## CERTIFIED COPY

1	
2	STATE OF CONNECTICUT
3	CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL
4	
5	Docket No. 519
6	Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless
7	Application for a Certificate of Environmental
8	Compatibility and Public Need for the Construction,
9	Maintenance, and Operation of a Telecommunications
10	Facility Located at 11 Chamberlain Road, East
11	Windsor, Connecticut.
12	
13	Zoom Remote Council Meeting (Teleconference),
14	on Tuesday, February 27, 2024, 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	ROBERT SILVESTRI
9	DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.
10	DR. THOMAS NEAR
11	CHANCE CARTER
12	
13	Council Staff:
14	MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.,
15	Executive Director and Staff Attorney
16	
17	ADAM MORRONE,
18	Siting Analyst
19	
20	LISA FONTAINE,
21	Fiscal Administrative Officer
22	
23	DAKOTA LAFOUNTAIN,
24	Administrative Support
25	

1	Appearances:(cont'd)
2	For CELLCO PARTNERSHIP d/b/a VERIZON WIRELESS:
3	Robinson & Cole, LLP
4	280 Trumbull Street
5	Hartford, Connecticut 06103
6	By: KENNETH C. BALDWIN, ESQ.
7	KBaldwin@rc.com
8	860.275.8345
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

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 Tuesday, February 27, 2024, 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; Robert Silvestri; Daniel P. Lynch, Jr.; Dr. Thomas Near, and Chance Carter.

Members of the staff are Executive Director
Melanie Bachman, Siting Analyst Adam Morrone, and
Administrative Support Lisa Fontaine and Dakota
Lafountain.

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 Cellco Partnership doing business as Verizon Wireless for a certificate of environmental compatibility and

public need for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 11 Chamberlain Road, East Windsor, Connecticut.

A complete application was received by the Council on December 28, 2023. The Council's legal notice of the date and time of this public hearing was published in the Journal Inquirer on January 6, 2024.

Upon this Council's request, the Applicant erected a sign in the vicinity of the proposed site so as to inform the public of the name of the applicant, the type of the 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 communication 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 Applicant, Cellco

Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Wireless; its

representative, Kenneth C. Baldwin, Esquire, of

Robinson & Cole, LLP.

We will proceed in accordance with the prepared agenda, a copy of which is available on

the Council's Docket Number 519 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 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 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 have 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 in 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 the 30 days of the date hereof, either by mail or by e-mail, and such written 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 519 webpage and deposited with the East Windsor Town Clerk's office for the convenience of the public.

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

We'll now move on to administrative notices taken by the Council. I wish to call your attention to those items shown on the hearing program, marked as Roman numerals 1B, items 1 through 84.

Does the Applicant have an objection of these items that the Council has administratively noticed?

Good afternoon, Attorney Baldwin.

MR. BALDWIN: Good afternoon, Mr. Morissette.

We have no objection.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Baldwin.

Accordingly, the Council hereby administratively

notices these existing documents.

We'll now continue with the appearance of the Applicant. Will the Applicant present its witness panel for the purposes of taking the oath? We will have Attorney Bachman administer the oath when you're ready.

Attorney Baldwin?

MR. BALDWIN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. Good
afternoon, everyone. Again, Kenneth Baldwin with
Robinson & Cole on behalf of the Applicant Cellco
Partnership, doing business as Verizon Wireless.

Our witness panel is listed in the hearing program. It consists of five professionals. To my far left is Elizabeth Glidden. Ms. Glidden is a real estate and regulatory specialist with Verizon Wireless.

To my immediate left is Mark Brauer, radiofrequency engineer with Verizon Wireless.

To my right is Mr. Carlo Centore, a professional engineer with Centek Engineering, the project engineers for the Broad Brook re-lo site.

To his right is Brian Gaudet, the project manager with All-Points Technology Corporation.

And to Brian's right is Matt Gustafson, a wetland scientist and professional soil scientist,

1 also with All-Points Technology Corporation. 2 And we offer them to be sworn as witnesses in 3 this afternoon's proceeding. 4 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Baldwin. 5 Attorney Bachman, please administer the oath. 6 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. 7 ELIZABETH GLIDDEN, 8 GAUDET, BRIAN 9 MARK BRAUER, 10 CARLO F. CENTORE, 11 MATT GUSTAFSON, 12 called as witnesses, being first duly sworn 13 by the EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, were examined and 14 testified under oath as follows: 15 16 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Bachman. 17 Attorney Baldwin, please begin by verifying 18 all the exhibits by the appropriate sworn 19 witnesses. 20 MR. BALDWIN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. 21 The exhibits that we'd like to have admitted 22 into the record in this proceeding are listed in 23 the hearing program under Roman two, section B 24 items one through five. They include the 25 application and, through our bulk file exhibits as

1 listed, the Applicant's affidavit of publication 2 in the Hartford Courant; our signed protective 3 order documents; our responses to the Council's 4 interrogatories dated February 14, 2024; and then 5 the Applicant's sign posting affidavit dated 6 February 14, 2024. 7 For verification purposes I'll ask our 8 witness panel, did you prepare or assist in the 9 preparation, and are you familiar with the 10 information contained in those exhibits? 11 Ms. Glidden? 12 THE WITNESS (Glidden): 13 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Brauer? 14 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Yes. 15 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Centore? 16 THE WITNESS (Centore): Yes. 17 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gaudet? 18 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yes. 19 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson? 20 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. 21 MR. BALDWIN: Do you have any corrections, 22 modifications or amendments to offer to any of the 23 information contained in those exhibits? 24 Ms. Glidden? 25 THE WITNESS (Glidden): I do not.

1 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Brauer? 2 THE WITNESS (Brauer): No. 3 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Centore? 4 THE WITNESS (Centore): No. 5 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gaudet? 6 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): No. 7 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson? 8 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): No. 9 MR. BALDWIN: Is the information contained in those 10 exhibits true and accurate to the best of your 11 knowledge? Ms. Glidden? 12 THE WITNESS (Glidden): Yes. 13 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Brauer? 14 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Yes. 15 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Centore? 16 THE WITNESS (Centore): Yes. 17 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gaudet? 18 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yes. 19 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson? 20 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. 21 MR. BALDWIN: And do you adopt the information 22 contained in those exhibits as your testimony in 23 this proceeding. Ms. Glidden? 24 THE WITNESS (Glidden): Yes. 25 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Brauer?

