



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

IN RE:

APPLICATION OF OPTASITE TOWERS LLC
AND OMNIPOINT COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL
COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR
THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND
OPERATION OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS
FACILITY AT 93 LAKE STREET
MANCHESTER, CONNECTICUT

DOCKET NO. _____

Date: November 1, 2007

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED**

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL**

IN RE:

APPLICATION OF OPTASITE TOWERS LLC
AND OMNIPOINT COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL
COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR
THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND
OPERATION OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS
FACILITY AT 93 LAKE STREET
MANCHESTER, CONNECTICUT

DOCKET NO. _____

Date: November 1, 2007

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED**

I. Introduction

A. Purpose and Authority

Pursuant to Chapter 277a, Sections 16-50g *et seq.* of the Connecticut General Statutes ("CGS"), as amended, and Sections 16-50j-1 *et seq.* of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies ("RCSA"), as amended, Optasite Towers LLC ("Optasite") and Omnipoint Communications, Inc., a subsidiary of T-Mobile USA, Inc. ("T-Mobile") (collectively the "Co-Applicants") hereby submit an application and supporting documentation (collectively, the "Application") for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a wireless communications facility (the "Facility") in the Town of Manchester. The proposed Facility is a necessary component in the network plan of T-Mobile to provide personal wireless communications services in the State of Connecticut and Hartford County. The proposed Facility will provide service in the Town of Manchester and particularly along Route 6, Route 44 and in adjacent areas.

B. Executive Summary

The proposed Facility will consist of a 110 foot, self-supporting monopole, antennas, associated equipment and other site improvements integral to a wireless communications facility. Optasite identified the property owned by Alan C. Rossetto, located at 93 Lake Street (the "Property") for the construction and operation of its proposed Facility. The Property consists of 23.4 acres and is currently developed with a residence and associated garage and pool. A majority of the 23.4 acre parcel is wooded. The Property is located in the RR residential zone.

The leased area is located in the western portion of the Property. A copy of Optasite's Notice of Lease is attached hereto as Exhibit A. Optasite proposes to install a monopole with appurtenances extending to approximately 110 feet in height and an equipment shelter at grade within a 70 foot by 70 foot fenced equipment compound (the "Site"). Vehicular access to the facility would extend from Lake Street over a separate parcel also owned by Mr. Rossetto utilizing a proposed gravel driveway to the Site. Underground utility connections would also extend from existing service on Lake Street to the Site.

The monopole and compound area will be designed to accommodate use by all of the wireless carriers active in Connecticut and the Manchester public safety communications, if requested. T-Mobile has committed to locating at the Site and will serve as the anchor tenant. The compound will be enclosed by an 8-foot high security fence. T-Mobile's equipment would be monitored 24 hours a day, 7 days a week from a remote location.

Included in this Application and the exhibits attached hereto, are survey-based plans, attached hereto as Exhibit B, and other information detailing the Facility proposed

at the Site and potential environmental impacts associated therewith. The Applicants respectfully submit that the reports and other supporting documentation included in this Application contain relevant site specific information as required by Statute and the regulations of the Connecticut Siting Council (the "Siting Council" or "Council"). A copy of the Council's Community Antenna Television and Telecommunication Facilities Application Guide with page references from this Application is also included in Exhibit C.

C. The Applicants

The Co-Applicant Optasite is a Delaware limited liability company with offices at One Research Drive, Suite 200C, Westborough, Massachusetts 01581. Optasite will construct and maintain the proposed Facility. The Co-Applicant T-Mobile is a Delaware corporation with a Connecticut office at 35 Griffin Road South, Bloomfield, Connecticut, 06002. The company and its affiliated entities are licensed by the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") to construct and operate a personal wireless services system in Connecticut, which has been interpreted as a "cellular system" within the meaning of CGS Section 16-50i(a)(6). T-Mobile does not conduct any other business in the State of Connecticut other than the provision of cellular services under FCC rules and regulations. T-Mobile is committed to use the proposed Facility as the anchor tenant.

