

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

DOCKET NUMBER 517: Application from MCM Holdings, LLC
For a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public
Need for the Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of a
Telecommunications Facility Located at the Boy Scouts of
America Camp Hoyt, 288 Simpaug Turnpike (Parcel No. 12-29),
Redding, Connecticut.

PUBLIC EVIDENTIARY HEARING
HELD VIA ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCING
JANUARY 23, 2024
AT 2:00 PM

HELD BEFORE:

John Morissette - Member and Presiding Officer
Brian Golembiewski - Designee for Commissioner Katie Dykes,
Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Quat Nguyen - Designee for Chairman Marissa Paslick
Gillett, Public Utilities Regulatory Authority
Robert Silvestri
Dr. Thomas J. Near, Ph.D.
Melanie Bachman, Esq. - Executive Director/Staff
Attorney
Robert Mercier - Siting Analyst
Lisa Fontaine - Fiscal Administrative Officer
Dakota Lafountain - Siting Council Clerk Typist

A P P E A R A N C E S

APPLICANT, MCM Holdings, LLC:

Lucia Chiocchio, Esq. - Cuddy & Feder, LLP

Daniel Patrick, Esq. - Cuddy & Feder, LLP

Witnesses:

Virginia King, Project Manager, MCM Holdings, Inc.

Jason Mead, P.E., Structural Engineering Department

Manager, All Points Technology Corporation P.C.

Matt Gustafson, Environmental Scientist, All Points

Technology Corporation P.C.

Brian Gaudet, Project Manager, All Points Technology

Corporation P.C.

INTERVENOR, Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless:

Kenneth C. Baldwin, Esq. - Robinson & Cole, LLP

Emily Deans, Esq. - Robinson & Cole, LLP

Witnesses:

Shiva Gadasu, Radio Frequency Engineer, Verizon Wireless

Elizabeth Glidden, Real Estate/Regulatory Specialist,

Verizon Wireless

GROUPED RESIDENT INTERVENORS:

Dorothy DeLuca

JoAnn Villamizar

Danielle Caldwell

Tim Keyes

GROUPED BUSINESS INTERVENORS:

Ann Taylor - New Pond Farm Education Center

1 (The hearing commenced at 2:00 p.m.)

2
3 MR. MORISSETTE: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.
4 Can everyone hear he me okay? Good thank you. This
5 continued evidentiary session is called to order this
6 Tuesday, January 23rd at 2:30 -- January 23rd, 2024 at 2:00
7 p.m. My name is John Morissette, member and Presiding Officer
8 of the Connecticut Siting Council. If you haven't done so
9 already, I ask that everyone please mute their computer audio
10 and/or telephones now, thank you.

11 A copy of the prepared agenda is available on the
12 Council's Docket Number 517 web page along with the record in
13 this matter, the public hearing notice, instructions for
14 public access to this public hearing, and the Council's
15 Citizen's Guide to Siting Council's Procedures.

16 Other members of the Council are Mr. Silvestri,
17 Mr. Nguyen, Mr. Golembiewski, Dr. Near, and Mr. Lynch.
18 Members of the staff are Executive Director Melanie Bachman,
19 Siting Analyst Robert Mercier, and Administrative Support
20 Lisa Fontaine and Dakota LaFountain.

21 This Evidentiary Session is a continuation of the Public
22 Hearing that was held on November 30, 2023. It is held
23 pursuant to provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General
24 Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act upon
25 an application from MCM Holdings, LLC for a Certificate of

1 Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the
2 construction, maintenance, and operation of a
3 telecommunications facility located at the Boy Scouts of
4 America Camp Hoyt, at 288 Simpaug Turnpike, which is Parcel
5 Number 12-29 in Redding, Connecticut.

6 A verbatim transcript will be made available of this
7 hearing and deposited with the Redding's Town Clerk's Office
8 for the convenience of the public. The Council will take a
9 10 to 15 minute break at a convenient juncture around
10 3:30 p.m.

11 We will now continue with the appearance of Verizon
12 Wireless in accordance with the Council's December 1st, 2023,
13 Continued Evidentiary Hearing Memo. We will begin with the
14 appearance of the intervenor, Verizon Wireless, to verify the
15 new exhibits marked as Roman numerals 3 items B7 and 10 on
16 the hearing program.

17 Attorney Baldwin or Attorney Deans, please begin by
18 identifying the new exhibits you have filed in this matter
19 and verifying these exhibits by the appropriate sworn
20 witnesses.

21 ATTORNEY DEANS: Thank you. Cellco has four additional
22 exhibits today, which are identified as items 7 through 10 in
23 Section 3B of the hearing program. Oh, I'm sorry,
24 Exhibits 12 through -- oh, 7 through 10, sorry about that.
25 7 through 10 in Section 3B of the hearing program, and I will

1 ask our witnesses, Shiva Gadasu and Liz Glidden a series of
2 questions to verify the exhibits.

3 Did you prepare or assist in the preparation of or are
4 you familiar with the information in the exhibits identified?

5 MR. GADASU: Shiva Gadasu, yes.

6 MS. GLIDDEN: Liz Glidden, yes.

7 ATTORNEY DEANS: And do you have any updates or
8 corrections to the identified exhibits?

9 MR. GADASU: No.

10 MS. GLIDDEN: No.

11 ATTORNEY DEANS: Is the information contained in the
12 identified exhibits true and accurate to the best of your
13 belief?

14 MR. GADASU: Yes.

15 MS. GLIDDEN: Yes.

16 ATTORNEY DEANS: And do you adopt these exhibits as your
17 testimony?

18 MR. GADASU: Yes.

19 MS. GLIDDEN: I do.

20 ATTORNEY DEANS: Thank you. We'd like to present them
21 as full exhibits.

22 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Does any party or
23 intervenor object to the admission of Verizon's new exhibits?
24 Attorney Chiocchio or Attorney Patrick?

25 ATTORNEY CHIOCCHIO: Thank you. No objection.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney Chiocchio. Does
2 the Grouped Resident Intervenors, JoAnn Villamizer, have any
3 objections?

4 MS. VILLAMIZAR: No objection.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. And Grouped Business
6 Intervenors, Dino Trevisani? Dino Trevisani, are you with us
7 this afternoon? Hearing none, the exhibits are hereby
8 admitted.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: I will remind the witnesses that you
10 are under oath. We were -- you were sworn in at the end of
11 the last hearing. With that, we will begin with
12 cross-examination of Verizon by the Council starting with
13 Mr. Mercier, followed by Mr. Silvestri. Mr. Mercier, good
14 afternoon.

15 MR. MERCIER: Good afternoon, thank you. I would like
16 to begin -- I just have a quick question for Verizon on
17 Council interrogatory response number 7, that is question
18 Number 7, the response. It states -85dBm RSRP for in-vehicle
19 coverage and -95dBm RSRP for in-building coverage. Are those
20 two values transposed?

21 MR. GADASU: This is Shiva Gadasu. I'm sorry about
22 that. Yes, they are -- they are swapped. -85 is for
23 in-building coverage and -95 should be for in-vehicle
24 coverage. Sorry about that.

25 MR. MERCIER: Okay, thank you. I'm now going to turn to

1 the coverage plots that were provided in the application. It
2 was attachment 1 of the application, and I'll just look at
3 the first plot, which is -- it says, existing Verizon
4 Wireless 700 megahertz coverage.

5 MR. GADASU: All right. We have it.

6 MR. MERCIER: Okay, yeah, thank you. Down at the bottom
7 you have the blue shaded, which is identified as in-building
8 as we just talked about -85 and the in-vehicle was -95,
9 excuse me.

10 MR. GADASU: That is correct.

11 MR. MERCIER: Now, when you establish these thresholds,
12 what is the basis for them? Is -- is there a certain percent
13 of reliability you're trying to obtain with in-building, and
14 -85 would be the minimum threshold for that?

15 MR. GADASU: Yes, so -- so given, you know, given the,
16 you know, the general materials of the buildings as
17 structures, you know, we -- we as Verizon think that -85 RSRP
18 is the lowest we need to get building penetration.

19 MR. MERCIER: Okay. But what's the call quality? Is it
20 99 percent of the time it would penetrate a building, like,
21 what's the parameter you're using to establish that value?

22 MR. GADASU: I mean -- I mean, I cannot say, you know,
23 what percentage but, you know, based on -- based on the
24 materials we have used in the past and used for, you know,
25 for construction and the team from Verizon determines, you

1 know, is this threshold, is the best we need to get
2 in-building penetration.

3 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Now, with that, would these values
4 be the same throughout Connecticut or just in this region?

