


CUDDY & FEDER^{LLP}

445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th Floor
White Plains, New York 10601
Tel 914.761.1300 Fax 914.761.5372
www.cuddyfeder.com

November 17, 2014

VIA E-MAIL & OVERNIGHT MAIL

Village Board of Trustees
c/o Mr. Robert Yamuder, Village Administrator
Village of Pelham
Village Hall
195 Sparks Avenue
Pelham, NY 10803




Re: Village Board Review of ExteNet's Pending
Chapter 87 Permit Application, SEQRA and ROW Agreement

Dear Members of the Village Board:

On behalf of ExteNet Systems, Inc. ("ExteNet"), enclosed please find information responsive to various questions and comments forwarded to us on your behalf in correspondence from Mr. Spolzino, dated November 10th. For ease of reference, each question and/or comment has been incorporated into the enclosed submission prepared by ExteNet with attachments where noted. Contributors to the enclosed materials included the ExteNet witnesses, Mr. Fridrich, Mr. Angelini and Ms. Slade who appeared on November 6th, T-Mobile's network engineers, and ExteNet's counsel. We understand from our conversation from Mr. Spolzino that tomorrow's continued public hearing will be adjourned to December 2nd or another date certain without the need for the Applicant's appearance tomorrow night in order to give CTC time to review the enclosed and report back to the Village Board. We thank you for your continued consideration of the foregoing.

Very truly yours,


Christopher B. Fisher

Enclosures

Cc: CTC
Robert Spolzino, Esq.
Steven Barshov, Esq.

C&F: 2590495.2



EXTENET RESPONSES TO VILLAGE BOARD QUESTIONS/COMMENTS
DATED NOVEMBER 10, 2014

Question 1


Please provide with respect to each pole that was discussed as being incapable of use for a DAS node, i.e., those in the vicinity of the Kaplan residence, as well as those heading north to the train station, either documentation from Con Edison that it will not allow the pole to be used or a detailed explanation that CTC can verify as to why the pole is unavailable for ExteNet's purposes.

Response 1


Con Ed has numerous requirements that govern the terms and conditions of pole attachments by any other provider of telecommunications services (i.e. landline, cable, wireless) to ensure principally the ability to supply electric service and otherwise have attachments comply with the NESC and related codes. Con Edison and ExteNet are parties to a Wireless Services Agreement and Pole Attachment Agreements. As referenced in the agreements, all construction and/or pole attachments must be constructed in accordance with NYS PSC tariffs governing same and NESC code requirements. Attached are exhibits directly from ExteNet's agreements with Con Ed which identify and incorporate the limitations noted at the public hearing on November 6th on use of certain poles and wireless pole attachment design requirements.

340361

PREFERRED POSITION
 POLE TOP ANTENNA
 TO BE INSTALLED
 BY CON ED
 NOT TO EXCEED
 8 FT IN HEIGHT



SECTION A-A



NO.	REVISION	BY	DATE
1	ADDED SAFETY AUTO SWITCH BOX CREATED MULTI SHEET 1 & 2. USED NEW MULTI-SHEET FORMAT. ADDED ST. DIM FROM TELEPHONE CABLE TO THE CATV FIBER SUPPLY BOX. CHG DISTANCE BETWEEN SECONDARY BACK AND ANTENNA TO 10'-0" MIN. CHG ANTENNA HEIGHT NOT TO EXCEED 8'-0" REMOVED POLE TOP EXTENSION. SEE SHEET 8 OF 8 FOR UPDATES TO NOTES. CHG POSITION OF POWER SUPPLY BOX AND WEATHERHEAD. ADDED 2" RIGID CONDUIT AND SECTION A-A.	D. GRABOWSKI	8/28/04
	HL:MARK	8/28/04	
2	MOVED METER PAN LOCATION UP ON POLE. RELOCATED LOCKABLE CUTOFF SWITCH BELOW METER PAN. ADDED MOLDING AND STAPLES TO WIRE FROM SECONDARY BACK TO WEATHERHEAD. ADDED 4" MIN DIMENSION FROM TOP OF POLE TO FIRST MOUNTING BOLT OF ANTENNA. SEE SHEET 2 OF 8 FOR NOTE CHANGES.	D. GRABOWSKI	10/28/04
	HL:MARK	11/22/04	

