



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

www.ct.gov/csc

September 28, 2012

Kenneth C. Baldwin, Esq.
Robinson & Cole LLP
280 Trumbull Street
Hartford, CT 06103-3597

RE: **DOCKET NO. 430** – 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 77 Milford Street, Burlington, Connecticut.

Dear Attorney Baldwin:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than October 19, 2012. Please forward an original and 15 copies to this office and a .pdf file. 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

c: Council Members
Parties and Intervenors
Sandy Carter, Cellco Partnership (via e-mail)

DOCKET NO. 430 – BURLINGTON

**CELLCO PARTNERSHIP d/b/a VERIZON WIRELESS
PRE-HEARING INTERROGATORIES**

1. Did Cellco receive return receipts for all adjacent landowners listed in Application Attachment 4? If not, describe any additional effort to serve notice.
2. In regards to notice of the application to abutters, Properties 4 and 5 in Attachment 4 are not shown on the abutters map C-1.0. Additionally, Sixteen Acres LLC is shown on map C-1.0- was notice given? Please explain.
3. In regards to Figure 2 and map C-1.1, would there be any benefit to reducing visibility by relocating the tower site approximately 100 feet to the east so that the tower is south/southeast of the small band of trees along the road. Would this location reduce visibility of the tower as shown in Photos 3, 4, 6 & 7 of the visibility analysis? If there is a benefit, would Cellco and the landowner consider this location as an alternate?
4. MapC-3, detail 1, specifies a Geo-Grid TX-160 road. Is this type of construction necessary for slopes at the site?
5. Was the Class III watershed land south of Rock Road considered for a tower facility? If so, what height was considered and why was it rejected?
6. What is the signal level threshold used to develop the coverage models in Application Attachment 6? What is Cellco's minimum signal level threshold for the proposed coverage area? Does the minimum signal strength differ according the different frequencies Cellco is licensed to use?
7. What is the current signal strength in the proposed coverage area? Did Cellco use any other data besides signal levels to determine inadequate service with the proposed coverage area? If so, please identify the data and explain how it was used.
8. What would be the effect of reducing the height of the tower by ten feet in terms of handoff and/or coverage?
9. What tower height would be required to meet coverage objectives if internal or external flush-mount antennas are used (Application p. 17).
10. Identify the safety standards and/or codes by which equipment, machinery, or technology would be used or operated at the proposed facility.
11. How many hours of run time would the generator have based on its fuel tank capacity? Has Cellco considered using a fuel cell as a backup power source for the proposed facility? Explain.
12. During construction of the site, does Cellco anticipate the use of a generator as a temporary power source for cell site operation until permanent electrical service is provided?
13. Would blasting be required to develop the site?
14. In regards to the avian resource evaluation in Application Attachment 15, please expand on USFWS- Item 4 given that a wetland area is located west and south of the site.
15. What is the tower design wind speed for this area (Hartford County)?