5 MR. GADASU: Through nationwide -- it's nationwide.

6 MR. MERCIER: Thank you.

7 MR. MORISSETTE: As a reminder to all, please state your
8 names before you respond. Thank you.

9 MR. MERCIER: Now, remaining with the coverage plot
10 here, we have the blue areas and the green areas, and then
11 there's the unshaded area. Is there some type of service
12 within the unshaded area that -- that could be usable if
13 you're outside or maybe in your car for a short stretch
14 how -- how do you --

15 MR. GADASU: I'm sorry to interrupt. This is Shiva
16 Gadasu. So, yeah, the answer -- the reason, mainly, you
17 know, it doesn't -- it doesn't mean that we don't have
18 service. We still provide service but it is -95, or, no,
19 it's less than -95, so, you know, at least we don't
20 categorize reliable service to maintain -- to maintain a call
21 or get continuous, you know, data.

22 MR. MERCIER: Okay, thank you. Given that there's sites
23 surrounding the proposed site, you know, there's Bethel West,
24 Danbury South, Connecticut and some other ones, you know, all
25 around. What's preventing signals from that -- those towers

1 from reaching the proposed service area?

2 MR. GADASU: So it's a typography and -- this is Shiva
3 Gadasu, again, I'm sorry. So it is typography and, you know,
4 the vegetation, combination of topography and vegetation.
5 And out of the structures, you know, in between -- in between
6 these sites. The signal passes -- the RF energy passes
7 through any -- any of these --

8 MR. MERCIER: So for topography a signal, say it just
9 can't go into a, like, a deep valley or there may be a hill
10 in the way or something of that nature?

11 MR. GADASU: Right. It's completely blocked, it doesn't
12 get through the hill. But if it is vegetation or if it is,
13 you know, any building materials, you know, it can pass
14 through but it gets -- the signal gets inundated.

15 MR. MERCIER: What role does like forested terrain play
16 or leaf clutter and things of that nature, does that reduce
17 the signal strength?

18 MR. GADASU: This is Shiva Gadasu again. Yes, it
19 significantly does.

20 MR. MERCIER: You know, I understand, you know,
21 according to the interrogatory response 1, the site search
22 was initiated about 2016 for a location in this general area.
23 You know, looking at the existent coverage map, why was a
24 location chosen, say, we'll just say in the green area rather
25 than, say, in one of the unshaded areas?

1 MR. GADASU: This is Shiva Gadasu again. So you know
2 anytime we look for a cell site we try to get on higher
3 elevation so that we have a clear line of sight, you know,
4 into the neighborhood so this is one of the location where
5 it's on higher elevation, you know, basically you have line
6 of sight in all directions, so.

7 MR. MERCIER: Okay. And looking at the next slide,
8 excuse me, the coverage plot, this is with the existing and
9 proposed Verizon Wireless 700 megahertz coverage, you know,
10 it does -- the new site will show a lot of overlapping
11 coverage with coverage from adjacent sites, you know, some of
12 the blue areas overlap and some of the green areas overlap.
13 So when a user is in one of the overlapping areas, how is the
14 call assigned? Does it go to a particular facility based on
15 distance or some other factor?

16 MR. GADASU: So again -- so there are something, you
17 know, KPIs as we call it, named for Key Performance
18 Indicator, so based on the, you know, the dominant server,
19 you know, the user equipment, you know, receives, you know,
20 it gets connected to the, you know, cell site. And, you
21 know, given, you know, this site as we see it or lack of
22 coverage it's only because, you know, we don't have any, you
23 know, cell site in this area. We have to extend the service
24 from the neighboring sites to provide service to Redding.
25 And once this site goes on air, you know, we pull back the

1 service from the neighboring sites, so that, you know, the
2 site -- the user is closer to those other existing sites to
3 receive better service.

4 MR. MERCIER: Okay. So -- so the adjacent sites would
5 also benefit through additional capacity or just in general
6 call quality; is that correct?

7 MR. GADASU: This is Shiva Gadasu. Correct.

8 MR. MERCIER: For network demand, is it typically lower
9 for phones that are just based on sending a text message
10 without video, or a just a call. Is that different than from
11 someone streaming, say, Zoom or some other high data
12 application?

13 MR. GADASU: This Shiva Gadasu again. So they're --
14 they're -- they're all considered data. So, you know, once
15 a -- once a user gets, you know, has better data speeds then,
16 you know, all of those come in the same factor.

17 MR. MERCIER: Okay. You just mentioned data speeds.
18 And -- and is your signal level threshold that we have
19 discussed, like, -85 for in-building and -95 for in-vehicles,
20 is that based on data speeds, somewhat?

21 MR. GADASU: This is Shiva Gadasu again. Yes, so the
22 stronger the signal, you know, the stronger the signal the
23 better data speeds the user can get. So the closer to the
24 site the better speed they get.

25 MR. MERCIER: Since the site was, you know, first

1 initiated in 2016, were there coverage plots generated at
2 times to indicate that there was a coverage gap? And if so,
3 over time are there continual updates to your coverage maps
4 until a site is built?

5 MR. GADASU: This is Shiva Gadasu again. So from --
6 from what is it, 2016? From 2016 so we -- we made
7 significant, you know, significant upgrades to -- we -- we
8 made on a regular basis significant upgrades to our sites,
9 you know, outdated equipment, you know, when there's a new
10 generation of equipment coming from the vendors and we add,
11 you know, add additional spectrum as we -- as Verizon gets
12 available from FCC, we upgrade the sites. But any -- any
13 additional spectrum we add to our existing sites is -- it's
14 all data. It's -- it's -- it's not wireless anymore, so the
15 700 megahertz, which we use as our base layer it's -- it's --
16 it's wireless only, I mean, I wouldn't say wireless only,
17 it's mainly wireless but it also gets data but, you know, the
18 data speeds compared to, you know, other frequencies which
19 Verizon uses are comparatively higher than the 700 megahertz
20 base layers that we use. So the 700 megahertz is only used
21 for coverage, say, a user can -- can and have, you know, a
22 phone call initiated and, you know, and does not get dropped.
23 And coming to the plots, you know, they are fairly -- they
24 are fairly similar from 2016, you know, even though we
25 upgraded the neighboring sites, the 700 base layer still

1 remains the same.

2 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. I have no other questions at
3 this time, thank you.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Mercier. We will now
5 continue with cross-examination of Verizon by Mr. Silvestri,
6 followed by Mr. Nguyen. Good afternoon, Mr. Silvestri.

7 MR. SILVESTRI: Good afternoon, Mr. Morissette, and
8 thank you. I had two questions from the last time that I had
9 posed to MCM and it was really Verizon that needed to answer
10 them. The first question that I have was, if you look at
11 tab 2, or attachment 2 to the application, why was the 101
12 Marchant Road location rejected? There doesn't seem to be a
13 reason listed there.

14 MR. GADASU: This Shiva Gadasu. So from an RF
15 perspective, you know, it's -- looking at the property,
16 it's -- it's a big parcel. And there is a significant change
17 in elevation in the parcel so depending on where the tower
18 location might be, you know, RF is completely okay with it,
19 given, you know, we just compensated with the tower height.

20 MR. SILVESTRI: So it's not an RF issue?

21 MR. GADASU: Yes, it's not an RF issue.

22 MS. GLIDDEN: If I may, for the record Liz Glidden with
23 Verizon. I think part of the issue here is that there was
24 tremendous -- that the site is 78 acres of forest and it
25 would require a tremendous amount of clearing in order to

1 develop the site. And it would also be more visible from
2 some of the other parcels; we were trying to avoid that.
3 Also due to some elevation issues, it might require a taller
4 tower.

5 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good, thank you both for your
6 responses. Then to follow up on Mr. Mercier's questions
7 about coverage, I was looking at the 850 megahertz coverage
8 plots that are in attachment number 1, and while I look at
9 the 700, and the coverage seems fairly extensive, why is
10 there such a drop off for the 850-megawatt coverage? And I'm
11 kind of looking at both the west side, if you will. It seems
12 coverage is there for north and east but not the west. Could
13 you explain that?

14 MR. GADASU: This is Shiva Gadasu. As I said, 700 is
15 our base layer for Verizon, so every -- every cell site in
16 lower Connecticut has 700 megahertz. But 850 megahertz it's,
17 you know, it's the largest spectrum we have and it is not
18 deployed across Connecticut yet. We are, you know, they're
19 still -- they're still deploying on a side-by-side basis.
20 Hence, you know, hence it's -- you don't see much coverage
21 from 850 as opposed 700.

22 MR. SILVESTRI: Just a related question. How much does
23 the terrain to the west affect your proposed tower?

24 MR. GADASU: This is Shiva Gadasu again. As you can
25 see -- completely compare, you know, and the proposed

1 coverage from this facility on Redding North, you know, it
2 doesn't go much to the west because of topography. It
3 doesn't get all the way, you know, to Route 7, not even
4 halfway.

5 MR. SILVESTRI: That's what I thought; it was a
6 topography issue. Very good. Thank you for your response.
7 That's all I have for Verizon at this point. Thank you.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Silvestri. We will now
9 continue with cross-examination of Verizon by Mr. Nguyen,
10 followed by Mr. Golembiewski. Mr. Nguyen, good afternoon.