**ANTENNA MOUNTED
 ON SECONDARY OR GUY
 DISTRIBUTION POLE**

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF N.Y., INC.
 DISTRIBUTION ENGINEERING DEPT.
 DATE 8/13/03 DWG. NO. 340361 REV. 2 SK. 1 OF 2
 LAST REV. 9/15/04

340361

CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION NOTES

1. A RF REVIEW, IN ACCORDANCE WITH INTERFERENCE SPECIFICATION 011404A WILL BE CONDUCTED BY COMMUNICATIONS PLANNING PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES. A POLE LOADING ASSESSMENT WILL BE CONDUCTED BY REGIONAL ENGINEERING AS PER ED-2138.
2. POLE TOP ANTENNA ARE NOT TO BE INSTALLED ON POLES WITH PRIMARY WIRES AND/OR EQUIPMENT.
3. THE POLE TOP ANTENNA MAY BE INSTALLED ON A POLE TOP EXTENSION, PROVIDED THE MINIMUM CLEARANCE OF 10 FEET FROM THE ANTENNA BASE TO THE HIGHEST CON EDISON ATTACHMENTS IS MAINTAINED.
4. ANTENNAS MAY NOT BE INSTALLED ON POLES WITH OTHER TELECOM POWER SUPPLIES.
5. ANTENNAS ARE NOT TO BE INSTALLED WITHOUT APPROVAL OF CECO NY.
6. ONLY ONE ANTENNA MAY BE INSTALLED ON A POLE.
7. THE ANTENNA MAY BE INSTALLED ON A GUY POLE. A MINIMUM CLEARANCE FROM THE BASE OF THE ANTENNA TO THE HIGHEST CON EDISON ATTACHMENT IS 10 FEET. A SERVICE FOR THE ANTENNA POWER SUPPLY WILL NEED BE INSTALLED.
8. CON ED OR APPROVED CONTRACTOR WILL PERFORM ALL WORK ABOVE THE TELECOM ZONE.
9. THIRD PARTY TRANSCEMERS SHALL NOT BE CO-LOCATED WITH CE DAS OR ITRON EQUIPMENT AT DISTRIBUTION FACILITIES.
10. THIRD PARTY OPERATORS SHALL DEPLOY AND OPERATE TRANSCIVER EQUIPMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RECOMMENDATION AND GUIDELINES FOR INTERFERENCE AVOIDANCE AND MITIGATION IN THE 800 MHz BAND SPECIFIED IN INTERFERENCE SPECIFICATION 011404A.
11. CUSTOMER IS RESPONSIBLE FOR PLACING A SIGN ON THE POWER SUPPLY INDICATING A 24 HR CONTACT PHONE NUMBER IN CASE OF EMERGENCY. PHONE NUMBER MUST BE VISIBLE FROM GROUND.
12. A WARNING SIGN IS TO BE PLACED ON THE POWER SUPPLY BY CUSTOMER REGARDING RF EMISSIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH IEEE C95.2-1998.
13. THE CUSTOMER'S POWER SUPPLY MUST BE EQUIPPED WITH AN EXTERNAL PAD-LOCKABLE AC/BATTERY COMBO DISCONNECT SWITCH BETWEEN THE METER PAN AND TRANSMITTER OR AN EXTERNAL PAD LOCKABLE RF DISCONNECT SWITCH BETWEEN THE TRANSMITTER AND THE ANTENNA. IF THE CUSTOMER CHOOSES TO INSTALL THE PAD LOCKABLE RF DISCONNECT SWITCH, THE TELECOMMUNICATION GROUP MUST FIRST APPROVE THE RF DISCONNECT SWITCH AND DESIGN BEFORE THE INSTALLATION. IF THE CUSTOMER CHOOSES TO INSTALL THE PAD LOCKABLE AC/BATTERY DISCONNECT SWITCH, THE SWITCH MUST CUTOFF AC POWER TO THE TRANSMITTER AND BACKUP BATTERY POWER (IF APPLICABLE) TO THE TRANSMITTER. THE POWER SUPPLY/AMPLIFIER CABINET WILL BE EQUIPPED WITH AN EXTERNAL INDICATOR LIGHT THAT WILL VERIFY THE ANTENNA IS SHUT DOWN. THE TELECOM EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE DIMENSION IS NOT TO EXCEED 24"W X 42"H X 24"D.
14. WHEN CON ED WORK REQUIRES THE ANTENNA TO BE LOCKED AND TAGGED OUT, CON ED WILL: (I.E. WHEN WORKING WITHIN 6 FEET OF ANTENNA)
 - MAKE NOTIFICATION TO THE CUSTOMER 24 HOURS PRIOR TO THE REQUIRED OUTAGE FOR SCHEDULED WORK.
 - FOR EMERGENCY WORK CON ED MAKE NOTIFICATION TO THE CUSTOMER AT THE TIME OF THE REQUIRED OUTAGE.
 - ON THE DAY OF THE SCHEDULED OUTAGE, THE CON ED CREW WILL SHUTOFF ANTENNA, PADLOCK AND STOP TAG CUTOFF SWITCH.
 - WHEN THE CON ED WORK IS COMPLETED OR AT THE END OF THE DAY, THE CON ED CREW WILL REMOVE STOP TAG AND PADLOCK. CON ED CREW WILL TURN ANTENNA ON. NOTIFICATION WILL BE MADE TO CUSTOMER THAT THE ANTENNA HAS BEEN TURNED BACK ON.
 - THE TIMES, STOP TAG NUMBERS AND ANTENNA'S REPRESENTATIVE WILL BE RECORDED ON THE DOCS SHEET.
15. CON ED EMPLOYEES WHO MAY HAVE TO WORK NEAR THE ANTENNAS SHALL RECEIVE A JOB BRIEFING ON RF AWARENESS. CON ED EMPLOYEES WILL MAINTAIN A CLEARANCE OF AT LEAST 6 FEET IN ALL DIRECTIONS OF AN ENERGIZED ANTENNA.
16. DRIVEN GROUND TO BE INSTALLED BY ANTENNA OWNER AND MUST HAVE A RESISTANCE OF LESS THAN 5 OHMS WHEN TESTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH IEEE STD#81. A TEST REPORT WILL BE SUBMITTED TO THE CFS-TECHNICAL SERVICE LABORATORY FOR REVIEW.
17. SEE DRAWING 33S241 FOR TELECOM CLEARANCES.
18. AN AMR METER IS TO BE UTILIZED FOR THIS APPLICATION.

