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THE CHAIRPERSON: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. This hearing of the Connecticut Siting Council is called to order today, Tuesday, March 10th, 2015, at approximately 3 p.m. My name is Robin Stein. I'm chairman of the Connecticut Siting Council. Other members of the Council present are Mr. Hannon, designee from the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection; Mr. Commissioner Caron, who's the designee from the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority; Mr. Ashton; Dr. Klemens; Dr. Bell; and Mr. Lynch.

Members of the staff present are Attorney Bachman, who's our executive director, and Fred Cunliffe who's our supervising siting analyst.

This hearing is held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act upon application from Cellco partnership, d/b/a Verizon Wireless for a certificate of environmental compatibility and public need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunication facility located at 99 East Street in Southington, Connecticut. This application was received by the Council on December 30, 2014.

As a reminder to all, off-the-record communication with a member of the Council or a member of the Council's staff upon the merits of the application is prohibited by law. The applicant in these proceedings is, as mentioned, Cellco Partnership, Verizon Wireless. Attorney Baldwin is their representative.

We'll proceed in accordance with the prepared agenda, copies of which are available. Also available are copies of the Council's citizen guide to Siting Council procedures. At the end of this afternoon's session, we will recess and resume again at 7 p.m. The 7 p.m. hearing session will be reserved for the public to make brief oral statements into the record.

I wish to note that parties and intervenors, including their representatives and witnesses are not allowed to participate in the public comment session.

I also wish to note for those who are here and for the benefit of your friends and neighbors who are unable to join us for the public comment session that you or they may send written statements to the Council within 30 days of the date hereof and such written statements will be given the same weight as if spoken at the hearing.

A verbatim transcript will be made of this hearing and deposited with the town clerk's office in Southington for the convenience of the public.

To start off, is there any public official here who would like to speak?

(No response.)

THE CHAIRPERSON: I wish to call your attention to those items on the hearing program marked as Roman numeral 1D items, 1 through 61. Does the Applicant have any objection to the items that the Council has noticed?

MR. BALDWIN: No, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Accordingly,
the Council hereby notices these existing

document statements and comments.

I'll have the appearance by

the Applicant, and Attorney Baldwin, will you

present your witness panel for the purposes

of taking the oath?

MR. BALDWIN: Yes,

Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon. Kenneth

Baldwin with Robinson & Cole on behalf of the

applicants, Celco Partnership, doing

business as Verizon Wireless.

Our witness panel today

consists of the following. To my left, the

Council's right, is Mr. Mike Libertine with

All-Points Technology Corporation. To my

immediate left is Sandy Carter, regulatory

manager with Celco Partnership. To my right

is Jamie Laredo, radio frequency engineer

with Celco Partnership.

To Mr. Laredo's right is Carlo

Centore, a professional engineer with Sintech

Engineering. And to Mr. Centore's right is

Dean Gustafson, a wetland scientist and

professional soil scientist with All-Points

Technology. And I present them to be sworn

at this time, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

Please rise.

Michael Libertine,

Sandy Carter,

Dean Gustafson,

Jamie Laredo,

called as witnesses, being first duly

sworn by the Executive Director, were

examined and testified on their oaths as

follows:

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman,

the hearing program identifies eight exhibits

that the Applicant would like to have

admitted into the record this afternoon.

They are listed in the program under Roman

II, Subsection B, items 1 through 8. And I

offer them at this time for identification

purposes subject to verification by the

witnesses.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Is there any

objection?

(No response.)

THE CHAIRPERSON: Continue

please.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman,

the only exhibit that I think the Council is

just receiving today is the March 3, 2015,

letter from the State Historic Preservation

Officer. That is a new exhibit that wasn't

in the original packet, just for your

reference.

I'll ask my witness panel, did

you prepare or assist in the preparation of

the exhibits listed in the hearing program

under Roman II, Subsection B, 1 through 8?

Mr. Libertine?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes,

I did.

MR. BALDWIN: Mrs. Carter?

THE WITNESS (Carter): Yes, I

did.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Laredo?

THE WITNESS (Laredo): Yes, I

did.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Centore?

THE WITNESS (Centore): Yes, I

did.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: And do you have

any corrections, modifications or amendments

to offer to any of those exhibits at this

time? Mr. Libertine?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): I

have none at this time.

MR. BALDWIN: Mrs. Carter?

THE WITNESS (Carter): Yes, I

do. On the application narrative, on page 21

under United States Fish and Wildlife

Service, Section C, where it says, see

section Roman Numeral III D3B1, it should

read see Section III C4B1.

The second correction is on

the same page, under D, Connecticut

Department of Energy and Environmental

Protection, Subsection 1, where it says, see

section Roman Numeral III D3B2. It should

read see Section III C4B2.

And the last correction is on

the same page under Section E, Connecticut

State Historic Preservation Officer, where it

says see section Roman numeral III D3B3. It

should say Section III C4B4. That is all.
MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Laredo, any corrections or modifications?

THE WITNESS (Laredo): Yes. On page 7 of the application narrative under the need for the East Street facility, the last part of it should read "as plots showing coverage from Celloco's existing Milldale, Southington 2; Berlin 3; Meriden, Southington North, Plainville 3; New Britain 2; New Britain 4 and Berlin/Kensington cell sites, and together with the coverage from the proposed East Street facility are included as Attachment 6. That would be all.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Centore?

THE WITNESS (Centore): No.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): No corrections.

MR. BALDWIN: And with those corrections and modifications, is the information contained in those exhibits true and accurate to the best of your knowledge?

Mr. Libertine?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Mrs. Carter?

THE WITNESS (Carter): Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Laredo.

THE WITNESS (Laredo): Yes, I do.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Centore?

THE WITNESS (Centore): Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: And do you adopt the information contained in these exhibits as your testimony today? Mr. Libertine?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes.

I do.

MR. BALDWIN: Mrs. Carter?

THE WITNESS (Carter): Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Laredo.

THE WITNESS (Laredo): Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Centore?

THE WITNESS (Centore): Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman, I offer them as full exhibits.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

MR. BALDWIN: Mrs. Carter?

THE WITNESS (Carter): Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Laredo.

THE WITNESS (Laredo): Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Centore?