11 MR. NGUYEN: Yeah, good afternoon, Mr. Morissette, my
12 question has been asked. So no questions, thank you.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen.
14 Mr. Golembiewski, followed by Dr. Near. Mr. Golembiewski,
15 good afternoon. Good afternoon, Mr. Golembiewski, I see you
16 on the -- I see you online and it is your time to cross-exam
17 Verizon, please. Good afternoon, Mr. Golembiewski.

18 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Thank you. I'm sorry, I got kicked
19 out on my tablet, so I had to quickly get to my computer. I
20 have no questions, thank you.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Golembiewski.

22 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: All that for nothing.

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Well, thank you, you're back. I will
24 now continue with cross-examination by Dr. Near, followed by
25 Mr. Lynch. Dr. Near, good afternoon.

1 DR. NEAR: Good afternoon, Mr. Morissette. I have no
2 questions at this time, thank you.

3 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. We will now continue
4 cross-examination by Mr. Lynch, followed by myself.

5 Mr. Lynch, good afternoon. Okay, I don't see Mr. Lynch on
6 the screen, so I will continue with cross-examination.

7 I have a few follow-up questions. The first one -- let
8 me just throw this one out, question 13. In response to
9 question 13 was discussion about the 1,000-gallon LNG tank.
10 Is 1,000 gallons your typical size? For some reason I was
11 thinking it was 500 gallons and why -- why is this proposing
12 1,000.

13 MS. GLIDDEN: This is Liz Glidden with Verizon. This is
14 a typical size tank.

15 MR. MORISSETTE: A typical size is 1,000, okay, I was
16 mistaken then. Okay, thank you. All right. Let's -- let's
17 go to the coverage maps on Tab 1 and I'll follow-up on some
18 questions that were asked earlier. Now, the write up of the
19 application says that you're fulfilling a need in
20 southwestern Redding and southern Danbury.

21 Now, can you tell me -- I don't quite see the increase
22 in coverage in southwestern Bethel, or Redding, excuse me.

23 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Just -- just for clarification,
24 Mr. Morissette, can you point us to the section in the
25 narrative that you are talking about because I think --

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Certainly, page 3 in the introduction.
2 It actually says southwestern Bethel --

3 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Right. Okay.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: -- and southern Danbury. And I'm not
5 understanding the southwestern Bethel.

6 MR. GADASU: This is Shiva Gadasu from Verizon. So, you
7 know, if you compare the existing and the proposed service
8 from 700 megahertz from the existing -- from the site
9 Redding North, we can see southwest of Bethel, and on Route
10 53 and its neighborhood you can see, you know, a significant
11 implement in service and also south of Danbury.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay, I -- I understand now. All
13 right. So it's -- it's essentially everything, it's north of
14 the site.

15 MR. GADASU: North of the site. Because as -- as I said
16 earlier, you know, the surrounding sites are over extended to
17 fill in the gap in Redding at the moment. You know, once
18 this site gets approved and goes on air, you know, we pull
19 back the service from the surrounding sites so that the
20 users, who are connected on the surrounding sites, get better
21 experience.

22 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay, thank you. All right. With that
23 in mind that we're looking for better coverage north of the
24 site, and I'd like to go to the site search section,
25 Section 2. And the second site that's discussed here is the

1 fire station. Now, if I go to the map of the sites that you
2 looked at, I'm trying to figure out which ones the fire
3 station --

4 MR. GADASU: So the fire station is approximately -- I'm
5 sorry.

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Go ahead.

7 MR. GADASU: I'm sorry to interrupt. This is Shiva
8 Gadasu. So the fire station is, you know, approximately one
9 mile to the southeast from the Hoyt property. So the
10 reason --

11 MR. MORISSETTE: So where is it on your map?

12 MR. GADASU: On the -- on the coverage map?

13 MR. MORISSETTE: No, on the map in that section on the
14 sites that you looked at.

15 MR. GADASU: So this is Shiva Gadasu again. So on the
16 site search, on the map if you are looking at the map, within
17 the white circle in the center, you will see it's called
18 Redding FD, Redding Fire Department --

19 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So that's -- that's the fire
20 department.

21 MR. GADASU: Correct.

22 MR. MORISSETTE: And you say that's a mile from the
23 site?

24 MR. GADASU: Approximately.

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay and -- and so why was that one

1 rejected? It says here, MCM leased property, RF rejected.

2 MR. GADASU: Shiva Gadasu again. Let me correct the
3 distance. So upon double checking it, it's almost like five,
4 seven miles from the Hoyt property from the southeast. The
5 reason it's rejected is the ground elevation at the fire
6 department is significantly less compared to the Hoyt
7 property. The ground elevation is approximately 150 foot
8 lower, so we need a significant taller tower to compensate
9 for the height.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So it's due to elevation?

11 MR. GADASU: Correct.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. All right. So moving on to the
13 next page of the existing towers considered. Both of these
14 sites are to the north, and as we just discussed the coverage
15 gap you're trying to fulfill is to the north of the site --
16 can you talk a little bit, you know, these are existing type
17 of existing structures and why -- why RF is rejected on a --
18 on a site that already exists and has been sited, considering
19 these are up to the north, why they just don't work for you?

20 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Mr. Morissette, could -- just for
21 clarification are you looking at the last two sites listed in
22 the site search --

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes.

24 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: -- summary list that are identified
25 as existing powers considered?

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes.

2 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Okay.

3 MR. MORISSETTE: That would be site one of 4 Dittmar
4 Road and site 2, 66 Sugar Hollow Road.

5 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Thank you.

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you.

7 MR. GADASU: This is Shiva Gadasu. So -- so the first
8 site, 4 Dittmar Road, is approximately 2.7 miles to the
9 northeast from the Hoyt property, which is too far out. As
10 we look at the coverage plots submitted, the proposed
11 coverage plots with Redding North, we still see, you know,
12 it's quite far, the Redding North site itself doesn't get all
13 the way to 4 Dittmar Road. It's too far out.

14 And the second site we're talking about is 66 Sugar
15 Hollow Road, Danbury. It is almost two miles northwest and
16 it is terrain plot between Sugar Hollow and the Hoyt
17 property.

18 MR. MORISSETTE: So if I -- if I look at the existing
19 700 megahertz plot, it appears that to the south that you
20 have pretty adequate coverage in that, you know, as you
21 stated earlier, the site is to provide more coverage to the
22 north. So the -- is it that the two existing sites are
23 either too far to the east and too far to the west where it
24 doesn't provide you coverage, you know, in the middle going
25 north versus moving it north to either one of those sites and

1 with adequate coverage to the south? I'm not sure if that
2 was real clear, a real clear question here. But it seems to
3 me that since you're trying to increase the coverage to the
4 north either one of those sites would provide some coverage
5 for you. Any reaction to that?

6 MR. GADASU: This is Shiva Gadasu. So if you're looking
7 at the existing coverage plot to the -- to the east, you
8 see -- you see a site named Redding CT.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Yep.

10 MR. GADASU: Along, you know, east of Route 107.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Yep.

12 MR. GADASU: So this, 4 Dittmar Road, it's not the
13 existing site Redding CT. So it's too far to the east and --
14 and when you compare that with the proposed coverage from
15 Redding North, it's still a significant gap, you know,
16 4 Dittmar Road, it's a very good site for us. You know, we
17 did consider it for -- for as, you know, as another new
18 build -- new build site in the region to -- to fill in the
19 gaps in our network to the east. But, you know, it doesn't
20 negate the purpose of Redding North.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Right. If you were to go to -- let's
22 see if I can kind of summarize that. If you went to Sugar
23 Hollow, you're too far to the west, and you're losing
24 coverage on Route 53?

25 MR. GADASU: This is Shiva Gadasu again. Yes, it

1 doesn't get to Route 53 because it is terrain plot between
2 Sugar Hollow and Hoyt. There is significant, you know, hills
3 between these two properties, it's terrain plot and it
4 doesn't reach, even to Hoyt.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. And okay, I'm still not clear on
6 the second one though.

7 MR. GADASU: This is Shiva Gadasu again. So the second
8 one --

9 MR. MORISSETTE: The Dittmar Road.

10 MR. GADASU: 66 Sugar Hollow, if you looking at the --
11 it's the existing coverage on the northwest you will see a
12 site named Danbury South, Danbury CT.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Yep.

14 MR. GADASU: So following that to the south along
15 Route 7, there you see, called Cemetery in the blue -- in the
16 blue --

17 MR. MORISSETTE: Yep.

18 MR. GADASU: That's where the site is, Sugar Hollow.
19 It's Sugar Hollow.

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Yeah, I'm okay with Sugar Hollow. I
21 understand that one. I'm on Dittmar -- Dittmar -- excuse me,
22 Dittmar Road. The existing site of Dittmar. I'm not getting
23 why that one wouldn't work.

24 MR. GADASU: So the site Dittmar Road is too far to the
25 east between Dittmar Road, you know, if you build a tall

1 enough -- if you can get a tall enough signal line, you know,
2 it's tough to get a signal to get past Route 53.

3 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. And you're also approaching
4 Bethel West by a significant distance as well; is that
5 correct?