Correspondence and/or communications regarding this Application shall be addressed to the attorneys for the applicants:

Cohen and Wolf, P.C.
1115 Broad Street
Bridgeport, CT 06604
Attention: Julie Kohler, Esq.
Carrie L. Larson, Esq.

D. Application Fee

Pursuant to RCSA Section 16-50v-1a(b), a check made payable to the Siting Council in the amount of \$1,000.00 accompanies this Application. The estimated total construction cost is \$179,000.00. As such, the applicable application fee is \$1,000.00 in accordance with RCSA Section 16-50v-1a(b).

E. Compliance with CGS Section 16-50/(c)

Neither Optasite nor T-Mobile is engaged in generating electric power in the State of Connecticut. As such, the proposed Facility is not subject to CGS Section 16-50r. The proposed Facility has not been identified in any annual forecast reports. As such, the proposed Facility is not subject to CGS Section 16-50/(c).

II. Service and Notice Required by CGS Section 16-50/(b)

Pursuant to CGS Section 16-50/(b), copies of this Application have been sent by certified mail, return receipt requested, to municipal, regional, State, and Federal officials. A certificate of service, along with a list of the parties served with a copy of the Application is included in Exhibit D. Pursuant to CGS 16-50/(b), notice of the Applicants' intent to submit this application was published on two occasions in The Hartford Courant, on Saturday, October 27, 2007 and Tuesday, October 30, 2007 and in The Journal Inquirer on Friday, October 26, 2007 and Monday, October 29, 2007. Copies of the published legal notices are included in Exhibit E. The publisher's affidavit of service will be forwarded upon receipt. Further, in compliance with CGS 16-50/(b), notices were sent to each person appearing of record as owner of a property which abuts the Site. Certification of such notice, a sample notice letter, and the list of property owners to whom the notice was mailed are included in Exhibit F.

III. Statements of Need and Benefits

A. Statement of Need

As the Council is aware, the United States Congress, through adoption of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, recognized the important public need for high quality telecommunication services throughout the United States. The purpose of the Telecommunication Act's overhaul of the Communications Act of 1934 was to "provide for a competitive, deregulatory national policy framework designed to accelerate rapidly private sector deployment of advanced telecommunications and information technologies to all Americans." H.R. Conf. Rep. No. 104-458, 206, 104th Cong., Sess. 1 (1996). With respect to wireless communications services, the Telecommunications Act of 1996 expressly preserved State and/or local land use authority over wireless facilities, placed several requirements and legal limitations on the exercise of such authority and preempted State or local regulatory oversight in the area of emissions as more fully set forth in 47 U.S.C. § 332(c)(7). In essence, Congress struck a balance between legitimate areas of State and/or local regulatory control over wireless infrastructure and the public's interest in its timely deployment to meet the public need for wireless services.

The Facility proposed in this Application is an integral component of T-Mobile's wireless network in this area of the State of Connecticut. Currently, a gap in coverage exists in T-Mobile's network in the Manchester area, specifically along Route 6 and Route 44 and the surrounding areas. The proposed Facility, in conjunction with other existing and future facilities in Manchester and surrounding towns, is needed by T-Mobile to provide its wireless services to people living in and traveling through this area of the State.

T-Mobile's specific need for the proposed Facility is detailed in the propagation plots which identify T-Mobile's specific need for this Facility in the Manchester area attached hereto as Exhibit G. Based on the location of the proposed Facility and the lack of coverage in this area, Optasite cannot readily predict a point in time at which the Facility might reach maximum capacity.

B. Statement of Benefits

T-Mobile is a leading provider of advanced wireless voice and data services throughout the United States with over 20 million subscribers. T-Mobile and its corporate predecessors constructed one of the first wireless networks in Connecticut and is actively involved today in the deployment of next generation wireless services. Over the past two decades, T-Mobile has seen the public's demand for traditional cellular telephone services in a highly mobile environment migrate to a demand for anytime-anywhere wireless connectivity with the ability to send and receive voice, text, image and video. People today are using their wireless devices more and more as their primary form of communication for both personal and business needs. Modern devices allow for calls to be made, the internet to be reached and other services to be provided irrespective of whether a user is mobile or stationary and provided network service is available.

