

1 STATE OF CONNECTICUT
2 CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL
3
4

5 Docket No. 506

6 New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T) application
7 for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility
8 and Public Need for the construction, maintenance,
9 and operation of a telecommunications facility
10 located at 499 Mile Lane, Middletown, Connecticut
11

12 VIA ZOOM AND TELECONFERENCE
13

14 Continued Remote Public Hearing held on Tuesday,
15 December 21, 2021, beginning at 2 p.m.
16 via remote access.
17

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

20 JOHN MORISSETTE, Presiding Officer
21
22
23
24

25 Reporter: Lisa L. Warner, CSR #061

1 **A p p e a r a n c e s:**

2 **Council Members:**

3 **QUAT NGUYEN**

4 Designee for Chairman Marissa Paslick
 Gillett

 Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

5 **ROBERT SILVESTRI**

6 **DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.**

7 **LOUANNE COOLEY**

8 **EDWARD EDELSON**

9 **MARK QUINLAN**

10 **Council Staff:**

11 **MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.**

12 Executive Director and
 Staff Attorney

13 **MICHAEL PERRONE**

14 Siting Analyst

15 **LISA FONTAINE**

 Fiscal Administrative Officer

16
17 **For Applicant, New Cingular Wireless PCS,
 LLC:**

18 **CUDDY & FEDER LLP**

 445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th Floor

 White Plains, New York 10601

19 **BY: CHRISTOPHER B. FISHER, ESQ.**

20
21 **For Party, the City of Middletown:**

22 **OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL**

 City of Middletown

 245 deKoven Drive

23 Middletown, Connecticut 06457

BY: CHRISTOPHER J. FORTE, ESQ.

24 Assistant General Counsel

25

1 I n d e x: (Cont'd)

2 For Party, Talias Trail:

3 JOSEPH BARBAGALLO
4 59 Talias Trail
5 Middletown, Connecticut 06457

6 KELLY PUGLIARES
7 50 Talias Trail
8 Middletown, Connecticut 06457

9 MICHAEL SITEMAN
10 29 Talias Trail
11 Middletown, Connecticut 06457

12 Also present: Aaron Demarest, Zoom co-host

13
14 **All participants were present via remote access.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Good afternoon, ladies
2 and gentlemen. This continued remote evidentiary
3 hearing session is called to order this Tuesday,
4 December 21, 2021 at 2 p.m. My name is John
5 Morissette, member and presiding officer of the
6 Connecticut Siting Council.

7 As everyone is aware, there is
8 currently a statewide effort to prevent the spread
9 of the Coronavirus. This is why the Council is
10 holding this remote hearing, and we ask for your
11 patience. If you haven't done so already, I ask
12 that everyone please mute their computer audio and
13 telephones now.

14 A copy of the prepared agenda is
15 available on the Council's Docket No. 506 webpage,
16 along with the record of this matter, the public
17 hearing notice, instructions for public access to
18 this remote public hearing, and the Council's
19 Citizens Guide to Siting Council Procedures.

20 Other members of the Council are Mr.
21 Edelson, Mr. Silvestri, Mr. Nguyen, Mr. Lynch, Ms.
22 Cooley, Mr. Quinlan, Executive Director Melanie
23 Bachman, Staff Analyst Michael Perrone, and Fiscal
24 Administrative Officer Lisa Fontaine.

25 This evidentiary session is a

1 continuation of the remote public hearing held on
2 November 30, 2021. It is held pursuant to the
3 provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General
4 Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative
5 Procedure Act upon an application from New
6 Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC, also known as AT&T,
7 for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility
8 and Public Need for the construction, maintenance,
9 and operation of a telecommunications facility
10 located at 499 Mile Lane, Middletown, Connecticut.

11 A verbatim transcript is made of this
12 hearing and deposited with the Middletown City
13 Clerk's Office for the convenience of the public.

14 We will take a 10 to 15 minute break at
15 a convenient juncture at around 3:30 p.m.

16 We have two motions on the agenda.
17 Attorney Bachman, Motion Number 1.

18 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr.
19 Morissette. On December 15, 2021, the City of
20 Middletown requested party status, and staff
21 recommends approval.

22 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
23 Bachman.

24 Is there a motion?

25 MR. SILVESTRI: Mr. Morissette,

1 Silvestri here, I'll move to approve the request
2 for party status.

3 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
4 Silvestri.

5 Do we have a second?

6 MR. EDELSON: I'll be glad to second
7 that. Edelson.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
9 Edelson. We have a motion by Mr. Silvestri and a
10 second by Mr. Edelson.

11 MR. LYNCH: Mr. Morissette.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, Mr. Lynch.

13 MR. LYNCH: Excuse my cold, please. If
14 we approve this motion, does the Town of
15 Middletown -- and we'll get another motion coming
16 up -- get to introduce evidence and testimony?

17 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes.

18 MR. LYNCH: Thank you.

19 MR. MORISSETTE: Attorney Bachman, do
20 you wish to comment?

21 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr.
22 Morissette. You are correct, we would hold a
23 continued evidentiary hearing session for the two
24 additional parties to have enough time to prepare
25 and participate in another hearing. Thank you.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
2 Bachman. And thank you, Mr. Lynch.

3 And we have a motion by Mr. Silvestri
4 and a second by Mr. Edelson to approve party
5 status for the City of Middletown. Is there any
6 discussion?

7 Mr. Edelson.

8 MR. EDELSON: No discussion. Thank
9 you.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr.
11 Silvestri, any discussion?

12 MR. SILVESTRI: No discussion, Mr.
13 Morissette. Thank you.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr.
15 Nguyen, any discussion?

16 MR. NGUYEN: No discussion. Thank you.

17 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr. Lynch,
18 any discussion?

19 MR. LYNCH: If someone could just
20 refresh my memory as to when this docket was
21 received by the Council.

22 MR. MORISSETTE: Let me see, Attorney
23 Bachman, do you have that information readily
24 available?

25 MS. BACHMAN: Yes, Mr. Morissette. The

1 application was received on October 6, 2021.

2 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
3 Bachman.

4 Mr. Lynch, anything else?

5 MR. LYNCH: Negative. Thank you.

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Lynch.

7 Ms. Cooley, any discussion?

8 MS. COOLEY: I have no discussion.

9 Thank you.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr.
11 Quinlan, any discussion?

12 MR. QUINLAN: No discussion. Thank
13 you.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. And I have
15 no discussion as well. We'll now move to the
16 vote.

17 Mr. Edelson, how do you vote?

18 MR. EDELSON: Vote to approve. Thank
19 you.

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr.
21 Silvestri, how do you vote?

22 MR. SILVESTRI: Vote to approve. Thank
23 you.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr.
25 Nguyen, how do you vote?

1 MR. NGUYEN: Approve. Thank you.

2 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen.
3 Mr. Lynch, how do you vote?

4 MR. LYNCH: Vote to deny.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Vote to deny. Thank
6 you, Mr. Lynch.

7 Ms. Cooley, how do you vote?

8 MS. COOLEY: Vote to approve. Thank
9 you.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr.
11 Quinlan, how do you vote?

12 MR. QUINLAN: Vote to approve. Thank
13 you.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. And I also
15 vote to approve. We have six for approval and one
16 for denial. The motion passes. Thank you.

17 Moving on to Motion Number 2, Attorney
18 Bachman.

19 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr.
20 Morissette. Motion Number 2, on December 20, 2021
21 Talias Trail, consisting of Mr. Joseph Barbagallo,
22 Ms. Kelly Pugliares and Mr. Michael Siteman,
23 requested party status, and staff recommends
24 approval.

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney

1 Bachman. Is there a motion?

2 MR. EDELSON: I'll make a motion to
3 approve. Ed Edelson.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
5 Edelson. Is there a second?

6 MR. SILVESTRI: I'll second, Mr.
7 Morissette. Thank you.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
9 Silvestri. We have a motion by Mr. Edelson and a
10 second by Mr. Silvestri to approve the grouped
11 Talias Trail party status. Is there any
12 discussion?

13 Mr. Edelson?

14 MR. EDELSON: No discussion. Thank
15 you.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr.
17 Silvestri?

18 MR. SILVESTRI: No discussion. Thank
19 you.

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr.
21 Nguyen?

22 MR. NGUYEN: No discussion. Thank you.

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr. Lynch?

24 MR. LYNCH: Same concern as last time,
25 they're two months late to the game.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Lynch.
2 Ms. Cooley, any discussion?

3 MS. COOLEY: No discussion. Thank you.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr.
5 Quinlan, any discussion?

6 MR. QUINLAN: No discussion. Thank
7 you.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
9 Quinlan. And I have no discussion. We'll now
10 move to the vote.

11 Mr. Edelson, how do you vote?

12 MR. EDELSON: Vote to approve. Thank
13 you.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr.
15 Silvestri, how do you vote?

16 MR. SILVESTRI: Vote to approve. Thank
17 you.

18 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr.
19 Nguyen, how do you vote?

20 MR. NGUYEN: Approve. Thank you.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr. Lynch,
22 how do you vote?

23 MR. LYNCH: Vote to deny.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Lynch.
25 Ms. Cooley, how do you vote?

1 MS. COOLEY: Vote to approve. Thank
2 you.

3 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr.
4 Quinlan, how do you vote?

5 MR. QUINLAN: I vote to approve. Thank
6 you.

7 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. And I also
8 vote to approve. We have six for approval and one
9 to deny. The motion passes. Thank you.

10 Now, with no objection from the
11 applicant, we will commence with the appearance of
12 the City of Middletown to swear in its witness,
13 Wayne Bartolotta, and verify its exhibits marked
14 as Roman Numeral III, Items B-1 through 3.

15 Will the City of Middletown present its
16 witness for the purpose of taking the oath?
17 Attorney Forte.

18 MR. FORTE: Yes, the city will appear.
19 And thank you to the members of the Council. At
20 this time with me virtually is Director Wayne
21 Bartolotta who's director of the city's central
22 communications. The Council will have to forgive
23 me. Is it appropriate at this time for the
24 Council to swear in the witness or do we mark the
25 exhibits as a matter of course first?

1 MR. MORISSETTE: No, we'll swear in the
2 witness first. Attorney Bachman.

3 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr.
4 Morissette.

5 Mr. Bartolotta, could you please raise
6 your right hand?

7 W A Y N E B A R T O L O T T A,

8 called as a witness, being first duly sworn
9 (remotely) by Ms. Bachman, was examined and
10 testified on her oath as follows:

11 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
13 Bachman.

14 We'll now begin. Please verify the
15 exhibits by the appropriate sworn witness.

16 MR. FORTE: Good afternoon, everybody.
17 Thank you. My name is Attorney Christopher Forte.
18 I'm the assistant general counsel for the City of
19 Middletown, and I'm appearing in this matter on
20 behalf of the City of Middletown. As already
21 sworn in and stated, with me virtually is Director
22 Bartolotta.

23 As listed in the hearing program under
24 Roman Numeral III, Item B, there are three
25 exhibits that have been marked for identification

1 purposes. These include first the City of
2 Middletown's waiver of the municipal consultation
3 that was received on October 4, 2021. Second was
4 the prefiled testimony of Wayne Bartolotta,
5 director of the City of Middletown's Central
6 Communications, dated December 13, 2021. And
7 third was the City of Middletown's request for
8 party status, dated December 15, 2021.

9 First, as a matter of course for the
10 record, Item Number 1, the City of Middletown's
11 waiver of municipal consultation, was reviewed and
12 signed by me, and that document is true and
13 accurate to the best of my belief. And Item 3,
14 the City of Middletown's request for party status,
15 consists of email correspondence between myself
16 and the Siting Council. And just, again, I would
17 state that those are in fact my emails and that
18 they are submitted and are true and accurate to
19 the best of my belief.

20 DIRECT EXAMINATION

21 MR. FORTE: Now moving forward to Item
22 Number 2, which is the prefiled testimony of
23 Director Bartolotta, I would just have a few
24 questions for you. Director Bartolotta, first,
25 did you prepare and assist in the preparation of

1 that document?

2 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Yes.

3 MR. FORTE: And as submitted, are they
4 true and accurate to the best of your belief?

5 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Yes, they
6 are.

7 MR. FORTE: And do you so present the
8 evidence submitted within that exhibit as your
9 direct testimony here today?

10 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): I do.

11 MR. FORTE: All right. Thank you,
12 Director Bartolotta. So to members of the
13 Council, I would ask that the Council accept these
14 as full exhibits for evidentiary purposes.

15 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
16 Forte. Does any party object to the admission of
17 the City of Middletown's exhibits?

18 Attorney Fisher.

19 MR. FISHER: No objection. Thank you.

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
21 Fisher.

22 Talias Trail, Mr. Barbagallo, Ms.
23 Pugliares and Mr. Siteman, do you object to the
24 admission of the City of Middletown's exhibits?

25 MR. BARBAGALLO: No objection.

1 MR. SITEMAN: No objection.

2 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. The
3 exhibits are hereby admitted.

4 (City of Middletown's Exhibits III-B-1
5 through III-B-3: Received in evidence - described
6 in index.)

7 MR. MORISSETTE: We will now begin with
8 cross-examination of the city by the Council
9 starting with Mr. Perrone followed by Mr. Edelson.

10 Mr. Perrone.

11 MR. PERRONE: Thank you, Mr.
12 Morissette.

13 CROSS-EXAMINATION

14 MR. PERRONE: Turning to the December
15 13, 2021 testimony of Mr. Bartolotta, looking at
16 Question Number 6, there's two alternative
17 options. The first one involves a new tower and
18 removing that and installing a temporary tower and
19 moving the equipment over. My question is, during
20 that construction process at what point would the
21 city experience a loss of emergency services
22 coverage?

23 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): As soon as
24 they begin the physical move. Are you able to
25 hear me okay?

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, we can hear you
2 fine.

3 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Okay. As
4 soon as they begin the physical move. So you have
5 a tower in place with cables going to the tower to
6 the antennas and cables inside the shelter to go
7 to our equipment. As soon as you begin the
8 physical move and you take off the antennas at the
9 cables to be able to move it to a new tower, you
10 lose that site and you lose it in two parts. Part
11 number one you lose is you lose that site as an RF
12 site, so in other words, it no longer operates as
13 a radio site for our communications in that area.
14 And you lose that site as part of our P25 800
15 megahertz system that's our master site, you start
16 to lose that as well. And that entails how the
17 other sites all link to each other and how the P25
18 system operates in itself. So this is what I
19 would probably consider the most critical site in
20 the city because of that.

21 MR. PERRONE: Are there any other
22 options for the cutover process?

23 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Not that I'm
24 aware of. I'm not an engineer, but not that I'm
25 aware of.

1 MR. PERRONE: For example, like a
2 mobile facility, sort of like a cell on wheels,
3 would that be an option?

4 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Well, if you
5 have a cell on wheels, it's the same thing is if
6 you built a tower next to the tower, you still
7 have that downtime. You have aligning of
8 microwaves to do. There's two microwave dishes,
9 both of which are critical. One links to the
10 dispatch center, the other one links us to the
11 state network, the CRM network for assets for the
12 state to provide our responders coverage out of
13 our immediate area. So as soon as you take apart
14 any part of that you lose it.

