



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)  
[www.ct.gov/csc](http://www.ct.gov/csc)

January 15, 2010

Julie D. Kohler, Esq.  
Monte E. Frank, Esq.  
Jesse A. Langer, Esq.  
Cohen and Wolf, P.C.  
1115 Broad Street  
Bridgeport, CT 06604


RE: **DOCKET NO. 391** - T-Mobile Northeast, LLC application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunications facility located 232 Shore Drive, Old Lyme, Connecticut.

Dear Attorneys Kohler, Frank, and Langer:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than January 28, 2009. 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. 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. A list of parties and intervenors dated December 23, 2009, is enclosed. Fewer copies of bulk material may be provided as appropriate.

Yours very truly,



S. Derek Phelps  
Executive Director

SDP/MP

c: Council Members  
Parties and Intervenors

**Docket No. 391**  
**Pre-Hearing Questions**  
**Set Two**

1. T-Mobile Northeast, LLC's (T-Mobile) response to the Connecticut Siting Council's (Council) interrogatory number eight indicated that T-Mobile's equipment would cost approximately \$23,000. Break down that total into two costs: antennas and radio equipment.
2. T-Mobile's response to Council interrogatory number 11 indicated that a second antenna ten feet higher would be required for a flush-mounted configuration. Approximately how many antennas would be located on each level if two levels were required for a flush-mounted configuration?
3. T-Mobile's response to Council interrogatory number 18 indicated that the proposed SBA facility on Cross Lane could provide adequate coverage to T-Mobile's target area. If T-Mobile were to co-locate at the Cross Lane site to provide coverage, at what height would T-Mobile locate its antennas? Provide existing and proposed coverage plots assuming that T-Mobile co-located at the SBA site at that height. Also, include the lengths of proposed coverage to the roads and rail lines that T-Mobile would seek to cover from such site.
4. Under Exhibit/Tab I of T-Mobile's application to the Council, T-Mobile lists all existing telecommunications towers within four miles of the proposed facility. Indicate which of the facilities T-Mobile is already co-located on and which ones T-Mobile is not on but would not provide adequate coverage to the target area.
5. Under Exhibit/Tab Q of the application, EBI Consulting indicated that four attempts were made to contact the Narragansett Tribe. What was the outcome of the consultation with the Narragansett Tribe regarding the proposed facility?