



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

May 16, 2017

Daniel M. Laub, Esq.
Cuddy + Feder LLP
445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th Floor
White Plains, NY 10601

RE: **PETITION NO. 1300** - New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T) petition for a declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the proposed replacement and relocation of an existing rooftop telecommunications facility installed at the front of the building with a new rooftop telecommunications facility to be installed at the rear of the building located at 1 Circular Avenue, Hamden, Connecticut.

Dear Attorney Laub:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than May 30, 2017. 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.

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.

Yours very truly,

Melanie A. Bachman
Executive Director

MB/MP/lm

c: Council Members

Petition No. 1300
Interrogatories
May 16, 2017
Set One

1. How was the existing facility approved, e.g. approved by the Town of Hamden (Town)? Were there any conditions on the Town approval?
2. Explain why New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T) is proposing to relocate the existing flagpole facility.
3. Is the new antenna and equipment configuration designed to improve AT&T's coverage and/or capacity from this site? If yes, for which frequency bands would the coverage and/or capacity be improved? Would only 1900 MHz be deployed at this site?
4. If the project is approved, would the existing facility be left in place until the new facility is operational? If yes, would that affect the Structural Analysis Report dated March 31, 2017 (SAR) or the capacity of what the building can support?
5. The SAR and AT&T Drawing A-4 show the proposed antennas as Kathrein No. 80010798. The RF Site Compliance Report dated March 8, 2017 shows Quintel No. QS66512-3 antennas. Explain the discrepancy. For example, are the Kathrein antennas proposed, but the Quintel antennas are functionally equivalent for the purposes of RF power density analysis?
6. At 2421 watts effective radiated power (ERP) for one sector, 1900 MHz frequency and an antenna centerline height of 39 feet above ground level, would the maximum worst-case power density at ground level be about 57.3 percent of the Maximum Permissible Exposure for public/uncontrolled access or (equivalently) about 5.73 percent with a 10-dB reduction?
7. Where would the "new stealth chimney" referenced on Page 2, Section IV of the Petition be located?
8. Page 2 of Petition notes that no Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) lighting or marking of AT&T's installation is required. Is it also correct to say that no notice to the FAA would be required?
9. Would the modified facility have battery backup? If yes, about how long could the battery backup supply power to the facility in the event of a power outage?
10. Would the relocated facility's equipment continue to meet the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection's noise control standards at the property boundaries?