6 MR. GADASU: Correct.

7 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Thank you. Thank you for
8 patiently going through that with me, I appreciate it. Okay.
9 That's all the questions I have this afternoon. Thank you
10 for your responses. We will now continue with
11 cross-examination of Verizon by the Grouped Resident
12 Intervenors, and I believe, JoAnn Villamizer is going to
13 represent the Resident Intervenors.

14 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Yep. That's me.

15 MR. MORISSETTE: Good afternoon.

16 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Good afternoon. Okay, I just have a
17 few questions. One second, we're having technical
18 difficulties. Okay. Nope.

19 MR. KEYES: No, speaker, turn your speaker off.

20 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Turn your speaker off -- volume. Okay.
21 I think we got it, sorry about that. Okay, so I just have a
22 couple questions. Cellco's Internal Coverage Mapping Tool,
23 Atool was used to ascertain the current coverage in the area
24 and the anticipated coverage utilizing the additional pole
25 that is the subject of this application.

1 So how much time is required to create a coverage map
2 using this mapping tool?

3 MR. GADASU: It's a fairly quick process.

4 MS. VILLAMIZAR: So time, quick?

5 MR. GADASU: Quick.

6 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Okay. So if, in fact, that it is so
7 quick to do this, my question is, relative to Dittmar, why
8 would you not provide -- and Sugar Hollow, provide the
9 coverage maps done from Dittmar and Sugar Hollow to support
10 your position that there is inadequate coverage?

11 MR. GADASU: This is Shiva Gadasu. We didn't provide
12 the plots because, you know, one, 4 Dittmar Road is too far
13 away, and two, 66 Sugar Hollow, we have significant
14 overlapping coverage from -- from the surrounding site to
15 Danbury South. It doesn't --

16 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Okay. So you didn't provide them why?
17 Because you think that -- your statement is -- to
18 substantiate your statement that they're not good enough, why
19 would you not provide the coverage maps that you did? I'm
20 confused.

21 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: I think what Mr. Gadasu said was that
22 because the sites are too far away, he didn't feel the need
23 to provide coverage plot.

24 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Okay. So that you did the coverage
25 plots for Dittmar and Sugar Hollow, but you didn't provide

1 them, correct?

2 MR. GADASU: Correct. This is Shiva Gadasu. It's for
3 internal use. Anytime, you know, when other candidates
4 submitted by our, you know, sited acquisition people, you
5 know, we reviewed the sites and see if the site makes sense
6 from an RF perspective. If it doesn't makes sense we just
7 reject it, we don't keep the request.

8 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Okay. But it takes like a few minutes
9 to run the program, so it could have easily been done in
10 order to support your position that there is no coverage,
11 correct?

12 MR. GADASU: Correct, correct.

13 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Yeah, okay, good. Then there's a
14 Verizon coverage map online for the public that shows the
15 coverage in the area. Is that using the same Atool or is
16 that using a different tool?

17 MR. GADASU: This is Shiva Gadasu. It use a different
18 tool and, you know, the thresholds provided and stated in --
19 on the Verizon website are significantly different from what
20 we take as -85 RSRP for in-building and -95 for in-vehicle
21 coverage for -- for reliable service. So they're completely
22 different thresholds.

23 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Okay. And there -- the term 4G LTE,
24 it's my understanding, means that you're going to be able to
25 download your favorite music, website, videos, make phone

1 calls, and text messages; is that correct?

2 MR. GADASU: This is Shiva Gadasu. Are you referencing
3 from the website?

4 MS. VILLAMIZAR: I'm just asking you a question.

5 MR. GADASU: 4G LTE meaning, it's both, you know,
6 wireless and data speeds. Correct.

7 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Oh, good, okay. Then the area that
8 you're saying that there is substantially no coverage in your
9 application to the Siting Council on Route 53, I checked on
10 your website, the Verizon website that's available online.
11 And I'm just gonna read the numbers, I checked 25 houses
12 along the route that you say that there's no coverage.
13 These -- I'm going to do it as fast as possible so as not to
14 waste your2 time, but I want it in the record. 551 Redding
15 Road, and all of these numbers are going to be Redding Road
16 so I won't repeat it. 551, 557, 560, 556, 573, 575, 580,
17 584, 590, 598, 613, 636, 649, 658, 667, 678, 692, 706, 721,
18 724, 729, 736, and then additionally I checked 223 Gallows
19 Hill Road, which was a little farther away on Route 53. And
20 then 58 Sidecut, because that's an area that was questionable
21 in Redding. And then I did go past on 53, did cross the line
22 into Bethel, to 72 Turkey Plain Road, which is what 53 turns
23 into in Bethel.

24 All these areas say that there is 4G LTE coverage, so
25 your promotion to the public is that you do have coverage so

1 I can buy your services if I lived in the area where you say
2 there's no coverage. And additionally, toward the end of 53
3 immediately crossing the border into Bethel, I get 5G.

4 So can you explain to me how it is that you're promoting
5 to the public that there is coverage on the area where you're
6 telling the Siting Council that you need coverage because
7 there's substantially no coverage.

8 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: I'm going to object to the question.
9 I think what Mr. Gadasu says that the plots that are being
10 referred to are run at different thresholds. And if the
11 question is does Mr. Gadasu stand by the plots and the
12 evidence in the record to support the argument for need he
13 can answer that question. Mr. Gadasu did not prepare any
14 plots appear on the company's website, although he did
15 testify that they're run at different thresholds. So I'm not
16 sure exactly what Mr. Gadasu can say in response to
17 Ms. Villamizer's statements.

18 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Well, I guess I can simplify it for
19 you --

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Hold on, hold on. We have an objection
21 on the table, and -- and at this point the website and the
22 plot websites are not part of the record. So to ask
23 questions associated with those plots is inappropriate
24 because it's not part of the record. But I'm going to ask
25 Attorney Bachman to weigh in on this.

1 I do think, however, the witness could expand a little
2 bit on, you know, why -- what the differences are between the
3 marketing information versus what is here in the record.

4 Attorney Bachman, do you have any opinions on this?

5 ATTORNEY BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. I think
6 Attorney Baldwin rephrasing the question as to whether or not
7 Mr. Gadasu stands by the plots that were provided and the
8 need, satisfies the question. But I certainly think your
9 suggestion is well taken and if Mr. Gadasu could give us an
10 answer as to the difference between the marketing plots and
11 the plots that are in the record, that would be appreciated.
12 Thank you.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney Bachman.
14 Mr. Gadasu, if you could expand on the difference between the
15 marketing information and the information in the, you know,
16 to the extent that you understand it understanding you're not
17 a marketing representative, thank you.

18 MR. GADASU: I stand by the plots submitted to the
19 Siting Council as part of this application. In referring to
20 the plots on the Verizon website, there is a disclaimer, you
21 know, at the bottom of these plots stating that it doesn't --
22 so, you know, the disclaimer says, you know, it doesn't
23 necessarily say it's a reliable service, you know, from the
24 plots on the Verizon website.

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, very good. All right.

1 Ms. Villamizer, if you could continue your cross-examination,
2 please.

3 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Yes. In order to make sure that it is
4 on the record, if you look at Exhibit 1 IV, Intervenor
5 Exhibit 2 from Villamizer's testimony, you will see that
6 there is a coverage map that was taken from the Verizon
7 website, and that has the area in question, on Route 53 on
8 it, which shows 4G and 5G coverage.

9 Could you please explain what the distinct -- why that
10 is? So that is on the record, so we don't have to worry
11 about it not being on the record. This is on the record.
12 Please explain the difference.

13 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: It's -- it's not in evidence yet
14 because it's not our exhibit. But -- but could you tell us,
15 again, what exhibit you're speaking to?

16 MS. VILLAMIZAR: It's exhibit -- Villamizer submission
17 of Exhibit IV 2, having to do with my testimony, additional
18 testimony, so it's my second set of testimony.

19 MR. MORISSETTE: Is it dated January 16th, 2024?

20 MS. VILLAMIZAR: It's not even dated. I failed to put a
21 date on it.

22 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: I see Villamizer's testimony dated
23 November 20th; is that it?

24 MS. VILLAMIZAR: It says, I am somewhat confused by
25 Cellco's statement that there is a need for additional

1 cellular service in west Redding based upon the Verizon
2 coverage map of west Redding -- west Redding available on
3 their website showing no gaps in coverage including Route 53.
4 It's shown on Exhibit IV 2.

5 MR. GADASU: So this is Shiva Gadasu again. In
6 referring to those plots from the website, again, stating
7 that, you know, there's a disclaimer at the bottom where it
8 says, you know, it's approximate other coverage and it's not
9 a guaranteed service. Actual coverage may vary depending and
10 subject to change, you know, depending on the, you know, the
11 situation, et cetera.

12 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Thank you. Okay. For each of the
13 sites that Cellco states the RF is not acceptable, was
14 Cellco's Atool used to contribute to making this
15 determination?