15 MR. PERRONE: During the prior
16 evidentiary hearing Mr. Silvestri had asked AT&T
17 about the possibility of a new tower with all new
18 equipment installed ahead of time before a
19 cutover. From the perspective of the city would
20 that be an option?

21 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): I think it
22 would be difficult. I think it sounds -- you
23 still have some downtime. I think the downtime
24 would be limited a little bit, but I still think
25 you'd undergo downtime. For instance, you could

1 put up a new tower, but now you have to have all
2 new equipment on that tower ready to go, you'd
3 have to have microwaves lined up. On paper it
4 looks easy, but it's not that way in real life.
5 If this site were just a normal stand-alone site
6 that we have as one of our other sites, you'd lose
7 that site for a period of time, and it would only
8 be that site. This is a site that links all the
9 other sites together. It's called the master site
10 for a reason.

11 MR. PERRONE: Under that scenario with
12 a new tower with new equipment already installed,
13 would you have any idea what the cost of all new
14 city equipment on that tower would be?

15 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): I do not.
16 And the reason I do not is when we went out for an
17 RFP and it was awarded to Motorola Solutions, it
18 was part of a package deal. So I wouldn't have
19 the experience to be able to tell you that
20 information.

21 MR. PERRONE: I'm going to move on to
22 the FirstNet topic. How and to what extent would
23 AT&T's proposed FirstNet interact or mesh with
24 your existing emergency services communications?

25 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Well,

1 FirstNet is part of a nationwide program. So
2 while the local impact depends on what's happening
3 locally, the goal of FirstNet is to be able to
4 keep a cellular operation up and running
5 nationwide for first responders. One of the
6 things that came out of 911 was when that event
7 occurred there was an overload onto the system,
8 and critical communications from first responders
9 couldn't take place because the cellular companies
10 couldn't segregate which was critical
11 communications and which was me calling to say I'm
12 on my way home type of communication.

13 So the impact to Middletown is not
14 necessarily on the FirstNet part of it, although
15 it's part of the nationwide and critical at times
16 because we've certainly had serious incidents
17 occur in Middletown. The big part of it is in
18 that area, the northern part of the city, cell
19 coverage along our Newfield Street corridor, we
20 call it, is poor for AT&T, and we have experienced
21 issues with cell coverage there. It's poor inside
22 our high school, which is very close to where
23 we're at with this site. There's a noticeable
24 difference in that area for general cell service,
25 but FirstNet is just what I would call the cherry

1 on top, per se, just to have that there.

2 MR. PERRONE: So would FirstNet's
3 network operate completely independently from
4 yours?

5 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Yes, no
6 connection.

7 MR. PERRONE: Is FirstNet a service
8 that municipal emergency entities subscribe to?

9 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Many do. At
10 the current time the city does not, but many do.
11 And AT&T has made a concerted effort nationwide to
12 try to get FirstNet in the hands of responders,
13 meaning you may be a member of a local volunteer
14 fire department, we'll give you so much off on
15 your phone, we'll move you over to our FirstNet
16 system to be able to help you do your job as a
17 volunteer firefighter. So nationwide there's been
18 a heavy push for this.

19 MR. PERRONE: And overall would the
20 FirstNet service improve or enhance your existing
21 emergency services capabilities?

22 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): The way we
23 perform it, the way we perform now under normal
24 circumstances there's not a lot of difference.
25 Well, in cases where many years ago, for example,

1 we had an explosion in a gas power plant, that was
2 a very large-scale event, in that type of a
3 situation most likely it could, but calls came in
4 from 15, 20 miles away, it was a lot of activity.
5 And now compared to then with the number of cell
6 phones that are out, it could have an impact. We
7 take 25,000 911 calls a year. About 75 percent or
8 more are by cell phone, so it's significant now.

9 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. That's all I
10 have for the city.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
12 Perrone. We will now move on with
13 cross-examination of the city by Mr. Edelson
14 followed by Mr. Silvestri.

15 Mr. Edelson.

16 MR. EDELSON: Thank you, Mr.
17 Morissette. Mr. Bartolotta, staying with Question
18 Number 6. Back then in 2017 and the subsequent
19 engineering report in 2019, was one of the
20 considerations the space on the tower to fit
21 AT&T's antennas?

22 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): No. The
23 primary consideration was for the City of
24 Middletown. We knew we had a tower with, we'll
25 call it for lack of better words, X amount of

1 equipment, meaning we knew how many antennas and
2 how many microwaves we needed for our equipment.
3 If a vendor came along, AT&T or otherwise, and
4 wanted to entertain a discussion with the city on
5 available space that's on the tower, and we could
6 go through the engineering studies and would
7 determine if there were interference and all the
8 engineering studies that would determine if the
9 tower could hold that equipment, and we could come
10 to an agreement, we would. So whether it's AT&T,
11 Verizon or anybody else, we were willing to do
12 that. We've done that already on a city tower.

13 MR. EDELSON: Right. But as I read the
14 answer, it said -- what I read in the answer is it
15 was really a structural analysis that was the
16 reason that you couldn't go ahead. People wanted
17 to do this in 2017, but it was only the structure,
18 not the spacing. So I think I'm on the same --

19 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): That's
20 correct, yes, it's the structure. And my point to
21 you is anybody wanting to come on the tower would
22 have to do that type of analysis whether it's AT&T
23 or --

24 MR. EDELSON: I'm not arguing with the
25 conclusion. I just want to know if -- because

1 this had come up at the prior hearing about
2 whether or not there was enough space, and I
3 believe that was why AT&T included a couple of
4 photographs of your, more of a closeup of the
5 existing tower and all of the arrays. But as I
6 read your answer, it was consistent is this was
7 the structural capacity or the weight bearing
8 capacity of the current tower was insufficient to
9 add cellular equipment for AT&T and other
10 carriers.

11 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Yeah, in the
12 beginning we actually thought by adding some
13 height to the tower that that would give them some
14 additional room, but it had to be done by a
15 structural analysis first to see if that would be
16 able to work at all with what we had, and it
17 didn't.

18 MR. EDELSON: Okay. So maybe it really
19 wasn't the structural analysis, just based on the
20 weight and not the spacing was enough to say we
21 can't go forward.

22 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): That's
23 correct.

24 MR. EDELSON: And then could have been
25 a subsequent issue if it had shown itself to be

1 structurally capable, still might have had an
2 issue with the amount of equipment and where it
3 could be spaced so that everybody got the coverage
4 they're looking for.

5 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): We also had
6 issues with the, it was brought up on
7 reinforcement, but that wasn't able to be done
8 either.

9 MR. EDELSON: I'm sorry, some of your
10 words are a little mumbled for me. So it could be
11 on my end. If you could get closer.

12 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): So we also
13 looked at reinforcement, but that could not be
14 done in this case.

15 MR. EDELSON: Very good. Now, in
16 answer to Mr. Perrone's questions, you indicated
17 your concerns in terms of any kind of failure in
18 the process of switching over between one set of
19 equipment to another. And my question is, and you
20 made the valid point that sometimes these things
21 look good on paper and they go very smoothly on
22 paper, but in practice sometimes the real world
23 throws some boomerangs at us from time to time.

24 So my question is, in terms of your
25 experience with tower replacement, tower transfer,

1 what is your personal experience, either projects
2 you've worked on or people you've worked with, who
3 have tried to migrate from one tower to another?

4 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): I have no
5 experience with tower migration.

6 MR. EDELSON: And you are aware that at
7 the prior hearing Mr. Lavin from AT&T noted that
8 AT&T has done this, I don't remember how many
9 times, but several times, and it's something
10 they're comfortable with doing, at least that's
11 the impression I had from his answer.

12 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): They may
13 have done it. And I will tell you this from the
14 city's point, if we were -- we have eight or nine
15 sites. If we were at any other site except for
16 this, our prime site, it wouldn't be an issue.
17 It's because of this site and what's at that site
18 that makes it an issue.

19 MR. EDELSON: Okay. I appreciate that
20 answer.

21 Mr. Morissette, I think that's all my
22 questions at this point. Thank you.

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
24 Edelson. And we'll now continue with
25 cross-examination of the city --

1 MR. QUINLAN: I have a couple --

2 MR. MORISSETTE: -- by Mr. Silvestri
3 and then by Mr. Nguyen.

4 Mr. Quinlan, you had a quick question?

5 MR. QUINLAN: A couple questions, yes.
6 First off, could you give us an estimate of how
7 long it would take, how long the outage would be
8 going from your pole to the AT&T pole?

9 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): No, I
10 couldn't. I wouldn't be doing the work. It
11 wouldn't be my responsibility. I couldn't.

12 MR. QUINLAN: So maybe that's a better
13 question for AT&T then. All right. I'm good
14 then. Thank you.

15 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr.
16 Silvestri.

17 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr.
18 Morissette. And good afternoon, Director
19 Bartolotta.

20 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Good
21 afternoon.

22 MR. SILVESTRI: I have a couple
23 questions for you. First off, has the city been
24 in a situation where that communication system has
25 failed?

1 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): No.

2 MR. SILVESTRI: No, okay. My second
3 question --

4 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): I'm sorry,
5 it went online November 2019.

6 MR. SILVESTRI: Great. Thank you. The
7 second one I have for you, has the city found it
8 necessary to replace any antennae or supporting
9 equipment since that construction?

10 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): No.

11 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you also.
12 Actually, the last question I have, do you have a
13 contingency plan for communication outages?

14 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): So what
15 happens, and I'm not going to get too, too
16 technical, but what happens in the 800 P25
17 trunking system, what happens is the sites go into
18 what they call site trunking, and communications
19 would be able to take place between the field
20 units, other sites would be able to hear them.
21 Let me qualify that. Other sites that are able to
22 hear the radios talking would be able to hear them
23 and they would have communications. You would
24 lose the communications between that site and the
25 dispatch center. The dispatch center would have

1 to go onto a rudimentary form of backup radios to
2 use to get into the system to be able to talk to
3 those responders. But what would happen
4 essentially is in that section of town you would
5 lose all coverage because that's, in addition to
6 being the master site, that's a site that covers a
7 great area in northern Middletown. So no, we've
8 been lucky not to have it, but if you have it, you
9 have a problem, it's a fairly serious problem.

10 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. And if I
11 heard correctly, you called that site "trunking";
12 is that correct?

13 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Site
14 trunking.

15 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you.

16 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): We have an
17 800 megahertz trunk radio system.

18 MR. SILVESTRI: Trunking, okay. And
19 the dispatch center that you just mentioned,
20 that's located on Miles Lane?

21 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): No, the
22 dispatch center is located on 169 Cross Street,
23 and it's tied into Mile Lane by a microwave.

24 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you.
25 That's all the questions that I have. Thank you,

1 Mr. Morissette.

2 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
3 Silvestri. We will now continue with
4 cross-examination of the city by Mr. Nguyen
5 followed by Mr. Lynch.

6 Mr. Nguyen.

7 MR. NGUYEN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.
8 Good afternoon, Mr. Bartolotta.

9 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Good
10 afternoon.

11 MR. NGUYEN: Good afternoon. There was
12 a question from Mr. Silvestri that there was no
13 downtime since the system, the City of
14 Middletown's safety network went online in 2019;
15 is that right?

16 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Yes.

17 MR. NGUYEN: That's wonderful. One of
18 the concerns that I gather is that the City of
19 Middletown is concerned with the continuity of the
20 emergency network, and it's a valid concern. But
21 to the extent that no system is infallible, to the
22 extent that if the interruption of services or
23 continuity of services can be maintained, if you
24 will, between parties, obviously we do not want,
25 you know, we try to minimize, if not eliminate,

1 any hiccup. So put that aside. Is the city
2 concerned or does the city have any concern
3 regarding whether, whichever option at the end of
4 this proceeding they would end up with, either
5 having an additional tower or a new tower to
6 accommodate all safety networks?

7 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): We do have a
8 concern and our concern is this: If we're sitting
9 here today and we have a failure, okay, in our
10 system and we go to our backup systems for site
11 trunking because of some type of a computer
12 element that goes bad, we respond to that, we can
13 repair that in a set period of time. And that's
14 an accidental thing, it's something that happens.

15 When you purposely take down the
16 network and you lose control over part of your
17 city for radio to move to another site or to do
18 any of those other things, you've caused that
19 issue, during that period of time the city is
20 concerned with what happens -- we're by a high
21 school. What happens if there's an event at the
22 high school at the time when this equipment is
23 down. There will be no communications in the high
24 school, I guarantee it, because there was poor
25 communications when we had our past system.

1 That's why we went to this type of system. So
2 that's our overall concern. And really there's
3 nobody, nobody on this call, nobody that can call
4 me that will tell me that we could take the -- put
5 up a light tower next to it and we can plug this
6 in, I'll plug this and plug this in it, and you'll
7 be up and running in an hour. Not going to
8 happen, just wouldn't work.

9 MR. NGUYEN: Yes, and I just want to
10 ask you that, were you aware that in the State of
11 Connecticut there are towers that other
12 municipalities are sharing their safety network on
13 the same towers?

14 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): I don't have
15 a problem with sharing. The location on that now
16 is 169 Cross Street. We're sharing our tower,
17 it's a city owned tower, with Verizon. We don't
18 have a problem with that. That's not a problem.
19 And if this tower was big enough to be able to
20 support the equipment proposed by AT&T or another
21 vendor, we don't have a problem with that either.
22 But my whole problem revolves around the downtime
23 that would occur in the process.

24 MR. NGUYEN: So assuming that the new
25 tower structurally can support AT&T's facility,

1 City of Middletown's facilities and other
2 carriers' facilities, would that be a concern for
3 City of Middletown?

4 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): The only
5 concern would be the time between, the loss
6 between the old tower and the new tower. A new
7 tower is not a concern. That's not a problem for
8 us. It's the convergence of equipment from one
9 tower to the other and that downtime.

10 MR. NGUYEN: Okay. And one last
11 question. In terms of the downtime, and you
12 mentioned that the City of Middletown has not
13 experienced any downtime since 2019, even now two
14 years pass by, any weather, you know, inclement
15 weather or technical issues even for a short
16 period of time?

17 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Not with
18 this system, and more importantly, not relating to
19 that site. We could have another site go, lose
20 connection, if you will, another site in another
21 part of town lose connection, but it's not as
22 critical as this overall site. Given the
23 microwave links that go to the dispatch center,
24 the microwave links that link us to the state to
25 give us statewide coverage for our responders,

1 this is the critical site. Any other site we
2 wouldn't have as much issue with a little bit of
3 downtime. This is the master site. It's what
4 runs it all.

5 MR. NGUYEN: Okay. Thank you very
6 much. That's all I have, Mr. Morissette.

7 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen.
8 We will now continue with cross-examination by Mr.
9 Lynch followed by Ms. Cooley.

