CERTIFIED COPY

1	CERTIFIED COPT
2	STATE OF CONNECTICUT
3	CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL
4	
5	Docket No. 518
6	New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC d/b/a AT&T and
7	Tarpon Towers III, LLC, Application for a
8	Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and
9	Public Need for the Construction, Maintenance, and
10	Operation of a Telecommunications Facility Located
11	at 99 Dart Hill Road, South Windsor, Connecticut.
12	
13	Zoom Remote Council Meeting (Teleconference),
14	on Thursday, December 14, 2023, beginning at 2 p.m.
15	
16	Held Before:
17	JOHN MORISSETTE, Member and Presiding Officer
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	Appearances:
2	Council Members:
3	JOHN MORISSETTE, (Hearing Officer)
4	
5	BRIAN GOLEMBIEWSKI,
6	DEEP Designee
7	
8	STEVEN CADWALLADER,
9	PURA Designee
10	
11	DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.
12	ROBERT SILVESTRI
13	
14	
15	Council Staff:
16	MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.,
17	Executive Director and Staff Attorney
18	
19	IFEANYI NWANKWO,
20	Siting Analyst
21	
22	LISA FONTAINE,
23	Fiscal Administrative Officer
24	
25	

Appearances:(cont'd)
For NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC:
CUDDY & FEDER, LLP
445 Hamilton Avenue
White Plains, NY 10601
By: DANIEL PATRICK, ESQ.
DPatrick@cuddyfeder.com
914.761.1300
and: LUCIA CHIOCCHIO
LChiocchio@cuddyfeder.com
914.761.1300
For TARPON TOWER III, LLC:
COHEN & WOLF, PC
1115 Broad Street
Bridgeport, Connecticut 06604
By: DAVID A. BALL, ESQ.
DBall@cohenandwolf.com
203.337.4134

1 (Begin: 2 p.m.)

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

Thank you.

This public hearing is called to order this
Thursday, December 14, 2023, at 2 p.m. My name is
John Morissette, member and presiding officer of
the Connecticut Siting Council.

Other members of the Council are Brian

Golembiewski, designee for Commissioner Katie

Dykes of the Department of Energy and

Environmental Protection. We have Steven

Cadwallader, designee for Chairman Marissa Paslick

Gillett of the Public Utilities Regulatory

Authority. Welcome, Steven.

And we have Robert Silvestri and Daniel P. Lynch, Jr.

Members of the staff are Melanie Bachman, Executive Director and staff attorney; Ifeanyi Nwankwo, siting analyst; Lisa Fontaine, fiscal administrative officer; and Dakota Lafountain, clerk typist.

If you haven't done so already, I ask that everyone please mute their computer audio and/or

telephones now.

This hearing is held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act upon an application from New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC, doing business as AT&T and Tarpon Tower III, LLC, for a certificate of environmental compatibility and public need for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 99 Dart Hill Road in South Windsor, Connecticut.

This application was received by the Council on August 22, 2023. The Council's legal notice of the date and time of this public hearing was published in the Journal Inquirer on September 16, 2023.

Upon this Council's request, the Applicants erected a sign in the vicinity of the proposed site as to inform the public of the name of the applicant, the type of facility, the public hearing date, and contact information for the Council, including the website and phone number.

As a reminder to all, off-the-record communications with a member of the Council or a member of the Council's staff upon the merits of

this application is prohibited by law.

The parties and interveners to the proceeding are as follows. The Applicants, New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC, represented by Lucia Chiocchio, Esquire, and Daniel Patrick, Esquire, of Cuddy & Feder LLP; and Tarpon Tower III, LLC, represented by David A. Ball, Esquire, and Philip C. Pires, Esquire, of Cohen and Wolf, PC.

We will proceed in accordance with the prepared agenda, a copy of which is available on the Docket Number 518 webpage, along with a record of this matter, the public hearing notice, instructions for public access to this public hearing, and the Council's citizen's guide to Siting Council's procedures.

Interested persons may join any session of the public hearing to listen, but no public comment will be received during the 2 p.m.

Evidentiary session. At the end of the evidentiary session, we will recess until 6:30 p.m. for the public comment session. Please be advised that any person may be removed from the evidentiary session or the public comment session at the discretion of the Council.

The 6:30 p.m. public comment session is

reserved for members of the public who signed up in advance to make brief statements into the record. I wish to note that the Applicant, parties, and interveners, including their representatives, witnesses, and members, are not allowed to participate in the public comment session.

I also wish to note for those who are listening and for the benefit of your friends and neighbors who are unable to join us for the public comment session, that you or they may send written statements to the Council within 30 days of the date hereof, either by mail or by e-mail, and such statements will be given the same weight as if spoken during the public comment session.

A verbatim transcript of this public hearing will be posted on the Council's Docket Number 518 webpage and deposited with the South Windsor Town Clerk's office for the convenience of the public. Please be advised that the Council's project evaluation criteria under the statute does not include consideration of property values.

We will take a 10 to 15-minute break at a convenient juncture at around 3.30 p.m.

I will now move on to administrative notices

1 taken by the Council. I wish to call your 2 attention to those items shown on the hearing 3 program marked as Roman Numerals 1B, items 1 4 through 82. 5 Do the Applicants have any objection to the 6 items that the Council has administratively 7 noticed? Attorney Chiocchio or Patrick? 8 MR. PATRICK: No objection. 9 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Patrick. 10 Attorney Ball or Attorney Pires? 11 MR. BALL: Good afternoon, Mr. Morissette. 12 We have no objection. 13 THE HEARING OFFICER: Good afternoon, Attorney Ball. 14 Accordingly, the Council hereby administratively 15 notices these existing documents. 16 Will the Applicant present its witness panel for purposes of taking the oath and we will have 17 18 Attorney Bachman administer the oath. 19 Attorney Patrick and Attorney Ball? 20 MR. PATRICK: Yes. Good afternoon, Mr. Morissette. I 21 have AT&T's witnesses here in the room with me. 22 We have Martin Lavin, Radiofrequency Engineer 23 from C Squared Systems, LLC. We also have Harry 24 Carey, the Director of External Affairs at AT&T. 25 So I present these two witnesses on behalf of AT&T