16 MR. GADASU: This is Shiva Gadasu again. I'm sorry, I
17 don't understand it. Could you rephrase the question,
18 please?

19 MS. VILLAMIZAR: For each of the sites that Cellco
20 states that they looked up but where RF was not acceptable,
21 was Cellco's Atool used to make -- contribute to making the
22 determination?

23 MR. GADASU: This is Shiva Gadasu again. Yes, all the
24 plots which are generated and submitted to the Council are
25 through, you know, the tool called Atool.

1 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Okay. Was Cellco aware of the
2 availability of the scout camp site at the time the search
3 for a site was initiated?

4 MS. GLIDDEN: For the record, this is Liz Glidden.
5 When -- in 2016 Cellco was looking for -- became aware of
6 some coverage issues in this area and began looking for a
7 possible site. And shortly after beginning a search in
8 looking at a number of different parcels, we became aware
9 that MCM had an option on this particular parcel.

10 MS. VILLAMIZAR: So was the site center for the search
11 determined before or after you were aware of the MCM site?

12 MS. GLIDDEN: Before.

13 MS. VILLAMIZAR: So before you found out that the MCM
14 site was available, you're saying that you need high ground
15 for your tower, but where your site center is, is at the
16 bottom of the hill. Why would you pick the bottom of the
17 hill as opposed to somewhere where there was a mountain?
18 You're basically in a valley.

19 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: The center of the search, is that the
20 one that we gave in response --

21 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Yes.

22 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: -- to another question?

23 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Yep. Which is Lonetown Road and
24 Simpaug intersection, which is dead center of the bottom of
25 the valley.

1 MS. GLIDDEN: The purpose of, again, Liz Glidden, for
2 the record. The purpose of the search area is to identify an
3 area. So typically we look at coverage maps and we create a
4 diameter from that. So we're not looking at topography when
5 we initiate a search ring. It's not until later on that we
6 go and we search the ring and we look around that we really
7 look at things like topography, existing structures,
8 vegetation, things like that.

9 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Okay. Then based on your --

10 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Just one -- just one second. We have
11 Mr. Gadasu to follow up on that.

12 MR. GADASU: Sorry to interrupt, this is Shiva Gadasu.
13 I confer with Ms. Glidden's statement. You know, we don't
14 take the topography into consideration when we first, you
15 know, open up a search ring because, you know, we -- given,
16 you know, a search radius and based on candidates we receive,
17 you know, we analyze the candidates and from there they
18 determine the heights of the towers needed from those
19 candidate's submitted locations.

20 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Okay. So when you do the site search
21 you -- you are looking based upon -- you're doing this based
22 upon your coverage maps where you have gaps in coverage,
23 correct?

24 MS. GLIDDEN: Yes.

25 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Okay, then in the event that -- so the

1 area that you're saying there is a substantial need for
2 coverage, in this particular instance, is on Route 53.
3 You've alluded to that on numerous occasions.

4 So why would you not have chosen an area by Route 53
5 where you do need substantial coverage -- where you have a
6 gap then Lonetown Road and Simpaug?

7 MR. GADASU: This is Shiva Gadasu. So we determined
8 this location because one, as I said, you know, the
9 surrounding sites are over extended to provide service to,
10 you know, this part of Redding, so, you know, once -- once we
11 pull back the service, you will see significant gaps in
12 Redding. So hence this location was chosen to fill in the
13 service all around the site.

14 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Well, that's the Hoyt campsite you're
15 referring to, not the site search, which is at the bottom of
16 the hill. I'm asking for the site search, not the Hoyt's
17 location, but the initial site search where you have --
18 you're saying that your gaps in coverage are how you
19 determine where your location is going to be for your site
20 search. Your gaps -- your major gap in coverage is on
21 Route 53.

22 So why would -- why is the site search, you know,
23 located at Simpaug and Lonetown, as opposed to, on Route 53
24 where your significant gap in coverage is? I don't
25 understand.

1 MR. GADASU: This is Shiva Gadasu. So there are two
2 things. One -- one, is coverage, and one is also capacity.
3 This site -- also this is a capacity needs on the two
4 surrounding sites. One to the south called Topstone, and one
5 to the north called Danbury South. These two sites which are
6 currently providing service to Redding are exhausted,
7 meaning, you know, they are taking more number of users than
8 the site can handle, itself, at any given time. Hence we
9 need this -- this location to also upload the user's data and
10 websites to give better service to the users around.

11 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Okay. But that just still doesn't
12 answer the question. The question is, if your substantial
13 gap coverage is how you determine where you're going to look
14 for a new location, is at Route 53, how is it you ended up at
15 Lonetown Road and Simpaug as your site center, as opposed to
16 being on Route 53 where you're saying the substantial need
17 is? I don't get it, and that didn't answer that question.

18 I mean, you knew about the Hoyt thing. You're saying
19 that was after you determined your site search center, so
20 your site search center doesn't make sense based upon the
21 coverage maps.

22 You're saying the coverage maps determine the site
23 center, but there, that would be Route 53 not Simpaug and
24 Lonetown conveniently located next to Hoyt. You can't, I
25 mean, it looks like you're just filling it in after-the-fact.

1 So anyway, can you still answer that question, like, what
2 happened to Route 53 where the substantial coverage is
3 lacking, that -- that's not the center?

4 MS. GLIDDEN: For the record, this is Liz Glidden. I
5 think the purpose of the site area or the search ring, is
6 essentially a circle on a map. It is intended to give a
7 general area where we are looking for service, or looking to
8 obtain service.

9 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Okay. But still, it doesn't -- you
10 still didn't answer the question on why it's not at Route 53
11 instead of Simpaug and Lonetown. I still -- I don't get it.

12 MR. GADASU: This is Shiva Gadasu. So, you know, based
13 on the search ring, we didn't receive any candidates, you
14 know, from any of the other, you know, along Route 53 or, you
15 know, within the search ring.

16 As we found out that, you know, MCM has a lease, you
17 know, signed -- it's an easy process, you know, it's on
18 higher ground elevation. It gives a better line of sight,
19 you know, around the site to provide service. So we just
20 went with the site.

21 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Okay. So I think that what you're
22 trying to say is that you basically just landed -- found out
23 MCM has a site available and therefore that was it. Done.

24 MR. GADASU: Correct.

25 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Okay, good. So there -- then I'm going

1 to move to question from one of my colleagues, Tim Keyes. He
2 would like to know, for Dittmar, is it a higher elevation?
3 It's at 790 feet versus Hoyt, which is at 520 feet. So
4 wouldn't that be more appealing and therefore Verizon to use
5 the Dittmar site?

6 MR. GADASU: This is Shiva Gadasu again. You are right
7 on the ground elevation on Dittmar Road. It's comparatively
8 higher to the Hoyt property, but again, it's almost 2.7 miles
9 from the Hoyt property and, you know, the site -- any site
10 doesn't get that far to provide RF service.

11 MS. VILLAMIZAR: How far will the RF service -- how --
12 what is the distance that will be provided for the RF service
13 from the Hoyt camp, because you're going on the way to the
14 Bethel border and into southern Danbury, so what is -- what
15 is that distance?

16 MR. GADASU: Given the flat terrain, it's approximately
17 between one and a half to two miles based on how far you are,
18 considering the flat terrain. And once the topography comes
19 into effect, you can never say.

20 MS. VILLAMIZAR: That's only one mile. He says that's
21 2.7. Okay. So now I have additional questions from Danielle
22 Caldwell. She wants to know what -- well, we've already
23 asked that. She wants to know whether or not you looked at
24 the cell tower at the Francis J. Clark Road, industrial
25 complex and whether that would be suitable to offer service

1 to the area on Route 53 since it is fairly close?

2 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Can you point us to an exhibit in the
3 record that identifies that location and, in particular, the
4 site search summary existing adjacent towers map includes
5 several locations around the proposed facility. I'm just not
6 sure which one you are talking about.

7 MS. VILLAMIZAR: No, I think it's further out than your
8 one mile radius. So if I have to point to something, no, she
9 did not indicate what she was referencing. I'm merely giving
10 you her questions, so we will move on. She would like to
11 also know if your goal is to offer service for Bethel and
12 Danbury areas as well as Redding, wouldn't finding a location
13 that was more centralized be best?

14 MR. GADASU: Again, considering -- considering our --
15 the need for Verizon, this is the best location.

16 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Okay. And she says she has lived on
17 Fire -- well, I guess my Fire Hill Road isn't going to tell
18 you anything. She has worked on Long Ridge Road, which is
19 your site center in west Redding for over ten years and has
20 never experienced any coverage policy problems with Verizon,
21 even walking in the woods at Long Ridge Road. She wants to
22 know, why it is, that there is a substantial need when she
23 does not have a problem?

24 MR. GADASU: This is Shiva Gadasu again. Referring to
25 the coverage plots submitted, the existing coverage plots at

1 700 megahertz, we can see, you know, significant coverage,
2 you know, south -- south of this Hoyt property, also west of
3 the Hoyt property, and also -95dBm RSRP, very significant
4 coverage around the site, from the Danbury site. As stated
5 before, very significant coverage at -95 because of the
6 existing site -- existing surrounding sites are over extended
7 to provide service.

