



# 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)

### VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

January 12, 2016

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

RE: **DOCKET NO. 464** – Blue Sky 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 at Bridgeport Tax Assessor Map 53, Block 1527, Lot 2, 220 Evergreen Street, Bridgeport, Connecticut.

Dear Attorneys Fisher and Laub:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than February 2, 2016. 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Melanie Bachman".

Melanie Bachman  
Acting Executive Director

MB/MP

c: Parties and Intervenors  
Council Members

**Docket No. 464**  
**Pre-Hearing Questions**  
**January 11, 2016**  
**Set One**

1. 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?
2. According to the Visibility Study under Tab 8 of the Application, Maplewood Annex Elementary School is listed as the closest school to the proposed tower location. Provide the address and direction (e.g. southwest) from the proposed tower.
3. Where is the nearest commercial child day care center from the proposed tower? Provide the address, distance, and direction from the proposed tower.
4. How many residences are located within a 1,000-foot radius of the proposed tower?
5. What is the distance and direction of the nearest residence from the proposed tower?
6. Could the proposed tower be designed with a yield point to ensure that the tower setback radius remains within the boundaries of the subject property?
7. Quantify the amounts of cut and fill (if applicable) that would be required to develop the proposed facility.
8. Sheet A-1 of the Application indicates that the equipment shelter is elevated approximately two feet above grade. Does this result in the equipment shelter being above the 100-year and 500-year flood elevations? Is the proposed tower located within the 500-year flood zone? Is the proposed backup generator located above both the 100-year and 500-year flood zones due to its 38-inch high fuel tank depicted on Sheet A-2?
9. What is the tower design wind speed for this area (Fairfield County)?
10. Sheet A-1 indicates that the antennas would be attached to a platform mount. Would this be a low-profile platform mount?
11. Would flush-mounted antennas or antennas attached to the tower at the proposed height via T-arms provide the required coverage? Would either configuration result in reduced coverage and/or necessitate greater antenna height with multiple levels of antennas? Explain.
12. Would the proposed tower have a grey, galvanized steel finish?
13. Would the tower be expandable in height beyond the originally proposed height?
14. Is Blue Sky Tower's LLC (Blue Sky) lease area generally limited to the fenced compound area?
15. What measures are proposed for the site to ensure security and deter vandalism? (This would include but not be limited to alarms, gates, locks, etc.)

16. Would any access or equipment compound upgrades (such as adding gravel) be required?
17. Would the temporary utility pole noted on Sheet C-3 become permanent?
18. Would any blasting be required to develop the site?
19. Would New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC's (AT&T) equipment shelter have a light fixture installed on the outside wall? What type of lighting would be utilized? When would the light be on?
20. If the Docket No. 464 permanent facility is approved, could the construction details and schedule for the removal of the temporary tower be included with the construction schedule and details for the permanent tower in the Docket No. 464 Development and Management Plan?
21. In lieu of a "search ring" history, approximately what year did AT&T determine a need for a facility in the vicinity of the HI HO structure, and approximately when was AT&T's original HI HO facility constructed and placed "on-air" (e.g. circa 2005)?
22. What was the antenna centerline height of the AT&T HI HO facility and the approximate height of the HI HO structure (if known)?
23. What is the current operational status of AT&T's HI HO facility? Is it currently operational with RF limitations or was it turned off upon installation of the temporary facility? Explain.
24. When was AT&T's temporary facility constructed and placed "on-air"?
25. Could AT&T's RF needs be met by use of multiple small cell facilities as opposed to the proposed facility?
26. Which frequencies are AT&T licensed to utilize in Fairfield County?
27. Would the proposed site be needed for coverage, capacity, or both? Explain.
28. Which frequency band services would AT&T install at the proposed site, e.g. 700 MHz, 850 MHz, 1900 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.
29. Of the adjacent sites listed on page 11 of the Radio Frequency Analysis Report (RF Report), would all of them interact with the proposed tower site to hand off signals? If no, indicate which ones would not interact with the proposed site. If any sites that would interact with the proposed site are not listed, provide them.
30. Are all frequencies used to transmit voice and data?
31. What is the lowest height at which AT&T's antennas could achieve its coverage objectives from the proposed site?
32. Provide the in-building and in-vehicle design signal strengths for AT&T's proposed facility for any frequency bands not included on pages 1 and 2 of the RF Report (e.g. 850 MHz and 2100 MHz) as applicable.