1	today.
2	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Attorney Ball?
3	MR. BALL: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. And for Tarpon
4	Towers III, we have Keith Coppins, Doug Roberts,
5	and David Archambault, all of whom are online
6	right now.
7	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Ball.
8	Attorney Bachman, please administer the oath.
9	MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. Could the
LO	Witnesses please raise their right hands?
L1	MARTIN LAVIN,
L2	HARRY CAREY,
L3	KEITH COPPINS,
L4	DOUG ROBERTS,
L5	DAVID ARCHAMBAULT,
L6	called as witnesses, being sworn remotely by
L7	THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, were examined and
L8	testified under oath as follows:
L9	
20	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Bachman.
21	Attorney Chiocchio and Attorney Ball, please
22	begin by verifying all the exhibits for the
23	appropriate sworn witnesses. Attorney
24	Chiocchio oh, Attorney Patrick, excuse me.
25	MR. PATRICK: No, no worries. The Applicant's exhibits

1 are identified in the hearing program as Roman numeral 2, subsection B, 1 through 5. For 2 3 verification purposes, I'll ask AT&T, their 4 witnesses a few questions and ask them to respond 5 yes or no, and then I'll let Attorney Ball do the same for his witnesses. 6 7 So the first question, did you prepare or 8 assist in the preparation of the exhibits 9 identified? 10 Mr. Lavin? 11 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin. Yes. 12 THE WITNESS (Carey): Harry Carey. Yes. 13 MR. PATRICK: Do you have any updates or corrections to 14 the identified exhibits? 15 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin. No. 16 THE WITNESS (Carey): Harry Carey. 17 MR. PATRICK: Is the information contained in the 18 identified exhibits true and accurate to the best 19 of your belief? 20 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin. 21 THE WITNESS (Carey): Harry Carey. Yes. 22 MR. PATRICK: Do you adopt these exhibits as your 23 testimony? 24 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin. Yes. 25 THE WITNESS (Carey): Harry Carey. Yes.

- 1 MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.
- 2 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Attorney Ball?
- 3 MR. BALL: Thank you. I'll be asking the same
- 4 questions of my panel.
- 5 Mr. Coppins, did you prepare, assist, or 6 supervise in the preparation of Exhibits 1 through 7

5?

- 8 THE WITNESS (Coppins): Yes.
- 9 MR. BALL: Do you have any revisions or corrections to 10 those exhibits?
- 11 THE WITNESS (Coppins):
- MR. BALL: Are they true and accurate to the best of 12
- 13 your knowledge and belief?
- 14 THE WITNESS (Coppins): Yes, they are.
- 15 MR. BALL: And do you adopt the exhibits as your
- 16 testimony?
- 17 THE WITNESS (Coppins): I do.
- 18 MR. BALL: Mr. Roberts, did you prepare, assist, or
- 19 supervise in the preparation of Exhibits 1 through
- 20 5?
- 21 THE WITNESS (Roberts): Yes, I did.
- 22 MR. BALL: And do you have any revisions or corrections
- 23 to the exhibits?
- 24 THE WITNESS (Roberts): No, I do not.
- 25 MR. BALL: Are they true and accurate to the best of

1 your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Roberts): Yes. 2 3 MR. BALL: And do you adopt them as your testimony 4 today? 5 THE WITNESS (Roberts): I do. 6 MR. BALL: Thank you. And Mr. Archambault -- if you 7 can unmute yourself? 8 THE WITNESS (Archambault): There we go. Sorry. 9 MR. BALL: All right. Did you prepare, assist, or 10 supervise in the preparation of Exhibits 1 through 11 5? 12 THE WITNESS (Archambault): I did. 13 MR. BALL: Do you have any revisions or corrections to 14 the exhibits? 15 THE WITNESS (Archambault): I do not. 16 MR. BALL: Are they true and accurate to the best of 17 your knowledge and belief? 18 THE WITNESS (Archambault): Yes. 19 MR. BALL: Do you adopt them as your testimony today? 20 THE WITNESS (Archambault): Yes. 21 MR. BALL: So, Mr. Morissette, with that, we would ask 22 that Exhibits 1 through 5 be made full exhibits. 23 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Ball and 24 thank you, Attorney Patrick. 25 The exhibits are hereby admitted.

1 We will now begin with cross-examination of 2 the Applicant by the Council, starting with 3 Mr. Nwankwo, and I will go second. 4 Mr. Nwankwo, good afternoon. 5 MR. NWANKWO: Good afternoon, Mr. Morissette. 6 I'll begin my question with a reference to 7 the Applicant's response to Council Interrogatory 8 Number 22. 9 My question is, what is the estimated 10 distance from the existing access drive entrance 11 from Dart Hill Road to the existing gate within 12 the Eversource right-of-way? 13 THE WITNESS (Roberts): That would fall under me, Doug 14 Roberts. 15 I don't have that specific dimension. If you 16 give me about three minutes, I can get back to you 17 on that. 18 MR. NWANKWO: No problem. Thank you. 19 THE WITNESS (Roberts): Thank you. 20 MR. NWANKWO: On my next question I'll refer to the 21 Applicant's response to Council Interrogatories 22 Number 22 on 59. 23 My question is, what uses of the right-of-way 24 are permitted and what uses are prohibited under 25 the Eversource application?