1 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Yes. 2 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Centore? 3 THE WITNESS (Centore): I do. 4 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gaudet? 5 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yes. 6 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson? 7 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. 8 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Morissette, I offer them as full 9 exhibits. 10 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Baldwin. The 11 exhibits are hereby admitted. 12 We will now begin with cross-examination of 13 the applicant by the Council, starting with 14 Mr. Morrone, followed by Mr. Silvestri. 15 Good afternoon, Mr. Morrone. 16 Please continue with your cross-examination. 17 MR. MORRONE: Good afternoon, Mr. Morissette. Thank 18 you very much. I'd like to start with some 19 questions regarding the existing facility. 20 Was the existing water tank 21 telecommunications facility approved by the Town? 22 THE WITNESS (Centore): I do not know. I'm sorry. 23 MR. MORRONE: Okay. And what are the dimensions of the 24 existing equipment compound that are currently on 25 the property?

```
1
    THE WITNESS (Centore): This is Carlos Centore with
2
         Centek Engineering. I may not have the
3
         information at the tip of my fingers, but if you
4
         give me a moment, I can -- I can look that up.
5
              I should have it here in my file.
6
    MR. MORRONE: Okay.
7
    THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. If we could continue
8
         with cross-examination and when that information
9
         is available, or after the break, it could be
10
         provided -- but please continue, Mr. Morrone.
11
    MR. MORRONE: Let's see. Then we'll move on to, in
12
         reference to the response to the Council's
13
         interrogatory number six, if requested by the
14
         property owner, would Cellco remove the abandoned
15
         water tank?
16
    THE WITNESS (Glidden): Yeah. For the record, this is
17
         Liz Glidden with Verizon Wireless. If requested,
18
         yes, we would remove the water tank.
19
    MR. MORRONE: Okay. And what would the approximate
20
         cost of removal be?
21
    THE WITNESS (Glidden): I don't -- I don't have those
22
         numbers.
23
    MR. MORRONE: Okay. Let me see.
24
    MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Morissette, perhaps -- and
25
         Mr. Morrone, perhaps we can take the cost estimate
```

1 as a homework assignment to answer that later in 2 the proceeding. 3 THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good, that would be great. 4 Thank you. 5 MR. MORRONE: All right, let's --6 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Morrone. Excuse me, I'm sorry. We 7 have an answer to the prior question about the 8 size of the existing compound. 9 THE WITNESS (Centore): Yeah, the existing fence 10 compound is 43 by 34 feet. And the tank that's 11 housed within the compound is 123 feet tall. 12 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): And Mr. Morrone --13 MR. MORRONE: Thank you very much. 14 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): -- I have a response for your 15 first question. It looks like the original 16 approval for the site was through the Town 17 Planning and Zoning Commission in 1995. 18 MR. MORRONE: Thank you very much. 19 THE WITNESS (Centore): And Mr. Morrone, I have one 20 more dimension for you on that compound that will 21 help you with what I believe you're looking for 22 there -- and the base of that tower is 30 feet by 23 30 feet. That's the footprint of the tank 24 structure itself. 25 MR. MORRONE: Okay. Then moving on to my next

question. If the property owner is not interested in having the tower dismantled, would Verizon be removing the compound in its entirety, assuming that T-Mobile would also relocate?

MR. BALDWIN: I think given Ms. Glidden's prior response about the removal of the tank, the question is somewhat moot.

But if you think otherwise, we're happy to expand on that, Mr. Morrone.

MR. MORRONE: No, I believe you're correct. Thank you.

All right. Then moving on in reference to the response to council interrogatory four, it's stated that Cellco would perform a geotechnical survey of the tower site.

What types of actions would be required for the geotechnical investigation?

THE WITNESS (Centore): This is Carlos Centore with

Centek Engineering. We'd have to do some minor

clearing to get a track-mounted rig, if not a

wheel-mounted rig up to the location of the tower

site. We would drill a hole at the center of the

compound to refusal and to find ledge.

And once we found ledge, we would drill into that five feet to determine the quality of ledge if, in fact, it's there. And we would also drill

1 four probes at the four corners of the compound to 2 refusal to determine the profile of ledge in the 3 area. And we would use that for -- for the tower 4 designer to use in the foundation design of the 5 tower. 6 MR. MORRONE: Thank you. 7 THE WITNESS (Centore): Yeah. 8 MR. MORRONE: And how long would the activity take 9 place at the site for the survey? 10 THE WITNESS (Centore): I typically allow for a day for 11 that type of activity. It's usually somewhat less 12 than a day, but it's a day's worth, worth a day's 13 work between setup and breakdown, and taking the 14 core borings. 15 MR. MORRONE: And what is the expected timing of that 16 type of survey? 17 THE WITNESS (Centore): As soon as we get authorization 18 to proceed with D and M plans, we would schedule 19 that. And that's typically a week to two weeks 20 out from that point. 21 MR. MORRONE: Thank you. 22 THE WITNESS (Centore): Yeah. 23 MR. MORRONE: All right. In reference to the response 24 to the Council's interrogatory number 36, Cellco

has stated that no stealth tower designs were

25

considered.

Is there any option for painting the tower that would decrease the visibility at the site?

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): This is Brian Gaudet with All-Points. You know, looking at, you know, your traditional stealth tower options here -- you mentioned painting, so I'll address that first.

The treeline is not incredibly high here. So the near views where you're going to see the structure, I can point you to photo three in attachment eight, which is the visibility analysis. You can see it extends a decent amount above the treeline, so painting it there would make it stick out more than -- than your traditional steel monopole.

That being said, the views are relatively limited. It's -- they don't extend beyond a mile. So there's not a tremendous need to stealth it here just from the fact that it's such a low visual impact as is.

We did discuss, you know, kind of your other options. Would a monopine work? There's not really any coniferous trees there. Again, at 120 feet, while it's relatively below tower profile, the trees in that area are about 60 feet. So

you'd be extending the monopine, you know, well above the treeline where it is visible.

