

1 STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
2 CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL  
3

4 Docket No. 507

5 Homeland Towers, LLC and Cellco Partnership d/b/a  
6 Verizon Wireless application for a Certificate of  
7 Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for  
8 the construction, maintenance, and operation of a  
9 wireless telecommunications facility located at  
10 222 Clintonville Road, North Branford, Connecticut  
11

12 VIA ZOOM AND TELECONFERENCE  
13

14 Public Comment Session held on Tuesday,  
15 March 15, 2022, beginning at 6:30 p.m.,  
16 via remote access.  
17

18  
19 H e l d B e f o r e :

20 JOHN MORISSETTE, Presiding Officer  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 Reporter: Lisa L. Warner, CSR #061

1   **A p p e a r a n c e s:**

2       **Council Members:**

3           **KENNETH COLLETTE, Designee for Commissioner**  
4           **Katie Dykes, Department of Energy and**  
            **Environmental Protection**

5           **QUAT NGUYEN, Designee for Chairman Marissa**  
6           **Paslick Gillett, Public Utilities Regulatory**  
            **Authority**

7           **ROBERT SILVESTRI**  
8           **DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.**  
9           **LOUANNE COOLEY**  
            **MARK QUINLAN**

10       **Council Staff:**

11           **MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.**  
12           **Executive Director and Staff Attorney**

13           **ROBERT MERCIER**  
            **Siting Analyst**

14           **LISA FONTAINE**  
15           **Fiscal Administrative Officer**

16           **For Applicants, Homeland Towers, LLC and**  
17           **Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless:**

18                   **ROBINSON & COLE LLP**  
19                   **280 Trumbull Street**  
                    **Hartford, Connecticut 06103-3597**  
                    **BY: KENNETH C. BALDWIN, ESQ.**

20  
21  
22           **Presentation by: ROBERT BURNS, P.E.,**  
23           **All-Points Technology Corporation P.C.**  
24  
25

1   **A p p e a r a n c e s : (Cont'd)**

2  
3       **Public Speakers:**

4           DAVID PALUMBO  
5           MICHAEL PAULHUS  
6           SARAH BROWN  
7           KENNETH MARTIN  
8           BONNIE MATHEWS  
9           JOSEPH REBESCHI  
10          HENRY PETRY

11  
12  
13  
14       **Zoom co-host:   Aaron Demarest**

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
**\*\*All participants were present via remote access.**

1 MR. MORISSETTE: This remote public  
2 hearing is called to order this Tuesday, March 15,  
3 2022, at 6:30 p.m. My name is John Morissette,  
4 member and presiding officer of the Connecticut  
5 Siting Council. Other members of the Council are  
6 Kenneth Collette, designee for Commissioner Katie  
7 Dykes of the Department of Energy and  
8 Environmental Protection; Quat Nguyen, designee  
9 for Chairman Marissa Paslick Gillett of the Public  
10 Utilities Regulatory Authority; Robert Silvestri;  
11 Louanne Cooley; Mark Quinlan; and Daniel P. Lynch,  
12 Jr.

13 Members of the staff are Melanie  
14 Bachman, executive director and staff attorney;  
15 Robert Mercier, our siting analyst; Lisa Fontaine,  
16 the fiscal administrative officer.

17 If you haven't done so already, I ask  
18 that everyone please mute their computer audio  
19 and/or telephones now. Thank you.

20 This is a continuation of the remote  
21 public hearing that began at 2 p.m. this  
22 afternoon. A copy of the prepared agenda is  
23 available on the Council's Docket No. 507 webpage,  
24 along with the record of this matter, the public  
25 hearing notice, instructions for public access to

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

3 This hearing is held pursuant to the  
4 provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General  
5 Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative  
6 Procedure Act upon an application from Homeland  
7 Towers, LLC and Cellco Partnership doing business  
8 as Verizon Wireless for a Certificate of  
9 Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for  
10 the construction, maintenance, and operation of a  
11 wireless telecommunications facility located at  
12 222 Clintonville Road in North Branford,  
13 Connecticut. This application was received by the  
14 Council on January 27, 2022.

