

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

IN RE:

APPLICATION OF NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS,
LLC (AT&T) FOR A CERTIFICATE OF
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC
NEED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE
AND OPERATION OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS
TOWER FACILITY IN ROXBURY, CONNECTICUT

DOCKET NO. 428

September 11, 2012

RESPONSES TO TOWN OF ROXBURY'S PRE-HEARING QUESTIONS SET ONE

- Q1. What tower and building construction techniques will be designed to specifically minimize adverse effects on natural areas and sensitive areas?
- A1. *To protect nearby wetlands during construction, all appropriate sediment and erosion control measures will be designed and employed in accordance with the 2002 Connecticut Guidelines For Soil Erosion and Sediment Control. Soil erosion control measures and other best management practices will be established and maintained throughout the construction of the proposed facility. The Contractor shall be responsible for the proper installation and daily inspection of erosion and sedimentation controls throughout the duration of the construction project and until disturbed areas are permanently stabilized with vegetation or engineering controls. In addition to the Contractor being responsible for the proper installation and daily inspection of erosion and sedimentation (E&S) controls, an independent Project Erosion and Sedimentation Control Monitor will inspect E&S controls and document their condition and recommend any actions necessary to bring the controls back into compliance. The Project Erosion and Sedimentation Control Monitor shall inspect erosion and sedimentation controls once per 7 days and after significant rainfall events of greater than one half inch over a 24-hour period to ensure that proper precautions are taken to avoid the release of sediment into nearby resource areas. The Contractor shall implement any recommendations or corrective actions within 24 hours of receipt of the notice.*
- Q2. How will the tower sit with respect to the ridgeline and what steps are being taken to protect the ridgeline where it will be located?
- A2. *For both Candidates the proposed compound would be located below the respective heights of land associated with each ridge such that no physical disturbances to the ridgelines would be anticipated. The placement of the facility below the top of the hill protects the existing tree line along the ridge. There are a few locations where the tower would be seen extending above the ridgeline tree canopy, as documented in the Application (Attachments 3(C) and 4(C)); in the case of either Candidate, these limited views are at distances of a mile and beyond.*
- Q3. Why can't the applicant co-locate its antennas and other equipment on the Town's tower site as do other providers?

- A3. *AT&T already maintains and operates an existing facility on the tower located at the Town transfer station. See, Docket 428 Administrative Notice item 20 S-CING-120-010227 - SNET Cellular LLC request for an order to approve tower sharing at an existing telecommunications facility located at Lower County Road, Roxbury, Connecticut. Please also see Table 4 included in AT&T's Application Attachment 1.*
- Q4. Describe the specific efforts made to share existing towers, including but not limited to installations on electric transmission poles, or to consolidate telecommunications antennas; please include a detailed engineering discussion evaluating the feasibility of using the Town of Roxbury's tower on the Roxbury Transfer Station site or any other existing Tower in the general area.
- A4. *AT&T's review and investigation of the area revealed no existing towers which could serve the area of need. See, Application Attachment 2 Site Search. As noted in A3 above, AT&T operates and maintains a facility at the tower at the transfer station located on Lower County Road. Existing coverage from the Transfer Station site is depicted in Maps 1, 2 and 3 of the Radio Frequency Engineering Report included in Attachment 1.*
- Q5. Provide a list of all currently shared telecommunication facilities in Roxbury and in neighboring towns to Roxbury.
- A5. *Please see Table 4 in Application Attachment 1.*
- Q6. Can the tower location for either alternative site be shifted to reduce the visibility from scenic roads in the area? If so, please describe or diagram such a proposal.
- A6. *For Site A, the only potential scenic road would be Flagg Swamp Road and no visibility would occur along this road. For Site B, the Visual Study in the Application does depict a short area along Grassy Hill Road where year-round visibility would occur at a distance of about a mile away. No additional scenic roads are expected to have views of the tower. A shift in location would not dramatically change the views from this area.*
- Q7. Please provide a technical engineering analysis of why repeaters on one or more sites cannot be used to provide Adequate Coverage in the area covered by this application?
- A7. *A cellular repeater is a device used for boosting the cell phone reception to the local area by the usage of a reception antenna, a signal amplifier and an internal rebroadcast antenna. Repeaters are intended for serving a discrete area or a single building. The area of need is large and requires a macro cell solution which cannot be served by a solution such as repeaters.*
- Q8. What assurance, including bonding/security, will be offered to guaranty the implementation and maintenance of the driveway serving the tower site?
- A8. *The site is visited at least once per month by a technician. Maintenance and repair is conducted on an as needed basis.*
- Q9. Identify the properties that were investigated for the use of repeaters? What was the response of the owners?
- A9. *Repeaters are insufficient to service the area of need.*

