

O'CONNELL, FLAHERTY & ATTMORE, L.L.C.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
280 TRUMBULL STREET
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06103-3598
TELEPHONE (860) 548-1300
FACSIMILE (860) 548-0023

GREGORY W. PIECUCH, Esq.
E-Mail: GPiecuch@OFALAW.COM

OTHER OFFICES

1350 MAIN STREET, SPRINGFIELD, MA 01103
22 MAIN STREET, MOOSUP, CT 06354
50 NEWTOWN ROAD, DANBURY, CT 06810
65 LASALLE ROAD, WEST HARTFORD, CT 06107

May 15, 2006

VIA HAND DELIVERY

David Martin, Siting Analyst
Connecticut Siting Council
Ten Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051

RE: T-Mobile Petition # 764;
CL&P Tower at 437 Hobart Street, Southington, Connecticut

Dear Mr. Martin:

I write in response to two issues that were raised by you and Mr. Wilensky during the May 12, 2006, site walk for the above-referenced petition. The first issue concerned the screening of the compound. The second issue concerned the selection of which transmission tower would be used to mount the wireless telecommunications equipment. Each issue will briefly be addressed in turn.

With regard to the screening, it appears that the topography and existing vegetation already provides a significant amount of screening. In addition, however, you have suggested that a stockade fence, as opposed to the chain link fence shown on the plans. T-Mobile gladly agrees to this proposed change, and would welcome this modification being listed as a condition of approval of the Petition.

As for the question of which transmission tower is used, my client notes that the ultimate choice of tower rests squarely with CL&P. Christine Farrell has informed me that T-Mobile did explore the idea of using one of the more southerly towers with CL&P. However, according to Ms. Farrell, CL&P had a number of concerns with these towers. First, access to the southerly sites presents more of a challenge, given the lack of an existing access road, as well as the wooden fence currently running along Hobart Street. Second, CL&P strives to provide wireless telecommunications carriers with the least amount of access to their properties. A several hundred-foot easement to the south would be significantly more than the roughly thirty-foot easement to the proposed tower. Finally, the proposed tower sits at a higher elevation than those further to the south. As a result, a higher extension to a southerly tower would be needed to achieve the same coverage. In short, T-Mobile actively explored using one of the more southerly towers, but for the foregoing reasons, CL&P only granted permission to use the tower shown on the Petition. As a result, T-Mobile is unable to move the proposal to a more southerly tower.

O'CONNELL, FLAHERTY & ATTMORE, L.L.C.

David Martin, Siting Analyst

May 15, 2006

Page 2

I hope this letter clarifies these issues. Please feel free to contact me if you have any further questions or concerns regarding this Petition.

Yours Truly,

**O'CONNELL, FLAHERTY
& ATTMORE, LLC**



Gregory W. Piecuch, Esq.

GWP/