



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)

Web Site: [portal.ct.gov/csc](http://portal.ct.gov/csc)

**VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL**

March 10, 2023

Kenneth C. Baldwin, Esq.  
Robinson and Cole LLP  
280 Trumbull Street  
Hartford, CT 06103-3597  
[kbaldwin@rc.com](mailto:kbaldwin@rc.com)

RE: **PETITION NO. 1559** – Crown Castle petition for a declaratory ruling, pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §4-176 and §16-50k, for the proposed replacement and extension of an existing telecommunications facility located at 41 Padanaram Road, Danbury, Connecticut.

Dear Attorney Baldwin:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than March 24, 2023.

Please submit an original and 15 copies to the Council's office and an electronic copy to [siting.council@ct.gov](mailto:siting.council@ct.gov). 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 requests 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 24, 2023 deadline.**

Copies of your responses are required to be provided to all parties and intervenors listed in 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/IN/Im

Enclosure: Petition No. 712 Post Construction Report dated May 6, 2006

c: Service List dated February 16, 2023

**Petition No. 1559**  
**Interrogatories to Crown Castle**  
**41 Padanaram Road, Danbury, Connecticut**

**March 10, 2023**

**Notice**

1. Referencing page 7 section B and Attachment 11 of the Petition, has the host property owner and/or any abutting property owners provided comments to Crown Castle (Crown) since the Petition filing? If yes, summarize the comments and how any concerns were addressed.

**Project Development**

2. What is the estimated cost of the proposed project?
3. Is the project, or any portion of the project, proposed to be undertaken by state departments, institutions or agencies, or to be funded in whole or in part by the state through any contract or grant?
4. Provide typical construction workdays and hours, and the anticipated duration of construction.
5. Would T-Mobile install the same equipment on the replacement facility as is installed on the existing facility consistent with T-Mobile's exempt modification request EM-T-Mobile-034-201208.
6. How long will it take to switch over T-Mobile's existing antennas/equipment to the replacement tower? When will the relocated equipment become operational? Will customers experience service outages?
7. Would a temporary tower facility be required to maintain T-Mobile service during the cutover of carrier equipment to the replacement facility?
8. Would there be any interruption in T-Mobile's service during the cutover of its equipment?
9. Referencing page 6 of the Petition, the project would not require notification to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA); however, page 2 of Attachment 10 of the Petition states that notification is required. Please clarify and provide the status of the notification to FAA, if applicable.

**Existing Facility Site**

10. Referencing Attachment 5, Sheet C-2 and Attachment 8 of the Petition, an existing lattice tower is noted. Please clarify.
11. Provide photographs of the existing facility and the proposed replacement facility area. Use stakes to show the limits of the proposed replacement facility area.

12. Provide the number of residences within 1,000 feet of the existing facility site.
13. What is the distance and direction from the existing facility site to the nearest residential property line?
14. When would the existing tower and equipment compound area be decommissioned/dismantled?

### **Proposed Replacement Facility**

15. Page 2 of the Petition indicates that T-Mobile would relocate to the 118-foot level of the replacement tower, however, page 4 of the Petition and Attachment 5, Sheet A-2 and the Radio Frequency Emissions Report indicates that T-Mobile would relocate to the 128-foot level of the replacement tower. Please clarify.
16. What is the distance and direction from the proposed replacement facility site to the nearest residential property line?
17. Would the tower have a galvanized gray finish?
18. Provide the diameter of the proposed tower.
19. What is the maximum number of tenants the replacement tower can support?
20. Have any other carriers, emergency service providers, the City of Danbury or other entities expressed an interest in locating at the proposed replacement facility?
21. Would the tower and foundation be designed to accommodate an increase in tower height?
22. The Connecticut State Building Code was updated effective October 1, 2022. Has the proposed replacement facility been designed to the updated code? If not, what changes are necessary to the design of the replacement facility to comply with the updated code?