10 Mr. Lynch.

11 MR. LYNCH: Mr. Bartolotta, if I could
12 just get a clarification on the cutover that we've
13 been talking about here. It's my understanding
14 from your testimony that there is no time period
15 that you feel comfortable with for the cutover to
16 a new tower; is that correct?

17 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): I feel very
18 uncomfortable with any loss of time or signal to
19 that tower. However, if somebody says I can do it
20 in an hour, you and I both know that the chances
21 are that it's going to take longer, a problem will
22 occur and then it will put us into a longer time
23 frame that exposes the city. We have responders
24 out there that we're responsible to be able to
25 hear their call for help or their ability to help

1 other people that call us for help. And, you
2 know, it's a critical site. It's a critical site
3 not only for the system, but it's a critical site
4 RF wise, radio wise to be able to hear our
5 responders from. That's what we're concerned
6 about.

7 MR. LYNCH: Understood. You mentioned
8 the FirstNet system. We've encountered them on a
9 lot of different towers and there's never been a
10 problem with interference. Why is it a problem
11 here?

12 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): I don't have
13 a problem with FirstNet.

14 MR. LYNCH: Then I misunderstood you.
15 Sorry.

16 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): What
17 generally happens is there's a study done, an
18 engineered study that says, whether it's a
19 FirstNet issue or whether it's other RF sites, you
20 do a test to make sure that there's no
21 interference. We use cell sites as part of our
22 radio system, and we've provided the owners of the
23 towers with studies that show we won't interfere
24 with your stuff. So no, I'm not concerned with
25 interference.

1 MR. LYNCH: Is there a set distance
2 between the radio equipment on the towers and the
3 antennae on the tower to prevent interference with
4 frequency?

5 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): The distance
6 between the tower and the physical shelter,
7 they're right next to each other. They're right
8 there. The tower is probably 20 feet away from,
9 or less, away from the shelter, if that's what
10 you're asking.

11 MR. LYNCH: Sorry, I'm having a hard
12 time hearing. Could you repeat that, Mr.
13 Bartolotta? I'm sorry.

14 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): No problem.
15 The tower is in a compound right next to the radio
16 shelter. So the cables from the antennas come
17 down under, and there's a short tray that brings
18 the antenna cables into the shelter. They're
19 right next to each other.

20 MR. LYNCH: All right. Thank you.
21 Those are my questions, Mr. Morissette.

22 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Lynch.
23 We will now continue with cross-examination by Ms.
24 Cooley followed by Mr. Quinlan.

25 Ms. Cooley.

1 MS. COOLEY: Good afternoon, Director
2 Bartolotta. Most of my questions have been
3 answered, but I just had a couple questions that
4 are maybe more for curiosity sake in trying to
5 understand how the timeline has worked here. In
6 number 6 you start by saying in 2017 AT&T
7 expressed interest in the facility for its
8 FirstNet program. The tower wasn't constructed at
9 that time; is that correct?

10 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): No,
11 everything was underway.

12 MS. COOLEY: Underway. So at that
13 point in the process was it too difficult or too
14 late to look at the proposed tower to see whether
15 or not at that time it would be appropriate for --
16 I'm just talking about the FirstNet equipment at
17 that time. Could it have been redesigned to
18 accommodate that?

19 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): So the one
20 thing I do have experience with is this: We've
21 had, we've leased towers from AT&T for this
22 project. We've leased towers from American Tower,
23 SBA. They don't move for anything. They'll come,
24 they'll give you interest in something. Two years
25 later maybe they'll call you back, maybe they

1 won't. So this was a project, and especially this
2 site we couldn't wait for them to say, oh, let's
3 do this. I mean, this has been going on and on
4 for quite some time. And if I would have waited
5 for them, we never would have had a radio system.
6 We just kept proceeding. Either they were going
7 to be onboard or they weren't. And really, as
8 time went on, they weren't, and then they circled
9 back. You know, it must be like a gigantic list
10 of things to do, they'll get to it when they get
11 to it.

12 MS. COOLEY: Sure. So after that
13 initial expression of interest, there was no
14 further communications during the process?

15 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): No.

16 MS. COOLEY: All right. I think that
17 really is the only other question that I had.
18 Thank you very much.

19 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): You're
20 welcome.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Ms. Cooley.
22 We'll now continue with cross-examination by Mr.
23 Quinlan followed by myself.

24 Mr. Quinlan.

25 MR. QUINLAN: I have no further

1 questions at this time.

2 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
3 Quinlan.

4 I have a few follow-up questions, Mr.
5 Bartolotta. And good afternoon, by the way.

6 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Good
7 afternoon.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Now, looking at the
9 structural analysis that was provided as part of
10 the application, they provided an inventory of the
11 equipment that you have on the existing tower.
12 And I see that you have three whip antennas and
13 two microwaves; is that correct?

14 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): That's
15 correct.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: And then you have a
17 lightning rod that goes up to 182 feet.

18 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): That's
19 correct.

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Now, your current
21 structure is approximately 180 feet; is that
22 right?

23 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Yes.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: And your highest whip
25 antenna, I believe, starts at 150 and goes as high

1 as 157. Am I --

2 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): I wouldn't
3 disagree with you. Off the top of my head, I
4 don't know.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. That seems to
6 be what they're indicating. What I'm trying to
7 get to is you offered two potential alternatives
8 that you looked at, one was reinforce and one was
9 to construct a new self-supporting lattice
10 structure, but what's not discussed is the
11 possibility of a monopole. And I'm curious as to,
12 if we had a monopole as proposed here at 150, why
13 your equipment couldn't go onto a 150 foot high
14 monopole given that the highest piece of equipment
15 is installed at around 150 so your whip would go
16 above it. Have you given any thought to that and
17 can provide some feedback as to why a monopole
18 wasn't looked at and why it doesn't work?

19 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): The monopole
20 was looked at, and it was looked at for the
21 purpose of the second tower at the facility. And
22 with us, whether our equipment went from the
23 current tower to a monopole, you still have the
24 same transfer problem and continuity issue.

25 The second thing is, with our tower we

1 don't have a limitation to if we want to add
2 additional equipment. For example, that site
3 there is where our emergency operations center is.
4 Our people in the emergency operations center have
5 talked about for the past year or so of adding
6 amateur radio, very high frequency radios, and
7 using an antenna on that tower. If we have that
8 tower, we have space on that tower, we could do
9 other city functions with that tower with the
10 space we have. If we're on a monopole, we have
11 limited space that would be available for the
12 city. We own that tower. We wouldn't own the
13 monopole. It's a bunch of things, but mainly it's
14 still you have to move the equipment from one
15 tower to the other that creates the problem for
16 us.

17 MR. MORISSETTE: Understood. So is it
18 possible to operate, for example, if you built a
19 new tower, whether it be a self-supporting or a
20 monopole, and you installed equipment on the new
21 structure, is it possible to run both systems in
22 parallel and when the new system is up and running
23 and fully functional then retire the second unit?

24 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): I'm not an
25 engineer, but I wouldn't think so. I'm just

1 talking, thinking from my perspective with
2 microwaves and stuff like that, there's an
3 alignment, and I don't know how that works. I
4 think, once again, it's something that looks real
5 good on a piece of paper, but I think in
6 practicality it's very difficult to undo. If
7 worse came to worse and it was ordered that there
8 was only going to be one tower, I would say the
9 best thing that the city would ask for then is the
10 regular lattice tower that is similar to what we
11 have now but fully sized. Because then we know,
12 as the city grows and we need more space on the
13 tower, we have this because of the size of the
14 physical tower itself where a monopole you're kind
15 of limited.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, yes, you are
17 limited, especially if other carriers go onto the
18 monopole.

19 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): And there's
20 also people that have concerns, and believe me,
21 and they're on plenty of monopoles, depending on
22 where the microwave is located on the monopole,
23 there could be some drift because of the type of
24 pole, some movement is what I'm told, but I see
25 plenty of microwaves on monopoles, and that would

1 be concerning for us too.

2 MR. MORISSETTE: Certainly. But as far
3 as your equipment that you have now concerning the
4 three whips and the two microwaves, it's not out
5 of the realm of possibility to install that onto a
6 monopole with cell equipment?

7 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Not out of
8 the realm of the possibility, I would be lying if
9 I said yes, but however, it puts the City of
10 Middletown into a large bind. The bind is now
11 we're handicapped as being able, if we want to add
12 more antennas for our emergency operations center,
13 it's difficult; and second, once again, we lose
14 the continuity of operations. So if we had to
15 have a replacement antenna, it was so ordered to
16 be a replacement antenna, a monopole would not --
17 the city wouldn't be happy with the monopole. We
18 want a full-fledged lattice tower that would give
19 us sufficient room for expansion.

20 MR. MORISSETTE: So you would want a
21 self-supporting lattice structure at 180 feet?

22 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Yes.

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Is that correct?

24 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Yes.

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you for that

1 clarification. Okay.

2 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): But still
3 not in favor of it.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, understood.
5 Thank you. All right. That's all the questions
6 that I have. Thank you so much.

7 We'll now continue with
8 cross-examination of the city by the Applicant,
9 Attorney Fisher.

10 MR. FISHER: Yes. Thank you, Chairman,
11 I do have some questions.

12 Thank you, Director Bartolotta, for
13 being here today and for your work on this
14 project. You mentioned that you had a little bit
15 over 40 years of experience with the City of
16 Middletown in various capacities. Could you talk
17 a little bit about what the US Military's use of
18 the property at 499 Mile Lane had been up until
19 its ownership ceased in 2012?

20 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Sure. In
21 the fifties, in the mid fifties it was a Nike
22 missile site, and it housed three silos there for
23 missiles, and this was during the cold war era.
24 These missiles were designed to go up in the air
25 and explode to take down any bombers before they

1 were able to let their payloads go. And it was
2 controlled from a different location but the silos
3 were there.

4 In the seventies it got turned over to
5 the army, and the army reserves took it over. And
6 by 1987 they had built a new building there and it
7 was used for a reserve base. And at one point in
8 the 2000s the BRAC Commission determined that this
9 is one facility they wanted to get rid of, and the
10 City of Middletown actively pursued it for some
11 time for its public safety operations, and we were
12 finally able to do that in I believe it was 2010.

13 MR. FISHER: Thank you. And what
14 activities occur at the site now since the city
15 acquired ownership of it?

16 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): So we have
17 our emergency operations center, and that facility
18 is where the mayor, the department heads go in
19 times of emergency and coordinate emergency
20 activities that are going on for the city, floods,
21 storms, all that type of information, all that
22 flows into there to assist our responders out into
23 the field. And that would be run 24/7 until the
24 disaster would be over. It's also used for public
25 safety training. We have classrooms set up there,

1 and we do training for police and fire and both
2 inside and outside. The fire department has done
3 some trench rescue in that area. And lastly,
4 since COVID we've used that as a vaccination and
5 testing site for municipal people.

6 MR. FISHER: And since the city
7 acquired it for that purpose, have you had to
8 invoke it for emergency preparedness purposes for
9 a natural disaster or any other threat?

10 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): I think
11 there was once or twice. It wasn't anything
12 serious. But before we were kind of limited, we
13 were in city hall and the space was a small space
14 and we had limited abilities in that space, and we
15 were able to move out there and be able to do that
16 with plenty of space and remotely.

17 MR. FISHER: Thank you. And are you
18 aware of any -- or are there any city plans beyond
19 what you just described for the property or is
20 that just simply future flexibility for the city
21 in terms of what happens there?

22 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Well, the
23 city has always talked about, or at least I always
24 talked about to the city, a relocation of the
25 city's 911 center there. There's plenty of

1 property. That's one of the things that we're
2 looking at. Originally the state was looking at
3 putting a state fire school there. That didn't
4 come through because of funding. But there have
5 been several potential projects on the burner over
6 the years.

7 MR. FISHER: You talked about it a
8 little bit earlier in some of your responses to
9 prior questions. Could you just talk a little bit
10 more about why this site itself is important for
11 purposes of the coverage it provides for city
12 first responder communications? I'm thinking
13 about, for example, the high school and some of
14 the other areas you talked about geographically in
15 the city.

16 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Okay. So we
17 went to this new radio system because we had a
18 problem overall with city-wide coverage for our
19 responders. And one of the things we did in our
20 RFP is we said to vendors was we needed to have 95
21 percent in-building coverage for our responders.
22 In order to do that you have to have certain
23 things, certain equipment in certain places. Now,
24 we had equipment in certain places in the city in
25 our old system, and many years ago when the FCC

1 did its narrowbanding we lost a lot of coverage.

2 So when we had this RFP proposed, an
3 engineering study was done to determine where best
4 we can locate our equipment to be able to provide
5 and get that 95 percent in-building coverage, and
6 that particular site was the best one in that
7 area. And that covers the northern part of our
8 city as well as into Cromwell and beyond for our
9 first responders.

10 MR. FISHER: And can you just
11 generally, we don't need specifics, but can you
12 just talk generally about the volume of call
13 responses that first responders rely on that tower
14 for and what the agencies involved are, what their
15 missions are?

16 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Sure. So we
17 dispatch for police, fire and medical people as
18 well as emergency management, and we take about
19 25,000 911 calls a year. We do about 40,000
20 police calls. We also cover the Town of Portland
21 through an interlocal agreement, which we've been
22 doing since the late nineties, and we've been
23 doing it very successfully. And we have equipment
24 in Portland at two different locations, one at
25 their high school and one at a private cell

1 carrier, and we're able to maintain coverage
2 throughout as well on our system. So the system
3 works, it works well, it works the way it was
4 designed to do, and we're pleased with it.

5 MR. FISHER: So some of the design work
6 that went into it for the city, I guess it didn't
7 surprise you when AT&T was talking about this
8 location for themselves then.

9 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): No. No, we
10 knew about the general cell phone coverage in the
11 area not being that great, so no it didn't
12 surprise us at all.

13 MR. FISHER: And would that include
14 some of the in-building situations at the high
15 school and other areas in that part of the city as
16 well?

17 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): The Board of
18 Education staff complained for a long time about
19 coverage in the building for cell phones in
20 general.

21 MR. FISHER: I want to fast forward a
22 little bit to some of the conversations you had
23 with AT&T previously. So after the structural
24 analysis was done in 2019 and shared with the
25 city, I understand that you and some AT&T

1 representatives kind of regrouped to look at some
2 options; is that right?

3 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Yes.

4 MR. FISHER: And my understanding, at
5 least, is you looked at three options, the
6 existing tower and foundation, whether or not
7 there could be a reinforcement plan, what the
8 industry would call a drop and swap for this much
9 bigger lattice tower we're talking about, and then
10 the third option being the addition of this second
11 monopole tower at the site. Are those the three
12 basic options that were discussed?

13 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Yes, that's
14 correct.

15 MR. FISHER: And at that time the city
16 and AT&T didn't talk about other properties the
17 city might own like the high school or others for
18 siting of a new tower?

