

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Docket No. 520

Homeland Towers, LLC and 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 124 Ague
Spring Road, Haddam, Connecticut.

Zoom Remote Council Meeting (Teleconference),
on Tuesday, March 21, 2024, beginning at 2 p.m.

H e l d B e f o r e :

JOHN MORISSETTE, Member and Presiding Officer

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

2 **Council Members:**

3 **JOHN MORISSETTE, (Hearing Officer)**

4
5 **BRIAN GOLEMBIEWSKI,**

6 **DEEP Designee**

7
8 **QUAT NGUYEN,**

9 **PURA Designee**

10
11 **ROBERT SILVESTRI**

12 **CHANCE CARTER**

13
14 **Council Staff:**

15 **MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.,**

16 **Executive Director and Staff Attorney**

17
18 **ROBERT MERCIER,**

19 **Siting Analyst**

20
21 **LISA FONTAINE,**

22 **Fiscal Administrative Officer**

23
24 **DAKOTA LAFOUNTAIN,**

25 **Administrative Support**

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

1 (Begin: 2 p.m.)

2
3 THE HEARING OFFICER: Good afternoon, ladies and
4 gentlemen. Can everyone hear me okay?

5 Very good. Thank you.

6 This public hearing is called to order this
7 Thursday, March 21, 2024, at 2 p.m. My name is
8 John Morissette, member and Presiding Officer of
9 the Connecticut Siting Council. Other members of
10 the Council are Brian Golembiewski, designee for
11 Commissioner Katie Dykes of the Department of
12 Energy and Environmental Protection; Quat Nguyen,
13 designee for Chairman Marissa Paslick Gillett of
14 the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority; Robert
15 Silvestri; Chance Carter; and Dr. Thomas Near.

16 Members of the staff are Executive Director
17 Melanie Bachman, Siting Analyst Robert Mercier,
18 and Administrative Support Lisa Fontaine and
19 Dakota LaFountain.

20 If you have not done so already, I ask that
21 everyone please mute their computer audio and/or
22 telephones now.

23 This hearing is held pursuant to the
24 provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General
25 Statute and of the Uniform Administrative

1 Procedure Act upon an application from Homeland
2 Towers, LLC, and Cellco Partnership, d/b/a,
3 Verizon Wireless, for a Certificate of
4 Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for
5 the construction, maintenance, and operation of a
6 telecommunications facility located at 124 Ague
7 Springs Road in Haddam, Connecticut.

8 A complete application was received by the
9 Council on December 28, 2023. The Council's legal
10 notice of the date and time of this public hearing
11 was published in the Haddam Killingworth News on
12 January 18, 2024.

13 Upon the Council's request, the Applicants
14 erected a sign in the vicinity of the proposed
15 site so as to inform the public of the name of the
16 Applicants, the type of the facility, the public
17 hearing date, and contact information for the
18 Council, including the website and phone number.

19 As a reminder to all, off-the-record
20 communication with a member of the Council or a
21 member of the Council's staff upon the merits of
22 this application is prohibited by law.

23 The parties and interveners of the proceeding
24 are as follows. The Applicant, Homeland Towers,
25 LLC, and Cellco Partnership, d/b/a, Verizon

1 Wireless. Their representative is Kenneth C.
2 Baldwin, Esquire, of Robinson & Cole, LLP.

3 We will proceed in accordance with the
4 prepared agenda, a copy of which is available on
5 the Council's Docket Number 520 webpage along with
6 a record of this matter, the public hearing
7 notice, instructions for public access to this
8 public hearing, and the Council's citizen's guide
9 to siting council procedures.

10 Interested persons may join any session of
11 this public hearing to listen, but no public
12 comments will be received during the 2 p.m.
13 Evidentiary session. At the end of the
14 evidentiary session we will recess until 6:30 p.m.
15 for the public comment session. Please be advised
16 that any person may be removed from the
17 evidentiary session or the public comment session
18 at the discretion of the Council.

19 The 6:30 p.m. public comment session is
20 reserved for members of the public who have signed
21 up in advance to make brief statements into the
22 record. I wish to note that the Applicants,
23 parties, and interveners, including their
24 representatives, witnesses, and members are not
25 allowed to participate in the public comment

1 session.

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

10 A verbatim transcript of this public hearing
11 will be posted in the Council's Docket Number 520
12 webpage and deposited with the Haddam Town Clerk's
13 office for the convenience of the public.

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

16 We'll now move on to administrative notices
17 taken by the Council. I wish to call your
18 attention to those items shown on the hearing
19 program marked as Roman numerals 1B, items 1
20 through 87. Does the Applicant have an objection
21 of the items that the Council has administratively
22 noticed?

23 Good afternoon, Attorney Baldwin.

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

25 On behalf of the Applicant, we have no

1 objection.

2 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Baldwin.