Wireless devices have become integral to the telecommunications needs of the public and their benefits can no longer be considered a luxury. Indeed, in an effort to ensure the benefits of wireless technologies to all Americans, Congress enacted the Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999 (the "911 Act"). The purpose of this legislation was to promote public safety through the deployment of a seamless, nationwide emergency communications infrastructure that includes wireless communications services. In enacting the 911 Act, Congress found that networks that

would provide for the rapid, efficient deployment of emergency services would enable faster delivery of emergency care with reduced fatalities and severity of injuries. With each year since passage of the 911 Act, additional anecdotal evidence supports the public safety value of improved wireless communications in aiding lost, ill or injured individuals such as motorists, hikers and boaters.

As an outgrowth of the 911 Act, the FCC mandated wireless carriers, such as T-Mobile, to provide enhanced 911 services (“E911”) as part of their communications networks. These services ultimately allow 911 public safety dispatchers to identify a wireless caller’s geographical location within several hundred feet. T-Mobile has deployed and continues to deploy network technologies to implement the FCC’s E911 mandates. The proposed Facility in Manchester will become an integral component of T-Mobile’s E911 network in this area of the state. These factors will apply equally to other wireless carriers as they expand their service in the Manchester area through the proposed Facility.

C. Technological Alternatives

The FCC licenses granted to T-Mobile and other wireless carriers authorize them to provide cellular and PCS services in this area of the State through deployment of a network of wireless transmitting sites. The proposed Facility is a necessary component of T-Mobile’s wireless network. The proposed Facility will also allow other wireless carriers to provide services in this area.

Repeaters, microcell transmitters, distributed antenna systems and other types of transmitting technologies are not a practicable or feasible means to providing service within the sizeable coverage gap in this area. Significant terrain variations and tree cover in Manchester and the surrounding area, as well as other practical considerations limit

the use of such technologies. As such, they are not an alternative to the proposed Facility. The Applicants submit that there are no equally effective technological alternatives to construction of a new tower Facility for providing reliable personal wireless services in this area of Connecticut.

IV. Site Selection and Tower Sharing

A. Site Selection

Optasite conducted the site search for this Facility in this area of Manchester. A search area is an area where a coverage and/or capacity problem exists within a carrier's network and where a new wireless facility is needed to provide service to the public. In general, wireless carriers and developers attempt to identify any existing towers or other structures of adequate height in a site search area and the surrounding environs which might accommodate the height and structural requirements for a wireless facility. There are no existing towers or other tall structures within approximately four miles of the proposed site sufficient for the operations of T-Mobile and no wireless facilities exist in this area of Manchester.¹

Initially, both individual carriers and Optasite seek to identify any existing towers or other structures of adequate height in a site search area and the surrounding environs that may accommodate a wireless facility. Optasite identified seventeen (17) towers, either existing or proposed, within approximately 4 miles of the site search area. All are shown in the table of "Surrounding Site Information" included in Exhibit H as well as plotted on a topographical map also included in Exhibit H.

¹ This includes a tower located at 12 Carpenter Road in Bolton that was recently approved by the Connecticut Siting Council. As discussed at length during those proceedings (Docket 323), T-Mobile will locate equipment on the 12 Carpenter Road facility and will still require an additional site in this area of Manchester to provide adequate coverage along Route 6 and Route 44.

Once it was determined that a new tower facility was required, Optasite's goal was to find properties upon which a tower could be constructed and provide service to the public while at the same time minimizing any potential environmental impact to the extent practicable and feasible. The Site Selection narrative and map of rejected sites, attached hereto as Exhibit I, provides a complete explanation of Optasite's methodology and actual search for potential sites in Manchester and depicts the locations reviewed during Optasite's search and the reasons for elimination from consideration of all but the proposed Site.²

B. Tower Sharing

To promote the sharing of wireless facilities in the Manchester area, Optasite has proposed a Facility that can accommodate up to four antenna platforms and equipment for the wireless carriers in the Connecticut marketplace and the Manchester public safety functions. T-Mobile has committed to use the Facility, if approved. Details of the design are included in Exhibit B. Optasite has committed to provide, free of charge, space on the proposed monopole for the Manchester public safety communications antennas.