15 This application is also governed by  
16 the Telecommunications Act of 1996, which is  
17 administered by the Federal Communications  
18 Commission. This act prohibits this Council from  
19 considering the health effects of radio frequency  
20 emissions on human health and wildlife to the  
21 extent the emissions from the towers are within  
22 the federal acceptable safe limits standard, which  
23 standard is also followed by the state Department  
24 of Public Health. The Federal Act also prohibits  
25 this Council from discriminating between and

1 amongst providers of functionally equivalent  
2 services. This means that if one carrier already  
3 provides service in the area, other carriers have  
4 the right to compete and provide service in the  
5 same area.

6 The Council's legal notice of the date  
7 and time of this remote public hearing was  
8 published in The New Haven Register on February  
9 16, 2022. Upon this Council's request, the  
10 applicants erected a sign along Clintonville Road,  
11 which is Route 22, at the entrance of the proposed  
12 site so as to inform the public of the name of the  
13 applicant, the type of facility, the remote public  
14 hearing date, and contact information for the  
15 Council, including the website and phone number.

16 This remote public comment session is  
17 reserved for the public to make brief statements  
18 into the record. These public statements are not  
19 subject to questions from the parties or the  
20 Council, and members of the public making  
21 statements may not ask questions of the parties or  
22 the Council. In fairness to everyone who has  
23 signed up to speak, these public statements will  
24 be limited to three minutes and will become part  
25 of the record for Council consideration. Please

1 be advised that written comments may be submitted  
2 by any party or person within 30 days of this  
3 public hearing.

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

8 I wish to note that parties and  
9 intervenors, including their representatives,  
10 witnesses and members, are not allowed to  
11 participate in the public comment session. I also  
12 wish to note for those who are listening and for  
13 the benefit of your friends and neighbors who are  
14 unable to join us for the remote public comment  
15 session that you or they may send written  
16 statements to the Council within 30 days of the  
17 date hereof by email or by mail, and such written  
18 statements will be given the same weight as if  
19 spoken at the remote public comment session.  
20 Please be advised that any person may be removed  
21 from the Zoom remote public comment session at the  
22 discretion of the Council.

23 We ask that each person making a public  
24 statement in this proceeding to confine his or her  
25 statements to the subject matter before the

1 Council and to avoid unreasonable repetition so  
2 that we may hear all the concerns you and your  
3 neighbors have. Please be advised that the  
4 Council cannot answer questions from the public  
5 about the proposal.

6 A verbatim transcript of this remote  
7 public hearing will be posted on the Council's  
8 Docket No. 507 webpage and deposited in the North  
9 Branford Town Clerk's Office for the convenience  
10 of the public.

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

14 Before I call members of the public to  
15 make statements, I request the applicant to make a  
16 very brief presentation to the public describing  
17 the proposed facility. And I believe, Mr. Burns,  
18 you are providing this presentation?

19 MR. BURNS: Yes, Mr. Morissette.

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Burns.  
21 Please continue.

22 MR. BURNS: For the record, my name is  
23 Robert Burns. I'm a licensed civil engineer in  
24 the State of Connecticut with All-Points  
25 Technology Corporation.

1           The proposed facility is located at 222  
2 Clintonville Road which is at the northern side of  
3 Clintonville Road. The proposed facility is  
4 located in the northeast portion of the parcel.  
5 Vehicle access to the facility will be from a new  
6 12-foot wide, 795-foot long gravel access drive  
7 which will commence from the existing driveway  
8 entrance off Clintonville Road onto the privately  
9 owned parcel to the proposed fenced compound.

10           Maybe we can put the next slide up. Do  
11 we have a blow-up of the compound? Perfect.  
12 Thank you.

13           The compound is a 4,061 square foot  
14 irregularly shaped gravel surface compound  
15 surrounded by an 8-foot high chain link fence with  
16 a 12-foot wide access gate on the northern side.  
17 The proposed compound has been sized for four  
18 carriers, Verizon and three future carriers, plus  
19 an area for municipal ground equipment.