I know I can anticipate Mr. Silvestri asking about some other stealth options like the water tank here. And I think the -- the footprint, you know, looking at that would require a much larger footprint for a compound and foundation. And again, while the water tank might fit in this agricultural area, it would certainly create a much more distinct visual impact in terms of a much wider structure, just much more to -- to pull the eye in.

So it's -- it's not -- there's nothing that could be done to really stealth this one other than traditional steel monopole.

MR. MORRONE: Thank you.

- 17 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): You're welcome.
  - MR. MORRONE: All right. Referring to the Connecticut
    Airport Authority comments and attachment 15 of
    the application, would Cellco coordinate with the
    air navigation facilities listed as possibly
    impacted?
  - THE WITNESS (Brauer): This is Mark Brauer from

    Verizon. The -- as far as coordination with the

    specific facilities, I would have to look into

whether we do that or not, but we would coordinate with the FAA, which typically that information is available to all those facilities.

MR. MORRONE: Okay. Then moving on, my next question is going to reference several attachments from the application that have to do with distances from the site to the wetland areas.

The distance from wetland one to the northwest of the site and the approximate wetland area to the southeast of the site, as shown in attachment one, sheet C3, are listed as 232 feet and 35 feet respectively. And in attachment ten, the wetland inspection map, these same distances are listed as 260 feet and 65 feet respectively. And additionally, in attachment ten the vernal pool analysis map shows the distance from wetland one to be 238 feet.

Could you please explain the discrepancies between those distances?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Sure. For the record,

Matthew Gustafson. I think I'll start by

correcting which one should be the accurate

distances.

From wetland one to the nearest compound corner is 232 feet, and the distance from the

1 offsite wetland to the nearest point on the access 2 road is 35 feet. 3 Some of the other erroneous calculations are 4 from documents that were earlier in the process 5 when the design of the facility was shifting 6 around. So some of those calculations obviously 7 were modified during that design process as things 8 were finalized. 9 So again, those, the two numbers I listed are the -- the final correct numbers -- as long as 10 11 Carlo agrees. 12 THE WITNESS (Centore): I do. 13 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Hope that answers the 14 question. Thank you. 15 MR. MORRONE: Yes, that's very helpful. Thank you. 16 And I believe that brings my questions to an 17 end for today. Thank you for your answers. 18 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Morrone. 19 I'll continue cross-examination of the 20 Applicant by Mr. Silvestri followed by 21 Mr. Golembiewski. Good afternoon, Mr. Silvestri. 22 MR. SILVESTRI: Good afternoon, Mr. Morissette. 23 good afternoon, all. 24 And Mr. Gaudet, thank you for anticipating my 25 question about a water tank design.

in t
labe
show
the

Let me begin with the site schematic that's in the very beginning of the application. It's labeled as Roman numeral four. And that schematic shows a bend in the proposed access road towards the east, yet when you start looking at the drawings under tab one, it doesn't have a bend.

So could you explain possibly what was originally proposed with the bend, and what changed?

THE WITNESS (Centore): What happens when these sites stick around for too long -- this is Carlo, Centek Engineering. Well, I do know that the -- the access drive that's in the Siting Council -- the plans that were filed for the Siting Council, dated September 13, 2023, are based on the topography of the area and the grading design for the road.

I -- I -- the only thing I can venture on is that that drawing was done from a schematic set of site plans, so that we didn't have all the contours in the area to do the road design and direct drainage design as well.

MR. SILVESTRI: So to clarify, the bend that I see on Roman numeral four site schematic is an error, if you will, and the true road would be in the

1 drawings that actually come below it on tab one? 2 THE WITNESS (Centore): That is correct. 3 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. 4 THE WITNESS (Centore): You're welcome. 5 MR. SILVESTRI: Then if you look at interrogatory 6 number 32, Cellco comments that it would implement 7 a wetland, comma, vernal pool and aquifer 8 protection area protection program. 9 My question, would that include a low level 10 oil alarm for the transformer? 11 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): So currently that is not a 12 part of the protection plan. However, if the 13 Council wished to see that, that certainly could 14 be included. 15 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good, thank you. 16 And did Cellco consider using a propane tank 17 for the generator instead of the diesel that's 18 proposed? 19 THE WITNESS (Centore): We were -- we were told that 20 the generator being used here is a diesel 21 generator. To -- to limit the amount of space in 22 the compound the propane tank was not used on this 23 particular site. 24 I'll ask Verizon, if you don't mind, to see 25 if there's a reason for not going with propane

1 here other than site space? 2 THE WITNESS (Glidden): I believe it was -- for the 3 record, this is Liz Glidden. I believe it was 4 site space, but Carlo is correct in that it's a 5 250 gallon diesel tank that is proposed. 6 MR. SILVESTRI: So propane wasn't considered because 7 you'd have to add a propane tank as well, and 8 you're looking at a spatial consideration or a 9 spatial restraint. Correct? 10 THE WITNESS (Centore): Correct. 11 THE WITNESS (Glidden): Yes. 12 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. 13 This is kind of related, at least in my mind, 14 on power generators. If you go back a couple days 15 to February 22nd, was Verizon in Connecticut 16 affected by the same outage as AT&T? 17 THE WITNESS (Brauer): This is Mark Brauer. I do not 18 believe we were. At least there was -- there was 19 nothing that I knew of. 20 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you. 21 Okay. Then moving on, under attachment one 22 to the interrogatories, the protection program 23 states that maintenance of the facility during the 24 winter months shall minimize the application of 25 chloride-based de-icers/salt, and use more

1 environmentally friendly non-chloride 2 alternatives. 3 A couple questions for you. What's an 4 example of a non-chloride alternative? 5 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): For the record, Matthew 6 Gustafson. Typical road sand that does not 7 include that salt mixture is a proven alternative. 8 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. 9 And related to that, if the project is 10 approved, can that more environmentally friendly 11 de-icer be exclusively used? 12 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. If the Council would 13 wish to see that, we can make that adjustment in 14 the protection plan of when it gets included in 15 the D and M plans. 16 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you. Thank you. 17 All right. Moving on, how many trees would 18 be removed for the proposed access way and 19 compound? 20 THE WITNESS (Centore): We have -- Carlos Centore with 21 Centek Engineering. We have a total of eight 22 trees to be removed along the access drive, and 23 ten trees within the compound area. Those are all 24 trees eight inches in diameter or greater. 25 MR. SILVESTRI: Eight and ten, very good. Thank you.

