

traffic in the beginning of 2008. As is the case for all ExteNet Das networks, the Brookline DAS network will be multi-carrier capable.

Q2. Does a wireless provider have the option to locate on select portions of the proposed Merritt Parkway system?

A2. Yes. ExteNet actively markets all of our existing and proposed DAS networks to the wireless service providers on an on-going basis. ExteNet will offer the Merritt Parkway DAS network to the wireless service providers operating within the State of Connecticut. ExteNet would execute a network license agreement for a segment of the fully constructed 27 node DAS network as proposed. Wireless providers do have the option of locating on select nodes only or along the entire length of the proposed system

Q3. Page 7 of the Petition states the “network can be configured to support certain state and local emergency services communications”. Describe what services are compatible with the DAS. What services cannot be accommodated? Would Extenet provide lease free infrastructure to local emergency response units?

A3. Without understanding the needs and specific services offered or desired by the state and local emergency services communications, it is hard to provide a complete list of compatible or non-supported services.

Services that might be compatible with DAS:

1. Services that utilize ExteNet's fiber backbone
 - a. Cameras
 - b. Electronic signage
 - c. Alarm and emergency notification systems
 - d. Sensors
 - e. Broadband wireless communication systems
 - f. 450MHz radio communication systems
 - g. A.S.O.

2. Services that utilize the fiber backbone and DAS infrastructure:
 - a. 850MHz radio communication systems
 - b. 900MHz radio communication systems

Services that might be difficult to accommodate with DAS:

- a. 150Mhz radio communication systems

Q4. Page 7 of the Petition states the network can support carriers that implemented a TDOA E-911 technology. Which carriers operating in Connecticut have implemented this technology? What E-911 carrier technology is not compatible with the proposed DAS?

A4. The following wireless service providers are utilizing TDOA E-911 technology:

1. AT&T Wireless
2. T-Mobile

Both T-Mobile and AT&T are using TruePosition's system for E-911 location. TruePosition has an established solution that support DAS.

The following wireless service providers are using A-GPS, a solution where the phone has integrated GPS. The location would be based on the GPS coordinates which the DAS is compatible with but would have not have any impact on.

1. MetroPCS
2. Sprint
3. Verizon Wireless

Q5. Page 9 of the Petition states coverage at -84 dBm can be attained in 90% of the network area. What specific areas would have deficient coverage? Could additional nodes provide 100% coverage? How does the DAS account for individual carrier coverage thresholds?

A5. The statement on page 9 in the application is based on a standard requirement for a 1900MHz service provider. The 90% area network probability is based on contractual network acceptance criteria. It implies that 90% of all measurement points along the defined drive route would meet or exceed the signal requirement. It does not imply that certain areas along the defined drive route will not have service. It defines an allowance for up to 10% of the collected measurement points to below the defined signal level. This allowance will accommodate for Raleigh fading, measurement accuracy, BTS transmit accuracy etc. 90% is an industry standard with respect to these type of measurements. -84dBm is an industry accepted signal level, and significant impact on voice quality or dropped calls would typically not occur until the received signal level is below -95dBm.

The proposed design is based on dedicated amplifier(s) on an individual carrier basis, and allow for individual carrier link budgets and thresholds.

Q6. What type of analysis was conducted to determine that residences within 500 feet of the Merritt Parkway would not have visibility of the proposed DAS infrastructure?

A6. ExteNet performed a visual analysis of each node location during the pre-engineering site inspection process. Considering the small size of the proposed antenna attachment as well as the proposed location of each node—centrally suspended over travel lanes at bridge overpass locations—ExteNet concluded that no visual impact would result to the residences within 500 feet of the Merritt Parkway. Additionally, dense foliage and undulating topography limit the direct line of site from adjacent residences along the parkway.

Q7. Describe the existing wireless facilities between nodes 18 & 19, and north of node 16.

A7. The existing wireless facilities between nodes 18 & 19 and north of node 16 are traditional, macro-cellular facilities.

Q8. The photo-simulation of nodes 10 and 17 depict each node as consisting of two cable-mounted antennas and a single pole mounted antenna. Are these depictions correct?

A8. Yes, these depictions are correct as illustrated.

Q9. What are the utility designated pole numbers for nodes 12, 20 and 33?

A9. The utility designated pole numbers for nodes 12, 20 and 33 are as follows:

Node 12: this pole is missing its plate/pole number

Node 20: SNET # 2038

Node 33: SNET # 8735

Q10. The DAS coverage model depicts coverage from a node identified as node 27; however, node 27 is not listed in the corresponding node location detail summary (Attachment A) or shown in the photo-simulations (Attachment E). Please provide.

A10. Node 27 as identified within the DAS coverage model is incorrectly labeled. This node number was changed to **Node 28** during pre-engineering. This was a name change only. The actual node location and all subsequent node details remained constant and are accurately reflected within the corresponding Node Location Detail summary and Photo-Simulation package. Therefore, Node 27 on the DAS coverage model is actually Node 28.

Respectfully Submitted,

By:  _____

Attorneys for the Applicant
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

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 26th day of July 2007, an original and twenty-one copies of the foregoing interrogatories were served on the Connecticut Siting Council by first class mail and a copy was served by first class mail on the following to:

Kenneth Baldwin, Esq.
Robinson & Cole LLP
280 Trumbull Street
Hartford, CT 06103-3597

Merritt Parkway Conservancy
c/o Karen Salerno, Executive Director
P.O. Box 17072
Stamford, CT 06907

Diane W. Whitney
Pullman & Comley, LLC.
90 State House Square
Hartford, CT 06103-3702

Ira W. Bloom, Esq.
Wake, Dee, Dimes, Brynizcka, Day & Bloom
27 Imperial Avenue
P.O. Box 777
Westport, CT 06881-0777

Christopher B. Fisher, Esq.
Cuddy & Feder LLP
445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th Floor
White Plains, NY 10601-5196

Stephen J. Humes, Esq.
McCarter & English, LLP.
185 Asylum Street, CityPlace I
Hartford, CT 06103

Thomas J. Regan
Brown Rudnick Berlack Israels LLP
City Place I, 185 Asylum Street
Hartford, CT 06103-3402



Carrie L. Larson