additional proposed site in this application?
9. What would be the height of the proposed poles used for the overhead power supply to proposed Site A? Why is the power supply to the site not proposed to be underground?
10. What distance of overhead utilities would be required for connection to the Site B facility? What distance of underground utilities would be installed?
11. What is the number of utility poles required for the utility connection to the Site B facility? At what height?
12. Did the Applicants request a determination of species from DEP? If yes, provide a copy of correspondence.
13. Is the condominium complex on West Side Drive included in the "Visual Comparison Chart" in the Visual Analysis Report as one of the residences that would have a year-round view of the proposed Site B structure? Approximately how many of the condominium units would have a view of the Site B structure?
14. Would the construction of the proposed Site A or Site B facility require blasting?

15. How many trees with diameters of six inches or greater would be removed for the construction of each proposed facility?
16. What is the dominant vegetation at each proposed site? What is the height of the dominant vegetation at each proposed site?
17. Provide vegetation type in the surrounding area of both proposed Site A and proposed Site B.
18. Provide the "2 Mile Viewshed Analysis Map" for proposed Site A and Site B in 11-inch by 17-inch format.
19. What is the name, distance and direction to the closest public airfield from the proposed Site A and proposed Site B?
20. Please clarify the distance of the Site B property owner's residence from the proposed site. Page 15 of the application states that the residence is located approximately 209 feet from the proposed site and behind Tab 11 of the application it states that the residence is located approximately 170 feet from the site.
21. Does Cellco use -75 dBm as a minimum signal level threshold for in-building coverage? Is -85 dBm Cello's threshold for in-vehicle coverage?
22. What is the minimum signal level threshold that Cellco would accept for the North Grosvenordale area of Thompson?
23. What is the existing signal level in the area of the proposed sites?
24. Provide the structure types, antenna heights, addresses, direction and distances of all Cellco facilities that would directly interact with each of the proposed sites?
25. Would the proposed Site A and Site B towers adequately fill the PCS coverage gap along Interstate 395? If not, how would Cellco propose to fulfill coverage in this area?
26. Provide clearer aerial photographs of the area surrounding each proposed site.
27. Would Cellco require a diesel storage tank to provide fuel for the proposed back-up generator? How would the storage tank be monitored for leaks? Describe containment for the storage tank in the even of failure.
28. What is the height of the existing CL&P structures located near the proposed sites?
29. Could Cellco provide coverage to the target area by locating antennas on the existing CL&P structures or increasing the height of the existing CL&P structures and locating antennas on them? Identify the circuit line number and voltage level or the transmission line.
30. Page 20 of the application states that proposed Site A and Site B would not be located in flood zone C as designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), please clarify in what FEMA zone each proposed site would be located.

31. Did the Applicants meet with Town of Thompson Officials? Provide the date and names of any officials that attended those meetings.
32. What was the Town of Thompson's response to the proposed project during the municipal consultation period?
33. Would any landscaping be installed at proposed Site A?
34. Could MCF construct a smaller compound at the proposed sites to minimize environmental impact?
35. For the proposed cellular system, provide a forecast of when maximum capacity would be reached for each proposed site.
36. Provide the distance and direction of each existing site listed behind Tab 10 of the application, to each proposed site.
37. Provide the data and formula used in the calculation of the power density for Cellco antennas at the proposed sites.
38. Would Cellco be willing to use a fuel cell at the proposed site?
39. Does Cellco have any plans to install fuel cells at any existing or future sites in Connecticut?
40. Provide a multi-signal level propagation plot (including the signal levels Cellco designs for), at a scale of 1:30,000, depicting coverage from the following:
 - a) existing sites and proposed Site A at an antenna height of 130 feet above ground level.
 - b) existing sites and proposed Site A at an antenna height of 120 feet above ground level.
 - c) existing sites and proposed Site B at an antenna height of 130 feet above ground level.
 - d) existing sites and proposed Site B at an antennas height of 120 feet above ground level.