And kind of related to that, could the proposed facility be shifted kind of towards the southwest? And again, I'm looking at that site schematic, possibly closer to what appears to be either a cleared area or a less forested area in the southwest -- and kind of avoid some tree removal? THE WITNESS (Centore): So into the -- Carlos Centore with Centek Engineering again. That area that you're referencing to the southwest, I'm assuming it is just above that clear area. That's, I'll say, to the northeast of the build -- upper most building on site.

MR. SILVESTRI: Yeah, basically correct. Yeah.

THE WITNESS (Centore): Yeah, so that that's a pretty steep embankment there. It doesn't show up on the -- on the aerial image that's shown, that we have here.

But we stayed away from that, number one, because the steepness of the hill, and then there were ledge outcroppings in that area as well that we were concerned with.

MR. SILVESTRI: Understood. Thank you.

Then if you could turn to the coverage plots,

I want to make sure that I understand these. And

I'll just focus on the 700 megahertz coverage

1 The first one that's in the package is plots. 2 labeled as existing Verizon wireless 700 megahertz 3 coverage without Broad Brook CT facility. 4 Is that what exists if you took the tower 5 that exists on the property away? 6 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Mark Brauer with Verizon. Yes, 7 that's correct. 8 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. 9 THE WITNESS (Brauer): That that plot shows what it 10 would look like if that facility was removed. 11 MR. SILVESTRI: Gotcha. Okay. Then if you look at the 12 second one, existing Verizon wireless and 13 surrounding areas, that would be with the existing 14 tower setup. Correct? 15 THE WITNESS (Brauer): That is correct, yes. 16 MR. SILVESTRI: All right. And then the third one in the series would be the towers removed and your 17 18 coverage is based on the relocated facility. 19 Also correct? 20 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Yes, that is correct. 21 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. So there's a little bit of 22 change with that last one with the proposed new 23 facility, and I'm going to assume that slight --24 slightly greater coverage is coming about because 25 of the slightly taller height that the antennas

1 would be located. Would that also be correct? 2 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Yes, that is correct because 3 the -- the ground elevation increases from where 4 our existing facility is by approximately 35 feet. 5 I believe it's 35 and some change, but it's --6 it's right around 35 feet. 7 So we -- we gain that extra ground elevation, 8 which enhances our coverage footprint. 9 MR. SILVESTRI: Understood. Thank you. 10 And Mr. Morissette, that's all I have. 11 And I thank you, and I thank the panel. 12 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Silvestri. 13 We'll now continue with cross-examination of 14 the Applicant by Mr. Golembiewski followed by 15 Dr. Near. Mr. Golembiewski, good afternoon. 16 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Good afternoon. Thank you, 17 Mr. Morissette. 18 I do have a few questions. My initial ones 19 may be a little repetitive, but I wanted to be 20 clear about exactly why the water tower no longer 21 is an acceptable tower -- found structure for 22 Verizon. 23 THE WITNESS (Centore): I'll give it my best shot. 24 Good afternoon again. Carlos Centore from 25 Centek Engineering.

Back in 2021, Centek was retained to do an analysis of that existing tank and do a condition assessment. What we -- what we found is that it's substantially under designed to act as a tower because it's used to being filled with water, and we have overturning concerns without that additional dead weight of the water in the tank, which is no longer being used for water storage.

We did some exploratory work of the foundation and found the -- the base plates and the anchor bolts to be in pretty bad condition, deteriorated, and there was a bunch of deterioration on the -- on the tank itself.

We proceeded to -- to do some cost estimating on behalf of Verizon to see what it would cost to bring the -- the tank structure into conformance.

We were able to get some estimates for that work, and I'm trying to pull those up as we go.

Bear with me.

And what -- what limited and made the project more difficult to do any type of restoration work there, or repair work to the foundation and the foundation base plates was the -- the fact that the Sprint equipment was at the base of the tank, T-Mobile's equipment was there and Verizon's

1 shelter was also there, congesting the area with 2 conduits and cables and equipment, so rendering 3 any kind of restoration work or repair work 4 difficult and costly. 5 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. All right. That makes sense. 6 THE WITNESS (Centore): Yeah. 7 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: I had a question about T-Mobile. 8 the record, I believe there was a statement that 9 T-Mobile has shown some interest in relocating 10 from the water tank to the new tower. 11 Is that correct? 12 THE WITNESS (Glidden): This is Liz Glidden. 13 Yes, they've expressed interest. 14 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: So I don't like playing scenarios, 15 but what if they choose to stay on the water tank? 16 THE WITNESS (Glidden): They've committed. 17 They've committed to move. MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Oh, they've committed to move? 18 19 Okay. 20 THE WITNESS (Glidden): Yes. 21 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. So you're saying there will 22 be no providers on the water tank provided --23 THE WITNESS (Glidden): That's correct. MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. All right. Well, that makes 24 25 things easier.

So again, I guess I'm -- so the one thing I'm looking for is not to have the tank standing once we have a new antenna. And clearly that's, you know, the host property, you know, decision.

But you believe at this point that the property owner, since it's not a functioning water tank, would not object to its removal?

THE WITNESS (Glidden): That's correct.

MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: All right. Thank you. I guess we can end that, end that line of questioning.

I did have some questions about the vernal pool. The one concern I had is that the area, the roadway and the compound could be -- I guess my question is, could that be adult frog habitat when they're not utilizing the vernal pool?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): For the record, it's Matthew Gustafson.

Yes -- the simple answer is that the areas that are proposed for development occur within mature upland forest habitat within the hundred to 750-foot critical terrestrial habitat buffer. As such, these areas are suitable habitat for the wood frogs that are currently utilizing the pool.

However, the increase in development within the CTH consists of less than 1 percent, looking

at about approximately .4 acres of the total terrestrial habitat. So even though there will be some loss of habitat, there has been -- there is sufficient hab, supporting habitat in other areas both on and off site to the north to fortify this population to continue using.