3 Accordingly, the Council hereby
4 administratively notices these existing documents.
5 Now I move onto the appearance by the Applicant.
6 Will the Applicants present its witness panel for
7 the purposes of taking the oath? And we will have
8 Attorney Bachman administer the oath.

9 Attorney Baldwin?

10 MR. BALDWIN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.

11 Our witness panel consists of six
12 individuals, five of whom are with me here in the
13 room and one is on the Zoom from his office.

14 I'd like to introduce, to my far right,
15 Mr. Robert Burns. Mr. Burns is a professional
16 engineer with All-Points Technology and the
17 project engineer for Homeland Towers on this
18 matter. Next to him is Brian Gaudet.

19 Mr. Gaudet is a project manager with
20 All-Points Technology responsible for the visual
21 assessment and other matters related to
22 environmental impacts.

23 To my immediate right is Ray Vergati.
24 Mr. Vergati is the regional manager of Homeland
25 Towers.

1 To my left is Wesley Stevens, a
2 radiofrequency design engineer with Verizon
3 Wireless.

4 To my far left is Mr. Martin Brogie.
5 Mr. Brogie is a principal environmental scientist
6 with Martin Brogie, Incorporated.

7 And on the phone joining us today is Manny
8 Vicente, who is the President of Homeland Towers.

9 And we offer those witnesses to be sworn at
10 this time.

11 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Baldwin.

12 Attorney Bachman, please administer the oath.

13 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. Could the
14 witnesses please raise their right hand?

15 R A Y M O N D V E R G A T I,

16 M A N N Y V I C E N T E,

17 W E S L E Y S T E V E N,

18 R O B E R T B U R N S,

19 M A R T I N B R O G I E,

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

21 called as witnesses, being first duly sworn
22 by the EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, were examined and
23 testified under oath as follows:

24
25 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you.

1 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Bachman.

2 Attorney Baldwin, please begin by verifying
3 all the exhibits by the appropriate sworn
4 witnesses.

5 MR. BALDWIN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.

6 The exhibits as identified in the hearing
7 program under Roman two, Section B, items one
8 through five include the application and the
9 attachments included therein, as well as bulk file
10 exhibits, including the technical report, the Town
11 of Haddam zoning regulations, inland wetland
12 regulations, and plan of conservation and
13 development.

14 We also have the Applicant's affidavit of
15 publication in the Hartford Courant dated December
16 7th,; the Applicant's signed protective order
17 related to the lease agreement that is redacted in
18 the application; the Applicant's responses to the
19 Council's interrogatories dated March 8, 2024; and
20 then the most recent signposting affidavit dated
21 March 14, 2024.

22 I ask my witnesses if you could answer the
23 following questions. Did you prepare or assist in
24 the preparation, and are you familiar with the
25 information contained in the exhibits listed in

1 the hearing program under Roman two, Section B,
2 items one through five?

3 Mr. Burns?

4 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes.

5 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gaudet?

6 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yes.

7 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Vergati?

8 THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes.

9 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Stevens?

10 THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes.

11 MS. BACHMAN: Mr. Brogie.

12 THE WITNESS (Brogie): Yes.

13 MR. BALDWIN: I'm not -- I'm intentionally leaving
14 Mr. Vicente out because I think we've got enough
15 folks verifying the exhibits without his
16 assistance, but we'll turn on him for help later
17 on.

18 And do you have any corrections,
19 modifications, or clarifications that you'd like
20 to offer to any of the information contained in
21 those exhibits?

22 Mr. Burns?

23 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes. On the Siting Council
24 interrogatories, the response to question number
25 27 reads that the nearest property line is

1 approximately 127 feet to the east. It should
2 read 35 feet to the north.

3 The rest of the response is fine.

4 MR. BALDWIN: Thank you.

5 Mr. Gaudet, any corrections, modifications,
6 or clarifications?

7 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yes. I have two, one is a
8 clarification and one is a modification.

9 Under Exhibit 4, interrogatory response
10 number 35, I just want to clarify the distance
11 there of 700 feet is to the property line from the
12 gateway zone border. The distance to the tower
13 itself would be an additional approximately 650
14 feet, bringing that total number to 1,350 feet to
15 the edge of the gateway zone from the tower.

16 The second is a correction to attachment nine
17 of the application. The visibility analysis,
18 photos number 44 and 45 and their subsequent lines
19 on the photo locations table should restate that
20 is Landing Road, not Saybrook Road.

21 That's all.

22 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Vergati, any corrections,
23 modifications, or clarifications?

24 THE WITNESS (Vergati): I do. I have three
25 corrections. The first being to the application

1 itself. Page 11 of the application states that
2 the closest resident is listed as 122 Ague Spring
3 Road, and in fact it should be listed as 121 for
4 the address.