19 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): No.

20 MR. FISHER: And that was in, was that
21 in about the spring of 2019?

22 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Yes.

23 MR. FISHER: Okay. And the first
24 option, I take it from your testimony, was pretty
25 much the parties agreed it was pretty unlikely

1 from a structural point of view, so that was
2 really not on the table, and reinforcement; is
3 that fair to say?

4 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Yeah, I
5 believe it was the structure of the tower and the
6 structure of the foundation.

7 MR. FISHER: And the second option from
8 your testimony earlier obviously presents concerns
9 from you, I take it, on the cutover and the
10 outages that might occur for the city's purposes?

11 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Yes.

12 MR. FISHER: All right. The third
13 option, can you just talk about why that was
14 chosen and why that, at least for your purposes,
15 balanced the city's interest in this project?

16 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Well, I
17 think the third option was twofold. One, it
18 didn't interfere or create a downtime for the
19 city. The second, aesthetically, once the package
20 was provided to the city, because we originally
21 wanted to have -- I guess I originally wanted to
22 have one of those, a monopine that looks like a
23 tree, solid antenna type of deal, to cut down the
24 aesthetic, the displeasing aesthetic for the
25 neighbors in the area.

1 And you in your package included
2 renderings of the two differences between a
3 regular monopole and the monopine. And the
4 monopine stuck out like a sore thumb, and the
5 monopole to me was less intrusive. Although it's
6 a pole, you know, it would have antennas on it, it
7 kind of blended with our current tower, and I
8 thought that the look was a better look versus the
9 monopine. And once again, there was no cutover
10 issues.

11 MR. FISHER: I'd like to talk just a
12 little bit about this, what we would call a drop
13 and swap, but building a new lattice tower for
14 reference. Location where the existing tower is,
15 what concerns would you have with that size tower
16 given the building, the access roads, do you think
17 you could really build something right where the
18 existing tower is or would it have to move, if
19 that was the project?

20 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Well, I'm
21 not an engineer. I think it would be difficult.
22 There's some questions in the area, and we have to
23 do the site borings, we have to do all that kind
24 of testing that is done prior to that. I would
25 think that that would be my first concern whether

1 that could be done at all. Once again, I think it
2 would be difficult but, you know, I wouldn't say
3 it would be impossible.

4 However, I would definitely say that,
5 and my concern, again, is for the general
6 neighborhood, that if the tower is sufficient for
7 the city to continue to provide services the way
8 we provide services beyond the next 10 or 15 years
9 and you put up the bigger tower, the lattice
10 tower, the bigger lattice tower, which is what we
11 would need, I think the aesthetics is much more
12 displeasing than the second monopole. So I think
13 the monopole is the way to go.

14 MR. FISHER: Thank you for your
15 testimony today.

16 I have no further questions, Chair.

17 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
18 Fisher. We'll now continue with cross-examination
19 of --

20 MR. LYNCH: Mr. Morissette.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, Mr. Lynch, go
22 ahead.

23 MR. LYNCH: You know my situation.
24 This may be a good time for me to leave and not
25 interrupt anybody in their testimony.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you,
2 Mr. Lynch.

3 MR. LYNCH: So if you'll excuse me,
4 I'll depart.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Have a
6 nice holiday.

7 (Whereupon, Mr. Lynch left the
8 hearing.)

9 MR. MORISSETTE: We'll now continue
10 with cross-examination of the city by Talias
11 Trail, Mr. Barbagallo, Ms. Pugliares and
12 Mr. Siteman.

13 Mr. Barbagallo, please commence your
14 cross-examination.

15 MR. BARBAGALLO: Thank you. Director
16 Bartolotta, you had mentioned that there was talks
17 in the past or there's been considerations of
18 using the site for different projects. Is the
19 city currently considering or talking with any of
20 these organizations of using that site for one
21 reason or another?

22 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): One
23 organization is the city itself. I will say
24 there's nothing active that I'm aware of, but I'm
25 just the director of communications. I wouldn't

1 know. I mean, our planning people might know
2 something. I don't see anything in the immediate
3 future, but the idea about that whole site, one of
4 the things that the city liked about it was the
5 amount of room that they had available. When that
6 was going to be a training center for the state
7 fire school, there was going to be an active fire
8 station there and there was going to be training
9 props and the classrooms inside, and that was the
10 last plan. And then that failed because of state
11 bonding. So I can say right now that there's
12 nothing I'm aware of active in the hopper. But
13 I'm not a Common Council member, I'm not the
14 mayor, so I wouldn't be the best to ask.

15 MR. BARBAGALLO: Okay. Thank you. And
16 like you mentioned in the past, there's been
17 training done there by firefighters as recently as
18 this summer. Would that continue if the tower was
19 put in place?

20 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Yes.

21 MR. BARBAGALLO: Okay. So with the
22 tower being approved and built and in place, how
23 would that affect either the training or
24 considerations for other projects using the land?

25 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): Depending on

1 where the physical tower is put, I don't think
2 that that's an issue. I think where to put the
3 physical tower is the biggest issue in relation to
4 where the city's equipment is now at the shelter
5 there.

6 MR. BARBAGALLO: Okay. So would it be
7 a fair statement that the tower's position greatly
8 affects the use of the facility and the rest of
9 the available land?

10 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): It could.
11 Hypothetically, if the only place to put the tower
12 would be north of the physical shelter, it's right
13 in the middle of an access road, it goes to the
14 back to the police impound lot, you know, so
15 there's different areas it could impact. It
16 depends on where the property is best to be able
17 to put that tower. And since I'm not an engineer,
18 I just don't know.

19 MR. BARBAGALLO: Okay. And I'm sure
20 you reviewed the plans from AT&T with the site
21 plans showing their proposed location. As
22 proposed, do you think that that would have an
23 effect?

24 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): As proposed,
25 looking closer to the Talias Trail side of the

1 current tower, if I'm not mistaken, is that
2 correct?

3 MR. BARBAGALLO: Well, I think there
4 was an adjustment due to the wetlands, but I
5 obviously can't speak directly to that, but based
6 on the plans in the application.

7 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): No, site
8 wise, and I'm not as much as concerned in that
9 general area of the current tower or back, it
10 doesn't concern me as much as the downtime and all
11 the necessary things you need to do because of the
12 downtime. I'm worried about the downtime, I'm
13 worried about the distance from the tower to the
14 shelter. They have things that calculate like
15 cable loss and stuff like that. Once again, I'm
16 not an engineer, but the general overall
17 operations of the current site the way it is, is
18 my main concern.

19 MR. BARBAGALLO: What is the concern of
20 the distance, aside from, you know, the fall
21 radius, what is the concern from the tower being
22 too close to the shelter?

23 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): I'm not
24 concerned with it being too close. I'm concerned
25 with it being too far.

1 MR. BARBAGALLO: All right. Thank you.
2 I have no further questions.

3 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
4 Barbagallo. We'll now turn to Ms. Pugliares.

5 MS. PUGLIARES: I have no further
6 questions at this time.

7 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. And
8 Mr. Siteman?

9 MR. SITEMAN: Thank you. Director
10 Bartolotta, the first question is, I believe you
11 sort of answered it already earlier but I just
12 want to clarify, back in 2019 when you began
13 discussions with AT&T or you were talking to AT&T
14 and you determined the existing tower wasn't
15 sufficient to put AT&T's equipment up there, were
16 any alternative sites on Middletown property
17 offered?

18 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): We looked at
19 a couple sites, a couple alternative sites, one by
20 Lawrence School, that's it, Lawrence School, and
21 because of the location and because of the
22 elevation, that didn't work out for them. I think
23 there was a look closer to the high school, but
24 I'm not a hundred percent sure. I would check
25 with AT&T. But I know Lawrence School was one of

1 the places we looked.

2 MR. SITEMAN: And you said the reason
3 is because of location and elevation. Could you
4 elaborate on that?

5 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): You're best
6 asking AT&T about that because it was their people
7 that did the study. There's a big picture on how
8 coverage gets done. There's a mapping program.
9 They look at the topographical maps and the
10 elevations between point A and point B. Mile Lane
11 is significantly higher or is higher than where
12 the school is and how tall of a tower could you
13 put there at the school, there's a lot of things
14 that they looked at and it was more beneficial to
15 have it at Mile Lane.

16 MR. SITEMAN: Okay. And are you aware
17 of any city-owned properties nearby Mile Lane that
18 you feel could be potentially considered?

19 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): No, I'm
20 really not even in the tower business to be honest
21 with you. They approached me, I did my due
22 diligence on behalf of the city. And I'll be
23 honest with you, we're just trying to do the best
24 for the city and the taxpayers.

25 MR. SITEMAN: Okay. And if you had to

1 compare these two options, one being building a
2 new tower and there's downtime in your emergency
3 system compared to AT&T selecting an alternative
4 site, what's the stance of the Town of Middletown?

5 THE WITNESS (Bartolotta): It's pretty
6 simple. We don't want any downtime. We don't
7 want any downtime.

8 MR. SITEMAN: Okay. That's all I have.
9 I appreciate your time. Thank you.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you,
11 Mr. Siteman.

12 We will now continue with the
13 appearance of the applicant, New Cingular Wireless
14 PCS, LLC, also known as AT&T, to swear in their
15 witness, Kelly Wade Bettuchi, and to verify the
16 new exhibits marked as Roman Numeral II, Items B-6
17 and 7 on the hearing program. And Attorney
18 Bachman will administer the oath.

19 K E L L Y W A D E B E T T U C H I,

20 called as a witness, being first duly sworn
21 (remotely) by Ms. Bachman, was examined and
22 testified on her oath as follows:

23 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you.

24 S C O T T P I K E,

25 M A R T I N L A V I N,

1 B R I A N G A U D E T,

2 D A N I E L H A M M,

3 called as witnesses, being previously duly
4 sworn (remotely) by Ms. Bachman, continued to
5 testify on their oaths as follows:

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
7 Bachman.

8 Attorney Fisher, please begin by
9 identifying the new exhibits you have filed in
10 this matter and verifying the exhibits with the
11 appropriate sworn witness.

12 DIRECT EXAMINATION

13 MR. FISHER: Good afternoon. Thank
14 you. In the hearing program listed under Roman
15 Numeral II-B, 6 and 7 there are two documents
16 identified. One includes the applicant's
17 supplemental filings and response to the Council's
18 request for late exhibits and information, dated
19 December 13, 2021. And then Item Number 7 is the
20 prefile testimony of Ms. Bettuchi who was just
21 sworn.

22 I would ask, we have a full panel of
23 witnesses, they're all here and present virtually
24 in different locations, I would ask each of the
25 witnesses the following questions related to Item

1 Number 6. Other than the memorandum that was
2 provided by our office to the Council, did you
3 prepare and assist in the preparation of the
4 documents so identified?

5 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin.

6 Yes.

7 THE WITNESS (Bettuchi): Kelly

8 Bettuchi. Yes.

9 THE WITNESS (Hamm): Dan Hamm. Yes.

10 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Brian Gaudet

11 Yes.

12 THE WITNESS (Pike): Scott Pike. Yes.

13 MR. FISHER: And in preparing for your
14 continued testimony here today, have you reviewed
15 the document, and is there any correction or
16 modification that you wish to make at this time?

17 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin.

18 No.

19 THE WITNESS (Bettuchi): Kelly

20 Bettuchi. No.

21 THE WITNESS (Hamm): Dan Hamm. No.

22 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Brian Gaudet.

23 No.

24 THE WITNESS (Pike): Scott Pike. No.

25 MR. FISHER: And on review of the

1 documents, is it true and accurate to the best of
2 your belief?

3 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin.

4 Yes.

5 THE WITNESS (Bettuchi): Kelly

6 Bettuchi. Yes.

7 THE WITNESS (Hamm): Daniel Hamm. Yes.

8 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Brian Gaudet.

9 Yes.

10 THE WITNESS (Pike): Scott Pike. Yes.

11 MR. FISHER: And do you adopt it here
12 as your testimony this afternoon?

13 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin.

14 Yes.

15 THE WITNESS (Bettuchi): Kelly

16 Bettuchi. Yes.

17 THE WITNESS (Hamm): Daniel Hamm. Yes.

18 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Brian Gaudet.

19 Yes.

20 THE WITNESS (Pike): Scott Pike. Yes.

21 MR. FISHER: And then, Ms. Bettuchi,
22 with respect to Item Number 7, did you prepare the
23 document, are there any corrections, is it true
24 and accurate, and do adopt it here today as your
25 testimony?

1 THE WITNESS (Bettuchi): I do.

2 MR. FISHER: Thank you. Chairman, I
3 would ask that the Council accept all of the
4 documents as exhibits in the proceeding.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
6 Fisher. Does any party object to the admission of
7 the applicant's exhibits?

8 Attorney Forte?

9 MR. FORTE: The city has no objections.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Talias
11 Trail, Mr. Barbagallo?

12 MR. BARBAGALLO: No objection.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Ms.
14 Pugliares?

15 MS. PUGLIARES: No objection.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. And
17 Mr. Siteman?

18 MR. SITEMAN: No objection.

19 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. The
20 exhibits are hereby admitted.

21 (Applicant's Exhibits II-B-6 and
22 II-B-7: Received in evidence - described in
23 index.)

24 MR. MORISSETTE: We'll now continue
25 with cross-examination of the applicant by the

1 Council starting with Mr. Perrone and then
2 followed by Mr. Edelson.

3 Mr. Perrone.

4 CROSS-EXAMINATION

5 MR. PERRONE: Thank you, Mr.
6 Morissette. Regarding the alternative of a new
7 tower for both the city and AT&T, what options
8 exist to cut over equipment to such a new tower?

9 THE WITNESS (Lavin): This is Martin
10 Lavin. In order to meet the city's requirement
11 for no disruption, we would basically have to
12 completely recreate their Mile Lane communication
13 system on the new facility once it's built,
14 antennas, transmission lines, radios. I'm not an
15 expert on P25 or project 25, so I don't know
16 exactly how much there is there, but it sounds
17 like all of that would have to be duplicated and
18 run in parallel to be ready to do what we call a
19 hot cutover once everything is tested and shown to
20 be running on the new system, switch over to it in
21 the middle of the night, and if anything goes
22 wrong, have the original system available to
23 switch back to.

24 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Sorry. To add
25 to that, Mr. Perrone, they would also need to,

1 with the microwave links, new microwave shots
2 would need to be set up and verified both at the
3 other locations, the dispatch, and one additional
4 location prior to that cutover.

5 MR. PERRONE: Generally how has AT&T
6 handled such cutovers at other sites in the past?

7 THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's hard -- this
8 is Martin Lavin again. It's hard to make an
9 analogy here. Previously I didn't realize the
10 extent to which this is the hub of the Middletown
11 system. I don't know if I have an analogy to it,
12 but this is certainly more complicated given that
13 it's pretty much the core of their whole emergency
14 communication system.