THE WITNESS (Centore): I do.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman, I offer them as full exhibits.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

The exhibits are admitted. We'll now begin with cross-examination by staff, Mr. Cunliffe.

MR. CUNLIFE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CROSS-EXAMINATION

MR. CUNLIFE: Did you fly a balloon today at the proposed site?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes.

There's been a red helium filled balloon at the site since approximately quarter to eight this morning. And that will be up until after 6 p.m. according to the Council's request.

We did lose one balloon during the site walk that we all witnessed. It did get back up. It is tethered, string tethered at a height of 95 feet with an approximate 4-foot diameter balloon on top of that to simulate the height of 97 feet.

MR. CUNLIFE: And could you describe the weather conditions?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Certainly. We had clear skies and very low winds, probably about 2 miles an hour or less up until midday -- things got a little bit more turbulent, and we're probably more in the 4 to 6-mile an hour range at the moment, but for the most part it's been a fairly good day at keeping the balloon aloft in place and at its full height, but obviously, we have some deflections midday.

MR. CUNLIFE: Thank you. Did Cellco consider other stealth camouflage type technologies for the tower?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): We did have some discussions and went through kind of the, what I'll consider to be the -- the normal rotation of options. One was to do something with a concealed pole. The technology and where it's leading today is not really -- it doesn't really fit that type of facility any longer without getting into much, much wider facilities to be able to accommodate it. So we felt as though that wasn't going to work.

We did talk briefly about doing some kind of a tighter array, but there were limitations for that, as well, and a full array, was needed here. So we thought with the -- the backdrop of trees that are...
there today we felt combined with the low, relatively low height that was proposed for the facility we felt the monopine was our best option for doing some type of camouflaging.

MR. CUNLIFFE: Would a silo be one that you thought of?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): A silo in this location, certainly there's, you know, an agricultural component to the -- the property. We didn't really consider a silo, mostly in -- from my own personal -- I can't speak to any of the other construction related or RF related issues, but for mine, I didn't really see the context.

There are no structures on this property. No other buildings. No barns, and so I felt a silo might actually -- because it would have to be a minimum, we're talking, 18 feet in diameter. Probably a little bit more than that. My feeling was that was going to be a much larger surface area. And again, because of the backdrop, it seemed to be -- although I wouldn't rule it out as a potential for this site, I felt as though the tree, from my perspective, just worked much better in the context of what we're dealing with out there.

MR. CUNLIFFE: And the only other thing is the Town does want to use this, so -- although the whips could be affixed on top, it's just one other component that has to be taken into consideration. And I guess there's another related issue -- would be, I'm not sure how the SHPO, State Historic Preservation Office, might feel about that. We had, as you are probably aware, we had a bit of a wrestling match on this site. They -- I can't speak specifically to silos, but I know any camouflage technique, we get into quite a bit of back and forth with that particular office. So that's just one other component that I'm not sure what their reaction would -- would be to something like that.

MR. CUNLIFFE: So a change in design would require a second look?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Or a third in this case, yes, absolutely.

MR. CUNLIFFE: In Council's Question Number 10, the Council requested data from traffic counts. Cellco provided the DOT average annual daily traffic data?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman, I think we have another correction to offer. Well, why don't we have our witness speak to it?

THE WITNESS (Laredo): Those words, "residences," I think should be translated to trips and actual traffic, not residences.

MR. CUNLIFFE: Vehicles?

THE WITNESS (Laredo): Yes.

DR. BELL: Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, we have a follow-up question by --

DR. BELL: I just wanted to ask, what page are we on with that correction?

MR. BALDWIN: Page 5 of the interrogatory responses, Dr. Bell.

DR. BELL: Thank you.

MR. BALDWIN: Response Number 10.

MR. CUNLIFFE: To date have any other wireless carriers expressed an interest in collocating on your proposed 5 (Pages 14 to 17)
THE WITNESS (Carter): No, no other wireless carrier has expressed interest, just the Town of Southington.

MR. CUNLIFFE: In response to Council's Question 6, Cellco provided percentage of dropped call and effective attempts. What is Cellco's threshold for substandard service?

THE WITNESS (Laredo): Specifically, for this type of environment it is ideal to have a .5 percent dropped call rate and ineffective attempts.

MR. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRPERSON: A follow-up, Mr. Lynch.

MR. LYNCH: Yeah, with regards to the same question Number 6, and in your response, second sentence, you use the term "effective attempts." What does that mean? Does that mean attempts for calls or nonrelated calls or both?

THE WITNESS (Centore): Just to clarify, that's "ineffective attempts." And that refers to CDMA voice.

MR. LYNCH: Could you speak up? I can't hear.

THE WITNESS (Laredo): That ineffective attempts statistics actually refers to CDMA voice call access. So when you try to make a call, that's the -- it flags whenever you cannot connect to the -- to the network.

MR. LYNCH: Okay. Then my follow-up question would be, how do you calculate nonrelated call interruptions for people that are streaming or going to an app or, you know, trying to text? Well, text doesn't really matter, but if your app isn't functional or you're trying to go to the clouds, or you're trying to stream something, you know and it doesn't work and it's actually ineffective, how do you calculate that?

THE WITNESS (Laredo): The main impact of this one is system delay, as system delay in -- in downloading data. So it actually drags the call to a point where the user equipment wasn't able to finish the data session that it's supposed to do if it's data related transaction or traffic.

MR. LYNCH: I'm not sure I really got it. So I guess is there another way -- let me put it this way, is there another way of monitoring data than how you monitor calls?

THE WITNESS (Laredo): Yes. Yes, we do, especially everything will be heading towards voice transmitted on all packets of data.

MR. LYNCH: Is a voice being used here, voice IP?

THE WITNESS (Laredo): Yes, its pretty much activated in all the cell sites nowadays.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CUNLIFFE: And to follow-up on substandard service, what is Cellco's tolerance for that substandard service?

THE WITNESS (Laredo): We're talking about CDMA signal level?

MR. CUNLIFFE: Uh-huh.

THE WITNESS (Laredo): It's neg 85 dBm.

MR. CUNLIFFE: And you stated the standard threshold was .5 percent. Your responses were, like, in the over 1 percent range. So anything over .5 percent is not tolerant?