20           Outside the fence on the northwest side  
21 of the compound is a proposed utility area which  
22 will include a utility backboard where the  
23 proposed electric meters will sit, an electric  
24 transformer, and a small telephone cabinet. This  
25 area will be surrounded by steel bollards for

1 protection.

2           The proposed electric and telco service  
3 that will feed the site will be installed  
4 underground beginning at an existing utility pole  
5 on the north side of Clintonville Road and run  
6 underground following the proposed access drive to  
7 the compound. Inside the fence in the southeast  
8 corner of the compound is Verizon's ground  
9 equipment which will include a 10-foot by 10-foot  
10 concrete pad with equipment cabinets, a 4-foot by  
11 8-foot concrete pad with a 50 kW propane fired  
12 generator and a 4-foot by 10-foot concrete pad  
13 with a 500 gallon propane tank to fuel that  
14 generator.

15           In the approximate center of the  
16 compound is a 110-foot high monopole with  
17 municipal antennas at the top, reaching, those  
18 antennas at maximum height will be to 134. The  
19 town will install whip antennas, one 24-foot long  
20 antenna and one 14-foot long antenna at the top of  
21 the tower. Verizon plans to install 12 panel  
22 antennas, 12 remote radio heads, and one MPB which  
23 will be mounted on double T-arms. The center of  
24 those antennas will be at 96 and will be painted  
25 and the antennas will be fitted with antenna

1 socks. The tower will be designed for three  
2 additional future carriers at 10-foot intervals  
3 below Verizon's installation, so at 86, 76 and 66.

4 The compound will be surrounded by  
5 5-foot to 6-foot tall evergreens for screening  
6 purposes. In addition, where the driveway enters  
7 the site, small proposed plantings will be planted  
8 along that driveway in the lawn area to screen the  
9 proposed access drive from the existing landlord.  
10 That's the site.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Burns.

12 MR. QUINLAN: Excuse me, I have one  
13 question before we start, or a comment before we  
14 start.

15 MR. MORISSETTE: Mr. Quinlan, we're not  
16 accepting questions this evening. Thank you.

17 MR. QUINLAN: It's not --

18 MR. MORISSETTE: No, you cannot.

19 MR. QUINLAN: We can't direct their  
20 comments?

21 MR. MORISSETTE: You cannot. Thank  
22 you.

23 Just a quick note on remote public  
24 hearings. Remote public hearings are quite  
25 different from in-person public hearings. For

1 in-person public hearings members of the public  
2 can sign in, step up to the podium and offer their  
3 comments. For remote public hearings, the public  
4 is required to sign up to speak in advance in  
5 order to provide Council staff with the time  
6 necessary to facilitate connection precautions and  
7 prevent interruptions, or in common terms,  
8 bombings of the proceedings. There are protocols,  
9 procedures and consistently measures that are  
10 followed as part of the remote public hearing  
11 process. Written comments may be submitted within  
12 30 days of this public hearing.

13 We will now call on David Palumbo,  
14 chairman of the North Branford Public Safety  
15 Communications Committee to make a public  
16 statement followed by Michael Paulhus, North  
17 Branford town manager.

18 David Palumbo, please.

19 DAVID PALUMBO: Thank you. Good  
20 Afternoon, Siting Council members. I want to  
21 thank you for the opportunity to speak in today's  
22 hearing regarding the proposed tower at 222  
23 Clintonville Road, Northford, Connecticut. My  
24 name again is David Palumbo, and I'm the chairman  
25 of the North Branford Public Communications

1 Committee.

2 I'm here to speak on behalf of the  
3 North Branford Public Safety Services as a unified  
4 voice. Today here with me is Kevin Halloran,  
5 chief of police; Anthony Esposito, interim chief  
6 of police; Victor Pietandrea, chairman of the  
7 Board of Police Commissioners; and Ed Prunier,  
8 chairman of the fire commissioners.