Furthermore, we do have -- or are proposing a protection plan to mitigate for potential mortality during construction. Some of those elements are contractor awareness so that they're aware of what kind of species are utilizing the area, the sensitivity of the activities in proximity to the vernal pool and wetlands, as well as establishment of a restrictive barrier and sweeps by a trained professional to ensure that any amphibians caught within the work areas after the exclusion fence has been established are moved outside the work areas.

MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. So we have BMPs during construction. And then I guess if I paraphrase, the loss of that habitat would not have a significant impact on the wood frog population in their success in using that vernal pool?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes, I'd agree with that assessment.

1 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: All right. Good. So I did notice 2 there, in the project area, there are some prime 3 farmland soils. I believe I read 0.16 acres. 4 I want to confirm, at least based on what's 5 in the file, that there is no current agricultural 6 use on those soils? 7 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Matt Gustafson. 8 That is correct. 9 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: And how likely, if this project were 10 not to go forward, would this area be farmed? 11 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It's a difficult question to 12 answer, but due to the slopes as of the areas that 13 we are proposing to develop for the facility, 14 these would certainly be more challenging areas to 15 farm. 16 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. I think someone touched upon 17 the Connecticut Airport Authority comment. Can 18 you explain to me what form FAA 7460-1 is? And 19 does that relate to attachment 15 in the 20 application, which is entitled Federal Airways and 21 Airspace Summary Report? 22 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Yes. This is Mark Brauer from 23 Verizon. So I believe that -- I'm not a complete 24 expert on the FAA process, but I believe that was 25 just -- when I looked it up, that was just a

notification, a requirement of notification.

MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. And so when you fill out this form and submit it to FAA, is it primarily to find out if you need to put lighting, or some type of, you know, power? It's not that FAA would say, no, that you can't put this here?

THE WITNESS (Brauer): Yes. Well, when -- when -- the Federal Airways Airspace Report is -- when we run it, that's based on the same rules that the FAA uses to determine things like marking, lighting. It goes farther in to see if there's AM radio station disruption, things like that.

And typically, when we see it's only a notice, it is more than likely that it will not require it to be lit, but -- however I can't say that with 100 percent certainty. But usually when there's marking and lighting involved, there's a lot more -- if you look at the notice criteria, there's many that -- notice not required, not required, notice not required.

You -- you'll start to see different hits in various places where it would lead you to believe that there may be many additional factors that the FAA would come back with. But in this case, with this report, with so many notice not required, and

1	only a filing to the FAA, it shouldn't need
2	anything extra in my experience.
3	MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. All right. Great.
4	Appreciate that.
5	I'm jumping around a little bit, but so I did
6	notice that the project will be a net cut of 1212
7	cubic yards. Is that all that material being
8	proposed to be removed from the site?
9	THE WITNESS (Centore): It is unless there's some
10	reason that the property owner needs fill on their
11	property that the the contractor could make
12	some arrangements with, but the intention is to
13	take it off site.
14	It's a difficult site to balance there.
15	MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Yeah. So it would be at least
16	outside of your project area?
17	THE WITNESS (Centore): Correct.
18	MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. Great.
19	Let's see. I noticed that the facility will
20	be in an aquifer protection area. A cell tower,
21	is that a regulated activity under the aquifer
22	protection program?
23	THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Can you I'm not sure I
24	understand the question.
25	MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: I guess, is there anything

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

associated with your facility that would need to be registered under that program?

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): So as part of the normal process, the -- the Connecticut Department of Public Health is -- is consulted as part of our application process. Beyond their advisement, I'm not aware of any requirements to gain approval from the local or from the -- the aquifer protection area, in this case, a well field aquifer protection area.

However, we will be making notifications to them prior to the start of the construction to ensure if they have any particular requests or concerns, that they're addressed prior to the start of the construction.

- MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: So your petroleum material storage and spill prevention essentially does address, I quess, those concerns then?
- THE WITNESS (Gaudet): That is what we've typically seen on past projects.
- MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: And then the diesel fuel you'll be storing on site will have some type of spill containment, like a secondary containment system?

  THE WITNESS (Centore): Carlo Centore with Centek.
  - Yes, the generator being supplied by Verizon has a

secondary containment on the tank, the double-wall tank, and it has a pan for -- as the form of secondary containment. And it also has spill protection built in, primary and secondary spill protection for when filling the tank.

MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. All right. Great.

I don't know if I missed it, but I know that there are some stormwater drainage measures. There's some swales, ripraps, splash pads, infiltration basins, level spreaders. I didn't notice any report in the record.

Did I -- is that something I missed, or?

THE WITNESS (Centore): I just got it in my hands

yesterday. So there is a report. I'm sure we can

put it in as a supplemental filing or as part of

the D and M. Or --

MR. BALDWIN: If the Council feels it's necessary to have that in the record, we can certainly do that.

We can speak to the drainage elements,

Mr. Golembiewski.

I think knowing Mr. Morissette's dislike for late-file exhibits, I would ask if we could address some of those drainage elements for you in our testimony, rather than submit the full report. We're happy to submit the full report if it's

required, but I think we can address your questions on the drainage elements through testimony.

MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Sure. And then the D and M plan could also include supporting. Okay. Great.

THE WITNESS (Centore): Yes.

MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: As my overall question is -- the design of them is consistent with general engineering practices, whether it's the DOT drainage manual, and DEEP's stormwater water quality manual?

THE WITNESS (Centore): Yes. What we did do is -- what we did do as part of our design is we assured that we wouldn't have any additional runoff on the -- off of the property.

As a matter of fact, we've reduced by introducing the -- the infiltration, the riprap lined infiltration basin. We've actually reduced the amount of runoff off the property rather than increase it, and we've reduced it significantly by doing so.

But I think overall in terms of being able to manage the water on the site, it's -- it turned out a very good design. We don't have anything offsite and we've reduced peak flows as well.