- Q10. Was there consideration of clustering or reconfiguring of tower(s) to avoid a new tower location? If not, what is the technical reason why not? If yes, please describe in detail.
- A10. *Clustering a new tower with an existing tower was not considered. Reconfiguration of existing towers would not be able to provide the additional coverage needed.*
- Q11 (8).¹ Were silos, steeples, tall barns, water towers, poles, and similar tall structures in the subject area inventoried/investigated to determine the feasibility of using those sites for repeaters or similar purpose technology? If not, why not? If so, please provide the results of that investigation. Who was contacted and which properties were considered?
- A11(8). *A review of the site search is included in Attachment 2 of the Application. Repeaters, as noted in A7 and A9, were not considered viable technological options for the area which AT&T seeks to serve.*
- Q12(9). Can the tower be lower than 170' and provide service for Applicant? For 3 co-location providers?
- A12(9). *The coverage begins to degrade at lower heights of 160' and 150' as modeled. Overall, the coverage footprints are relatively similar. AT&T cannot attest to the radio frequency needs of other carriers in the market as they maintain different networks and have separate frequencies from AT&T.*
- Q13(10). Has the applicant consulted with other companies who will share space on the proposed new tower? How many providers are anticipated to share the tower? If so, which companies and what agreements are in place (subject to CSC approval)?
- A13(10). *AT&T has received no official communication in this regard.*
- Q14.(11) Why are competitor providers able to provide Adequate Coverage or at least commercially acceptable coverage in Roxbury, but the Applicant is not? How can the site search area be redrawn to facilitate the use of the existing Town tower on Lower County Road alone or in combination with other sites?
- A14(11). *AT&T cannot attest to the quality or type of service of other carriers in the market and indeed there are no facts or evidence in this Docket regarding the coverage of other carriers nor the adequacy of their coverage. As noted in other answers in these interrogatories the site at Lower County Road is being utilized.*
- Q15(12). Identify the sites currently used and/or under contract for use by applicant for telecommunications of the "fifteen (15) existing telecommunications facilities in Roxbury, Southbury and Woodbury" referenced in the application materials. Which of these sites does AT&T currently use (if this information is already provided, please direct us to that information?) Which of these sites will be used in the future? Which will be dropped if this application is approved? Are there any additional sites to add to this list? Which sites "outside of the site search area" either alone or in combination could provide reliable coverage to the area identified (by tower or repeaters) in this Application?

¹ Please note the numbers in parentheses are as in the original.