THE WITNESS (Laredo): There are situations that we tolerate that kind of situation, but for this specific one it's double than -- than the ideal success rate.

MR. CUNLIFFE: Okay. The coverage plots for the 700 megahertz and 2100 megahertz refer to signal threshold of 120 dB operational path loss. And the 850 megahertz and the 1900 megahertz
MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Fred.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Lynch.

MR. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Lynch.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Fred.

THE WITNESS (Centore): We don't have a model number at this point.

They just indicated that there -- they did not give us a time frame.

The Town provided any information regarding the types of antennas they might install?

THE WITNESS (Centore): We didn't.

MR. CUNLIFFE: And did the Town provide data to substantiate the 90-foot height for its use?

THE WITNESS (Centore): They did not.

MR. CUNLIFFE: All right.

Cellco stated in response to Question 16 that the tower is designed with 10-foot above the tower? Because you're asking us to bank an extra 10 feet with no time frame involved.

Cellco's antennas for future use by the Town. Did the Town provide data to substantiate the 90-foot height for its use?

THE WITNESS (Laredo): It can be a tablet, a phone or even data card used in computers.

MR. CUNLIFFE: When you're speaking of a user's equipment, you're speaking to a mobile device, like an iPad or a phone?

THE WITNESS (Laredo): The case of a user's equipment, you're speaking to a mobile device, like an iPad or a phone?

MR. CUNLIFFE: When you're speaking to a mobile device, like an iPad or a phone?

THE WITNESS (Laredo): They did not. We had -- we had some preliminary conversations due to concerns of mounting and attachment, and they're -- they're looking at a whip -- whatever type of antenna, we don't have a -- we don't have a model number at this point.

MR. CUNLIFFE: Is there a reason to incorporate the added 10 feet now?

Is there a tower design that, as far as attaching something in the future it's better to put it in at this point than putting in something at 80 and then having to bolt something to that, and then assuming that it may go up even higher than that?

THE WITNESS (Carter): The Town has indicated to us that they do want to use the site in the future. So we -- we do know that, and normally there's 10 feet of separation, so we're -- we're locating 80 feet, hence the 90-foot monopine.

We could -- we could certainly build it to 80 feet and put the top seven branches on the top. It would be more difficult to extend it later. It will be built with a 20-foot extension capability, and in order to increase the height of the monopine -- we're doing this in Vermont presently -- we have to put up the extension and then push all the branches up. That's the way it's going to be designed and disguised. So it would be something would be more difficult in the future rather than just incorporating the 10 feet at this time.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Fred.

You're leading into all my questions. I can get rid of them early.

Do we have any time frame on when the Town may use -- want to use the tower? Because you're asking us to bank an extra 10 feet with no time frame involved.

MR. CUNLIFFE: Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Lynch.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Fred.

You're leading into all my questions. I can get rid of them early.

Do we have any time frame on when the Town may use -- want to use the tower? Because you're asking us to bank an extra 10 feet with no time frame involved.

MR. CUNLIFFE: And another follow-up. If we don't -- are we sure they're only going to use whip antennas, because I know a lot of municipalities are now using microwave technology. So do we have any idea on that, Mr. Centore?

THE WITNESS (Centore): We don't, but I would think that -- we don't have any idea, but I would think that whatever -- whatever antenna type, whether it's a small dish for a -- for a microwave technology or a whip could be accommodated within those, those branches.

MR. LYNCH: You answered my next question which was, you know, would a microwave have problems getting through the branches?

THE WITNESS (Centore): We...
had experience extending a monopine tower? I

MR. CUNLIFFE: And has Cellco
THE WITNESS (Centore): Yes.

THE WITNESS (Centore): Yes.
MR. CUNLIFFE: And has Cellco
had experience extending a monopine tower? I

MR. ASHTON: The branch. Oh,
the branch.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Fred.

MR. CUNLIFFE: To follow up on
Mr. Lynch's observations about the types of
antennas at the top, how would they be
disguised or how would they affect the
visibility of the proposed monopine?

THE WITNESS (Centore): In the
case of -- in the case of a panel antenna, if
that were to be implemented here, it would
be -- it would be screened pretty well by the
branches. In the case of the whip antenna
I -- I would think that you would see a
2-inch diameter rod extending up beyond
the -- beyond the top or hidden within the
branches, but at some point would be -- would
be visible if you're looking for it.

THE WITNESS (Libertine):
Yeah, at the distances off the site where
this facility will be visible, I think you'd
be hard-pressed to pick out that, especially
with the backdrop of other trees.

MR. CUNLIFFE: If the tower
were extended, how would that affect the
Town's position on the tower? Are they
reserving the top only, so if it went up
20 feet they still have the position at the
top, or it's at the 90-foot level reserved?

THE WITNESS (Centore): That's
a very good question, and I would think that
if -- if a whip antenna technology were to be
used here, it would need to be relocated to
the top for it to -- for it to get the proper
separation.

MR. CUNLIFFE: Thank you. Is
the proposed tower capable of being extended
20 feet in height?

THE WITNESS (Centore): Yes.

MR. CUNLIFFE: And does that
20 feet potentially accommodate two
additional carriers?

THE WITNESS (Centore): Yes.
MR. CUNLIFFE: And has Cellco
had experience extending a monopine tower? I

believe Ms. Carter already started to tell us
a story.

THE WITNESS (Carter): As
stated previously, we are in the process
right now in Hartford, Vermont, to extend a
90-foot monopine 20 feet, so it's -- it's
being proposed and permitted right now.

MR. CUNLIFFE: It was at the
top?

And this would be probably
your only instance that you can speak of, or
have you attempted other extensions of
monopines?

THE WITNESS (Carter): This is
our first experience with extending a
monopine since the tower has probably been up
about 12 years, and so it's our first
experience with extending it.

MR. CUNLIFFE: And have you
had any issues in accommodating new antenna
designs or radio heads being installed with
the rollout of new equipment? Just in
typical monopines, not just extending them,
just adding to them.

THE WITNESS (Carter): Not to
Mr. Cunliffe: Did Cellco explore use of an existing 250-foot self-supporting lattice radio tower located approximately 5,000 feet due west of the proposed tower? This tower is located on 40 Old Turnpike Road. I believe this is a radio tower. It might jog your memory.

