

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL
10 Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051
siting.council@ct.gov

IN RE:

APPLICATION OF NEW CINGULAR
WIRELESS PCS, LLC FOR A
CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL
COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED
FOR THE CONSTRUCTION,
MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF A
TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY AT
95 BALANCE ROCK ROAD, HARTLAND,
CONNECTICUT

DOCKET NO. 408

RECEIVED
FEB - 8 2011
CONNECTICUT
SITING COUNCIL

February 6, 2010

HEIKE KRAULAND'S INTERROGATORIES TO THE APPLICANT

Heike Krauland submits the following interrogatories to the Applicant, New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC:

1. In light of the fact that coverage for the entire eastern portion of Hartland along Route 20 will not be obtained by this cell tower and a portion of the area will still be left without coverage as well as the fact that the area that AT&T is proposing to cover is a desolate stretch of road with no residential or commercial properties and only small areas that are actually open for public use, how is safety and public need met when weighed against the impact on the residential neighborhood, degradation to the pristine ridgeline on a potentially scenic Connecticut highway and disturbance to a DEP listed natural biodiversity area?
2. Please clarify the visibility that will occur from the homes at 88, 72, 64 and 48 Balance Rock Road?
3. How does AT&T plan to address the fact that significantly more than a quarter of the monopole and all the antennas will be 100% visible year round from two abutting neighbors and also from many vista points overlooking the nine mile Barkhamsted Reservoir?

4. How does AT&T plan to address the fact that three of the neighbors will have visibility, screened only seasonally if none of the birch trees with a life expectancy of about 25 years and other select trees doesn't perish?
5. Why were 48, 40 and 38 Balance Rock Road not included in AT&T's visual impact study?
6. Will visibility occur from the yards of 40 and 38 Balance Rock Road?
7. How does AT&T plan to address the impact to residential properties during the construction phase of the monopole and compound as well as during any servicing and maintenance of the compound, given that Balance Rock Road is a small rural road with no outlets?
8. How does AT&T plan maneuver the tractor trailers and other equipment required to bring in the material both at the entrance of Balance Rock Road as well as accessing the property of 95 Balance Rock Road?
9. In the above reference question, will additional trees be removed at the driveway entrance to accommodate the large tractor trailers? Were these included in the tree count?
10. How is AT&T's proposal to erect the monopole and compound at 95 Balance Rock Road consistent with Hartland's 2007 Plan of Conservation, in light of the responses received to the related survey, where 444 of the 894 households surveyed returned the survey and of the 444 responses, 82% indicated that Hartland should pursue a policy of slow or no growth?
11. How is AT&T's proposal to erect the monopole and compound at 95 Balance Rock Road consistent with Hartland's 2007 Plan of Conservation, particularly the first two of the four main objectives and strategies (1. preserve and protect Hartland's rural character and 2). guide and manage conservation and development) given that the proposed tower location will be invasive in a residential area, visible from vista points on a scenic road, implanted in a DEP natural biodiversity site and abutting the Tunxis State Forest on three sides?
12. Will AT&T's proposed location of the monopole and compound comply with the requirement of recently revised regulations, protecting land up to 100 feet from regulated wetlands or watercourses?

13. Why is the drainage conduit located between the existing building and the proposed wireless communication structure on the VBH Wetland Delineation Map not considered to be an intermittent stream, thereby falling within the 100 foot regulated requirement?
14. Why were the studies of the area referenced in the preceding question conducted in October and August, during a drought, rather than during a time of active wetland activity?
15. Will the above referenced studies be conducted again during a time of active wetland activity? If not, please explain.
16. Was the above referenced conduit considered as a possible breeding site for amphibians and reptiles, many of which could potentially be listed as Connecticut species of concern or endangered species? If not, please explain.
17. In light of the fact that much of the abutting "non wetland" area is a disturbed wetland that was filled in years earlier, should this area continue to be degraded?
18. Was soil sampling conducted at the current proposed location and/or at the shooting range itself where concentrations of lead would be highest?
19. Since the proposed location is in a wetlands area with the potential for vernal pools and also abuts Tunxis State Forest thus, providing a potential habitat for many amphibians and fauna listed on the Connecticut Endangered Species List, should not other endangered species in addition to the saw-whet owl be considered as well? If not, please explain.
20. Has archeological testing been conducted for the current proposed and alternate locations?
21. With respect to the Site Search regarding North Hollow Road (Tunxis State Forest), has it been confirmed if this a DEP or DOT property?
22. With respect to the property referenced in the preceding question, what efforts have been taken to determine whether this site is a feasible alternative site for the proposed monopole and compound, in light of the fact that this is already a disturbed site with a State DOT salt shed and wire fence surrounding the compound?
23. With respect to the Site Search regarding the Barkhamsted Reservoir, has the MDC been contacted to determine whether Class I and Class II watershed properties are available as a potential site for the monopole and compound?

24. How does AT&T respond to the OLR Research Report conducted by Kevin E McCarthy, Principal Analyst on December 3, 2010? (A copy has been provided).
25. Has the MDC been contacted to see if there are any existing structures that they would be willing to lease for a telecommunications antenna?
26. Being part of the MDC Watershed, has it been determined what class of watershed 95 Balance Rock Road, East Hartland, CT is?
27. Would the DOT garage on Rte 20 be considered a State Forest or Park?
28. Were any Granville or Tolland, Massachusetts sites investigated, given that they lie well within the 4 mile radius of the proposed coverage area, including the tower under construction on Main Street in Granville, MA and the tower that exists on Wendy Road in Granville, MA? If not, please explain.
29. Were RF tests performed to determine whether height extensions to existing towers mentioned in AT&T's application including site numbers 1167 (tower height 150'); 1170 (tower height 120') and 1272 (tower height 160') would provide cell phone coverage in the Eastern part of Hartland along Route 20?
30. Were discussions held with the First Church regarding the feasibility of concealing a tower within the church steeple? If so, please provide the results of any such discussions.
31. Was any public notice given regarding the August 16th public information session held before the Hartland Planning and Zoning Commission? If not, please explain.

Respectfully submitted,

By Heike Krauland

Heike M. Krauland
64 Balance Rock Road
East Hartland, CT 06027
Tel. (860) 413-9483
Email: heiketavin@yahoo.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 7 day of ~~January~~^{February}, 2011, a copy of the foregoing was

sent, first class U.S. mail, postage prepaid, to:

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

Michele Briggs
AT&T
500 Enterprise Drive
Rocky Hill, CT 06067

David F. Sherwood, Esq.
Moriarty, Paetzold & Sherwood
2230 Main Street, P.O. Box 1420
Glastonbury, CT 06033-6620

Margaret F. Rattigan
Murphy, Laudati, Kiel, Buttler &
Rattigan, LLC
10 Talcott Notch, Suite 210
Farmington, CT 06032


Heike M. Krauland