1 THE WITNESS (Coppins): I can try to answer that. the -- on the permitted use application for the --2 3 for Eversource, there I didn't see any 4 restrictions on use of their -- of the 5 right-of-way. 6 MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. Did the Applicants make any 7 requests from Eversource for any specific 8 permitted use within the right-of-way? 9 THE WITNESS (Coppins): The -- the only thing that 10 we -- that we've requested is access over their 11 existing right-of-way, and their questions were 12 more about where the tower was located. And they 13 wanted us to be 60 feet away from the existing 14 poles, which we are. 15 MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. What is the status of the 16 application currently? 17 THE WITNESS (Coppins): We've -- we paid -- we paid the 18 application fee several weeks ago, and we're just 19 waiting on Eversource -- or Cornerstone, who is 20 Eversource's consulting vendor, to finalize the 21 application. And then I think it has to go to 22 engineering, but when we talked to the -- to the 23 group, they didn't see any issues with what we 24 were trying to accomplish here.

Thank you, Mr. Coppins.

25

MR. NWANKWO:

My next

1 question, is the existing Eversource right-of-way 2 access gate locked? 3 THE WITNESS (Roberts): Yes, it is. And to answer your 4 question, it's around 400 feet from that gate 5 across their right-of-way to our approximate 6 compound area. 7 MR. NWANKWO: Excellent. Thank you. 8 THE WITNESS (Roberts): You're welcome. 9 MR. NWANKWO: So my next question will be, how would 10 the Applicants, and maybe possible future tenants 11 who are co-located at the facility, how would they 12 be granted access for maintenance or in emergency 13 situations? 14 THE WITNESS (Coppins): Similar to -- similar to all 15 the other sites that we have, Eversource is going 16 to give us an easement to allow access for all, 17 all purposes for the use of the cell tower. 18 Thank you. Does the Applicant have any MR. NWANKWO: 19 idea of approximately how many construction 20 vehicles, or what type of vehicles will be 21 expected to enter the site during construction? 22 THE WITNESS (Coppins): Just during construction, 23 we'll -- we'll use -- we'll need a crane. We'll 24 need, you know, some, you know, backhoes and --25 and things to, you know, to clear, to clear the

1 area.

Once -- I think the crane is probably the biggest thing, concrete trucks as well, and they all will have full access to the -- to the site.

- MR. NWANKWO: Thank you for that. Has there been any designated parking area for these construction vehicles within the project area?
- THE WITNESS (Coppins): I don't think we have

 designated specific parking areas for them, but

 they would -- they typically will, during the

 construction phase, park outside or, you know,

 park within, in the -- within the -- of our lease

 area when they -- when they leave, but nothing is

 going to be parked on a permanent basis.
- MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. I'll actually refer to page 6 of the power density report, which indicates that AT&T would allocate both the 3500 and the 3700 megahertz frequencies to its 5G service.

My question is, will both frequencies become operational at the same time? Or would one frequency be commissioned and then another one for the future?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): This is Martin Lavin. I'm not sure of the schedule for those two. They might come out together, or they might come out

separately. I would have to verify that.

MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. How would the topography of the surrounding area impact the site coverage?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): We're -- Martin Lavin again.

We're located on a hill, which is a good spot to be. We're roughly between at least three or four sites about the same distance, a mile, a mile and a half. Sitting up on that hill allows us to cover this whole area.

In terms of topography, this is really the best place to be. It's a hill more or less right in the middle of the coverage gap.

MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. Is AT&T anticipating any interference from adjoining hills or any topography in that area?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): The topography will limit the coverage somewhat as opposed to being in a flat area, but in this particular case this hill works out well in terms of being high enough to see a lot of this.

There are other ridges around this area, but to be in this particular spot minimizes any loss of coverage due to terrain to the -- to the extent practical.

MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. I would like to refer to the

Applicant's response to Council Interrogatory

Number 5, also called Exhibit 5, within the

response. Could the Applicant please confirm the

number of omni antennas that the Town proposes to

install?

- THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think that's more of a question for Tarpon. Keith? Or --
- THE WITNESS (Coppins): Can you just repeat that question for me, please?
- MR. NWANKWO: Yeah. In the response to Council
 Interrogatory Number 5, I think there was an
 attachment which was called Exhibit 5. So I think
 that shows the town's application to co-locate on
 the tower. Under the section for the omni
 antennas, there was a section that was blank for
 quantity. So there are two sections for the omni
 antennas, I believe.
- THE WITNESS (Coppins): So then, let me just -- so they're going to -- so they're going to go at the 155-foot, and they're doing two. It looks like they're doing a total of two antennas, two, two omni antennas.
- MR. NWANKWO: Okay. Under the column that says, antenna one, just the quantity shows that it's empty. Does that mean that nothing has been

installed there?

THE WITNESS (Coppins): In the application, it just shows that, nothing in there, but it gives a model number underneath it. So I'm assuming that it's -- it may have hit into the number two, because it looks like it's the same exact one.

MR. NWANKWO: Okay. Thank you.

For my next question, I would like to refer to Attachment I of the application, and the updated US Fish and Wildlife Service

Correspondence. It's dated April 21, 2023, which indicates that the monarch butterfly may occur within the site. The Fish and Wildlife Service also recommended coordination to determine if the proposed project would have an impact on these species.

My question is, has the Applicant coordinated with the Fish and Wildlife Service regarding the monarch butterfly?

THE WITNESS (Coppins): We have not coordinated with them as of yet. We would coordinate with them once the -- if the -- if the Council approve this, this application. Docket approved, then we would hire somebody from ECA to -- to coordinate with Fish and Wildlife.

MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. Also, referring to the

Applicant's response to Council Interrogatory 19,

which indicates that blasting is not anticipated

during construction. My question is, what methods

would be used if rock or ledge were encountered

during construction?

THE WITNESS (Roberts): Doug Roberts here. Normally what we have done is the rock, traditionally the first five feet of rock is heavily fissured, and that usually can be removed with a machine. Only when we get sort of through that does that present a problem, and our -- basically, our foundation is usually five to six feet below grade.

MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. I would also like to refer to the Applicant's response to Council Interrogatory 28, which references the tower's proximity to the transmission lines and distance to the nearest property line. My question is, has the Applicant considered installing a yield point, and at what height would Tarpon install the yield point for the proposed tower?

