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THE CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to call to order this meeting of the Connecticut Siting Council today, Tuesday December 15, 2015, at approximately 3 p.m. My name is Robin Stein. I'm Chairman of the Siting Council.

Other members of the Council present are Senator James Murphy, our Vice Chairman; Mr. Hannon, designee from the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection; Mr. Levesque, designee from the Public Utilities Regulatory authority; and Mr. Lynch.

Members of the staff present, Attorney Melanie Bachman, who is our Executive Director; and Mr. Mercier, our Siting Analyst.

This meeting, or hearing is held pursuant to provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of Uniform Administrative Procedure Act upon an Application from American Towers, LLC, and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC, for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the Construction,
Maintenance and Operation of a
Telecommunications Facility located at 351A
Boston Post Road, East Lyme, Connecticut.
The application was received by the Council
on October 6, 2015.

As a reminder to all,
off-the-record communication with a member of
the Council or a member of the Council staff
upon the merits of this application is
prohibited by law.

The parties to the proceeding
are as follows. The Applicant, American
Towers, LLC, and New Cingular Wireless PCS,
LLC, Attorney Fisher from Cuddy & Feder; the
Town of East Lyme, their Attorney Tracy
Collins; and BHSO Community Conservancy and
their attorney, Mr. Ainsworth.

We will proceed in accordance
with the prepared agenda, copies of which are
available, I believe, in the back. Also
available here are copies of the Council's
At the end of this afternoon's session we
will recess and then 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 the
parties, 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.

If necessary, party
presentations may continue after the public
comment session if time remains. A verbatim
transcript will be made of this hearing and
deposited with the town clerk's office in
East Lyme for the convenience of the public.

Is there any public official
who would like to make a statement?

First Selectman Nickerson?

MARK C. NICKERSON: Thank you,

yeah.
I'm the First Selectman of East Lyme. Mr. Chairman and Commissioners and members of the public, and applicants, welcome to East Lyme. Thank you for coming out here and conducting this in public on behalf of and in front of the town so we can hear all the testimony. It's an important part of the process and we do appreciate that.

The Siting Council has been here several times. We had a solar farm just a couple of years ago that we're still working out the details on. It isn't quite a finished product, although it should have been finished years ago.

And there was a cell tower a couple of years back that came with some controversy. But I welcome you back and I want to welcome the process.

I will note for the record, I believe one of the intervenors has negotiated an extension of the lease of the current tower that sits up on the hill now and that is being used, that is to be replaced as part of this application.
And we've identified another site that's on the National Guard site that we would urge the commission to at least consider and do its due diligence, as I know you do with every application and with every idea, that there is an existing tower there that we'd like to see an extension on.

It would benefit the Town because we have public safety antennas on there now and we would like to see that extended. And I think it would be less intrusive to -- I don't believe there's any neighbors that would object to that. So do least consider that in your deliberations.

But again, welcome to the town. Have a good dinner in between. Enjoy our town. We have a great downtown. The shops are open tonight, too, so I hope you brought your credit card.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if we can end the evening session at a reasonable hour, maybe we can enjoy your shops, but I guess we can't guarantee that.

Thank you very much.
I wish to call your attention
to those items shown on the hearing program
marked as Roman numeral 1D, items 1 through
69. Does the applicant or any party have any
objection to the items that the Council has
administratively noticed?

MR. FISHER: No objections.

THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing and
seeing none, the Council hereby
administratively notices these existing
documents, statements and comments.

We'll now go to the appearance
by the applicant. Attorney Fisher, will you
present your witness panel for the purposes
of taking the oath, please?

MR. FISHER: Good afternoon,
Chairman and members of the Council.
Attorney Chris Fisher for the applicants,
American Tower and AT&T.

We do have several witnesses
who are listed in the hearing program, most
of all are here today. If you want to swear
them now -- if they would introduce
themselves for purposes of the Council?

MICHAEL LIBERTINE: Mike
Libertine with All-Points, handling the environmental aspects of the project.

CAMILO A. GAVIRIA: Camilo Gaviria with Centek Engineering, handling the structural and civil aspects.

HARRY ROCHEVILLE: Harry Rocheville also with Centek Engineering.

MARTIN LAVIN: Martin Lavin, C-Squared Systems, doing the yard portion.

JENNIFER YOUNG GAUDET:

Jennifer Young Gaudet on behalf of American Towers, and I'll be addressing portions of the site acquisition process.

DAN BILEZIKIAN: Dan Bilezikian, SAI Communication, also will be addressing portions of the site acquisition.

KEVIN MASON: Kevin Mason, Area Manager, AT&T.

KELLY WADE BETTUCHI: Kelly Bettuchi, Area Manager, AT&T, responsible for government relations, community relations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you all rise, and join Mr. Libertine, to take the oath?
MICHAEL LIBERTINE,
CAMILO A. GAVIRIA,
HARRY ROCHEVILLE,
MARTIN LAVIN,
JENNIFER YOUNG GAUDET,
DAN BILEZIKIAN,
KEVIN MASON,
KELLY WADE BETTUCHI,
called as witnesses, being first duly
sworn by the Executive Director, were
examined and testified on their oaths as
follows:

MR. FISHER: Chairman, we have
items listed in the hearing program under
Roman numeral 2, capital B, 1 through 8,
which are the applicant's materials submitted
to the Council. If you would accept those
for identification I'll go through the
process of verifying them?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, please go
ahead.

MR. FISHER: I'd ask each of
the witnesses a few questions. If you could
each individually answer yes or no, or
provide any clarifications as necessary.
Did you prepare or assist in the preparation and assemble the documents that have just been identified in the hearing program one through eight, under the applicant's appearance?

THE WITNESS (Libertine):  Mike Libertine, yes.
THE WITNESS (Gaviria):  Camilo Gaviria, yes.
THE WITNESS (Rocheville):
Harry Rocheville, yes.
THE WITNESS (Lavin):  Martin Lavin, yes.
THE WITNESS (Gaudet):
Jennifer Young Gaudet, yes.
THE WITNESS (Bilezikian):  Dan Bilezikian, yes.
THE WITNESS (Mason):  Kevin Mason, yes.
THE WITNESS (Bettuchi):  Kelly Bettuchi, yes.
MR. FISHER:  And having reviewed those documents in preparation for your testimony today, are there any corrections or modifications that you
identified that need to be made for the record?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike Libertine. I have no changes at this time.

THE WITNESS (Gaviria):

Camilo Gaviria, no changes at this time.

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):

Harry Rocheville, I have two changes. It's going to be on the site plan, the CSK-1.

There are two trees to the southwest of the southern retaining wall that we have deemed we'll be able to protect rather than remove. They are the two trees right at the southwest corner of the southern retaining wall that are not touching it.

MR. FISHER: And just for the record, that's interrogatory responses and it's behind exhibit tab D.

MR. LYNCH: Mr. Fisher, you're going to have to speak up. I'm having a hard time hearing you.

MR. FISHER: Yes, Mr. Lynch.

And additional corrections
that you have at this time?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):

Yeah, the second correction

would be to interrogatory response 15. There

will be 45 trees removed with a 12-inch

diameter breast height. I believe the

interrogatory currently says 96 trees, and

that should be corrected to 45.

MR. FISHER: Mr. Lavin?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin

Lavin, no changes.

THE WITNESS (Gaudet):

Jennifer Young Gaudet. I do

have one change which would appear in three

locations. This is with respect to the date

at which the site search process began.

Those, the date currently reads 2014.

In fact, the site search dates

back to approximately August of 2013, and

those corrections would be made in the

introduction section at pages 3 and 14, as

well is in the section entitled, site search

summary.

MR. FISHER: And that change

should also be made in the statement of
facts, the third bullet point down.

Mr. Bilezikian?

THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): Dan Bilezikian, no changes at this time.

THE WITNESS (Mason): Kevin Mason, no changes at this time.

THE WITNESS (Bettuchi): Kelly Bettuchi, no changes at this time.

MR. FISHER: And with the corrections and modifications that were just made, are the documents true and accurate to the best of your belief?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike Libertine, yes.

THE WITNESS (Gaviria): Camilo Gaviria, yes.

THE WITNESS (Rocheville): Harry Rocheville, yes.

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, yes.

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Jennifer Young Gaudet, yes.

THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): Dan Bilezikian, yes.

THE WITNESS (Mason): Kevin
Mason, yes.

THE WITNESS (Bettuchi): Kelly Bettuchi, yes.