No.	REVISION	DATE	BY
1	CREATED MULTI SHEETS 1 & 2 AND NEW MULTISHEET FORMS. UPDATED NOTES 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.	0.0000000	8/28/04
2	UPDATED NOTES 1, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 & 17. ADDED NOTE 18. SEE SHEET 1 OF 2 FOR UPDATED DRAWING.	0.0000000	10/28/04

FILING INFORMATION
FIELD MANUAL No. 9 OVERHEAD CONSTRUCTION, SECT. 2; POLE INSTALLATION
FIELD MANUAL No. 2 O.H. CONSTRUCTION, SECT. 1.5; SECONDARY/SERVICE
CONSTRUCTION STD. MANUAL No. 3 SECT. 5; POLES AND CROSSARMS

ANTENNA MOUNTED
ON SECONDARY OR GUY
DISTRIBUTION POLE

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF N.Y., INC.
DISTRIBUTION ENGINEERING DEPT.
DATE 8/15/03 DWG. NO. 340361 REV. 2 SH. 2 of 2
LAST REV 8/15/04

Question 2

Please provide the details of the potential alternative site that you have identified as well as any potential alternative site in the vicinity of the train station, including the specific location and the necessary height of a pole at those locations.

Response 2

The details of the one potential alternative site for the node currently installed at the intersection of Cliff Avenue and 2nd Street and identified by ExteNet in the context of settlement discussions were provided to the Village Board in a handout at the November 6th public hearing, another copy of which is attached hereto in Attachment A. The location is on Cliff Avenue where there is currently a double pole installation as shown in the photographs included in the handout.