5 The second correction I have is page 15 of
6 the application, which lists the effective date of
7 Haddam's plan in conservation and development as
8 being January 23rd of 2028, and that should be
9 corrected on the record to be January 23rd of 2018
10 when it became effective.

11 The third correction I have on the
12 application is page 17, number six, second
13 paragraph. It lists the public information
14 meeting that was held in October of 2021, and that
15 should be corrected to be October 12th of 2023.

16 Those are my only three corrections.

17 **MR. BALDWIN:** Thank you.

18 Mr. Stevens, any corrections or
19 modifications?

20 **THE WITNESS (Stevens):** Yes, I do. A correction in
21 Exhibit 1, page 2. The introduction lists the
22 quantity for equipment of up to twelve antennas
23 and six radios. And then in attachment one, page
24 1, it lists up to 12 antennas or nine -- and nine
25 radios.

1 This should be corrected to the exact
2 quantities for the equipment on Exhibit 1, page 8,
3 which is correct, which lists eight antennas and
4 seven radios.

5 MR. BALDWIN: Thank you.

6 Mr. Brogie, any corrections or modifications?

7 THE WITNESS (Brogie): None, sir.

8 MR. BALDWIN: And is the information contained in those
9 exhibits with your modifications and corrections
10 true and accurate to the best of your knowledge?

11 Mr. Burns?

12 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes.

13 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gaudet?

14 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yes.

15 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Vergati?

16 THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes.

17 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Stevens?

18 THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes.

19 MS. BACHMAN: Mr. Brogie.

20 THE WITNESS (Brogie): Yes.

21 MR. BALDWIN: And do you adopt the information as
22 corrected and modified in those exhibits as your
23 testimony in this proceeding?

24 Mr. Burns?

25 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes.

1 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gaudet?

2 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yes.

3 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Vergati?

4 THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes.

5 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Stevens?

6 THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes.

7 MS. BACHMAN: Mr. Brogie.

8 THE WITNESS (Brogie): Yes.

9 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Morissette, I offer them as full
10 exhibits.

11 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Baldwin. The
12 exhibits are hereby admitted.

13 We now begin cross-examination of the
14 Applicant by the Council, starting with
15 Mr. Mercier, followed by Mr. Silvestri.

16 Good afternoon, Mr. Mercier.

17 MR. MERCIER: Good afternoon. Thank you.

18 I'm going to begin by just going through the
19 investigatory responses that were provided on
20 March 8th, and I'm going to begin with number
21 four. And this question had to do with a site
22 that was proposed back in 348 -- the Council back
23 in 2008. It was down towards the south end of
24 Cove Road.

25 And I asked whether, you know, this property

1 was looked at during the process for a potential
2 site to serve the area. And the response stated
3 that they looked -- Cellco looked at an existing
4 tower at the property. And what it says is, there
5 is no adequate coverage along 154.

6 In what areas where there would be sufficient
7 coverage? Is it just a small area? Is it a large
8 area? How extensive was the gap on 154?

9 THE WITNESS (Stevens): So in the -- Exhibit 1 do list
10 a need for the gap of coverage along 154 of
11 several miles. I believe it was four miles? Yes,
12 approximately a four-mile stretch of Route 154, as
13 well as local roads nearby.

14 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Is that the existing gap? Or is
15 that the gap that would remain if you did locate
16 at the existing tower?

17 THE WITNESS (Stevens): That's the existing gap.

18 MR. MERCIER: Okay. So when you looked at it
19 potentially as a site, you know, you looked at
20 locating it on an existing CL&P power pole.

21 I just wanted to know, was there substantial
22 gaps for one or two miles remaining if you did use
23 this pole? Or is it a small area such as a
24 quarter mile?

25 THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would be -- it would be

1 extensive.

2 MR. MERCIER: Do you have any sense of the distance?

3 THE WITNESS (Stevens): At least a mile.

4 MR. MERCIER: In addition to the pole, was this
5 property ever considered for, like, a new build
6 site, a new tower on this property?

7 THE WITNESS (Vergati): This is Ray with Homeland
8 Towers.

9 While this site, this particular parcel owned
10 by CL&P off of Cove Road that had the application
11 that was granted, I believe, in 2008 -- while it
12 was not considered directly by Homeland as a
13 candidate, from 2018 to 2019 Homeland Towers
14 attempted to work with Eversource/CL&P with the
15 real estate department on doing a template lease
16 for any CL&P property in the state of Connecticut
17 or that they own really in New England, both fee
18 simple and right-of-way.

19 We wasted two years trying to work with
20 Eversource on dealing with these properties, if
21 they would entertain a raw land new build site.
22 It dragged on for two years. They were
23 unresponsive, and at the end of the day they just
24 were not interested in having Homeland lease
25 towers on any of their lease simple properties or

1 right-of-ways.

