CERTIFIED COPY

STATE OF CONNECTICUT CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

1 0

Reporter: Lisa L. Warner, CSR #061

Docket No. 506

New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T) application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 499 Mile Lane, Middletown, Connecticut

VIA ZOOM AND TELECONFERENCE

Remote Public Comment Session held on Tuesday,

November 30, 2021, beginning at 6:30 p.m.

via remote access.

Held Before:

ROBERT SILVESTRI, Presiding Officer

| 1 | Appearances: |
|----|---|
| 2 | |
| 3 | Council Members: |
| 4 | QUAT NGUYEN Designee for Chairman Marissa Paslick |
| 5 | Gillett Public Utilities Regulatory Authority |
| 6 | LOUANNE COOLEY |
| 7 | EDWARD EDELSON |
| 8 | |
| 9 | Council Staff: |
| 10 | MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ. Executive Director and |
| 11 | Staff Attorney |
| 12 | MICHAEL PERRONE Siting Analyst |
| 13 | SICING ANALYSC |
| 14 | |
| 15 | For Applicant New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC: CUDDY & FEDER LLP |
| 16 | 445 Hamilton AVenue, 14th Floor White Plains, New York 10601 |
| 17 | BY: CHRISTOPHER B. FISHER, ESQ. |
| 18 | |
| 19 | Public Spookors. |
| 20 | Public Speakers: |
| 21 | KELLY PUGLIARES JOSEPH BARBAGALLO MIGUARI GIRRANI |
| 22 | MICHAEL SITEMAN DIANA LOMBARDO |
| 23 | LIANA YI KARA TIMEK |
| 24 | ADAM SZCZERBICKI MARISABEL BARBAGALLO |
| 25 | |

Appearances: (Cont'd) Also present: Brian Gaudet, All Points Technology Aaron Demarest, Zoom co-host **All participants were present via remote access.

MR. SILVESTRI: Ladies and gentlemen, good evening. This remote public hearing is called to order this Tuesday, November 30, 2021, at 6:30 p.m. My name is Robert Silvestri, member and presiding officer of the Connecticut Siting Council. Other members of the Council with us this evening are Quat Nguyen, designee for Chair Marissa Paslick Gillett of the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority, and Louanne Cooley. Members of the staff are Melanie Bachman, executive director and staff attorney, and Mr. Michael

Perrone, siting analyst.

As everyone is keenly aware, there is currently a statewide effort to prevent the spread of the Coronavirus. This is why the Council is holding this remote public hearing, and we do ask for your patience. And if you haven't done so already, I ask that everyone please mute their computer audio and/or telephone at this time.

This is a continuation of a remote public hearing that began at 2 p.m. this afternoon. A copy of the prepared agenda is available on the Council's Docket No. 506 webpage, along with the record of this matter, the public hearing notice, instructions for public access to

this remote public hearing, and the Council's Citizens Guide to Siting Council Procedures.

This hearing is held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act upon an application from New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC, doing business as AT&T, for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 499 Mile Lane, Middletown, Connecticut. This application was received by the Council on October 6, 2021.

This application is also governed by the Telecommunications Act of 1996, which is administered by the Federal Communications

Commission. This Act prohibits this Council from considering the health effects of radio frequency emissions on human health and wildlife to the extent the emissions from towers are within the federal acceptable safe limits standard, which standard is also followed by the state Department of Public Health. The Federal Act also prohibits this Council from discriminating between and amongst providers of functionally equivalent

services. This means that if one carrier already provides service for an area, other carriers have a right to compete and provide service in the same area.

The Council's legal notice of the date and time of this remote public hearing was published in The New Haven Register on October 24, 2021. Upon this Council's request, the applicant erected a sign along Mile Lane at the entrance to the proposed site so as to inform the public of the name of the applicant, the type of facility, the remote public hearing date, and contact information for the Council which included website and phone number information.

This remote public comment session is reserved for the public to make brief statements into the record. These public statements are not subject to questions from the parties or the Council, and members of the public making statements may not ask questions of the parties or the Council. These statements will become part of the record for the Council consideration. And please be advised that written comments may be submitted by any person within 30 days of this public hearing.