THE WITNESS (Coppins): I can answer that. Keith

Coppins. We have installed yield points in, in

towers in the past. If the Council desires us to

have a yield point in the -- in the tower we can.

1 We can do that to have it fall within a certain 2 area. Doug would probably be able to best answer 3 of what height it would be at, but we would 4 certainly do that for you. 5 THE WITNESS (Roberts): Yeah, we would look at the 6 closest property line and/or the right-of-way and 7 determine that closest distance, and that would be 8 the fall zone from the top. 9 MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. 10 THE WITNESS (Roberts): You're welcome. 11 MR. NWANKWO: I would like to refer to Council 12 Interrogatory 48. My question is, will AT&T's 13 ground equipment be alarmed? 14 THE WITNESS (Lavin): This is Martin Lavin again. 15 Yes, it will be alarmed. 16 MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. Also referring to the 17 Applicant's response to Council Interrogatory 18 Number 62, could the facility be treated or 19 painted to match the electric transmission line 20 structures? 21 THE WITNESS (Roberts): The transmission line 22 structures are actually wood. They're a utility 23 pole, like a regular street side utility pole. 24 We're proposing it to be galvanized steel in 25 color.

1 MR. NWANKWO: Okay. Would any different type of 2 stealth tower design blend in with the surrounding 3 area? 4 THE WITNESS (Coppins): Did you ask if there was -- if 5 there was other stealth around the area --6 MR. NWANKWO: Yes, if there was another -- yes, that 7 stealth tower design that would blend in with the 8 surrounding area? 9 THE WITNESS (Coppins): Other than -- other than a 10 monopine, I think that would probably be the only 11 design that would blend with the -- with the area 12 given the -- given the tree cover there. 13 THE WITNESS (Roberts): And at 165 feet it would be 14 quite out of place. 15 Thank you. I would like to refer to the MR. NWANKWO: 16 Applicant's response to Council Interrogatories 35 17 and 36. 18 And my question is, how is the need for new 19 facility or additional data capacity, how is that 20 determined when nearby sites are not near 21 exhaustion? 22 THE WITNESS (Lavin): This is Martin Lavin. 23 Specifically AT&T, the capacity relief, there 24 isn't any capacity relief needed in this 25 situation. This is strictly a coverage gap.

1 That's by measurements and by predictions to show 2 critical areas where coverage is lacking. 3 MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. Similar to a coverage map, 4 can capacity exhaustion be predicted on a map, 5 too? 6 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Capacity exhaustion is predicted. 7 We hope -- we always hope to stay ahead of it 8 running out. We probably take a year's worth of 9 data or so, I believe, and do a line fit to it, 10 and see when it's going to exceed the criteria. 11 MR. NWANKWO: Excellent. Thank you very much. 12 you, Mr. Morissette. That's all my questions. 13 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Nwankwo. 14 I will continue with my cross-examination for 15 this afternoon. And I would like to turn to the 16 drawings attached to the interrogatories, 17 specifically the drawing of the property, and the 18 topo map. 19 My first question is, how much improvement to 20 the access road will be required? 21 THE WITNESS (Roberts): The existing road is certainly 22 serviceable right now. When we, if we were to be 23 approved and install the underground utilities, 24 after that we would resurface that road and bring 25 it up to better condition than it is today.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Now, given that it's an existing access road within Eversource's easement, there to the south, it appeared that there was room to go up the side of the right-of-way.

Did you have any comment on that?

I know that given that it's an existing access road, I can see why you're using it, but it looked like there was room in the south side of the right-of-way.

THE WITNESS (Roberts): Well, we're coming right off of Dart Hill Road, right onto their main access to that utility run. The properties that are to the south of that right-of -- well, along the street, are privately held not by our tenant.

So our tenant has just that strip of land that goes from Dart Hill Road and then expands up and crosses the right-of-way, and we're on the south side of their transmission line right-of-way. So that was the area that kind of was just woods. Our landlord owns that property and it was away from any of the other structures along that, that road.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah, that makes sense.

Thank you.

THE WITNESS (Roberts): You're welcome.

1 THE HEARING OFFICER: Concerning the actual property itself, if we could, using the same exhibit. Now, 2 3 the property owner on the leased area is Judith 4 Eckhouse? 5 THE WITNESS (Coppins): Eckhouse. 6 THE HEARING OFFICER: Eckhouse, okay. 7 And she also owns the property to the south? 8 THE WITNESS (Roberts): That is correct. 9 THE WITNESS (Coppins): That is correct. 10 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. So that's two separate 11 properties. Is that right? 12 THE WITNESS (Coppins): Yes, she owns two lots there. 13 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. And the property to the 14 south, it appears to be landlocked. 15 THE WITNESS (Roberts): Yes, you are correct. There is 16 an easement over the host property that we're 17 looking at, to that lot. It's depicted on the 18 survey map, access and utility easement, it shows 19 right along the western property line. 20 THE HEARING OFFICER: Uh-huh. 21 THE WITNESS (Roberts): Access to that. I believe she 22 gave herself an easement. 23 THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, I see it. Yeah, okay. 24 All right. The concern I have is the pad for 25 the location of the site. It's going to be a

25

hundred feet from her property -- or I'll call it THE WITNESS (Roberts): Correct. That is correct. THE HEARING OFFICER: And you're 60 feet, approximately 60 feet to the right-of-way on the north-northeast My concern is that you're going to have a tower pretty close to that property. I'm asking you a question as to what she's going to do with that property, but with the structure there, it may encumber her, what she can do with it? THE WITNESS (Coppins): I -- Keith Coppins. I -- I've been in contact with the Eckhouses and asking them what their future plans were for the property. And they -- they had a house that was -- that was approved at one point in time, I believe, but there they have no -- they have no plans to do anything with the property. I asked them that specific question when we were trying to locate the spot on the -- on the property for this, for the site. THE HEARING OFFICER: Was there any thought of putting this site on that property? It is a higher

THE WITNESS (Coppins): I don't think there was --

there was a thought of putting it there. I don't know that there was a thought of not putting it there either. When -- when we found the property, Doug and I, we talked about where the best place to put it on the single property. We didn't necessarily want to go on the second one, but it possibly could be -- be relocated over onto that other parcel.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah, I was just curious.

