

2/21/2012

From: Robert and Cathleen Alex
435 Bassett Road
Watertown CT 06795

To: Cuddy & Feder
445 Hamilton Avenue 14th Floor
White Plains NY 10601

Re:Docket 422
AT&T New Cingular Wireless/North Atlantic Tower Application @ 655 Bassett Road, Watertown CT

Supplementary Pre-Hearing Interrogatories

Intervenors Robert and Cathleen Alex respectfully request responses from the applicants AT&T New Cingular Wireless and North Atlantic Towers to the following additional questions:

Q95: Does the adjoining city of Waterbury watershed property contain any Bald Eagle nests?

Q96: How will this proposed tower affect the hundreds of crows who travel through the site twice daily during the winter months?

Q97: What Environmental Impact Studies (EIS) have the applicants done to prove that the EMR from cell towers at the frequencies and power densities proposed will not adversely affect nearby wildlife and plants?

Q98: Will this tower displace predators from my berry fields like hawks, owls, turkey vultures, coyotes, and fox that would then lead to increased populations of mice and voles that damage my crops? Please provide documentation.

Q99: Has North Atlantic Towers contacted other wireless providers to determine their coverage gaps and potential desire to co-locate on this tower?

Q100: Will other wireless providers be able to share a 130' tower and still meet their coverage gaps or will multiple towers be needed to fulfill the needs of multiple carriers?

Q101: Please provide a Signal Degradation Coverage Map for an ATT antenna array located at 127' on a 130' tower (as you proposed to SHPO in letter from SHPO dated January 31, 2012) compared to the original proposal of 147' antenna array on 150' tower. Please also provide a signal degradation coverage map for the lowest platform location proposed at this site for the additional carriers on a 130' tower. Please note the height that lowest carrier antenna array would sit at.

Q102: Do the applicants intend to erect a 130' monopine or a low profile antenna array at the proposed site as indicated in the recent photo simulations the applicants provided to SHPO?

Q103: Was a southern approach access road considered from the Linkfield Road Extension through the Gustafson hayfield and pasture that would meet town codes for road grades?

Q104: How many trees would be removed for an access road if a southern approach through the hayfield/pasture was made in comparison to the applicant's current proposal?

Q105: Is the proposed access road designed to keep construction costs at a minimum? Is this sacrifice of safety and disregard for Watertown Regulation to provide higher profit margins for the Applicants?

Q106: Why was visibility from homes and roads in Thomaston omitted in your Visual Resource Analysis?

Cc: CT Siting Council, 10 Franklin Square, New Britain CT 06051
Paul Jessell, Town Attorney, Slavin Stauffer & Scott LLC, 27 Siemen Company Drive, Suite 300W, Watertown CT