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.

I wish to note that parties and intervenors, including their representatives, witnesses and members, are not allowed to participate in the public comment session. I also wish to note for those who are listening, and for the benefit of your friends and neighbors who are unable to join us for the remote public comment session, that you or they may send written comments to the Council within 30 days of the date hereof by mail or by email, and such written statements will be given the same weight as if spoken at the remote public comment session.

Please be advised that any person may be removed from the Zoom remote public comment session at the discretion of the Council.

And we ask that each person making a public statement in the proceedings to confine his or her statements to the subject matter before the Council and to avoid unreasonable repetition so that we may hear all of the concerns that you and your neighbors may have. Please be advised that

the Council cannot answer questions from the public about the proposal.

A verbatim transcript of this remote public hearing will be posted on the Council's Docket No. 506 webpage and deposited at the Middletown City Clerk's Office for the convenience of the public.

Please be advised that the Council's project evaluation criteria under the statute does not include consideration of property values.

Before I call upon members of the public to make statements, I request that the applicant make a very brief presentation to the public describing the proposed facility.

And Mr. Gaudet, are you prepared to do that?

MR. GAUDET: Yes, sir.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. Please proceed.

MR. GAUDET: For the record, my name is Brian Gaudet. I'm a project manager with All Points Technology Corporation. The applicant for this proposed 150-foot monopole is New Cingular Wireless doing business as AT&T. The site is located at 499 Mile Lane in Middletown, and it's

an approximately 23.72 acre parcel currently owned by the City of Middletown.

The new compound expansion will be located off the northwestern side of the existing compound where the existing 180-foot tall lattice tower currently stands. Vehicle access to the site will be along the existing paved driveway off of the south side of Mile Lane.

The compound expansion will be gravel based surrounded by an 8-foot high chain-link fence with a 12-foot wide access gate on the northeastern face of the new expanded fenced area.

Utilities will run from an existing utility pole outside of the compound underground to a new meter bank inside the compound which will house a fiber box and power meter for AT&T.

AT&T's walk-in equipment cabinet will be located on an 8-foot 6-inch by 8-foot 6-inch concrete pad in the southeastern corner of the existing compound. A 20 kW diesel generator will sit on a separate 4-foot by 6-foot concrete pad adjacent to the equipment cabinet pad. Next slide, please.

The new 150-foot tall monopole will be located in the northern corner of the new

expansion area with an approximately 40-foot long ice bridge running from the tower to the AT&T equipment pad. AT&T plans to install 9 antennas, 12 remote radio units, and 3 surge arresters mounted on the collar mount and sector frames on the tower. The centerline of those antennas will be 150 feet above ground level. The tower will be designed to accommodate up to two future carriers with additional lease area within the existing compound.

That's all I have for you. Thank you very much.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Gaudet.

Just a note on remote public hearings.

Remote public hearings are quite different from in-person public hearings. For in-person public hearings, members of the public could sign up, step up to the podium and offer their comments.

For remote public hearings, the public is required to sign up and speak in advance in order to provide Council staff with the time necessary to facilitate connection precautions to prevent interruption, or in common terms, what we call bombing of the proceedings. These are protocols, procedures and consistency measures that are

followed as part of the remote public hearing
process. And again to reiterate, written comments
may be submitted within 30 days of this public
hearing.

And I'd like to remind those who have signed up to speak this evening that your comments will be limited to three minutes. And should you not be able to finish, you're more than welcome to submit written comments as I had mentioned. And I'll apologize in advance should I mispronounce anyone's name.

So our first speaker this evening is Kelly Pugliares followed by Marisabel Barbagallo.

Is Kelly here?

KELLY PUGLIARES: Yes, I'm here.

MR. SILVESTRI: Please proceed. Thank you.

KELLY PUGLIARES: Good evening. My name is Kelly Pugliares, and I live on 50 Talias Trail. I'm here tonight to express concerns regarding the 5G tower that's on the agenda.