2 This property at the end of Cove Road fell
3 into that bucket, obviously.

4 THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Mercier, if I may interrupt
5 here for a moment?

6 Is this the old CY site?

7 Connecticut Yankee's nuclear site?

8 THE WITNESS (Stevens): Is this question directed to
9 the applicant.

10 THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes.

11 THE WITNESS (Stevens): Or to Mr. Mercier? Sorry.

12 THE HEARING OFFICER: No, to the Applicant, please.

13 THE WITNESS (Stevens): This particular site in
14 question on Cove Road, it's parcel ID 27012A.
15 It's a 33.78 acre parcel.

16 To my understanding, that's where the
17 application was proposed by Sprint back in 2008.
18 It is just north of the -- where the Haddam Yankee
19 Power plant was decommissioned. That particular
20 property that Yankee Atomic still has in their
21 name, the 544 acres is just south of the Cove Road
22 property that CL&P owns.

23 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Thank you for that.

24 Mr. Mercier, sorry to interrupt, but I just
25 wanted to get that out there in case others had

1 questions associated with it. Thank you.

2 Please continue.

3 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. I'm going to move to question
4 number seven, and this had to do with small cells.
5 You know there's quite a lot of information in
6 here. What would be the cost of one small cell?
7 You know, typically, you know, they involve a
8 single canister antenna, a remote radio head or
9 two, and some fiber connection.

10 Do you have any cost estimate for one small
11 cell?

12 THE WITNESS (Stevens): It very much depends on where
13 the pole is, or if it is a utility pole, or some
14 other structure that we're attaching to, and what
15 equipment we decide.

16 From rough -- rough estimations that I have
17 seen recently, it could be anywhere from 50,000 to
18 a hundred thousand.

19 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you.

20 Bear with me. I'm moving down to question
21 number 15, please, and this had to do with, is
22 there any way you can maybe lower the tower? And
23 if so, how would that affect service?

24 So, you know, if the tower was lowered about
25 20 feet or so, how would service be affected in

1 the area of the proposed need?

2 THE WITNESS (Stevens): If we lower the current center
3 line of the antennas by 20 feet, it would have a
4 significant impact on the reliable coverage that
5 we'd be able to provide in the current gap that
6 exists along Route 154.

7 MR. MERCIER: Is there any specific area you're trying
8 to cover? Obviously, there's a large gap on 154,
9 but is there any particular area you want to fill?

10 Or if coverage was slightly deficient as
11 compared to the proposed, could Cellco be okay
12 with that?

13 THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yeah, so currently there is a
14 specific area of 154 that this proposed tower
15 specifically is trying to address. So in the
16 tabs -- at six, we have the plots, the covered
17 plots that show some of the existing gaps along
18 Route 154.

19 And I'm trying to see intersections to refer
20 to -- yes.

21 THE REPORTER: A quick question from the Reporter.

22 That is Wesley Stevens answering?

23 MR. BALDWIN: Yes, that's correct.

24 THE REPORTER: Thank you.

25 THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes.

1 So yes, in response to question 17, along
2 Route 154, there's an intersection with Lockley
3 Hill Road up until -- to the northern portions of
4 Haddam to the Haddam/Chester town line to the
5 south.

6 So that's a distance of approximately seven
7 miles, which is a larger gap, but this tower
8 specifically is trying to address the first four
9 miles of that existing gap of the west, the west
10 portion of that gap of 154.

11 **MR. MERCIER:** Okay. I'm looking at the coverage map
12 and I see a denotation for Tylerville Cemetery and
13 just north of that is, you know, some green
14 coverage. I guess, that's in building -- and you
15 have little bit of blue. Then it goes green again
16 up to the Haddam Cemetery, if you could see that
17 on the map along 154.

18 If the tower was lowered, would that be an
19 area that would be affected? If the antennas were
20 installed, say, 20 feet lower, is that a difficult
21 area to fill based on topography? And is that one
22 of the areas that could degrade?

23 **THE WITNESS (Stevens):** So, that would be at the edge
24 of what this tower would be providing according to
25 our current design. So lowering it would for sure

1 have an impact in that area.

2 You'll see that on the second page of the
3 coverage maps showing the proposed 700 megahertz
4 coverage.

5 If I'm looking at the maps correctly, the
6 area you're describing is mostly in green there,
7 which means it's at our neg-95 RSRP level, which
8 is the minimum level for reliable coverage that
9 we're targeting, as opposed to the blue neg-85,
10 which is strong coverage.

11 So that, that green area could be
12 significantly impacted if we lower the centerline
13 by 20 feet.

14 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you. And by looking at this
15 map, I see a lot of yellow. Some other
16 applications I think don't have that.

17 Is there a particular reason why the yellow
18 was included on this, on these coverage plots? I
19 assume, you know, the yellow area, you have it
20 denoted as outdoor coverage and not really
21 sufficient for customer use for the most part.