8 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Thank you. What is that?
9

10 (Discussion was held away from the microphone with the
11 Grouped Intervenors which was not audible.)
12

13 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Okay. So apparently, sorry. The Hoyt
14 site is one mile from Route 53 and the Dittmar site is
15 approximately one mile from Route 53.
16

17 (Discussion was held away from the microphone with the
18 Grouped Intervenors which was not audible.)
19

20 MS. VILLAMIZAR: One mile 1,000 feet. Oh, okay. So
21 there -- why would the Dittmar site not be suitable since
22 it's so close?
23

24 (Discussion was held away from the microphone with the
25 Grouped Intervenors which was not audible.)

1 MS. VILLAMIZAR: And it's 790 feet taller, or no, it's
2 790 feet period, not taller.

3 MR. GADASU: This is Shiva Gadasu again. Referring to
4 4 Dittmar Road, if you are looking at a horizontal distance
5 to Route 53, which is the shortest, it's almost two --
6 1.25 miles and, you know, as you come further south on
7 Route 53 it goes all the way to 2 miles, which is far away
8 for RF.

9 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Thank you. That's all the questions we
10 have.

11 MS. DELUCA: I have one more.

12 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Oh, wait, sorry.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Please continue.

14 MS. VILLAMIZAR: One more from Dottie Deluca and we're
15 done. Sorry.

16
17 (Discussion was held away from the microphone with the
18 Grouped Intervenors which was not audible.)

19
20 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Two more from Dottie Deluca. Dottie
21 has also lived and worked at the center of the site location
22 for 12 years. If there is no coverage she would not be able
23 to run her business or retail shop. So, I think it's going
24 to be the same answer as the previous question.

25

1 (Discussion was held away from the microphone with the
2 Group Intervenors which was not inaudible.)

3
4 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Okay, no, I'm sorry. We're done.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you, Ms. Villamizer.
6 We will not continue with cross-examination of Verizon by the
7 Grouped Business Intervenors. We have Dino Travesini or Ann
8 Taylor. Who is going to represent the Business Intervenors
9 this afternoon?

10 MS. VILLAMIZAR: We're just getting Ann because I don't
11 think Dino is on. So we'll get Ann for you.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good, thank you. I see Ann Taylor
13 on the screen. Ann are you there?

14 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Actually, we are using her screen. So
15 she's coming right upstairs. She wasn't participating, but
16 she can come and tell you that she has the questions.

17 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay, thank you.

18 MS. TAYLOR: Hi.

19 MR. MORISSETTE: Good afternoon, Ann.

20 MS. TAYLOR: Hi, how are you?

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Good. How are you doing?

22 MS. TAYLOR: I'm well, thank you. Thanks, no, I don't
23 have any questions. Dino was going to be the one that might
24 hop on and I think Dottie is just speaking with him. He's
25 just having a hard time connecting with you, but he was the

1 one who was going to represent the business group.

2 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Unfortunately, it's his time
3 to -- your time to cross -- examination.

4
5 (Discussion was held away from the microphone with the
6 Group Intervenors which was not audible.)

7
8 MS. TAYLOR: All right. So I don't --

9 MS. VILLAMIZAR: I think you're just going to represent
10 the business group. You don't have any questions?

11 MS. TAYLOR: I do not have any questions, thank you.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Very good.

13 MS. TAYLOR: Thanks.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: We're going to have to move on. Okay,
15 with that, the appearance of the Grouped Resident
16 Intervenors. Will the Grouped Resident Intervenors present
17 their witness panel for purposes of taking the oath. We will
18 have Attorney Bachman who will administer the oath.

19
20 (Discussion was held away from the microphone with the
21 Group Intervenors which was not audible.)

22
23 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Okay, ready? Are you ready? Oh, it's
24 me? Can you hear me?

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, we can hear you.

1 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Oh, great. So the Grouped Resident
2 Intervenors have the testimony of Villamizer --

3 MR. MORISSETTE: Oh, excuse me, for one second. Please
4 identify the individuals that are on your panel.

5 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Oh, my panel -- my panel -- we don't
6 have a panel -- well, we have a -- we don't have a panel.

7 MR. MORISSETTE: So who will be answering questions this
8 afternoon?

9 MS. VILLAMIZAR: I guess, if in fact you -- okay so our
10 panel would be -- so sorry would be Danielle Caldwell, Dottie
11 Deluca, JoAnn Villamizer -- did you give testimony? Did you
12 give testimony? And Tim Keyes.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: If you submitted testimony you now have
14 to declare it under oath to swear to it under oath and admit
15 it into evidence.

16 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Yep, that's -- we're -- not Tim Keyes.
17 So let me do it again. So sorry to cause you so much
18 trouble. It's going to be Danielle Caldwell, Dottie Deluca,
19 JoAnn Villamizer.

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So we have three people -- is
21 that -- did I count that right?

22 MS. VILLAMIZAR: That's all what we got.

23 MR. MORISSETTE: So we have Dottie Deluca, the second
24 one was who?

25 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Danielle Caldwell.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: And the third one was?

2 MS. VILLAMIZAR: JoAnn Villamizer.

3 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Thank you, JoAnn. So,
4 Attorney Bachman, could you please administer the oath on the
5 individuals that are present.

6 ATTORNEY BACHMAN: Mr. Morisette, I just want to ask at
7 this time. I do see that Mr. Keyes, Dr. Keyes, excuse me,
8 filed a request for intervenor status. I'm not sure if he
9 wants to be sworn in, so that in case anyone has any
10 questions about the contents of the request.

11 MS. VILLAMIZAR: That would be great, Tim Keyes, we'll
12 add him, thank you.

13 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Okay. Could everyone please raise
14 your right hand.

15 MS. DELUCA: I'd like to be put on camera, you've taken
16 away my camera --

17 MS. VILLAMIZAR: It's okay.

18 MS. DELUCA: -- so that I'm not on the record raising my
19 hand.

20 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Yeah, you are.

21 MS. DELUCA: Not visually.

22 MS. CALDWELL: Can you put it back on.

23
24 (Discussion was held away from the microphone with the
25 Group Intervenors which was not audible.)

1 MS. DELUCA: Melanie can you answer the question?

2 ATTORNEY BACHMAN: Dottie are you behind JoAnn?

3
4 (Whereupon the Grouped Resident Intervenor's panel was
5 duly sworn in by Attorney Bachman.)

6
7 ATTORNEY BACHMAN: Thank you.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Let's see Dorothy Deluca --

9 MS. DELUCA: Yes.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: -- Danielle Caldwell, JoAnn Villamizer,
11 and Tim Keyes, you have offered the exhibits listed under the
12 hearing program Roman numeral 4, excuse me, B1 through 15 for
13 identification purposes. Unfortunately, there are exhibits
14 here that were not prepared by -- they were prepared by
15 others.

16 Attorney Bachman, what do you propose that we do about
17 that? Should we ask Attorney Baldwin and Attorney Chiocchio
18 if they will entertain admitting those into the record?

19 ATTORNEY BACHMAN: Certainly, Mr. Morissette, I think we
20 should identify the exhibit numbers, which would be Number 2,
21 Suzanne Fogel's request for intervenor status; Number 5,
22 Meredith Miller's request for intervenor status; Number 7,
23 Suzanne Fogel's pre-filed testimony; Number 12, Michael
24 Ungerer's request for intervenor status and pre-filed
25 testimony; and Number 13, CLJ Lancaster's request for

1 intervenor status; and finally, Number 14, Suzanne Fogel's
2 additional pre-filed testimony. And certainly we should ask
3 is there any objection, thank you.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney Chiocchio or
5 Attorney Patrick do you have any objections admitting those
6 into evidence?

7 ATTORNEY CHIOCCHIO: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. No
8 objections. Just noting that we do not have the opportunity
9 to cross-examine the folks that prepared those exhibits. I
10 think it'd probably be more appropriate that they be just
11 considered comments, but no objections.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney Chiocchio.
13 Attorney Baldwin any objections?

14 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: I will object, Mr. Morissette. If we
15 don't have the opportunity to cross-examine, they shouldn't
16 procedurally come into the record. They can certainly be
17 offered as limited appearance statements, which we would not
18 object to.

19 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Thank you, Attorney Baldwin.
20 Attorney Bachman, I think the suggestion is to introduce them
21 as comment letters versus information into the record. Do
22 you concur?

23 ATTORNEY BACHMAN: Without the opportunity for
24 cross-examination, Mr. Morissette, they could be nothing but
25 admitted appearance statements, thank you.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. So Exhibits 2, 5, 7, 12,
2 13, and 14 will be introduced as limited appearance letters
3 and will not be part of the record to be cross-examined this
4 afternoon. So with that, Dorothy Deluca, Danielle Caldwell,
5 JoAnn Villamizer, and Tim Keyes, you have offered the
6 exhibits listed under the hearing program under Roman numeral
7 4B1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 15. Is there any
8 objections to making these exhibits identification purposes
9 only at this time? Dorothy Deluca?