All right. Talking about sites, did anybody look at Topstone or Willow Brook Golf courses for a possible site?

THE WITNESS (Coppins): Specifically for this, for this area here?

THE HEARING OFFICER: Uh-huh.

THE WITNESS (Coppins): We did -- we did not. I looked in this area with the notion that there was -- there was a need for -- for a site in this area. The reason that we picked the area that we picked was mainly the -- the power lines that were -- that were already going through and would be a good, good location for a site.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Well, the elevation here is -well, the golf courses are a much lower elevation,
so it probably is not/were good locations anyways

1 because of their low elevation. 2 I'm going to switch to Mr. Lavin. Good afternoon, Mr. Lavin. How are you? 3 4 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I'm muted, unmuted now. 5 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. I've got a couple of 6 questions associated with your coverage map. 7 If we could go to the existing and proposed 8 coverage map? 9 THE WITNESS (Lavin): From the report or from the --10 THE HEARING OFFICER: From the application? 11 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Application. 12 THE HEARING OFFICER: 700 megahertz. 13 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Okay? 14 THE HEARING OFFICER: So it looks like your objective 15 here is to essentially cover the circle gap, but 16 also coverage to the north as well. 17 Now the mall is to your south. Does this 18 improve the coverage at the mall at all? Or is it 19 totally -- I know you will have two towers down by 20 the mall that they'll interact to, but it doesn't 21 necessarily -- let me rephrase it. Sorry. 22 Does the mall need improvement based on 23 you've got adequate coverage at the mall area, and 24 this has nothing really to do with it? 25 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I'm thinking it's CT-5308 and

1093, the mall location, just to the left of the legend, at the bottom of the plot.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Well, no. If you look at your neighboring sites map, it will help you identify it. The one, 5307 and then you have 5323, which is the water tower. Those are right adjacent to the mall.

Unfortunately, your coverage gap doesn't go down that low. Your coverage map, the existing coverage doesn't show --

THE WITNESS (Lavin): At that location, this, this site is not to be doing anything. I don't know whether or not any improvement might be needed, but this site will not do anything for the mall that extensive.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah, I would expect that between those two sites that I just stated, that you would have more than enough coverage down there. So this is really to improve coverage north of the mall into South Windsor?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Concerning the Town's desire to attach to the facility, I'm curious as to why they would need additional equipment on this tower considering that they have a tower at

their police department.

Is this -- I know it may be difficult for you to answer this question, because you're not at the police department, but is this to help communicate with that tower? Or is it independent to try to obtain larger coverage for emergency purposes?

THE WITNESS (Coppins): It's going to be hard to -- hard to answer that with what the police station wants. I know that when we did the technical report, they jumped in very quickly to want to

locate on the tower. So I'll -- I'll defer to

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yeah. While I can't speak directly for them, the fact that they're putting up omni antennas would indicate to me they are looking for coverage rather than interconnection to other sites in the network.

Mr. Lavin on the -- on the coverage area.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. And that kind of goes into my next question as to why, why the police department tower is not adequate to obtain coverage for this area? Is there a feature that I'm not seeing that is obstructing the police department going north, coverage going north?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): I guess I have to know where the police department tower is, and --

1 THE HEARING OFFICER: That's CT-1139, just for your information. 2 3 THE WITNESS (Lavin): You're looking kind of uphill 4 there. You wouldn't get that there's -- that red 5 ridge that runs from CT-1,003. Through the 6 proposed site and down to -- forward CT-1093. 7 believe that the coverage -- let me check the 8 height on 1139. 9 THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah, it looks like you do have a 10 ridge through there. Yeah. 11 THE WITNESS (Lavin): We're 170. There's a ridge 12 through there that I know would certainly cut us 13 off from going anywhere east of there. And 14 there's kind of a ridge there that I think is 15 cutting us off. 16 And when it goes from green up to yellow and 17 up to red, I think that's kind of where we're the 18 ground elevation at -- the ground elevation is 19 down in the blues, like, 150 feet. The site is up 20 that 375. 21 So it's quite a bit downhill from there. 22 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay, and so that the ridge on 23 the proposed site is actually helping you get

coverage to the northeast?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yeah, by being on top of the

24

25

31

I

ridge we get coverage on both sides, yes.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah, okay. That's helpful. All right. That makes sense. Thank you.

Okay. I would like to turn to the sound study. Is the sound study person on the panel this afternoon, or is somebody else answering questions for it?

All right. I'll start in and we'll see where we go. I'm kind of going back to my original questioning about the property lines. If you look at page 14 and 15 of the report, you had 63 dBA and 54 dBA at the property line with the generator, recognizing that the generator is exempt from the noise.

Again, I was concerned about that piece of property if, in fact, something was done with that property, or a house was put on that property, the noise levels from the generator, if it was operating during an emergency, could be up to 76 dBA at 23 feet. So any comments on that?

MS. CHIOCCHIO: Good afternoon, Mr. Morissette. It's

The engineer who performed the study is not on the witness panel, but if in the future there was an issue with respect to sound, we would

Attorney CHIOCCHIO.

certainly work with the property owner to ensure that the equipment met whatever applicable sound regulations are in place.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. Well, as it stands now, based on the analysis, all the equipment, including the generator, would meet the requirements without doing anything.

Okay. Well, thank you.

Let's see what else I got here. Just a comment on the hinge point. I think a hinge point is going to be necessary to ensure that the structure doesn't collapse into the right-of-way, into the transmission facilities.

