

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Docket No. 503

Arx Wireless Infrastructure, LLC application for a
Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public
Need for the construction, maintenance, and operation
of a telecommunications facility located at 43 Osgood
Avenue, New Britain, Connecticut

Zoom Remote Council Meeting (Teleconference), on Thursday, September 2, 2021, beginning at 2 p.m.

Held Before:

JOHN MORISSETTE, Member and Presiding Officer

1	Appearances:
2	Council Members:
3	JOHN MORISSETTE, (Hearing Officer)
4	
5	QUAT NGUYEN,
6	PURA Designee
7	
8	ROBERT SILVESTRI
9	ED EDELSON
10	LOUANNE COOLEY
11	
12	Council Staff:
13	MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.,
14	Executive Director and Staff Attorney
15	
16	MICHAEL PERRONE,
17	Siting Analyst
18	
19	LISA FONTAINE,
20	Fiscal Administrative Officer
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	Appearances:(cont'd)
2	For Arx Wireless Infrastructure, LLC (Applicant):
3	COHEN & WOLF, P.C.
4	1115 Broad Street
5	Bridgeport, Connecticut 06604
6	By: DAVID A. BALL, ESQ.
7	DBall@cohenandwolf.com
8	203.337.4134
9	
10	For NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC (Intervenor):
11	BROWN RUDNICK, LLP
12	City Place I, Number 38
13	3463 Asylum St
14	Hartford, Connecticut 06103
15	By: THOMAS J. REGAN, ESQ.
16	TRegan@brownrudnick.com
17	860.509.6522
18	
19	For THE CITY OF NEW BRITAIN:
20	CITY OF NEW BRITAIN CORPORATION COUNSEL
21	27 West Main Street,
22	New Britain, Connecticut 06051
23	By: JOSEPH E. SKELLY, JR., ESQ.
24	860.826.3420
25	860.826.3397 (fax)

THE HEARING OFFICER: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Can everyone hear me okay?

A VOICE: Yes.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.

This continued remote evidentiary hearing session is called to order this Thursday,
September 2nd, 2021, at 2 p.m. My name is John
Morissette, member and Presiding Officer of the
Connecticut Siting Council.

As everyone is aware, there is currently a statewide effort to prevent the spread of the coronavirus. This is why the Council is holding this remote hearing, and we ask for your patience.

If you haven't done so already, I ask that everyone please mute their computer audio and telephones now.

A copy of the prepared agenda is available on the Council's Docket Number 503 webpage along with the record of this matter, the public hearing notice, instructions for public access to this remote public hearing and the citizen's guide to the Siting Council's procedures.

Other members of the Council are Mr. Edelson,
Mr. Silvestri, Mr. Nguyen, Ms. Cooley, and the
Executive Director Melanie Bachman, Staff Analyst

Michael Perrone, and Fiscal Administrative Officer Lisa Fontaine.

This evidentiary session is a continuation of the remote public hearing held on July 20, 2021. It 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 Arx Wireless Infrastructure, LLC, for a certificate of environmental compatibility and public need for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the telecommunications facility located at 43 Osgood Avenue, New Britain, Connecticut.

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

A verbatim transcript will be made of this hearing and deposited with the New Britain City Clerk's office for the convenience of the public.

The Council will take a 10 to 15-minute break at a convenient juncture around 3:30 p.m.

We will now continue with the appearance of the Applicant. And in accordance with the Council's July 21st 2021 continued evidentiary hearing memo, we will continue with the appearance

1 of the Applicant Arx Wireless Infrastructure, LLC, 2 to verify the new exhibits marked as Roman numeral 3 two, items B10 on the hearing program. 4 Attorney Ball, please begin by identifying 5 the new exhibits you have filed in this matter and verifying exhibits with the appropriate sworn 6 7 witnesses. Thank you. 8 Attorney Ball? 9 MR. BALL: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. David Ball on 10 behalf of the Applicant. We have the same panel 11 of witnesses who are here. This particular 12 exhibit, which is Exhibit 10 in the program, I 13 will be able to introduce into the record through 14 Doug Roberts who is on the line. 15 Mr. Roberts, if I could unmute you. 16 you. 17 KEITH COPPINS, 18 DOUGLAS ROBERTS, 19 MICHAEL LIBERTINE, 20 BRIAN GAUDET, 21 recalled as witnesses, having been previously 22 duly sworn, were examined and testified under 23 oath as follows:

MR. BALL: Mr. Roberts. Did you prepare, assist or

24

25

1	supervise in the preparation of Exhibit 10 which
2	is Arx's supplemental response to the Siting
3	Council's interrogatory number one?
4	THE WITNESS (Roberts): Yes, I did.
5	MR. BALL: All right. And is the supplemental response
6	true and accurate to the best of your knowledge?
7	THE WITNESS (Roberts): Yes it is.
8	MR. BALL: Do you have any corrections or revisions to
9	the response?
10	THE WITNESS (Roberts): No, I don't.
11	MR. BALL: Do you adopt the supplemental response to
12	interrogatory number one as your testimony today?
13	THE WITNESS (Roberts): I do.
14	MR. BALL: Thank you.
15	Mr. Morissette, with that I would ask that
16	our supplemental response to interrogatory number
17	one, which is dated August 26, 2021, and is
18	Exhibit 10, be made a full exhibit.
19	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Ball.
20	Does any party or any intervenor object to
21	the admission of the Applicant's New Exhibit?
22	Attorney Regan?
23	MR. REGAN: No objection.
24	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
25	Attorney Skelly?

MR. SKELLY: No objection.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. The exhibit is hereby admitted. We will continue with the cross-examination of the Applicant by the Council starting with Mr. Perrone, and then Mr. Edelson.

Mr. Perrone?

MR. PERRONE: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.

Just as another update, have any other wireless carriers expressed an interest in co-locating on the proposed facility to date?

THE WITNESS (Coppins): Keith Coppins for Arx Wireless.

No, not as -- no other carriers have expressed interest at this point in time.

MR. PERRONE: And Mr. Coppins, on pages 34 and 35 of the evidentiary hearing transcript you had mentioned an alternative site property on Farmington Avenue that you had rejected because most of the acreage was in front of the building, rather than behind the building.

Do you have the address of such property?

THE WITNESS (Coppins): I will get that address for you. I don't have it at my fingertips, but I'll get it for you.

MR. PERRONE: Okay. And turning to page 28 of the transcript, Mr. Gaudet, this is a visibility

related question. In that response on page 28 you talk about visibility to certain residences to the north of the facility and also across the street across Beach Street. Could you explain if those are seasonal or year-round views?

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Sure thing. Give me one second just to pull that up.

So there's going to be a combination of seasonal and year round, depending on where you are on those streets and where on the property on some of those residences. Certainly the -- the residences that are closest to the facility will likely have year-round views, at least from some portion of their property.

As you move, you know, again a little bit further down the street, there are some intervening trees. So you will experience seasonal visibility.

I think that the guaranteed spot of year-round visibility is directly across the street on Beach Street. There's a few residences there essentially where the access drive comes in. They will be able to see that facility above the building.

MR. PERRONE: But as far as the properties to the north

1 would you expect year round --2 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): That those properties will be a 3 combination of year round and seasonal. 4 Certainly, I think it's expected that -- that 5 from, you know, maybe one corner of a backyard it 6 will be seasonal. The other corner, depending on 7 where that foliage is, maybe year round. 8 MR. PERRONE: And that's for the upper section of the 9 tower? 10 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): I would say probably the upper 11 section. Again, depending on where you're 12 standing, you know, we don't have access to these 13 private residences. So it's tough to depict 14 exactly where that visibility will be. 15 They will likely see -- there is some 16 existing fencing, so I think the compound will be 17 shielded itself. They will likely see portions of 18 the -- the monopole structure, whether that be the 19 top or the -- the central piece. 20 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. That's all I had for the 21 Applicant. 22 THE WITNESS (Coppins): Mr. Perrone. That address is 23 444 Farmington Avenue. 24 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. 25 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Perrone.

now continue with cross-examination by Mr. Edelson followed by Mr. Silvestri.

Mr. Edelson?

MR. EDELSON: Yes. I have no questions of the applicant. Thank you.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Edelson.

We'll now continue with cross examination of the Applicant by Mr. Silvestri followed by Mr. Nguyen.

Mr. Silvestri?

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Morissette, and good afternoon all. I'm not sure who's going to respond to this. If it's AT&T, then I'll ask it again at the appropriate time -- but I do have a follow-up question about the site search summary.

Site five which was addressed as 221

Farmington Avenue -- which I believe is the old school across the street from Holy Cross Church, the parcel itself appears relatively large, being boarded by Farmington Avenue, Eddy Glover Boulevard and Worthington Street.

And in the site search summary, Arx mentioned that no responses were received from the owner, but it continued that AT&T site acquisition team spoke with the owner who in turn said there was no

interest.

My question on that, did conversations about potential use of 221 Farmington Avenue include all areas of the parcel? Or was it just conversations limited to the building?

THE WITNESS (Coppins): So I'll only do -- and respond to what -- to what I have and what I've done, and sent out letters. I never spoke with the owner directly at -- at that, at 221 Farmington Ave.

AT&T may have, but determined that it wasn't usable for whatever reason or had a different conversation, but I didn't receive any response back from the -- from the landowner.

MR. SILVESTRI: All right. Thank you, Mr. Coppins.

And I'll hold the question again that I pose to

AT&T when the time comes.

Mr. Coppins, one other followup. You mentioned 444 Farmington Avenue. What type of structure building is present there now?

THE WITNESS (Coppins): I believe it's -- and I have to look a little closer, but I think it's a mortuary, and there's a lot of parking in the back -- or a funeral home.

But I'll double check and -- and make sure I know what that is.

MR. SILVESTRI: But the concern you had is, that space potentially available would be street side of the building, not behind the building.

Did I understand that right?

- THE WITNESS (Coppins): The entire rear of the building looks like it's a paved parking lot that's used during -- during the -- during the services. And a large portion of the -- it's a fairly large parcel of land, and it looked like a large portion of it was in the street side portion of the building, yes.
- MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. And just one followup on that. Was any type of RF study done for 444

 Farmington Avenue to see if that would provide the coverage that would be needed?
- THE WITNESS (Coppins): I did not pass that along to AT&T because I just didn't think that that was going to be a constructable site.
- MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. I'll pose that to AT&T just to see if anything was done when the time comes, but thank you for your response.

And Mr. Morissette, that's all the questions

I have at this time. Thank you.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Silvestri. We will now continue with cross examination by

1 Mr. Nguyen followed by Ms. Cooley. 2 Mr. Nguyen? 3 MR. NGUYEN: Good afternoon, Mr. Morissette. I don't 4 have any questions for the Applicant. Thank you. 5 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen. We'll 6 continue with cross examination by Ms. Cooley, 7 followed by myself. 8 Ms. Cooley? 9 MS. COOLEY: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. 10 At this time I don't have any further 11 questions for the Applicant. Thank you. 12 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Ms. Cooley. 13 Okay. I have a few questions. I want to 14 make sure I fully understand the control of the 15 property that we're talking about here. Is the 16 Applicant leasing the site from the property 17 owner? 18 THE WITNESS (Coppins): So we currently have an option 19 to -- option to lease, but in the -- in our -- in 20 our amendment that we did back on July, I think it 21 was July 18th or 19th, we put a provision in the 22 amendment that we extended the option in the event 23 that this site were to be approved Arx Wireless 24 would, within 30 days, purchase the property at a 25 predetermined price.

Currently Cohen & Wolf holds the down payment in escrow for Arx Wireless.

THE HEARING OFFICER: And the option to purchase the entire site, does that mean the entire property or just the cell site specific?

THE WITNESS (Coppins): That's the entire property including the structure.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good. And just so I

understand, then what is your intent to do with

the structure once that you own the property?

THE WITNESS (Coppins): So my -- my understanding with

the structure is that there's some issues with

access and security on the property. So we would

immediately secure the building.