V. Facility Design

Optasite has leased a 70 foot by 70 foot parcel within the approximately 23.4 acre Property. The proposed Facility would at a minimum require the construction of a 110 foot high self-supporting monopole. T-Mobile would install up to nine panel antennas at 107 AGL and occupy an equipment shelter, approximately 10 foot by 12 foot in size, within the 70 foot by 70 foot equipment compound. The compound would be enclosed by

² Of note, the Co-Applicants had previously submitted an application to the Council for a site located at 1027 Middle Turnpike East (Docket 328). Prior to the public hearing on that Docket, the Co-Applicants requested a postponement of that Docket because of the possibility of locating a facility on the Property that is the subject of this current Application. Therefore, the Site proposed in this Application is considered in lieu of the site proposed in Docket 328.

a security, eight (8) feet in height. The monopole and equipment compound are designed to accommodate the facilities of all wireless carriers active in the Connecticut marketplace and Manchester emergency services, if requested.

Vehicular access to the Facility would extend from Lake Street over a proposed gravel driveway. Of note, vehicular access will cross a separate parcel of property also owned by Mr. Rossetto. Optasite's lease with Mr. Rossetto does provide the right to cross that property. Construction will result in the removal of ten (10) trees of 6" in diameter or greater. See Exhibit B, tree inventory letter. Underground utility connections would extend from existing service on Lake Street to the compound. Exhibit B contains the specifications for the proposed Facility at the Site including a site plan, a compound plan, tower elevation, access map and other relevant information. Exhibit J contains visual resources evaluation including a computer-based, predictive viewshed model and photosimulations. Exhibit K contains a preliminary NEPA evaluation letter. Some of the relevant information included in these exhibits for the Site reveals that:

- The property is classified in the RR Residential zoning district;
- No wetlands are found anywhere on the 23.4 acre Property;
- The property is and will continue to be undeveloped, partially wooded land;
- Minimal grading of the proposed access drive and minimal grading of the proposed compound area would be required for the construction of the proposed Facility;
- Minimal clearing would be required for development of the proposed access drive and compound area;
- The proposed Facility would be over 400 feet away from the nearest residence and 490 feet from the residence on the Site;

- The proposed Facility is expected to have no effect on historic or architectural resources; and
- The proposed Facility will have no impact on water flow, water quality, or air quality and will not emit any noise.

VI. Environmental Compatibility

Pursuant to CGS Section 16-50p, the Council is required to find and to determine as part of the Application process any probable environmental impact of the facility on the natural environment, ecological balance, public health and safety, scenic, historic and recreational values, forest and parks, air and water purity and fish and wildlife. As demonstrated in this Application and the accompanying Attachments and documentation, the proposed Facility will have no significant adverse environmental impacts.

A. Visual Assessment

The visual impact of the proposed Facility would vary from different locations around the towers depending upon factors such as vegetation, topography, distance from the towers, and the location of structures around the towers. Exhibit J contains a computer-based, predictive viewshed model which depicts the potential impact of the proposed Facility from surrounding views for the Site as well as a Visual Resource Evaluation.

Optasite retained Vanasse Hangen Brustlin ("VHB") to prepare the Visual Resource Evaluation. On June 27, 2007, VHB conducted a balloon test at 110 feet AGL at the proposed Site in order to evaluate the potential viewshed associated with the proposed Facility. VHB sought to determine the visibility impact of the Facility, accounting for local, state and federal historic, hiking and recreational sites within the study area, as well as within a two-mile radius of the proposed Site ("Study Area").

The Visual Resources Evaluation demonstrates that the Facility will be as inconspicuous as possible. The topography and the mature vegetation at the proposed Site will significantly limit the visual impact of the proposed Facility.

