

KENNETH C. BALDWIN

280 Trumbull Street
Hartford, CT 06103-3597
Main (860) 275-8200
Fax (860) 275-8299
kbaldwin@rc.com
Direct (860) 275-8345

Also admitted in Massachusetts
and New York

August 31, 2023

Via Electronic Mail and Federal Express

Melanie A. Bachman, Esq.
Executive Director/Staff Attorney
Connecticut Siting Council
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051

Re: **Petition No. 1584 - Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless for a Declaratory Ruling on the Need to Obtain a Siting Council Certificate for the Installation of a Wireless Telecommunications Facility at 1212 Main Street, Hartford, Connecticut**

Interrogatory Responses

Dear Attorney Bachman:

On behalf of Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless (“Cellco”), enclosed please find the original and fifteen (15) copies of Cellco’s Responses to Council Interrogatories related to Petition No. 1584. Electronic copies of these responses have also been sent to the Council today.

If you have any questions or need any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Kenneth C. Baldwin

KCB/kia
Enclosure

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

IN RE:	:	
	:	
A PETITION OF CELLCO PARTNERSHIP	:	PETITION NO. 1584
D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS FOR A	:	
DECLARATORY RULING ON THE NEED TO	:	
OBTAIN A SITING COUNCIL CERTIFICATE	:	
FOR THE INSTALLATION OF A WIRELESS	:	
TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY AT	:	
1212 MAIN STREET, HARTFORD,	:	
CONNECTICUT	:	AUGUST 31, 2023

RESPONSES OF CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS TO
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL INTERROGATORIES

On August 15, 2023, the Connecticut Siting Council (“Council”) issued Interrogatories to Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless (“Cellco”), relating to Petition No. 1584. Below are Cellco’s responses.

Notice

Question No. 1

Referencing Petition, Section III-B, p. 4 and Attachments 7 & 8, has the City of Hartford and/or any abutting property owners provided comments to Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless (Cellco) since the Petition filing? If so, please summarize the comments.

Response

No comments have been received from the City of Hartford.

Project Development

Question No. 2

What is the estimated cost of the proposed project?

Response

Cellco estimates the total cost of the proposed facility to be approximately \$285,000.

Question No. 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?

Response

No.

Question No. 4

Is the proposed facility needed for improved coverage, capacity, or both? Explain.

Response

The proposed facility is primarily needed to improve network capacity in the area surrounding the subject parcel.

Question No. 5

What target areas would the proposed facility serve to improve coverage? What target areas and/or adjacent sites would the proposed facility improve capacity and/or provide capacity relief for, if applicable?

Response

The primary target to improve network capacity is the “Dunkin Park” baseball stadium. Dunkin Park, with its seating capacity of 6,121, requires a solution to ensure that patrons attending events at the stadium, as well as the corresponding ingress/egress of patrons, employees, and surrounding businesses, have the necessary network capacity to maintain connectivity and service. The proposed facility helps Cellco meet these objectives.

In addition to Dunkin Park, the wireless facility will provide enhance coverage to the commercial, residential, and institutional uses in the area and provide improved service along Main Street, Albany Avenue (Route 44), Windsor Street and Trumbull Street, as well as portions of I-84 and I-91.

Question No. 6

Provide typical construction workdays and hours, and the anticipated duration of construction.

Response

Cellco anticipates that construction would occur between 7 a.m. and 4 p.m. Monday through Friday. Construction of the Hartford YG facility should take approximately eight (8) weeks.

Public Safety

Question No. 7

Provide the distance, direction, and elevation above ground level to the nearest publicly accessible area from the proposed antennas. What is the far-field percentage maximum permissible exposure (%MPE) value at the nearest publicly accessible area?

Response

The nearest publicly accessible area to the proposed facility would be the sidewalk directly in front of the antennas and directly in front of the 1212 Main Street building. The distance to this point is the same as the antenna centerline height (84.8 feet AGL). The % MPE at this location is 4.51%.

Question No. 8

Provide the distance, direction, and elevation above ground level of the nearest residence on the host parcel from the proposed antennas. What is the far-field % MPE value at the nearest residence?

Response

The nearest residence to the proposed facility would be the apartment directly below each sector's antennas. The floor of this apartment is approximately 19 feet below the antennas. The worst case % MPE at this location is 47.4%.

Question No. 9

Provide the distance, direction, and elevation above ground level of the Millennium residential building from the proposed antennas. What is the far-field %MPE value at the Millennium building?

Response

The sector nearest to the Millennium Building is the Beta Sector. The nearest portion of the Millennium residential building to this sector would be a location at a distance of 220 feet from the proposed Beta sector antennas at a bearing of 83 degrees (True North) and at the same height above ground level as the antennas. The % MPE at this location is 4.65%

Question No. 10

Would the proposed equipment installation be capable of supporting text-to-911 service and comply with federal E911 requirements and the Warning, Alert and Response Network Act of 2006?

Response

Yes.

Question No. 11

What measures are proposed for the site to ensure security and deter vandalism?
(Including alarms, gates, locks, etc.) Is the host building rooftop accessible to the public?

Response

The portion of the building roof where the antennas would be located is not accessible to the public or residents of the Pennant at North Crossing apartment building. Cellco's equipment on the fourth level of the parking garage would be surrounded by a security fence and locked gate. The equipment and battery cabinets are also equipped with intrusion alarms which are monitored remotely by Cellco cell site technicians.

Question No. 12

Identify the safety standards and/or codes by which equipment, machinery or technology that would be used or operated at the proposed facility.

Response

- 2021 International Building Code (IBC), with the 2022 Connecticut State Building Code amendments.
- National Electric Code (NFPA 70).
- 2021 International Mechanical Code, with the 2022 Connecticut State Building Code amendments.
- 2022 Connecticut State Fire Safety Code.
- ANSI/TIA-222-H "Structural Standard for Antenna Supporting Structures and Antennas and Small Wind Turbine Support Structures"

- Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA).

Backup Power

Question No. 13

Does the building have a backup power source? If yes, does Cellco intend to connect to it? If so, identify the backup power source and where it is located.

Response

The Pennant at North Crossing building does not maintain a backup generator on site. Because the facility is primarily a capacity site Cellco's sole source of backup power will be the battery cabinet which will be installed in the fenced equipment area.

Question No. 14

Referencing Petition, Attachment 4, Structural Analysis Report, Appurtenance Configuration, a battery cabinet is included. How long could Cellco's proposed battery backup supply power to the facility?

Response

Depending upon load, Cellco's backup battery cabinet could provide power to the proposed facility for up to eight (8) hours.

Question No. 15

If the duration of a power outage exceeds the battery's capacity, would a temporary generator be brought to the site?

- a. If yes, what would be the fuel source?
- b. Provide the location of the generator hookup.

Response

Because the facility at the Property is primarily a capacity site, Cellco would not bring in temporary backup power to the facility nor is it planning to provide an external generator hookup

at the site.

Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Question No. 16

What, if any, stealth antenna design options were discussed with the City? Would any stealth design options be feasible to employ at this site? Provide costs related to each stealth design.

Response

No stealth design options were discussed with the landlord or the City. The only feasible stealth design option for the proposed facility would involve the installation of RF transparent screening panels around the antenna mounting structures. The installation of screening panels would add significantly to wind loading and could result in structural issues for the building roof and the antenna mounting structure. The addition of screening panels would also add a minimum of \$30,000 to the overall project cost.