10 MS. DELUCA: No objection.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Dottie -- Danielle Caldwell, any
12 objection?

13 MS. CALDWELL: Nope.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: JoAnn Villamizer?

15 MS. VILLAMIZAR: No objection.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Tim Keyes?

17 MR. KEYES: No, sir.

18 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Continuing on. Dorothy
19 Deluca, Danielle Caldwell, JoAnn Villamizer and Tim Keyes,
20 did you prepare and assist and prepare the exhibits 4B -- the
21 exhibits I listed off earlier? Please respond.

22 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Yes, we prepared the ones that we
23 submit with our names on it.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Each person has to respond,
25 please.

1 MS. CALDWELL: Yes.

2 MS. DELUCA: Yes.

3 MR. KEYES: Tim Keyes here, the exhibit with my name on
4 it.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Thank you for that
6 clarification. Do you have any additions, clarifications,
7 deletions, or modifications to those documents?

8 MS. DELUCA: No.

9 MS. CALDWELL: No.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Are these exhibits true and
11 accurate to the best of your knowledge?

12 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Yes.

13 MS. CALDWELL: Yes.

14 MS. DELUCA: Yes.

15 MR. KEYES: Yes.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Do you offer these exhibits as your
17 testimony today?

18 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Yes.

19 MS. DELUCA: Yes.

20 MS. CALDWELL: Yes.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good, thank you. Thank you for
22 working through that with me. Does any party or intervenor
23 object to the admission of the Grouped Intervenors Exhibits?
24 Attorney Chiocchio?

25 ATTORNEY CHIOCCHIO: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. No

1 objections.

2 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Attorney Baldwin?

3 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: No objection.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. And, Ann Taylor? Hearing
5 no objections, the exhibits are hereby admitted. Thank you.
6 We will now begin with cross-examination of the Grouped
7 Resident Intervenors by the Council starting with
8 Mr. Mercier, and then followed by Mr. Silvestri. Mr.
9 Mercier, please continue.

10 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. I have no questions, thank
11 you.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr. Silvestri, followed by
13 Mr. Nguyen. Mr. Silvestri.

14 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. I had one
15 question because there was a concern about the propane tanks
16 and firearms used by the scouts. Does anyone know what type
17 of firearm is actually used by the scouts at the camp?

18 MS. VILLAMIZAR: .22 shotguns and they use some larger
19 caliber shotgun.

20 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. So they're bona fide guns as
21 opposed to pellet or BB guns, correct.

22 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Yes.

23 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good, thank you. Mr. Morissette,
24 that's all the questions I have, thank you.

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Silvestri. We will now

1 continue cross-examination of the Grouped Resident
2 Intervenors by Mr. Nguyen, followed by Mr. Golembiewski.
3 Mr. Nguyen.

4 MR. NGUYEN: I don't have any question, thank you,
5 Mr. Morissette.

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good, thank you. We will now
7 continue with cross-examination by Mr. Golembiewski, followed
8 by Mr. Lynch. Mr. Golembiewski.

9 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. I don't
10 have any questions. Their positions are pretty clear, and I
11 appreciate their input. Thank you.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you Mr. Golembiewski. We will
13 now continue with cross-examination by Mr. Lynch. I don't
14 believe Mr. Lynch is with us this afternoon though. I don't
15 see him, so I will continue with my cross-examination. I
16 don't have any questions for the Grouped Resident
17 Intervenors. I believe their -- as Mr. Golembiewski stated,
18 I think their positions are very clear, and I thank them for
19 participating in the hearing and the comments here today. We
20 will not continue with cross-examination of the Grouped
21 Resident Intervenors by the applicant. Attorney Chiocchio.

22 ATTORNEY CHIOCCHIO: Thank you, Mr. Morissette, no
23 questions.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney Chiocchio. We will
25 now continue with cross-examination of the Grouped Resident

1 Intervenor by Verizon Wireless. Attorney Baldwin.

2 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: No questions, Mr. Morissette. Thank
3 you.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney Baldwin. We will
5 now continue with cross-examination of the Grouped Resident
6 Intervenor by the Grouped Business Intervenor. Ann Taylor.

7 MS. VILLAMIZAR: She's got no objections. No questions.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good, thank you. With that, we
9 will continue with the appearance of the Grouped Business
10 Intervenor. Will the Grouped Business Intervenor present
11 their witness panel for purposes of taking the oath? That
12 would be Ann Taylor and Dino Trevisani.

13 MS. VILLAMIZAR: They're not here. They're not going to
14 present the panel.

15 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. With that,
16 Attorney Chiochio and Attorney Baldwin, do you have any
17 objections to entering the exhibits identified in the hearing
18 program into the record? Attorney Chiochio?

19 ATTORNEY CHIOCCHIO: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. I would
20 suggest that they would be entered as limited appearance or
21 public comments given that there are no witnesses here to
22 cross-examine on those exhibits.

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good, thank you.
24 Attorney Baldwin?

25 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: I concur, Mr. Morissette.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Attorney Bachman?

2 ATTORNEY BACHMAN: I also concur, Mr. Morissette, thank
3 you.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good, thank you. The exhibits
5 listed as Identifications 1 through 4 will be submitted as
6 limited appearance public comments statements and will not be
7 part of the record except for as stated as limited
8 appearances, so therefore, there's no cross-examination by
9 the Council or by the intervenors or parties.

10 With that we will continue with the appearance of the
11 applicant. All right. We're going to take a ten-minute
12 break and we will reconvene at 3:30, at which time,
13 MCM Holding will take the stand to -- we will be able to
14 cross-examine them on the new exhibits that they have filed
15 in this docket. So a ten-minute break, we'll see everybody
16 at 3:30. Thank you, everyone.

17
18 (Recess taken from 3:20 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.)
19

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Thank you, everyone, we're back.
21 Is the court reporter back with us? Yes, okay, I see you,
22 thank you. Okay. Now, we will continue with the appearance
23 of the applicant -- appearance of the applicant
24 MCM Holding, LLC, to verify the new exhibits that they have
25 submitted marked as Roman numeral 2, items B12 through 16.

1 Attorney Chiocchio or Attorney Patrick, please begin by
2 identifying the new exhibits you have filed in this matter
3 and verifying the exhibits by the appropriate sworn
4 witnesses.

5 ATTORNEY CHIOCCHIO: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. The
6 applicant's exhibits include those identified in the hearing
7 program under Roman numeral 2B, item numbers 12 through 16,
8 and I'll ask each of our witnesses a series of questions
9 regarding those identified exhibits and ask that they answer
10 individually. And I'll ask our -- to perhaps come into the
11 camera so that way you're identified. Thank you. Did you
12 prepare or assist in the preparation of the exhibits I've
13 identified? Virginia?

14 MS. KING: Virginia King with MCM, yes.

15 MR. GUSTAFSON: Matt Gustafson, yes.

16 MR. GAUDET: Brian Gaudet, yes.

17 MR. MEAD: Jason Mead, yes.

18 ATTORNEY CHIOCCHIO: Do you have any updates or
19 clarifications to the information contained within those
20 exhibits?

21 MS. KING: Virginia King, no.

22 MR. GUSTAFSON: Matt Gustafson, no.

23 MR. GAUDET: Brian Gaudet, no.

24 MR. MEAD: Jason Mead, no.

25 ATTORNEY CHIOCCHIO: Is the information contained within

1 those exhibits true and accurate to the best of your
2 knowledge and belief?

3 MS. KING: Virginia King, yes.

4 MR. GUSTAFSON: Matt Gustafson, yes.

5 MR. GAUDET: Brian Gaudet, yes.

6 MR. MEAD: Jason Mead, yes.

7 ATTORNEY CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt those exhibits as
8 your testimony in this proceeding?

9 MS. KING: Virginia King, yes.

10 MR. GUSTAFSON: Matt Gustafson, yes.

11 MR. GAUDET: Brian Gaudet, yes.

12 MR. MEAD: Jason Mead, yes.

13 ATTORNEY CHIOCCHIO: Thank you. Thank you,
14 Mr. Morissette, we'd ask that MCM's exhibits be accepted into
15 the record.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney Chiocchio. Is any
17 party or intervenor object to the admission of the
18 applicant's new exhibits? Attorney Baldwin?

19 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: I'm not sure if you heard me. No
20 objection.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, I heard you this time.
22 Thank you. Okay, the Grouped Resident Intervenors, JoAnn
23 Villamizer?

24 MS. VILLAMIZAR: No objection. No objection.

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Grouped Business

1 Intervenors, Ann Taylor?

2 MS. VILLAMIZAR: She's not present. She has no
3 objection.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good, thank you. The exhibits are
5 hereby admitted. We will now continue with cross-examination
6 of the applicants on the new exhibits by the Council.
7 Starting with Mr. Mercier, followed by Mr. Silvestri.
8 Mr. Mercier.