The existing vegetation in the area of the proposed Site is mature, mixed deciduous hardwood species with an average estimated height of 65 feet. Based on the viewshed analysis contained in Exhibit J, areas from which the proposed Site will be at least partially visible comprise only 34 acres, which is less than one half of one percent (>.5%) of the entire Study Area. The visibility of the tower at the proposed Site will be minimized due largely to the topography and mature vegetation found within the Study Area and particularly on the Property itself, which is 23.4 acres. The Facility at the proposed Site will be visible above the tree canopy from portions of Lake Street, but views from the proposed Facility are expected to be limited to primarily within 0.25 miles of the proposed Facility and much of the anticipated visibility will occur on the host Property itself. Overall, twelve (12) residences will have partial year round views of the Facility and eight (8) additional residences will have partial, seasonal views of the Facility.

The compound area will have a de minimis visual impact as it will be screened by the proposed fencing. In addition, the Property itself provides a vegetative buffer around the Site and will serve to greatly reduce any potential visual impact of the proposed Facility.

These Visual Resources demonstrate that, even from most of the areas where the Facility will be visible, the tower is unobtrusive. Accordingly, the proposed Facility will not result in an unacceptable adverse visual impact.

As the Visual Resources confirm, the location of the proposed Facility at the proposed Site will not have a significant visual impact on the surrounding area. In

addition, the Visual Resources confirm that the location of the proposed Facility at the proposed Site will not have a significant visual impact on any hiking or recreational sites, scenic highways or historic sites. Of note, the Facility will not be visible from the nearby Shenipsit Trail.

Weather permitting, Optasite will raise a balloon with a diameter of at least three (3) feet at the proposed Site on the day of the Council's first hearing session on this Application, or at a time otherwise specified by the Council.

B. Solicitation of State Agency Comments

Optasite has submitted a request for review and comment for the proposed Site to the Connecticut State Historic Preservation Officer ("SHPO") and the Department of Environmental Protection ("DEP"). Given the nature of the terrain and soil on the Property, no impacts are anticipated. Optasite will forward the final determination from the SHPO and DEP, once received.

C. Power Density Analysis

In August 1996, the FCC adopted a standard for exposure to Radio Frequency ("RF") emissions from telecommunications facilities like those proposed in this Application. To ensure compliance with applicable standards, T-Mobile has performed maximum power density calculations for the proposed Facility assuming that the antennas were pointed at the base of the tower and all channels were operating simultaneously. The resulting power density for T-Mobile's operations at the proposed site would be approximately 4.5668% of the applicable MPE standards. Copies of the Power Density Calculations and Memorandum attached hereto as Exhibit L.

D. Other Environmental Factors

The proposed Facility would be unmanned, requiring monthly maintenance visits by each carrier that will last approximately one hour. T-Mobile's equipment at the Facility will be monitored 24 hours a day, 7 days a week from a remote location. The proposed Facility at the Site would not require a water supply or wastewater utilities. No outdoor storage or solid waste receptacles will be needed. Further, the proposed Facility will not create or emit any smoke, gas, dust or other air contaminants, noise, odors or vibrations. The construction and operation of the proposed Facility will have no significant impact on the air, water, or noise quality at the Site.

Optasite has commenced an evaluation of the Site in accordance with the FCC's regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 ("NEPA"). A copy of a preliminary NEPA analysis is attached hereto as Exhibit K. Based upon preliminary review, the Site was not identified as a wilderness area. No National Parks, National Forests, National Parkways or Scenic Rivers, State Forest, State Designated Scenic Rivers or State Gamelands are located in the vicinity of the Site. The Site is not located in or adjacent to any areas identified as a federal wildlife preserve. Further, as discussed, no federally regulated wetlands or watercourses will be impacted by the proposed Facility since there are no wetlands located anywhere on the 23.4 acre parcel. In addition, the preliminary NEPA analysis indicates that the proposed Facility is not located in a floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency ("FEMA"). As such, and based on the information contained in other reports included in this Application, the Site is expected to be categorically excluded from any requirement for further environmental review by the FCC in accordance with NEPA and no permit is required by that agency prior to construction of the proposed Facility. See 47 C.F.R. §§

1.1306(b) and 1.1307(a). Optasite will forward a copy of the final NEPA documentation, once received.