15 MR. PERRONE: Moving on to the FirstNet
16 topic, does AT&T and FirstNet work together to
17 determine which sites are prioritized?

18 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes, they do.
19 This is Martin Lavin.

20 MR. PERRONE: Is FirstNet a subscriber
21 service for local emergency entities?

22 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes, it is.

23 MR. PERRONE: And would FirstNet, the
24 FirstNet equipment operate completely
25 independently from the town's emergency

1 communications?

2 THE WITNESS (Lavin): This is Martin
3 Lavin again. Yes, it would.

4 MR. PERRONE: Moving on to Late-File
5 Exhibit A, which is the number of small cell
6 facilities, and there's an estimate of 42 to 48 at
7 a minimum. My question is, do you have an
8 estimate of the cost to have such small cell
9 configuration?

10 THE WITNESS (Lavin): This is Martin
11 Lavin. I don't have the cost figures on that, no.

12 MR. PERRONE: Moving on to Late-File
13 Exhibit F, the last sentence of the response,
14 "Voice and data sessions for surrounding sites and
15 sectors in the direction of the proposed site are
16 performing below AT&T's standards and network
17 planning goals." My question is, could you tell
18 us more specifically about which areas are
19 underperforming?

20 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. Since the
21 last hearing we got AT&T to provide some more
22 detailed data. The four sites around it are all
23 underperforming. There's not, in the realm of
24 data it's not as it was in phone, phone calls are
25 all the same, they're either proceeding or not

1 proceeding at all, and a 1 or 2 percent blocking
2 rate was the bar, originally 2 percent, then 1
3 percent, and it kept going down.

4 Right now for data there is no specific
5 goal for AT&T's engineers. The overarching
6 objective is not to block or drop at the RF layer.
7 To that end, the data they've given us for the
8 four or five sites, I think actually it's five, on
9 a daily basis are having, with one exception at
10 least, 100 blocks or drops and in some cases over
11 1,000, which certainly does not fit the objective
12 of not blocking and dropping at the RF layer.

13 MR. PERRONE: Moving on to the backup
14 generator topic, I understand a diesel generator
15 is currently proposed. A question came up last
16 time about the availability of natural gas at the
17 site, and I believe the answer was that AT&T had
18 not looked into that. Does AT&T know at this time
19 if natural gas is available?

20 THE WITNESS (Pike): This is Scott Pike
21 from Smartlink. At this time we looked at a
22 diesel generator as well as propane, and from what
23 we got as far as numbers is that there's an issue
24 from a ground space perspective. So for a typical
25 diesel generator you're looking at around 200

1 square feet within the compound which has a
2 containment for the actual diesel itself. And
3 then with propane you're looking at more, 715
4 square feet, so it's a much more, larger
5 footprint. And with being so tight, you know,
6 obviously with the wetlands in this area it would
7 take up more ground space from that perspective.
8 So those are the numbers that we've kind of given
9 as far as the size of the actual site with the
10 actual backup generators. As far as natural gas
11 goes, we don't have -- we didn't have anything on
12 that.

13 MR. PERRONE: And getting to your
14 comment about the area, is the diesel generator
15 more compact because the generator and fuel tank
16 is one unit?

17 THE WITNESS (Pike): Yes, correct. In
18 the propane you have an additional, obviously a
19 tank. And as I said, you go from 200 square foot
20 to 750 square foot which is much larger.

21 MR. PERRONE: Okay. Lastly, I'd like
22 to move to the wildlife topic. On tab 11 of the
23 supplemental information there's a letter from the
24 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding the
25 northern long-eared bat, and there's also mention

1 at the bottom of the page about how the
2 determination does not apply to the monarch
3 butterfly, an ESA protected species. My question
4 is, on the federal level I understand it's ESA
5 protected, but does it have any special
6 designation, be it threatened or endangered, or is
7 it just a general ESA species?

8 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Are you asking
9 for the monarch butterfly itself?

10 MR. PERRONE: Yes.

11 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): It's a species
12 that's in consideration. So it's not technically
13 classified as threatened or endangered yet, but
14 it's certainly a species of special concern.

15 MR. PERRONE: How would the proposed
16 project impact the monarch butterfly?

17 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): There would be
18 no impact, no adverse impact, as currently
19 proposed.

20 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. That's all I
21 have for AT&T.

22 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
23 Perrone. We'll now move on with cross-examination
24 by Mr. Edelson followed by Mr. Silvestri.

25 Mr. Edelson.

1 MR. EDELSON: I switched my setup here.
2 Can you hear me okay?

3 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, I can hear you
4 fine. Thank you.

5 MR. EDELSON: All right. I was having
6 trouble hearing, so I tried this different unit
7 which I don't often use.

8 Mr. Morissette, I was wondering if this
9 was not a good time for a break. Maybe it's just
10 my own personal preference but --

11 MR. MORISSETTE: We can do that. Why
12 don't we move to a break and we'll reconvene at
13 3:30.

14 MR. EDELSON: Thank you.

15 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, all.

16 (Whereupon, a recess was taken from
17 3:23 p.m. until 3:30 p.m.)

18 MR. MORISSETTE: Mr. Edelson, please
19 continue with your cross-examination.

20 MR. EDELSON: Thank you, Mr.
21 Morissette. Thank you for that little break.

22 I think my first question is for
23 Mr. Pike. And this is in regard to how AT&T got
24 to this position. If I understand correctly, AT&T
25 in a sense wanted to work with an existing tower

1 and put all of its equipment or necessary
2 equipment on that existing tower in Middletown to
3 meet a need, and that's why you really didn't do,
4 from what I can understand, a complete site search
5 that then came to this tower, you wanted to use an
6 existing tower. Is that part and parcel of how we
7 got here?

8 THE WITNESS (Pike): Right.

9 MR. EDELSON: Maybe a little louder.

10 That was --

11 THE WITNESS (Pike): That is correct.

12 MR. EDELSON: So when you evaluated
13 that tower, it was at least on the surface clear
14 to you that you could fit what you needed on that
15 tower?

16 THE WITNESS (Pike): Not necessarily
17 from how we looked at it. We wanted to go on the
18 tower, but then after, you know, we talked about
19 it and the structural was ran, we determined that
20 we wouldn't be able to with, you know, it would be
21 one and done if we -- if AT&T went on that with
22 the city, the tower would no longer be able to
23 house any other carriers as well. But from that
24 standpoint, you know, we wanted to be on a higher
25 elevation at that location, but, you know, just

1 from a structural standpoint it just wasn't
2 possible.

3 MR. EDELSON: But once that was
4 determined, I mean, AT&T is a private company
5 interested in the best solution for AT&T, so if
6 you could fit on that tower, that was your
7 objective -- I'm going back to 2017 -- correct?

8 THE WITNESS (Pike): Uh-huh.

9 MR. EDELSON: Correct?

10 THE WITNESS (Pike): Correct.

11 MR. EDELSON: I don't think you were
12 looking at it to say what's best for Verizon or
13 what's best for T-Mobile, you were saying what's
14 best for AT&T, and that tower would have served
15 your purposes. Unfortunately, what you found out
16 was structurally it wasn't going to be able to do
17 it. But from what I can see, and maybe I've
18 missed something, at that point you said, well,
19 then we really would like to stay at this site in
20 this particular location and did not do a site
21 search to say what else is available around the
22 area to meet what I think multiple parties have
23 said was quite a deficiency in AT&T's coverage.

24 THE WITNESS (Pike): We did from the
25 original, we did look at the Lawrence School, but

1 as stated before from Wayne, you know, it was much
2 different elevation wise from where, you know, the
3 tower is set at now. So for us it was more, you
4 know, we wanted to be at a higher elevation. That
5 ridge is really where we wanted to be from an RF
6 standpoint, so that was really kind of why we went
7 to that option.

8 MR. EDELSON: Okay. But again, maybe I
9 missed it, and sometimes the application, the
10 dockets get a little mixed up in my mind, but I
11 don't remember discussing a site search ring in
12 our prior hearing. I don't remember, you know,
13 evaluating a number of other sites and comparing
14 them and saying whether or not we get landowner
15 approval or what would be reasons for saying they
16 were an inferior site to this one.

17 THE WITNESS (Pike): No, we didn't.

18 MR. EDELSON: So you really --

19 THE WITNESS (Bettuchi): I'm sorry.

20 MR. EDELSON: No, please go ahead to
21 clarify.

22 THE WITNESS (Bettuchi): No. I think
23 really what it comes down to is, you know, and I
24 think that Director Bartolotta mentioned this
25 earlier, you know, when they had even done their

1 initial, you know, identification of the ideal
2 location to place their tower, that location was
3 determined to be the best site because it
4 essentially provided 95 percent coverage. And
5 that was their own analysis. And really what we
6 saw was something that not only still met that
7 need that we had as a company but that was
8 consistent with the intent of the statute that
9 really drives very much what we do. So we look
10 for locations where we could potentially be on the
11 same site that will allow for collocation and that
12 will, you know, at the end of the game find a
13 technical, environmental and public safety
14 solution that really meets everyone's needs.

15 And so there were some additional
16 sites, and I think Scott mentioned that, you know,
17 the Lawrence site and some others, but at the end
18 of the day we came to the same conclusion that the
19 city did which was that this was ideally the best
20 site that balanced the most needs with respect to
21 our coverage objectives as well as the city's
22 concerns and limiting environmental and aesthetic
23 impact. I hope that helps.

24 MR. EDELSON: Well, I think what I'm
25 seeing and hearing is there's a lot of agreement

1 about how we got to this and that the issue really
2 is about, in my mind, one tower versus two towers.
3 And when I look at the visuals of two towers at
4 the particular site versus one tower, to me it
5 raises the aesthetic question. And I think that's
6 what's really the driver here. As a council we're
7 asked to look to make sure that if tower sharing
8 is a possibility to do that.

9 Now, when I think about tower sharing,
10 it's not about just sharing an existing tower.
11 It's at the end of the day are we on one tower or
12 two towers. And if I was a resident in the area
13 and I had to look at a site with one tower with
14 the existing condition versus what was in the
15 application with two towers, I'd much prefer one
16 tower. And I would say that the subsequent visual
17 renderings that were done, I guess, in the
18 December 13th document that even for some reason,
19 and maybe this is a question for Mr. Gaudet, makes
20 the one tower look much better aesthetically. And
21 I'm not sure exactly what the reason for that is,
22 but it seems in the pictures to me to be less
23 intrusive, and this being the one tower that would
24 be a new tower that would, as I understand the
25 description, handle the city and the carriers'

1 communication needs or meet their needs.

2 Mr. Gaudet, can you comment about the
3 visibility of those in existing pictures in the
4 new or the December 13th filing?

5 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yeah, I think
6 one thing to point out is that you'll notice in
7 our renderings with the singular upgraded
8 self-support structure there's no appurtenances on
9 there, there's no antennas, microwave dishes,
10 AT&T's equipment is not on there. So it will --
11 this is, you're looking strictly at a lattice
12 structure. With all the equipment then added on,
13 it will increase that visual aesthetic impact.
14 But the reason that we sort of stopped short of
15 portraying all of that information is the
16 excessive costs and coordination with the city in
17 order to do a singular self-support structure.

18 This location was chosen, as Director
19 Bartolotta had spoken to, that parking area, that
20 access drive, there's really no place to put this
21 side of the self-support structure, so we have to
22 move farther back into the property. In order to
23 do that, we want to get outside of that wetland
24 buffer. So we would be trenching or running
25 overhead lines much farther. We would have to not

1 only put all of AT&T's equipment, but we'd have an
2 entirely new compound, and we would have to
3 replace in new all of the city's equipment, not
4 just at this site, but as I mentioned before, the
5 microwave links at other sites as well. So you're
6 looking at costs in the million dollar range to do
7 that.

8 MR. EDELSON: I'm sorry, could you
9 repeat that? In the what?

10 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): The cost is in
11 the range of a million dollars.

12 MR. EDELSON: Is that additional cost
13 or that's total versus the current project?

14 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): That would be
15 total. So if we were looking at the monopole, I
16 believe the numbers were 150,000, \$200,000 range.
17 Mr. Pike or Mr. Hamm could speak to that. I don't
18 recall those figures offhand. But this would be a
19 million dollars versus 200,000, let's say.

20 MR. EDELSON: Well, I think that's kind
21 of important to me. So Mr. Pike, can you or
22 someone else reflect on those numbers?

23 THE WITNESS (Pike): Yeah, I'll run
24 through the numbers I wrote down for three
25 scenarios just so you guys have that. So for a

1 new monopole, and these are rough estimates that
2 we got from our civil team, construction team, so
3 for a new monopole you're looking at 300,000.
4 That's 150,000 for the antennas and the equipment,
5 150,000 for the tower and steel. This also
6 involves the ground work, foundation work and
7 finishing work.

8 For the reinforcement of the old tower
9 you're looking at a total between 350,000 and
10 450,000. This includes the modifications. This
11 will depend obviously on steel prices due to
12 shortages. This could change. The foundation is
13 also another variable in this pricing. So a full
14 cost breakdown is somewhat difficult to determine
15 due to the cost, shortages, materials currently,
16 so this is just kind of a rough estimate for the
17 reinforcement.

18 And then as far as the drop and swap,
19 like Brian was just talking about, you're looking
20 at anywhere from 950,000 to 1.1 million, and this
21 is the full cost of steel pricing, this is moving
22 the ground space and equipment. Yeah, that's
23 basically the cost of the three scenarios is what
24 we're looking at right now.

25 THE WITNESS (Bettuchi): I was going to

1 say, Scott, correct me if I'm wrong, that does not
2 include the fact that we would need to purchase
3 the city's equipment and replicate that on the new
4 site.

5 THE WITNESS (Pike): Right. That is
6 correct.

7 THE WITNESS (Bettuchi): So in order to
8 do that drop and swap, we would essentially need
9 to buy the city brand new equipment, which they've
10 already invested in, and have that recreated on a
11 new site before we could potentially do a hot
12 cutover.

13 THE WITNESS (Pike): Correct.

14 MR. EDELSON: Any estimate about how
15 much that is?

16 THE WITNESS (Pike): You're looking at
17 anywhere probably I think (Inaudible) --

18 THE COURT REPORTER: What was that
19 again? Would you say that again, please?

20 THE WITNESS (Pike): 200,000.

21 THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

22 MR. EDELSON: So if you're really
23 trying to compare apples to apples, we really
24 should include that because the other two numbers
25 you gave us will give us full coverage of city and

1 commercial communications. There's nothing in
2 terms of the output and what they're able to do at
3 that site. You're talking anywhere from 300,000
4 for an additional monopole, 350,000 to 450,000 to
5 structurally reinforce the existing tower but put
6 AT&T's equipment on it, and then the drop and
7 swap, which now sounds like it's more like between
8 1.1 and 1.3 million, in that range.

