



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

January 7, 2011

Ms. Sandy Carter
Regulatory Manager
Verizon Wireless
99 East River Drive
East Hartford, CT 06108

RE: **DOCKET NO. 413** - 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 located at 723 Leetes Island Road, Branford, Connecticut.

Dear Ms. Carter:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than February 3, 2011. To help expedite the Council's review, please file individual responses as soon as they are available.

Please forward an original and 20 copies to this office. 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,

Linda Roberts
Executive Director

LR/cdm

c: Kenneth C. Baldwin, Esq., Robinson & Cole
Council Members
Parties and Intervenors

**Docket 413: Cellco
Branford, Connecticut
Pre-Hearing Interrogatories, Set One**

1. Would Cellco's antennas comply with E911 requirements?
2. Identify the adjacent sites with which the proposed site would hand off signals. Include addresses of these sites.
3. What is the lowest height at which Cellco's antennas could achieve its coverage objectives from this site? Submit propagation maps showing the coverage at ten feet below this height.
4. Of the letters sent to abutting property owners, how many certified mail receipts did Cellco receive? If any receipts were not returned, which owners did not receive their notice? Did Cellco make additional attempts to contact those property owners?
5. What is the signal strength for which Cellco designs its system? For in-vehicle coverage? For in-building coverage? Does this signal strength differ according the different frequencies Cellco is licensed to use?
6. What is the existing signal strength in those areas Cellco is seeking to cover from this site? At what frequencies?
7. Does Cellco have any statistics on dropped calls in the vicinity of the proposed facility? If so, what do they indicate? Does Cellco have any other indicators of substandard service in this area?
8. What are the lengths of the respective coverage gaps on Route 146 and along the Amtrak rail line that Cellco is seeking to cover from the proposed site at cellular frequencies? At PCS frequencies?
9. What are the coverage gaps on local streets that Cellco would cover from the proposed site at cellular frequencies? At PCS frequencies?
10. Quantify the amounts of cut and fill that would be required to develop the proposed facility.
11. What was the approximate radius of Cellco's search ring for this area? What was the center of this search ring?
12. Would any blasting be required to develop the site?
13. Has Cellco received any formal, written comments from any of the local governmental or advisory boards and commissions with which it consulted about its planned facility? If so, provide copies of any correspondence.
14. Did representatives of AT&T and T-Mobile attend the October 8, 2010 meeting with town officials?
15. Describe the fuel storage and containment system for Cellco's diesel-fueled generator.

16. How would Cellco mount its antennas to the proposed tower?
17. Would the tower's setback radius encroach on any adjoining properties? If so, state the distance of the encroachment and who owns these properties?
18. Has Cellco received any response to VHB's letter of December 3, 2010 to DEP, regarding the site habitat survey for the roseate tern and the maritime sunflower borer moth , in which it asked for DEP's written opinion regarding the potential of its proposed facility to impact these two listed species?
19. Would Cellco's proposed facility comply with recommended guidelines of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for minimizing the potential for telecommunications towers to impact bird species?
20. Are the diameters at breast height of the ten trees to be removed for the proposed facility greater than six inches?
21. The total estimated cost of Cellco's proposed facility does not equal the sum of the itemized costs listed on page 24 of the application. What is the correct total?