

STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

IN RE: :  
: :  
APPLICATION OF CELLCO PARTNERSHIP : DOCKET NO. 368  
D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS FOR A :  
CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL :  
COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR :  
THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE :  
AND OPERATION OF A WIRELESS :  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY OFF :  
STERLING ROAD (ROUTE 14), :  
PLAINFIELD, CONNECTICUT : DECEMBER 18, 2008

RESPONSES OF CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS  
TO CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL POST-HEARING INTERROGATORIES

On December 3, 2008, the Connecticut Siting Council (“Council”) issued Post-Hearing Interrogatories to the Applicant, Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless (“Cellco”), relating to the above-captioned docket. Below are Cellco’s responses.

Question No. 1

If Cellco were to locate its proposed facility between 200 and 600 feet south of the location identified in its application:

- a. Would the increase in ground elevation allow Cellco to reduce the height of the proposed 160-foot monopole tower and still achieve its coverage objectives from this site? Please provide propagation maps to indicate what Cellco’s coverage would be, at different heights as necessary.
- b. How would such a change in location affect the visibility of the tower within the application’s study area?
- c. Would Cellco’s landlord be amenable to such a change in location?

- d. How would such a change in location affect the engineering of the project?
- e. Would such a change in location be amenable to the tribal entities that are interested in this area of Connecticut?
- f. How many additional trees would need to be removed for a change in location?
- g. Would there be any other significant environment impacts such as wetlands disturbance, encroachment on listed species habitat, etc.?

Response

During the December 2, 2008 public hearing, the Council and Cellco discussed the possibility of relocating the proposed Moosup tower site to the south of the location proposed in the Docket No. 368 application (“Application”). By doing so, the Council suggested that Cellco would be able to take advantage of a higher ground elevation on the property; may be able to reduce the height of the proposed tower; and may be able to reduce the visual impact of the proposed tower.

The alternative location selected and investigated by Cellco’s technical consultants is located approximately 660 feet south of the proposed cell site location. Attached behind Tab 1 is a combination aerial photograph and topographic map showing the location of the proposed and alternative cell site location.

a. The ground elevation at the alternative site location is approximately 513’ above mean sea level (“AMSL”), about 60 feet higher than the ground elevation at the proposed tower location (approximately 454’ AMSL). At the alternative site location, Cellco’s RF engineers determined that it would need an antenna centerline height of 147 feet in order to satisfy its coverage objectives in the Moosup area and provide coverage comparable to that achieved at the 157-foot level on the proposed tower. As discussed in the Application and during the Council’s

public hearing, the primary objective for Cellco's proposed Moosup Facility is to provide PCS and, to a lesser extent, cellular coverage along significant portions of Route 14 between Cellco's existing Sterling and Plainfield North 2 cell sites. By relocating the tower approximately 660 feet to the south, Cellco begins to lose valuable coverage along Route 14 to the west due to shadowing caused by topography in the area of Whitney Hill. (See Application Tab 1, p. 2 – USGS Topographic Map). Attached behind Tab 2 of these responses are coverage maps showing Cellco's PCS and cellular coverage from the proposed alternative cell site location with antennas at a centerline height of 147 feet.

Mounting antennas 10 feet lower, at the 137-foot level at the alternative site location, results in the opening of a PCS coverage gap of approximately 0.15 miles along Route 14 to the west, in the Whitney Hill area. This same coverage gap appeared on the coverage plots prepared in response to Council Interrogatory No. 9, showing PCS coverage from the proposed Moosup cell site at a height of 150 feet (147' centerline), ten feet lower than proposed in the Application. Attached behind Tab 3 are PCS and cellular coverage maps for the alternative location at 137 feet.

- b. See Supplemental Visual Evaluation behind Tab 4.
- c. Cellco has contacted its landlord and was told that the alternative cell site location shown on the map behind Tab 1 and discussed in these responses would be acceptable.
- d. The change in location of the cell site compound to the alternative site location would not have a significant affect on site engineering or construction activity. The increased distance of the cell site south of Sterling Road would result in the need to construct an access road approximately 815 feet longer than that required to access the proposed cell site. As discussed during the December 2, 2008 hearing, the access road to the proposed cell site location