MR. FISHER: And for purposes of your testimony today, do you adopt them as your sworn testimony?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes I do. Mike Libertine.

THE WITNESS (Gaviria): Camilo Gaviria. Yes, I do.

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):

Harry Rocheville, yes.

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, yes.

THE WITNESS (Gaudet):

Jennifer Young Gaudet, yes.

THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): Dan Bilezikian, yes.

THE WITNESS (Mason): Kevin Mason, yes.

THE WITNESS (Bettuchi): Kelly Bettuchi, yes.

MR. FISHER: Thank you.

Chairman, I would ask that the applicant's exhibits be accepted into
evidence at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Do any of the parties object
to the admission of the applicant's exhibits?

(No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Seeing

none, the exhibits are admitted. We will now

begin with the cross-examination by

Mr. Mercier.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you.

I'd just like to review some

of the items that were discussed at the field

review today. First off, would you please
describe the conditions today for the balloon

that was to be flown at the site the same

height of the tower?

THE WITNESS (Libertine):

Certainly. As the

Councilmembers I'm sure are aware as soon as

they stepped out of the car, it's a

challenging day out there to maintain any

type of height with a balloon.

But we were able to have a

five and half foot diameter balloon. It was

red and yellow tethered to 194 feet at the
centerline of the proposed tower. And that was up from seven o'clock this morning until about shortly after 1, about 1:15 or so. That was punctured in multiple locations.

We then attempted three separate consecutive floats with a four-foot diameter red balloon to no avail. It's just at this point we have winds anywhere from 10 to 25 miles an hour with gusts pushing upwards of 30 or 40 miles an hour. And so it's -- we're going to continue to try if we get some calm spots this afternoon.

I'll be apprised of the situation, but it certainly was not what we would call anything close to an ideal day to simulate the height.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you.

Now as we walked up the paved driveway to the dirt access way across the property, is the paved driveway a shared driveway with the property to the north? I think that's 351B Boston Post Road.

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):

Yes, that's a shared driveway.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Is that
driveway on the property owner's, the tower
lessor's property itself? Or is there some
type of an arrangement where it's on both
properties?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):
Yeah, it's on both properties.

As the property owner explained to us in the
field, the property line runs right down the
middle of the driveway.

MR. MERCIER: Would there be
any type of legal restriction on the use of
that driveway for this type of installation?

MR. FISHER: I'm not aware of
any legal restriction. I did check with
American Tower after the site visit, which
their in-house counsel would have done title
review. And they did share the title with
me. I took a very quick look at it, but I'm
not aware of any restriction.

If there is a restriction,
certainly between our land or the property
owner and the adjacent property owner we
would like to be apprised of that, but
there's nothing that shows up in the title
from what I'm advised from American Tower.
MR. MERCIER: Thank you.

For the section of the paved driveway going up to the proposed dirt access way, is it necessary to clear any trees along the driveway, the paved driveway that is?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):

There might be clearing of branches, but no full trees will be coming down for the -- during the construction time.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. As we walked along the proposed gravel driveway, I believe you mentioned the average grade of the driveway. Do you have that figure?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville): For the proposed or existing driveway?

MR. MERCIER: The proposed driveway from the paved area to the tower site?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):

Yeah, the average grade is between 3 and 5 percent for the most part within there, and the maximum gets up to about 8 percent on that little knoll.

MR. MERCIER: Now as we walked
along the proposed access way, you had the
centerline marked out with some stakes. And
it appeared that in some locations the
centerline kind of passed at the edge of the
woods. And maybe to the right or left there
were some cleared areas.

Is it possible to reconfigure
the road slightly to take advantage of those
cleared areas rather than cutting larger
diameter trees?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):
Yes, it's certainly possible.
And we will look at that at the D and M
phase.

THE WITNESS (Libertine):
Mr. Mercier, we also have had
a few discussions with the property owner and
their preference would be to take advantage
of those as much as we possibly can. So that
is certainly something they would be amenable
to.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lynch has a
follow up.

MR. LYNCH: When Mr. Mercier
asked you about the grade to the access road,
does that also include -- are you including
in that the paved shared portion of the
driveway?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville): No,
that was specifically for the proposed gravel
section that we would be coming off of.

MR. LYNCH: And what would the
grade be on that part of the access road?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville): The
existing driveway?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):
That grade is approximately
15 percent on average.

MR. LYNCH: Could you repeat
that? Sorry, I just didn't hear.

THE WITNESS (Rocheville): The
existing paved driveway is about 15 percent
on average.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you.
Thank you, Mr. Mercier.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you.
At the compound location out
in the field you discussed some of the
earthwork that needs to be done to create a level surface. Could you just please repeat some of the information you talked about?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):

Yes, absolutely. The existing conditions at the compound, the grade drops about 12 feet over the span of the compound. So what we plan to do is keep the centerline about where it is at the 200-foot contour where the tower will be located, and essentially balance our cut and fills with a six-foot cut-in retaining wall and then a six-foot fill retaining wall and level that surface out.

MR. MERCIER: Would any type of drainage features be necessary right at the compound area itself?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):

Yes, we -- we anticipate a riprap swale on along the southern retaining wall at the top to catch any water that would run off over the retaining wall into neighboring properties, and directs that swale to meet up with another swale on the access drive eventually leading to some
detention on the site.

MR. MERCIER: When you say, detention, there will be some type of shallow basin? Or can you describe what it might be?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):

Right now we anticipate some sort of maybe CULTEC systems. It is very preliminary at this point. We still have a lot more homework to do on what type of detention we're going to actually go with.

MR. MERCIER: For the preliminary design of the road you have shown here on the interrogatories as tab D, I see two level spreaders along the access drive. Is that the extent of the drainage necessary for the access drive at this point?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville): At this -- at this preliminary phase, yes, and the idea would be to -- to have some sort of catchbasin at the edge of -- at the end of those level spreaders leading to the detention systems where the dashed lines would be.

I anticipate probably needing another one down towards the basin extending
that swale all the way along the southern
portion of the access drive to -- to catch
any increase in runoff that we may cause
during this, constructing this site.

MR. MERCIER: I'm sorry. You
said the catchbasin at the base of the paved
portion. Is that what you just stated, or
no?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville): No,
there -- there isn't actually a catchbasin
down at the -- at the -- where the paved road
meets the street as far as we know from our
surveys. So we would have to detain all
water on this site. There's really no other
way to tie it into existing systems. All --
all increase in runoff will have to be
detained.

MR. MERCIER: On this figure
you show a number of trees that will be
removed. I counted about 71, so I'm not sure
if this was based on a 6-inch diameter breast
size or 12 or what?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):
Yeah, that 70 number is based
on 6-inch.
MR. MERCIER: Okay. Would the installation of the underground detention system -- I see two marked here. Would that require additional, some type of additional clearing?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville): It may. That would -- we would need to get back out with the survey crew to determine the size and quantity of trees in those areas. We would like to place it somewhere where we, you know, can minimize any additional clearing.

MR. MERCIER: Now for the underground system I know you stated some type of name. How does it actually work? Is it, to say, a chamber that fills up with water?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):

Essentially, yes. It would be a series of chambers that would fill up water to their maximum volume, but there would also be gravel two feet around it in all directions for infiltration.

MR. MERCIER: And what type of design is that? Is that a hundred-year rain
event, or something of that nature?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):

Yes, per in our legwork looking through the zoning regulations for the Town they need a hundred-year storm. You can't have any increase in runoff for a hundred-year storm.

MR. MERCIER: Now for the western end of your access drive where it meets the paved driveway, is there any type of runoff concern you have in that location where dirt or gravel will rush down the paved driveway towards the street?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville): The idea will be to stop it before it can get to the paved drive, and hopefully it will all just be the same existing runoff that would be the case if the site wasn't here. That would go down the existing paved drive. We want to catch all of our additional runoff at that point.

MR. MERCIER: Back to your level spreaders and your underground system.

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):

Uh-huh.
MR. MERCIER: On most of the sites I haven't seen that particular underground system. Is that just because the property line is so close to the south that there's some concern that diverted runoff along those ditches and spreaders will just travel downhill to the adjacent homes?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):

Yes, it is. That is part of it where you have all the residences directly downhill from -- from this location, and another part is the size of this compound being a lot bigger than other compounds, being 60 by a hundred.

It's almost double the size of other cell sites we usually deal with. So that -- so that counts for an increase in runoff right there as well.

