



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

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

May 20, 2015

Daniel M. Laub, Esq.
Christopher B. Fisher, Esq.
Cuddy & Feder LLP
445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th Floor
White Plains, NY 10601

RE: **DOCKET NO. 459** – Message Center Management and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T) application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a telecommunications facility located at Glastonbury Tax Assessor Map E3, Block 0820, Lot E0002, Seven J's Farm, Candlewood Road, Glastonbury, Connecticut.

Dear Attorneys Laub and Fisher:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than June 3, 2015. To help expedite the Council's review, please file individual responses as soon as they are available.

Please forward an original and 15 copies to this office, as well as send a copy via electronic mail. In accordance with the State Solid Waste Management Plan and in accordance with Section 16-50j-12 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies 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.

Copies of your responses shall be provided to all parties and intervenors listed on the service list, which can be found on the Council's pending proceedings website.

Yours very truly,

Melanie Bachman
Acting Executive Director

MB/MP

c: Parties and Intervenors
Council Members

Docket No. 459
Pre-Hearing Questions
May 20, 2015
Set One

1. Did New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T) and Message Center Management, Inc. (MCM) (collectively, the Applicant) have the same search ring? If yes, when was the search ring established? Provide the approximate radius of the search ring for this area. Provide the longitude and latitude coordinates of the center of the search ring. If AT&T and MCM had separate search rings, provide the information requested above for both search rings.
2. Of the letters sent to abutting property owners, how many certified mail receipts were received? If any receipts were not returned, which owners did not receive their notice? Were any additional attempts made to contact those property owners?
3. What type of light fixture(s) would be attached to the outside of AT&T's equipment shelter? When would the light be on?
4. Would any blasting be required to develop the site?
5. Is the proposed site located within a 100-year or 500-year flood zone, or is it located in Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Zone X, an area outside of both flood zones?
6. What measures are proposed for the site to ensure security and deter vandalism? (This would cover alarms, gates, locks, etc.)
7. Is AT&T proposing to install an emergency backup generator (herein after referred to as "generator") only large enough for AT&T's needs at this time? If yes, would the Applicant consider reserving space in the fenced compound for a future shared generator should additional carriers co-locate on the tower?
8. Would the generator run on propane (supplied from the proposed 500-gallon propane tank)? What is the size of the generator in kilowatts? Provide the estimated run time for the generator based on the fuel tank capacity. What type(s) of containment measure(s) would the generator have for oil and/or coolant leakage?
9. Would there be any interruption in service between the time power goes out and the generator comes online? For example, would AT&T provide battery backup to prevent a reboot condition and provide seamless power until the generator starts? If AT&T has a battery backup system, how many hours could it supply power in the event that the generator fails to start?
10. What size generator fuel tank would be necessary to satisfy a potential need for a minimum of 48 hours of runtime for AT&T? What size generator and fuel tank would be needed if two carriers were to share the generator and both required 48 hours of runtime? What if the generator were also shared with Town/emergency equipment?
11. What size concrete pad or equivalent would be needed to accommodate a generator for AT&T approximately 50 kW in capacity? What size concrete pad or equivalent would be needed to accommodate a generator approximately 200 kW in capacity?

12. Please provide the cost of a 50 kW generator. Please provide the cost of a 200 kW shared generator.
13. Has AT&T considered using a fuel cell as an emergency backup power source for the proposed site? Explain.
14. Identify the safety standards and/or codes by which equipment, machinery, or technology would be used or operated at the proposed facility.
15. On page 21 of the Application, the Applicant notes that, if approved, an Eastern Box Turtle Protection Program (EBTPP) can be included in the Development and Management Plan. Provide a summary or draft/preliminary version of the EBTPP.
16. Provide page 5 of the Wetland Investigation report (located behind Tab 6 in the Application) with the scientists' signatures.
17. Provide a Functions and Values assessment of Wetland 1.
18. What is the cumulative noise level that the Applicant expects at the nearest property line from the proposed facility taking into account AT&T's two air conditioning units attached to its equipment shelter? Would the expected noise levels comply with applicable standards? If no, indicate which noise mitigation measure(s) may be employed to ensure compliance.
19. Is the site located within an aquifer protection area?
20. Is EIA/TIA-222 version F (EIA version F) the current mandatory (minimum) standard in Connecticut because the Connecticut State Building Code currently adopts the 2003 International Building Code (2003 IBC) and the 2003 IBC adopts EIA version F? Is Version G (as proposed) more conservative than Version F for this tower such that the proposed tower would comply with both Version G and Version F standards?
21. What is the tower design wind speed for this area (Hartford County)?
22. Would the tower be designed to be expandable in height beyond the originally proposed height? If yes, how many feet would the tower extend to?
23. What type of antenna mounts would be used for AT&T's proposed antennas, e.g. T-arms?
24. Given the taper of the faux tree material, would the top antenna platform (i.e. AT&T's platform) still be sufficiently covered by the faux tree branches? Specifically, how long are the tree branches at the approximately 116-foot level of the tower, and, as a comparison, how far away from the tower do AT&T's antennas and antenna mounts extend?
25. Could the antennas and antenna mounts be painted to blend in with the color of the faux tree branch material?
26. What color options exist for the monopole or "tree trunk?" Is the monopole proposed as a galvanized gray color?
27. What other, if any, stealth tower design options were considered or would be feasible to employ at this site?