- A15(12). *For a list of facilities please see Radio Frequency Engineering Report included in the Application as Attachment 1. The proposed facility is designed to be a part of AT&T's network in this area and no sites will be "dropped" if this Application is approved.*
- Q16(13). Why would either church at the corner of state highway 67 and state highway 172 not be feasible for installation of repeaters/antennas to provide reliable coverage to the area identified in this Application?
- A16(13). *Please see Application Attachment 2 regarding AT&T's review of this site. As noted, repeaters are not an option which will provide adequate service to the area of need.*
- Q17(14). Is the Applicant willing to stipulate to an equipment shelter design, color and landscaping, that is in keeping with a residential neighborhood in Roxbury (pitched roof, color and landscaping near the fence to blend the shelter and other equipment with the external environment.) Will a generator be mandated at the site?
- A17(14). *AT&T has in the past included Facility designs including solid (slat) fencing, landscaping and different types of shelters. Of note, if slat fencing and landscaping is implemented, visibility of compound components including shelters, would be obscured. A backup generator is proposed to be installed at an approved Candidate site.*
- Q18(15). Please provide a visibility study including the most vulnerable locations along the scenic roads named in the Visibility Studies included in the Application.
- A18(15). *The Visibility Study in the Application encompasses a study area two miles in diameter so is inclusive of all roads and lands within that study area.*
- Q19(16). The visibility studies indicate that the tower will be seen from the Bronson Conservation Subdivision and from other roads that Roxbury has designated as Scenic Roads pursuant to Connecticut Gen. Stat. § 7 – 149a and the Town's ordinances. A photograph provided by the Applicant illustrates a substantial visual impact. What plans are there to mitigate this impact?
- A19(16). *While it is anticipated that views of the tower could be achieved from portions of the Bronson Conservation Subdivision, as represented in photo number 9 in the Application (Attachment 3(C)), the topography and existing trees limit these primarily seasonal views to the general area near the end of the road at its cul-de-sac. Further, even in "leaf-off" conditions, the tree mast is sufficiently dense to obscure large portions of the facility from these locations. Painting the monopole brown and affixing T-arms (in lieu of full platforms) could soften near-view visibility through the trees.*
- Q20(17). If the existing town-owned tower at the transfer station on Lower County Road is not feasible for the Applicant to provide coverage or shared coverage with other tower(s) antenna locations, then what technical changes could be made to make that tower feasible?
- A20(17). *No technical changes to the existing facility would provide coverage to the area of need to the south.*
- Q21(18). The applicant is requested to provide evidence that it has exhausted all technologically feasible improvements to allow co-location on the shared tower of the Town or other

shared Tower(s); if there are any available alternatives not previously described, please so describe.

A21(18). *AT&T maintains or operates a facility on all available towers in the area including the tower at Lower County Road which is on Town-owned property.*

Q22(19). Please indicate the possible locations for a tower or other facility within the Town or Towns that is/are primarily receiving service from the proposed Facility.

A22(19). *No additional towers beyond the two candidate facilities in this Docket are proposed within the area targeted for service.*

Q23(20). What impact does the minimum lot size in Residential Zone C in Roxbury have on the estimate of the number of persons to be served in Roxbury by the proposed facilities; how many Roxbury and total households will be served base on the 2008 census? What is the area in square miles for each town other than Roxbury served by the proposed tower covered by this Application? What is the number of persons and households for each town other than Roxbury served by the proposed tower covered by this Application? How many current customers does Applicant have within the service area proposed? How many new customers does it expect?

A23(20). *Predicted population coverage utilizing 2008 Census Block data is included in Application Attachment 1. A breakdown of coverage area and persons/households in adjoining municipalities is not available at this time. Information regarding current customers is information confidential to AT&T as are any market analyses.*

Q24(21). What accommodation is the applicant willing to make to camouflage the tower (other than simulated trees that do not reflect the area), lower the tower height, or other adjustments to provide the maximum protection of the region's vistas?

A24(21). *It is agreed that a simulated tree or monopine type facility would be out of context. While certain closer views of the tower benefit from a brown colored monopole more distant views might not. T-Arm mounts could lessen the silhouette of the facility above the tree line. As noted in the Application, there are only a limited number of locations where either facility would be seen above the tree line and these locations are all a mile or more distant from those view points.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this day, a copy of the foregoing was sent electronically and by overnight mail to the Connecticut Siting Council with copy to:

John W. Knuff, Esq.
Hurwitz, Zagarin, Slossberg & Knuff, LLC
P.O. Box 112
Milford, CT 06460
203 877 8000
JKnuff@hssklaw.com

Barbara Henry
First Selectman
29 North Street
P.O. Box 203
Roxbury, CT 06783
860 354 9938
bhenry@roxburyct.com

Paul R. Jessel, Esq.
Slavin, Stauffacher & Scott, LLC
27 Siemon Company Drive, Suite 300W
Watertown, CT 06795
(860)-274-2511
pjessell@sssattorneys.com

Gerald Stomski
First Selectman
Town of Woodbury
281 Main Street South
PO Box 369
Woodbury, CT 06798
wdbysel@woodburyct.org

Dated: September 11, 2012


Daniel M. Laub