My backyard is adjacent to the property where the tower is proposed to be constructed. I am deeply concerned about the negative impact that this tower will have on my property value. For

most people their home is not only where they live and raise their family, but it's also their most valuable asset. There are many articles and studies published which prove that having a cell tower next to or visible from your home can decrease the value of your property up to 20 percent. For many of us that equates to around \$100,000.

Here are just three examples of the research available on this topic. According to Business Wire, a survey by the National Institute for Science, Law and Public Policy, they found that 94 percent of people surveyed would not buy or rent a home next to a cell tower.

Secondly, The Appraisal Journal conducted a survey of prospective home buyers and found that most buyers would be willing to pay 20 percent less compared to sales price analysis.

Additionally, a recent article in The New York Times which captured commentary from top realtors on Long Island revealed that buyers will steer clear of buying a home near cell towers not only because of how unattractive they are, but also because of the perceived health risks.

Now, I recognize that studies exist

that there are no health risks, and that may be true. I am not here to debate that. But the perception of those health risks is true, it's real, it's there. And that fact, in addition to how aesthetically unpleasing they are, will degrade our property values.

It is also worth noting that there's already a tower there. This tower was constructed after we personally signed a contract with the builder but before we moved in, so we were never made aware of it. Since that time, this tower has had additional dishes added to it making it more unpleasant. I cannot bear the thought of a second tower next to the one that already exists.

We live in a beautiful new neighborhood. We built our home only three and a half years ago, and there are still three available lots on the cul-de-sac. One of the reasons we enjoy our property so much is because of the wooded landscape. We have deer, wild turkey, fox and large birds on our property, and this tower, I can imagine, will surely disrupt their natural habitat.

I am not suggesting that this town shouldn't put up a 5G tower, but I am asking that

1 they not allow one to be constructed in such a 2 residential area. If I'm floating in my pool, 3 hosting a barbecue or playing with my children, 4 there will be no avoiding the sight of this tower. 5 I don't know any of you personally, but 6 I can't imagine that you would want this type of 7 eyesore in your backyard, so I'm appealing to you 8 as a fellow homeowner and as a neighbor. 9 In summary, I ask that you reconsider 10 the personal and financial ramifications that this 11 decision has on those of us who live here. Thank 12 you for your time and consideration. 13 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you for appearing 14 tonight, and thank you for your comments as well. 15 Our next speaker is Marisabel 16 Barbagallo followed by Joseph Barbagallo. 17 JOSEPH BARBAGALLO: I think she's having connection issues. If you don't mind, I'll 18 19 go. 20 MR. SILVESTRI: Yeah, Joseph, you could 21 go, and whenever she connects, we could double 22 back to her at another point in time. 23 JOSEPH BARBAGALLO: I appreciate that. 24 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Please proceed. 25 JOSEPH BARBAGALLO: Thank you. My name

is Joseph Barbagallo. I live directly across the street, 59 Talias Trail. We were one of the ones that didn't get notified because the letter of the law only says abutting properties, but obviously this affects everyone. So to me I already have a bad taste in my mouth considering how this has been going.

From what I was able to see and looking at AT&T's website, looking at T-Mobile's website, there is no coverage gap in this area. There is plenty of service. As a matter of fact, T-Mobile has even better service. And considering we keep referencing the different acts, Telecommunications Act from 1966, the whole goal is to reduce the amount of towers but increase competitiveness. If we're increasing competitiveness, why can't they share a tower with one of the ones that have plenty of signal.

So many questions that were asked from the Council to AT&T were talking about the different options, and it seemed like whatever question was asked, the answer was no this is the only spot. But looking at their paperwork, there's several towers that are either at or above centerline level from what they are proposing, and

I don't see why that can't be used.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I submitted some maps to the Council earlier through email, and you can clearly see that there is an abundance of open space with road access, especially by the high school. If we wanted to do a 180-foot tower there, you would get the same signal. I mean, I can't speak to that, I'm not a scientist, but I feel like it's just as open.