VII. Consistency with the Manchester Land Use Regulations

Pursuant to the Council’s Application Guide, included in this section is a narrative summary of the consistency of the project with the local municipality’s zoning and wetland regulations and plan of conservation and development. A description of the zoning classification of the Site and the planned and existing uses of the proposed site locations are also detailed in this section.

A. Manchester Plan of Conservation and Development

The Manchester Plan of Conservation and Development (the “Plan”), a copy of which is included in the bulk filing, was adopted on September 18, 1998. Wireless communications facilities are not specifically addressed in the Plan. However, the Plan does suggest that Route 6 and Route 44 are “major arterial” roads for the Town and references the increased traffic volume on the roads in the area of the proposed Facility. See Bulk Filing, Plan of Conservation and Development at 27, 38. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed Facility, which will provide needed wireless communications service within the Town along major arterial roads within the Town, is consistent with the Town’s Plan.

B. Manchester Zoning Regulations and Zoning Classification

According to the Town’s zoning map and municipal tax records, the Site is classified in the RR Residential zoning district. Article IV, Section 19 of the Town’s Zoning Regulations discusses wireless telecommunications facilities and lays out the Town’s standards for permitting such facilities.

Sections 19.05, 19.06 and 19.07 of the Town's Zoning Regulations set forth the Town's recommended zoning requirements for new wireless communications facilities. See Bulk Filing, Zoning Regulations, ART IV, Sec. 19. Consistency of the proposed Facility at the Site with these standards and dimensional requirements are illustrated in the following table.

Standards and Dimensional Requirements

| Regulation Section | Requirement of Regulation | Proposal |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| Section 19.07.2 | Maximum Height of Tower | Site |
| | Max. Height of tower: 175 feet | Proposed Height is 110 feet |
| Section 19.07.1 | Minimum Lot Area | Site |
| | Min. Lot Area is 20,000 square feet | Lot size is 23.4 acres |
| Section 19.06.1 | Setback from Residences | Site |
| | Min. Setback from Residences is 200 feet | Proposed is 437 feet |
| Section 19.07.3 (c) | Setbacks | Site |
| | Min. 130 foot setback for Tower; Min. 20 feet sideyard setback for equipment | Minimum setback distances are: 225 foot frontyard 550 foot rearyard 385 foot sideyard |
| Section 19.06.4 | Lighting | Site |
| | None permitted unless required by the FAA | None proposed |
| Section 19.06.7 | Design | Site |
| | Must be Monopole unless otherwise approved | Monopole design |

C. Planned and Existing Land Uses

The proposed Site will be located in the west central portion of an approximately 23.4 acre Property. The Property is currently developed with a residence and associated garage and pool with a large portion of the 23.4 acre Property that is undeveloped and wooded. No further development other than the proposed Facility is planned. Mixed residential and commercial developments are found in the surrounding areas.

Consultation with municipal officials and observations did not indicate any known or planned changes in surrounding land uses.

D. Manchester Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations

The Manchester Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations (“Local Wetlands Regulations”) regulate certain activities conducted in or adjacent to “wetlands” as defined therein. One such regulated activity is “any activity that will significantly alter the inland wetlands or watercourses by reason of removal or deposition of material, clear-cutting, alteration or obstruction of water flow, or will result in the pollution of the wetland or watercourse. See Bulk Filing, Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations, § 2 (8). Wetlands buffers are defined as 50 feet from the boundary of any wetland or watercourse. See Bulk Filing, Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations, § 2 (22).

According to the site survey, field investigations conducted at the Site, no watercourses or wetlands are located anywhere on the 23.4 acre Property. In accordance with the Connecticut Soil Erosion Control Guidelines, as established by the Council of Soil and Water Conservation, soil erosion control measures and other best management practices will be established and maintained throughout the construction of the proposed Facility.

VIII. Consultations with Local, State and Federal Officials

A. Local Consultations

CGS Section 16-50/(e) requires an applicant to consult with the local municipality in which a proposed facility may be located and with any adjoining municipality having a boundary of 2,500 feet from the proposed facility concerning the proposed and alternate sites of the facility.