22 THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yeah, so -- so the yellow area,
23 the neg-105 RSRP values, that is showing where --
24 where there, you may get a connection and may be
25 able to make a phone call, for example. It is not

1 reliable coverage.

2 It's not up to the standards that we have for
3 our customers to be able to both use voice and use
4 data. So it's kind of showing where there, again
5 you might be able to connect. It is marginal
6 service, and therefore we are trying to also
7 improve the yellow areas.

8 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you. While we're on this
9 coverage map, there is a filing at the Council at
10 Petition Number 1616 that's for Cellco site at 194
11 Mount Parnassus Road in East Haddam. And it's
12 going to be called East Haddam Three as the new
13 site, and that is over looking at the maps from
14 that petition and comparing to this map.

15 It looks like it will be over to the right
16 hand of the plot where it says 434, right around
17 that area -- if you see that State Route 434.

18 Would that site, Haddam Three which is
19 proposed, does that have any play with the
20 proposed site? Meaning, you know, is there
21 handoff or is there duplicative coverage? Or is
22 that so far over to the east that really wouldn't
23 have any benefit to this site?

24 THE WITNESS (Stevens): I don't believe that there
25 would be any significant overlap.

1 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you. So for interaction
2 purposes, you know, with Haddam Two on this map,
3 you know, the tower would handoff signals there in
4 Haddam down to the south, I presume?

5 THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yeah. So primarily for
6 handoffs I would expect that along 154, on the
7 west side of the coverage that we're trying to
8 fill in, that is some of the area. That Higganum,
9 Connecticut site is currently covered at the -- at
10 really the edge of what that site is covering
11 today.

12 And then as you go east and south along 154,
13 it's kind of a gap between East Haddam Two to the
14 northeast and Haddam, Connecticut, to the south.

15 And so there, there's a potential handoff
16 with those sites.

17 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you. Moving to question 16,
18 there was a question regarding flush-mounted
19 antennas at the site, and the answer talked about
20 a feature called beam forming.

21 Could you explain a little bit more what beam
22 forming is?

23 THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure. So at many of our tower
24 sites we deploy side-by-side antennas on a bracket
25 with fixed spacing based off of the wavelength of

1 the frequencies that we're using. And the idea of
2 that is to form, in effect, what's known as beam
3 forming, whereas we have one radio that's actually
4 serving two different antennas.

5 And by having that specific spacing on the
6 wavelength, you can have essentially the output
7 power of the two antennas combined positively with
8 each other to essentially improve the -- the
9 transmit power and effective throughput of
10 devices.

11 MR. MERCIER: Great, thank you. I'm going to move to
12 question number 23 now, and this had to do with
13 text-to-911 services. And I think I asked the
14 question, is additional equipment required for
15 this purpose?

16 And the response is, yes.

17 What additional equipment would be required?

18 THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe -- correct me if I'm
19 wrong, the yes is respond -- it's responding to
20 the first part of the question, would the proposed
21 facility support text-to-911 service? And that's
22 what the yes is answering.

23 MR. MERCIER: Right.

24 THE WITNESS (Stevens): We -- I don't think we
25 addressed the second part, is -- is additional

1 equipment required? Because it's not applicable.

2 MR. MERCIER: Yes, it was -- I couldn't hear that. Can
3 you repeat that?

4 Is there additional equipment required?

5 THE WITNESS (Stevens): No, no additional equipment is
6 required.

7 MR. MERCIER: All right. Thank you.

8 Moving down to question number 28, it's a
9 question regarding lighting. And it stated there
10 would be timer-controlled LED lights, you know,
11 for workers at night. I'm not familiar with
12 these.

13 When you program the lights, can you do it
14 for like eight hours? Six hours? Or is there,
15 you know, say a worker is there for one hour, you
16 know, what's the maximum the light is going to be
17 on?

18 THE WITNESS (Burns): So this is Robert Burns with APT.

19 It's a manual timer. So he comes into the
20 compound. It's essentially he turns the switch
21 and it's -- he has so much time before the lights
22 go off. If he needs it, he turns it again. And
23 then it will go off by itself.

24 MR. MERCIER: Right.

25 THE WITNESS (Burns): It's a manual timer.

1 MR. MERCIER: Oh, right. I wasn't sure if you can turn
2 it to -- it will say eight hours and you leave at
3 three hours, and the lights are still on. That's
4 my question. And there must be a limit.

5 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yeah. I'm not exactly sure, but
6 I've seen them before and I can't imagine it's
7 more than an hour or two. And if that means he
8 has to keep, you know, turning it back on, then so
9 be it while he's there if it takes longer.

10 MR. MERCIER: Great, thank you.

11 THE WITNESS (Burns): You're welcome.

12 MR. MERCIER: Moving down to question number 34, this
13 has to do with the Connecticut River Gateway
14 Commission. And I see in the response that the
15 Applicants notified the commission in August 2023,
16 giving a copy of the technical report to the
17 commission, or its representative.

