STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

RE: APPLICATION BY T-MOBILE NORTHEAST LLC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR A TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY AT 158 EDISON ROAD IN THE TOWN OF TRUMBULL, CONNECTICUT

DOCKET NO. 421

Date: February 28, 2012

OBJECTION TO WRITTEN CROSS-EXAMINATION REGARDING SUPPLEMENTAL PRE-FILED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL LIBERTINE

The Applicant, T-Mobile Northeast LLC ("T-Mobile"), respectfully submits this Objection to the Written Cross-Examination Regarding Supplemental Pre-Filed Testimony of Michael Libertine, filed by the Intervenor, Citizens Against Trumbull Tower ("CATT"), dated February 21, 2012. T-Mobile objects only to Questions 11 and 12.

These questions address T-Mobile's coverage assessment. They are as follows:

> 11. Was tree height considered or inputted into the modeling software for the coverage modeling performed by T-Mobile for its coverage objectives?
>
> 12. What tree height was used in the coverage modeling for T-Mobile's coverage map and why?

T-Mobile's objection rests on four grounds. First, the questions were to be limited to Mr. Libertine's supplemental pre-filed testimony, dated January 31, 2012. That testimony addressed updated photographic simulations of the proposed telecommunications facility at 158 Edison Road, Trumbull, Connecticut ("Facility"). Thus, CATT's inquiry was to be limited to visibility. *(See Connecticut Siting Council Memorandum, dated February 9, 2012; February 7, 2012 Transcript, pp. 4-9.)* Questions regarding T-Mobile's coverage assessment fall well outside the Council's instructions.

Second, CATT had ample opportunity to question and did question T-Mobile about its coverage assessment. T-Mobile responded to detailed interrogatories regarding coverage. Additionally, Scott Heffernan, T-Mobile's Radio Frequency Engineer, was present and subject to cross-examination over several hearing dates.

Third, the components of T-Mobile's coverage assessment are irrelevant to the subject of visibility. The irrelevancy is more pronounced since T-Mobile provided in its Application the average tree height used in assessing the potential visual impact of the proposed Facility. Mr. Libertine reiterates this information in response to Questions 9 and 10 of CATT's written cross-examination.

Finally, Questions 11 and 12 implicate T-Mobile's clutter model. T-Mobile's clutter model is proprietary information – information T-Mobile maintains as proprietary. This is a position T-Mobile and other wireless providers have assumed in other dockets (see Docket 413).

WHEREFORE, T-Mobile respectfully objects to Questions 11 and 12 of the Written Cross-Examination Regarding Supplemental Pre-Filed Testimony of Michael Libertine.

Respectfully Submitted,

T-MOBILE NORTHEAST LLC

By: 

Julie D. Kohler, Esq.
Cohen and Wolf, P.C.
1115 Broad Street
Bridgeport, CT 06604
Tel. (203) 368-0211
Fax (203) 394-9901
jkohler@cohenandwolf.com
jlanger@cohenandwolf.com

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that on this day a copy of the foregoing was delivered by Electronic Mail and regular mail, postage prepaid, to all parties and intervenors of record, as follows:

Keith R. Ainsworth, Esq.
Evans Feldman & Ainsworth, L.L.C.
261 Bradley Street
P.O. Box 1694
New Haven, CT 06507-1694
(Via Email: krainsworth@snet.net***)***

Julie D. Kohler