MR. MERCIER: Is there any particular reason why the compound is sized so large, if it's not normally large as you stated?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):

The -- the size that's shown in our plans are the dimensions that were
given to us from American Tower, for the
60-by-100 compound and the 70-by-120 lease
area.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thanks.

Thank you.

Have you done any subsurface
investigation in regards to potential need
for site blasting at this particular location
to put in a tower foundation?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville): We
have not had a Geotech performed at this
time.

MR. MERCIER: In the field you
also talked about emergency power generation
at the site, and I believe you said it's
designed for shared use. How many tower
users could be supported by the generator
that's proposed?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):
Yeah, the shared generator
would be up to four carriers at the site.

MR. MERCIER: And what is its
power source? Is it diesel or propane?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):
Diesel.
MR. MERCIER: What type of containment features does the generator have to ensure there's no spill into the ground?

You could get back to me on that if it's necessary.

THE WITNESS (Rocheville): I know there is something. I just don't know the exact --

MR. MERCIER: Okay. So other than manufacturers, it's self contained.

There's nothing extra that AT&T is going to be doing?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):

Correct.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you.

And do you know the runtime?

Assuming there was four carriers using power off the generator, is it something like three days, four days?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):

That would be specific to the gallon, the gallon of the tank that we use. But for a -- I believe it's -- a 300-gallon tank would run for 48 hours, approximately.
A 300-gallon tank would run for 48 hours.

MR. MERCIER: And that was at full capacity, all four tower users utilizing the generator?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville): Yes.

MR. MERCIER: Just turning briefly to the tab one, the coverage models. The last page of that tab had a coverage model showing coverage lost with the new proposed facility. And I believe that's shown in light green. Is that correct? This light green is coverage lost if this proposed site was on air, and the other site was decommissioned?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): That's for attachment three. The light green shows the coverage of the original site that is not recovered by the new one.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. So that, that light green area there will still be some type of service, in there, in that along Scott Road, say?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): That will be coverage that's lost. It's not -- it is not regained by the new site.
MR. MERCIER: So totally cut off, no service whatsoever?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Had coverage before the decommissioning of the current site and will not have it after the new one is built.

MR. MERCIER: Now is that based on your reliability signal threshold? Or is that just no service whatsoever?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's based on measurements. It's no reliable coverage. And being on the other side of the hill it's probably very likely to be virtually no coverage.

MR. MERCIER: Now is there any potential plan by AT&T to provide service into that coverage lost zone that's also areas to the north?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): At some point. There isn't anything specific in the development pipeline at the moment, no.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Now I understand there's a site up there on Scott Road. I believe it's site number nine on your site summary, the Connecticut State
Police Tower?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.

MR. MERCIER: And in the responses to the interrogatories -- let me find the right question -- number 18, response C. Yes, just reading that I just want to understand.

So a height of 199 feet, if this site was available for a tower would work and provide similar?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): It would not work.

MR. MERCIER: It would not?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): We -- we checked it up to the height that would require lighting. At that point it still didn't provide coverage. It is on the wrong side of the hill that the current site is on. It is very likely it would take well over a hundred more feet of tower at least, if not even more than that, to reach over the hill.

So it became impractical. We checked it specifically up to that, and it was not even close to being able to cover.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Because
reading it, it implies that a tower up to 199 could work, but you don't have the lease. A lease would not be available?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): That would be a leasing issue. In terms of our RF analysis we went up to the height that would require lighting, and it wasn't close to covering then. It would take substantially more height and require lighting and/or possibly marking. So we -- we didn't look any further into that.

MR. MERCIER: Is the area a concern -- I assume would be Route 1?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): The eastern side of the hill of Boston Post Road, right. Yes.

MR. MERCIER: Because it's down in the valley.

THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's completely blocked by the hill that the current site is on.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you.

And the answer to D, site 15, I believe that listed in your site search
summarized was another potential tower at the former airport of the Stones Ranch Military Base?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): The airstrip, yes. It's said that, yeah.

MR. MERCIER: Is there a tower proposed in that location by some other entity?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): You would have to ask site acquisition about that. I'm not sure how that came up as a candidate.

THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): My predecessor approached the state police. This -- there was a tower proposed there, but it's -- AT&T proposed to put a new tower there, but that was rejected.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Just reading the site summary down to number 15 it says, a new tower location was rejected by AT&T's radio frequency engineers. So I'm a little confused as to whether AT&T proposed the tower there, or it was some other entity.

MR. FISHER: I'm not aware of any other entity proposing a tower there.
This information obviously comes from ATC and AT&T. I guess one point I would make is that because of the nature of the proceeding the site acquisition efforts have been quite expansive. So they've proposed things that may not meet necessarily even our RF needs. So I would defer to my witnesses on how to further answer those questions.

THE WITNESS (Bilezikian):
Yeah, it was rejected by AT&T's radiofrequency engineers. Yeah, my predecessor did approach them.

MR. MERCIER: What you're saying is ATC approached Stones Ranch property for a tower, but meanwhile AT&T rejected that proposed tower location?

MR. FISHER: I think it was AT&T approached it, and ATC did not.

Jennifer, you want to clarify that?

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): That's correct. American Tower did not approach the state police or any of the Stones Ranch properties.

MR. MERCIER: Okay.
MR. FISHER: Essentially we've had not quite simultaneous, not quite concurrent site searches going on by ATC, by AT&T and even third parties who are not part of the proceeding.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you.

Now just stepping to page 4 of the application. It talks -- it's a continued paragraph from the previous page, and then the first full paragraph talks about site search over on the Ancient Highway area, Wilson Hill. And that the site was rejected because the tribal review by the Mohegans stated it would severely impact various ceremonial landforms.

What actual parcel has these ceremonial landforms?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's our understanding that an adjacent parcel to the Ancient Highway parcel that AT&T was interested in at one point actually held some of these features. That was expanded to the, essentially to the entire area once the tribe came out and did a walk back in June.
They felt as though there were other features in a general landscape form that suggested these were ceremonial lands at one time. And so at that point it became clear that we were going to get an adverse decision from the tribe. And we also had already been looking at 351 Boston Post Road.

So once that determination came from the tribe, the property on -- the reason I'm hesitating is because I know there's several properties along that road, and we did look at a few. That was officially terminated by AT&T and we focused on 351 Boston Post Road, because we -- that was a clear site from that standpoint.

But in general the tribe, after walking -- we walked that site. We walked the entire road and then we ended up walking all the way to the southern extent of the road up on top of a hill where there was another property that was at one point under consideration.

I don't believe it really was a formal site in terms of a lease, but again once they walked that entire area the feeling
was that entire road and it's immediate
environs represented very sensitive areas.

MR. MERCIER: So they didn't
draw, like, a circle on a map and say this is
the limit of our concern. They just
basically walked up and down the road?

THE WITNESS (Libertine):
That's correct. And it was
really their feeling that there would be an
adverse visual impact of this ceremonial
landscape. So yes, you're right. There was
no -- there's nothing formal from a mapping
standpoint, or delineation of the beginning
or the end of that particular landscape
feature.

MR. MERCIER: Was it only
properties abutting Ancient Highway? Or was
it properties east or west of the Ancient
Highway, too?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): We
were only informed of the properties that
were on either side of the Ancient Highway
Road. So they would be abutting the actual
access road.

MR. MERCIER: There was a site
in your site search summary that was number
22. It was known as the Gateway Development
property. Do you know if the multifamily
units are actually under construction on that
property?

It talks about there's a
planned development to put in multifamily
units. Reading from the tab two language,
that was your initial site C, which was given
no adverse environmental effect?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's
286 Flanders Road, but that Gateway
Development -- there is a large development.
I'm not sure if this is a bit confusing and
if that may be under the same property
ownership.

MR. FISHER: I can provide
information for the Council. The Town
actually had suggested that parcel as part of
our consultations. And I spoke with the, I
presume him to be a principal of the
developer there. They do have development
that has been completed. Some of them
multifamily use, but there's also additional
development to take place there.
And my understanding is that
the area of land that we were focused on as a
possibility per se was what would be the back
of the Gateway Development, but is off of
Ancient Highway.

THE WITNESS (Libertine):
Right. There, there is
access. It's actually the hill that I was
explaining earlier. It's at the terminus of,
or the south end of Ancient Highway, although
it has a mailing address or, an address of
Flanders Road.

And that there is a large
multifamily or multiunit development just
south of there, and again held in ownership
by Gateway Development.