Chris Fridrich, ExteNet's Radio Frequency Engineer (as a supplement to his verbal testimony at the November 6th hearing) has prepared various propagation plots included in Attachment B in response to the Village's request for further information regarding alternatives. Please refer to Figure 1 in Attachment B for the current DAS network baseline coverage.

If ExteNet shifted the node labeled PLH003 650' north along Cliff Ave (Figure 2) to the potential alternative site, there is compromised coverage overlap between node PLH002 to the south and this potential alternative location. With respect to other pole line locations in the vicinity of the train station or tracks, if ExteNet shifted the node to Cliff Ave & 1st which is at an even lower ground elevation (Figure 3), the same compromised area between nodes PLH002 and PLH003 becomes significantly larger and unacceptable for reliable service. If ExteNet were to shift the node to Corlies Ave and 1st (Figure 4), reliable coverage would be missing on the east side of the target area as well as the node would be propagating outside the target area and may cause interference issues with surrounding macro cell site service layers. If ExteNet were able to place an 80ft pole at Cliff Ave & 1st (Figure 5), comparable coverage could be matched to the baseline (Figure 1) between nodes PLH002 and PLH003, but that height would then significantly propagate outside the target area and have unacceptable overlap with service from node PLH001 to the north.

In conclusion, the plots clearly show that the existing PLH003 location provides the best service for T-Mobile's subscribers and it is ExteNet's position that this node is preferred for service over any alternate location including those discussed with the Village Board and evaluated above.

Question 3

Please provide some documentation to support the statements made by ExteNet's representatives that a potential site in "the valley" will not substitute for a proposed site "on top of the hill."

Response 3

Please refer to Figures 1, 2 and 3 in Attachment B for comparisons. Clearly, where the current PLH003 node is located is optimum for service; it is at a relative maximum ground elevation height in its vicinity (105ft) as well as virtually geometrically centered between nodes PLH001 and PLH002 equalizing the coverage between these nodes. Most importantly, it will provide the highest quality of service to more T-Mobile subscribers and other future users of ExteNet's DAS network than if the node were located elsewhere. Of note, not only is an 80ft wood pole in "the valley" by the railroad tracks not practical (or permissible by ConEd), but it causes other potential issues within the network related to interference as noted in Figures 4 and 5. Please also see the supplemental RF report prepared by T-mobile and Mr. Joseph Menio in Attachment C.

Question 4

Please quantify, in a way CTC can verify, the diminution in service that would result from placing the node on the potential alternative site that you have identified as compared to the node proposed for the vicinity of the Kaplan residence. ExteNet has stated that the primary coverage extend out 1,000 to 1,200 feet. As was discussed at the hearing, moving the node 600 feet, or more, north will obviously compromise that coverage. Is that quantifiable?

Response 4

Yes. The reduction in coverage for existing node PLH003 in comparison with the potential alternative 650' north on Cliff Avenue is geographically identified on Figure 2 with the corresponding reduction in signal strength from -90 dBm to -98 dBm for a significant area in this part of the Village. T-Mobile subscribers (and likely those of future carriers that may use ExteNet's DAS system) that reside in the compromised area would have diminished or no reliable in-building service. This diminished coverage is qualitative and can be quantified by comparison to the aerial maps in Figure 1 to a significant number of homes south of 2nd street and north of 3rd street in a substantial area running east to west in Pelham. Please also see the supplemental RF report prepared by T-Mobile and Mr. Joseph Menio in Attachment C.

Question 5

If a new node cannot be placed at the train station because such a site is not feasible or because Metro North will not agree, please provide either documentation from Metro North or a detailed explanation that CTC can verify.

Response 5

The majority of the existing utility distribution poles near the train station are across the street in the Village's right-of-way along 1st Street. As noted in response to Questions 2 and 3 above, 80' poles in the right-of-way of 1st Street (including the location evaluated across the street from the train station) would not be effective network design solutions to replace existing node PLH003. As such, any use of the actual MTA property would require a macro-cellular tower in lieu of PLH003 and PLH001 and require a height of at least 80' or more to address the coverage footprint and potentially taller for purposes of planning for collocation by other carriers and still have issues related to potential interference.