We would, you know, I'd send out a group of people to clean up the property. If we needed to plant some -- plants some trees along the -- get rid of some dead trees, get rid of some dead bushes. Basically just clean up the property until we understand what we have, and what we're going to do with it.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. I'd like to talk a little bit about these site search summary,

Exhibit F. Let's start off with site number three. It's at -- 662 Barrett, is that a

1 cemetery? 2 THE WITNESS (Coppins): I would have to take a look at 3 that, but it may be. 4 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. And number four, the 285 5 Osgood Avenue, that's the larger cemetery. 6 that correct? 7 THE WITNESS (Coppins): There are a few cemeteries over 8 there that I -- that I searched. And -- and I 9 will -- I can -- if you give me one second. 10 will either pull up the letter that I sent out. 11 That's -- yes, that's a cemetery by Sacred 12 Heart of Jesus. 13 THE HEARING OFFICER: That's Number 662 --14 THE WITNESS (Coppins): That's number three. That's 15 number three. And number four is --16 THE HEARING OFFICER: Is Trinity? That's the larger 17 one, I believe. 18 THE WITNESS (Coppins): That one was 34 acres. 19 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Just do you know if the 20 Town has control of either of those cemeteries? 21 Or are they affiliated with a church? 22 THE WITNESS (Coppins): I think they're affiliated. 23 think they're affiliated with a church. Holy 24 Trinity Greek Catholic Cemetery is the other one. 25 And the -- and that one, actually I mean, it may

1 have a couple of parcels to it. 2 No, it's -- that one is 2.96 acres. So the 3 first one that you asked me for 662 Barrett 4 Street, New Britain, is -- is the larger of the 5 two. THE HEARING OFFICER: 662 Barrett is the larger? I 6 7 thought --8 THE WITNESS (Coppins): So I'm looking at two -- 285 9 Osgood -- Osgood is 2.96. And the other one is 34 10 acres. 11 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. I had them reversed. All 12 right. And neither of those properties, the 13 owners did not show any interest. Is that 14 correct? 15 THE WITNESS (Coppins): That is correct. After -- we 16 did send certified mail to each one just to add 17 one more in since our last hearing on the 20th. 18 We went back for the 8th, Allen Street, which is 19 owned by -- it's -- I think it's number seven on 20 my site search, but that one by Beth Alom 21 Cemetery. Phonecalls were made on that. And the 22 certified letter, another certified letter was 23 sent out. 24 And to date no -- no response to that, to 25 those, to those properties -- to that property.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay.

THE WITNESS (Coppins): I think that was -- I think that was a question on -- somebody else had it, and I wanted to, you know, run that one down as well.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Very good. In looking at AT&T's propagation at 700 megahertz, it appears that if you were to locate your site further south somewhere in the vicinity of Farmington Avenue and Allen Street that you would probably get a better coverage, the area that you're trying to cover.

And I believe there was a couple of properties in that area. I think one of them, as you just talked about, was 48 Allen Street and that was also a cemetery. And they showed no interest?

THE WITNESS (Coppins): They haven't gotten back with me at all, and I've -- I've contacted them more than one time. And you -- I think Mr. Bilezikian from AT&T has done the same and that he didn't receive any responses either -- but you could ask that question directly to him.

But I -- again I ran it down because I knew it was a question that was there as well.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah. There seems to be other

1 properties in that general location that may fit 2 the bill, too, on the corner of Allen and 3 Farmington and New Britain and Farmington. 4 believe there's a church on one side and another 5 commercial property on the other side. Were those 6 two properties looked at? 7 THE WITNESS (Coppins): So I'm going to take a look and 8 see, but they may have been already looked at and 9 rejected for lack of interest. But that's the --10 THE HEARING OFFICER: I apologize for the confusion, 11 but I was getting confused with all the potential 12 sites here, the ones that were looked at and the 13 ones that weren't looked at. 14 You've got Holy Cross School and then across 15 from that, you have a church across from that. 16 THE WITNESS (Coppins): So Holy Cross Church, Holy 17 Cross Church was looked at. 18 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. What number was that on 19 your list? 20 THE WITNESS (Coppins): Going back to my -- all right. 21 Holy Cross Church on Farmington Avenue, 22 October 14th letter was sent to them with no 23 response. That is -- I think that's 210 Farmington 24 25 Avenue.

1	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. That's Holy Cross?
2	THE WITNESS (Coppins): I believe so. I want to
3	make I want to make sure the record is correct.
4	So I'm just going to verify.
5	That is correct. It's two tenants on Burritt
6	Street and Farmington Avenue.
7	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. And you also looked at
8	Holy Cross School.
9	THE WITNESS (Coppins): Holy Cross School is directly
10	across the street.
11	THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah.
12	THE WITNESS (Coppins): And that is located at it's
13	at 221 Farmington Avenue. Let me just make sure
14	that I'm correct on the other one.
15	And the other one was 210 Farmington Avenue.
16	So they're both owned by the same people, 210 and
17	221.
18	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. So Holy Cross the Church
19	and Holy Cross the School, the owner indicated
20	they were not interested. Okay. All right.
21	And just up the road is the Beth Alum
22	Cemetery?
23	THE WITNESS (Coppins): Yes, that's the 48 Allen
24	Street. That's the one I just referenced.
25	THE HEARING OFFICER: Gotcha.

1 THE WITNESS (Coppins): And the attempts to that, to 2 that property was done by both AT&T and myself. 3 And I agree with you that I -- it looks like it 4 would have worked, but because I didn't -- I 5 didn't have an opportunity. I didn't send it over 6 because I didn't have a willing landlord at that, 7 at that parcel. 8 THE HEARING OFFICER: So the landowner didn't respond? 9 THE WITNESS (Coppins): They haven't responded to any 10 of us, correct. 11 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. And do we know if that's a 12 town cemetery or not? 13 THE WITNESS (Coppins): It -- it doesn't appear to be. 14 It looks like it's a -- it's owned by Beth Alom 15 Cemetery and it doesn't have -- it doesn't have --16 it's got a mailing address of 48 Allen Street, and 17 it's by Beth Alom Cemetery, Incorporated. 18 THE HEARING OFFICER: Well, that's unfortunate. 19 looks like a good site. 20 Okay. Thank you. I'd like to move off the 21 site search for now. Does the Applicant have 22 somebody available to answer questions about 23 noise? 24 THE WITNESS (Coppins): Yes, that's Mr. Roberts. 25 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.

Mr. Roberts, well, first I'd like to go to the revised drawing C-2. And I'd like to understand with that revised drawing what has changed? I think Mr. Coppins, you would answer that?

THE WITNESS (Coppins): That would be Mr. Roberts.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Roberts? Thank you.

Mr. Roberts?

THE WITNESS (Roberts): I believe on C-2 we added a fourth carrier.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. All right. So we've got a fourth carrier, and that fourth carrier is about 64 feet AGL?

THE WITNESS (Roberts): Correct.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Using C-2 as a guide I noticed the property line from the pole to the north is 89 feet. And the cooling cabinet is southwest, and will be away from the residential property line.

My first question is, given that the site and the cooling cabinet, and the generator for that matter, will be in a closed area in the courtyard, I'll call it, it will have buildings on all three sides; does that impact or cause some echoing off the building in the direction of the property

1 line?

THE WITNESS (Roberts): You're absolutely correct. And normally when, you know, we would place a generator set on -- on a site, we try to locate it as far away from the residents as possible.

In this case it was determined that, in fact, because of the three sides and possible reverberation that it would be better to have it a little closer and allow the equipment, the AT&T equipment shelter to dissipate some of that, as opposed to hard reflection. Very good.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. So they be cooling, the cabinet -- the cooled cabinet actually has some noise attenuation properties built into it.

Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Roberts): That is correct. It has almost a muffin fan, if you will, configuration, or that, you know, similar to a fan in a computer.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. So the worst property, the north property, the worst case scenario with the generator and cooler Operating during the day would be 51 dBA at the property line. Correct?

THE WITNESS (Roberts): Yes.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Do you know or can you tell us, tell me what it would be with just the cooler and

not the generator?

THE WITNESS (Roberts): The cooler itself will actually be below ambient noise level in that area. So basically it would emit no additional sound levels at the property lines, very faint.

THE HEARING OFFICER: What is it? 40, ambience 40? THE WITNESS (Roberts): Yes, yes.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. So the cooler is about 40.

Relatively with the generator you're at 51. Okay.

Now, given that the tower has the ability to add three, three additional carriers, so you would have three additional cooling cabinets and then you would have three additional generators.

What impact would that have on the noise

values at the property with the 51 dBA?

THE WITNESS (Roberts): Obviously it would increase as, you know, additional carriers were located upon that site and if they'd have a generator or not.

The advantage of the generator that AT&T is proposing, which is the Kohler Power Generator, it's a DC generator and quite -- it runs quite differently than a traditional generator that we've used in the past for the last 25 years at many, many sites, or one might even have at their home that automatically starts up when there's a

loss of power, whether there's a need for it to run, even if there is no load needed at that time it runs and ramps up.

A DC generator will start up and will just idle along and charge the batteries, and then shut off even with a loss of power. It does have the ability in -- in certain instances where we have a -- we don't have them in Connecticut, but you know, certainly California, we've seen, you know, rolling brownouts where, you know, they'll have short durations of loss of power or -- or low power, and it will start up and charge those batteries.

So reality is it's not -- it would be different than a normal AC generator where if power was lost to this part of the city all -- all -- technically if every carrier on site had a generator, all four would start up.

In this case it would -- they would be, I'm going to say, there could be one or two on at a time and -- but they're basically just looking to charge the batteries and then shut themselves off.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Now the generators are exempt under emergency conditions.

For testing are they also exempt?

1	THE WITNESS (Roberts): Testing is done during the day
2	a time when there's a lot the ability to emit a
3	little bit more noise, and usually they're done
4	midday unless there's circumstances that
5	THE HEARING OFFICER: And how many hours? How long is
6	the runtime when they're exercised?
7	THE WITNESS (Roberts): Normally it's a half an hour.
8	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. So the real issue, the
9	real issue is the cooling cabinet. So if the
10	cooling cabinet at that property line is
11	approximately 37 dBA, and assuming that we had
12	four, a total of four cabinets on the site, all
13	that with the same sound attenuation on it at 37
14	dBA, the sound levels are not a cumulative factor.
15	Correct?
16	THE WITNESS (Roberts): Correct. Absolutely.
17	THE HEARING OFFICER: So if that scenario was present,
18	what kind of sound level would you see at the
19	property line? Or would you hear it? I know it's
20	a difficult question to answer.
21	THE WITNESS (Roberts): Without doing the math, if you
22	will, they're not going to be noticeably louder
23	than ambient. I mean, we might get a dB or two
24	per additional carrier.
25	Again, they are not running normally

concurrently. Again, they will run kind of on the hottest day of the year. They might be the times when they'll be running the most, but they're normally in the silent position.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Thank you. That was very, very helpful in understanding the details of the report.

By the way, I thought your report came out very nice. It was very clear and concise and laid out the scenarios and the information very thoroughly. Thank you. Thank you for that.

That's all the questions I have.

I do have several questions on the propagation plots for AT&T, but we'll go to them when AT&T is on the stand. So with that we will continue with cross-examination of the Applicant by AT&T.

Attorney Regan?

- MR. REGAN: No questions. No questions for the Applicant.
- THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We will now continue with cross-examination of the Applicant by the City of New Britain.

Attorney Skelly?

MR. SKELLY: Good afternoon. I'm not sure who this

question is for, but it's for the man that was talking about whether the proposed cell tower was going to be visible year round or seasonal.

Can I ask that person, how high is the proposed cell tower going to be?

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): It's proposed at 104 feet to the top of the tower.

MR. SKELLY: So isn't it fair to say that the residents that live all around this proposed tower are going to be able to see it year round if it's that high?

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): It -- again, there's intervening trees. So not every residence will have year-round views.

MR. SKELLY: Okay. But aren't most trees -- excuse me, aren't most trees not higher than 104 feet?

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): That's accurate. The -- the trees, depending on where you're standing -- right? So if you're -- let's assume you're a tenth of a mile away, and you have a 40-foot tree in front of you looking towards 104-foot tower.

If you were right up against that tree you will likely not see the tower. So you -- you won't be seeing the top of the tower wherever you are. There will be areas of year-round visibility, you know, within -- within a half

mile.

A large portion of that is at the cemetery to the southwest, certainly scattered about in some of those nearby neighborhoods. You will have -- it's anticipated that there will be some year-round views.

MR. SKELLY: All right. Thanks. And I'd like to ask questions to the individual who was talking about an option to lease the property with the provision to extend the option to purchase the entire property at a predetermined price.

So for that individual, have you already worked out an option to buy the property for a specific price with the owner of 43 Osgood Avenue?

THE WITNESS (Coppins): Yes, we have.

MR. SKELLY: And when does that option run out?