9 The Public Safety Communications  
10 Committee has been charged with replacing the  
11 North Branford public safety radio communication  
12 system which is an aging system at the end of its  
13 life. The town has been struggling for many years  
14 to provide a reliable uninterruptible  
15 communication system which is critical to the safe  
16 operations and operations of the police, fire,  
17 emergency medical services, and operation of the  
18 Regional Center for Life Safety for North Branford  
19 residents.

20 Police, fire and EMS are the front line  
21 response whether it's a crime in progress, fire,  
22 medical emergency, terrorist attack, natural  
23 disaster or today's global pandemic. Effective  
24 communications play a critical role in  
25 coordinating an executive public safety response

1 in any given incident. Land mobile two-way radios  
2 are a public safety organization's primary  
3 communications tools and a lifeline during calls  
4 and rely on their radios connected to share and  
5 receive timely and accurate information.

6 As I said, our current radio system is  
7 aging and at the end of its life. There are dead  
8 spots throughout the town, streets, coverages are  
9 spotty in multiple locations throughout our town,  
10 coverage in the residential and public buildings  
11 are poor or nonexistent at times. In addition to  
12 the poor radio communications coverage, mutual aid  
13 is inoperable and is challenged with local and  
14 public safety partners. Most of our surrounding  
15 towns of the state police have moved into a modern  
16 digital age radio system that allows them to  
17 easily communicate with each other. We rely on  
18 our local and public safety partners in times of  
19 crisis and ability to communicate is critical.

20 We specifically benefit by moving from  
21 a conventional system, as we have today, to a  
22 digital system. Digital systems create an  
23 effectiveness and allow more users to operate in  
24 fewer frequencies. Most importantly, the  
25 transition from conventional to digital will

1 provide pathways to full interoperability, and the  
2 new radio system will leverage the Connecticut  
3 land mobile network which will provide superior  
4 street and building coverage throughout our town.  
5 Enhanced interoperability within our -- outside of  
6 our town in North Branford through much of the  
7 State of Connecticut are a few of the benefits for  
8 the Connecticut land mobile radio (TIME ELAPSED)  
9 --

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.  
11 Palumbo. Unfortunately your time has expired.  
12 Thank you for coming out this evening and speaking  
13 with us.

14 We will now turn to Michael Paulhus,  
15 the town manager, followed by Sarah Brown.

16 Mr. Paulhus.

17 MICHAEL PAULHUS: Thank you. And good  
18 evening. My name is Michael Paulhus, and I am the  
19 town manager for the Town of North Branford. And  
20 I am appearing today in support of the application  
21 by Homeland Towers for a proposed tower at 222  
22 Clintonville Road in Northford, Connecticut. I  
23 would like to thank the Siting Council for this  
24 opportunity to participate in this public hearing  
25 and to speak in support of this application.

1           This application is important to North  
2 Branford because it provides the town with an  
3 opportunity to improve our public safety  
4 communications system. The proposed tower is an  
5 integral part of a comprehensive plan to upgrade  
6 and improve deficiencies in the town's current  
7 radio system. The town's topography and aging  
8 system presents significant challenges to  
9 providing effective communication in our  
10 community. Our Public Safety Communications  
11 Committee has been hard at work to address these  
12 challenges, as you've just heard from Chairman  
13 Palumbo, who I believe has laid out a very  
14 effective summary of the challenges we face and  
15 what we hope to accomplish by having a tower  
16 placed at 222 Clintonville Road.

17           So again, I support the application and  
18 would like to thank you for your time. That is  
19 all I have.

20           MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you,  
21 Mr. Paulhus. We appreciate your time as well.

22           We now call upon Sarah Brown followed  
23 by Kenneth Martin. Sarah Brown.

24           SARAH BROWN: Hi. Thank you for  
25 allowing me to speak today. As a town employee, I

1 don't deny the town's need for improved emergency  
2 communications, but as a resident on Pistapaug  
3 Road where I'll be able to see the cell tower  
4 directly out my kitchen window, I don't think this  
5 site is appropriate for a cell tower. The town  
6 had an opportunity to put a cell tower on  
7 town-owned property and about a mile away from the  
8 historic district but chose not to do so.