9 THE WITNESS (Pike): Correct.

10 THE WITNESS (Bettuchi): Just another
11 point I'd like to make is that, you know,
12 reinforcement of the other tower does not allow
13 for future collocation of any other carriers which
14 is something that we do try to consider. We are
15 making the investment in the tower itself, but we
16 understand the intent of, you know, the Siting
17 Council and the state with respect to
18 proliferation of towers. And so, you know, if we
19 can find a balance and allow for other carriers to
20 potentially, you know, join that site, that's
21 another goal that we keep in mind.

22 MR. EDELSON: Just remind me then. Has
23 any of the other carriers approached AT&T to say
24 that they want to be on the tower?

25 THE WITNESS (Bettuchi): Not at this

1 point, but I would say that, you know, considering
2 the feedback from Director Bartolotta with respect
3 to the impact that this particular location has,
4 you know, providing 95 percent coverage and the
5 fact that it actually bleeds into other towns and
6 provides coverage at the height that we're looking
7 for, I would expect that there would be interest
8 going forward. And I think that, you know, at the
9 end of the day, whenever we look at search rings
10 and we try to identify the best way to provide the
11 reinforcement that we need in a particular area,
12 you are limited by distance. So it's not as
13 simple as saying, you know, let's go five miles
14 out and find another location. There are only so
15 many places that are going to essentially fill
16 that gap.

17 And it is a highly residential area.
18 I'm actually originally from Middletown, lived
19 very close to this location, so I personally am
20 aware of where we're talking about. And so I
21 think from our perspective we were looking at
22 something that said, you know, there's an existing
23 site here, it would certainly be, you know, an
24 additional structure, but it would be within the
25 same general compound and would be smaller than

1 the existing tower, and ideally, you know, that
2 would be something that would be less of an impact
3 aesthetically.

4 MR. EDELSON: Well, I just point out
5 that in AT&T's submission you indicated in your
6 memo that basically, if the structural analysis
7 had gone another way, you would have been very
8 comfortable proceeding with AT&T and AT&T only on
9 the existing tower. So there doesn't seem to have
10 been much in the way of the city or the commercial
11 carriers working to create one tower that would
12 meet everybody's needs, as Ms. Cooley pointed out,
13 back in 2017, and that would be designed to meet a
14 more complete coverage to the area for all
15 purposes.

16 And that's why the Council is here
17 today because of frustration that we're having
18 tower proliferation, and we want to make sure
19 before we allow that tower proliferation to
20 happen, which to me has shown very clearly in the
21 visual renderings that were done in the
22 application, is an unfortunate situation for the
23 people living in that area. And that's why we
24 want to make sure that all stones or everything
25 has been analyzed to make sure we've got the best

1 solution. And quite honestly at this point I'm
2 not really that comfortable.

3 But I think that's all my questions,
4 Mr. Morissette, at this point. So thank you.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
6 Edelson.

7 We'll now continue with
8 cross-examination by Mr. Silvestri followed by Mr.
9 Nguyen.

10 Mr. Silvestri.

11 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr.
12 Morissette. I do want to continue on this site
13 search and search ring, but before I get to that,
14 I want to fill in the blanks on some of the
15 responses that were received just now. First of
16 all, Mr. Pike, in your response to Mr. Perrone
17 about natural gas you mentioned you did not have
18 anything on that. Does that mean that natural gas
19 is not available or you don't know if natural gas
20 is available?

21 THE WITNESS (Pike): I honestly don't
22 know off the top of my head right now if it's
23 possible. Usually we can do that. But just what
24 I was trying to clarify is just from a ground
25 space perspective for the site between diesel and

1 propane it most likely would be similar with
2 natural gas, but we can look into that as well.

3 MR. SILVESTRI: I understand the
4 footprint for both diesel and propane. My opinion
5 is natural gas takes up less of a footprint in a
6 compound but you do have to run the line. That's
7 why I wanted to know if natural gas is available
8 there, and I guess that's still a question.

9 THE WITNESS (Pike): Yes. We can look
10 into that.

11 MR. SILVESTRI: All right. Mr. Lavin,
12 another fill in the blank. You had mentioned two
13 terms that I'd like you to either define or
14 differentiate for me. One term was blocking rate
15 and the other one was dropping rate. Could you
16 define or differentiate between the two?

17 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Blocking, the
18 technical term is ineffective attempts either
19 inbound or outbound to a user where the system
20 attempts to contact them and can't. Our
21 statistics only reflect outbound contacts because,
22 of course, you can't tell how many people try to
23 make a call and had no coverage. That particular
24 thing we don't know from the system side. So it's
25 a measurement of the system attempting to reach

1 the user and not being able to. That is a block.

2 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. And if I could
3 put it simplistically, you cannot connect, that's
4 a blocking rate?

5 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.

6 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. And the dropping
7 rate is that you do connect but then you lose your
8 call?

9 THE WITNESS (Lavin): That is correct.

10 MR. SILVESTRI: Excellent. Thank you.
11 Okay. Then I had kind of a follow-up question
12 from what I heard from Director Bartolotta. It
13 seemed he had maybe some concerns if there was
14 going to be a new lattice tower and concerns about
15 the foundations, if I heard correctly. So let me
16 ask this follow-up question to that: From a
17 geotechnical standpoint, will the underlying
18 terrain support the foundation for a monopole?

19 THE WITNESS (Hamm): I would assume,
20 yes, it's supporting the SST.

21 MR. SILVESTRI: So a follow-up there,
22 was a geotechnical study performed?

23 THE WITNESS (Hamm): Not at this point,
24 no.

25 MR. SILVESTRI: So right now we're

1 under the assumption that it could?

2 THE WITNESS (Hamm): Yes.

3 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you for
4 that response. Now I want to go back to the
5 search ring because to me it's a bit convoluted.
6 As Mr. Edelson alluded, customarily an applicant
7 will provide us with a drawing or a schematic or a
8 plot plan or whatever that depicts the search ring
9 circle, and I did not see that in the submittals
10 that we had but instead was provided with
11 coordinates for the center of the search ring and
12 the quarter mile radius. And you can refer back
13 to the first set of interrogatory responses. This
14 goes back to Question 9, Question 10, in
15 particular.

16 So if I use the coordinates that were
17 provided in the response to Question 10, I'm
18 finding the center of the search ring is located
19 on the transmission line right-of-way somewhat
20 west of Middletown High School and near Azalea and
21 Aspen Drives, am I correct, in that center of the
22 search ring?

23 (No response.)

24 MR. SILVESTRI: Or with the silence,
25 who provided the answer to Question Number 10?

1 Maybe that person could answer.

2 MR. FISHER: All of our witnesses are
3 in remote locations. I think that question really
4 goes to Mr. Lavin who may have to look up the
5 coordinates and search ring and provide an answer
6 to that question.

7 MR. SILVESTRI: The rest of my
8 questions are actually based on whatever answer
9 that I could get. So if we could find that, I
10 could continue.

11 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I am actively
12 looking and will let you know as soon as I can.

13 MR. SILVESTRI: Mr. Morissette, from a
14 time standpoint, do you want me to pause for now
15 and come back to me, or do we want to wait?

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Do you have any other
17 questions on another matter that we could continue
18 on?

19 MR. SILVESTRI: No, they're all
20 connected to this center of the search ring and
21 followups from there.

22 MR. MORISSETTE: All right. Why don't
23 we come back and we'll keep moving and give Mr.
24 Lavin some time to search for that. So we'll come
25 back, we'll continue on and we'll come back

1 shortly.

2 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you.

3 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. We'll
4 continue with Mr. Nguyen, Mr. Nguyen, followed by
5 Mr. Lynch -- Mr. Lynch is no longer here today --
6 followed by Ms. Cooley.

7 So Mr. Nguyen, if you could continue
8 cross-examination, please.

9 MR. NGUYEN: Thank you. Allow me with
10 a couple of clarification questions. Mr. Pike,
11 you mentioned earlier in response to Mr. Edelson
12 about the costs, and you mentioned you're giving
13 out two costs for two scenarios. One, the
14 reinforcement that costs over a million dollars.
15 The second option is build a monopole that costs
16 about \$300,000. Is that right?

17 THE WITNESS (Pike): Yeah, there were
18 three options. It's the new monopole, the
19 reinforcement of the old tower, and then the drop
20 and swap. So the drop and swap is the million
21 plus, the reinforcement was the 350,000 to
22 450,000, and the new monopole was 300,000.

23 MR. NGUYEN: Okay. And that's all I
24 have, Mr. Morissette.

25 Thank you, Mr. Pike.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen.
2 We'll now continue with cross-examination by
3 Ms. Cooley.

4 Ms. Cooley.

5 MS. COOLEY: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.
6 I have a couple of questions. I've heard you talk
7 about the three scenarios and the money multiple
8 times, and I just want to make sure that I'm clear
9 that all of the numbers that you're giving us
10 include every single thing that you would need to
11 accomplish that. That means the cost of the
12 construction, the cost of any new equipment, the
13 cost of moving that equipment. Does that number
14 that you're giving us for each of those three
15 scenarios include all of that?

16 THE WITNESS (Pike): Yes, but it's also
17 a rough estimate. So when we got this from our
18 civil team, you know, understand there's obviously
19 issues with materials, delays, lead times, all
20 that stuff factors in. But as far as what we got
21 from our civil team, from our construction team,
22 these numbers are accurate.

23 MS. COOLEY: Okay, final numbers. And
24 then my next question is, in the late filings I'm
25 looking at number 5 where you have an example of a

1 proposed site for a new lattice tower that would
2 combine everything. And I'm looking at that, and
3 I'm wondering why you have the access road going
4 through wetland areas a little bit, like it looks
5 like you could have adjusted that a little bit to
6 take away a little bit there. It's not that big
7 of a deal. It looks like this is in already
8 disturbed area, is that correct, so why would
9 that -- did I hear you mention earlier that that
10 proposed lattice tower replacement would require
11 tree cutting and other kinds of things, but it
12 looks like it's in an already disturbed area.

13 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): That's correct,
14 it's in a previously disturbed area. So the goal
15 there with moving to that location, call it
16 southeast on the property, is that cleared section
17 past the impound lot, the goal would be get us
18 outside of the wetland buffer area there. There
19 wouldn't be any access going through the wetlands.
20 It would be --

21 MS. COOLEY: Okay, around.

22 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yeah, you'd have
23 to upgrade that drive, call it just north and
24 west -- sorry, north and east of the wetland
25 itself, but again, still outside of that treeline.

1 MS. COOLEY: Okay.

2 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): So no tree
3 clearing required.

4 MS. COOLEY: Okay. So no tree clearing
5 at all would be required. Okay. So putting aside
6 the city's issues that they have with making sure
7 that there is no interruption in coverage
8 whatsoever, has the city looked at that proposed
9 site and had any comment on it?

10 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): I have not had
11 any discussions with the city. I'm not sure if
12 Mr. Pike has.

13 THE WITNESS (Pike): No, not that I
14 have. I have not had a conversation with them.

15 MS. COOLEY: Okay. So this proposed
16 location has been submitted to the Council, but it
17 hasn't actually been discussed with the city in
18 any way?

19 THE WITNESS (Pike): Excuse me, no, it
20 has, the new location has. Sorry.

21 MS. COOLEY: Your proposed lattice
22 location number 5 has been discussed with the
23 city?

24 THE WITNESS (Pike): Correct.

25 MS. COOLEY: And did they have comment

1 on that?

2 THE WITNESS (Pike): Actually, I'm
3 sorry, I think that was for the monopole, not for
4 the lattice. I apologize.

5 MS. COOLEY: Okay. You haven't given
6 that to the city or proposed it to them in any way
7 so there's no comment from them?

8 THE WITNESS (Pike): No.

9 MS. COOLEY: Okay. I think that's all
10 that I have right now. Thank you.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Ms. Cooley.

12 Mr. Lavin, are you prepared to continue
13 the discussion with Mr. Silvestri?

14 (No response.)

15 MR. MORISSETTE: Hearing none, we'll
16 continue with Mr. Quinlan.

17 MR. QUINLAN: Thank you. I do have a
18 few questions.

19 First, if you were to do the original
20 proposal which is a new monopole, how long would
21 the switchover take without duplication of
22 equipment? How long would it take to switch the
23 equipment to that pole and get it in service?

24 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): You're asking
25 about moving the city's equipment from the

1 existing tower to the monopole?

2 MR. QUINLAN: Yes.

3 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Without
4 providing new equipment.

5 MR. QUINLAN: Right.

6 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): You're talking
7 probably a couple of weeks at least. You've got
8 to run all new coax cable.

9 MR. QUINLAN: Okay.

10 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): It's a
11 substantial amount of time that the city would be
12 down. I don't see that as being feasible at all.

13 MR. QUINLAN: How about if you do the
14 drop and swap and you duplicate the equipment, how
15 much time is it to cutover then?

16 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): It's tough to
17 tell. I mean, you're essentially creating a new
18 network, so it's, you know, to Director
19 Bartolotta's point, is that on paper in a perfect
20 world you cutover and everything is up and running
21 and it's fine, but that does rarely happen.

22 MR. QUINLAN: In a matter of hours?

23 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): You're probably
24 looking at a day's worth of time to make sure that
25 everything is running appropriately.

1 MR. QUINLAN: Can you provide a little
2 more clarification as to what the breakdown of the
3 cost is for the drop and swap? What is the cost?
4 You say it's approximately 950,000 to 1.1 just
5 without the town's equipment. What's the
6 breakdown of those costs just roughly?

7 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Scott, do you
8 have that breakdown?

9 THE WITNESS (Pike): Yeah, I do. So
10 you're looking at 950,000. So that's between the
11 full cost of steel, moving the ground equipment.
12 This doesn't include the demolition or the decom
13 of the tower. So you're looking at around 750,000
14 just for the cost of steel price, plus the 200,000
15 to add the decom, and this is without AT&T too as
16 well. So if you add with their equipment too,
17 you're looking at 1.1 million.

18 MR. QUINLAN: Why is the cost still up
19 from a couple hundred thousand on the monopole to
20 almost 750,000 for this design?

21 THE WITNESS (Pike): These were the
22 numbers that were given to us. You know, you're
23 looking at anything from, you know, the equipment,
24 the cost of steel, materials, lead time.

25 MR. QUINLAN: You have all those costs

1 anyway on the monopole. What's the difference?

2 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): There's a lot
3 more steel involved, Mr. Quinlan, for a
4 self-support tower as opposed to a monopole. A
5 monopole at 150 feet can be stacked in a day. A
6 self-support structure, you have to build it
7 really from the ground up in section by section so
8 that you have no structural deficiencies as it's
9 being built. There are crossmembers, cross
10 angles, you've got multiple legs. The foundation
11 is far more substantial than a standard monopole
12 foundation. You've got an entirely new compound
13 now which would be, call it 50 by 50 or 60 by 60
14 feet. So there's a lot more with the monopole
15 cost here where we're just doing a compound
16 expansion, there's a lot more that goes into it to
17 get the site to be a full facility as opposed to
18 just a tower.

19 MR. QUINLAN: Thank you. I have a
20 couple others. How many days fuel supply do you
21 have in your backup at the site, do you have a
22 tank with fuel on site?