THE WITNESS (Coppins): So that option, that option is a year. When we -- when we paid the option payment that option is for another year. However, we have -- we have caveats in the -- in the new amendment that would require us to purchase it before we build a tower here.

I'm thinking if the tower would be approved, if the tower is approved, once the final approvals are -- are completed, Arx Wireless would close on

the property. The property would change hands into Arx Wireless Infrastructure, Inc, and as I said earlier, Cohen & Wolf has the escrow down payment in their escrow account.

- MR. SKELLY: Okay. Has the option to purchase been recorded on the land records, if you know?
- THE WITNESS (Coppins): It has not been. To my knowledge, it has not been recorded on the land records.
- MR. SKELLY: Do you have any objection to providing the City of New Britain with a copy of the option and the option to extend?
- THE WITNESS (Coppins): I'm not sure if I have an objection to that. I'm going to -- I'm going to defer to my counsel on that.
- MR. BALL: Well, yeah. Of course we want to be cooperative with the City. I think I'm going to need to just take a look at the documents. To the extent there's any confidentiality, Attorney Skelly, I would like to just be able to talk with you about that off the record.
- MR. SKELLY: All right. Thanks. And just a couple of follow up questions to the gentleman I was just talking to. Are you aware that there are currently some significant blight violations on

this property, and that it's generating -- either generating or will be generating significant fines because no effort has been made to resolve the blight conditions?

THE WITNESS (Coppins): I know there are some fines

that are -- there are some issues on the property

that -- that have fines that -- associated with

them. I don't know to the extent that they are.

I haven't talked with the -- the owner directly.

I mean, I've talked with the owner, but -but our goal is to make sure that this, this site
is cleaned up, is -- is brought back into what
I -- I call compliance, so that somebody can come
in whether it's us or somebody else to -- to
possibly develop the site for something else.

- MR. SKELLY: Okay. And you're aware that there's going to be liens that are going to be recorded on the New Britain land records as it relates to that property?
- THE WITNESS (Coppins): I -- I do not -- I don't know what lien would be -- would be put on the land records. I'm not aware of any.
- MR. SKELLY: You understand that if liens are put on the property, then you're going to have to deal with them as part of the purchase of the property?

THE WITNESS (Coppins): I -- I understand that there's going to -- there's going to be some -- some things that we're going to need to deal with, and we're willing to do that.

MR. SKELLY: All right. Now what plans do you have?

Assuming that your application gets granted and you put a cell tower at this site, what plans do you have with this property? What do you want to turn it into? It was a former school.

THE WITNESS (Coppins): I mean, I have -- so I'm -this is, you know, for the last 30 years, I've
just -- I've done cell tower development.
That's -- that's been my -- my complete role in my
career here.

As far as developing that, that building to something else, Arx Wireless would not be the ones that would do the development of that. However, we're going to get with somebody. We're going to -- we're going to market it to somebody that would -- that does that type of development.

So you know, we don't really have a plan in place yet, but we -- we certainly have a plan to clean up the property, secure the building, make sure that the -- make sure the City is happy with -- with what we're doing with it.

1 And from there we're going to, you know, work 2 with another developer to develop the site for 3 whatever purpose they have. 4 MR. SKELLY: Have you reached out to Mayor Stewart? 5 She'll be talking to you folks later today. But 6 have you reached out to Mayor Stewart about trying 7 to figure out some alternative sites, because you 8 know she's opposed to this, to the plant site at 9 43 Osgood. 10 THE WITNESS (Coppins): I haven't reached out to the 11 Mayor. 12 MR. SKELLY: Okay. Thanks. And regarding alternative 13 sites, are you familiar with the property around 14 where Holy Cross Church is located? 15 THE WITNESS (Coppins): Is that the one in Farmington 16 and Burritt Street? 17 MR. SKELLY: It's at the corner of Farmington and 18 Biruta Streets. 19 THE WITNESS (Coppins): Yeah. The one that we just 20 talked about earlier, yes. MR. SKELLY: And, and if you go -- I'm not good at 21 22 directions, but if you go across the street from 23 the side of the church, there's a gas station there that's on Farmington Avenue. 24 25 Are you aware of that gas station?

```
1
    THE WITNESS (Coppins): I'm not. I'm not, you know,
2
         personally aware of it, of the -- of the gas
3
         station that -- that's there. We typically would
4
         not build a site on a gas station due to tanks and
5
         whatnot, if that's the question.
6
    MR. SKELLY: I understand that. I understand that, but
7
         my question is, right next to the gas station --
8
         so you have Holy Cross Church, then you have
9
         Biruta Street. Then you have the gas station and
10
         you're still on Farmington Avenue, and then you
11
         have this piece of property that's owned by
12
         Eversource that doesn't have any buildings on it.
13
              Have you approached Eversource about seeing
14
         if you could utilize their property to build your
15
         cell tower there?
16
    THE WITNESS (Coppins): So I'm trying to figure out
17
         where, where the property is that you're asking
18
         about.
                 So --
19
    MR. SKELLY: Okay, if you're at --
20
    THE WITNESS (Coppins): I'm on the corner of Farmington
21
         Avenue.
22
    MR. SKELLY: And Biruta. Okay?
23
    THE WITNESS (Coppins): Okay.
24
    MR. SKELLY: Holy Cross Church is on one side of
25
         Biruta.
                  There's a gas station that should say
```

Gulf on the opposite side of Biruta and then right next to the to the gas station -- I think it's marked 148. There's a square piece of property, a rectangular piece of property.

It looks like it has some Eversource equipment on it, but the rest of the area looks like it's completely paved and there's no buildings on it. Have you talked to Eversource about possibly having your cell tower at that location instead of at 43 Osgood Avenue?

THE WITNESS (Coppins): I did not -- I did not reach out to Eversource for that piece of property.

MR. SKELLY: Wouldn't that be a good site?

THE WITNESS (Coppins): I would have to take -- I mean,
the -- I'm not saying it would be a bad site. I
don't know the -- I don't know the -- all the -all the details of the site to tell you whether
it's going to be a good site or bad site.

I'm just having -- saying, does it work out from an RF point of view? We need to -- we need to look at that, but we also need to look and see if Eversource is interested in leasing space to us on that piece of property.

MR. SKELLY: It looks like it's diagonally across the from the school.

1 THE WITNESS (Coppins): No -- I'm looking at the -- I'm 2 looking at the parcel that you're talking about. 3 MR. SKELLY: Okay. All right. So that's something you 4 might be interested in exploring with Eversource? 5 THE WITNESS (Coppins): It -- it's something I -- I 6 could. I mean, I -- I haven't, is my point, but 7 certainly something that we -- we could take a 8 look at. 9 MR. SKELLY: I don't have any further questions. 10 Thanks, sir. 11 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Skelly. 12 Just to go back to the purchase and the 13 options of the property, the Siting Council's 14 evaluation criteria doesn't take into account what 15 the purchase of the underlying property or the 16 options associated with it as part of its evaluation criteria. 17 18 Before we move on to the continued appearance 19 of AT&T, I'd like to go back to the Council and 20 see if Mr. Perrone or any Council members have any 21 follow-up questions at this point. 22 Mr. Perrone? 23 MR. PERRONE: Not at this time. 24 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. 25 Mr. Edelson, any followup?

1 MR. EDELSON: Well, I might have been a little confused 2 about the environmental sound assessment. I was 3 going to wait until AT&T was before us, but it 4 sounded like --5 THE HEARING OFFICER: It's an Arx exhibit. It's not an 6 AT&T exhibit. 7 MR. EDELSON: It seemed to me it was submitted by AT&T, 8 but whatever. 9 I do have a question, and on page 12 the top 10 of the environmental sound assessment, the 11 paragraphs says, as result of sound level 12 modeling. There's a confusing typo, at least 13 confusing to me on the second line. 14 Could you take a look at that and indicate 15 what that should be there? You see where it says, 16 cabinet cooler or generators so emits only? I 17 think this is for Mr. Roberts. THE WITNESS (Roberts): Yes. Let me take a look at 18 19 that and read into that, and I'll get right back 20 to you -- if I could get a few moments? 21 MR. EDELSON: Okay. And I think -- well, I just want 22 to clarify. It's been a long time since I've done 23 sound analysis, and I was a little confused by 24 Mr. Morissette's questions. 25

So my understanding is sound is not

cumulative. And so if you had one, two or four cooling cabinets as long as they were the similar design and emissions, the total amount of noise from them would be basically the same as one. It might be different depending on how close you are to a certain one than another, but basically it's not cumulative. It's the loudest sound that basically you hear as a recipient.

Am I correct in that understanding?

THE WITNESS (Roberts): My experience has been that

it's almost a logarithmic addition. So it's -
it's not a doubling of sound if you have two, or

quadrupling of the sound levels if you have four.

It's logarithmic addition of sound, so that

it's -- it's once you have one it's not very much

more sound if two are running, or three are

running.

You are correct.

- MR. EDELSON: But if they are, all four of them -- so go to the ultimate case and they, none of them are above the ambient sound level, you will only hear the ambient sound level?
- THE WITNESS (Roberts): Most likely the ambient sound level will exceed any noise given off by, like you said, if four units, similar units were placed.

They would probably be below that ambient sound level.

MR. EDELSON: All right. I think I'm understanding you correctly -- but okay. That's all I have at this point, Mr. Morissette.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Edelson.

Mr. Silvestri, any follow up questions?
MR. SILVESTRI: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Morissette.

Mr. Coppins, I wanted to get back to that 444
Farmington Avenue site. I did pull it up on
Google maps just to see what it looked like, and
in looking at it from Google maps I'm counting
90-plus parking spaces in the rear of the facility
as well as a substantial wooded area. And I'm
just curious as to why that wasn't considered for
a cell site location?

THE WITNESS (Coppins): I'm going to go back to that.

I think when I looked at that I saw the -the -- I think I -- I saw the -- the -- mostly in
the front of the parking lot and the back, and it
was, like I said, it was a mortuary, and didn't
pursue it.

I think it went a little -- two things. I think it went a little bit further north than what I thought was going to work. The second -- the

second thing was I -- I looked at it from a perspective of that, sitting in the parking lot or in the front, I didn't like the front necessarily. But certainly in the -- in the rear, I just saw it sitting in a parking lot.

In hindsight I probably should have done a little bit more research on that site, but I didn't.

MR. SILVESTRI: Yeah. Again, from my perspective I don't know if it would work or not. I was just looking at location, seated in back of a facility not too much in plain sight, if you will. So that's why I was posing the question as to what you might have looked at and why you might have rejected it -- but thank you for your response.

Mr. Morissette, that's all I have at this point. Thank you.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Silvestri.

Mr. Nguyen, any followup?

MR. NGUYEN: Yes, I do. Thank you, Mr. Morissette.

Mr. Coppins, If I may I follow up with the discussion that you had with Mr. Morissette regarding the site search? And you mentioned that you have reached out to the owners. You sent out certified mails and you received no response.

Have you received any confirmation that the owner is absolutely not interested, or just because they haven't responded and therefore you concluded that they're not interested?

THE WITNESS (Coppins): So yeah. I -- I think that I've come to a conclusion when I sent out the first set of letters, or you know, we're doing our search and we make a phonecall. The -- I find that the easiest way to do -- to get a response -- and I want to make sure that we -- we do our

homework, so to speak.

But If I send out a certified letter and it's -- it's not -- we still don't have a response to it yet, we have -- we know that they've received it. That tells us that there's just no interest, and that's why we've come to a conclusion that there's no interest.

And hear back from one cemetery that he called and said, well, where would you put it?
Because it's wide open over here.

And you know, this is -- he came -- he came to the conclusion, well, it's probably not going to work for us. So that's why sometimes we -- we'll -- definite, it's a definite no.

