



# 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](mailto:siting.council@ct.gov)

[www.ct.gov/csc](http://www.ct.gov/csc)

January 26, 2012

TO: Parties and Intervenors  
Council Members

FROM: Linda Roberts, Executive Director *L. Roberts*

RE: **DOCKET NO. 423** – North Atlantic Towers, LLC, and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC Application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a telecommunications facility located off of Route 198, Woodstock, Connecticut.

---

At the public hearing of the Connecticut Siting Council (Council) on January 9, 2012, the Council requested that the Applicants provide responses to the following "homework assignments." Please provide responses to the following no later than February 23, 2012:

1. Please provide a radiofrequency propagation map showing potential coverage from a site at 279 Route 198, owned by the Connecticut Department of Transportation, as listed as #7 behind Tab 2 of the application.
2. Is there Town of Woodstock-owned property located on Parker Road? If so, has the Applicant contacted the Town regarding the potential for negotiation of a lease on that property? Please provide a radiofrequency propagation map showing potential coverage that property.
3. Please provide a radiofrequency propagation map showing potential coverage from the proposed site at a height of 110 feet above ground level using the same parameters as shown in the application.
4. Please provide the wetlands report that was previously done at the proposed property.
5. Please provide photosimulations of other simulated tree design options and indicate the manufacturer of each.
6. What is the cost difference of overhead versus underground utilities to the proposed facility?
7. Please confirm the length of time that the proposed backup power generator would provide power to the proposed site.
8. Please quantify how much of the proposed tower would be visible from each photosimulation location at 150 feet and 110 feet.
9. Does the National Park Service have any prohibitions on new manmade structures within Heritage areas?
10. Please provide calculations of the sound level for the proposed generator at the nearest property boundaries to the east and south, and at the nearest residence to the proposed facility.



11. What is the status of AT&T's antenna on the existing 87 West Quassett Road tower? What is the type and height of the antenna? Does AT&T expect that this tower will be removed in the near future?
12. Would AT&T co-locate on the recently approved Verizon tower to be located at 87 West Quassett Road? If so, at what height?
13. Does NAT have an alternate access road for the proposed site? If so, please provide detailed site drawings of the alternate access road.
14. Did the Applicant or its representatives correspond with the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) regarding potential for Endangered, Threatened or Special Concern Species located on the host property? Please provide DEEP's response to such correspondence.
15. Please confirm the balloon flight information provided at the day of the hearing for the balloon that was to be located at the proposed site. Including where it was located, what height it reached, how long the balloon was at the intended height, weather conditions, etc.

In addition, please respond to the following questions:

16. When was a wetland delineation of the host property performed?
17. Why were no numbered wetland flags in place during the January 10, 2012 field review?
18. Please provide the names and qualifications of the individuals that performed the wetland delineation.
19. Was the wetland delineation performed in accordance with both Connecticut and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers accepted methodologies?
20. Do any intermittent watercourses exist on host property?
21. Were soil maps, vegetation surveys, or hydrology investigations generated to perform the wetland delineations? If so, could they be provided?
22. Was any wildlife habitat, wetland functions and values analysis or wetland impact assessments performed at the site?
23. What type and quality of aquatic resources does the watercourse associated with the wetland at the site sustain?
24. Are any vernal pools or amphibian breeding areas located within the wetland corridor at the site?
25. What is the square footage of inland wetland and watercourses that will be impacted temporarily or permanently by the proposed access road crossing?
26. What construction activities would occur within the inland wetland and watercourses at the site?

27. Would there be any seasonal restrictions on construction activities associated with construction of the proposed project?
28. Would there be any significant long term adverse impacts to the inland wetland and watercourses at the site?
29. What is the total acreage of new land disturbance (including temporary and permanent) that would be required for the construction of the access road and compound?
30. Would installing utilities underground to the proposed site increase or decrease land disturbance at the site?
31. The site plans in the application show runoff from the access road would be directed to stone berm level spreaders. Would runoff be directed to swales along the road prior to being discharged at the level spreaders? If so, please show locations and channel lining on appropriate plan sheets. Would the swale design conform to the detail on page Z9 of the current plans? Would the swales impact any historic stone walls?
32. Would the proposed compound, access road and associated stormwater management features alter local drainage patterns? Would peak runoff rates increase at design storm flows at the property line?
33. Would emergency vehicles be able to traverse the proposed access road?
34. Please provide a Viewshed Analysis map showing year-round and seasonal visibility areas for both a 150-foot tower and a 110-foot tower at the proposed site. Please estimate the number of acres within the 2-mile study area from which the proposed 150-foot and 110-foot tower would be visible year-round and seasonally.
35. Would the proposed tower, at 110 feet and 150 feet, visually affect any important cultural and environmental resources located within the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor?
36. From how many photograph locations provided in the supplemental visibility analysis that show a 150-foot tower visible at the proposed site, would a 110-foot tower not be visible. Please provide a list with the photograph location numbers and addresses.
37. Please confirm which sites listed in the Existing Tower List behind Tab 2 of the application AT&T is currently located on. What is the height of AT&T's antennas at each of these sites?
38. What is the threshold at which the Applicant would need an air permit from DEEP for the operation of the proposed backup generator? Why would the proposed generator not require an air permit? Would this be in accordance with the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies § 22a-174-3.
39. Does AT&T have statistics about the existing dropped call rate in the area for which coverage would be provided by the proposed site? What dropped call rate would trigger the need for an establishment of a new facility?

40. What is the length of the existing coverage gaps along the main roads in the project area assuming that AT&T antennas are located on all facilities for which it has approval?
41. What is the coverage footprint in square miles the proposed site would provide at 147 feet at each frequency AT&T would use in the area of the proposed site? At 107 feet?
42. Please provide a radiofrequency propagation map showing potential coverage from the proposed site at a height of 100 feet above ground level using the same parameters as shown in the application.