

# 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

September 17, 2018

Lucia Chiocchio, Esq. Cuddy & Feder, LLP 445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th Floor White Plains, NY 10601

RE: **PETITION NO. 1349** – New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC petition for a declaratory ruling, pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §4-176 and §16-50k, for the proposed extension of an existing wireless telecommunications facility located at 250 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike, Southington, Connecticut.

Dear Attorney Chiocchio:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than October 1, 2018. 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 and in accordance with Section 16-50j-12 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, 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.

Sincerely,

Melanie A. Bachman Executive Director

MB/lm

cc: Council Members



# Petition No. 1349 New Cingular Wireless PCS LLC (AT&T) 250 Meriden-Waterbury Turnpike, Southington Interrogatories September 17, 2018

- 1. Of the letters sent to abutting property owners, how many certified mail receipts were received? If any receipts were not returned, which owners did not receive their notice? Were any additional attempts made to contact those property owners?
- 2. What is the estimated cost of the modification and how does the petitioner intend to recover said cost?

## Site/tower

- 3. What other alternatives were considered? Why were these alternatives rejected?
- 4. Did the petitioner consider the tower farm on West peak or the water tank or adjacent tower east of Village Gate Drive?
- 5. Does the existing tower have a yield point? If so, at what height and sector/direction?
- 6. Has the yield point been considered in the proposed modification request to ensure that the tower setback radius remains within the boundaries of the subject property and if so, what is the conclusion?
- 7. What is AT&T's backup power for the site? For extended commercial power outages what does AT&T plan to do?
- 8. According to Notes on sheet Z-1 in the Site Plans, "the closest residence to the existing tower is ± 10-feet" and "the nearest property line is ± 86-feet", how does this relate to the tower setback, yield point and fall zone.

# Coverage/Capacity

- 9. Does AT&T have any statistics on dropped calls and/or ineffective call attempts in the vicinity of the proposed facility? If so, what do they indicate? Does AT&T have any other indicators of substandard service in this area?
- 10. What is the minimum height that the tower extension could be without compromising AT&T's wireless services?
- 11. How was the height of AT&T's antenna determined? What AT&T coverage objective requires an antenna height of 120-feet?
- 12. Would use of a temporary tower-facility be necessary during construction? If so, could the temporary facility accommodate the equipment of both AT&T and Verizon?

### Environment

- 13. Did the visibility analysis include an assessment from nearby recreational resources, including parks and trails notably the New England Trail, a national scenic trail?
- 14. Identify the nearest Important Bird Area" as designated by the National Audubon Society? Would the proposed project adversely impact such IBA?
- 15. Would AT&T's proposed modified facility comply with recommended guidelines of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for minimizing the potential for telecommunications towers to impact bird species?