Listening earlier to the evidentiary hearing, we're already doing -- looking at a 180 tower. I forgot the gentleman's name, but he had asked about what if we go from 150 to 180, you know, the service is so much better, could we get rid of a tower somewhere else. To me this is a foot in the door technique. We're basically getting a smaller tower in on this hill. We're going to say it's just for AT&T. Then the next thing you know, the tower goes up another 20 feet, 30 feet, we have multiple carriers, and now instead of a few antennas at the top of a tower, a monopole, we have literally four different sets of antennas for four different carriers making it even worse. One tower is bad enough. Adding to this one tower is even worse. Having two towers

is just intolerable.

There's 12 brand new homes on this street alone, another 19 were built a block away. There's three more planned at the end of the cul-de-sac. People don't buy into this neighborhood to look at cell phone towers. That one is ugly enough. We don't need to increase it. There's plenty of wildlife, as Ms. Pugliares said, you see everything, migrating birds, all the different habitats that they have, and up there especially because of the treeline. It's just going to be a blight on the neighborhood.

I personally don't have cell phone signal issues in my house, in my basement, no where --

(TIME ELAPSED.)

MR. SILVESTRI: We're sorry, but you did run out of time. Two things: One, I do appreciate that you submitted written comments earlier, and again, I offer that you're more than welcome to continue to submit written comments as well either by email or by letter. But thank you again.

I want to double back to see if Marisabel Barbagallo had joined us.

1 (No response.) MR. SILVESTRI: All right. If not, 2 3 I'll double back in a minute with her. 4 Our next speaker that I have on my list 5 is Christopher LaVigne, if I pronounced that 6 correctly. Christopher, are you with us tonight? 7 (No response.) MR. SILVESTRI: I'm just scanning my 8 9 I do not see Christopher, so we'll double 10 back later. 11 Michael Siteman is our next speaker to 12 be followed by Palmer Gaines. 13 Michael, I know you're here because I 14 did see you on the screen. 15 MICHAEL SITEMAN: Yes, one second. 16 Thank you. My name is Michael Siteman. I also 17 live on Talias Trail as well as the last two 18 speakers. I appreciate you guys giving us this 19 public hearing to give our thoughts and feelings 20 on the tower that's being put in. 21 You know, I listened to the hearing 22 earlier today, and there was significant mention 23 during that hearing and the questions that were 24 asked the Town of Middletown's feelings on this.

The Town of Middletown made the decisions without

25

a public hearing, without alerting the neighbors to what they were looking to put in the property next to us. And I think their lack of appearance in this morning's -- this afternoon's hearing speaks volumes to where they're at right now. I feel once the neighbors were alerted to what they were looking to do with the property and we alerted them to our displeasure with it, a lot of the town officials have backed away from what they were looking to do.

One thing that I want to highlight is that the resolution from the Common Council of Middletown, it talks about the intent of why they've approved this. The intent says, and I'll read directly from it, "The intent of such agreement is to offset costs incurred by the city to lease towers for its public safety radio system." This sentiment was also directly told to us from town officials. And it's very clear that the goal from the town side is to offset costs that they're incurring from putting their public radio and communication towers there. It's not there -- they're not putting this tower here to improve service for the residents. It's mainly as a source of revenue for the town.

1 2 g 3 e 4 e 5 t 5 t 7

As Joe mentioned, the lease agreement gives AT&T leniency to add other leases of equipment to put it on there. It's already an eyesore as is with the current tower. I just want to express the sentiment that adding a second tower is really a ludicrous thought to put a second tower when there's already one in a residential neighborhood.

I want to thank you guys for your time, and I appreciate you listening. And I hope that you guys reject this proposal and ask AT&T to find an alternative location.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you for joining us this evening, again, and thank you for your comments.

Our next speaker is Palmer Gaines to be followed by Diana Lombardo. Is Palmer with us this evening?

(No response.)

MR. SILVESTRI: I did not see Palmer on my screen. Again, we'll double back. So let me proceed with Diana Lombardo who I did see on my screen.

Diana, you with us? I just saw that you came off mute.