23 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Mr. Hamm, do you
24 have those numbers for the containment on that
25 diesel generator?

1 THE WITNESS (Hamm): I do not know that
2 number, but I know that ours at our building is
3 seven days so it's a similar type setup.

4 MR. QUINLAN: Can I can get a Read-In
5 or something on that?

6 MR. MORISSETTE: We could accept a
7 Late-File on the run time of the generator if we
8 could, Mr. Hamm.

9 THE WITNESS (Hamm): We can do it, yes.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you.

11 MR. QUINLAN: And then what is your
12 plan to resupply in case of emergency and use of
13 the backup generator?

14 THE WITNESS (Hamm): I'm sorry, what
15 was that question?

16 MR. QUINLAN: How do you resupply the
17 fuel?

18 THE WITNESS (Hamm): I believe AT&T has
19 a contract with Fuel Sprague and they just come
20 fill it when they're requested to.

21 THE WITNESS (Bettuchi): That is
22 correct.

23 MR. QUINLAN: That's all my questions.
24 Thank you.

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.

1 Quinlan. I'm going to go next and then we'll
2 circle back to Mr. Silvestri and Mr. Lavin to see
3 if Mr. Lavin is ready.

4 So I'm going to jump on the three
5 scenarios and cost discussion that we've been
6 having this afternoon. I really believe that
7 there is a fourth option and it has to do with the
8 monopole. So we have the drop and swap on the
9 monopole. So the estimates that I'm looking at
10 are 300K for the monopole, 200K for the city's
11 equipment, and then I believe what was testified
12 in the last hearing was approximately 200K for
13 demolition of the original lattice structure. Is
14 that 200K skill a valid number, Mr. Pike?

15 THE WITNESS (Pike): Yes, that is
16 correct.

17 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay.

18 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Mr. Morissette,
19 that 200,000 is really for the decom of the -- it
20 would be the decom of the shelter and the
21 structure itself. So that does not incorporate --
22 let's put the scenario out there that we're going
23 to an entirely new compound, anything that would
24 need to be redone to the existing compound as far
25 as removing the foundation, regrading, seeding,

1 anything like that.

2 MR. MORISSETTE: You mean the city's
3 compound?

4 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Correct.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So that would
6 increase the decommissioning cost for the city to
7 something north of 200K?

8 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Probably an
9 additional 50,000 to 100,000 depending on how
10 substantial the removal of the existing foundation
11 would be.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So if we
13 installed a 300 -- 150 foot monopole and installed
14 the city's equipment on the new monopole, which we
15 now understand is three whip antennas and two
16 microwaves, is that something that is achievable
17 or within the realm of possibility?

18 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): I think from a
19 construction standpoint it's certainly feasible.
20 It doesn't sound that for future business purposes
21 for the city's communications that that would be
22 an acceptable option for them based on their, you
23 know, planning for additional buildouts in the
24 future, additional equipment. I think at 150 feet
25 you're also limiting, you know, noting that the

1 city's top whip antenna currently is at 150 feet,
2 you might want to increase that height of the
3 tower to accommodate that appropriately as opposed
4 to having a whip antenna top mounted on a 150 foot
5 monopole.

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good.

7 Recognizing that the city does have the desire to
8 expand, I was curious about that whip antenna. So
9 it's not recommended to install a whip antenna on
10 the very top of a tower, of a monopole?

11 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): It can be done,
12 certainly, but I think at 150 feet if AT&T, if
13 their goal is 150 foot centerline, you know, AT&T
14 would have to drop a few feet there. You're
15 looking at most likely a collar mount on the top
16 of that tower to be able to support that whip
17 antenna. So at that point it might be more
18 beneficial to bump up the tower height, call it 10
19 feet or so, and have AT&T take that top point on
20 the monopole and the city can remain at that 150
21 foot mark.

22 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.

23 So structurally, given the city's equipment, the
24 whip antenna, three whip antennas and the two
25 microwaves, structurally a monopole should be able

1 to handle it with the addition of AT&T and two
2 other carriers. Am I interpreting that correctly?

3 THE WITNESS (Hamm): Yes, it can be
4 designed for that.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. I just
6 have a quick question for Mr. Lavin and then we'll
7 go back to Mr. Silvestri's discussion on the
8 search ring. Mr. Lavin, are you with us?

9 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes, I am.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Great. Mr. Lavin, you
11 were having a discussion with Mr. Perrone about
12 underperforming. I think it was four to five
13 sites. Could you explain to me what you meant by
14 that, underperforming?

15 THE WITNESS (Lavin): That the
16 ineffective attempts and dropped calls were at an
17 unacceptable level on those four sites surrounding
18 this area due to the lack of coverage.

19 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So it's due to
20 the lack of coverage in the area where the
21 proposed installation is going to be?

22 THE WITNESS (Lavin): That's correct.

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. I think I've
24 got it now. Thank you for that.

25 Okay. We're going to turn it back to

1 Mr. -- first of all, Mr. Lavin, are you ready to
2 go with Mr. Silvestri's line of questioning?

3 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes, I am.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Great. Thank you so
5 much.

6 Mr. Silvestri, please continue.

7 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr.
8 Morissette.

9 Mr. Lavin, am I correct on that center
10 of the search ring?

11 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes, you are.

12 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. Okay. So
13 that was established, as we noted from the
14 response in the interrogatories, back in August
15 2018 with the quarter mile radius. So also in the
16 interrogatory responses it was noted that the
17 location at this Lawrence School on Kaplan Drive
18 was evaluated and rejected due to elevated --
19 elevation concerns and wetlands. First question,
20 what area of the school property was evaluated?

21 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I don't know
22 exactly what area, but the whole school, as far as
23 I know, is in a low area. There is nothing close
24 to the elevation we have. They are between,
25 around 75 feet lower than we are. As far as I

1 know, there's no high elevation to compare with
2 ours on the Lawrence School property.

3 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. So do you know
4 if a particular tower height was evaluated at that
5 school?

6 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Certainly I know
7 150 wouldn't create the coverage we needed from
8 that location being so low and the addition of any
9 reasonable amount up to 200 feet where we'd have
10 to add red and white stripes and a light wouldn't
11 really solve the problem. It's also somewhat
12 offset relative to the ridge, so I think there
13 would be shadowing on the western side of the
14 ridge that wouldn't really allow a tower of any
15 practical height at 200 feet and under to give us
16 the coverage we needed.

17 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you for
18 the response. The followup I have, now that we
19 established the center of the search ring, I
20 calculate it's approximately .76 miles from the
21 center of that search ring to the school property.
22 So the question I have is, why was this location
23 evaluated if it's beyond the quarter mile radius
24 of the August 2018 search ring?

25 THE WITNESS (Lavin): The search ring

1 center is about a quarter mile south of the
2 current proposed site location. I don't know
3 about the 2018 submission.

4 MR. SILVESTRI: All right. Let me move
5 on then. Again, using the center of that radius
6 that we just decided upon, I actually calculate
7 .332 miles from the center of that search ring to
8 the proposed location. Again, it's outside the
9 .25 mile radius. Why was that site selected if
10 it's outside the search radius?

11 THE WITNESS (Lavin): The search ring
12 radius is not a hard and fast rule. It's the RF
13 engineer sitting at his desk looking at maps and
14 Google Earth. In this case the search ring center
15 is very close to the highest point on the ridge.
16 And particularly in the case of a ridge, a round
17 radius is probably not a good way to look at it.
18 A quarter mile will put you down at Middletown
19 High School or over to the other side where you're
20 losing at least 100 feet of elevation from the top
21 of the ridge. It's a starting point for site
22 acquisition to look and in this case find an
23 existing tower between a quarter and a third of a
24 mile away on the same ridge.

25 MR. SILVESTRI: Actually what I'm

1 getting from this is that the search ring could
2 extend in this case well beyond the quarter mile.
3 So the follow-up question, in reality, how far
4 could it go?

5 THE WITNESS (Lavin): In this case
6 certainly you're talking about getting, when you
7 get up to Mile Lane, you're back down maybe half a
8 mile there. It's not been my experience that site
9 acquisition people stop looking at a quarter mile
10 or where it is since you specify it is a starting
11 point and where you should be looking first. It's
12 my experience that site acquisition always looks
13 beyond that. In particular, in this case we've
14 had to do a 4 mile search for existing facilities.

15 MR. SILVESTRI: I want to get to the 4
16 mile part in a minute. There was a question
17 earlier about were other potential locations for a
18 cell tower evaluated in this search ring or beyond
19 the search ring, and I believe the answer was yes
20 in addition to what we had for Lawrence School,
21 but nothing was really submitted to us or
22 mentioned.

23 Mr. Morissette, seeing that we have one
24 Late-File coming in, could we also get that as
25 another Late-File as to what other locations were

1 looked at?

2 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, Mr. Silvestri, I
3 think that's appropriate to get that information
4 into the record.

5 And Mr. Pike, if you could assemble
6 that information and submit it as a Late-File,
7 that would be helpful. Thank you.

8 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr.
9 Morissette.

10 Continuing on, there's a sand and
11 gravel operation that I saw from Google Maps.
12 It's located on the eastern end of Mile Lane. It
13 seems to be near Newfield Street. Was that site
14 evaluated at all for potential use for a cell
15 tower?

16 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I don't know if
17 it was specifically evaluated, but that's
18 significantly lower elevation and also would be
19 blocked to the west side of the ridge in terms of
20 coverage. So it really didn't have -- wouldn't
21 have much potential to substitute for the site on
22 top of the ridge.

23 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you for that
24 response. Now, if I understand correctly also,
25 the coverage plots that were provided in the

1 application were based on on-air AT&T macro sites.
2 And this is back in Table 2 of the application,
3 not the interrogatory. Is that correct that the
4 coverage plots that were provided were based on
5 those macro sites?

6 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Existing macro
7 sites and small cells, if any.

8 MR. SILVESTRI: Yeah, we do have a
9 rooftop that's there. Okay. Thank you. Then if
10 you go to attachment 4 of the application, which
11 is a couple pages down, and I just want to pull it
12 up on my screen, this is CT 3470 and it has
13 neighbor sites and radial distances. The question
14 I have, are all of those sites identified AT&T
15 macro sites?

16 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes, they are.

17 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. Now, if we
18 go to the first set of interrogatory responses and
19 attachment 4, that has a ring that's there, and it
20 depicts the locations of existing adjacent towers
21 within a 4 mile radius of the proposed location.
22 Does AT&T currently utilize any of those towers at
23 the present time?

24 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I'm just trying
25 to get to that. Existing adjacent towers within 4

1 miles?

2 MR. SILVESTRI: Yeah, this is, again,
3 attachment 4 of the first set of interrogatory
4 responses. It doesn't have a page number so I
5 can't give you a page number.

6 THE WITNESS (Lavin): In terms of all
7 of the towers in that chart, we either use them or
8 they are directly adjacent to a current site or
9 they are farther away than the current sites
10 around it.

11 MR. SILVESTRI: All right. Let me pose
12 a follow-up question to see if I understand your
13 answer. For those sites in that drawing that are
14 not occupied by AT&T, can AT&T tower share to
15 provide the needed coverage? For example, you
16 know, for example, I was pointing out 201 Main
17 Street or 90 Industrial Park Road or 238 Meriden
18 Road, for example.

19 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I've plotted out
20 the locations of all those towers. We're either
21 on them already or they are directly adjacent to
22 one we're on already, very close, or they are
23 further away than the adjacent tier of sites and
24 would not provide coverage that we need in this
25 area.

1 MR. SILVESTRI: In the case that
2 they're further away, could a tower share still
3 exist and be supplemented by a small cell
4 somewhere else in the area?

5 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Not that I'm
6 aware of. Having one site overreach the other
7 into this area is probably not good engineering
8 practice. I haven't studied that particularly.
9 At the distances they'd be, we're looking within 4
10 miles here. Anything further than that would be
11 serving from so far away as to be generally
12 unreliable.

13 MR. SILVESTRI: Understood, I believe,
14 Mr. Lavin. Thank you. Any follow-up questions
15 I'll have I guess will be based on the Late-File
16 on the different locations that were examined. So
17 I thank you for your responses.

18 And thank you, Mr. Morissette.

19 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
20 Silvestri. We'll now continue with
21 cross-examination of the applicant by the city,
22 Attorney Forte.

23 MR. FORTE: The city has no questions.
24 Thank you.

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney

1 Forte.

2 We'll continue with cross-examination
3 of the applicant by Talias Trail by
4 Mr. Barbagallo.

5 MR. BARBAGALLO: Thank you, Mr.
6 Morissette. Just to follow up with Mr. Lavin. In
7 the question you just answered, speaking that it's
8 the 4 mile radius and the towers would be too far
9 away, it was in the documentation that the purpose
10 of this tower is to install low band antennas.
11 For low band 5G what is the actual, I guess let's
12 call it, optimal range?

13 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Optimally we're
14 usually getting to a situation where there's a
15 site every 1 to 2 miles, sometimes more than that.
16 It's all dependent on terrain and land usage.
17 Every site is its own special case.

18 MR. BARBAGALLO: Okay. So you had said
19 that the area that was -- I believe you said four
20 sites in the area that you're using as far as your
21 statistics of dropped calls or obviously assuming
22 from outgoing calls. Can you be more specific in
23 where those sites are? I'm basically trying to
24 get an idea of what your target location is.

25 THE WITNESS (Lavin): They are the four

1 closest sites to this one. If we can pull this
2 up, CT 5437, 5272, 5271, 5144, 1044, there are
3 probably six of them now that I look at it, and CT
4 0044.

5 MR. BARBAGALLO: Okay. So would that
6 coincide with Director Bartolotta's Newfield
7 corridor and high school area?

8 THE WITNESS (Lavin): They are arrayed
9 around this area. I would have to look at my
10 plots to see. Our objectives from here are
11 probably a subset of what Mr. Bartolotta is able
12 to cover from this site.

13 MR. BARBAGALLO: Okay. You had
14 mentioned about looking at the Lawrence School and
15 obviously the 200 foot limit, and which is an
16 understanding that obviously would have to be
17 marked differently. If the tower is put in
18 place -- I guess it's a two-part question -- and
19 we needed to put the city's equipment on that
20 tower, can it be done to include, as you testified
21 in the earlier hearing, that four carriers, the
22 tower -- or, excuse me, the monopole would be for
23 four carriers, could a 150 foot monopole carry
24 four carriers and the city's equipment?

25 THE WITNESS (Lavin): It could

1 physically hold it all up, but I believe the city
2 testified that they want to be able to utilize a
3 180 foot tower, so it would be 30 feet short of
4 what I believe the city has stated is their needs.

5 MR. BARBAGALLO: Okay. So if we, let's
6 say, move up to a 180 foot monopole and we take
7 the whip antenna and put it on top of a 180 foot
8 monopole, would then that exceed the 200 foot
9 limit?