1 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. Well, that's good. I was 2 going to just ask a basic question. The riprap 3 infiltration basins, I think by their name answers 4 the questions, but I would like to get in the 5 record -- they are not intended to hold water? 6 THE WITNESS (Centore): No. 7 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: For anything more than just a storm 8 event? So --9 THE WITNESS (Centore): Correct. 10 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Yeah. 11 THE WITNESS (Centore): They're designed to -- to let 12 the water slowly leach back out into -- into the 13 ground and into the surrounding area. 14 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: So they would not be decoy basins 15 for, say, wood frogs, wood frog spawning? 16 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Matt Gustafson for the 17 record. That's -- that's correct, as well as part 18 of our protection plan, under section four of that 19 protection plan, through the -- the monitoring 20 during construction those elements will be 21 observed to ensure that through various, whether 22 it was capping of it by siltation that -- that those areas are not -- do not hold water for in 23 24 excess of 48 hours, so to your point, they do not 25 become decoy pools by accident.

MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. Great. All right. That is all I have. Thank you, panel, and thank you Mr. Morissette.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you Mr. Golembiewski.

We'll now continue the cross-examination of the Applicant by Dr. Near, followed by Mr. Carter.

Dr. Near, good afternoon.

DR. NEAR: Good afternoon, Mr. Morissette, and good afternoon all.

My question is about the wood frog
population. I'd like to revisit that. So one
interesting thing about this species that is a
little unusual for frogs in this part of the world
is they have a high affinity to the ponds of which
they were hatched.

And so I'm impressed by the answer with regard to mitigating the impact of the construction on the wood frogs that are kind of -- they're terrestrial. Once they're, you know, they kind of develop as adults and they kind of revisit their ponds in the winter to lay their eggs.

And I guess the question I have is, are there any plans for monitoring? So for example, seeing this spring, are there wood frog masses in the wetland? And then also as the project moves on

and construction is passed, are there any plans to assess the impact that construction has had on the wood frog population by looking at egg masses in that pond?

Because given the fact the species has this behavioral tendency of visiting the pond of which they were hatched, it seems like that would be a natural way of -- a good way of assessing whatever impacts the construction may have had.

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Currently there are not any plans to do extended monitoring of this resource post construction. Certainly during construction, the resource will be monitored and depending on the time of year, you'll be able to get certain observations that will be included in the reporting that is going to be a part of the protection measures.

But no, there there's no current plan for post-construction monitoring of this resource.

DR. NEAR: Okay. Thank you.

I have no further questions.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Dr. Near.

We'll now continue with cross-examination of the Applicant by Mr. Carter, followed by Mr. Lynch. Good afternoon, Mr. Carter.

MR. CARTER: Good afternoon, Mr. Morissette, and good afternoon, all. And thank you to the panel and my fellow council members. Your questions have been great. So once again, I won't be taking up too much time.

Y'all -- the panel sort of got into this
earlier around T-Mobile moving to this new
proposed tower. And looking back at interrogatory
question 28, is there any change now to the
proposed size of the generator considering that
the tower will be shared based off of what y'all
said earlier?

THE WITNESS (Glidden): For the record, this is Liz

Glidden. Verizon typically does not share their

generator. So we would be using our -- the 250

diesel is for us. And then when T-Mobile were -
would come, they would design their own generator

to fulfill their needs.

MR. CARTER: Okay. Thank you. And then I had another question about FAA, slash, airplane, slash, airports.

I know that we've received comment from the Connecticut Airport Authority, but have you received any comment from any of the other surrounding air facilities that are privately

1 owned? 2 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Mark Brauer. 3 To my knowledge, we have not. 4 MR. CARTER: Okay. Thank you. 5 And Mr. Morissette, thank you. That's all I 6 have. 7 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Carter. 8 We'll continue with cross-examination by 9 Mr. Lynch followed by myself. 10 Good afternoon, Mr. Lynch. 11 MR. LYNCH: Can you hear me, Mr. Morissette? 12 THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes, I can. Thank you. 13 MR. LYNCH: I have -- my question is more of a 14 clarification on some of the previous questions. 15 I have a hard time -- and I apologize to the 16 witness panel for some of their -- it came through very soft and I could barely hear them. So I 17 18 might want to revisit a couple of things, 19 especially the water tower. 20 I know you described it, you know, a couple 21 of times in the past, but like I say, I have a 22 hard time hearing it. Is the tower -- if you have 23 to replace the tower, who picks up the cost for 24 that? 25 THE WITNESS (Centore): Carlo Centore with Centek

1 Engineering. I'm going to try to answer your 2 question, but it's --3 MR. LYNCH: Hello? THE WITNESS (Centore): Can you hear me okay? 4 5 Carlo from Centek. 6 MR. LYNCH: Just barely, but if you speak clearly I can 7 get it. 8 THE WITNESS (Centore): This is Carlo Centore from 9 Centek Engineering. Dan, I'm going to do my best 10 to answer your question, but it's -- I don't know 11 who would pick up the cost to repair that tower, 12 that water tower. 13 I would -- I would assume that would have to 14 be negotiated with the landowner and Verizon, 15 because the tower itself is owned by the 16 landowner. 17 MR. LYNCH: I don't know if I heard you correctly 18 before, but the landowner has no use for the 19 tower -- or if it is removed. 20 Is that -- did I hear that correctly? THE WITNESS (Centore): That is correct. It's no 21 22 longer functioning as a water tower and it's not 23 in any shape to be able to do so. 24 MR. LYNCH: Okay. Now that we've killed the water 25

tower, I want to go to -- I had the same concern

1 as Mr. Silvestri. And I didn't get your answer to 2 the AT&T outage, whether that impacted Verizon or 3 not. I think if you could just -- wouldn't mind 4 5 repeating that? THE WITNESS (Brauer): Yes, of course. Mark Brauer 6 7 from Verizon. To my knowledge, we did not -- we 8 were not part of that same outage that AT&T had. 9 We didn't see any issues that they did. 10 MR. LYNCH: (Unintelligible) -- what happened to 11 AT&T -- is your system protected from --12 (inaudible). 13 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Morissette, I don't know if you heard 14 Mr. Lynch's full question, but he broke up at the 15 end, I think. 16 THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Lynch, can you try it again? 17 MR. LYNCH: Could you repeat? 18 THE HEARING OFFICER: Repeat your question. 19 MR. LYNCH: Could you repeat that? I didn't hear it. 20 THE HEARING OFFICER: Could you repeat your question 21 please, Mr. Lynch? 22 MR. LYNCH: Oh. The question was, what happened to 23 AT&T with their outages? Is that something that 24 your system and Verizon could happen to, or are 25 you protected from it?