THE WITNESS (Carter): No, it was not considered.

Mr. Cunliffe: Could antennas at a higher height on this tower provide the necessary coverage?

Mr. Baldwin: We're still talking about the Old Turnpike Road tower?

Mr. Cunliffe: Yes.

Mr. Baldwin: Perhaps that's something we can take a look at over the dinner break, if we could take that as a homework assignment?

Mr. Cunliffe: Thank you. Would Cellco agree that use of an existing electric transmission structure to support wireless antennas was pursued more often in the past than it is today?

THE WITNESS (Carter): Yes.

Mr. Cunliffe: And can Cellco recall the last conversation that they've had with Eversource Energy, formerly known as CL&P, on collocating on an existing electric transmission structure?

THE WITNESS (Carter): I -- I can't be certain, but I would say at least two to three years ago there was a meeting to discuss the use of the transmission lines. And as indicated in the interrogatories to Question Number 15, we state why we do not have applications as recently as this year had applications as recently as this year where other carriers have gone on towers. Can you explain why they would and you won't?

THE WITNESS (Carter): I cannot speak for other carriers or why they do things or don't do things.

Mr. Ashton: What's the scuttlebutt?

THE WITNESS (Carter): It's just that Verizon takes its network reliability very seriously and that when our RF people tell us that we're having problems with a broken antenna or that an antenna is not performing the way it should or we have to do our antenna changes or add new 700 LTE or AWS antennas to the tower and we cannot, it is unacceptable to Verizon to not be able to complete their work. And we've had numerous times where we -- we were not able to do the work because the transmission lines cannot be shut down.

Mr. Ashton: Do you know where the revenue goes from your rental to, formally CL&P now -- or Eversource, does that go back to ratepayers do you know?

THE WITNESS (Carter): No, I do not. I have no idea.

Mr. Ashton: Okay. Thank you very much.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Just as a follow-up to that, if this is helpful, we actually did look at these towers initially, but obviously, we have some issues
with being able to access them, and I know there are, to your point, the other carriers that are still using those. From my perspective, and again, I don't want to speak for either Verizon or the other carriers, but I look at it similarly to a business decision that some of the carriers are making as to whether or not they're going to have a backup generator at their site. They've made the decision that they can use these structures and knowing full well that there's going to be times that they can't access them. They're going to have to wait for outages, so there is -- there is a different philosophy, I think, among different carriers. In this case, we made a conscious decision, even if we could have used those towers not to. And actually, Mr. Gustafson and I were at the initial site design visit, and we reported back to Ms. Carter that our feeling was there are homes that are really literally right next to those towers today, and they're so open there that adding the infrastructure on top, I felt from my perspective, was going to be just an eyesore. So it's kind of a combination here of being a site-specific issue as well as a bigger systems issue, in general, as well. So it's kind of a combined conundrum here.

MR. ASHTON: Thank you.

MR. ASHTON: There are a few. THE WITNESS (Libertine):

There are a few mostly where there are -- where there's redundancy and double lines so that if one can go up they can have more frequent outages or planned outages. But I think you're absolutely right. I think the vast majority are going on the 115s. I think they have a shorter lead time for them to coordinate the outages.

DR. BELL: But so just to get back to the base question here. So your dislike or your unwillingness to go onto towers would include the 115 lines as well as the 345 lines?

THE WITNESS (Carter): That is my understanding from Verizon, yes.

DR. BELL: Thank you.

MR. ASHTON: There are locations along the Atlantic seaboard, I've seen, where 500 kV towers have cell towers in their tops. So I haven't figured out yet how this experience gets made consistent across the Northeast. To my mind there are some differences that I find surprising as a person with a little bit of a background in this area.

THE WITNESS (Centore): I'd like to step in a little bit, because I -- I deal with the utility towers quite a bit working with Connecticut Light & Power. And we've found that it doesn't necessarily mean if it's a 115 or 345 kVA line if it -- if it's actually going to be delayed and shut down.

There's actually a rating system. They rate them from one to four on -- on what level they need to be, what level of time required to shut down the line, and it has to do if there's redundancy in the system.

I also know that there's some level one sites that are typically easy sites. If those site -- of those lines, I should say, if those lines feed a railroad line or have anything to do with the railroad, they're off, off limits altogether because they're concerned with shut -- with shutting power down to railroads. So there's
a whole formula that gets figured in when we go out to these site visits. You're basically --

MR. ASHTON: I can well understand that. And, well anyway --

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

Staff, any other questions?

MR. CUNLIFFE: Yes, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Centore basically answered basically my next question and it has to do with the Council's administrative notice Item Number 49, which was a letter from Mr. Morissette to Attorney Fisher regarding CL&P's policy on installation of cellular and PCS antennas. Are you familiar with that document?

THE WITNESS (Centore): I'm actually not familiar with the document itself. I'm sorry.

MR. CUNLIFFE: If I was to provide a copy for you and then maybe you could peruse it and then respond back after the break, dinner break?

THE WITNESS (Centore): Absolutely.

MR. CUNLIFFE: So I'll give it to you when we break.

THE WITNESS (Centore): Thank you.

MR. CUNLIFFE: And basically the premise of the reading of the letter has to do with the outage availability ratings that are mentioned in the letter and whether you know what the availability outage rating is for the adjacent lines to the site.

Would the slats inside the chain-link fence deter climbing?

THE WITNESS (Centore): They would, along with the smaller hole size in the fence mesh.

MR. CUNLIFFE: Is Cellco proposing to put a smaller mesh on their fence?

THE WITNESS (Centore): Yes.

MR. CUNLIFFE: Would the generator run periodically to maintain it in proper working condition?

THE WITNESS (Centore): Yes, the generator would be cycled once a week for approximately 20 minutes.

MR. CUNLIFFE: And would the noise from the HVAC units comply with applicable noise standards at the property lines?

THE WITNESS (Centore): Yes, they would.

MR. CUNLIFFE: The town of -- inland wetland and watercourses regulations has a 200-foot setback to vernal pools. Is the proposed site 200 feet from a vernal pool?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): No, we're -- we're within 200 feet. We're more than a hundred feet away from the nearest vernal pool, but we're approximately 115 feet or so from the nearest vernal pool edge.