9           The cell tower proposed at 222  
10 Clintonville Road would actually be erected closer  
11 to my property on Pistapaug Road by only 589 feet  
12 away. The cell tower would have an enormous  
13 impact on my family and myself and my neighbors.  
14 We're a family that spends most of our time  
15 outside. We play with the dog, we host parties,  
16 and we even had our wedding in our backyard. The  
17 cell tower would be visible as I watch my boys  
18 play outside from my kitchen window, and my son  
19 will see it every time he looks out his bedroom  
20 window.

21           When a cell tower was proposed at 80  
22 Old Post Road further away from the historic  
23 district, it was rejected in part because of the  
24 negative visual impact it would have on the  
25 historic district and surrounding areas. This

1 cell tower would practically abut the property  
2 line of a historic district and at the ACES School  
3 for children with autism and developmental  
4 disabilities, and it would be seen in all  
5 directions instead of just one.

6 I was actually shocked to read the  
7 letter from the State Historic Preservation Office  
8 that there would be no adverse effect to the  
9 historic sites because it would negatively impact  
10 the character of downtown Northford. It was sold  
11 to the people by Homeland Tower as going in a  
12 wooded area, but they're going to be taking over  
13 100 trees down, so it won't be so wooded anymore,  
14 and there will be even more visible impact to the  
15 neighbors in the community and not to mention the  
16 noise. When I asked at the informational meeting,  
17 they said there would be a constant low hum and  
18 they would have to be testing the generators. So  
19 that would also greatly negatively impact the  
20 residents and neighbors in this town.

21 My husband and I chose to raise our  
22 family here in this wonderful quiet neighborhood.  
23 We did not choose to live in a house with a giant  
24 cell tower and generators 580 feet from us. I'm  
25 asking the Siting Council to please reject the

1 application from Homeland Towers and Verizon  
2 Wireless. There are other places in town where it  
3 can be erected. Having better cell service is not  
4 good enough reason to put a cell tower up so close  
5 to the residents, students and teachers in a  
6 historic and a small farming community. Thank  
7 you.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Ms. Brown.  
9 Thank you for your comments this evening.

10 We'll now call upon Kenneth Martin  
11 followed by Henry Petry. Kenneth Martin.

12 KENNETH MARTIN: Hi. Thank you for  
13 hearing us out here today. I listened to the  
14 hearing this afternoon, and I noticed there was a  
15 lot of consideration given to visibility and a  
16 number of other issues. There really wasn't any  
17 consideration given to property values or  
18 potential health issues for people that lived in  
19 the area. Personally, I'm a little conflicted  
20 over this whole matter because I would really like  
21 to see my neighbor receive the financial benefits  
22 that this lease would bring him, you know, and I  
23 know it would be a game changer for them, and I  
24 would very much like to see them receive that.  
25 But I am concerned about the property values and

1 about the EMF and RF waves that we'd be dealing  
2 with.

3 I know the state has levels and I know  
4 the Council is comfortable with those, and that's  
5 what you have to go by when you do this. But, you  
6 know, in looking at the internet, it's very  
7 confusing. There's a lot of studies that say  
8 these are safe levels, and there's just as many  
9 studies that says that they're not. So I looked  
10 at a couple of things that I just want to point  
11 out. The American Cancer Society on their  
12 publication regarding cell phone towers they state  
13 at this time there's no strong evidence that  
14 exposure to RF waves from cell phone towers causes  
15 any noticeable health effects. However, this does  
16 not mean that RF waves from cell phone towers have  
17 been proven to be absolutely safe.

18 They go on to say, Most expert  
19 organizations agree that more research is needed  
20 to help clarify this, especially for any possible  
21 long-term effects. So obviously the American  
22 Cancer Society is not totally convinced that  
23 there's no harmful effects from these.

