



Daniel F. Caruso  
Chairman

# 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/csc](http://ct.gov/csc)

July 25, 2008

Christopher B. Fisher, Esq.  
Lucia Chiocchio, Esq.  
Cuddy & Feder, LLP  
445 Hamilton Avenue, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
White Plains, NY 10601

RE: **DOCKET NO. 366** - 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 52 Stadley Rough Road in Danbury, Connecticut.

Dear Attorneys Fisher and Chiocchio:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than August 19, 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

**Docket 366: Optasite and T-Mobile  
Danbury, 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. What accounts for the seemingly long interval between the date of Optasite's submittal of a technical report to the City of Danbury (January 31, 2006) and its application submittal to the Siting Council (June 30, 2008)?
3. Which party originally initiated a search for a site in this area, Optasite or T-Mobile?
4. 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.
5. During the site search, did Optasite contact any knowledgeable resource persons other than municipal officials for suggestions for alternate sites?
6. Optasite seems to have originally presented the City of Danbury with plans for a 130-foot tower. What lead to the change to a 140-foot tower?
7. What changes to Optasite's original plans were made in response to City of Danbury's comments?
8. Is the Nabby Road water tower referred to in the Planning Commission's letter the same as the water tank at Sterling Woods Condominiums?
9. Did Optasite investigate the CT DOT garage on Rockwell Road as suggested by the Danbury Planning Commission? If so, what were the results of the investigation?
10. Have either Verizon or Sprint/Nextel indicated the heights they would like to reserve for their antennas and the number of antennas they would like to install on the tower? If so, what are they?
11. How much cut and fill would be required to develop the proposed site?
12. Would any blasting be required to develop the site?

Questions for T-Mobile:

13. What would T-Mobile use for back up power?
14. What are T-Mobile's licensed operating frequencies in this part of the state?

15. What is the design signal strength for T-Mobile's system for in-vehicle coverage? For in-building coverage?
16. What is the existing signal strength in the area T-Mobile would serve from this proposed site?
17. What would be the total area T-Mobile could cover from the proposed site?
18. What is the size of the coverage gap T-Mobile is seeking to cover from this site?
19. 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.
20. What is the minimum height at which T-Mobile could achieve its coverage objectives from the proposed site?
21. 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.
22. What is the approximate cost of the antennas and related equipment that T-Mobile would install at the proposed facility?
23. In addition to extending T-Mobile's coverage, would this site provide capacity relief for any adjacent sites, especially those covering I-84?
24. Would it be possible for T-Mobile to meet its coverage/capacity goals by utilizing additional hardware such as tower mounted amplifiers on existing towers, thereby eliminating the need for a new tower or at least requiring a lower tower?