The Metro North train station is a parcel of property owned and controlled by the Metropolitan Transportation Authority and includes a parking lot for commuters. ExteNet's network architecture is a distributed antenna system utilizing existing utility infrastructure and Village rights-of-way (Village rights-of-way and utility pole lines do not extend onto the train station property). The MTA will not allow use of its catenary system and as such any development on the MTA parcel would require a new macro cellular tower site. Irrespective of whether MTA and the Village would entertain a new 80' or taller tower site at the Pelham train station, such an alternative is outside the scope of ExteNet's project which utilizes utility pole lines and rights-of-way for development of a DAS network.

Question 6

If the node in the vicinity of the Kaplan residence is to be moved, what assurance can ExteNet give the Board that there will not be a subsequent application to increase the power or height of the other proposed nodes, or to add a fourth node, because the new node did not work as well as the "Kaplan" node would have?

Response 6

The need for wireless infrastructure to reliably serve the public is not static. There are multiple FCC licensed wireless carriers and various technical challenges in providing reliable wireless services to the public. Continued growth in consumer demand, the need for additional coverage and capacity in any carrier's 4G LTE network and even future technologies and applications might require additional node site locations in the Village irrespective of the currently designed ExteNet

network with three node locations in Pelham. As stated at the public hearing, ExteNet has no plans for additional node sites and is not aware of any such requests by T-Mobile or any other wireless carrier. As such, for the Village's purposes, prospectively the Village Board would retain its review authority on a case by case basis to the extent any modifications or new node sites required such review.

Question 7

Please provide a higher resolution coverage plot for the three proposed sites showing clearly in color and labeling T-Mobile's requirements for street, in vehicle and residential in building coverage. A large exhibit, say two feet by three feet, might make it far clearer that the exhibits which were presented on Thursday evening.

Response 7

Please refer to Figure 1 in Attachment B; this plot was generated at 5m resolution. Green represents good in-building coverage. Yellow represents good in-car coverage. Blue represents good outdoor coverage. Red is the system threshold; users will be at the limit of being able to originate and maintain a call outdoors. Please also see the supplemental RF report prepared by T-mobile and Mr. Joseph Menio in Attachment C regarding its plots and resolution.

Question 8

Please provide photographs to illustrate how the DAS nodes compare in size and appearance with large utility transformers, CATV power supplies, fiber cable bundles, etc.

Response 8

Please see photographs in Attachment D which indicate the relatively same or smaller size of ExteNet's antennas and node site equipment as compared with Con Edison transformers, FIOS cabinets and boxes, Optimum cable and WiFi attachments and even municipal lighting equipment installed on the pole lines in Pelham. These photographs are taken of various poles in and around the three node sites in Pelham and can be compared to the photographs included in ExteNet's prior submissions to the Village Board.

Question 9

Please quantify in a more detailed way the gap that proposed node one eliminates or reduces and provide, as Trustee Kagan requested, the factors considered in the drive test, i.e. time of day tested, how many test runs, dates of tests. If that is not

provided, the Board will assume that the testing was done under conditions most favorable to ExeNet.

Response 9

Please see the coverage maps provided by ExteNet in Exhibit B. Chris Fridrich from ExteNet notes that there are three key metrics that these nodes address for the provision of reliable service in commercial mobile service provider networks:

- a. Coverage – signal level for service. The target area is primarily a coverage gap.
- b. Capacity – when the macro layer becomes overloaded and “blocks” subscribers, the underlying nodes will offload the macro layer to provide service to subscribers.
- c. Dominance/Interference – there can be areas where several macro sites service an area all with good signal strength but none of those macros sites are more dominant than the others and they all can potentially interfere with one another.

Nodes PLH002 and PLH003 address coverage and capacity and node PLH001 addresses all 3 metrics. CTC and the Village Board are further referred to the supplemental RF report prepared by T-mobile and Mr. Joseph Menio in Attachment C.