9 MR. MERCIER: I have no questions, thank you.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr. Silvestri, followed by
11 Mr. Nguyen. Mr. Silvestri.

12 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. I'd like to
13 refer to drawing SP2. And one of the questions I have on
14 that, I see a difference inside the compound with the revised
15 drawing now has three additional propane tanks, each at
16 500 gallons versus the original drawing, which only had two
17 propane tanks at 500 gallons; is that correct?

18 MR. MEAD: Good afternoon, Mr. Silvestri. Yes, that is
19 correct. Jason Mead.

20 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Then I've been studying the two
21 inside the compounds. I can't see any other changes that are
22 there. If there are any changes could you point them out?

23 MR. MEAD: There are no other changes --

24 MR. SILVESTRI: Just -- okay, just the propane tanks,
25 thank you. Then a related question on that. I guess Verizon

1 would have 1,000-gallon tank of propane. The other three
2 would be 500-gallon tanks. Is that the norm for additional
3 carriers, or would the tank size be increased, or how is the
4 500-gallon tanks justified?

5 MR. MEAD: The trend in the industry has been
6 500 gallons maximum. Verizon has an exception, their
7 national directive requires 1,000 gallon for a 50kW
8 generator.

9 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good, thank you. Mr. Morissette,
10 that's all the questions I have, thank you.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Silvestri. We'll
12 continue with cross-examination of the applicant by
13 Mr. Nguyen, followed by Mr. Golembiewski. Mr. Nguyen.

14 MR. NGUYEN: Mr. Morissette, I have no questions. Thank
15 you.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen. We will now
17 continue with cross-examination with Mr. Golembiewski,
18 followed by myself. Mr. Golembiewski.

19 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. I just
20 had a question regarding the revised plans. I wanted to
21 confirm that the utility connections are the same, they have
22 not been revised since the initial plan?

23 MR. MEAD: Good afternoon, Jason Mead again. That is
24 correct. There is no -- there have not been any changes to
25 the proposed utility runs to the compound.

1 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Thank you. And then my second
2 question, I know the issue of trying to move the compound to
3 approximately 100 feet from the wetlands, if Mr. Gustafson,
4 could you remind me why that -- why that's not being proposed
5 again.

6 MR. GUSTAFSON: Good afternoon, Matthew Gustafson for
7 the record. The reason behind the location of the compound
8 being where it is from an environmental impact statement
9 perspective, is that moving it farther to the east would
10 result in greater tree clearing, as well as grading, and
11 proliferation of the forested habitat, as well as moving it
12 closer to Wetland 2, which has the imbedded vernal pool
13 resource, as well as moving the compound outside of the
14 100 foot buffer that I expect would provide additional, or
15 substantial additional buffering to Wetland 1 that would
16 compensate for those additional impacts.

17 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. Thank you. My last question,
18 there was, I guess, some questions as to how can a
19 100-foot -- 150-foot monopole that is significantly above the
20 tree line, how can it have such limited visibility?

21 And I guess if -- if you could sort of summarize as
22 well -- as concisely as you can why the visibility in this
23 case is -- I think it ends up being less than 1 percent of
24 the viewshed or -- so if you could just explain to me, why
25 exactly the visibility is pretty limited in this case?

1 MR. GAUDET: Yeah, Brian Gaudet with APT. It's -- it's
2 perspective is what it comes down to. I think the easiest
3 way to describe this would be, if you see a 150-foot tower
4 and you're 200 feet away from it, if there's a tree one foot
5 in front of that tower you're going to see -- let's say an
6 80-foot tree, one foot in front of that tower, you're going
7 to see, for arguments sake, 69 feet of that tower, if my math
8 is correct, there. It's been a while since I've done it off
9 my head but, if you move that tree to 100 feet from the tower
10 the mid point between you and the tower, you might only see
11 the top 20 feet of that tree.

12 So as -- as the visual obstructions in this case, where
13 you have pretty significant tree cover in the area, impede
14 your view as you get closer to those obstructions, so if
15 there is a tree directly in front of you, you're not going
16 see any of the tower. If you move 10 feet back you might not
17 see any of the tower. That's the perspective that I'm
18 talking about.

19 If you've ever seen line-of-sight drawings on
20 engineering documents, sometimes they -- those can play well
21 in situations like this to explain it. Unfortunately,
22 there's none on the record, but that's the general concept is
23 that, you know, obstruction as it moves closer to the viewer,
24 obstructs more of the object behind it.

25 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: How does the topography in the area

1 of the tower site versus say the closest homes. How does
2 that play into effect or if -- or does it?

3 MR. GAUDET: It does it in a somewhat similar concept.
4 You're now, instead of looking straight out at the tower,
5 you're looking more up. This point is one of the higher
6 points in the area, from my time driving around that area.
7 Most of the roads and residential properties sit at a lower
8 grade than where the tower is proposed. So you would be
9 looking up, even if there were no trees, the topography
10 itself would -- would impede the views. If there were no
11 trees you would certainly see more of the tower from a
12 year-round perspective. With the trees you can see the tower
13 through the trees, but they wouldn't be extending above the
14 tree line, again, with the trees being there and the fact
15 that your perspective is that you're looking up a hill as
16 opposed to down.

17 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank
18 you to the panel. Mr. Morissette, that's all I have.

19 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Golembiewski. With
20 that, I didn't quite understand what was -- why was the new
21 drawings submitted into evidence. Was it just to reflect the
22 tanks, the fourth tank is -- that's the only reason why you
23 filed it?

24 MR. MEAD: Good afternoon, Mr. Morissette.

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Good afternoon.

1 MR. MEAD: Yes, that is correct to purely demonstrate
2 that we could indeed fit another tank within the compound.

3 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay, very good. Okay, thank you.
4 That's all the questions I have. With that, we will continue
5 with cross-examination of applicant on the new exhibits by
6 Verizon Wireless. Attorney Baldwin.

7 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: We have no questions, Mr. Morissette.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney Baldwin. We will
9 now continue with cross-examination of applicant on the new
10 exhibits by the Grouped Resident Intervenors.

11 JoAnn Villamizer.

12 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Hi, I just have one question. It's
13 following up to a previous question. Relative to moving the
14 facility 100 feet away from Wetlands 1, in response to
15 interrogatory number 8 of my second set of interrogatories,
16 you indicated that the infrastructure trails and usage by the
17 camp prohibit movement that 50 feet; is that correct?

18 MR. MEAD: Good afternoon, Jason Mead. Yes, that is
19 correct.

20 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Okay, thank you.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good, thank you. We will now
22 continue with cross-examination --

23 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Sorry, I'm sorry. I missed Mr. Keyes's
24 questions.

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good, please continue.

1 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Sorry, I'm very sorry. Verizon's
2 1,000-gallon standard verses MCM's 500-gallon standard, could
3 you clarify why you would be putting in the 1,000-gallon --
4 gallon-tank if, in fact, yours is a 500-gallon standard.

5 MR. MEAD: Good afternoon, Jason Mead. I think I can
6 answer that question. Verizon's national directive, as I
7 mentioned earlier, for a 50kW generator, requires a certain
8 amount of runtime, and with that, we need the water capacity
9 and the gallons that would be proposed within 1,000-gallon
10 tank. 500-gallon tank would not base sufficient for that
11 50kW.

12 MS. VILLAMIZAR: So you don't anticipate that additional
13 cell providers would be using the same size generator, they
14 would use and a smaller one?

15 MR. MEAD: The trend has typically been smaller
16 generator, yes.

17 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Okay. So then, I don't get that, I
18 already ask that one. Thank you.

19 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. We will continue with
20 cross-examination of applicant on the new exhibits by Grouped
21 Business Intervenors. Ann Taylor.

22 MS. VILLAMIZAR: Ann Taylor is not present and she has
23 no questions.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good, thank you. Very good, that
25 concludes our hearing for this afternoon. Before closing the

1 evidentiary record in this matter, the Connecticut Siting
2 Council announces that briefs and proposed findings of fact
3 may be filed with the Council by any party or intervenor no
4 later than February 22, 2024.

5 A submission of briefs or proposed findings of fact are
6 not required by this Council, rather we leave it to the
7 choice of the parties and intervenors. Anyone who has not
8 become a party or intervenor but who desires to make his or
9 her views known by the Council may file written statements
10 with the Council within the 30 days of the date thereof.
11 Council will issue draft findings of fact and therefore after
12 parties and intervenors may identify errors or
13 inconsistencies between the Council's draft findings of fact
14 and the record. However, no new information, no new
15 evidence, no arguments, and no reply briefs without our
16 permission will be considered by the Council.

17 Copies of the transcript of this hearing will be filed
18 in the Redding Town clerk's Office for the convenience of the
19 public. I hereby declare this hearing adjourned, and thank
20 you, everyone, for your participation. Have a good evening,
21 and stay safe with the storm coming in. Bye now.

22
23 (The hearing was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.)
24
25