1 DIANA LOMBARDO: I did. I'm here. 2 This is Diana Lombardo from 30 Talias Trail. Ι 3 don't want to take up too much time tonight 4 because I know that there are other speakers that 5 would like to go through a couple of other issues 6 that they're having. I just want to echo what 7 other neighbors are stating in the neighborhood. 8 We all have the same concerns. And we want to 9 just echo that we hope that you guys reject this 10 proposal and find another location that would, you 11 know, fit better. And there's plenty of area here 12 in Middletown that are less residential that have 13 a lot of wooded areas that the tower would fit 14 better than a neighborhood like ours, like 15 everybody had stated, that's only a couple years 16 old. And that's going to affect our property 17 values and our families. 18 And thank you for your time. 19 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you for joining 20 us this evening, and thank you for your comments.

Our next speaker on my list is Liana Yi, if I pronounced that correctly, followed by Kara Timek.

21

22

23

24

25

Is Liana Yi with us, please? And I don't see her on my screen, so let's proceed with

Kara Timek. Is Kara with us tonight? There you go.

LIANA YI: I was here but I was talking. I didn't hit star 6. This is Liana.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Liana, please proceed, and then we'll go to Kara. Go right ahead, Liana.

Trail as well, and I agree with all the concerns that have been mentioned. I think most importantly I think my concern is medical concerns. I guess that, granted, you know, these towers are brand new. There probably haven't been enough studies out there to kind of see what kind of health risks we would be exposed to long term with this RF frequency radiation, whatever you want to call it, you know. AT&T's report shows that the total radio frequency electromagnetic power density at the site will be 8.19 percent of the allowable FCC established public limit.

So I think, you know, what kind of health risk is that for our families because I can say most of us have kids. So that's a big concern for a lot of us. But I agree, you know, I believe that this tower, it can go up, but just don't put

it here. You know, we have a beautiful
neighborhood that we've all grown to love. And
I've been here for, I think, almost three years
too. So that's my concern is just the RF exposure
and what it would have on us long term. That's
all.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you very much, and thank you for joining us.

Kara, thank you for being patient.

Kara Timek, you're up next, followed by Omeed

Manabat.

KARA TIMEK: I'm here.

MR. SILVESTRI: Please proceed, Kara. Thank you.

KARA TIMEK: Thank you for listening to our concerns this evening. I am also a resident of Talias Trail. I was on the side of the street that was also not notified. I do have serious concerns about the location of the tower for the neighbors on the opposing side of the street where the access road is in their immediate backyard.

The tenant has the option to install lines, wires, poles, pipes to improve the site. They have the option without asking the town to modify, supplement, upgrade or expand the

communications facility within the designated 2,500 square foot plot at any time. Additional dishes or antennas can be installed. They have the right to sell, sublease or transfer in part or full at any time within the lease period. The word tenant applies to any and all affiliates of New Cingular Wireless which means the possibility of more antennas for various usage. The lease term is five years with five more automatic five-year periods for a total of 30 years.

The tenant also has a right to fly unmanned aircraft systems to survey, record or inspect the area. That means that they can fly a drone over our property at any time without our consent or knowledge.

By law, towers are required to be shared, so additional providers can add more to the tower at any time. And the tower can be raised 10 percent or 20 feet higher without permission. That's just all from the drafted lease agreement with the City of Middletown. And all the City of Middletown is getting for it is \$30,000 a year and all of the residents on our street are getting is an eyesore. Thank you for your time.

1 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you very much for 2 joining us, and thank you for your comments as 3 well. 4 Our next speaker was Omeed Manabat, if 5 I pronounced that correctly, to be followed by 6 Adam Szczerbicki. 7 Is Omeed with us this evening? 8 (No response.) 9 MR. SILVESTRI: I don't see Omeed on my 10 screen, but we will double back. 11 Adam Szczerbicki, I did see you 12 earlier. Are you still with us? 13 ADAM SZCZERBICKI: Yes, I am here. 14 Thank you very much. 15 MR. SILVESTRI: There you go. 16 you. Please proceed. 17 ADAM SZCZERBICKI: Okay. I would like 18 to thank everybody for giving us the opportunity 19 to speak on this. I would just like to make a 20 quick comment since I do live right behind the 21 original tower that's already there, and the one 22 that's being constructed will be a few feet away. 23 So I just want to make one comment, like one 24 little request, if I may. 25 And I'll start. I reside on 70 Talias

Trail with my family. Because this tower will be placed directly behind my house, I would request that the tower be moved back on the 25-acre plot of Middletown property closer to the high school. That way it is not visible from our house and further away from our neighborhood. And I would also like it to blend within the treeline and, I mean, if there is some possibility that you guys can make this look like a tree so that it can do so. That is all for me. Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you also for joining us, and thank you for your comments.