Question 10

The Board would like CTC to verify by field measurements the RF readings that ExteNet provided with respect to MPE and to spot check ExteNet’s level of service readings. Please provide CTC with whatever it needs to accomplish that.

Response 10

There is no specific information or special access needed for CTC to perform this scope of work on the Village Board’s behalf should it choose to undertake it. Given federal preemption regarding consideration of (or any municipal regulatory authority) in the area of radiofrequency emissions from wireless facilities, this is something the Village may elect to do at its cost and expense. See 47 U.S.C. § 332(c)(7) and Cellular Phone Taskforce, et al. v. Federal Communications Commission and United States of America, 205 F.3d 82 (2d Cir. 2000).


Pelham Nodes
Prediction w/PLH003 Current
Ground Elevation = 105ft



Scale: 1:10,569
0 0.1 0.2 0.3mi

Green: -84dBm, Yellow: -90dBm, Red: -98dBm, Blue: -104dBm


Pelham Nodes
Prediction w/PLH003 ExteNet Proposed
Ground Elevation = 82ft



Scale: 1:10,569
0 0.1 0.2 0.3mi


Green: -84dBm, Yellow: -90dBm, Red: -98dBm, Blue: -104dBm

Pelham Nodes
Prediction w/PLH003 Cliff & 1st
Ground Elevation = 68ft



Green: -84dBm, Yellow: -90dBm, Red: -98dBm, Blue: -104dBm

Pelham Nodes
Prediction w/PLH003 Corlies & 1st
Ground Elevation = 75ft




Scale: 1:10,569

0 0.1 0.2 0.3mi

Green: -84dBm, Yellow: -90dBm, Red: -98dBm, Blue: -104dBm

Pelham Nodes
Prediction w/PLH003 Cliff & 1st
Ground Elevation = 68ft
Pole Height = 80ft



Scale: 1:10,793

0 0.1 0.2 0.3mi

Green: -84dBm, Yellow: -90dBm, Red: -98dBm, Blue: -104dBm



© 2014 Google
© 2014 Google

40°54'32.27"N 73°48'19.5

T-Mobile


TO: Chris Fridrich, Senior RF Engineer, NE Region for ExteNeT

The three DAS nodes within the Village of Pelham work together as a system in order to provide reliable coverage to the local area. Coverage from "Node 1" cannot be analyzed in isolation. If "Node 1" was removed the DAS system would not work as efficiently with the existing network. "Node 1" provides the ability to connect the coverage from the southern nodes to the existing northern macro sites, and is a crucial part of the DAS system within the Village of Pelham. Even with "Node 1", reliable coverage is a challenge based on the topography and low height of each DAS node, particularly in comparison to the installation of a new tower to replace the DAS.


The proposed alternative location of "Node 2", 650 feet to the north of its existing location, would adversely impact T-Mobile's wireless network. The current location of "Node 2" is centrally located between "Node 1" and "Node 3" and is also centrally located within the area of need within the Village of Pelham. "Node 2" being centrally located between the two other nodes is crucial for the ability to reliably handoff between DAS nodes and existing macro sites. If "Node 2" was moved to the north, it would weaken an already marginal hand off to the South. Likewise if the node was moved to the south, it would weaken an already marginal hand off to the North. In order to provide reliable coverage to the local area it is important that "Node 2" remain as close as possible if not in its current location. Locations further north towards the railroad tracks or near the MTA train station at pole heights (i.e. +35' in height) are unacceptable due to the relative ground elevation, intervening terrain and distance from "Node 3" to the south. As such, any location near the train station would necessarily involve a tower site.

The submitted predicted coverage plots are predicted at the maximum resolution of the T-Mobiles prediction tool. The resolution used in previously provided coverage maps is 25 meter by 25 meter bin sizes.

Thank You,



Senior RF Engineer
Joseph Menio




Google earth

feet
meters

100

50






Google earth

feet
meters





Google earth

feet
meters





Google earth





Google earth

feet
meters






Google earth


feet
meters





Google earth





Google earth

feet
meters





Google earth

feet
meters