24 Next I went on to, this is a study  
25 published in 2019 by the Swiss Re Institute. This

1 is an institute that evaluates risk for the  
2 insurance industry, and in 2019 they published  
3 something called New Emerging Risk Insights. On  
4 page 29 they refer to "Off the Leash - 5G Mobile  
5 Networks," and they state, As biological effects  
6 of EMF, in general, and 5G, in particular, are  
7 still being debated, potential claims for health  
8 impairments may come with long latency.

9 So this is the insurance industry  
10 saying that they're preparing for the possibility  
11 of lawsuits for these EMF exposures.

12 Then I went on to, this is a 10-K  
13 filing that Verizon Wireless did in 2020 with the  
14 United States Securities and Exchange Commission  
15 for their stockholders. It goes on and they say,  
16 We are subject to a significant amount of  
17 litigation which could require us to pay  
18 significant damages or settlements (TIME ELAPSED)  
19 --

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Martin.  
21 Unfortunately, your time has run out. And I thank  
22 you for coming out this evening.

23 We will now continue with Henry Petry  
24 followed by Bonnie Mathews.

25 Henry Petry. I understand Mr. Petry

1 will be calling in. Henry Petry?

2 (No response.)

3 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. We will  
4 continue on and we'll come back when Henry is  
5 available. We'll continue with Bonnie Mathews  
6 followed by Joseph Rebeschi.

7 Bonnie Mathews.

8 (No response.)

9 MR. MORISSETTE: I don't see Bonnie on  
10 the screen. We'll come back to Bonnie.

11 We'll continue with Joseph Rebeschi.

12 BONNIE MATHEWS: Hello?

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Is that Bonnie?

14 BONNIE MATHEWS: That's me.

15 MR. MORISSETTE: Hi, Bonnie. Go ahead.  
16 You've got the floor.

17 BONNIE MATHEWS: You ready?

18 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes. Thank you.

19 BONNIE MATHEWS: Okay. My name is  
20 Bonnie Mathews. I live on Pistapaug Road, and I  
21 grew up here on my family's land at 222  
22 Clintonville Road in Northford. There's a lot of  
23 focus on the historic village aspect of Northford.  
24 Many very old historic buildings are on this  
25 block. The Northford Congregational Church was

1 built in 1780, the Stanley Williams House, the  
2 Little Red School House, and my grandmother's  
3 house on Old Post Road were built in the 1800s.  
4 The former William Douglas School, now ACES, was  
5 built in 1925. A cell tower on this block would  
6 greatly impact the historic appeal of our village.  
7 A 110-foot tower would be visible at each of these  
8 locations.

9           The tower salesman seriously misled us  
10 as to the location and what the tower would  
11 entail. With the upcoming 5G cells, the RF rays  
12 would be stronger. The FAA has already determined  
13 that 5G is powerful enough to disrupt airplanes.  
14 So what's it's doing to us? Health risks from  
15 these rays are a major concern.

16           A cell tower should not be built in a  
17 residential area. There are several open spaces  
18 in town. The Town of Wallingford has leased some  
19 open land to cell tower companies and added over  
20 \$500,000 to their town funds. Our Town Council  
21 should take a lesson and not miss this opportunity  
22 to help our town. Apparently the Town Council  
23 voted that no tower be built on town property  
24 behind Stanley T. Williams School. Why is this  
25 site unacceptable behind that school but it's okay

1 behind ACES School? That make no sense.

2           There's an underground spring on the  
3 property. This spring feeds the pond which is a  
4 backup water source for the Northford Fire  
5 Department. The tower company wants to build an  
6 access road in the spring area. We have protected  
7 bats on the property that feed on the pond's  
8 mosquito population as well as an endangered hawk  
9 in our woods. We have a lot of wildlife here,  
10 including fish and frogs. These poor birds,  
11 reptiles and animals will suffer from the  
12 construction of a tower. Many trees would be cut  
13 destroying or damaging habitats. This tower would  
14 be an eyesore and a nuisance with the constant  
15 humming and the loud routine maintenance.