MR. MERCIER: I guess my
question is, is if the site is already
compromised, I say it's being built upon and
there's buildings and things?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): No,
this -- this parcel is a separate undeveloped
parcel. It's probably the highest point on
that road and it's just immediately north of
the large development as part of Gateway. So
it has not been from -- there is a
single-family residence, I believe, on one
portion of the property, but it's about a
26-acre parcel and it's mostly a rounded
hilltop undeveloped.

MR. MERCIER: For the portion,
I guess, the adjacent parcel to the hilltop
that you're talking about that's already
been -- has apartment construction on it,
multifamily. Did you look at that particular
parcel since it's already been built upon as
part of it?

THE WITNESS (Libertine):
We -- I didn't from an
environmental perspective. I'm sure we did,
but I'll have to turn that --

MR. FISHER: David Vivian
who's no longer an employee of the
applicant's did this site search with me at
that time. He was the individual responsible
for those conversations. My belief is, and
I'd have to get the tax maps to verify this,
that those are assembled parcels and they
are, for purposes of the Town, they're viewed
the same.
So I believe the answer to your question is, yes, that it's just a portion of that property that extends further up the Hill from the Gateway Development to Ancient Highway.

MR. MERCIER: I guess my question is could you put a tower, you know, near the developed area on, you know, near the apartment complex? Was that ever examined since it's already been developed and potentially not going to impact the ceremonial features that are in the area?

MR. FISHER: Understood. That would be a question for Martin.

THE WITNESS (Lavin): I believe that would be too far down the slope.

MR. MERCIER: Have you looked at the elevation of that area?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): And if I'm thinking of exactly the right area. I'm not sure from --

MR. FISHER: Let's look at a map just so we can --

Mr. Mercier, I'm referring behind tab two of the application, to the
aerial map which shows the tax parcels, and
in blue. And then it has the red kind of
search rings and some pin drops.

MR. MERCIER: Yeah, I tried to
blow that up, yes.

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yeah,
I -- I believe that location is too close to
95, too far down the eastern slope of that
hill to be used.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Yes, the
parcel I'm referring to is just to the left
of number 30 where it says 95. There appears
to be some kind of building?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yeah,
number 22.

MR. MERCIER: South of 22?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Oh,
south of 22. So that would definitely be --
the elevation is very low there, and that
would not be able to see you back over the
hill of the Ancient Highway. And where the
search ring is, is an elevated area. You
would have to see over that back to Boston
Post Road, and not at any practical height
could we do that.
MR. MERCIER: Okay. So I assume this number 22 is near the summit of that hill, or along that hill ridge. And then you're saying it slopes, the elevation slopes downward towards 95?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes, and it's at the far side of the sort of flattish top, too, so it has trouble seeing over the other side.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you. When they were talking about visual impacts of these ceremonial mounds, I'm not really sure what they meant by that. It's just a tower, or any structure in the area would impact the characteristics of the mounds. Is that what they're getting at?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): I wish I had a definitive answer for you. This has been a very frustrating process all around. The best I can tell you is that the feeling was that -- and I don't want to put words in, certainly, any of the representatives from the tribe's mouths.

But the answer that we got was, yes, there would be -- a tower would
create an adverse visual impact on a

ceremonial landscape, and that is -- that was
the extent of our conversation.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank

you.

THE WITNESS (Libertine):

You're welcome.

MR. MERCIER: I'm going to

switch to a couple environmental questions.

Application tab nine, there's a document
called the IPAC Trust Resource Report.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes.

MR. MERCIER: I've never seen

a report like that before. Is that something

that's mandated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife

Service? Or is that a new type of filing?

THE WITNESS (Libertine):

Well, no. It's actually part

of the FCC process going through the

compliance for NEPA. So under the National

Environmental Policy Act, we are, or the

applicants who hold federal licenses are

required to consult with certain state and

federal agencies.

And in this case with U.S.
Fish and Wildlife Service, the first step is to run a IPaC which is their electronic system to understand what may or may not be in the vicinity of your site.

Based upon the results of that particular screening process, then you have a determination whether or not you may have a conflict and have to go through a formal section seven consultation with that agency.

So it's kind of a prescreening tool, very similar to what we do with the Natural Diversity Database to get an understanding of whether or not -- the kind of a big-picture planning tool.

MR. MERCIER: Now I understand you did this preliminary search as you just described with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

THE WITNESS (Libertine):

That's correct.

MR. MERCIER: And then you also did the Natural Diversity Database screening?

THE WITNESS (Libertine):

Correct.
MR. MERCIER: How come the two entities or lists don't match up? Say, for this particular site I understand you have a red bat that could potentially occur in the wooded area.

THE WITNESS (Libertine):

Right.

MR. MERCIER: But as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service report states, maybe the long-eared bat might be there also?

THE WITNESS (Libertine):

Yeah, there -- there are inconsistencies at times depending upon the timing and the data that's been provided to DEP. They don't necessarily share all that specific data with U.S. Fish and Wildlife, and vice versa. So there are discrepancies at times.

In this case, it may have just been the timing in terms of what may have been listed or not listed at the time of the initial database. I don't know if that is the case. I can find that out in this, but we've seen that it's not uncommon to have multiple, or I should say different species
identified by each of the agencies.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you.

THE WITNESS (Libertine):

You're welcome.

MR. MERCIER: And I understand the materials from the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection that there was a proposed restriction to protect potential red bats roosting on the wooded area?

THE WITNESS (Libertine):

That's correct.

MR. MERCIER: Does the long-eared bat have a similar breeding period? Do you know that?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): We will know after January 1st. What's happened at the federal level with northern long-eared bat is that they have been inundated with requests over the past six months to a year, and because of the decimated populations with bats in general and in particular with northern long-eared bat, they have taken the approach in the last month or two where they are essentially waiting to hear from the
federal level down to their regional level to
give some guidance.

I think the easy answer for
today is that there will be a restriction on
cutting. We just don't know if it's going to
be substantially a longer time period, if
they're going to go with what they've been
using as kind of their protocol for the last
couple of years.

We have not been able to get a
firm answer and we've been told, you will not
get an answer until after the first of the
year. So we're kind of in a holding pattern
in terms of being able to give a specific
timeframe to our clients.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank
you.

Mr. Libertine, to the
responses to the Council's interrogatories,
you gave some information in response eight.
Then you submitted a supplemental visibility
analysis. So I'm just wondering if the
information in response eight needs revision?
Or is the information in there still valid
based on your supplemental visibility
analysis?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): I would say the information is still valid and you know, those are approximate numbers, but there -- they're certainly in that immediate ballpark.

We -- we did find a few new things just for the Council's benefit. The original visibility analysis was actually conducted in the field back in June when we had a full leaf-on condition. And I'll also note, although we spent a full long day almost -- I think it was almost on the longest day of the year we were out here. We were actually evaluating three separate sites at that time. So we relying heavily on the computer models for some areas.

What we were able to do on our most recent work last week was to focus on this site and also assess things from a leaf-off perspective. So that's why some of the numbers in some of the areas were tweaked a little bit. We were able to get a little bit more focused in on the site.

But to answer your question, I
don't think it substantially changes the
number of properties that would have views of
the tower.

MR. MERCIER: Now I notice
that was a seasonal, based on seasonal views.
Did you have any information on potential
year-round views for the half a mile?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): I
don't off the top of my head, but I can
certainly get that for you folks. That's not
a problem.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. In the
last sentence in response eight it talks
about intervening tree masts will act as
screening for the facility.

When you develop the model for
the site is there a minimum distance you use
from the tower that is automatically deemed
visible? You know, for instance, you know, a
distance out to 500 feet. Someone looking
through trees, you'll definitely see it?

THE WITNESS (Libertine):
Correct, yes. We use, as a
rule of thumb, we use 500 feet as a minimum
distance because my experience has been that
although you will probably have a highly
obstructive view, you still may be able to
see portions of the tower at those distances.

   It depends on the matrix of
the forest and the density of the trees, but
for the most part we found working throughout
Connecticut that that seems to be a good
general rule of thumb.

   MR. MERCIER: Would that be
the same for the compound? A compound in
general just as a level?

   THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes,
but again depending on the forest, we have a
lot of understory. That can be reduced
substantially. In the particular case of
this site we do have a fairly amount of -- a
fairly substantial amount of understory
there, so I'd say it would probably be
somewhat a little bit less than 500 feet.