18 Now I understand, as you said before, on
19 October 12, 2023, there was a public information
20 meeting and eight residents showed up, and then
21 the first selectman also showed up.

22 Do you know if the gateway, any gateway
23 commission members or staff showed up for that
24 meeting?

25 THE WITNESS (Vergati): This is Ray with Homeland

1 Towers. You're correct, there were eight people
2 that did show up, including Bob McGarry, the First
3 Selectman; five people spoke.

4 To the best of my knowledge and recall, I do
5 not recall any representative from the gateway
6 commission attending that public information
7 meeting in October.

8 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you.

9 Regarding the gateway zone itself, I
10 understand, you know, reading the application
11 that, you know, towers are not permitted, you
12 know, on a local zoning level in the gateway zone.

13 And I was looking at your site search summary
14 that's application number eight, application
15 attachment number eight. And there was two sites
16 over on Quarry Hill Road. That's the CL&P line
17 where there was some towers that you looked at.
18 That was sites four and five. They were located
19 east of Quarry Hill Road.

20 Were any raw land sites examined, you know,
21 between Quarry Hill Road and the power line east
22 of it? Because, you know, it appears there might
23 be some open space there. Maybe there's some
24 other landlords besides CL&P.

25 Was any property looked at over there? It

1 appears that area is outside the gateway zone. So
2 I'm just curious to the extent of the search that
3 was up there.

4 **THE WITNESS (Vergati):** Yeah, this is Ray with Homeland
5 Towers. We did not focus a search that far east.
6 The topography does tend to drop off back there.
7 The locations for ground elevation for four and
8 five are -- are 368 and 358, respectively. We're
9 at 403, so we lose elevation going to the east.

10 We concentrated obviously on this property
11 due to existing infrastructure that is there right
12 now, and the fact that we basically saw 154 very
13 clearly.

14 **MR. MERCIER:** Okay. Thank you. I'm going to move to
15 the site plans. This was application attachment
16 one, and I'm going to look at -- let's see here --
17 site plan SP number two. I have just a couple
18 questions on that plan.

19 Now looking at this site, I see the existing
20 driveway going up to the old lookout tower. It
21 kind of goes straight up the hill, then the
22 proposed access road takes a quick left. I guess
23 that's, you know, north, northwest a little bit.

24 Was there any consideration of following
25 the -- using the existing driveway all the way up

1 to almost where the lookout tower was, and then
2 cutting over to the north northwest?

3 THE WITNESS (Burns): When we looked at this -- once
4 again -- sorry, Robert Burns with APT. When we
5 looked at the site, we looked at a couple -- a few
6 different configurations of the driveway. That
7 driveway gets extremely steep as we go up that
8 hill, at bordering on 20 percent.

9 The driveway that's designed here doesn't --
10 isn't any steeper than 9 and a half percent, so
11 the whole thing can be gravel. In addition, it
12 keeps it a little further tucked into the tree
13 line. And we're able to access the site without,
14 I'm going to say, significant grading even though
15 it looks like it here. It was more significant
16 than the other direction, and without removing any
17 trees. So it does end up working out better this
18 way, but we did look at a few different -- a few
19 different configurations.

20 The other thing, that existing driveway
21 that's going up there is in really poor condition
22 once it passes our proposed turn. So we would
23 have to probably reconstruct it as well. So
24 you're talking adding, you know, pavement back.

25 We thought this was the best way to get us to

1 the tower.

2 MR. MERCIER: Okay. I see a small drainage pipe, you
3 know --

4 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes.

5 MR. MERCIER: -- a short way up the driveway. What's
6 the purpose of that? Where's the water coming
7 from, and how is the discharge controlled?

8 THE WITNESS (Burns): So my concern when I was
9 designing this is, as we make that turn to go up
10 the hill, that's in a bit of a fill section, and
11 it would be trapping the water that's running
12 between the compound just in that little area.
13 It's not a lot, so it would run along the toe of
14 slope.

15 So instead of that, I'm proposing a one foot
16 deep, two foot wide grass swale. It's only 150
17 foot long to a small culvert to cross the street,
18 just to keep the water moving in the direction it
19 moves today.

20 And it's very limited. It's not that -- it's
21 not that -- it's not taking that much runoff.

22 MR. MERCIER: Okay. In the event of, like, a large
23 storm that we're having lately, you know, the
24 two-inch events or so, what happens at the
25 discharge?

1 Do you have any concerns, you know, beyond
2 the small discharge area at the grading edge that
3 there could be more erosion going down to the
4 road?