THE WITNESS (Brauer): Mark Brauer from Verizon. I'm

not sure how AT&T has their system set up, but our

switches, our facilities are typically -- we have

redundancy in each of our facilities.

So I would not anticipate -- I'm not sure the full scope of what happened to AT&T, but Verizon does have some protections in place for failures.

MR. LYNCH: All right. Thank you. And I have one question regarding security. I forgot which interrogatory it was, but you talked about someone breaking into the compound and being unable to climb up the tower.

And what do I see this morning -- in either the Washington Post or the Wall Street Journal, was some teenage kid crawling up a cell tower. So there is a possibility, knowing teenagers, this becomes an attractive nuisance.

Is there any audio alarm that goes off if they break into the compound and somehow manage -- I know you took the pegs out, but somehow managed to try to climb the tower? I know it's a long question, but I hope it's a short answer.

THE WITNESS (Centore): Carlos Centore with Centek.

I've been doing this for a while. I haven't seen
any sites alarmed yet. I've seen taller fences

put in. I've seen barbed wire fence put in. I've seen the rungs taken off the lower portion of the tower to eliminate the -- the possibility of anyone getting to those climbing rungs, to climb, and I've also seen guards on ladders.

But in terms of an alarm system, I don't know that there's anything that we could use. It -- it would be set off by animals and anything else that would go into those unoccupied spaces.

So Brian, do you have something on that?

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Brian Gaudet. The only thing

I've seen in Connecticut, specifically it would be

on the state police towers. They do have remote

video monitoring for the compound entrance.

But those are, again, only for those, primarily police, you know, first responders, the kind of critical infrastructure aspect there.

MR. LYNCH: An 18-year-old kid climbing it -- it looked like an old radio tower, but he was up pretty far.

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Anything is possible. We did see a 200-foot tower was stolen down in Alabama.

So anything is possible, I guess.

MR. LYNCH: Now my last question is more of a curiosity question. I've heard a couple of times being advertised on radio or some -- that someone is out

there talking to landowners who have property being leased to cell towers to buy out their lease.

How would that impact your operation, if at all?

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): This is Brian Gaudet. I know, you know, typically for the public or private -- private tower owners, you know, American Tower, Crown, SBA, some of the smaller mom-and-pop developers, they certainly go head to head and try and compete for those ground leases.

But I've never experienced or seen anything that impacts the carriers themselves in that aspect. It certainly wouldn't affect service or coverage. I don't know if there would be any financial implications, but typically it's just those are -- those are plays to grab the portfolio.

MR. LYNCH: Just a followup to that, a follow-up question to that. What if the current landowner decides to sell all of his property?

Does your lease have an ability to continue on if he does sell the property?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Lynch, if you don't mind? I think

I'll take that one, as it really is a legal

question.

The answer is yes, the lease would continue; the same if an underlying property owner sells his leasehold interest, the lease would continue. Someone else would just be stepping into the shoes of the landlord.

MR. LYNCH: That's what I assumed, Mr. Baldwin, but thank you very much.

Mr. Morissette, those are all my questions.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Lynch.

Okay, well, I want to thank Mr. Silvestri for stealing a couple of my questions concerning the location and improvements of coverage. So we've covered that, but I would like to beat up the airport thing a little bit. And now that we've established that Mr. Brauer is the FAA expert, I would like to go to Exhibit 15.

This, this whole section confuses me because I'm not really sure what it says. I know that there are two airports close by. One is Skylark, which is in close proximity to this site, and then we have Ellington. Now, if I go to page 2 -- well, let me start from page 1.

The VFR traffic pattern aerospace for Skylark begins at the bottom of page 1, and it continues

on to page 2. And then following that is the VFR traffic pattern airspace for Ellington.

Now it appears that there's no problem with Ellington, however for Skylark they say the structures exceeding the greater of -- I'm not

THE WITNESS (Brauer): Yes. Mark Brauer, the, ahem, expert.

kindly try to explain it to me?

sure what that paragraph means. Could somebody

Yes, this -- this paragraph that's in there typically is -- it shows up often, and it's -- I believe it's just part of the -- the report itself. It's just it's giving an informational piece to it. It's -- we certainly did not -- we do not exceed that, that 350 feet.

So we're -- we're not -- I guess it's more of -- it's more of an informational piece than anything else because all -- all of our others we did not exceed on anything else.

- THE HEARING OFFICER: So the bottom line is that there's no problem?
- THE WITNESS (Brauer): There should not be a problem, that is correct.
- THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Thank you. Thank you for explaining that.

7 8

10

11

12

9

13 14

15

16

17

19

20

21

18

22

24

23

25

Okay. And since we haven't beaten up the water tower enough, I think I'll go back to that. Now the water tower is owned by the property owner. And for the tower to be dismantled, either it needs to be done by the property owner or under separate agreement outside of the proceedings Is that correct? here.

THE WITNESS (Glidden): Liz Glidden.

Yes, that's correct.

THE HEARING OFFICER: All right. So there is no expectation -- well, there's no -- we will not be in a position of ordering Verizon to dismantle the water tower primarily because it's outside of our jurisdiction and outside of the site, outside the site boundaries.

So my interpretation is that that would be totally a business transaction between Verizon and the property owner outside of our domain.

Could you confirm that as well?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Morissette, on the legal side, I might -- the Siting Council has approved several modifications to Verizon's facilities on that water tank over the years. And I would assume without, you know, subject to check that they've done the same for T-Mobile.

10

11

9

13

12

14 15

16

17

19

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. BACHMAN:

Thank you, Mr. Morissette.

I agree with Attorney Baldwin to an extent,

I think there's an argument that could be made that the Siting Council retains jurisdiction over that water tank in its use as a telecommunications facility. I don't think there's a lot of argument that anyone really wants to keep the water tank, whether the Council has the legal authority to tell Verizon to take it down or tell the property owner to take it down. I understand that, your concern there.

I certainly think under the circumstances, given your history with that water tank and its use as a telecommunications facility, you certainly can cite a preference. You can certainly make a recommendation if your executive director decides that you don't have the authority to demand that it be removed.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Certainly. Thank you, Attorney Baldwin. We certainly could make a recommendation. I'll ask Attorney Bachman to see if she has an opinion on this matter. I just want to make sure we flesh this out during the hearing so that there's no confusion later on.