Oh, yes. One final question and then I'll move on. On page 2 of the application, it indicated that the Town's equipment would be at no cost. Does that mean that there's no rental cost to be on the tower? Or is that -- I'm sure it doesn't mean there's no cost to install the equipment?

THE WITNESS (Coppins): Yes. That there's no -there's no rental income for them to be on the
tower.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay.

THE WITNESS (Coppins): We're giving them space at no

1 charge. 2 THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good. That's what I 3 thought. I just wanted to be clear. All right. Well, thank you, everyone. We will now move 4 5 on to Mr. Cadwallader, followed by 6 Mr. Golembiewski. Mr. Cadwallader, good afternoon 7 and welcome. 8 MR. CADWALLADER: Good afternoon, Mr. Morissette. 9 I don't have any questions at this time. 10 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We'll now continue 11 with cross-examination by Mr. Golembiewski, 12 followed by Mr. Lynch. Mr. Golembiewski? 13 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Good afternoon, Mr. Morissette. I 14 had a question regarding the site search summary, 15 Exhibit F. And my question was specific to a 16 question as to the viability of a tower at 2990 17 Ellington Road, which is in there, is in the list of existing towers. And it appears to be on 18 19 either water towers, or some type of silo 20 structure. 21 If you look at the site search summary in 22 rejected sites maps, they are just northeast of 23 number three of the, I guess, rejected sites. So 24 I was just wondering why that was not a viable 25 alternative.

THE WITNESS (Lavin): This is Martin Lavin again. I believe another carrier is on there, those tanks. It's visible from the road, but those tanks are right at the edge of our current coverage. If we build there, half the coverage would be overlapping with the site to the north, CT-103, I believe. And the other half would stop -- be stopped by the ridge that we're located on with the proposed site.

It's kind of halfway in between the two places we need to be, the one where we are and the one we're going to. The ridge we're on, the red ridge you see on that map of the terrain shows where we would get blocked going south from there. So that would not reach. So that would not give us any of the coverage we're getting to the south from our proposed site.

MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. So that -- so that answer leads me to a question. Then why would you even throw three, four, and six in your rejected sites then if you knew it wasn't going to give you the coverage you need?

Why would you even put that in there?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): I -- I know it was listed as number seven. I don't know if it was listed as

1 rejected. 2 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: No, I was just saying, so you showed 3 us six potential sites. And of those on this map, 4 three, four, and six are pretty much -- you could 5 hock a loogie from those to the tower. So why 6 would you even put those in there? 7 It seems like you're just kind of saying, 8 yeah, well. We'll -- we looked at these, but we 9 knew they weren't going to be good, so I don't 10 It just doesn't sit well if your answer is know. 11 you knew that the water tanks were not viable. 12 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I don't think the water tank was 13 listed as rejected. I'm not sure. 14 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: No, it's not. It wasn't listed as 15 rejected. It was listed as an existing tower, but 16 clearly we want you to co-locate. 17 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. 18 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: So if three, four, and six somehow 19 got through the sausage maker to your final 20 grouping of towers, how come seven wasn't? 21 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I know the seven wasn't. 22 Keith, did you want to comment on that? 23 THE WITNESS (Coppins): Yeah, I can. So I can answer. 24 I can answer some of that of why we -- why we went 25 where. When I started the sites, when I started

this, these are the -- these are the different areas when I -- when I looked at the map and when I -- when I did my -- my travel around, I looked at everything, not knowing what AT&T, Verizon, or T-Mobile even needed. I just looked at sites that would be possible.

And when -- the reason that number three, four, and six, that they weren't interested in leasing to us, so that, that was why it was rejected, not because of coverage.

MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. All right. That makes sense.

THE WITNESS (Coppins): Once I -- once I would finish that, then I would send it out to the carriers to see if they would -- if they would need it.

Usually, AT&T would get back and say, oh, yeah.

This, this one doesn't work. We need to be further to the north, or further to the east.

MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. All right. My next question is about the visibility assessment, and I'm calling it up now. So when I look at the maps, and I guess I can refer to, let's see, I guess the page 2. I -- I had a question in regards to the visibility, I guess, from Dzen Farm.

And I know photo 26 shows that it wasn't visible, but there seems like a whole lot of

streaking of red, orange, and yellow across almost the entire property. So I was just wondering what the visibility from those fields and that, that property -- is there a photo that would be -- I mean, I know it's a fairly significant distance.

But how would you characterize that visibility?

THE WITNESS (Archambault): So when we do a viewshed,
we do a viewshed with, that's the map, the
streaking that you're talking about. We can do
that across an area, regardless of property
ownership, property line.

When we do photo simulations, we can only go on public property to take our photo. In this particular case, that edge of the road there, that's on the east side of the road where the photo was taken. It's actually raised up considerably. If you're standing on the road, you would go up a certain number of feet before you would plateau on that property.

Those are open fields that are part of that farm area. I don't know what they use the fields for, whether it's cattle or corn, or whatever, but yes, there would be from those fields, if you were standing in the field you would have visibility.

1 On the road itself, there is no visibility because of tree cover along the road, and the road 2 3 being lower than the property that it's right next 4 to. 5 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. And based on the color, it 6 would be the seasonal or year round? I'm trying 7 to figure that out. 8 THE WITNESS (Archambault): So if you look at them, 9 we -- we list them either leaf on or leaf off. 10 if the color is there, you're going to see it. 11 And with that being that color orange, even though 12 you're getting close to a mile away at this point, 13 there would be a straight line of sight to about 14 half of the tower. 15 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. Yeah, I see. So I have the 16 Yes. Okay. So then I guess my leaf-on one. 17 question -- or two is, so it looks like to the 18 northeast, it's sort of like a paint spatter. 19 Right? 20 THE WITNESS (Archambault): Yeah. 21 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: And so what, in your opinion, gives 22 you that spatter? Is that just the trees or the 23 topography or? 24 THE WITNESS (Archambault): Yes. So we use LIDAR data,

which is fairly accurate data. And we use two

25

different sets of data. We have one set of data, which just shows the ground. If you picture a proper area where everything is stripped off, every bush, every tree, every building, every sign is stripped off the land.