5 **THE WITNESS (Burns):** I don't. The plan is to -- to
6 the outlet, to put in a riprap apron, and if need
7 be a level spreader to take that limited amount of
8 water that's going to come through there and
9 spread it out and maintain the -- the drainage
10 flows that are -- exist on site today.

11 **MR. MERCIER:** I'm looking at the plan. I see the
12 riprap entranceway, and then there's that box that
13 says approximate location of electric easement in
14 favor of CL&P.

15 Do you know what that actually is for?

16 **THE WITNESS (Vergati):** The easement?

17 **MR. MERCIER:** The electric easement? Yes.

18 **THE WITNESS (Vergati):** Yeah, this is a Ray Vergati,
19 Homeland Towers. That box that you see there
20 referencing existing CL&P easement, that served
21 the old lookout tower where Nextel had antennas
22 back in the late '90s, early 2000s. That's what
23 that was for.

24 And I've spoken to Eversource. That easement
25 language in the deeds should expire. It ran with

1 the lease, I believe, the old Nextel lease. I
2 don't believe it's been taken off the land
3 records.

4 So my conversations with Eversource will work
5 to remove that easement. It's no longer being
6 used for the lookout tower where Nextel was
7 installed, and we'll have a new utility easement
8 access for Eversource put onto the plans,
9 obviously.

10 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you. Was there any
11 geotechnical investigation done at the tower site
12 or along the road? Or is that going to be done
13 during the -- prior to the D and M?

14 THE WITNESS (Burns): This is Robert Burns with APT
15 again. We have not done geo-tech. If this does
16 move to the D and M phase, a geo-tech will be done
17 at the tower location so that the tower and the
18 tower foundation can be properly designed.

19 MR. MERCIER: And would that involve, you know, typical
20 track vehicles and, you know, some drill bits or
21 that type of equipment?

22 THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes, I believe -- hmm. The
23 answer is yes. I'm not sure if he can get access
24 with a truck vehicle, or he's got to take an ATM
25 vehicle, an ATM drill rig up there. But more than

1 likely he'll be able to get a truck up there, I'm
2 hoping, so.

3 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you.

4 THE WITNESS (Vergati): You're welcome.

5 MR. MERCIER: Would the tower and the foundation be
6 designed to accommodate an increase in tower
7 height if it's potentially needed in the future?

8 THE WITNESS (Vergati): If needed -- and the answer
9 would be yes, if needed and allowed by this
10 approval.

11 MR. MERCIER: Is that typically a 20-foot or a 10-foot,
12 you know, enhancement to the foundation and tower
13 to, you know, would it support a 20 or 10-foot or
14 some other type of extension?

15 THE WITNESS (Vergati): I don't know if it's -- this is
16 Ray with Homeland Towers. I believe that 6408
17 allows either the greater of 10 percent of the
18 tower height or a 20-foot extension.

19 As a matter of smart business practice,
20 Homeland always designs or over designs their
21 towers to accept extension. In this case, we
22 would design to accept a 20-foot extension,
23 bringing it to an overall height of 170 if, in
24 fact, a future carrier could justify that height
25 for the Council.

1 MR. MERCIER: Have any other carriers to date expressed
2 any interest to you to co-locate on the facility,
3 proposed facility?

4 THE WITNESS (Vergati): This is Ray with Homeland
5 Towers. Nothing in writing, no applications
6 received, but you know there are customers. There
7 are tenants. We speak to them regularly. They
8 are interested. There they all have a need here.
9 They've all looked over the years in Haddam and
10 have attempted to try to do something to no avail.

11 So we expect if this tower is approved, I
12 kind of feel that they will come and we would
13 expect other carriers to come soon thereafter.

14 MR. MERCIER: I forgot to mention, did the Town or any
15 emergency response entity express interest in the
16 facility?

17 THE WITNESS (Vergati): They've expressed interest in
18 having it for their first responders. They rely
19 on their cell phones immensely. There are a lot
20 of volunteers there in town, along with the
21 resident trooper.

22 They haven't expressed a need right now to
23 put any whip antennas on the facility itself.

24 MR. MERCIER: Okay. For this plan set I'm going to
25 refer to figure three, I guess it's called. It's

1 called site location map. It's near the beginning
2 of this plan set that was provided as attachment
3 one. And I'm actually going to use it for the
4 visibility analysis as attachment nine.

5 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Mercier, just to clarify, are you
6 talking about the one that is an aerial base map?
7 Or do you want to use the topographic base map?

8 MR. MERCIER: The aerial, please. Thanks.

9 Okay. Looking at the viewshed analysis, you
10 know, towards the back we have the aerial image
11 and it shows the two-mile radius and the photo
12 locations, and it maps out visibility. And I was
13 just trying to zoom in as to what the views would
14 be for some areas with visibility. I guess I'll
15 look at number five on the visibility map.