But in this particular case a lot of the

1 cemetery did not -- did not respond to us. 2 MR. NGUYEN: Yeah. I mean, to the extent that there's 3 always a chance that it might be the correct 4 address, but the recipient might have been 5 changed. A phonecall, you know, personnel have 6 changed. 7 So I'm just kind of curious as to whether or 8 not it's really confirmed that the owners are not 9 interested. 10 THE WITNESS (Coppins): So, yeah. Just -- just to give 11 another example, 48 Allen -- Beth Alom Cemetery on 12 48 Allen street, I thought that was a good site. 13 I thought it was. I thought Mr. Morissette made a 14 good point where that area is --15 MR. NGUYEN: Is that the site number 7. 16 THE WITNESS (Coppins): 48 Allen Street is site 17 number -- I moved my stuff here. Hold on. Yes. 18 Site number seven. 19 I -- I looked up that site on online, made 20 several attempts to call them. I got through one 21 time to an answering service, but not to an actual 22 person to -- to deal with. 23 That's when I sent out another letter, 24 another certified letter to the address on file at

the -- at the city hall that had -- that they have

25

1 on -- in there, in their land records and sent out 2 another letter. 3 Again, I agree with Mr. Morissette that that 4 may be a good spot. 5 MR. NGUYEN: And the record indicates that AT&T sent 6 out certified letters. Are you saying that Arx 7 also sent out certified letters? 8 THE WITNESS (Coppins): Yes, and made phone calls. 9 MR. NGUYEN: So in addition to AT&T's certified 10 letters, the two sets of letters? 11 THE WITNESS (Coppins): Yes, you are correct. 12 MR. NGUYEN: The other question with regard to the 13 backup generators -- and I think that would be 14 Mr. Roberts. And I understand that if this site 15 is approved AT&T would install natural gas, a 16 backup generator, is that right? 17 THE WITNESS (Roberts): That is the plan, sir. 18 MR. NGUYEN: And I understand that if other carriers, 19 potential carriers utilize this facility, would 20 they provide the natural gas backup generators as 21 well? 22 THE WITNESS (Roberts): It varies from carrier to 23 carrier and site to site within the carriers. 24 Plans -- not every site. Each carrier has is 25 automatically fitted with a generator. It depends

how -- where it fits in their network and whether that the loss of commercial power would require -- could take over for this, from a coverage point of view.

So in this case AT&T is proposing a Kohler DC generator for their backup power in case of a loss of emergency power or a brownout, if you will.

MR. NGUYEN: So I apologize. AT&T would provide what type of backup generator?

THE WITNESS (Roberts): Natural gas.

MR. NGUYEN: Natural gas. Yeah?

THE WITNESS (Roberts): Yeah, that's correct.

MR. NGUYEN: And as the owner of this facility, would you mandate that all the carriers, or your tenants if you will, that they have a specific requirement that they have to utilize the natural gas and provide backup generators?

THE WITNESS (Roberts): I think that falls to Keith -but I don't want to speak for him, but I would
think that if we have natural gas on site on -that the carriers would -- and brought natural gas
onto the site, that they would all jump at the
chance to -- to connect to it.

It solves two problems. When we do have a major hurricane where we do lose power, generators

1	that are diesel have run times, and you know they
2	have to come and fill them, where natural gas
3	is basically will run perpetually as long as
4	the gas is still there.
5	MR. NGUYEN: Okay. That's all I have, Mr. Morissette.
6	Thank you. Thank you, gentlemen.
7	THE WITNESS (Roberts): Thank you.
8	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen.
9	Ms. Cooley, do you have any follow-up
10	questions?
11	MS. COOLEY: I do not. I think my questions I did have
12	have been adequately covered. Thank you.
13	THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good. Thank you. And I
14	have no follow-up questions.
15	Mr. Edelson, are you satisfied with the I
16	believe you had an open response from Mr. Roberts
17	that is due. Did you get your answer, or did I
18	miss it?
19	MR. EDELSON: No, I don't think he's had a chance to
20	look at it and give me an answer, so.
21	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. We're going to be moving
22	on.
23	Mr. Roberts, did you have a chance to look at
24	that?
25	THE WITNESS (Roberts): I did. Basically the the

1 site would not normally be run -- you wouldn't normally have a fan unit running. It really only 2 3 runs on peak hot days. So the section I can see 4 where it is slightly confusing. 5 It does -- it's not expected to be running --6 it's not something that runs continuously, only on 7 hot days when it needs to provide that, that 8 cooling within the unit. 9 So normal operation, that fan wouldn't be 10 It's not like a PC that has a fan running. 11 running constantly while it's running. 12 MR. EDELSON: So you're saying that that sentence reads 13 the way you want it to read? 14 THE WITNESS (Roberts): It does. 15 MR. EDELSON: To include the cabinet cooler or 16 generator so it emits only fan sounds? THE WITNESS (Roberts): Correct. 17 18 MR. EDELSON: I guess that's as good as I'm going to 19 get, Mr. Morissette. Thank you. 20 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Roberts. 21 Thank you, Mr. Edelson. 22 Well we will now continue with the appearance 23 of the Intervener AT&T, to swear in their witness 24 Daniel Bilezikian to verify --25 MR. SKELLY: Can I just interrupt you for a second?

1 THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes, Attorney Skelly? 2 MR. SKELLY: I was wondering would it be possible to 3 have Mayor Stewart go out of turn because she has 4 a previously scheduled commitment later this 5 afternoon? I don't know if there's any 6 objections. 7 She'd be very short with her testimony and --8 THE HEARING OFFICER: Well, the agenda was pre-posted, 9 but I'll ask the attorneys to see if they object 10 or would agree to changing the order. 11 Attorney Ball? 12 MR. BALL: I have no problem with it, Mr. Morissette. 13 THE HEARING OFFICER: Attorney Regan? 14 MR. REGAN: No objection, Mr. Morissette. 15 THE HEARING OFFICER: Attorney Bachman? 16 MS. BACHMAN: No objection, Mr. Morissette. Thank you. 17 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Very good. Attorney 18 Skelly, there you go. 19 MR. SKELLY: Thank you. 20 THE HEARING OFFICER: We'll now go with the appearance 21 of the City in Britain. Will the party present 22 its witness panel for the purpose of taking the 23 oath? 24 Attorney Bachman will administer the oath. 25 MR. SKELLY: Okay. I'm going to have Mr. Schiller also

1	take the oath now, but I'll wait until AT&T
2	finishes its case before we bring Mr. Schiller
3	back, if that's what you want me to do. I was
4	just going to have Mayor Stewart testify now.
5	THE HEARING OFFICER: No, we're going to go with the
6	City of New Britain in its entirety at this point
7	in time. So please
8	MR. SKELLY: Okay. That's fine.
9	STEVEN P. SCHILLER,
10	ERIN STEWART,
11	called as witnesses, being first duly sworn
12	by the Executive Director, were examined and
13	testified under oath as follows:
14	
15	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
16	Attorney Skelly, I didn't see on this your
17	second witness on the oh, there he is. I see
18	him now. The affidavit from Steven Schiller.
19	Okay. Very good. Please continue.
20	MR. SKELLY: Okay. I'm going to start with Mayor
21	Stewart.
22	You're the mayor of the City of New Britain?
23	THE WITNESS (Stewart): Yes.
24	MR. SKELLY: Okay. And what has been previously marked
25	City of New Britain Exhibit 4 for identification

1 is your prefiled two-page testimony dated July 13, 2021. You're familiar with that document? 2 3 THE WITNESS (Stewart): Yes. 4 MR. SKELLY: Okay. And you understand you're now under 5 oath and have sworn to tell the truth? 6 THE WITNESS (Stewart): Yes. 7 MR. SKELLY: Okay. Have you had the opportunity to 8 review your profiled testimony? 9 THE WITNESS (Stewart): Yes, I have. MR. SKELLY: And is the information set forth in your 10 11 prefiled testimony true and accurate to the best 12 of your knowledge? 13 THE WITNESS (Stewart): It sure is. 14 MR. SKELLY: And do you adopt here today everything you 15 wrote in Exhibit 4 as your testimony today? 16 THE WITNESS (Stewart): Yes. 17 MR. SKELLY: And you're asking the Siting Council to 18 accept your prefiled testimony? 19 THE WITNESS (Stewart): Yes, please. 20 MR. SKELLY: Okay. And are there any additional 21 matters that you want to bring to the Siting 22 Council's attention today that you did not mention 23 in your July 13, 2021, letter. 24 THE WITNESS (Stewart): Yes. 25 MR. SKELLY: Okay. Can you tell the Siting Council

what that information is?

THE WITNESS (Stewart): So I just need to make the Siting Council -- if you'll indulge me -- aware of the poor condition of the location that's proposed at 43 Osgood Avenue, which has necessitated our building officials to send letters to the property owner in May of 2021 as well as June, specifically June 15th of 2021 -- but notice the violations regarding the blight conditions on this property.

While I understand that the blighted nature of the property is not a condition that the Siting Council takes into consideration, I must expand a little bit on that.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Before you expand I must interrupt. We're not at that point for testimony at this time. We'll be taking testimony when the cross-examinations occur after the witnesses have verified their exhibits -- and we take cross-examination. So if we could hold off for one moment, please?

Please continue, Attorney Skelly.

MR. SKELLY: Can you just clarify? So I'm not allowed to ask her if there's any additional items that she wants to testify to at this point?

THE HEARING OFFICER: No, you are not, not at this

1 point. Thank you. But you have another witness 2 that has to verify their exhibits and their testimony as well, their prefiled testimony. 3 4 MR. SKELLY: I understand that, but when can I have her 5 testify about other matters that she did not talk 6 about in her prefiled letter almost two months 7 ago? 8 THE HEARING OFFICER: During cross-examination she'll 9 have an opportunity to testify. 10 MR. SKELLY: Okay. I understand. So I have no further 11 questions of her at this point. 12 THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good. And the verification 13 of the prefiled testimony exhibits by the other 14 witness? 15 MR. SKELLY: So you want me to put Mr. Schiller on now? 16 THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes, you need to confirm with him 17 as you did with Mayor Stewart. 18 MR. SKELLY: Okay. Mr. Schiller, you're under oath. 19 You submitted an affidavit with supporting 20 exhibits to the Siting Council back on July 16, 21 2021? 22 THE WITNESS (Schiller): Yes, I did. MR. SKELLY: And that affidavit was signed under oath? 23 24 THE WITNESS (Schiller): It was. 25 MR. SKELLY: And have you had the opportunity to review

1 your affidavit in the exhibits that you attached? THE WITNESS (Schiller): I have. 2 3 MR. SKELLY: Okay. And is the information set forth in 4 your affidavit true and accurate to the best of 5 your knowledge? 6 THE WITNESS (Schiller): It is. 7 MR. SKELLY: And are the exhibits that were attached to 8 the affidavit, specifically the recommendation of 9 the city plan commissions for 43 Osgood Avenue 10 submitted to the Zoning Board of Appeals in May of 11 2016 in the minutes of the May 26, 2016, meeting 12 of the Zoning Board of Appeals official documents 13 maintained by the City of New Britain? 14 THE WITNESS (Schiller): They are. MR. SKELLY: Okay. And are there any additions, 15 16 corrections, modifications or clarifications which 17 you want to make, keeping in mind what the Siting 18 Council just said? 19 THE WITNESS (Schiller): I do not at this time. 20 MR. SKELLY: And you, you're seeking that the Siting 21 Council accept your affidavit and the exhibits 22 thereto as your testimony today? 23 THE WITNESS (Schiller): Yes. 24 MR. SKELLY: I have nothing further. 25 THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good. Thank you, Attorney

1	Skelly.
2	Does any party or intervenor object to the
3	admission of the City of New Britain's exhibits?
4	Attorney Ball.
5	MR. BALL: No objection.
6	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
7	Attorney Regan?
8	MR. REGAN: No objection.
9	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
10	The exhibits are hereby admitted. We will
11	now begin with cross-examination of the City of
12	New Britain by the Council.
13	Mr. Perrone?
14	MR. PERRONE: I have no questions for the City. Thank
15	you.
16	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
17	Mr. Edelson?
18	MR. EDELSON: That was a little faster than I expected
19	from Mr. Perrone. Well, I believe I'd like to, I
20	guess, begin with an open question for Mayor
21	Stewart.
22	If she would like to comment on the existing
23	conditions of the site at 43 Osgood?
24	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Edelson.
25	Mayor Stewart, please continue. Sorry for

the confusion.

THE WITNESS (Stewart): Thank you, Mr. Edelson. I appreciate it, and thank you very much.

So I -- it's a concern for me because of the nature of 43 Osgood Avenue and the problems that have been located on that site for decades. This has been a blighted property. It's been an eyesore in the area, but prior to my letter and specifically the testimony that you have today, Officials from the City's Building Department sent letters to the owner of 43 Osgood Avenue on two separate occasions in May and June where several violations for blight on this property were noticed with ample time to be given to rectify.