10 THE WITNESS (Lavin): In the case here,
11 I mean, we know that 180 feet has been given a
12 determination of no hazard to air navigation. I
13 don't know how close it comes to requiring
14 lighting or marking, so I can't say that putting
15 another 20 feet on top of the 180 would not put it
16 over where it would need to have a beacon or
17 painted marking.

18 MR. BARBAGALLO: Again, if I
19 misunderstood, please someone correct me. Is the
20 city whip antenna 30 feet?

21 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I'm not sure
22 offhand exactly what size it is.

23 MR. BARBAGALLO: Okay. So then I guess
24 my question is, if it does in fact come close to
25 that 200 foot mark from ground level, there would

1 have to be additional lighting that would be on
2 all the time, correct?

3 THE WITNESS (Lavin): It is possible.
4 I can't speak for what the city's needs are. A 20
5 foot long whip is very long. I don't know if
6 that's what they plan for that height, so I can't
7 really say.

8 MR. BARBAGALLO: Okay. Thank you for
9 that. My next question is for Attorney Bettuchi.
10 You had mentioned, and I think it was a quote from
11 Director Bartolotta, the 95 percent coverage. I
12 just want to be clear. Are you specifically
13 talking about the current antenna has 95 percent
14 coverage or when the monopole gets put up that
15 will have 95 percent coverage?

16 THE WITNESS (Bettuchi): So first I'm
17 not an attorney.

18 MR. BARBAGALLO: Sorry --

19 THE WITNESS (Bettuchi): That's okay.
20 I just didn't want anyone to have any false
21 impressions of my knowledge. No, so what it was,
22 was just that when they had done their analysis
23 when they were trying to identify a site that
24 would meet their coverage needs, they had
25 determined that that particular location met 95

1 percent of their needs. Now certainly our needs
2 are different. Ours is based on our current
3 network build. But what I think it does speak to
4 is, you know, that the elevation on this
5 particular site is arguably more advantageous than
6 a lot of other areas in that general vicinity, and
7 so that was really what my intent was with that
8 statement.

9 MR. BARBAGALLO: Thank you. Thank you
10 for clarifying that. And actually going back to,
11 and I apologize, Mr. Lavin, coming back to you,
12 you had stated that the lower elevation, the west
13 ridge would actually impede the signal from going
14 through. But even at the current elevation, the
15 west ridge is much higher than the 499 Mile Lane.
16 So I guess what is the balance, how much do you
17 lose by going down the hundred and something feet
18 of elevation?

19 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I haven't
20 quantified it exactly, but you'll lose pretty much
21 all the coverage if you move down to either side
22 of the ridge, east or west you would lose
23 substantially most, if not all, of the coverage,
24 again, on the opposite side of the ridge.

25 MR. BARBAGALLO: So the -- and again

1 from the application, the four mile radius of
2 towers, it seems that there are towers on that
3 side of the ridge, so those do not meet your
4 needs?

5 THE WITNESS (Lavin): No, all the
6 towers that are identified in that table are
7 either ones we're already on, ones that are
8 immediately adjacent to ones we are on, or ones
9 that are even further away than the ones we're on.

10 MR. BARBAGALLO: Okay. Thank you for
11 that. And then I don't know who can answer this
12 question, but it pertains to the back-up
13 generator. It was testified in a previous hearing
14 that the back-up generator would only be on if the
15 site lost power, but if we're using some type of
16 fuel like diesel, which obviously has a high rate
17 of coagulation of fuel, would that have to be run
18 periodically; and if so, for how long?

19 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): The backup
20 generators are typically exercised about once a
21 week, as you would see with a home generator,
22 standby home generator, during a weekday during
23 the daytime for about 20 to 30 minutes.

24 MR. BARBAGALLO: Okay. Thank you for
25 that.

1 THE WITNESS (Hamm): I'd like to add
2 that it was basically a 48-hour run time on the
3 generator when the power goes out.

4 MR. BARBAGALLO: I believe that's
5 everything I have. Thank you.

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. We'll now
7 continue with cross-examination by Ms. Pugliares.

8 Ms. Pugliares. You're on mute.

9 MS. PUGLIARES: Sorry about that. My
10 question is really around the site location.
11 There's been a lot of conversation today about the
12 elevation that's needed. And there is another
13 state or city-owned property where Moody School,
14 another school, another elementary school like
15 Lawrence that's just down the street. I just
16 looked it up on my phone which is, you know, I'm
17 obviously sitting right next to the tower here,
18 and it's about a mile and a half from here, and it
19 has a much higher elevation than the 499 Mile
20 Lane. It's way up the road over here. I was
21 wondering why that town property wasn't in
22 consideration.

23 THE WITNESS (Lavin): This is Martin
24 Lavin. I haven't studied it specifically, but it
25 is on the west side of the ridge. I'd have to

1 look more closely. But it seems likely that the
2 ridge would shadow coverage on the eastern side to
3 a tower located at Moody School.

4 MS. PUGLIARES: Okay. Thank you.
5 That's the only question that I have.

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. We'll now
7 continue with Mr. Siteman.

8 Mr. Siteman.

9 MR. SITEMAN: Thank you. Mr. Silvestri
10 really pushed the line of questioning that I was
11 hoping to ask, so we'll wait for that Late-Filing
12 and then review that and go from there on
13 alternate site locations. But I would like to
14 better understand the conversation that occurred
15 between the city and AT&T from 2019 onwards. Once
16 it was determined that the current tower wasn't a
17 feasible option, was there real discussion about
18 alternative locations or was it driving forward
19 with the 499 Mile Lane location?

20 MR. FISHER: Kelly and Scott, do you
21 want to take that question, please?

22 THE WITNESS (Pike): Yeah. So, you
23 know, unfortunately this kind of predates my
24 employment, but from what I was told obviously
25 when we had these conversations was that, you

1 know, we looked at the Lawrence School, but that
2 was really the only option that we had as an
3 alternate, and, you know, from the elevation
4 standpoint, which was the deciding factor as to
5 stick with the city and to kind of move forward
6 with that. I wasn't aware -- and Kelly, I don't
7 know if you have anything else to add too -- about
8 any other locations at the time, but I think
9 that's kind of the process of the way we went with
10 it, just from it being at higher elevation, the
11 city's interest to kind of move forward with us,
12 you know, we stuck with it, and that's kind of why
13 we went that route.

14 THE WITNESS (Bettuchi): I think when
15 we looked at everything in balance, I think this
16 goes back to trying to find an existing site that
17 was already developed. You know, I have to say
18 that I think for the most part generally we try to
19 avoid school sitings. It's just not generally
20 something that we find communities to be amenable
21 to. And so certainly trying to be considerate of
22 that is always at the forefront of our approach.
23 I think, you know, certainly this particular site
24 had a significant elevation advantage. It was
25 already a developed location.

1 And so, you know, we initially
2 approached the city with this being what we felt
3 was minimizing the impact to the local community
4 as best as we could. And then certainly we needed
5 to vet out, you know, some of the alternatives
6 that were presented. And so initially we had
7 talked about whether or not we could potentially
8 just reinforce the existing site and that, you
9 know, that didn't ideally work, you know, from a
10 structural standpoint it wasn't feasible. And so
11 then, you know, there was the potential of a swap
12 and drop. But we also really do try to find a
13 balance between the considerations of the
14 community that we're interacting with.

15 So in this particular case it was very
16 clear to us that this particular site was
17 significant for the city. It meant a lot to them
18 with respect to public safety and communication
19 and how that interacted with other sites and their
20 ability to serve their community. And so we said,
21 okay, so what are some of the other options that
22 we have in place or available to us. And, you
23 know, we looked at, you know, could you
24 potentially move it back further on the site. You
25 know, I think Director Bartolotta had mentioned

1 earlier that the city does have some hope for
2 potentially developing that general parcel in the
3 future, and so we take that into consideration.

4 And then we also knew that at the end
5 of the day the swap and drop in any form was
6 really going to be a serious concern for them.
7 And there was also a cost factor. You know, I
8 mean, for us to take that site and move it back
9 further into a different parcel, you know,
10 requires demolition of old towers. It's arguably
11 a minimum of six times more expensive. You have
12 more ground space impact, whereas potentially
13 creating a tower that is in the same view site as
14 something that is there but lower, we frankly felt
15 was the best path forward.

16 That being said, you know, I think from
17 our perspective we are always open to any
18 suggestion. And so we made the submission
19 thinking that we've done our due diligence and
20 that we're coming up with what we think is the
21 best option that balances the needs of the
22 community and the needs of the municipality and
23 our coverage concerns. That being said, you know,
24 if other options exist, that's never off the table
25 for us. It really isn't.

1 And so I think that's why we come to
2 the Council and we say, you know, this is what we
3 have, this is what we're looking at, but we defer
4 to you. If there's another option that's better,
5 you know, we're happy that the community is a
6 party and is providing feedback because at the end
7 of the day we want to ensure that we can provide
8 quality service. We want to ensure that we have
9 the ability to provide for the public safety
10 objectives that we have in front of us, but we
11 also, you know, we're part of the community, and
12 so we don't really want to disrupt anything.

13 So you're right, I think we did go down
14 this path and we felt that this was the best
15 balance of all of those concerns, but at no time
16 are we saying that we're not open to other
17 suggestions. So we welcome the dialogue.

18 MR. SITEMAN: I appreciate your
19 comments there. Can you please confirm though
20 that this new proposed tower at 150 feet has the
21 ability for a 30 foot extension and add four
22 carriers on there which would add significant
23 equipment and what effect it has on a visual
24 aspect?

25 THE WITNESS (Bettuchi): I'd have to

1 defer to the engineers on the call. That would
2 really be more in their purview.

3 MR. SITEMAN: Can someone from AT&T
4 who's familiar with the current proposal? Because
5 our understanding as a neighborhood that the
6 current proposal is for 150 feet but has the
7 option for a 30 foot extension plus adding other
8 carriers to it.

9 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): So towers can be
10 extended, they can be designed to be extended in
11 the future. I think one of the misconceptions out
12 there is that it can be done, you know, overnight
13 without any approvals. There's still regulatory
14 processes that have to go through. If the site
15 were to be extended at any height, it would still
16 have to come back in front of the Connecticut
17 Siting Council and be reviewed to make sure that
18 it is still in line with the Certificate of Public
19 Need. So, you know, it's not to say that it could
20 not be, but it's not just, you know, AT&T decides
21 that we want to throw another 30 feet up there,
22 let's go do it. There is a process similar to
23 what we go through for a full tower design as
24 well.

25 MR. SITEMAN: Understood. I appreciate

1 the clarification there. Last question that I
2 have is, I'd like some clarification on the
3 current proposals that we're talking about, the
4 one in the application that's adjusted for the
5 wetlands as well as the drop and replace, those
6 two options, will trees have to be removed for
7 either of those options?

8 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): No, not for the
9 drop and swap. Again, as proposed in that
10 location that AT&T identified, that new compound
11 location would be wholly outside of the treeline.
12 There would be no need for tree clearing or
13 removal to run power lines, access drive. And
14 certainly the proposal with the compound expansion
15 is in a cleared area already as well, so there
16 would be no tree removal there either.

17 MR. SITEMAN: Okay. I appreciate the
18 answer. Thank you.

19 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): You're welcome.

20 MR. SITEMAN: That's all I have.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
22 Siteman.

23 The appearance of Talias Trail will be
24 presented at the continuation of the public
25 hearing.

1 The Council announces that it will
2 continue the evidentiary session of this public
3 hearing on Thursday, February 3, 2022 at 2 p.m.
4 via Zoom remote conferencing. A copy of the
5 agenda for the continued remote evidentiary
6 hearing session will be available on the Council's
7 Docket 506 webpage, along with the record of this
8 matter, the public hearing notice, instructions
9 for public access to the remote evidentiary
10 hearing session, and the Council's Citizens Guide
11 to Siting Council Procedures.

12 Please note that anyone who has not
13 become a party or intervenor but who desires to
14 make his or her views known to the Council may
15 file written statements with the Council until the
16 public comment record is closed. Copies of the
17 transcripts of this hearing will be filed at the
18 Middletown City Clerk's Office.

19 I hereby declare this hearing
20 adjourned. Thank you, everyone, for your
21 participation and have a very happy holidays.

22 (Whereupon, the witnesses were excused
23 and the hearing adjourned at 4:41 p.m.)
24
25

1 CERTIFICATE FOR REMOTE HEARING

2

3 I hereby certify that the foregoing 124 pages
4 are a complete and accurate computer-aided
5 transcription of my original stenotype notes taken
6 before the Connecticut Siting Council of the
7 CONTINUED REMOTE PUBLIC HEARING IN RE: DOCKET NO.
8 506, NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC (AT&T)
9 APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL
10 COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE
11 CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATION OF A
12 TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY LOCATED AT 499 MILE
13 LANE, MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT, which was held
14 before JOHN MORISSETTE, PRESIDING OFFICER, on
15 December 21, 2021.

16

17

18 

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

1 I N D E X

2
3 CITY OF MIDDLETOWN WITNESS:

4 WAYNE BARTOLOTTA (sworn on page 143)

5 EXAMINERS:

	PAGE
Mr. Forte (Direct)	144
Mr. Perrone (Start of cross)	146
Mr. Edelson	152
Mr. Quinlan	157
Mr. Silvestri	157
Mr. Nguyen	160
Mr. Lynch	164
Ms. Cooley	167
Mr. Morissette	169
Mr. Fisher	174
Mr. Barbagallo	184
Mr. Siteman	188

12 AT&T WITNESSES:

13 KELLY WADE BETTUCHI (sworn on page 190)
14 SCOTT PIKE (previously sworn)
15 BRIAN GAUDET (previously sworn)
DANIEL HAMM (previously sworn)
MARTIN LAVIN (previously sworn)

16 EXAMINERS:

	PAGE
Mr. Fisher (Direct)	191
Mr. Perrone (Start of cross)	195
Mr. Edelson	201
Mr. Silvestri	214, 232
Mr. Nguyen	219
Ms. Cooley	220
Mr. Quinlan	223
Mr. Morissette	228
Mr. Barbagallo	240
Ms. Pugliares	246
Mr. Siteman	247

1 I n d e x: (Cont'd)

2
3 CITY OF MIDDLETOWN'S EXHIBITS
(Received in evidence)

4 EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
5 III-B-1	City of Middletown's waiver of the municipal consultation, received 6 October 4, 2021	146
7 III-B-2	Pre-filed testimony of Wayne Bartolotta, Director, City of Middletown Central Communications, dated 12/13/21	146
8 III-B-3	City of Middletown request for party 9 status, dated December 15, 2021	146

10
11
12 APPLICANT'S EXHIBITS
(Received in evidence)

13 EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
14 II-B-6	Applicant's Late-Filed exhibits and supplemental submission, dated 15 December 12, 2021	194
16 II-B-7	Applicant's pre-filed testimony of Kelly Wade Bettuchi, AT&T, dated 17 December 13, 2021	194