16           I sincerely hope you will deny Docket  
17 507's application. It would be detrimental to the  
18 people of the neighborhood, the environment and  
19 the historic village of Northford. Please  
20 consider (TIME ELAPSED) --

21           MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Ms.  
22 Mathews. Your time has also expired.

23           We'll now continue with Joseph  
24 Rebeschi.

25           JOSEPH REBESCHI: Yes. Good evening.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Good evening, Joseph.  
2 Followed by Peter Zaehringer.

3 Go ahead, Mr. Rebeschi.

4 JOSEPH REBESCHI: Sure. I'm a resident  
5 of Pistapaug Road for many, many years. Just a  
6 couple of points. Some of them have already been  
7 covered. I think one of the things that has been  
8 downplayed is really the visual impact of the  
9 viewshed. I think the pictures that have been  
10 supplied by the applicant are completely  
11 inadequate to show the true impact of what it will  
12 do to the Northford Historic District.

13 So I'd love to, I'm a graphic artist by  
14 trade. I'd volunteer my services gratis to be  
15 able to show that to the Council and how it really  
16 will look and not by a red dot hovering over a  
17 tree. I don't think that's a very fair or clear  
18 depiction of what it will impact the town center  
19 with.

20 Also, I was surprised. I did attend  
21 the meeting earlier today. I was surprised that  
22 the tower that's been proposed to cover or take  
23 care of inadequacies in coverage don't really do  
24 that, right? So it's going to cover, what, the  
25 southern part of town? Can't we put a -- you

1 know, that goes back to why not put a cell in the  
2 church towers. If you're not going to cover 150,  
3 you know, what are we doing there? So that's two  
4 of the points I have.

5 And then the third one. I know the  
6 town is supporting this surprisingly in a  
7 residential neighborhood, historic district with a  
8 school ACES there because they want their radio  
9 antenna on top of the tower. Now that choice or  
10 Tilcon which is a strip mine. So just a message  
11 to the town. If I'm going to make a decision, I'd  
12 rather put the antenna in a strip mine than in the  
13 middle of a neighborhood. So they should rethink  
14 their position on that. So those are those three,  
15 my three points I just wanted to make today. So  
16 thank you.

17 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. And just a  
18 reminder, you have 30 days to provide written  
19 comments to follow up to this meeting, if you  
20 would so choose to.

21 JOSEPH REBESCHI: Okay. Thank you.

22 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. We'll now  
23 call on Peter Zaehringer. Peter? Peter  
24 Zaehringer.

25 (No response.)

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. We'll go back  
2 to Henry Petry. Henry, have you joined us?

3 A VOICE: Henry, press star 6.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Henry, are  
5 you with us? There you are. No?

6 Henry Petry? Henry, I think I see you  
7 on the screen. Take yourself off mute and you can  
8 provide your comments.

9 HENRY PETRY: Hello? You got me now?

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, we have you.

11 HENRY PETRY: My name is Henry Petry.  
12 I own the property at 250 Clintonville Road south  
13 of the proposed cell tower. My property has been  
14 in the family for over 100 years, and I was born  
15 and raised on the property. In January of 2021, I  
16 was approached by Homeland Tower to see if I was  
17 able and interested to have a cell tower on my  
18 property. After a lot of investigation and  
19 thought, it was quite clear that it was not only  
20 unfavorable to my property, but more importantly,  
21 to the town and village of Northford. Also, it  
22 would not be fitting with the plan of conservation  
23 and development that went into effect October 13th  
24 of 2019.

25 The proposed cell tower is not only

1 surrounded by residential homes but is adjacent to  
2 numerous contributing structures to the Northford  
3 Center Historic District and National Registration  
4 of Historic Places. The proposed cell tower would  
5 be less than 300 lineal feet to 900 lineal feet  
6 from the historic church, school and town library.  
7 Furthermore, there are potential environmental  
8 concerns of the noise and removal of trees that  
9 would negatively impact the area. In addition,  
10 the proposed generator, the first of possibly  
11 three additional generators, appear to exceed the  
12 town's noise ordinance for Class A residential  
13 levels.