MR. CUNLIFFE: I believe Mr. Gustafson, you characterized the area is within an active agricultural compost area and, quote, is primarily located within existing unsuitable vernal pool terrestrial habitat, unquote. And would you agree with that?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That's correct.

MR. CUNLIFFE: And is there a benefit to shift the compound in a southwest direction so as to the northeast corner of the compound is located where approximately the tower is proposed to be located to retain the maple trees and not disturb the edge of the forested habitat which is part of the critical terrestrial habitat of the vernal pools?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): For this particular facility, we're trying to find a balance with utilizing some of the screening of the -- the mature tree edge vegetation and minimizing our encroachment into habitat that's being provided for the critical terrestrial habitat to the nearby vernal pools.

So I felt that we -- we provided a balance point to -- to adjust the development to minimize impacts to the critical terrestrial habitat. I don't think we're having a significant effect by removing a few trees, and we are providing some vegetative screening for the facility.

MR. CUNLIFFE: You have the
THE WITNESS (Gustafson): What would that mean?

MR. CUNLIFFE: And you speak properly protected during construction.

MR. CUNLIFFE: Is one and to ensure that those species are like, what you need to do if you do encounter encountering spotted turtles, what they look development site, the potential for they understand the sensitive nature of the area for planting and farming, to minimize area of -- of where most of the heavy equipment will be working to construct the facility.

That will be done in -- in coordination with providing an education session with the -- the construction crew so they understand the sensitive nature of the development site, the potential for encountering spotted turtles, what they look like, what you need to do if you do encounter one and to ensure that those species are properly protected during construction.

MR. CUNLIFFE: And you speak of installation. Describe exactly what that would mean?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson):

THE CHAIRPERSON: I think Mr. Hannon has a follow up.

Mr. Hannon: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think you just basically answered it. So there is going to be sort of an active search every morning to make sure if any turtles happen to get in during the evening hours, that before construction starts you'll have somebody physically walking the site and removing the turtles if any are found within that?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That's true. What we've done on other construction projects with Verizon Wireless is that there will be some type of gate established for -- to essentially close off the entire project area at the end of the workday so that way turtles don't have an opportunity to -- to migrate into the construction zone after the end of the workday and the beginning of the next morning.

However, you know, obviously the workers need to drive up to the facility.
So typically what we do is, you know, we do an education session and we find -- for the construction crew -- we find or identify an individual in the construction crew who's responsible for essentially monitoring the area.

This is a fairly wide open area, so if there are turtles that are essentially on the -- the access road in there, you'll be able to see them. They're not going to be obstructed by vegetation or anything. So you know, that responsible person will be responsible for essentially sweeping the area as they move into it each morning.

But the construction's actual work zone will be cordoned off each night to prevent that from occurring, from turtles having an opportunity to work and make their way into the construction zone.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

MR. CUNLIFFE: Thank you.

THE WITNESS: You're welcome.

MR. CUNLIFFE: In the turtle protection plan, it states a monthly reporting requirement will be provided to the Council. Does this apply to when turtles are found?

THE WITNESS: Well, if we do find a turtle that will be noted in our report, but a monthly report will be submitted regardless of whether the turtles are found or not.

MR. CUNLIFFE: And will Cellco request a natural diversity database review with DEEP if commencement of construction does not begin before December 18, 2015?

THE WITNESS: Yes, they will.

MR. CUNLIFFE: The overall scheduling states approximately eight to ten weeks to complete installation of tower and operations. The Council observes that this has occurred over several months. Describe the actual process and timeline expected to construct the proposed facility.

THE WITNESS: For this site here, you're looking at a eight- to ten-week construction period from -- from beginning to end. There will be a lot of activity up front to cut in the road and actually dig out the compound area for the tower foundation.

Then, at that point, I would say that would happened within the first four to five weeks there's going to be a bit of activity. Once -- once that's backfilled and stabilized the site -- this site cleans up pretty well in that everything is brought back to a state where it's stable. There's no open excavations, and -- and it's waiting for the tower to come in and be erected.

The eight to ten weeks, could extend that to 12 weeks, but those additional weeks wouldn't be due to additional construction activity, but lead time associated with getting the tree type, tower and branches delivered to the site.

MR. CUNLIFFE: I think my point is that, you know, we're thinking eight to ten weeks, and you think it would just happen. But I think what you're trying to characterize is that there's periods of time when there's activity, and then there could be periods of time when you're waiting for equipment to come in or something. So there could be a few weeks delay before that goes in. So there could be a quiet period, and then again you get the tower up, and now you've got to wait for electric interconnections. Am I characterizing that right?

THE WITNESS: Yes, and those things could all change. You might get the power in sooner if they can, and they will bring that in if that's not contingent on -- on the tower going up. So it's all a matter of timing, that with the utility company.

MR. CUNLIFFE: Will Cellco incorporate the provisions in accordance with the Department of Public Health's recommendations outlined in its letter to the Council dated February 4, 2015?

THE WITNESS: Yes. And we prepared a response to address the concerns of DPH for proper protection of resources so that during construction, you know, with respect to possible fuel releases from construction equipment to sediment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 50</th>
<th>Page 52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>THE WITNESS (Centore): The propane tank is outside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MR. LYNCH: Okay. I misunderstood that. Thank you very much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>We'll now go to cross-examination by the Council. We'll start with Mr. Ashton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MR. ASHTON: Thank you. We've talked already about the use of the CL&amp;P structures. There's one other structure that I wondered if you looked at. Adjacent to the CL&amp;P substation is a building that fronts on Bellevue Avenue and it has a new lattice structure, three-sided structure with microwave dishes on it. And it's about 80 feet high. I would guess. And it's -- I think it's capable of going higher. But was that structure examined? If not, why not? It's just north of the historic house that's on Bellevue Avenue, a few hundred feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Ashton, can we take that as a homework assignment? I think we have an answer, but we just want to put our minds together, if you don't mind.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 51</th>
<th>Page 53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Those are my questions, Chairman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mr. Lynch, you want to follow up now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MR. LYNCH: Just to follow up on the propane. In the past you stated that it's site specific as to whether you use diesel or propane. My first part of the question is, why was this selection propane?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>THE WITNESS (Centore): Correct. Any of the -- the actual generator equipment room has a -- can hold the fluid from -- from any spillage from the -- from the generator itself. In this case, seeing that it's a propane generator, it would only be any of the oil or coolants that are in the generator room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MR. CUNLiffe: Thank you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 52</th>
<th>Page 53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Ashton, can we take that as a homework assignment? I think we have an answer, but we just want to put our minds together, if you don't mind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MR. ASHTON: Okay. You've answered the question about other carriers. Could a monopine be striped of its branches and converted to a monopole. I know I'm not proposing anything here, but I'm trying to get educated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>THE WITNESS (Centore): They are going to be coming off an existing phone number 413, which is on the north side of East Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MR. ASHTON: Okay. You've answered the question about other carriers. Could a monopine be striped of its branches and converted to a monopole. I know I'm not proposing anything here, but I'm trying to get educated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>THE WITNESS (Centore): They are going to be coming off an existing phone number 413, which is on the north side of East Street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Exactly. It will have some stubble left behind, but it can be stripped of its branches.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Actually, CL&P did that to one of my trees in my front yard, and I'm still rather upset about that.