   MR. MERCIER: The area around
the proposed tower, did you have an estimate
of the tree heights?

   THE WITNESS (Libertine):
   Yeah. Those trees range --
they probably range in height, the mature
trees are probably pushing 75 to 80 feet. And then we've got several that are probably down in the 45 to 50-foot range as well.

MR. MERCIER: Now in the responses to the Council's interrogatories, the last page of the filing that's tab E there's a property map. And I'm looking at the map, Mr. Libertine. If you could just please describe what the residents to the north may see. That's the 351B parcel.

THE WITNESS (Libertine):

Certainly. From the residence itself there's probably going to be some seasonal views. As they move eastward on their property into the open fields there's very little dense coverage in that southeast corner of their lot.

So I think, you know, from my perspective they've probably got a fairly substantial view certainly above the trees when the leaves are on the trees, and then a fair amount of the tower within the mast of the trees when the leaves are off. I'm not sure the compound is going to be highly visible from their locations unless they're
right up against the property line.

    MR. MERCIER: Is that property
at a higher elevation than the proposed
tower?

    THE WITNESS (Libertine): It
does rise some, yes. I don't have the
specific topography right here, but that does
begin to rise up the hill.

    MR. MERCIER: So as it rises
obviously there would be less tree shielding,
because the trees would be lower?

    THE WITNESS (Libertine):
    Depending upon perspective,
yeah, as you move away from the treeline,
certainly. And I was told from -- as we get
from the tower location to that property line
that's a rise of about 15 feet, and it
certainly goes up from there.

    MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank
you.

    How about the property looking
at the map again that abuts 351B to the east?
It's developed. It appears to have a pool
and it's off a cul-de-sac?

    THE WITNESS (Libertine):
Right. We -- we drove that both in the summer and most recently last week. From the end of the cul-de-sac looking down we could not see anything through the trees. That's not to say that once this is constructed that there may not be some views in the wintertime, but it's not a substantial view.

We were there were for quite a while. And again, we had a five and half foot balloon at 194 feet that was highly visible in those locations where you could see it. So I'm fairly confident that the density of the woods as they exist today are probably providing a pretty good visual buffer.

MR. MERCIER: I think that is 24 Sunset Trail, according to the map. But I was just looking at the rough bar scale here and it appears to be within from 500 feet.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): As I say, there's a potential, but we could not see it and I can't confirm that. It's very dense in that area even this time of year. So I would surmise that if there are views
during a leaf-off condition, that they are
going to be highly obstructed. It certainly
does not break the treeline from the -- from
the cul-de-sac.

So my sense is if you were in
the backyard and kind of enveloped by those
trees that it's going to be even more
shielded from that perspective. Again,
through the trees this time of year certainly
there's potential portions of the pole that
will be visible.

MR. MERCIER: And moving to
the south along Boston Post Road there
appears there are about seven residences that
abut the property. Could you describe what
these residents might be able to see of the
facility?

THE WITNESS (Libertine):

Yeah. I think, again we've
shown that all in seasonal visibility. My
sense is standing at the back of the property
lines and looking through, I don't believe
the tower itself is going to eclipse the
trees from the perspective in those
backyards.
But through the trees
certainly at those distances there's a good
chance that portions of the pole will be
visible through the trees during this time of
year.

MR. MERCIER: Now looking
directly north there appears to be some type
of dirt roadway or clear-cut area. I don't
know the date of this picture, but are there
houses in that area now? It looks like a
proposed roadway.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): It
is proposed. There's quite a bit of
development going on. I don't believe that's
been fully developed in this, in that
location. There is -- and again, off this
aerial to the north and to the northwest it
continues to be built out.

So they are heavily under
construction, but my recollection from last
week and I can double check my photographs, I
don't believe there's a lot of new
development to the east. There may be a few
homes, but I don't think that's been
certainly developed out.
MR. MERCIER: Again, on your supplemental visibility analysis there was a chart provided on page 2 that had no road locations. Several of the roads were repeated. You know, obviously different photos from the same road. Did you have any corresponding house numbers that you were in front of that you could submit?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): I could do that at a later date. I would have to just have to verify that, but yes.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): What we try to provide, and I can see where -- because we have several from Harbor Crossing, which is a little bit to the west off of this map. And then Plum Hill Road, which is essentially the main road that you're seeing in that development going -- you can actually see the -- the label is cut off at the lower left-hand side.

Plum Hill Road runs from Boston Post Road up into that neighborhood.

We took several -- wanted to show different
perspectives. It's a very steep rise in that particular development, so the views tend to vary.

One of the things that struck me, though, was that this particular proposal at 194 feet really does not eclipse the treeline from these, you know, these areas. And as you first drive into Plum Hill Road, of course, the existing tower is on the top of the hill on a very prominent feature. So from that perspective I almost -- my initial feeling was that this was an improvement from -- from a visibility standpoint.

MR. MERCIER: Going back to the near views that we just discussed from the abutting properties, would a brown painted pole be any benefit here in your belief?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): I don't, you know, this time of year when you take a look at the -- the matrix of trees that are out there there's really a gray undertone going on there. So brown on a certain day may actually jump out a little bit more.
If -- if we were thinking about doing some type of camouflaging, I think actually a steel pole unpainted may work, but I think perhaps doing something with the antennas, whether that's brown or a modeled gray brown may -- may actually be a bigger benefit because, again most of the views, near views don't really look up and see anything eclipsing over the trees.

But as you're looking up through the trees this time of year I think white antennas may actually jump out at you a little bit more than they might normally. Obviously, once we get further away and there are views above the treeline, I'm not sure it really matters, but certainly from close views, yeah. Certainly some painting scheme could certainly be an improvement.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you. I have no other questions at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now go to questions by the Council.

Senator Murphy.

SEN. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
First off, the First Selectman mentioned the site with the National Guard. Is that something that's under discussion and is it realistic?

MR. FISHER: Subject to any corrections by the First Selectman, I believe the National Guard site is what we've referred to as either the Stones Ranch U.S. Military Installation or the state police tower. Those have been used somewhat interchangeably.

SEN. MURPHY: They've already been discussed?

MR. FISHER: They have been, yes.

SEN. MURPHY: And as I recollect your testimony, you've ruled those out?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): From an RF standpoint, yes, we have.

SEN. MURPHY: You have? Okay. To follow up on the question I asked in the field regarding the foundation that will be constructed for the placement of this tower if it's approved, I realize that in most
instances the foundation is put in, keeping
in mind that possibly the tower will be
raised up above the initial construction
height, which today is 194 feet.

Is the intention of American
Towers to have the construction of the base
foundation made in such a way that the tower
can be raised up above 194 feet without any
additional construction? You know my real
central concern is once you hit 200 feet, is you've
got to put lights on, and lights are just
another bugaboo that we have.

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): I don't
believe that American Tower has made a final
determination about how the foundation would
be designed.

In general it's safe to say
that as a tower owner in the business of
making space available for multiple carriers
that they would generally want to do all they
can to make it usable in the future. In this
instance --

SEN. MURPHY: Usually they're
not interested in going to 200 feet because
of the lighting requirement and the expenses
involved, but go ahead. I'm sorry to interrupt.

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): That -- that's correct. In general, American Tower would look to avoid having a tower higher than 200 feet, but also want to be responsive to the needs of carriers. Now the proof, of course, would have to be made at the time any kind of change of that nature were to be made.

So I guess the best answer I can give you, Senator Murphy, is that at this point we don't know, but certainly American Tower would respond affirmatively to -- to any directive from the Council, either to beef that foundation up so that it could be used in the future, or -- or to restrict it in some way.

SEN. MURPHY: So if the Council should approve this and in its decision indicate that it was our opinion that we did not want the tower to be increased in height above the initial 194, there may not be objection from the applicant?
THE WITNESS (Gaudet): I'm not -- I guess I am not --

SEN. MURPHY: That's putting you on the spot, isn't it?

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): It is.

SEN. MURPHY: I'll withdraw the question.

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): I should note, though, that there are other reasons that one might want to -- to beef a foundation up and that is, you know, over the years we have certainly seen increased loads.

SEN. MURPHY: I understand that, but in that regard the propagations from this particular tower, or should it be approved at 194 feet, those going down underneath AT&T and presumably T-Mobile become important. And I haven't seen any propagations below the 190 from AT&T and I'm sure you've done them. What sort of a dropoff is there?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): If we were trying to, of course, replace the -- the site way up on the top of the hill which is --
SEN. MURPHY: And I realize from some of the inference from your answers is you're not totally happy with your replacement. You would prefer to have the other one, but we've got to deal with what you've got. So go ahead.

