



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

www.ct.gov/csc

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

July 14, 2015

Christopher B. Fisher, Esq.
Cuddy & Feder, LLP
445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th Floor
White Plains, NY 10601

RE: **PETITION NO. 1169** – Blue Sky Towers, LLC and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC petition for a declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the proposed installation of a temporary telecommunications facility to be located at 220 Evergreen Street, Bridgeport, Connecticut.

Dear Attorney Fisher:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than July 28, 2015. 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 a copy via electronic mail. In accordance with the State Solid Waste Management Plan, 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.

Yours very truly,

Melanie A. Bachman
Acting Executive Director

MB/MP/lm

c: Council Members

Petition No. 1169
Blue Sky Towers, LLC and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC
Interrogatories - Set One

1. Have Blue Sky Towers, LLC (Blue Sky) and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T) (collectively the Petitioner) considered locating the proposed temporary tower on the same subject property as the existing HI HO coal silo facility at 370 North Avenue, Bridgeport? Did AT&T consider co-locating on any other existing structures in the area? Explain.
2. Would the existing AT&T facility at HI HO remain on-air until a repair (necessitating climbing the structure) is necessary and then shut down, or would it be turned off when the temporary facility is activated?
3. Have any existing carriers on the HI HO facility expressed an interest in re-locating to the temporary facility at this time?
4. Approximately how long would the temporary tower be in place?
5. Is the proposed temporary tower site being considered as a potential permanent site?
6. How long would it take to construct the temporary site and provide wireless service?
7. Would AT&T have backup power at the site such as battery backup or a backup generator? How many hours of run time would be provided?
8. Is the shaded FEMA Zone X a 500-year flood zone, or is it outside the 500-year flood zone?
9. Is the temporary facility and associated equipment expected to meet applicable noise standards at the property lines?
10. Would the tower be visible from any historic properties on the National Register of Historic Places?
11. Would the proposed temporary tower utilize existing access to the subject property or would new access be constructed? Explain.