Then we take another layer of data, which includes all of those things that are taken off.

And we put that on top of the bottom layer. And it literally, if there's a tree there, it will block on the opposite side of where you're coming.

So being little spots like that, you're probably seeing it in a little valley of trees that if you walk five feet to the side, that tree will now be in front of you. And because there are houses, roads and trees in this area, there's a lot of combinations of things that could be blocking certain parts or leaving certain little tunnels available to see.

MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. That makes sense.

THE WITNESS (Archambault): And if you look at photo twelve, I think that will give you a little bit of an idea of what that kind of spattering looks like. That's right in the middle of that particular spattering, and we have it as a seasonal visibility from there.

1 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. Yeah, all right. When I go 2 to the simulation on photo two, that's from Mara, 3 Mara Trail. That's one of those residential lots, 4 I think, just to the southeast of the tower site. 5 And I see the tower there, and I guess I just 6 want to confirm with you that you feel like that's 7 a fair simulation of what they're going to see 8 leaf off? 9 THE WITNESS (Archambault): Yes. 10 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. All right. Thank you, Mr. 11 Morissette. Those are the questions I had. 12 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Golembiewski. 13 We will now continue with cross-examination 14 by Mr. Lynch, followed by Mr. Silvestri. 15 Mr. Lynch, good afternoon. 16 MR. LYNCH: No questions. 17 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Lynch. We'll now 18 continue with cross-examination by Mr. Silvestri. 19 Good afternoon, Mr. Silvestri. 20 MR. SILVESTRI: Good afternoon, Mr. Morissette, and 21 good afternoon to the panel. Let me go back to a 22 couple questions that were asked, one by 23 Mr. Nwankwo, one by Mr. Morissette. 24 Starting with the security part of it, my 25 understanding is that that gate would be locked.

And if I heard correctly, would access, meaning a key, be granted to the individual tower tenants?

Did I get that correct?

THE WITNESS (Coppins): Usually what we would do when there's an existing site, and for instance,

Eversource has a key, we would daisy chain the new lock into our combination lock so that there would be access by everyone.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. Then going back to the coverage plots brought up by Mr. Morissette.

And this one, I'm looking at the 700 megahertz existing and proposed coverage.

Does the ridge to the south, southeast of the proposed tower interfere with coverage on the eastern portion of Beelzebub Road?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): It drops from yellow to green at Beelzebub Road. So you're looking -- Beelzebub Road is kind of on the backside of the ridge, between the site and Beelzebub Road. So it -- it's shadowed from being behind that, behind that drop in terrain.

MR. SILVESTRI: So is it correct to say that signals would pass over because that road is so low?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes, it probably -- if you look at the plot here, it seems they pick up again.

1 Yes.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay.

THE WITNESS (Lavin): So that's kind of a bad thing.

It just skips over that.

MR. SILVESTRI: That's what I thought. Thank you.

All right. We talked about the hinge point.

Color of the tower. You mentioned galvanized

steel. Would painting it brown be better to blend
in with the existing Eversource poles and whatever
the deciduous trees that might be there?

David Archambault. There's very little places that you can see the tower and those poles blending them together. It doesn't make any sense as there, they're not seen together. So you'd just be adding a brown pole into the New England sky.

THE WITNESS (Archambault): I think I can answer that.

A galvanized pole after a year of weathering is a very dull gray. And we have found again, our opinion, we have found that that dull gray blends with most skies in New England. You know, you have a perfect picturesque blue day, maybe it doesn't blend in perfectly, but when you have clouds and any kind of other than perfect day, it blends in more often than not.

1 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay, no. Thank you for your response. Then there was a comment about not looking at 2 3 a false evergreen. A question I always like to 4 ask, was a watchtower configuration looked at, at 5 all, instead of just a straight monopole? 6 THE WITNESS (Coppins): We -- we didn't consider a 7 watch tower. 8 MR. SILVESTRI: Any particular reason? 9 THE WITNESS (Coppins): Probably just that it, I don't 10 know that it would fit in this, in this, in this 11 I would think that the monopole would area. 12 probably be the best, the best option here. 13 MR. SILVESTRI: Yeah. My two rationale points would 14 be; one, too high; and the second one, too 15 expensive -- but I appreciate your comments, 16 Mr. Coppins. 17 THE WITNESS (Coppins): Thank you. 18 MR. SILVESTRI: If you could turn to page 30 now of the 19 application, there is a paragraph that's labeled 20 as number eight, and I'll read it to you. 21 says, there will be no psychological injury, in 22 quotes, because there is no major natural area, 23 also in quotes, that will be intruded upon. And 24 then it has, see Exhibit G, H, I, and K. 25 A question I have for you, how does that

1 sentence apply to Exhibit G, which is the site 2 plan? 3 THE WITNESS (Coppins): I'm looking for that, for that, 4 please. Hold on one second. 5 MR. SILVESTRI: No, take your time. 6 Again, this is page 30. 7 THE WITNESS (Coppins): Too many things open on the 8 computer to look at. Hold on. 9 MR. BALL: Well, if it helps, I can jump in just a 10 little bit, Mr. Silvestri, because I was involved 11 in working on the drafting of that portion of it. 12 And I think we were simply trying to refer 13 the Council to the plans themselves. I think you 14 have to look at it in conjunction with the other 15 exhibits -- not to step on Mr. Coppins' answer, 16 but I think I can take responsibility for that 17 inclusion. 18 THE HEARING OFFICER: The words that threw me are 19 "psychological injury." That's why I --20 MR. BALL: Right, and that's a local zoning regulatory 21 term. So we were literally applying the special 22 permit, special exception factors that exist in 23 the town regulations which come above it. 24 That's one of the nine factors. 25 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. I could take that as a good

answer. Thank you.