14 A letter dated September 29, 2021 from  
15 Robinson & Cole had an enclosed drawing show a  
16 proposed cell tower 134 feet from my property line  
17 in a compound 89 feet from my property line. A  
18 second letter dated January 24, 2022 from Robinson  
19 & Cole had an enclosed drawing that the proposed  
20 cell tower was 96 feet from my property line in a  
21 compound 51 feet from my property line. This is  
22 significantly closer than the first received  
23 drawing.

24 Anderson Engineering & Surveying  
25 Associates in a proposed subdivision on my

1 property whereby a number of building lots to be  
2 obtained in the R40 zone, but the lot 40, the  
3 proposed cell tower property would have the house  
4 126 feet from the cell tower and 81 feet from the  
5 compound itself and be compliant with town zoning  
6 regulations. I am quite concerned about the noise  
7 created by the generators and the overall effect  
8 on human and wildlife habitat. It is quite  
9 possible that Northford needs a cell tower, but  
10 placing it in the R40 zone extremely close to the  
11 center and village of Northford and the overall  
12 effect on the village is not in the best interest  
13 of anyone in Northford.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Petry.  
15 Does that conclude your comments?

16 HENRY PETRY: That is correct.

17 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Thank you  
18 for participating this evening.

19 I will now call upon Peter Zaehring.  
20 Peter Zaehring?

21 (No response.)

22 MR. MORISSETTE: Unfortunately, I don't  
23 see Peter Zaehring on the menu. I'll give him  
24 one more minute. Peter Zaehring?

25 Thank you, everyone. That concludes

1 our public comment session for this evening. But  
2 before closing the evidentiary record in this  
3 matter, the Connecticut Siting Council announces  
4 that briefs and proposed findings of fact may be  
5 filed with the Council by any party or intervenor  
6 no later than April 14, 2022. The submission of  
7 briefs or proposed findings of fact are not  
8 required by this Council, rather, we leave it to  
9 the choice of the parties and intervenors.

10 Anyone who has not become a party or  
11 intervenor but who wishes to make his or her views  
12 known to the Council may file written statements  
13 with the Council within 30 days of the date  
14 hereof. The Council will issue draft findings of  
15 fact, and thereafter the parties and intervenors  
16 may identify errors and inconsistencies between  
17 the Council's draft findings of fact and the  
18 record. However, no new information, no new  
19 evidence, no new arguments, and no reply briefs,  
20 without our permission, will be considered by the  
21 Council.

22 Copies of the transcript of this  
23 hearing will be filed at the North Branford Town  
24 Clerk's Office. I hereby declare this hearing  
25 adjourned, and thank you everyone for your

1 participation this evening. Have a good evening,  
2 and thank you again.

3 (Whereupon, the above proceedings  
4 concluded at 7:06 p.m.)

5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 CERTIFICATE FOR REMOTE HEARING

2  
3 I hereby certify that the foregoing 31 pages  
4 are a complete and accurate computer-aided  
5 transcription of my original stenotype notes taken  
6 before the CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL of the  
7 REMOTE PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION IN RE: DOCKET NO.  
8 507, HOMELAND TOWERS, LLC AND CELLCO PARTNERSHIP  
9 D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS APPLICATION FOR A  
10 CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND  
11 PUBLIC NEED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND  
12 OPERATION OF A WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
13 FACILITY LOCATED AT 222 CLINTONVILLE ROAD, NORTH  
14 BRANFORD, CONNECTICUT, which was held before JOHN  
15 MORISSETTE, PRESIDING OFFICER, on March 15, 2022.  
16

17  
18 

19 -----  
20 Lisa L. Warner, CSR 061  
21 Court Reporter  
22 BCT REPORTING SERVICE  
23 55 WHITING STREET, SUITE 1A  
24 PLAINVILLE, CONNECTICUT 06062  
25