



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
Web Site: portal.ct.gov/csc

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

October 25, 2023

Daniel Patrick, Esq.
Lucia Chiocchio, Esq.
Cuddy & Feder, LLP
445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th Floor
White Plains, NY 10601
dpatrick@cuddyfeder.com
lchiocchio@cuddyfeder.com

RE: **PETITION NO. 1590** – TowerNorth Development, LLC and New Cingular Wireless, PCS d/b/a AT&T petition for a declaratory ruling, pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §4-176 and §16-50k, for the proposed replacement of an existing municipal communications tower located at 13 Pomeroy Avenue, Meriden, Connecticut. **Council Interrogatories to Petitioners.**

Dear Attorneys Patrick & Chiocchio:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than November 8, 2023. Please submit an original and 15 copies to the Council's office and an electronic copy to 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 November 8, 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 A. Bachman
Executive Director

MB/ANM/dll

Petition No. 1590
TowerNorth Development, LLC and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC
13 Pomeroy Avenue
Meriden, Connecticut

Interrogatories
October 25, 2023

Notice

1. Referencing Section V, p. 5 and Attachment 9 of the Petition, has the City of Meriden (City) and/or any abutting property owners provided comments to TowerNorth Development LLC (TowerNorth) or New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T) since the Petition filing? If so, please summarize the comments.

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?

Existing Rooftop Non-Tower Antenna Array

4. When was AT&T's non-tower antenna array installed on the roof of the Comfort Inn & Suites at 900 East Main Street?
5. What is the centerline height of the AT&T antennas on the roof of 900 East Main Street?
6. Who approved the AT&T installation on the roof of 900 East Main Street?
7. What equipment is installed and what services are provided from the rooftop site?
8. What modifications has AT&T implemented at the rooftop site since it was approved?
9. What structural modifications would be required if the property owner of 900 East Main Street was willing to complete them?
10. Would AT&T's existing equipment at 900 East Main Street be removed immediately upon operation of the proposed facility?
11. Would a temporary tower facility be required to maintain AT&T and City of Meriden service during the cutover of equipment to the replacement facility?

Existing Municipal Tower Site

12. What is the height of the existing self-supporting lattice tower?
13. When was the existing tower constructed?

14. Provide photographs of the existing facility and the proposed replacement facility area. Use stakes to show the limits of the replacement facility area.
15. If the replacement facility were to be of the same lattice design as the existing tower, what height would be required for AT&T and the City of Meriden to meet service objectives and approximately how much would it cost?
16. When the existing tower is decommissioned and removed, will the existing tower foundation remain? Explain.
17. What is the nearest distance of the existing tower site to the wetland to the west?
18. Would the existing tower and compound be removed upon construction and operation of the proposed facility? When?

Proposed Replacement Facility

19. Provide typical construction workdays and hours, and the anticipated duration of construction.
20. Will excavation and/or filling be required to accommodate the facility?
21. Would the tower and foundation be designed to accommodate an increase in tower height?
22. What is the maximum number of tenants the tower can support?
23. Have any carriers expressed an interest in locating on the proposed facility?
24. Referring to Petition page 2, the fenced equipment compound would be 1,684 square feet. According to Sheet Z-1 of the site plan provided in Petition Attachment 2, the fenced compound dimensions would be 24 feet by 50 feet (1,200 square feet). Sheet Z-2 provided in Petition Attachment 2 shows the fenced compound as a 25-foot by 50-foot (1,250 square feet) area. Please clarify.
25. What type of antennas and equipment would be installed by the City? What would be the maximum height above ground level at the top of the City's antennas?
26. Would the City's ground equipment be located within the proposed fenced compound?
27. Referencing Petition page 2, would AT&T's collocation on the proposed replacement facility provide 5G service?
28. Referencing Petition Attachment 7, approximately how much larger is the coverage area of the replacement facility compared to the existing rooftop installation?
29. Approximately when was the search ring established for the AT&T installation?
30. Were other potential sites considered for the proposed AT&T installation? If so, please identify the other potential sites and why they were rejected.
31. Referring to Petition Attachment 2, Sheet Z-1, a retaining wall is proposed along the edge of the parking lot east of the site. Would that retaining wall be constructed as part of this project? What is the proposed length of the retaining wall? What is the purpose of the retaining wall?

32. How many parking spaces would be eliminated? Would additional parking spaces be installed on the parcel?

Public Safety

33. Could the construction or operation of the proposed 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.
34. Identify the safety standards and/or codes by which equipment, machinery or technology that would be used or operated at the proposed facility.
35. 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 of 2006?
36. What measures are proposed for the site to ensure security and deter vandalism? (Including alarms, gates, locks, etc.)
37. Would any lighting be installed at the site? If so, what would it be used for? Would it be on all the time, have a motion sensor or work on a preset timer?
38. Provide a far-field radio frequency power density analysis that includes the City's antennas.
39. Would the facility comply with Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Noise Control Standards at the property boundaries?
40. Referring to Petition Attachment 5, a tower extending to a height of 154 feet above ground level was considered for the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) determination. If the City's antennas exceed a height of 154 feet above ground level, would a new FAA determination be required?
41. What is the distance from the proposed tower to the Interstate 91/Route 15 off ramp?
42. Would the proposed tower be constructed with a yield point to ensure the tower setback radius remains within the property boundaries? If so, at what height would the yield point be installed?
43. What is the distance from the proposed tower to the existing fire department building?
44. Referring to Petition Attachment 2, Sheet Z-3, bollard detail is provided. Where would bollards be installed?

Emergency Backup Power

45. Could AT&T install a propane-fueled emergency backup generator given the proximity to wetlands?
46. AT&T's emergency backup power source is described as a 15kW diesel generator:
- Would the backup generator run periodically for maintenance purposes? If so, at what frequency and duration? Would this be scheduled for daytime hours?
 - Would the backup generator have containment measures to protect against fluid leakage?
 - What would be the fuel tank capacity and how often would refueling be required?

- d. How long would the generator be capable of powering the facility with the fuel tank at maximum capacity?
47. Would battery backup power be installed? How long would a battery backup alone supply power to the facility?

Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

48. What is the nearest distance of the proposed site/limits of disturbance to the wetland to the west? What type of wetland is located here? (e.g. stream, highway drainage)
49. Provide a detailed site plan showing erosion and sediment control measures.
50. Could the proposed facility be moved to increase the distance to the adjacent wetland?
51. Referring to Petition page 3, provide the best management practices that would be employed during construction.
52. What is the total limit of disturbance for the proposed replacement facility and the decommissioning of the existing facility?
53. Referring to Petition page 3, no trees would be removed for the construction of the proposed facility. However, Sheet Z-1 shows an existing tree to be removed. Please clarify.
54. Referencing Attachment 4 of the Petition, Viewshed Map, describe the change in visibility, if any, of the proposed replacement facility versus the existing tower in the surrounding area.
55. What, if any, stealth tower design options would be feasible to employ at this site? Please provide costs related to each stealth tower design.
56. Would visibility of the proposed replacement tower be reduced if it was painted? If so, what colors are available that may reduce visibility? Would Petitioners be willing to paint the replacement tower and wireless carrier panel antennas/mounting equipment?
57. Identify the nearest "Important Bird Area" as designated by the National Audubon Society?
58. 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-towerguidance.pdf>)