The owners applied for permits to do work, but never paid, and applications to -- to do work were denied subsequently. And there's still currently no permits for repair work to be done on this property, and the building is still extremely un-secure and an eyesore in the neighborhood. It's resulted in thousands of dollars of fines that have been issued to the owners.

So while the City would certainly like to see something done with this property, the location of it being in that single family zone is not really conducive to having a massive hundred-foot cell tower. It's in an open field, basically. So there's no way that you wouldn't be able to see it from any given angle when you go into that neighborhood.

I gather many of those that have spoken today have not been through the neighborhood. It was clearly evident, but I also am a little bit confused as to why assistance wasn't asked from me or my staff to try to find a suitable site otherwise.

We would have been happy to help. As I stated in my testimony, we're still happy to help. And we can certainly help make connections for the Arx Wireless Group with the owners of said cemeteries that were mentioned, or the Eversource location that we put forth to.

So from the City's perspective it's just a bit frustrating when we have a property owner that has been unwilling to do anything with the property for decades. And then all of a sudden we have this proposal, and we end up in front of the Siting Council having to testify here without any, you know, offering of -- of wanting to work together. So from my perspective, that's awfully

1 frustrating.

MR. EDELSON: Well, thank you for that explanation. So according to the narrative presented by the Applicant a report was sent back in November to your office indicating that they wanted to build this tower. I think that included the site search information.

But as I understand it, and please clarify if I'm wrong, they did not hear anything back from your office in regard to that, that report that outlined what their plans were.

Do you know why there -- well, am I mistaken? Was there a response? And if so, what was that response? And if there wasn't, why did you not call in Mr. Coppins and say, hey, we need to talk?

THE WITNESS (Stewart): I never saw anything.

MR. EDELSON: I'm sorry. Can you repeat that?

THE WITNESS (Stewart): I never saw anything.

MR. EDELSON: So you're saying the report that they say they submitted in November did not make it to your office.

THE WITNESS (Stewart): It did not make it to me.

MR. EDELSON: Subsequently in their narrative to us, they indicated on three days later there was a letter sent to Mr. Skelly -- oh, sorry, there was

a letter from Mr. Skelly back to Arx indicating that they'd like two alternative sites to be looked at.

Isn't that sort of a reaching out on behalf of the Town of New Britain to Arx to think about other ways of doing things?

THE WITNESS (Stewart): I'm unaware of that.

MR. EDELSON: And I believe for the record what we were told is those two sites were evaluated and determined that they really did not meet the need.

So I just want to reiterate, I agree with you completely. It's very useful when the town and the applicant work together. It makes our job, I think, sometimes a lot easier if we know what the town's desires are. And if they are supportive of a particular site, you know, that makes, I think the process move a little quicker.

So I would encourage you to think about that and why your office -- well, I don't know. I don't want to point fingers about something. I don't know who sent what, and what was received by who?

THE WITNESS (Stewart): Thank you.

MR. EDELSON: But something seems to have fallen between the cracks there.

Your letter was quite interesting and I would like to ask you a few questions about that, because as you know one of our jobs, our mission here is to balance public need with environmental impacts, environment in the largest sense.

So do you agree that quality cellular service for the residents of New Britain is a critical piece of the infrastructure of the town?

THE WITNESS (Stewart): Yes, but not when it -- when it impedes on someone's quality of life.

MR. EDELSON: Okay. So you do reference this quality of life issue. Can you expand on what you -- how you interpret that? I think you used, you know, that this location will negatively impact their quality of life.

So if you could be a little more specific about, you know, what you mean by that? I think that would be helpful.

THE WITNESS (Stewart): So as I stated before, if
you've been to the property it's an open field in
the middle of a residential neighborhood. There's
no, you know, there's no trees. There's no
growth. There's nothing blocking anything.

You're across the street from a very elderly neighborhood, too, of single-family homes.

There's no hiding a hundred-foot cell tower in that neighborhood.

The neighbors have expressed serious concern to my office, to the City Council. It's certainly a hot topic of discussion because of the nature of the property to begin with, because it's been such an eyesore in the neighborhood for many years.

Not ideally what the residents in that neighborhood have pictured to see there. I think that they would have wanted to see the building come down first before they see a hundred-foot cell tower being put there.

MR. EDELSON: Now the Applicant -- I'm not sure if you had a chance to review the transcript from the prior hearing -- seemed to me to be well aware of the condition and the past history of this building, and I think has made statements about wanting to improve the site from a security standpoint, in terms of securing it from further vandalism as well as improving it from a landscaping point of view.

I would think you would see that as somewhat of a mitigating factor here, that now you might have a tenant -- an owner, I should say, who's willing to work with the Town to improve the site

as opposed to what you've described here as a current owner who has not been willing to work with the Town.

Do you see that --

THE WITNESS (Stewart): Is see this as rewarding bad behavior.

MR. EDELSON: What's rewarding bad behavior? Allowing him to sell it?

Can you -- who's being rewarded for bad behavior?

THE WITNESS (Stewart): You have a property owner that has neglected the property for many years. You have a company in my eyes who has done nothing to try to reach out to me personally to talk about this, or the building department.

Sending a certified letter is -- is one thing. Picking up the phone and making a personal phone call, or sending a direct e-mail is another. I don't think that there was ample effort done there, to do so.

I reached out to the lobbyist for AT&T as well and expressed concern in saying that I'd love to have a conversation to talk about alternate sites. Apparently that message didn't get where it needed to go. So I still think that there's

opportunity for us to work together to talk about other locations other than in the middle of this residential neighborhood, and I'm still willing to do so.

MR. EDELSON: In your letter you refer to the disruptive operation of the cell tower facility by Arx employees. And again, this is not the construction, but the operation is what you refer to.

What's your understanding of the nature of the operation that would be, quote, unquote, disruptive?

THE WITNESS (Stewart): The residents having to look at it.

MR. EDELSON: So it has nothing to do with the employees? Your sentence refers to the disruptive operation of the cell tower facility by Arx employees who can be expected to be a regular presence, maintaining the site for as long as the proposed facility exists.

Our understanding is these visits are quite infrequent. It basically almost runs by itself. Periodically someone will come out to inspect and make sure everything is working. If something goes wrong, obviously somebody responds to that,

but maybe you have a different understanding of what Arx employees would do, and I just want to 3 kind of understand what that might be.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS (Stewart): Whatever you just said, but I would anticipate that they would have a communication with the City, or in the neighborhood, or with the neighbors, too, of what they could expect. My job is to represent what the community wants. That's what I'm here doing right now.

The neighborhood in that community in that area of town just simply does not want this in their neighborhood. They don't want it in their backyard.

MR. EDELSON: All right. At the prior hearing I suggested to Mr. Coppins the idea that if the building could be -- I forget the exact word, but rehabilitated and become something like a neighborhood community center, is that something he would consider doing so that it actually had value to the residents?

Were you aware of that suggestion? THE WITNESS (Stewart): Yes, and I do not believe that a community center is needed in that area of town. MR. EDELSON: Okay. I think that's all the questions I

1 have at this point, Mr. Morissette. So thank you. 2 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Edelson. 3 Will now continue with cross-examination by 4 Mr. Silvestri. 5 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. And good 6 afternoon, Mayor Stewart. 7 Mayor Stewart, you had mentioned the blight 8 issues at 43 Osgood Avenue. I'm trying to fill in 9 a blank, if you will. I'm aware of plans that 10 were to convert that building into an 11 age-restricted apartment with X amount of parking 12 spaces, that type of thing. What happened there? How did that fall 13 14 through, or any comments on that one? 15 THE WITNESS (Stewart): No permits were ever pulled to 16 do the work. It is our understanding that the 17 property owners could never, I don't know, get it 18 together to -- to have it done. I don't know. 19 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. 20 THE WITNESS (Stewart): There was a deal for that 21 neighborhood, though, I will say. 22 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. Turning to 221 Farmington 23 Avenue, which I believe is the old school that's there on the corner. 24 25 THE WITNESS (Stewart): Holy Cross.

1 MR. SILVESTRI: Yes. Do you know what the current 2 status is of that parcel? 3 THE WITNESS (Stewart): It's still owned by the church 4 and it's currently being utilized as swing space 5 for the Chamberlain Elementary School Project, a 6 renovation project that the City is -- is doing 7 right now. So you have a school, full. 8 MR. SILVESTRI: So it is in session to some degree. 9 Okay. And the back part of it, the paved area, 10 the grass area, if I saw correctly is used for --11 how should we say? Get-togethers, or possibly 12 carnivals in the past. Is that correct? 13 THE WITNESS (Stewart): Currently it's being used as 14 recess space for the school. But yes, in years 15 past the church has utilized that for their annual 16 carnival. 17 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. And not to put you on the 18 spot, but you had mentioned, you know, some 19 consideration by the City possibly for the 20 cemetery or the Eversource property. 21 What's your feeling if it were feasible to 22 put a cell tower at 221 Farmington Ave? 23 THE WITNESS (Stewart): At the Holy Cross site I feel 24 uncomfortable with the kids being there all day, 25 but I would have to see what the -- where and

exactly how they would propose to put this in there.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. It was a hypothetical, but thank you.

- THE WITNESS (Stewart): Okay. I still think that this cemetery option or the Eversource site is going to be a much better location in terms of neighborhood disruption, and I don't think that you're going to have as many people that would be very upset about it. But again, we still stand here ready to help facilitate discussions if possible.
- MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. I'm going to put one more hypothetical to you, because the topic came up earlier today About 444 Farmington Avenue. It really hasn't been investigated, but I'm just curious about your thoughts about a potential location for a cell tower there.
- THE WITNESS (Stewart): It's a funeral home and a banquet facility that sits right next to a condominium complex where there's probably -- it's got to be about a hundred units that are right there.

I'm not really sure that would -- would be pretty feasible as the parking lot is always jam packed with cars. I'm not sure if that would

1 necessarily be ideal. 2 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mayor Stewart. 3 Again, my visibility on that today was 4 limited to just looking at Google maps and looking 5 down on it, if you will. 6 THE WITNESS (Stewart): I understand. 7 MR. SILVESTRI: So I appreciate your comments as to 8 what's around that area as well. Thank you. 9 Mr. Morissette, that's all the questions that 10 I have. 11 And again thank you, Mayor Stewart. 12 THE WITNESS (Stewart): Thank you. 13 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Silvestri. 14 We'll now continue with cross examination by 15 Mr. Nguyen, followed by Ms. Cooley. Mr. Nguyen? 16 MR. NGUYEN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. I don't have 17 any questions for the City. Thank you. 18 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen. 19 Ms. Cooley, any cross-examination? 20 MS. COOLEY: Thank you. Mr. Morissette. I just have 21 one question for Mayor Stewart. First of all 22 Mayor Stewart, thank you for attending today and I 23 appreciate your advocacy for the people of New 24 Britain in this matter. 25 In your letter you noted that a potential use

that you think would be appropriate would be some kind of an adaptive reuse of this property, and you consider it a historic property. But are you aware that the property was reviewed by SHPO and found not to be eligible for listing as a historic place?

THE WITNESS (Stewart): No.

MS. COOLEY: Okay. So just so you're aware of that,
the property has to go through review for the
State Historic Preservation Office, which it did.
And their conclusion was that there would be no
impact on the site from a project like this, and
that the site itself was not eligible for historic
listing.

I do agree with you. It would be lovely had the owner tried to do something like that with the site, but we are only able to evaluate the project that is before us at the moment. And I think that we're getting an idea of what could and couldn't be done there. And I think that looking at other sites is valuable, and we have attempted to get more information about that. So thank you.

THE WITNESS (Stewart): If I may? Just that the City --

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Ms. Cooley --

7

10

11

12

8

9

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

21

20

22

23

24 25

We also never applied for any type of historic tax credit on the property or anything like that to -we're going off of this year, the year and the nature of the -- the building, which is how it's viewed in the eyes of the federal government when

THE WITNESS (Stewart): The city never -- oh, sorry.

So I think that's what we were just, when I'm making those comments, based off of.

it comes to historic preservation as -- as well.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Ms. Cooley. I will continue with cross-examination. At this point the questions that I had have already been asked by my fellow Council members, however I will give the Mayor an opportunity to provide any last moment commentary if she would like.

Mayor Stewart?

THE WITNESS (Stewart): Sure. I, you know, again I just want to reiterate the fact that if, you know, that my office and the City does still stand willing to work together with Arx to find another site that's suitable that we don't think would impact a neighborhood as deeply as how we feel that this property would.