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Nothing we'd like better than to stay exactly where we are. When -- if we drop from 190 we start to lose connection into the area around the public safety complex at the northeastern end of Boston Post Road. Any further and we loose more coverage there and some of the bottom as well.

So even a small reduction from that starts to hit us in terms of overlapping with our current coverage from the remaining sites.

SEN. MURPHY: If the tower at Docket Number 67 were to continue to be available, would you be contemplating putting this tower in at all?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): If the original site as it is were staying there?

No.
SEN. MURPHY: Okay. You could provide me with -- provide the Council, rather, with a propagation at ten feet underneath your proposed height, and at your convenience before the next hearing. I guess we would probably have another hearing.

I realize that T-Mobile is on the Docket Number 67 tower and is shown in the application to be on this tower. Is T-Mobile committed to go in this, this tower? I haven't seen anything to that effect, but I guess that's the question for American Tower.

THE WITNESS (Mason): Yes, Kevin Mason.

They've been involved in this entire site search and had expressed a complete interest in getting a replacement site as well. I don't think they formalized a lease. That's probably just a procedural process with American Tower, not leasing it up until approved.

SEN. MURPHY: So you don't have a lease with them finalized, but all the discussions would indicate that they're going to go to this tower when it goes up as a
replacement?

THE WITNESS (Mason):

Absolutely.

SEN. MURPHY: And they've done their propagations and what have you, and for whatever satisfaction they have they're willing to go in this tower?

THE WITNESS (Mason): Yes.

That's my understanding, yes.

SEN. MURPHY: I think that's all I have right now, Mr. Chairman, because we'll be meeting again. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr. Hannon?

MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I do have some questions.

There was a document that was submitted by the Town to intervene and on the last page of that document there is a list of, like, six locations. I'm trying to match up what the Town had versus what you're showing behind attachment two.

And so I think the first one that you had mentioned was -- it's number
nine, the 6 Stones Ranch Road military reservation. That is the National Guard location.

MR. FISHER: Just a moment.

MR. HANNON: No problem.

Their map was the very last page.

MR. FISHER: We have their aerial map of the site survey. And sorry, just if you could repeat?

MR. HANNON: I think it's number nine, but I just want to make sure.

MR. FISHER: Attorney Collins and I were just conferring on the map and the indication was that Stones Ranch was not on their list on this map.

MR. HANNON: Okay.

MR. FISHER: On this map it's to the upper-left corner.

MR. HANNON: Okay. So I guess the Scott Road water tower, I think that's number 18 with your locations. Correct? I mean, it's listed as the water tank, so I'm assuming that that's one and the same?

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yes, that is correct.
MR. HANNON: Okay. The next one, UBS Lumber, I think that matches up with your number 30?

THE WITNESS (Bilezikian):
Forty-nine Industrial Park Road.

MR. HANNON: Yes. I mean, it looks pretty close, so just trying to get a verification.

THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): Yes.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Then Norwich Orthopedic, that's listed as your site number 29?

THE WITNESS (Bilezikian):
Eleven Industrial Park Road, Herb Chambers.

MR. HANNON: Yes. Then the East Lyme ECO, I believe that's your site number eight?

THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): 171 Boston Post Road, Flanders Safety Center.

MR. HANNON: Then True Value, I think is your site location number 28.

THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): 300 Flanders Road, Cash Home Center, Inc.
MR. HANNON: And then the KSK Associates, that's your site number 27. Correct?

THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): Yes.

MR. HANNON: Okay. So I'm just trying to make sure that what was listed on that map you also showed what you're listing of the 30 different sites. Thank you.

Going to tab number eight in the application, on photo six. It's, I think, the second one on six and the second one on the nine. I just want to make sure that the cell tower that looks like it's off to the right is the existing tower?

THE WITNESS (Libertine):

Could you repeat that?

MR. HANNON: Sure. It's photo number six and photo number nine. It's the second page on both of those which shows the locations. I just want to make sure that the tower on the right is the existing tower.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): That is correct. I'm checking number 9 to make sure I have the orientation correct, but yes,
on six that is correct. And yes, the same
with the nine, yes.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Then a
question I asked out in the field was we've
seen the number of cell towers where they
originally come in at a certain height and
then they come back for an extension. This
being at 194 based on the numbers I read in
the report talks about if you go -- 200 seems
to be the magic number. You go above the
200, that's going to trigger lighting.

With the analysis that you did
in terms of the site view, how much more of
an impact would potential lighting have on a
cell tower? Because to me it would seem like
it would draw more attention to it than
what's maybe currently proposed.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): I
would agree with that. And the 200-foot rule
we kind of all go by doesn't mean absolutely
you have to light it. There may be a
painting requirement as opposed to lighting,
or it may be both.

But your point is well taken.
One way or the other it is going to be much
more highly visible, certainly to those areas
where you've got -- well, view six is
probably a great example where it is
significantly above the treeline. You would
be talking about some type of flashing light
or steady stream light.

So either way, yes, it would
certainly bring your eye to it. And I think
it would probably have more of an impact also
this time of the year on some of the closer
neighbors who might, through the trees now,
start to see that, that light.

MR. HANNON: Thank you. In
the responses to the Siting Council
interrogatories on the map CSK-1 can you give
me a little more detail? I'm not looking for
absolute specifics, but can you give me a
little more detail on the proposed
underground storm water detention system?

And the reason I'm asking is
if you've got an approximate size of them,
because in walking this site there's a lot of
ledge. So I'm wondering if you're even going
to be able to put something like that in.
And if you are, my guess is you'd need more
blasting there, or the possibility of blazing is greater there than it would be conceivably for the roadway and the underground utilities. So I don't know if you want to comment on that.

THE WITNESS (Rocheville): So we basically did this approximation by looking at other jobs that we've used these detention systems on before. And those were about 24 of those CULTEC systems I described. And they are about two feet in diameter, eight feet wide.

So you probably have about an 8-by-24 footprint at both locations. And they would go down about six feet deep with when -- after you have the gravel all around it with the two feet above it, above and below the chambers.

So as you said, with the ledge outcrops definitely visible, we would -- and after the Geotech came back and if it was the case that there was too much ledge to use those systems we would have to look at some other, whether it's a detention basin or some sort of detention pond, rain garden system,
anything that we could -- or maybe a
combination of all of them, anything that we
could do to combat the excess runoff on this
site.

MR. HANNON: Okay, because I
just see that as a bit automatic because of
actual site conditions.

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):
Absolutely.

MR. HANNON: And then the last
couple of questions I have is because I have
old eyes. So -- and I even had the
magnifying glass out on this, and I couldn't
find it.

So for example, on the
supplemental information that came in, on
photo number 17, can you tell me where the
green arrow is? Because you're saying it's
seasonal visibility, but I can't find a green
arrow or where the balloon was.

THE WITNESS (Libertine):
We're very conservative in our
approach when we say that, so I'm not
surprised. There are a lot of views where we
call it seasonal because, again we were using
a highly colored bright red and yellow combination balloon. So conceivably I could see it in the field, but certainly, and I think that's one of the examples. If a tower was built, I don't think unless you knew exactly what you were looking for you would be able to pick it out in that mass.

MR. HANNON: I was just thinking, because I couldn't find it and on almost all the others I saw the green arrows.

So --

THE WITNESS (Libertine): And it may be. It may have been omitted from that one, and I'm not sure. I don't have the copy right in front of me. Excuse me one second.

MR. HANNON: And then on --

THE WITNESS (Libertine):

Yeah, Mr. Hannon, just so you'll know, that that particular view does not have the green arrow in it, and it should. It is buried in there. It's very difficult to see and it is behind a tree, but there is a small splotch of red that can be seen, but you have to really know what you're
looking for.

MR. HANNON: And then on 24, 25, pretty much right is the center, and I think on 26, is that the existing tower?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, it is. On both 24 and 25, that's the existing tower. And again we wanted to show from those perspectives along those stretches of the road that the new facility, or the proposed location would not be visible from those.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you. I do not have any other questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Levesque?

MR. LEVESQUE: The applicant was asked about the intensification of the use of the shared driveway and the answer was, I took a brief look at the title search. Can you give us a copy of the deeds and the maps that created that shared use of the driveway?

MR. FISHER: Yeah, I'll have to go do some additional research and get that information, but certainly that's
publicly available information. We can organize it and provide it to the Council.