### **Public Safety**

23. Referencing Petition, Attachment 5 Sheet C-1 the nearest property boundary is 127-feet northeast of the proposed 145-foot monopole. Could the tower be designed with a yield point to ensure that the tower setback radius remains within the boundaries of the host parcel?
24. Could the construction or operation of the replacement facility impact or interfere with any existing utilities or infrastructure within the project area? If so, identify any measures that would be employed to protect existing utilities or infrastructure from impact or interference.
25. Would the replacement facility comply with Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Noise Control Standards at the property boundaries?
26. What measures are proposed for the site to ensure security and deter vandalism? (Including alarms, gates, locks, anti-climb fence design, etc.)
27. Identify the safety standards and/or codes by which equipment, machinery or technology that would be used or operated at the proposed facility.

## **Backup Power**

28. Could a shared emergency backup generator be installed at the site for the carriers that intend to locate at the replacement facility? If so, what size, type, etc. and how much would it cost?

## **Environmental**

29. How would the existing tower and equipment compound area be restored?
30. Quantify the amounts of cut and fill that would be required to develop the proposed facility.
31. Referencing page 5 of the Petition, clearing and grading is depicted in Attachment 5, Sheet SP-1. Please provide Sheet SP-1.
32. Would E&S controls comply with the *2002 Connecticut Guidelines for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control*?
33. How many trees with a diameter of six inches or greater at breast height would be removed?
34. Identify the nearest "Important Bird Area" as designated by the National Audubon Society?
35. Would the proposed replacement tower comply with the USFWS Recommended Best Practices for Communication Tower Design, Siting, Construction, Operation, Maintenance and Decommissioning? (available at <https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/usfws-communication-tower-guidance.pdf>)
36. What, if any, stealth tower design options would be feasible to employ at this site? Please provide costs related to each stealth tower design.
37. Would visibility of the proposed replacement tower be reduced if it was painted? If so, what colors are available that may reduce visibility? Would Crown be willing to paint the replacement tower and wireless carrier panel antennas/mounting equipment? Provide costs associated with painting.
38. Did Crown consider a wood laminate finish for the proposed replacement facility similar to the finish of the existing tower? If so, provide costs related to this design.
39. The Council's June 10, 2005 Declaratory Ruling and May 8, 2006 Post Construction Report on Petition 712 (attached) indicated year-round views of the 80-foot tower from Route 37 to the west and seasonal views from the condominiums to the south. How many acres of additional visibility would result from the construction of the proposed replacement tower? Characterize the additional visibility from the surrounding area.

## Post-Construction Report

To: S. Derek Phelps, Fred Cunliffe

From: David Martin

Re: **PETITION NO. 712** - Omnipoint Communications, Inc. (T-Mobile USA) petition for a declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the proposed pole replacement and antenna installation at 41 Padanaram Road, Danbury, Connecticut.

Date: May 8, 2006

In this petition, T-Mobile sought to replace a 60-foot wood utility pole with an 80-foot wood laminate pole on which it would mount a platform with 12 antennas. The Council approved this petition on June 8, 2005.

I visited this site on May 5, 2006. My primary concern was to assess its visibility in the surrounding area, especially to the condominiums immediately to the south of the site and the nearest homes in the residential area to the north of the site.

The site itself is near the top of a small hill that rises above Padanaram Road (Route 37) in Danbury. The side of the hill below the tower site is used as a storage yard for a maker of large concrete construction-related products such as drainage pipes and catch basins.

At the time of my visit, construction work related to this site appeared to be complete. The tower was in place. Antennas had been installed (six antennas on T-arm mounts), and the small equipment compound was finished. The access road to the tower was stabilized with stone. Power had not yet been brought to the site as there were no meters on the utility board, and there was a portable generator in place to provide power for the antennas.

From my observations, the site appeared to conform to the plans given to the Council with the petition application.

Because of its relatively low height and the presence of surrounding trees of comparable height, the tower did not have much of a visual presence in the landscape. It was visible for a very short distance on Route 37, but a driver would have to be really looking for it to see it. I drove the nearest street to the north of the site and could not see the tower. I could see the tower, however, from the nearest condominiums to the south of the site. But the intervening trees and the height of the tower made it scarcely noticeable.

**View of Tower**



**Close-up View of Compound**



**View of Tower from Nearest Condominiums to South**