I'm intrigued at their comments about wanting to, you know, rehab the location. While that

23

24

25

certainly is something that we have been looking for, for many years, I'm not, you know, too keen on what that might look like with a company that specializes in cell towers and not redevelopment.

So again, I'm still welcoming those conversations. We think that we have other opportunities in town and other locations that would achieve the ultimate goal here. And again, we're just -- we're still willing to -- to work together.

And we hope that the Siting Council will not allow this location to go through in this very elderly and residential neighborhood. Thank you.

We will now continue with cross-examination

of the City of New Britain by the Applicant.

Attorney Ball.

Thank you, Mr. Morissette. MR. BALL:

Good afternoon, Mayor Stewart.

THE WITNESS (Stewart): Good afternoon.

MR. BALL: My name is David Ball. I represent Arx Wireless, the Applicant. And I just wanted to ask you just a few questions sort of following up on some of your testimony a few minutes ago.

Are you aware that before Arx filed this

1 application that we sent a copy of the application as part of a municipal consultation process to you 2 3 directly? 4 THE WITNESS (Stewart): No. 5 MR. BALL: Okay. So have you seen my letter to you, 6 which is Exhibit M, as in Mary, in the record, 7 Dated November 13, 2020, where I sent it to you 8 via Federal Express; and I wrote a letter to you 9 asking if we could meet with you? 10 And in the letter I specifically said, if the 11 City has any proposed alternative sites, it must 12 provide them to us within 30 days of our initial 13 consultation meeting. 14 Have you never seen that letter? 15 THE WITNESS (Stewart): No. 16 MR. BALL: Okay. All right. Do you doubt that the 17 package was delivered to your office? 18 THE WITNESS (Stewart): I never saw it. 19 MR. BALL: Okay. You saw that -- well, then Joseph E. 20 Skelly, Jr., who's sitting next to you, Assistant 21 Corporation Counsel was also provided a copy of 22 that letter and the technical report that went 23 along with it. Are you aware of that? 24 THE WITNESS (Stewart): No. 25 MR. BALL: Okay. Do you know whether the City of New

Britain provided to us, to Arx, the Applicant,
proposed alternative sites within 30 days of any
kind of discussion? Do you know if that happened?

THE WITNESS (Stewart): I don't believe it did. If I
didn't know about it, then I'm assuming it didn't.

MR. BALL: In our letter we also offered to have an informational meeting in the City of New Britain within 60 days of our initial consultation with you.

Do you know if the City agreed to allow us to provide an informational meeting within that time?

THE WITNESS (Stewart): Sir, if I never saw the letter, how would I know that?

MR. BALL: Okay. But you're not aware of any consultation, any meeting that Arx was allowed to put forward at the City?

THE WITNESS (Stewart): Obviously not.

MR. BALL: Okay. Now earlier you were asked about a couple of alternative sites that your Counsel did provide asking Arx to look at those sites, and I just want to be clear about this.

So Mr. Skelly wrote a letter on November 17, 2020, and he identified two sites. One was a water tank on Elm Street, 1780 Corbin Avenue, and the other was on Osgood Park. Those were the two

1 sites that were provided to me as something that 2 Arx should take a look at. 3 Do you have knowledge of those two sites? 4 THE WITNESS (Stewart): I mean, yes, I'm aware of those 5 two sites. They're owned by the City and would 6 have been much easier to work with here. 7 MR. BALL: Okay. You're aware they're both in 8 residential neighborhoods also. Right? 9 THE WITNESS (Stewart): Well, the Elam Street water 10 tank is also high above the residential 11 neighborhood, and Osgood has a huge area of wooded 12 area behind it, which is also in the area of other 13 developments, like business developments like 14 Polamer Precision and -- and others. 15 MR. BALL: Okay. So are you aware that on March 5, 16 2021, my partner Phil Pires wrote back to Attorney 17 Skelly to advise him that AT&T had rejected both 18 of those sites from a coverage standpoint because 19 both sides were so close to other existing AT&T 20 sites. Have you seen that letter? 21 THE WITNESS (Stewart): No. 22 MR. BALL: Okay. I appreciate that, you know, you've 23 indicated your willingness to meet with us. 24 In Exhibit M to the application we submitted

an e-mail exchange between Phil Pires and Attorney

25

Skelly where Mr. Pires twice asked if we could have a Zoom meeting with you, and asked if the City would like to participate with us to discuss alternative sites. And the last response we got from Attorney Skelly was that he'd get back to -- we'll let you know, he wrote, on March 5, 2021. Are you aware that those communications were happening? THE WITNESS (Stewart): No.

MR. BALL: Okay. And in fact, you never did -- or

Attorney Skelly never did set up a Zoom meeting

with us to discuss any alternative sites. Did he?

THE WITNESS (Stewart): Obviously not.

MR. BALL: Okay. In your letter dated July 13, 2021, which you've already been asked about, as I understand it, you know, one of your points is that there's development potential to this property. And correct me if I'm wrong -- I guess your position is that if there's a telecommunications tower, that will impede its -- the property's development potential.

Is that your position?

THE WITNESS (Stewart): Correct.

MR. BALL: Okay. Has the City ever commissioned a

study of any sort concluding that building a telecom tower at this site would somehow impact its development potential?

THE WITNESS (Stewart): No, we don't own the site.

MR. BALL: Okay. And you're aware that whether or not a property's value increases or decreases as a result of a telecommunications facility is an issue that is outside the scope of what the Siting Council can consider. Right?

THE WITNESS (Stewart): Yes.

MR. BALL: All right.

THE WITNESS (Stewart): But it's still relevant to the quality of life of the people that live in the neighborhood in the city that I represent, that obviously Arx doesn't care about.

MR. BALL: Right. I understand. So now you also discussed the, I guess, the potential of the property being designated for historic purposes.

And I just want to follow up on Commissioner Cooley's questions -- and if you think

Mr. Schiller is more appropriate to respond, I'm happy to talk with him about that issue.

But we submitted in connection with the prefiled testimony of Michael Libertine and Brian Gaudet the letter from SHPO dated November 24,

2020, which specifically concluded that there would be no adverse effects on any sites eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places if this telecommunications facility was built.

Have you seen SHPO's letter?

THE WITNESS (Stewart): No.

MR. BALL: Okay. Mr. Schiller in his affidavit talked about a local New Britain grand list identifying 43 Osgood Avenue as a property that should at least be considered for historic status.

Mayor Stewart, are you aware that the City maintains an online document called, a listing of historic properties by district?

THE WITNESS (Stewart): Yes, but I -- I don't think that's been updated in quite some time.

MR. BALL: Right. And the last time it was updated was 2016. Okay? And we submitted that in the prefiled testimony of Mr. Libertine and Mr. Gaudet on July 12, 2021. And we attached the entire listing within the city of New Britain of all historic places. It's accurate. Is it not?

Forty-three Osgood Avenue is not listed anywhere on the Monument Historic District Properties, Walnut Hill Historic District

1 Properties, West End Historic District Properties, 2 or Downtown Historic District Properties. 3 Isn't that right? 4 THE WITNESS (Stewart): I don't know. 5 MR. BALL: Okay. And just to close out my question, so 6 there is no dispute 43 Osgood Avenue is not listed 7 on the National Register of Historic Places. 8 Isn't that SHPO's conclusion? 9 THE WITNESS (Stewart): I don't know what SHPO's 10 conclusion is, but I can tell you what my thought 11 process was in my testimony. 12 MR. BALL: I appreciate your thought process. I'm just 13 trying to make sure the record is clear and the 14 facts are clear. This property is not on the 15 National Register of Historic Places. 16 Isn't that true? 17 THE WITNESS (Stewart): Nor did I say that it was, 18 though. 19 MR. BALL: Okay. So the record is clear. It is not? 20 THE WITNESS (Stewart): I never said that it was on the 21 historic place -- okay. I get it, like, yeah, 22 your point is made. 23 MR. BALL: Okay. And SHPO concluded that it is not 24 eligible for that status? 25 THE WITNESS (Stewart): We don't know that.

- MR. BALL: In the letter that SHPO provided November

 24, 2020, that is exactly what they communicated.

 That's part of the record.
- 4 MR. SKELLY: Who's that letter to?

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

- MR. BALL: It is Exhibit A, to Mr. Libertine and

 Mr. Gaudet's prefiled testimony that you have,

 Mr. Skelly, dated July 12, 2021.
 - MR. SKELLY: Yeah, but who's the letter addressed to, though?
- 10 MR. BALL: Mayor Stewart, have you seen the communication?
- 12 THE WITNESS (Stewart): No. Who is the letter sent to?
 - MR. BALL: If you look at the record -- and I'm sure your attorney has seen it. The letter from SHPO dated November 24, 2020, to Stacey Vairo of All Points Technology corp who makes the conclusion that this property is not eligible for that historic status.
- Are you aware of any communication to the contrary?
- 21 MR. SKELLY: We were not aware of that letter since it
 22 wasn't addressed to the City in Britain.
- 23 MR. BALL: Okay. It's part of the record.
- MR. SKELLY: I understand that.
- MR. BALL: Attorney Skelly, for the record, it was

1	provided to you in our application. It was
2	provided to you in our prefiled testimony.
3	MR. SKELLY: I understand that.
4	MR. BALL: Okay. Thank you.
5	I have no further questions of this panel,
6	Mr. Morissette.
7	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Ball.
8	Attorney Regan, do you have questions for the
9	City of New Britain? We should take a break? Or
10	do you have a short list of questions?
11	MR. REGAN: No, I have no questions for the City.
12	Thank you.
13	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Very good. That concludes
14	the cross-examination of the City of New Britain.
15	Mayor Stewart, thank you very much for your
16	time today and the information that you've shared
17	with the Council. Thank you.
18	We'll now take a twelve-minute break and be
19	back here at 3:50. Thank you, everyone.
20	See you at 3:50.
21	
22	(Pause: 3:38 p.m. to 3:50 p.m.)
23	
24	THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good. Thank you, everyone.
25	We'll now return back to AT&T. We will

continue with the appearance of the Intervener AT&T.

MR. EDELSON: Excuse me, Mr. Morissette? I thought we were trying to be deferential to Mayor Stewart, and so I delayed asking questions of Mr. Schiller because I thought we were trying to move through that quickly.

Is there any chance I could ask a question of Mr. Schiller?

MR. SKELLY: I thought that's what you folks were going to do when we had Mr. Schiller take the oath as well as Mayor Stewart. So Mr. Schiller is here.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Well, I was clear at the offset that we were going to go through the cross-examination of the City of New Britain in it's entirety. I was very clear on that matter.

Mr. Edelson, if we need to go back, we'll go back -- but I was very clear. So please ask your question and we'll move on. Thank you.

MR. EDELSON: Thanks you, Mr. Morissette.

Mr. Schiller, as you heard there were letters and reports sent to the City of New Britain based on what we heard from the Applicant. Were you aware of the application for this cell tower as the City Planner? Did that come before your

1 organization? 2 THE WITNESS (Schiller): I was not aware of it until 3 earlier this year. So this site was -- lead to 4 the process here. 5 MR. EDELSON: And so the follow-up letters also that 6 were noted in addition, and the technical report, 7 they never came to the planner office -- planning 8 office? 9 THE WITNESS (Schiller): 10 MR. EDELSON: Okay. That was my question, 11 Mr. Morissette. Thank you. 12 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Edelson. 13 We will now continue with the 14 cross-examination with the appearance of the Intervener AT&T, to swear in their new witness 15 16 Daniel Bilezikian and to verify new exhibits marked as Roman numeral three, items B4 through '8 17 18 on the hearing program. 19 Attorney Bachman, please begin by swearing in 20 Mr. Bilezikian. Attorney Bachman? 21 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. 22 DANIEL BILEZIKIAN, 23 called as a witness, being first duly sworn 24 by the Executive Director, was examined and 25 testified under oath as follows:

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Bachman.

Attorney Regan, please begin by identifying the new exhibits you have filed in this matter and verifying exhibits by the appropriate sworn witnesses.

MR. REGAN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.

The Intervener AT&T has five new exhibits that it would like to introduce, have verified and then be admitted as full exhibits. They are identified as 3B4 through 3B8 on the program agenda.

There are the late-filed exhibits submitted in response to Council 721 memorandum; late response to the City of New Britain -- the responses to the City of New Britain's July 22nd interrogatories; supplemental profiled testimony of Martin Lavin; resume of Dan Bilezikian, and the modeling specialty environmental sound assessment report dated 8/27/'21.