MR. ASHTON: Maybe.

Another question that I've experienced that I need a little guidance on, my phone, which just happens to be other than a Verizon, I get the message occasionally, emergency calls only. Does that mean that the system is so low that it will only accept 911 calls?

THE WITNESS (Laredo): That may mean that the carrier for your phone is not capable of giving you enough coverage sufficiently enough to rely on the --

MR. ASHTON: It comes from an area around my house which gets marginal coverage at that point, you know, at one bar, if you will. But I've gotten it a couple of times in different locations, and the thought struck me that this was maybe a way of saying that the network is too heavily loaded.

THE WITNESS (Laredo): I defer to agree with that. If those events happened in the same day and in close proximity, probably there's a maintenance operation going on with that specific --

MR. ASHTON: I'm sorry. I couldn't hear you.

THE WITNESS (Laredo): There could possibly -- a troubleshooting or maintenance operation happening during that time if it happened on that specific date only. That's the closest I can relate it to.

MR. ASHTON: My last question goes to the issue of optimizing the use of a site. With the towns indicating that some day in the future, God knows when, that other carriers not expressing interest, the temptation is so upon us that they're going to prune the tree down.

By the same token, the planning horizon for a cell tower, a cell carrier seems to be quite short relatively speaking, you know, a couple years at most. The tower has the ability to be extended 20 feet over what has been proposed. Am I correct in that?

THE WITNESS (Carter): That is correct.

MR. ASHTON: So that would give you enough room for three carriers and the Town. Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Centore): Correct.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. Nothing further. Thank you very much.

Dr. Bell.

DR. BELL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

In Tab 14 of the application, which is the wetland and vernal pool evaluation, page 7, at the end of the top paragraph, I'm trying to understand the sentence that's the last sentence there. The context is that you're describing a situation where there's a potential for the amphibians to mistake a wet area for the vernal pool, and you don't want to lure them into this type of situation.

And you're saying that you're not going to do that.

And you're mentioning that you will have certain storm water control features there which would be two riprap level spreaders and a grass line swale. But the sentence isn't exactly expressing why these would not produce the bad situation for the critters. So I just need you to expand on this a little.

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Sure. I'd be happy to. The site conditions or soil conditions at the site are such that we're located on top of excessively drained glacial outwash material. I think it's classified as Manchester gravelly sand.

And in combination with that and the small area, drainage area that these storm water features would capture, we're looking at a small volume of storm water that will be treated by these features. So we're not talking about a large volume of water to begin with. So the duration of any water standing in these features would be, you know, a fairly short period.

In addition, the underlying
So the intention here was to make them realize that not only was this particular facility not going to be visible from that location, but if you're looking from the property out, that there are other nontraditional or nonhistoric resources in the area. And I'm not trying to color it in a way that suggests, well, two wrongs now make a right. Its more just, again I want to make sure they understand what they're looking at in terms -- and they're not looking just kind of within a box saying, well, this has a certain status so everything is off limits. It's really a matter of just, I wanted to make sure we were framing what they were looking at correctly.

As you could see, we also took the exact same photos we took in the summer, in the wintertime. We had had a conversation early on, on this -- or about this particular site with the SHPO, and it was somewhat confusing during that initial conversation to figure out whether or not they were really concerned about the resource, or were they just concerned about a monopine, because there has been, in my opinion, a bit of some office bias in that office against monopines in general. So what we wanted to do was give them everything so that we wouldn't run -- and in this case it worked, not just because they actually rescinded their original decision, but more so that we got some resolution before we came before you folks.

So again, a long story short is that it was really the intention just to give them as much information as we could, which we thought would help in them understanding. They're so overloaded with work that they can't get out to these sites on a regular basis, so I just didn't want them to be -- their judgment to be focused just solely on, we have this resource and it's only so far away, so all bets are off. So again, it was more to give context more -- more than anything else.