MR. LEVESQUE: Okay. That's the only thing I have.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: That would be helpful, Mr. Fischer, to get that information.

Mr. Mercier did a good job of asking a lot of my questions, but I still have one or two as usual. I'm going to continue to beat this dead horse on the height of tower. From what I understand, the FCC does have a procedure where someone could actually go above the 200-foot line and then the tower, of course as you said Mr. Libertine, could be lighted or marked, and/or both.

Now is it possible that if it doesn't go above 200 feet, and let's say we get up about, you know, at least you get that 10-foot separation so you're up a little higher, would the proximity of two commercial airports, one in Groton and one in New Haven have that tower, cause that tower to be
lighted? I didn't see an FAA report,
Mr. Fisher, so if it's in there I missed it.
I'm sorry.

THE WITNESS (Libertine):
Yeah, I don't know. Your
questioning is -- the intent of your
questioning is absolutely correct in that if
there are flight paths in the area then those
tolerances become much tighter. So it's
conceivable in some cases we could have a
140-foot tower that requires some type of
lighting or painting just because of its
proximity to an airport.

I don't know the specifics of
this. That's why I said 200 feet here may
not require lighting. It may just require a
simple marking, which is usually kind of the
combination orange and white, or red and
white painting. But that we would have to go
and actually take a closer look and see
what -- what height would actually trigger
that in this particular location.

MR. FISHER: Mr. Lynch, just
for the record, it's behind tab four of the
application. And it just references that
the -- there's no airport within
eight kilometers or five miles, so there
would be no registration or lighting
requirement here.

MR. LYNCH: Okay. Thank you
Mr. Fisher.

MR. Lavin, I think it's
probably a boilerplate part now of your
application where you talk -- well, and it's
been in the last few, where wireless
communications are supplanting wireline
communications.

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.

MR. LYNCH: You say it hasn't
really happened in Connecticut, but myself
having been with a bunch of techies and not
knowing what the hell they're talking about
last week, they were saying that if you take
the cumulative aggregate of everything that's
wireless, you know, whether it's, you know,
wireless modems, wireless TVs, wireless
whatever, they're out there, they were saying
that it far surpasses any type of wired
support. And I'm just asking whether that's
your feeling, too?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): What kind? Wireless, all that wireless as opposed to using a wired support?

MR. LYNCH: Yeah, wired support. You know, whether it's telephone or cable or anything like that?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): I don't know offhand. Fiber interconnects a lot of our sites, which has tremendous capacity far above what we have. To get everything back to the switch is normally not done wirelessly.

So everything that travels on a licensed wireless system like ours, generally it's the wired system to reach other systems. And even unlicensed Wi-Fi and things of that nature end up going to a cable modem and back through a wired system to the rest of the world.

MR. LYNCH: Like I said, they're all 20 and 30, so I have no idea what the hell they're talking about. So I figured I'd ask.

To the AT&T people down on the end here. In recent years you've come before
us and have applied usually with a tower builder for a facility to put your antennas on. But then afterwards you kind of stall and you don't really build them and they get delayed and delayed and delayed.

    My question to you is, what basically is the cause of these things? Does it have to do with your recent acquisitions and, you know, other situations that are going on with AT&T? It seems like you're banking these sites rather than using them.

THE WITNESS (Bettuchi): I mean, those are all taken as a business decision and it's something that is reviewed continuously. So it's certainly not triggered by any one event. We are consistently and constantly looking at our overall wireless coverage.

I think in this particular example it's a little bit of a different scenario mainly because we're already serving these customers today and that's what's brought forth a sense of urgency.

MR. LYNCH: I agree with you on that part, correct. You know, because
this is a replacement, but in some of the other facilities that you applied for, like I said different tower builders, they seem to be getting delayed. And it hasn't been a policy of the Council in the past to bank sites. And things change, so that could be changing, too. You know, so I just want to inquire as to, you know, what brought that about or what's bringing that about. That's all.

And coming back to the emergency generator, the 300 gallons. You said a 48-hour capacity, but that's when it's topped off?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):

Correct.

MR. LYNCH: Now, if you have it -- it runs about once a week, once a month. What do you have in place to tell you when that tank is below, for regular maintenance below, let's say, 150 gallons, which would only give you 24 hours?

Do you have regular -- let me ask it this way. Do you have someone under contract that would regularly go out and
check this and fill the tank? Or is it done on a, you know, by-need basis?

THE WITNESS (Libertine):

That's electronically monitored back at the -- one of the switches. So that there are alarms for low -- I don't know what the values or what the typical levels are when they have to go back out and fill them, but that is not -- it's not something that needs to be done as a routine inspection.

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hannon has a question.

MR. HANNON: I just want to follow up on Mr. Lynch's question about the generators.

Now we start getting weather reports that there may be a blizzard coming in. I mean, do you have somebody under contract that theoretically might go out before the storm hits to be able to top off these tanks? Or -- and I don't know what the policy is. I'm just curious about that.
THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Because it's American Towers' generator and it's shared we can find out for you what their particular protocol is for addressing that.

MR. HANNON: I'm just curious, because if it's a hundred gallons left and we get a blizzard we may be without power for a number of different service carriers. So thank you.

THE WITNESS (Gaudet):

Understood. We'll find out.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Just a couple questions. I guess this was a response to some of the Siting Council questions. Anyway, it's dated December 3rd. And after tab A there's a noise evaluation report.

I just want to make sure I understand this correctly. Page 2 of that noise evaluation, it states the allowable noise levels, residential, day and night. And I assume you have to, and correct me, you have to meet the night standard. I mean, the noise isn't going to just turn off at night.

Anyway my question is, when
you go through your results, all your results are 45 DBA or less except for one which is 55 -- okay. I'm being corrected. This would be if the emergency generator was on. Is that where these numbers are, which is exempt from the standard?

THE WITNESS (Gaviria): Yes, that's correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So again, these levels are if for the emergency generator, which is by state statute, exempt from those standards. Okay. And in any case, the worst case is the 55 even if the emergency generator was triggered?

THE WITNESS (Gaviria): That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. The other question is I just want to make sure, because we have a letter from, I guess, it's the adjoining property. I believe it's to the east, of 335 Boston Post Road.

And it's talking about a proposed -- although I don't know if it's actually been mapped -- 335B flag lot. Of
course, the property owner would like you to show some interest in their property. Did you look at that property to see if that was a possible site?

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): We did not specifically look at that individual property. We did however look exhaustively at the entire area, basically taking all areas down from the top of the hill where the existing site is located.

In general, because that property would be a smaller one, and in particular because of the narrow, relatively narrow width, as well as what appears to be a pretty steep grade coming up from Boston Post Road without the existing driveway that's in place for the proposed site, we would not have pursued that in comparison to the proposed site.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

Is there anybody else from the Council?

MR. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I have one more question.
I'm looking at the design area of CSK-1, and maybe I'm reading this wrong. If you could help me. Mr. Ashton is not here so I don't know about utilities, but your proposed AT&T access easement for the utilities seems to start up right where the paved road ends and your new gravel road will start. Is that where you're tapping into, or do you come up from the street?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville): No, that access -- that access easement, access and utilities is going to actually extend all the way down the street. And just, yeah, it is cut off here on this, on the CSK-1. It does go, in fact, all the way down the street line where there is a utility pole.

MR. LYNCH: Are you using an existing trench? Or are you going to dig a new trench?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):
These will be two trenches.

MR. LYNCH: All right. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll
now go to the party, the Town of East Lyme, I
guess, next to Mr. Libertine. I don't know.
If you could come up so you could -- Attorney
Collins, I assume?

MS. COLLINS: I only have a
few questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have any
exhibits?

MS. COLLINS: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Go
ahead with cross examination.

MS. COLLINS: I wanted to
follow up on the Stones Ranch site briefly
that the First selectman had mentioned. And
it's my understanding, is it true that that
site, it didn't pass the engineering
examination? Is that why you chose not to
follow up on that site?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): The RF
engineering study showed it wouldn't provide
the coverage we needed.

MS. COLLINS: Okay. And did
you ever look for whether the coverage in the
Gateway site would provide the coverage that
you need, assuming that it's out of the
Ancient Highway ceremonial grounds area?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Gateway is --

Site 22, we did look at it.

It is on the backside of that flat top of the hill. It has lost some elevation and has to look all the way back over the top of the hill to get to Boston Post Road, which it doesn't do at any feasible height.