I would ask Mr. Lavin, Ms. Redding,
Mr. Roberts and Mr. Bilezikian to answer to each
of the following questions.

1 HOLLIS M. REDDING, 2 DOUGLAS ROBERTS, 3 MARTIN J. LAVIN, 4 recalled as witnesses, having been first duly 5 sworn, were examined and testified under oath 6 as follows: 7 8 MR. REGAN: First, did you prepare or assist in the 9 preparation of these exhibits? Mr. Lavin? 10 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, yes. 11 MR. REGAN: Ms. Redding? 12 THE WITNESS (Redding): Hollis Redding, yes. 13 MR. REGAN: Mr. Roberts? 14 THE WITNESS (Roberts): Yes. 15 MR. REGAN: And Mr. Bilezikian. 16 THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): Dan Bilezikian, yes. 17 MR. REGAN: Are there any corrections, modifications or 18 clarifications to any of these exhibits? 19 Again, Mr. Lavin? THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, no. 20 21 MR. REGAN: Ms. Redding? 22 THE WITNESS (Redding): Hollis Redding, no. 23 MR. REGAN: Mr. Roberts? 24 THE WITNESS (Roberts): Yes, I have a couple, and that 25 will be regarding the sound assessment on page 2.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS (Bilezikian):

I would like to substitute the word "backup" generator for "emergency" generator.

Sorry.

On page 9 on the first line, propane fired to natural gas. On the end of the second first paragraph, emergency would be standby use. And the next paragraph it says, emergency, and that would be also standby use.

And on page 13 under conclusion, second paragraph, we have emergency generator. would go to backup or standby use, and the reason for that is NFPA 70, which part of the Connecticut Building Code defines emergency generator as a life safety generator.

That would be something that one would see in a building where we have -- emergency lights would turn on, or a hospital where, you know, loss of life would be hindered if -- if power was not done.

Where our -- our site is unoccupied we wouldn't have loss of life. So it falls under the definition of a backup system, or standby system.

MR. REGAN: Thank you, Mr. Roberts.

No.

Mr. Bilezikian?

- 1 MR. REGAN: Are these exhibits as amended true and
- accurate to the best of your knowledge?
- Mr. Lavin?
- 4 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, yes.
- 5 MR. REGAN: Ms. Redding?
- 6 THE WITNESS (Redding): Hollis Redding, yes.
- 7 MR. REGAN: Mr. Roberts?
- 8 | THE WITNESS (Roberts): Yes.
- 9 MR. REGAN: And Mr. Bilezikian?
- 10 | THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): I'm sorry. I should have
- indicated yes to that.
- 12 MR. REGAN: Okay. And finally, and you accept these
- exhibits as your testimony here today? Mr. Lavin?
- 14 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, yes.
- 15 MR. REGAN: Ms. Redding?
- 16 THE WITNESS (Redding): Yes. Hollis Redding, Yes.
- 17 MR. REGAN: Mr. Roberts?
- 18 THE WITNESS (Roberts): Yes, I do.
- 19 MR. REGAN: And Mr. Bilezikian?
- 20 THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): Yes.
- 21 MR. REGAN: I would ask that AT&T's exhibits noted B4
- through B8 be admitted as full exhibits.
- 23 | THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Regan.
- 24 MR. REGAN: And our panel is ready for questions,
- Mr. Morissette.

1	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Does any party or
2	intervener object to the admission of the AT&T's
3	new exhibits? Attorney Ball?
4	MR. BALL: No objection.
5	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Attorney Skelly?
6	MR. SKELLY: No objection.
7	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. The exhibits are
8	hereby admitted.
9	We will continue with cross-examination of
10	AT&T By the Council starting with Mr. Perrone
11	followed by Mr. Edelson.
12	Mr. Perrone?
13	MR. PERRONE: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.
14	Referencing page 87 of the evidentiary
15	hearing transcript. I had asked about AT&T
16	looking at the council's comprehensive database of
17	sites, and Ms. Redding had indicated that Mr.
18	Bilezikian did the initial search or scrub of the
19	Council's comprehensive database.
20	Mr. Bilezikian, is that correct?
21	THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): Yes.
22	MR. PERRONE: Could you tell us how you performed the
23	search of the Council's comprehensive database?
24	For example, did you locate sites within a
25	certain radius? Or how is that done?

1 THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): I believe it was with a 2 certain radius, but typically we move outside 3 the -- the search ring radius and examine anything 4 that's even reasonably appropriate. I don't have 5 the details of how I did that, but that's 6 typically how it's done. 7 MR. PERRONE: So you don't know a ballpark radius that 8 you used? 9 THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): I -- I don't. 10 MR. PERRONE: But within the area you searched did you 11 look at all possible facilities, rooftop, 12 small-cell or non tower arrays? 13 THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): Did not look at small-cell, 14 no. 15 MR. PERRONE: While I'm on the small-cell topic I'm 16 going to go to Mr. Lavin. On page 88 of the 17 transcript I had asked Mr. Lavin about small-cell 18 sites, specifically installing on existing 19 small-cell sites. And Mr. Lavin had testified 20 that existing small-cell sites were not looked at. 21 My question is, are there any existing 22 small-cell sites on utility poles within a 23 four-mile radius that AT&T could use if you made 24 them taller, if you swap out the poles with taller

25

poles?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): This is Martin Lavin. There are two existing small-cell sites for AT&T in New Britain, 89 Grove and 865 East Street. They are both on utility poles basically at the curb.

I -- I don't believe there would be any way to convert them to full towers. And they're certainly -- 8 on Grove is very close to one of our current sites And 865 East Street is too far away to do us any good here.

MR. PERRONE: So you don't see a way to convert them to full macro sites?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): No, I -- and I -- I don't see any real advantage in -- I -- I don't think they would. The one is too close. The other one wouldn't really serve over here just in terms of rolling them out. And I don't -- I don't think there's any real advantage to putting a macro site where those two are. I think there they serve well as small cells for their concentrated coverage areas, but I don't think it would give us any advantage in terms of building out a macro site.

MR. PERRONE: And lastly on that topic, would you be able to extend them just to have a small cell on top? Would that work if you had both?

1 THE WITNESS (Lavin): They are currently operated as small cells. 2 3 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. That's all I have. 4 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Perrone. We will 5 now continue with cross examination by Mr. Edelson 6 followed by Mr. Silvestri. 7 Mr. Edelson? 8 MR. EDELSON: Yes, I had one question regarding the 9 response of the AT&T, who -- I guess, it's your 10 late-filed exhibit -- I'm sorry. And it includes 11 a diagram that's called, terrain profile proposed 12 site to corner of Allen and Derby. I'm not sure 13 who prepared that. 14 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Mr. Lavin, it would be me. 15 MR. EDELSON: So I was hoping you could explain a 16 little bit about the lines, especially the one 17 that -- I think it's called the Fresnel zone. I'm 18 not sure if I understand how to interpret that. 19 THE WITNESS (Lavin): The Fresnel zone, the -- by 20 colors, the dark gray colors tend to be the 21 ground. The green is intended to be the --22 MR. EDELSON: You should know the copy I have is black 23 and white. So that might be --24 THE WITNESS (Lavin): The lowest part would be the --25 would be the ground. The next uncolored strip

1 would be the trees and the last uncolored area up 2 above is just blue in our copy to denote the sky. 3 MR. EDELSON: Okay. And so the Fresnel zone is between 4 the ground level and the treetop? 5 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. The straight line is direct 6 line of sight. The Fresnel zone underneath is an 7 area we try to keep free, if we can. 8 particular line is -- denotes where a reflecting 9 object would create a reflection that canceled at 10 the receiving end. It will be exactly 180 degrees 11 out of phase. 12 If something were in that zone, right at that 13 line or in that zone it has potential to create a 14 canceling reflection at the site at the receiving 15 end. 16 MR. EDELSON: Because it seems to me that line goes 17 through the earth. 18 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. 19 MR. EDELSON: Through the ground. 20 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yeah. And in this case the 21 primary --22 MR. EDELSON: You're talking about cancellation? 23 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. The primary thing to note 24 is that the direct line of sight goes through the 25 trees, and also there's no line of sight to that

area around the 52 Derby.

And even if the trees weren't there, the terrain blocks, and it creates a shadow behind on -- to the right side of that hill in the middle there's a big shadow that it creates. That's why the -- that area shows poor coverage in our proposed coverage plots.

- MR. EDELSON: I don't want to belabor the point, but even the line of sight you have going through trees --
- 11 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes, uh-huh.
- 12 MR. EDELSON: I'm not able to do that, so.
- THE WITNESS (Lavin): The trees absorb our signal. So that's another factor that knocks down our coverage in that direction.
 - MR. EDELSON: In addition to not being able to see

 through them -- that's why I was kind of surprised

 that that was line of sight. So to me, the line

 of sight would be above the tree level.
 - THE WITNESS (Lavin): Along that profile to the corner of Allen and Derby, the direct line of sight goes through the trees. It was answering a question about why coverage was so poor from our proposed site in that, in the vicinity of Allen and Derby.

MR. EDELSON: Okay. Maybe it's just terminology.

1 But I think that that's all the questions I 2 have, Mr. Morissette. 3 THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good. Thank you, 4 Mr. Edelson. 5 We'll now move on to Mr. Silvestri followed 6 by Mr. Nguyen. Mr. Silvestri? 7 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. 8 Mr. Lavin, good afternoon. 9 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Good afternoon, sir. 10 MR. SILVESTRI: I'd like to stay on that diagram for 11 two quick questions, if you will. How tall is the hypothetical cell tower at 52 Derby in that plot? 12 13 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Same height as the proposed 14 tower. Just to show you the profile, at the same 15 tower height at each end. 16 MR. SILVESTRI: Gotcha. Then the other question I had, 17 when you're looking at the line of sight, why does it come down from the proposed site to the middle 18 19 of that tower as opposed to a higher elevation, or 20 maybe to the top of that hypothetical tower? 21 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Because our users are down at 22 ground level. The line of sight, there would be 23 pretty much uninterrupted line of sight between the tops of the two towers, but that's not -- this 24 25 is just -- that's really not what we're looking

at, the two towers communicating with each other.

This was intended to -- to show that the same, the same reason we have poor coverage in the area of Allen and Derby and 52 Derby is the same reason as the tower at 52 Derby wouldn't see back up the hill to the area of the proposed site.

MR. SILVESTRI: I think I understand you. Thank you.

THE WITNESS (Lavin): That that hill in the middle

causes both problems.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Let me stay with you for the next question that I have. This goes back to your prefiled testimony dated August 26th. And the question I have for you is on page 3, your response to question number eight.

And I'm going to quote what you have down here on the bottom of one of the paragraphs. The ideal areas for the deployment of small-cell facilities are highly concentrated population urban areas where the network requires capacity, which can be addressed by these low power, lower height small-cell facilities in the specific areas in need of capacity, end quote.

The question I have for you, the area of Osgood Avenue appears, at least in my opinion, to be a highly concentrated population urban area.

So why doesn't that area fit into what you just provided for your answer to question 8?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Because the coverage area is greater than we can do, we can cover with a small cell at heights we, you know, determine pole by pole.

The two we have are in varied areas of high capacity which could be reached by a small cell, and in the immediate vicinity they kind of stand out on their own, more or less unobstructed line of sight to the homes and businesses they serve in the immediate area there.

That approach -- and if we tried to get the same amount of coverage out of small cells in the area around the school, around 43 Osgood, I'd say we would probably have to put at least a dozen of these up and, you know, pole by pole to try to figure out whether we can do it or not.

MR. SILVESTRI: And what's the primary frequency that you're using for the other two small cells that you just mentioned?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): I believe those are PCS and AWS.

It makes for an easier -- and they don't perhaps

cover as far, but they're only intended to have a

very concentrated area of capacity in the

immediate vicinity that PCS and AWS can reach.

It keeps -- it makes the equipment smaller, it makes the antenna smaller, and it gets those users off the 700 megahertz system. So it allows a little more quiet -- or environment for 700 to operate.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. And the last question I

have -- I don't know who it might be directed to,

but it's just to close the gap on the question

that I had posed to Arx earlier about 221

Farmington Avenue.

The question I have is, did the conversations about potential use of that site at 221 Farmington Avenue include all areas of the parcel? Or were conversations just limited to the building area?

THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): I can answer that, Mr.