33. What would be the approximate existing signal strength within the area AT&T is seeking to cover from this site assuming that there is no HI HO facility and no temporary facility active?
34. Provide the individual lengths of the existing coverage gaps on State roads that AT&T is seeking to cover from the proposed site at each frequency used by AT&T (assuming that there is no HI HO facility and no temporary facility active). Break this down by street names. (A State road can generally be considered a road with a route number.)
35. Provide the individual lengths of the existing coverage gaps on local roads that AT&T is seeking to cover from the proposed site at each frequency used by AT&T (assuming that there is no HI HO facility and no temporary facility active). Break this down by street names. (A local road can generally be considered a road without a route number.)
36. What is the total (not incremental) predicted coverage footprint from the proposed permanent tower (in square miles), at each frequency to be used by AT&T? Provide such data for the proposed antenna height and ten feet shorter.
37. In the RF Report under Tab 1 of the Application, AT&T included an existing coverage plot with CT5092, an existing coverage plot without CT5092 and an existing and proposed coverage plot for 1900 MHz. Provide similar plots for 700 MHz, 850 MHz, and 2100 MHz, or as applicable.
38. 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, or as applicable.
39. Provide the individual lengths of the coverage that AT&T would provide along State roads from the proposed site at the proposed frequencies, e.g. 700 MHz, 850 MHz, 1900 MHz, or as applicable. Also provide such data assuming that the tower is ten feet shorter. (A State road can generally be considered a road with a route number.)
40. Provide the individual lengths of the coverage that AT&T would provide along local roads from the proposed site at the proposed frequencies, e.g. 700 MHz, 850 MHz, 1900 MHz, or as applicable. Also provide such data assuming that the tower is ten feet shorter. (A local road can generally be considered a road without a route number.)
41. Page 4 of the RF Report provides the population living within the incremental coverage area for 700 MHz and 1900 MHz. Provide similar data for 850 MHz or other frequencies as applicable.
42. Is the Applicant proposing to install a backup 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?
43. What is the size of the diesel backup generator in kilowatts? Provide the estimated run time for the generator based on its fuel tank capacity.
44. 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?

45. Has AT&T considered using a fuel cell as a backup power source for the proposed site? Explain.
46. What size generator 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 City/emergency equipment?
47. What size concrete pad or equivalent would be needed to accommodate a backup generator for AT&T at approximately 50 kW? What size concrete pad or equivalent would be needed to accommodate a shared backup generator at approximately 200 kW?
48. Please provide the cost of an approximately 50 kW backup generator. Please provide the estimated cost of a 200 kW shared backup generator.
49. Will the proposed facility support text-to-911 service? Is additional equipment required for this purpose?
50. Are you aware of any Public Safety Answering Points in the area of the proposed site that are able to accept text-to-911?
51. Identify the safety standards and/or codes by which equipment, machinery, or technology would be used or operated at the proposed facility.
52. Is the proposed site near an "Important Bird Area" as designated by the National Audubon Society?
53. Would AT&T'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?
54. What, if any, stealth tower design options would be feasible to employ at this site?
55. 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 heating/ventilation/air conditioning (HVAC) units attached to the outside of the 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.
56. What is the approximate distance and direction of the nearest off-site wetland?
57. Typical viewshed maps presented to the Council include year-round visibility areas and seasonal (or leaf-off) visibility areas. However, because the proposed tower is located in an industrial zone with a minimal amount of trees in the surrounding areas, is it reasonable to conclude that, generally, there would not be a significant seasonal difference between views of the tower? As such, is the viewshed map approximately accurate for all year?
58. Provide the visibility area (in acres) that is identified in red in the Viewshed Map. Provide the percent visibility area relative to the total 0.5-mile radius study area.
59. Approximately how many residences would have views of the proposed tower and, generally, which streets would they be located on?

60. Are any hiking trails located within a two-mile radius of the proposed tower? If yes, would the tower be visible from such trails?