DR. BELL: Okay. And just to follow up on the comment you made about they're overloaded and can't get out to every site. They have in the past, gone out to sites, telecom sites. Haven't they.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE WITNESS (Libertine):</th>
<th>THE WITNESS (Carter):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| There -- there have been. I will say going back a few years, it used to be almost routine where I was asked by clients, primarily Mrs. Carter, to see if we could get a balloon float, drive the AP with the SHPO so that they could really get a sense. So they tended to be much more receptive to that. That has not been the case in the last couple of years. There's been a regime change, but to your point, we have recently gotten them out on less than a handful of sites, but it's taken a lot of prying and really, I hate to say it, but almost putting -- putting them into a corner to do that. I mean it with all due respect. I know they are -- they are very understaffed. They don't -- they have three people, and only one person is really dedicated to the telecom program because they're so inundated with other type of work. So it's become harder and harder, but yes there are instances. One of the most recent dockets, we were able to go back out two weeks ago on that site, and we're waiting to hear back from them on how we're going to deal with that. So it can happen, but it's getting very difficult to do. DR. BELL: Thank you. Those are my questions. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Dr. Klemens? DR. KLEMENS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You indicated that you're removing -- or you're phasing out the antennas on Meriden Mountain. And my question is, and I think I know the answer to this, you're not the only people using that antenna. Are you? THE WITNESS (Carter): We are phasing out, eventually, the antennas on Meriden Mountain. And no, we are not the only user of that tower. DR. KLEMENS: So there will be other users still using it? THE WITNESS (Carter): To my knowledge, yes. DR. KLEMENS: Okay. Thank you. I figured that was the answer. I notice on the site that you have this bifurcated access. You have the utilities coming in in one area and the road coming in another area. And I guess I understand that part of it has to do with the location of the utilities and the location of the existing road. There's no way those could be combined to have less impact and less disturbance? THE WITNESS (Centore): The -- the routing for the utilities on this was -- was based on a site visit with the utility company and where they wanted to see the utilities come in for the site. DR. KLEMENS: Okay. Thank you. On the vernal pool report, the figure at the end, as I see it, you have the cultivated fields. You're considering them as developed habitat. And this is not -- I would just ask you to go back. And this is not for a late-file, but just for the future, to go back into Calhoun and Klemens and look, yeah, and look how cultivated fields are treated as to whether they're considered habitat or not for the future. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): We will. DR. KLEMENS: It doesn't alter anything here, but I think it's just a comment. Can you just, for the record, to follow up on what Mr. Cunliffe was saying, can you tell us how much of the terrestrial, for the record, how big the increase and loss of forested habitat this is going to be for each of the vernal pools, the removal of these trees? THE WITNESS (Gustafson): The -- the total development within the -- the critical terrestrial habitat is three hundredths of an acre of impact. So it ends up being .05 percent increase in development in the critical terrestrial habitat, which we certainly considered a de minimis. It will not have adverse effect on that habitat. DR. KLEMENS: And I would agree with that response. I think it is de minimis. And I want to just go back and ask, because I think you said something that I don't think I heard correctly, or maybe
they're going to be moving out of the wooded area. As you move further to the west and southwest, there isn't possible to have that vernal pool habitat, there probably is a greater chance of them migrating out into the forest habitat and utilizing some of that opening for nesting.

DR. KLEMENS: And so, by excluding activities from the 20th of June -- 20th of May to the 20th of June, you would feel that would probably cover the turtle nesting season then?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It would, and I would probably recommend to Verizon with respect to that issue, that we set up -- make sure that we set up erosion control measures, isolation barriers before that period so that we don't have turtles nesting within the construction zone laying eggs, and then moving, you know, out and then us coming in after the fact and not knowing where those nests are located. So --

DR. KLEMENS: But you'll leave ample areas for the turtles to move into the rest of the cultivated field?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That's correct. There would be a fairly small area. And we're talking -- we're not talking about a large linear project. We're talking about a fairly distinct construction zone, so it wouldn't affect their migration.

DR. KLEMENS: Great. I have no further questions. Thank you.

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

Mr. Hannon?

MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

On the application, I have a question, introduction, the bottom of page 6 and on the top of page 7, where it looks as though the philosophy of the company is going away from the larger towers to developing shorter more numerous towers, is that correct? Because I guess one of the issues...
that that leads to is then will there be a
proliferation of towers?

THE WITNESS (Laredo): That is
correct.

THE CHAIRPERSON: That's your
answer.

THE WITNESS (Laredo): It
would actually mean that we will densify in
terms of number of sites and not specifically
towers.

MR. HANNON: So would this
then include these mini units that we're
seeing coming in at different sites, whether
it's on buildings?

THE WITNESS (Laredo): That's
exactly right.

MR. HANNON: Things at some of
the fairgrounds, things of that nature?

THE WITNESS (Laredo): That's
entirely true, yes.

MR. HANNON: Okay. So
although the number may increase, the numbers
of towers per se may not increase?

THE WITNESS (Laredo): That's
correct.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you.
In the March 3, 2015, letter,
the aquifer protection area assessment, I
mean, the first paragraph talks about this
being an area of the aquifer protection zone
for Well 7 and 8 in particular. I didn't see
any details associated with the propane tank
other than the fact that I believe it's a
thousand-gallon propane tank. Can you
provide some information on that? And I'm
making sure that that is not going to have
any adverse impact on the aquifer.

Because I know that typically,
when you're talking about the diesel
generators, you've got the double-walled
tanks, things of that nature. But I did not
see any documentation as far as the propane
tank itself, so I have no idea what the
details are on it, nor do I know what may be
there, incorporated with the pad or if it's
just a slab. And if anything happens to roll
off, it can get into the surface. So --

THE WITNESS (Centore): The
detail is steel, steel tank, propane tank,
and it's mounted to the top of a concrete pad

that's bolted down to the pad.

MR. HANNON: Okay. So there's
no double wall or anything like that.

There's no area on the bottom of the pad to
retain any type of material that might happen
to discharge?

THE WITNESS (Centore):
Correct. There's no
containment for the propane tank.

MR. HANNON: And I think this
has probably been discussed somewhere in the
past. And I know the reason for using
propane when you have wetlands areas is
because it tends not to be as destructive to
the environment. But if there was some type
of a leak or a rupture of the tank and you
started having the propane leaking out, what
impact would that have on the ground or on
the wetland area, which is relatively close
by, or the aquifer which is below?

THE WITNESS (Centore): I'm --
I'm not aware, in my experience, of any
propane leakage that -- that actually leaked
into the ground. In most -- in most cases
it's the vapor gas that would -- would leak
off the tank, and you would smell it.

So in terms of spills, I've
never seen any -- any situations where
they -- where we've come across that problem.

And I would think at this -- at this point,
if that were a concern we would be seeing
propane tanks with double-walled containment,
and I haven't seen any of those, in my
experience, over the last 15 years.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you.
And then a question I raised
at the site walk. Tab 4 in the application,
there's an aerial photograph, and to the area
to the right of where the wind rows are, it's
sort of the northernmost wind row, there
appears to be what I would consider
potentially a stream over that area, I mean,
just based on the aerial photo.

