



# 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](mailto:siting.council@ct.gov)

Internet: [ct.gov/esc](http://ct.gov/esc)

Daniel F. Caruso  
Chairman

July 11, 2008

Carrie L. Larson, Esq.  
Pullman and Comley, LLC  
90 State House Square  
Hartford, CT 06103-3702  
Attn: Carrie Larson, Esq.

RE: **DOCKET NO. 365** - Optasite Towers LLC and Omnipoint Communications, Inc. application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 39 Maennerchor Avenue, in the Taftville section of Norwich, Connecticut.

Dear Attorney Larson:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than August 5, 2008. To help expedite the Council's review, please file individual responses as soon as they are available.

Please forward an original and 20 copies to this office. 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,



S/Derek Phelps  
Executive Director

SDP/cdm

c: Council Members  
Parties and Intervenors  
Attorney Julie Kohler, Cohen & Wolf



CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL  
Affirmative Action / Equal Opportunity Employer

**Docket 365: Optasite and T-Mobile  
Norwich, Connecticut  
Pre-Hearing Interrogatories, Set One**

Questions for Optasite:

1. How many of the return receipts for the notices sent to abutting landowners did Optasite receive? If some return receipts were not received, did Optasite make other attempts to notify the landowners? If yes, explain.
2. To what engineering standard would the proposed tower be built? What would be the dimensions of the tower (diameter of tower at base; diameter of tower at top)?
3. Who owns the nearest residence to the proposed facility?
4. How much cut and fill would be required to develop the proposed site?
5. Would any blasting be required to develop the site?
6. The application states that Optasite representatives met with the Norwich City Council on August 20, 2008. Should this date be August 20, 2007?
7. What accounts for the seemingly long interval between the date of Optasite's submittal of a technical report to the City of Norwich (June 28, 2007) and its application submittal to the Siting Council (June 11, 2008)?
8. Has Optasite received any written correspondence from the Norwich fire department indicating its interest in locating antennas on the proposed tower? If so, please provide a copy.
9. Has Optasite received any written correspondence from AT&T indicating its interest in locating antennas on the proposed tower? If so, please provide a copy.
10. Would Optasite allow the City of Norwich to place antennas on its proposed tower for no fee, if the City wanted to use the tower?
11. Have any town boards or commissions had any meetings or hearings on these proposed sites? Have any boards or commissions submitted any reports or letters to Optasite regarding its proposal? If so, provide copies of such correspondence.
12. Which party originally initiated a search for a site in this area, Optasite or T-Mobile?
13. When did this site search begin? Where was the site search centered? What was the extent of the search ring? Provide a map, with scale and compass, of search ring.
14. What is the address of the Norwich Fire Department, identified as number 11 in Exhibit H? What kind of tower is at this location?
15. Confirm the addresses, latitude and longitude coordinates, tower heights, and types of existing towers of the sites identified as numbers 12 and 13 in Exhibit H.

Questions for T-Mobile:

16. What would T-Mobile use for back up power?
17. What are T-Mobile's licensed operating frequencies in this part of the state?
18. What is the design signal strength for T-Mobile's system for in-vehicle coverage? For in-building coverage?
19. What is the existing signal strength in the area T-Mobile would serve from this proposed site?
20. What would be the total area T-Mobile could cover from the proposed site?
21. Is Route 97 also a target for coverage from the proposed facility?
22. What is the length of T-Mobile's coverage gap on Route 12 in the vicinity of the proposed facility? On Route 97? On Route 169?
23. What is the distance T-Mobile could cover on State Routes 12, 97, and 169 respectively?
24. Identify, by address, sites with which T-Mobile's antennas at the proposed site would hand off signals – include type and height of structure and height of T-Mobile's antennas on structure.
25. What is the minimum height at which T-Mobile could achieve its coverage objectives from the proposed site?
26. Provide a propagation map, at the same scale as the maps provided in the application, showing what T-Mobile's coverage would be at 10 feet below its antennas' proposed heights at the proposed site.
27. Provide a propagation map showing the full extent of the possible coverage from the proposed site (without showing the coverage from any other sites).
28. Provide a propagation map showing the full extent of the possible coverage from the proposed site combined with the existing coverages from the adjacent sites.
29. What is the approximate cost of the antennas and related equipment that T-Mobile would install at the proposed facility?
30. What height would be required for T-Mobile's antennas to cover its target area from one of the towers at 1 Cuprak Road? If T-Mobile's antennas were located at this height would they create problems in T-Mobile's system in the Norwich area? If so, please explain.