Attorney Bachman?

but I'm just going to go back to the response that Mr. Gaudet kindly gave us earlier, that the original facility itself was approved by the Town.

We approved a bunch of exempt modifications over the years for Verizon and Sprint, and whether or not those were actually exempt modifications or tower shares, or whether there was water in the tank at any time in the last -- what? 40 years -- that is determinative.

But I think the fact still remains, the tank itself is owned by the property owner. And certainly we couldn't order him or her to remove that tank.

But we could -- and I don't recommend that we do this -- preclude it from being used for telecommunications purposes, which I believe was the point Mr. Marrone was trying to get at about the equipment shelter. If the water tank remains, there's an equipment shelter there for T-Mobile and Verizon. If the property owner would like to retain it, certainly that's his prerogative.

But if he didn't want to retain it, and there's telecommunications equipment in that compound area, certainly we could order the equipment to be removed. Thank you.

```
1
    THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you for that clarification,
         Attorney Bachman. And thank you, Attorney
2
3
         Baldwin. That concludes my line of questioning
4
         for this afternoon.
5
              We do have one open item, I believe, Attorney
6
         Baldwin, relating to the cost to remove the water
7
         tank. I believe that's the only thing we have
8
         open. Does your list agree?
9
    MR. BALDWIN: It does, Mr. Morissette.
10
    THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Would you like to take a
11
         short break to get the answer?
12
              Or do you happen to have it now?
13
    THE WITNESS (Centore): I don't have it yet.
14
    MR. BALDWIN: If we could take a short break, then
15
         hopefully we'll come back with that response?
16
    THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good. So is 12 minutes good
         enough, or do you want 15?
17
18
    THE WITNESS (Centore): Let's do 15.
19
    THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. All right.
20
    THE WITNESS (Centore): Thank you.
21
    THE HEARING OFFICER: So we will meet back here at --
22
         let me see. What do we got? 3:10 -- 3:25. So we
23
        will reconvene at 3:25. Thank you, everyone.
24
25
              (Pause: 3:10 p.m. to 3:25 p.m.)
```

1 THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good. Thank you, everyone. 2 Is the Court Reporter back with us? 3 THE REPORTER: I am, and we are on the record. 4 THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good. Thank you. 5 Attorney Baldwin, how did you make out? 6 MR. BALDWIN: We have a response for you, 7 Mr. Morissette. 8 THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good. Thank you. 9 MR. BALDWIN: I'll ask Mr. Centore to address the 10 question. 11 THE WITNESS (Centore): So Carlos Centore with Centek 12 Engineering. 13 I'm going to preface this, this budget 14 estimate that it's with pre-2019 numbers that I'm 15 referring back to for some example tank 16 replacement numbers, because the numbers for 17 things are all over the place now. I would 18 recommend to note for the cost for this tank, that 19 a separate estimate be done. 20 But they -- they range. We were able to 21 contact some people we've worked with in the past. 22 There was a tank in Norwalk that ranged about 23 \$400,000 to take down, and there was one in Groton

that ranged to about 600 -- 660 thousand dollars

24

25

to take down.

1 There's environmental abatement associated 2 with it and the removal costs and engineering that 3 go along with it that come into -- into play with 4 that cost. So the short answer, the range is 5 between 400 and 600 thousand is -- is a number to 6 keep in mind to take that tank down and offsite. 7 THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good. 8 Thank you, Mr. Centore. 9 THE WITNESS (Centore): You're welcome. 10 THE HEARING OFFICER: With that, we're going to go back 11 through the Council to see if there's any 12 follow-up questions, and specifically Mr. Morrone 13 with the cost of the tank removal. 14 Mr. Morrone, any follow-up questions? 15 MR. MORRONE: I have no follow-up questions at this 16 time. Thank you, Mr. Morissette. 17 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. 18 Mr. Silvestri, any followup. 19 MR. SILVESTRI: A curiosity question, Mr. Morissette. 20 On the estimates that we just heard from 400 to 21 600 thousand, would that include reclaimed costs 22 for the steel? 23 THE WITNESS (Centore): That's a good question. 24 would tend to say no, because the fact that 25 it's -- it's got lead coated paint on it. I'm not

1 sure what the -- the cost to abate that paint to be able to reuse the steel would be or what --2 3 what happens there, but. 4 MR. SILVESTRI: No, fair enough. Thank you. 5 Thank you, Mr. Morissette. 6 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Silvestri. 7 Mr. Golembiewski, any follow-up questions? 8 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: I have no follow-up question. 9 Thank you, Mr. Morissette. 10 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. 11 Dr. Near, any follow-up questions? 12 DR. NEAR: (Inaudible.) 13 THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Carter, any followup. 14 MR. CARTER: No followup for me. Thank you. 15 THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good. 16 Mr. Lynch -- I don't see Mr. Lynch. And I 17 have no follow-up question. Thank you. Thank you 18 to the panel for your responses this afternoon, 19 and thank you to the Council for your questions. 20 The Council will recess until 6:30 p.m., at 21 which time we will commence with the public 22 comment session of this public hearing. 23 Thank you, everyone. Have a pleasant dinner 24 and we'll see you at 6:30. 25 (End: 3:27 p.m.)

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

## CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing 57 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. 519, CELLCO PARTNERSHIP d/b/a VERIZON WIRELESS APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATION OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY LOCATED AT 11 CHAMBERLAIN ROAD, EAST WINDSOR, CONNECTICUT, which was held before JOHN MORISSETTE, Member and Presiding Officer, on February 27, 2024.

Robert G. Dixon, CVR-M 857

Notary Public

My Commission Expires: 6/30/2025

1	INDEX
2	WITNESSES PAGE
3	Elizabeth Glidden Brian Gaudet
4	Mark Brauer Carlo F. Centore Matt Gustafson
5	
6	(EXAMINER) By Mr. Baldwin 10
7	EXAMINERS
8	By Mr. Morrone 12 By Mr. Silvestri 20, 55 By MR. Golembiewski 27
9	By Dr. Near 39 By Mr. Carter 41
10	By Mr. Lynch 42
11	By The Hearing Officer 48
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	