28. Would flush-mounted antennas provide the required coverage? Would such configuration result in reduced coverage and/or necessitate greater antenna height with multiple levels of antennas? Explain.
29. Provide a list of frequencies that AT&T is licensed to utilize in Hartford County?
30. Of the existing sites noted on page 9 of the Radio Frequency Analysis Report (RF Report), indicate which ones that the proposed site would interact with to hand off signals. If AT&T's proposed antennas would interact with any other sites not listed, include those also. Also include the tower/structure heights of such facilities and direction (e.g. N, S, NW) from the proposed site.
31. Which frequency band services would AT&T install at the proposed site, e.g. 700 MHz, 850 MHz, 1900 MHz, 2100 MHz, etc.? Would all of these frequencies be provided initially, or would some be provided initially and others deployed in the future at this particular site? Explain.
32. Would the proposed site be needed for coverage, capacity, or both? Explain. If the proposed facility would also provide capacity relief, provide data to support the current capacity issue and demonstrate how the proposed facility would improve capacity in the area.
33. Are all frequencies used to transmit voice and data? Explain.
34. What is the lowest height at which AT&T's antennas could achieve its coverage objectives from the proposed site?
35. What are the signal strengths for which AT&T designs its system for the frequency bands that AT&T seeks to utilize at the proposed site? For in-vehicle coverage? For in-building coverage?
36. What are the existing signal strengths within the area AT&T is seeking to cover for this site for the frequency bands that AT&T would utilize?
37. Does AT&T have any statistics on dropped calls and/or ineffective attempts in the vicinity of the proposed facility? If so, what do they indicate? Does AT&T have any other indicators of substandard service in this area?
38. Provide the individual lengths of the existing coverage gaps on major roads that AT&T is seeking to cover from the proposed site at each frequency band used by AT&T. Break this down by street name and include the town(s) that the streets are located in.
39. Provide the individual lengths of the existing coverage gaps on secondary roads that AT&T is seeking to cover from the proposed site at each frequency band used by AT&T. Break this down by street name and include the town(s) that the streets are located in.
40. What is the predicted coverage footprint from the proposed site (in square miles), at each frequency band used by AT&T? Provide such data for the proposed antenna height and ten feet shorter.
41. In the RF Report under Tab 1 of the Application, AT&T included an existing coverage plot and an existing and proposed coverage plot for 700 MHz and 1900 MHz. Provide similar plots for 850 MHz or 2100 MHz or other frequencies that AT&T would utilize, as applicable.

42. Provide propagation maps showing existing plus proposed coverage at an antenna height that is ten feet shorter than proposed for 700 MHz, 850 MHz, 1900 MHz, 2100 MHz, or as applicable.
43. Provide the individual lengths of the coverage that AT&T would provide along primary roads from the proposed site at the proposed frequencies, e.g. 700 MHz, 850 MHz, 1900 MHz, 2100 MHz, or as applicable. Also provide such data assuming that the tower is ten feet shorter. Break this data down by street name and include the town(s) that the streets are located in.
44. Provide the individual lengths of the coverage that AT&T would provide along secondary roads from the proposed site at the proposed frequencies, e.g. 700 MHz, 850 MHz, 1900 MHz, 2100 MHz, or as applicable. Also provide such data assuming that the tower is ten feet shorter. Break this data down by street name and include the town(s) that the streets are located in.
45. If the worst-case power density analysis under Tab 7 of the Application was performed without the nominal 10 dB off-beam pattern loss, would the total percent maximum permissible exposure be approximately 10 times the 5.59 percent or 55.9 percent?
46. Pages three and five of the RF Report in the Application provide the population living within the existing and incremental coverage areas for 700 MHz and 1900 MHz. Provide similar data for 850 MHz and 2100 MHz or other frequencies, if applicable.
47. Will the proposed facility support text-to-911 service? Is additional equipment required for this purpose?
48. Are you aware of any Public Safety Answering Points in the area of the proposed site that are able to accept text-to-911?