On June 28, 2007, Optasite submitted a letter and a technical report to the Town of Manchester with respect to the proposed Facility at the Site. A copy of the letter to the Town of Manchester is attached hereto as Exhibit M. The technical report, a copy of which is being bulk filed, included specifics about the proposed Site and addressed the public need for the facility, the site selection process and the environmental effects of the proposed Facility.

On July 19, 2007, Optasite met with Manchester officials Mark Pellegrini Director of Economic Development, Jack McCoy, Chief Information Officer City of Manchester, and Robert Dusza Jr., Project and Technical Support Manager to discuss the proposed Facility. No comments have been received from Manchester as of the date of this filing nor did the Town hold any public hearings to discuss the Application.

B. Consultations with State Officials

As noted in Section VI.B of this Application, Optasite has commenced review of the proposed Facility with both the SHPO and DEP. Copies of the determinations from the SHPO and DEP will be forwarded to the Council upon receipt.

C. Consultation with Federal Agencies

Optasite has received a determination from the Federal Aviation Administration ("FAA") for the Site, which is included in Exhibit N. The results indicate the proposed Facility would not require FAA registration, let alone FAA review as a potential air navigation obstruction or hazard.³ As such, no FAA lighting or marking would be required for the towers proposed in this Application.

³ As indicated in the FAA determination, the FAA conducted its study based on a proposed tower height of 150 feet AGL. Although Optasite subsequently reduced the proposed tower height, the FAA determination is unaffected since the current tower height of 110 feet AGL is below the height at which the FAA conducted its study.

T-Mobile's FCC license permits it to modify its network by building wireless facilities within its licensed area without prior approval from the FCC provided that a proposed facility does not fall within one of the "listed" categories requiring review under NEPA. The "listed" categories, included in 47 CFR §1.1307, are activities that may affect wilderness areas, wilderness preserves, endangered or threatened species, critical habitats, National Register historic districts, sites, buildings, structures or objects, Indian religious sites, flood plains and federal wetlands. As noted in Section VI.D of this Application, Optasite has commenced a review for the Site and expects a determination that the Site does not fall under any of the NEPA "listed" categories of 47 CFR §1.1307. Therefore, upon receipt of that determination, the proposed Facility does not require review by the FCC pursuant to NEPA. A copy of the preliminary NEPA report is attached hereto as Exhibit K.

IX. Estimated Cost and Schedule

A. Overall Estimated Cost

The total estimated cost of construction for the proposed Site facility is \$179,000.00. This estimate includes:

- (1) Tower and foundation costs (including installation) of approximately \$74,000.00;
- (2) Site development costs of approximately \$74,000.00; and
- (3) Utility installation costs of approximately \$31,000.00.

B. Overall Scheduling


Site preparation and engineering would commence immediately following Council approval of Optasite's Development and Management ("D&M") Plan and is expected to be completed within three (3) to four (4) weeks. Installation of the monopole, antennas

and associated equipment is expected to take eight (8) weeks. The duration of the total construction schedule is approximately eight (8) weeks. Facility integration and system testing is expected to require an additional two (2) weeks after the construction is completed.

X. Conclusion

This Application and the accompanying materials and documentation clearly demonstrate that a public need exists in the Manchester area for improved wireless services. The foregoing information and attachments also demonstrate that the proposed Facility will not have any substantial adverse environmental effects. The Applicants respectfully submit that the public need for the proposed Facility outweighs any potential environmental effects resulting from the construction of the proposed Facility at the Site. As such, the Applicants respectfully request that the Council grant a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need to Optasite for a proposed wireless telecommunication facility at 93 Lake Street, Manchester, Connecticut.

Respectfully Submitted,

By:  _____

Attorneys for the Applicants
Julie D. Kohler, Esq.
jkohler@cohenandwolf.com
Carrie L. Larson, Esq.
clarson@cohenandwolf.com
Cohen and Wolf, P.C.
1115 Broad Street
Bridgeport, CT 06604
Tel. (203) 368-0211
Fax (203) 394-9901