MS. COLLINS: Okay. Those are the only questions I have.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

And we'll now continue with cross examination by Attorney Ainsworth.

MR. AINSWORTH: Thank you.

There we go. And I'm going to go in no particular order, but one of the first things that came up was that -- the title search. Did I understand correctly that you would be submitting a copy of the deeds that show the easement access to the property?

MR. FISHER: I'm going to provide a copy of the deed. I don't know whether it will show -- I just received the
MR. LEVESQUE: And the map?

MR. FISHER: Yeah, deed, or maps, yes.

MR. LEVESQUE: And then any land-use decisions that got it approved?

MR. FISHER: We can try to find that from the Town. I may actually interrogatory the Town to actually get that.

MR. LEVESQUE: Thank you.

MR. AINSWORTH: And so how much fuel will be stored on the site for the generators?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):

There are multiple capacities of the diesel generator that could be used. The one we're talking about right now is a 300-gallon diesel tank.

MR. AINSWORTH: And does it have secondary containment around the tank?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville):

Within the -- within the tank.

Within the generator itself it does have a
secondary. If there was ever a spill inside it has a means to catch that spill within the, you know, infrastructure of the -- of the generator.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): And they're typically referred to as double-walled so that if the internal breach occurs then the outer tank is actually a reservoir to hold the fluid.

MR. AINSWORTH: So it's a double-walled tank that's actually inside the structure of the generator container?

THE WITNESS (Rocheville): That's correct.

MR. AINSWORTH: And coming back to the police tower on Scott Road, you mentioned that it was on the, what you said was the wrong side of the hill and it was blocked by the existing hill where the existing tower is.

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.

MR. AINSWORTH: But did you explore any possibility for a two-tower solution that would involve two shorter towers than a single 194-foot tower?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): We hadn't found any really feasible scenarios there, where our approach was to replace one tower with another tower. And probably once we go down that road to find multiple towers that won't be objectionable to anyone, we could easily be looking at three or four to possibly do this. So we haven't gone -- we haven't really identified any two-site solution.

MR. AINSWORTH: Okay. Well, but the police tower, the state police tower at the reservation is currently existing. Is it not?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes, it is.

MR. AINSWORTH: And so if you were try to light up or cover the eastern side of the existing tower's hill you could provide that coverage with one tower. Would you not be able to do that?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): It wouldn't be -- it wouldn't be the state police tower. The State police tower essentially won't do anything on the eastern
side of Boston Post Road and that whole
stretch. It really contributes almost
nothing there. It's thoroughly blocked by
Plum Hill.

MR. AINSWORTH: Correct, and
that's my point, is that with the state
police tower you cover that western portion
where you're losing coverage. And you would
only need then a single tower in the eastern
side of Plum Hill to cover the eastern area
of coverage?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Which
would be the one we're proposing, yes.

THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): The
tower is not available for lease.

MR. AINSWORTH: And actually
following up on that question, with whom did
you inquire regarding the state police
tower's availability?

THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): I
don't know the individual, but my predecessor
did contact them and was told that the tower
is not available, that they were trying to
renegotiate a lease with the government and
they had no intention of leasing space to
MR. AINSWORTH: Was that the
government having no interest? Or the state
police having no interest?

THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): The
state police.

MR. AINSWORTH: Did they give
a reason why they wouldn't share their tower?

THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): No.

MR. AINSWORTH: Now with
regard to the -- actually let me see if I
could get the list -- the water tank, the
state -- excuse me, the town owned property
with the water tank. I believe that was
modeled at 45 feet.

Did you consider modeling that
one at a higher height perhaps with putting
the tower either adjacent to it, or some sort
of extension pole off the tower?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yeah, I
don't have the plot with me, but I did look
at that. And it doesn't -- it leaves a half
a mile to a mile gap at the 199-foot magic
height above which it would require lighting
at the very least. At that height it still
doesn't cover all the way up. It covers more than at 45, but doesn't complete the coverage going out there, no.

MR. AINSWORTH: And when you said, it doesn't complete the coverage, going in which direction?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): It doesn't complete the coverage going toward the northeastern end of Boston Post Road.

MR. AINSWORTH: Okay. And did you prepare a coverage map or coverage analysis?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): I looked at it on my screen. I did not print out a hardcopy or submit it to the Council, no, but we could.

MR. AINSWORTH: Would you be willing to print out a run of that analysis?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): We can provide that, sure.

MR. AINSWORTH: Now there were a number of -- I mean, you looked at a number of alternative potential sites and there were sort of blanket statements that said, you know, these sites were rejected by AT&T's RF
engineers. Were there actual coverage plots generated for those particular alternatives?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): We produced the plots that were requested by the Siting Council. We looked at all the sites and produced plots and submitted them for the ones that were requested.

MR. AINSWORTH: And so for the ones that, say, they were rejected but there weren't requests for plots, do you have plots available?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Not with me. We could produce those.

MR. AINSWORTH: And what Heights did you look at when you reviewed those other sites?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): They were all evaluated up to 199 feet.

MR. AINSWORTH: Would the applicant be willing to restrict the height of the tower to 194 feet voluntarily so that it wouldn't go beyond that height?

MR. FISHER: That's something we'd take under advisement and speak with American Tower and get back to you and the
Council on that.

MR. AINSWORTH: And now with regard to the access driveway, who arranges to plow the driveway so that if one were to top off the tanks that could be accomplished after a storm?

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): We can provide the answer to that question as part of the information that we're determining about American Towers' protocol for addressing filling tanks.

MR. AINSWORTH: Thank you.

And we may have already covered this in general, but with regard to the Gateway site number 22, I believe the answer that was given just now is that the site doesn't work from an RF perspective.

Again, was there a plot submitted that shows what coverage it might provide?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): It was -- been studied. A plot was not submitted. I don't think it was requested as part of the interrogatory, but it can be supplied.
THE WITNESS (Libertine):

Could we just clarify?

Because I think the original number 22 site may be the site at the end of Ancient Highway. And so I think we're talking about the Gateway Development site at the toe of the hill further south. Is that correct?

MR. AINSWORTH: Right. And just to clarify, I'm not referring to the previous application for the Ancient Highway site, but the Gateway Development that's south of it.

MR. FISHER: It's a good point and I think just for our purposes as a witness panel, Gateway is what I understand to be one parcel. Twenty-two is also in our site search summary, and I believe that is something that, in our consultations with the Town, we called site C.

Gateway, the actual developed areas are areas down the slope and something else altogether. So we should be really, I think, clear about what we're being asked to produce if it's 22 site C, or it's Gateway, the developed area. But when we look at
Gateway we have probably two different
physical areas we're talking about.

MR. AINSWORTH: Agreed. I
mean, the Gateway development is a PDD, so
it's a fairly large conglomeration of
parcels. And so when I refer to the Gateway,
there's actually the residential version and
there's also the commercial version. I
believe the commercial version is closer to
the highway which would be further down the
hill. I'm talking the residential or the
northern portion of the commercial
development. They're both controlled by the
same party.

But in general, my inquiry on
behalf of my client is whether or not there
were areas that didn't run afoul of the
ceremonial landscape problems, but were still
on the northern portion of either of those
commercial developments?

THE WITNESS (Libertine):

Thank you for the
clarification.

MR. AINSWORTH: Behind number
2 there was a Town of East Lyme site, 171
Boston Post Road and it says there's a
125-foot lattice work tower.

I'm not sure I have a sense of
why that one wouldn't have provided some
relief for coverage purposes?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's not
an especially tall tower in a very low spot.
And it is also blocked by the highway that
our previous -- one of our previous -- the
Ancient Highway, the mound, the ceremonial
landscape hill blocks it from coming very far
down Boston Post Road.

We'd have to rebuild and I
think it's 75 feet from the elementary
school, or something like that. Yeah,
it's -- it's packed in pretty tightly there.
It's a very light-duty tower. I don't
suspect it would hold up. It's a very
light-duty tower. I don't suspect it would
hold up our installation and T-Mobile's.

It would have to be rebuilt at
a much higher height and even then it still
wouldn't cover down southwest on Boston Post
Road.

MR. AINSWORTH: One moment.
I have no further questions at this time. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Attorney Ainsworth.

The Council will now recess until 7 p.m., at which time we'll commence the public session of this hearing. See you all then.

(Whereupon, the witnesses were excused and the above proceedings were concluded at 4:49 p.m.)
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