Okay. I'd like to double back to the people that we called the first time but somehow missed. And the first one that I do have is Marisabel Barbagallo, and I did see you back on my screen. Right now I do see that you're on mute. There you go.

MARISABEL BARBAGALLO: Hello. My apologies. I'm at work, so my connection is a little off. I was not aware that I was able to speak as well tonight. I thought it was just three minutes per household, so I really didn't prepare. But I just want to say that I, you know,

1 just like the rest of our neighbors, I'm on 59 2 Talias Trail with my husband Joseph Barbagallo, 3 and along with the rest of my neighbors I'm 4 concerned about the tower just not only because of 5 an eyesore, because of health concerns. And we 6 just moved to the street as well two years ago, 7 and we love the neighborhood. You know, we pretty 8 much built this to be our forever home. And to 9 have a tower literally built right in front of our 10 home, it's really upsetting, and the fact that we 11 weren't given an opportunity to fight this earlier 12 in advance just because we weren't abutted to the 13 tower. So along with everybody else, I don't want 14 the tower to go up. 15 So I appreciate you guys listening to 16 all of our concerns, and that's all I have to say. 17 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you for your 18 comments, and thank you for joining us as well

MARISABEL BARBAGALLO: Have a good evening.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this evening.

MR. SILVESTRI: You do the same. Thank you again.

Okay. Doubling back on the list, we had called Christopher LaVigne, if I said that

1 last name correctly. Did Christopher join us or 2 rejoin us? 3 (No response.) 4 MR. SILVESTRI: And I don't see him on 5 my screen. Let me move to another person that we 6 called earlier, and that's Palmer Gaines. 7 Palmer join us in the interim? 8 (No response.) 9 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. And the third person that I called but missed is Omeed Manabat, 10 11 if I did say that name correctly. 12 (No response.) 13 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. So I'm going to 14 go through those three names one more time in the 15 hopes that they didn't hear me the first or second 16 time and that they'll hear me the third. 17 first one was Christopher LaVigne, V-i-g-n-e. 18 (No response.) 19 MR. SILVESTRI: Nobody there. Second 20 one was Palmer Gaines, G-a-i-n-e-s. 21 (No response.) 22 MR. SILVESTRI: No one there. And the 23 third one was Omeed Manabat, M-a-n-a-b-a-t. 24 (No response.) 25 MR. SILVESTRI: And I don't see any of

those three.

Okay. As a reminder to those that did join us, if you do run across those people, please remind them that they could submit written comments to us as well by email or by mail.

So with that, ladies and gentlemen, the Council announces that it will continue the evidentiary session of this public hearing on Tuesday, December 21, 2021, at 2 p.m., and that's via Zoom remote conferencing. A copy of the agenda for the continued remote evidentiary hearing session will be available on the Council's Docket No. 506 webpage, along with the record of this matter, the public hearing notice, instructions for public access to the remote evidentiary hearing session, and the Council's Citizens Guide to Siting Council Procedures.

And again, please note that anyone who has not become a party or intervenor, but who desires to make his or her views known to the Council, may file written statements with the Council until the public comment record closes.

Copies of the transcript of this hearing will be filed at the Middletown City Clerk's Office. I hereby declare this hearing

adjourned. I thank you all for your participation, and have a good evening. Thank you again. (Whereupon, the above proceedings adjourned at 7:00 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE FOR REMOTE HEARING

I hereby certify that the foregoing 30 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original stenotype notes taken before the Connecticut Siting Council of the REMOTE PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION IN RE: DOCKET NO. 506, NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC (AT&T) APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATION OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY LOCATED AT 499 MILE LANE, MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT, which was held before ROBERT SILVESTRI, PRESIDING OFFICER, on November 30, 2021.

Lisa L. Warner, CSR 061

Court Reporter