Looking at the topo maps there
does not appear to be one. So can you give
an explanation as to what this might be?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson):
Sure. And it is not an intermittent stream
or any type of stream feature. We did look
at that area during our wetland investigation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 74</th>
<th>Page 75</th>
<th>Page 76</th>
<th>Page 77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back in May of last year, and we do note --</td>
<td>Thank you.</td>
<td>THE WITNESS (Centore): Sorry.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we did note during our investigation that</td>
<td></td>
<td>COMM. CARON: No. No. No, I</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is some storm water runoff coming from</td>
<td>appreciate that. And if anything, just a bit</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the compost area, as well as probably some</td>
<td>of the monopine as it rises into the</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>runoff from the surrounding agricultural</td>
<td>treeline. And based on the photo</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field that kind of channels through that</td>
<td>simulations, I mean, with I think only one</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area.</td>
<td>exception, it seemed to blend right in in</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And there is some small rain</td>
<td>terms of the treeline.</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erosion that -- that was cutting through that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area. That eventually drains into the woods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At that point, once it hits the woods, the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wood line, it kind of disperses throughout</td>
<td>THE WITNESS (Libertine): That</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the area. Although we did note a little bit</td>
<td>was the intent of the -- the design of the</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of settlement, isolated sedimentation into</td>
<td>monopine. And in terms of the landscaping,</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one area of Wetland 1, but we didn't, you</td>
<td>that was kind of a combined effort. We did</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know, it wasn't a significant issue, but that</td>
<td>meet with several neighbors during the summer</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was -- that's what the future that is -- that</td>
<td>or early fall, and there had been some</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you're looking at on that aerial photograph.</td>
<td>current concerns from them about looking into</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you.</td>
<td>the compound and that type of thing. So we</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no other questions.</td>
<td>took kind of a conservative approach and</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.</td>
<td>decided that we would more or less</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Caron?</td>
<td>overpopulate those sides where there is some</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM. CARON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.</td>
<td>openness.</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Chairman.</td>
<td>But you're right in your</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So just some questions</td>
<td>assessment in driving by there today. It's a</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>very narrow window where you're really able</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to see directly out to that area. And those</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. concerning the evergreen screening. So I looked at one of your renderings. It looks like it's on three sides. And as I walked the property, it seems like the sightlines to the proposed facility area are mostly screened already. Is that correct? Is that a correct assessment?

THE WITNESS (Centore): That is a correct assessment. And actually, with the -- with the construction of that, I'll call it the North, the northerly court -- the northeasterly corner of the compound where we're clearing those trees, that's actually getting cut in a little bit. So just the situation where the site sits, it provides its own screening.

COMM. CARON: Its own screening? And so with the addition of the evergreen plantings, and as I look at, again, it's in Tab 4, with very few exceptions it looks like virtually no one will be able to see certainly the --

THE WITNESS (Centore): The compound.

COMM. CARON: The compound.
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1. are areas where just from there, and there are two neighbors on the west side of the road that we wanted to make sure that they wouldn't be looking and being able to see any lower portions of the -- the facility.

COMM. CARON: As I was looking at the balloon flight and looking at some of the photo simulations, unless I'm actually looking for this, it's blending in pretty good. It seems like it blends in pretty good based on what we're seeing, at least in the presentation.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): I would agree. And that was really, again we felt, you know, again -- that the tree towers don't always work. We know that. But the combination of the height and this setting seems to really be, I think, a good combination. So that's really why we went with that. So I'd agree with your assessment.

COMM. CARON: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's good for me.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

Mr. Lynch?
MR. LYNCH: Thanks to Mr. Cunliffe, most of my questions have been answered. That probably scares the hell out of him.

But inasmuch as I want to get into the discussion of monopine, monopole, silo, I'm going to pass on that also. I do have one minor question, and that regards the backup generator for Verizon. In the future when the Town does come on board, if they come on board, would they be able to tie into this generator, or they have to get their own?

THE WITNESS (Centore): Under the current design they would have to get their own.

MR. LYNCH: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Those are my questions.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Would you then be amenable if the Council determined that maybe you should provide a generator that would allow the Town, so we wouldn't have a proliferation of generators and also given the sensitivity of the wetlands?

THE WITNESS (Centore): I would think to say that, if it were to provide emergency power for the Town, there the equipment that they typically have is minimal, and it could be accommodated within Verizon's equipment room and proper sizing of the generator. If -- if the intent is for future expansion of the facility for other carriers, I think that would be a more difficult situation.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, the question was specifically about the Town, so I think you've answered that. We're still grappling with that other issue, which I guess so far only one carrier, which doesn't seem to be building many towers lately, seems to think it's a good idea. And the others are still struggling. Are there any --

MR. ASHTON: I got one question.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Ashton.

MR. ASHTON: I'm almost embarrassed to ask, so bear with me. Is there natural gas available at the site as opposed to propane?

THE WITNESS (Centore): There is natural gas available in the street. We haven't confirmed what the pressure is on the gas or if a booster pump will be necessary or not. But Verizon's preferred method of fueling, when it comes to gas, is to use a propane.

MR. ASHTON: It's your call.

THE WITNESS (Centore): Correct.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. The Council will recess until 7 p.m., at which time we'll commence the public comment session. And we will expect that your homework assignments will be completed prior to that time or at that time. So thank you. We'll see you all back at seven.

(Whereupon, the witnesses were excused, and the above proceedings were adjourned at 4:25 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE
I hereby certify that the foregoing 80 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original verbatim notes taken of the Council Meeting in re: DOCKET NO. 455, CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS, APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATION OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY LOCATED AT SOUTHINGTON TAX ASSESSOR MAP/LOT 066053, 99 EAST STREET, SOUTHINGTON, CONNECTICUT, which was held before ROBERT STEIN, Chairperson, at the Southington Town Hall, Council Chambers, 75 Main Street, Southington, Connecticut, on March 10, 2015.

____________________________
Robert G. Dixon, CVR-M 857
Court Reporter
UNITED REPORTERS, INC.
90 Brainard Road, Suite 103
Hartford, Connecticut 06114
## INDEX

1. WITNESSES
   - MICHAEL LIBERTINE
   - DEAN GUSTAFSON
   - SANDY CARTER
   - JAMIE LAREDO
   - CARLO F. CENTORE

2. EXAMINERS:
   - Mr. Cunliffe

3. Pages:
   - Page 7
   - Page 12