MR. BALL: Thank you.

MR. SILVESTRI: All right. For clarification purposes now, there's a number of drawings that were both in the application and then they came into the interrogatory responses. I'd like you to refer to Drawing L-2.

And the question that I have on this is L-2 has six leased areas as opposed to four. It also has the proposed tower height at 155 feet as opposed to going higher. So would anything related to Drawing L-2 be, how should we say, moot?

Because somehow the projected plans were overriding this, and now we're back to C-103 as the final site plan, or compound plan.

THE WITNESS (Coppins): I think I can try to answer that. So the L-1 was a lease exhibit that we -- that we did. And when we went into the technical report, when the Town came in, obviously they wanted to go off the top of the tower.

We wanted to keep AT&T where they were located, so we increased the height of the tower to -- to the 165 so that we could accommodate the Town, leaving AT&T -- which is why there was a

1 discrepancy in the height. 2 MR. SILVESTRI: As well as the number of leased areas. 3 Because L-2 would show six, and C-103 would have, 4 I quess, five? 5 THE WITNESS (Coppins): That is correct. We -- we did 6 put -- I'm sure that Doug put some things in there 7 just to see, to get as much room in the compound 8 itself. But having four carriers available at 9 this point in time, plus the Town, it would be 10 five. 11 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. So ignore L-2 for all intents 12 and purposes? 13 THE WITNESS (Roberts): Yes. 14 THE WITNESS (Coppins): That is correct. 15 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. Okay. All right. And you 16 mentioned the diesel generator. Was any 17 consideration given to propane? 18 THE WITNESS (Coppins): Okay. We'll let mister --19 we'll let the AT&T panel answer that one. 20 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. 21 THE WITNESS (Carey): Harry Carey for AT&T. 22 It was not. 23 MR. SILVESTRI: Any reason why? 24 THE WITNESS (Carey): I'd say our procedures are mostly 25 driven diesel.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Then I believe I have one last question for you. This goes back to the response to Interrogatory Number 16.

And this mentions that the maximum wind speed tolerance for the antennas is 60 miles per hour.

Is that correct, 60 miles per hour?

THE WITNESS (Roberts): And that was my response. This is Doug Roberts. That's the serviceable velocity. So they're designed to a criteria and that's the serviceable. It's nothing that would be -- nothing catastrophic would happen above 60 miles an hour.

It would be possibly, their azimuths, and it might change a bit because again, a tower is going to move just by the nature of a 60 mile an hour wind. So that's sort of a serviceable, you know, the criteria for their antennas is up to that, that speed of wind.

MR. SILVESTRI: Yeah. Mr. Roberts, I kind of thought that would be the answer. Because I looked at that and I said, this looks kind of low. And my thought was that, you know, 60 or so, you might have to go back up and readjust them, but I didn't see the antennas blowing off until you get to some much higher, higher mile per hour.

1 THE WITNESS (Roberts): Yeah. And it's not even a 2 matter of blowing, or getting out of whack. It's 3 really a matter of the tower is going to move. 4 It's going to sway. I mean, there's -- there's 5 movement in the tower. 6 And you know, Martin has criteria with AT&T 7 as azimuths and down tilt and such, and all that 8 kind of gets compromised with anything above, say, 9 60 miles an hour. 10 MR. SILVESTRI: Understood, no. Thank you for your 11 response. And Mr. Morissette, I believe that's 12 all I have. Thank you. 13 THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good. Thank you, 14 Mr. Silvestri. We will just quickly run through 15 and see if anybody's got any follow-up questions. 16 Mr. Nwankwo? 17 MR. NWANKWO: No, no questions. 18 I have no questions. Thank you. 19 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. I have no follow-up 20 questions. Mr. Cadwallader? 21 MR. CADWALLADER: No followup. Thank you. 22 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Mr. Golembiewski? 23 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: I have no followup. Thank you. 24 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Mr. Lynch? 25 Mr. Lynch, any follow-up questions?

1	(No response.)		
2			
3	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay.		
4	Hearing none, Mr. Silvestri?		
5	MR. SILVESTRI: I'm good, Mr. Morissette. Thank you.		
6	THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good. Thank you.		
7	All right. Very good. That concludes our		
8	hearing for this afternoon. We will recess.		
9	MR. LYNCH: Excuse me, Mr. Morissette?		
10	THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes, Mr. Lynch?		
11	MR. LYNCH: I'm having trouble here with this computer.		
12	No questions.		
13	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Very good. Thank you.		
14	All right. The Council will recess until		
15	6:30 p.m., at which time we will commence with the		
16	public comment session of this public hearing.		
17	And thank you, Mr. Silvestri, for covering		
18	the public comment session for me this evening.		
19	I appreciate it.		
20	MR. SILVESTRI: My pleasure. My pleasure,		
21	Mr. Morissette.		
22	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. And good afternoon		
23	and good evening, everyone.		
24			
25	(End: 3:06 p.m.)		

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing 50 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original verbatim notes taken of the remote teleconference meeting of THE CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL in Re: DOCKET NO. 518, NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC, d/b/a AT&T AND TARPON TOWERS III, LLC, APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATION OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY LOCATED AT 99 DART HILL ROAD, SOUTH WINDSOR, CONNECTICUT, which was held before JOHN MORISSETTE, Member and Presiding Officer, on December 14, 2023.

Robert G. Dixon, CVR-M 857

Notary Public

My Commission Expires: 6/30/2025

1	INDEX			
2	WITNESSES Martin Lavin	PAGE		
3	Harry Carey Keith Coppins			
4	Doug Roberts David Archambault	9		
5	EXAMINERS	-		
6	By Mr. Patrick By Mr. Ball	9 11		
7	By Mr. Nwankwo By The Hearing Officer (Morissette)	13		
8	By Mr. Golembiewski By Mr. Silvestri	34 41		
9				
10				
11 12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				