Silvestri. At the time that we approached the church about that property we were told that it was up for sale and that they weren't considering anything at all.

- MR. SILVESTRI: And that would be for the whole property?
- 23 | THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): Yes.
 - MR. EDELSON: Okay. And then related to that, the conversations that perhaps you had regarding the

1 steeple in the church, how did that conversation 2 go? 3 THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): That was a phone 4 conversation. We -- since there was an existing 5 carrier there, it seemed logical that they would 6 be interested, but it turns out that they were 7 apparently regretful that they had moved forward 8 and -- and they weren't considering -- they 9 weren't going to consider any more attachments to 10 that steeple and that was -- that was final. 11 No -- no room for negotiation. They made the 12 decision that they didn't want anything else 13 there, and we were told, you know, it wouldn't be 14 considered. 15 MR. SILVESTRI: No. Thank you for your response. 16 Mr. Morissette, that's all the questions that 17 I have. Thank you. 18 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Mr. Silvestri. We'll 19 now continue with cross-examination by Mr. Nguyen 20 followed by Ms. Cooley. 21 Mr. Nguyen? 22 Thank you, Mr. Morissette. MR. NGUYEN: 23 To the extent that when AT&T sent out letters 24 to the owners of a particular site -- and I 25 understand that you sent out certified mail and

1 you received no response. Is that the conclusion 2 that they are not interested in leasing or renting 3 that particular space? 4 I'm just trying to understand AT&T's process 5 behind this. 6 THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): Yes. Well, it -- it goes 7 beyond just sending a certified letter. We, in 8 the particular case I think you're referring to 9 the Bethel Alum cemetery. Right? MR. NGUYEN: I'm talking about site number seven. 10 11 me pull the record up. 12 It's alternative site number seven. 13 THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): Yeah. Yes, that's -- that's 14 the Bethel St. Mary --15 MR. NGUYEN: Forty-eight Allen Street. 16 THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): Yes, that's correct. We 17 tried to approach them by phone on numerous 18 I don't know if I was ever able to occasions. 19 leave a voice mail with them because the phone 20 just rang, rang, rang and then it went dead 21 on several -- more than several occasions. 22 We -- we did send a certified letter. 23 certified letter came back undeliverable. We did 24 a search on -- on the Internet to see. Oftentimes 25 you can get some clues, but there weren't any.

And it -- by all appearances on comments on Yelp and -- and other reviews, the data back a long, long time ago it was apparent that -- or seemed -- seemingly apparent there they weren't active for whatever reason; any further line on anybody there.

So yeah, we dropped it. Didn't -- didn't pursue it any further.

MR. NGUYEN: So you sent out the letters and you get it back that it's unbelievable.

THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): Unbelievable, yes.

MR. NGUYEN: And in terms of a phonecall, how did you obtain the numbers for this particular site?

THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): I believe -- well, on the Internet they have the number listed. So that was the number that I called.

THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): The address was obviously from the assessor's office and there weren't any other numbers. That that number is the only one that I was able to find for Beth Alum in my search.

So just couldn't -- couldn't get a line on them at all other than those two pieces of information.

MR. NGUYEN: If I could ask about a reference to the transcript page number 116, I believe. And there was a question to AT&T from Mr. Edelson. And the question was, did AT&T make any effort to explain to the City of New Britain why you believe there's a public need in the vicinity of, you know, for coverage?

And the answer from AT&T from Mr. Lavin and Ms. Redding is that you did not.

So with what the City of New Britain presented earlier, to the extent that if there's a communication between the parties, I'm just wondering if you could comment on whether or not this, this process could facilitate the need for a tower in the city of New Britain; and two, to meet your objectives.

- THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): I'm sorry. Are you asking me?
- MR. NGUYEN: Well, I'm asking AT&T's witnesses. So if anyone can offer that, offer your comments it will be appreciated.
- THE WITNESS (Bilezikian): Well, AT&T stepped out of the -- the direct process early on and Arx took over the site, and from that point on they were in -- they were the ones that were driving the

process.

So we did an initial site ac to -- to determine, you know, to run through the possible alternatives. And then when Arx showed an interest in -- in taking the site on, they -- they assumed those responsibilities. So I'd have to defer to -- to Mr. Coppins to answer those questions.

- MR. NGUYEN: Okay. And Mr. Lavin, have you had any conversation with City of New Britain officials since the last hearing?
- 12 THE WITNESS (Lavin): No, I have not.
- 13 MR. NGUYEN: Ms. Redding?
- 14 THE WITNESS (Redding): I have not either.
- MR. NGUYEN: Okay. And that's all I have. Thank you,

 Mr. Morissette. And thank you very much.
- THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen. Thank
 you.

We now continue with cross examination of AT&T by Ms. Cooley. Ms. Cooley?

MS. COOLEY: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. I have just one question I think directed to Mr. Lavin. It's related to the question about small cells. I just want to make sure that I'm understanding the issue at this site.

1 So small cells are efficient when you have 2 capacity issues, but they're not as efficient in a 3 situation like this when really it's a coverage 4 issue. Would that be accurate? 5 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes, it would. The small cells 6 are there for capacity, not for primary coverage. 7 This site is providing the primary coverage to 8 this area, so it's much more suited to a macro 9 site. MS. COOLEY: Okay. Thank you. All right. That's all 10 11 that I have, Mr. Morissette. Thank you. 12 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Ms. Cooley. 13 I have some follow-up questions for Mr. 14 Lavin. Good afternoon, Mr. Lavin. 15 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Good afternoon. 16 THE HEARING OFFICER: I'd like to go to your original 17 analysis attached to the application, and it's 18 Exhibit E, if we could? 19 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Okay. 20 THE HEARING OFFICER: And if we could go to attachment I was a little confused when I was reading 21 two? 22 your supplemental prefiled testimony filed 23 August 26th related to question five. And it had 24 to do with the DiLoreto School. 25 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes?

1 THE HEARING OFFICER: In using attachment two, my 2 understanding, and correct me if I'm wrong, is 3 that cell site CT 5419 is DiLoreto School. 4 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes, it is. Uh-huh. 5 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. So that cell site is 6 located at that facility. So therefore, moving 7 this cell site to that location would not work? 8 THE WITNESS (Lavin): No, we're already on there. 9 Yeah. 10 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Very good. 11 And the CREC Academy of Science and 12 Innovation is just up the road from CT 5419. 13 Correct? 14 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Very close, yes. 15 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Very good. Thank you for 16 clarifying that for me. I thought that was the 17 case, but I wanted to make sure. 18 Okay. Turning to the 700 megahertz coverage 19 plot attachment three on the next page of your 20 original filing attachment E, if I see the 21 original -- let me see. Is it the existing? 22 Actually if we could go to attachment four, 23 which would be the existing coverage plus the proposed. You with me so far? 24 25 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Well, if we were to move the CT 1430 site south in the general area of Allen and Farmington Avenue, would we generally obtain the same coverage as we're seeing here, plus additional, additional coverage for the area in white.

THE WITNESS (Lavin): We would be more directly in the area of somewhat weaker coverage. I don't know if it would lose us the coverage up by Dean Drive,

Heather Lane and McKinley Drive to the northwest.

I don't have that right in front of me.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah. Okay. I see what you're saying, is if you go further south you lose that coverage in that area of Dean Drive. It seems like a small area that could possibly be picked up by a small cell?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Possibly. I just -- but you know, we're at the proposed site. Just because I think moving down to that area would be generally moving to the Holy Cross School or the -- or the cemetery, which you know, according to our site ac are not leasable.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah, understanding that there, at this point in time, that those sites have been determined as not being available. But if they

were to become available for some reason and that was we're able to obtain the location at either one of those properties, the coverage would be approximately the same with the exception of the Dean Drive area.

THE WITNESS (Lavin): It would seem that they would probably be certainly worth taking a close look at given their proximity to our proposed site.

They're a little downhill. Putnam hill -- or Putnam School is on top of a hill. So it's very likely that we would lose.

If we move down that intersection that hill is probably a hundred feet higher in that intersection and that might shadow us in the northwestern direction. So I'm not exactly sure, robbing Peter to pay Paul, exactly how much we would gain versus how much we'd lose.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Very good. Thank you for that. That concludes my line of questioning. We will now continue with cross-examination of AT&T by the Applicant. Attorney Ball?

MR. BALL: I have no questions. Thank you,
Mr. Morissette.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Ball.

We will continue with cross examination of

AT&T by the City of New Britain. Attorney Skelly?

MR. SKELLY: Thank you. I wanted to follow up on

Exhibit E that the Chair referenced in his prior

questions. So attachment four, and this would be

for, I think Mr. Lavin, or one of the other AT&T

people.

But even -- the way I'm looking at this, even if the cell tower's site, or their application is approved, there's still going to be significant gaps in coverage. Because if you look at attachment four there's a lot of -- I think it's the orange area, and there's still three significant areas in white.

So this is clearly not going to solve the coverage issue 100 percent. Correct?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): That's correct. In this terrain,
no -- no site is going to solve all the problems.

MR. SKELLY: So attachment four, it's better. It's better than attachment three, but there's still significant gaps in coverage even if you win your case. Correct?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. And as I said, there are always -- no site, especially when we've got a hundred -- to a hundred-foot, 50-foot variations in terrain here, no site is going to solve all the

problems.

This site does a very good job of solving about as many as a hundred-foot tall tower can.

MR. SKELLY: And is AT&T willing to sit down with Mayor Stewart to explore the alternative sites at the cemetery and the other source property, assuming that we can hook all the parties up together?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): AT&T is here to get the best site we can, all the parties involved. I don't see any reason why AT&T wouldn't participate.

MR. SKELLY: All right. Thank you. I don't have any further questions.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Attorney Skelly.

That concludes our hearing for today. Before closing the evidentiary record in this matter the Connecticut Siting Council announces that briefs and proposed findings of fact may be filed with the Council by any party or intervener no later than October 2, 2021.

The submission of briefs and proposed findings of fact are not required by this Council, rather that we leave it to the choice of the parties and interveners. Anyone who has become a party or intervener but who desires to make his or her views known to the Council may file written

statements with the council within 30 days of the date hereof.

The Council will issue draft findings of fact, and thereafter parties and intervenors may identify errors or inconsistencies between the Council's draft findings of fact and the record. However, no new information, no new evidence, no new arguments and no reply beliefs without our permission will be considered by the Council.

I hereby declare this hearing adjourned. And thank you, everyone, for your participation.

Have a good evening.

(End: 4:07 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing 106 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original verbatim notes taken of the remote teleconference meeting in Re:

ARX WIRELESS INFRASTRUCTURE, LLC APPLICATION

FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY

AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE,

AND OPERATION OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY

LOCATED AT 43 OSGOOD AVENUE, NEW BRITAIN,

CONNECTICUT, which was held before JOHN

MORISSETTE, Member and Presiding Officer, on

September 2, 2021.

Robert G Dixon, CVR-M 857

Notary Public

BCT Reporting, LLC

55 Whiting Street, Suite 1A

Plainville, CT 06062

My Commission Expires: 6/30/2025

1	INDEX
2	WITNESSES PAGE
_	Keith Coppins
3	Douglas Roberts
1	Michael Libertine
4	Brian Gaudet 6
5	EXAMINERS PAGE
6	By Mr. Ball 6
	By Mr. Perrone 8
7	By Mr. Silvestri 11, 39
0	By Hearing Officer (Morissette) 14
8	By Mr. Skelly 27
0	By Mr. Edelson 37, (45)
9	By Mr. Nguyen 40
10	WITNESSES PAGE
	Steven P. Schiller
11	Erin Stewart 48
12	EXAMINERS
13	D M Gl11
13	By Mr. Skelly 48 By Mr. Ainsworth 13
14	By Mr. Ainsworth 13 By Mr. Edelson 53, 79
	By Mr. Silvestri 63
15	By Ms. Cooley 66
	By Hearing Officer (Morissette) 68
16	By Mr. Ball 69
17	WITNESSES PAGE
	Daniel Bilezikian 80
18	
19	Hollis M. Redding
19	Douglas Roberts Martin J. Lavin 82
20	Marcin J. Lavin 62
	EXAMINERS
21	
	By Mr. Regan 82
22	By Mr. Perrone 85
	By Mr. Edelson 88
23	By Mr. Silvestri 91
_	By Mr. Nguyen 95
24	By Ms. Cooley 99
	By Hearing Officer (Morissette) 100
25	By Mr. Skelly 104