



# 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

March 6, 2020

Lucia Chiocchio, Esq.  
Daniel Patrick, Esq.  
Cuddy & Feder, LLP  
445 Hamilton Avenue, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
White Plains, NY 10601

RE: **DOCKET NO. 487** – Homeland Towers, LLC and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC d/b/a AT&T application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 183 Soundview Lane, New Canaan, Connecticut.

Dear Attorneys Chiocchio and Patrick:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than March 27, 2020. 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.

**Please be advised that the original and 15 copies are required to be submitted to the Council's office on or before the March 27, 2020 deadline.**

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 website under the "Pending Matters" link.

Any request for an extension of time to submit responses to interrogatories shall be submitted to the Council in writing pursuant to §16-50j-22a of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies.

Sincerely,

Melanie Bachman  
Executive Director

MB/MP

c: Parties and Intervenors



**Docket No. 487**  
**Pre-Hearing Questions**  
**March 6, 2020**  
**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. Please provide proof of notice to the Western Connecticut Council of Governments.
3. Referencing page 7 of Homeland Towers, LLC (Homeland) and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T) (collectively, the Applicants) Application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need (Application), it states, "Pursuant to C.G.S. 16-50l (b), notice of the Applicant's intent to submit this application was published on two occasions in The New Canaan Advertiser...The original affidavits of publication will be provided to the Siting Council once received from the publisher." Please provide the affidavits.
4. Referencing Tab 2 of the Application, Site Search Summary, Site Alternative O, did Saint Luke's School indicate why it did not wish to pursue a lease with Homeland?
5. How is the cost of the tower construction recovered?

**Site/tower**

6. Would any blasting be required to develop the site?
7. Referencing Tab 4 of the Application, Drawing VB102, Note 6, it states, "The project area is in Zone X (unshaded)." Is unshaded Zone X an area outside of both the 100-year and 500-year flood zones?
8. Referencing Tab 4 of the Application, Sheet CP-1, the proposed facility would have triple T-arm mounts on the tower. What is the structural design standard applicable to such antenna mounts?
9. Would the tower and foundation be designed to accommodate an increase in tower height?
10. What measures are proposed for the site to ensure security and deter vandalism?
11. Identify the safety standards and/or codes by which equipment, machinery or technology that would be used or operated at the proposed facility
12. Does the proposed site contain any Connecticut Prime Farmland and/or Important Agricultural Soils? If so, what acreage of prime farmland and important soils would the facility and associated equipment be located on and what is the total acreages of prime farmland and important soils on the subject property.

### **Coverage/Capacity**

13. Page 14 of the Application notes that, "Closing the coverage gaps and providing reliable wireless services in northeastern New Canaan requires a tower site that can provide reliable service over a footprint that spans several hundred square-feet." Under Tab 1 of the Application, Radio Frequency Analysis Report (RF Report), page 5, the Applicants note that the incremental coverage from the proposed facility would be 0.89 square miles and 2.37 square miles for 700 MHz at different signal strengths. (Emphasis added.) Please reconcile.
14. Referencing Tab 1 of the Application, RF Report, Attachment 2 – Neighboring Site Data, identify which sites that the proposed facility would hand off signals with. Indicate the structure types, e.g. tower, building mount.
15. Would the proposed facility be needed for capacity as well as coverage? Explain.
16. Would AT&T provide service via 700 MHz, 850 MHz, 1900 MHz, and 2100 MHz frequency bands? Are all frequencies used to transmit voice and data?
17. What is the lowest height at which AT&T's antennas could achieve its wireless service objectives from the proposed site?
18. Referencing Tab 1 of the Application, RF Report, pages 3 and 5, provide tables for the 850 MHz, 1900 MHz, and 2100 MHz frequencies similar to the 700 MHz Tables 1 and 2.
19. 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?
20. What was the approximate size of the Applicants' search area in the vicinity of the proposed site?
21. Have any other wireless carriers expressed an interest in co-locating on the proposed facility to date? Has the host municipality expressed an interest in co-locating emergency services antennas?

### **Backup power**

22. Would the backup generator have containment measures to protect against fluid leakage?
23. Could the proposed generator be shared by other carriers that may locate at the proposed facility? What effect would a shared generator have on the run time of the generator if at full load?
24. Would a battery backup (if applicable) be used to provide uninterrupted power and prevent a reboot condition? How long could the battery backup alone supply power to the facility in the event that the generator fails to start?
25. Would the backup generator run periodically for maintenance purposes? If so, at what frequency and duration? Would this be scheduled for daytime hours?
26. Would the backup generator be managed to comply with Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies Section 22a-174-3b?

### **Public Safety**

27. Will the proposed facility support text-to-911 service? Is additional equipment required for this purpose?
28. Would AT&T's installation comply with the intent of the Warning, Alert and Response Network Act of 2006?

### **Environment**

29. Referencing page 17 of the Application and Tab 8 – Visual Assessment, Conclusions, the Applicants note that the approximately 25 acres of predicted year-round views of the facility from John D. Milne Lake is about 55 percent of the total year-round predicted visibility. However, the Viewshed Analysis Map notes that the total predicted year-round visibility area is approximately 35 acres. Thus, would the predicted year-round visibility over John D. Milne Lake comprise roughly 71 percent of total predicted year-round visibility?
30. What, if any, other stealth tower design options would be feasible to employ at this site? Please provide applicability and costs related to each stealth tower design.
31. Referencing page 19 of the Application, the Applicants note, "Furthermore, the proposed Facility will neither create nor emit any...noise...other than those created by any heating and ventilation equipment or generators installed by carriers." Would the proposed facility comply with Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) Noise Control Standards at the property boundaries?
32. While the proposed backup generator would be exempt from DEEP Noise Control Standards, estimate the projected sound levels at the abutting property lines taking into account the proposed sound attenuation blankets noted on Sheet C-1 under Tab 4 of the Application. Would the sound attenuation blankets be located inside the proposed fence compound for aesthetics?
33. Have the Applicants received a response from the State Historic Preservation Office regarding the Phase 1B Report?