

Interrogatories for T-Mobile - Continuation of Siting Council meeting on May 9th

1. In my previous interrogatories sent on March 14th in the first paragraph I asked why does Celco feel they are above this legal agreement which neighbors depended on and if approved will lead to costly legal action and was recognized by T-Mobile in an article in the Greenwich Time dated Feb 8th 2010? I assume everybody is aware this question should have read "Why does T-Mobile feel they are above this legal agreement" However, I need to ask it again since T-Mobile responded to this question by saying "T-Mobile has not responded to the legality of the settlement referenced in Interrogatory 1. Therefore, the question still remains "Why does T-Mobile feel they are above this legal agreement?"
2. Also, in your response to Interrogatory 1 you state the Greenwich Time article I reference related to a different telecommunications facility proposed by T-Mobile. The February 8, 2010 article (attached) stated "T-Mobile wrote the existing flag-pole structure at 34 Ritch Ave. would have to be extended 'because it cannot accommodate T-Mobile's arrays.' AT&T isn't interested in increasing the height because of previous litigation it had with the town, T-Mobile said" Since this quote is about the proposed site at 36 Ritch Avenue, what facility are you referencing in your response?
3. ATT/T-Mobile announcement - The announcement of this merger would if approved make it unnecessary to have T-Mobile on this proposed tower thus eliminating seven feet off the height of the tower. What are your plans to make sure the seven feet are removed or isn't it smarter to wait for the merger so your customers could use the existing AT&T antennas? If this cell tower application is not approved won't your customers be accessing the current tower as it exists today with no additional cost since this would not be in conflict with the legal settlement which bars additional carriers on this site.