16 And are there any homes in that area? You
17 know, I was looking at figure one, as I mentioned,
18 and I see a house kind of south, almost really
19 pretty much due south, kind of bordered by trees.
20 Then further to the southeast is another property
21 with, it looks like two houses on it that are not
22 part of the host parcel. And there's one across
23 the street that's not part of the host.

24 So there's, like, four homes in this general
25 area, four homes on three parcels or --

1 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yeah. I'll point to --
2 actually, I think photo eight might paint a better
3 picture of the residences along Ague Spring Road
4 to the south there.

5 If you look at photo eight, you can see a
6 couple residential structures there. The house
7 that's sort of centered, centered in the photo
8 there, off-white. That is the residence on the
9 host property.

10 You can see a residence in the foreground on
11 the left, the wood siding. And you can see a
12 walkway that should -- I believe, is going up to
13 the residence immediately south of the host
14 property.

15 MR. MERCIER: Yes, I was looking at, you know, the
16 colored areas around eight and five, and I was
17 just trying to determine which of these residents
18 actually have the visibility.

19 It's hard to see with the overlay, so I
20 wasn't sure if it's one residence or three or
21 four -- or one, just in that general area of the
22 tower.

23 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): I would say there's -- yeah,
24 including -- again, this is Brian Gaudet with
25 All-Points. Including the host property I believe

1 there are four residential houses there. All of
2 them would experience some form of seasonal and/or
3 year-round visibility.

4 **MR. MERCIER:** Do you have a sense of the year-round
5 visibility from the houses that are not on the
6 parcel?

7 **THE WITNESS (Gaudet):** Bear with me one second.

8 Due to the -- I will say the house across the
9 street from the host property farthest north and
10 nearest the tower, I think from their property
11 they'll have some year-round views.

12 As you move further south -- I call it
13 southeast from the tower facility itself, those
14 views, if any, from the residences would most
15 likely be seasonal. You've got some pretty decent
16 tree coverage around these homes themselves.

17 The only other house I think that might
18 experience potentially some year-round views would
19 be the one immediately southwest of the host
20 property.

21 **MR. MERCIER:** When you say, year-round views, are you
22 saying, you know, it's like through gaps in trees?
23 Or is it above the treeline they'll see it?

24 **THE WITNESS (Gaudet):** I would say above the treeline.
25 If you look at -- I'll point you to photo nine.

1 This is, again, further, further southwest.

2 But it points, I think, to kind of give you a
3 picture of what that tree coverage is from the
4 residence, that red residence there is the one
5 immediately adjacent to the host property
6 residence.

7 And while there is, you know, a good line of
8 trees between those properties, it does appear
9 that there might be some -- some areas on that
10 property where it would be a little sparse and
11 they would have some year-round views above the
12 trees.

13 MR. MERCIER: Okay. They're looking at the viewshed
14 map again, there's a photo location number 24.
15 And I'll just say basically to the left and right
16 below it there's two areas that are kind of
17 yellowish. And I was trying to compare that with
18 that figure one, the application attachable one.
19 And I could not determine if there is actual
20 residences in those locations.

21 Have you determined if there's residents
22 there and what they might be able to see?

23 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): One second.

24 Yeah, so there, there are in the area around
25 24. I'm trying to get a clear picture here. I

1 want to give you the right count. One second.

2 Okay. I'm having a tough time deciphering
3 whether some of these are just outbuildings as
4 opposed to a residence, but it looks like there
5 would be visibility from one, two, three, four --
6 up to five residential properties from the
7 residences themselves. I would say visibility
8 from maybe three.

9 MR. MERCIER: And that's year-round visibility?

10 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): I think at this distance it's
11 mostly going to be seasonal. It's tough to tell
12 when, you know, when you can't access the -- the
13 properties, private properties.

14 Sometimes where you have these large patches
15 of seasonal visibility and the viewshed mapping is
16 showing that there are some year-round views as
17 well, that that could indicate that one inch of
18 the tower is visible above the tree line.

19 So where you have these very small patches or
20 even pixelated patches of year-round visibility in
21 these larger pockets of seasonal views, typically
22 while that may be technically visible above the
23 treeline, a lot of times when you're out in the
24 field that distance is, you know, a quarter mile
25 plus away, you may not be able to discern the top

1 of that tower sticking above the trees.

2 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you.

3 I'm going to move to figure five -- excuse
4 me, proposed photo simulation number five for the
5 visibility analysis, you know, photograph of the
6 tower.

7 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yeah.

8 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Yeah. Are any offsite residences,
9 you know, developed properties, would anybody have
10 this view? Or is that strictly just from the road
11 across the field?

12 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): That one is across the road. It
13 is, I think, more likely the view would be similar
14 to view six. The residence that is directly
15 across the road does have -- it does have some
16 trees screening it to that direction. It's
17 essentially due south of where the tower is
18 located.

19 I would say if you, you know, if they were to
20 walk to the edge of the street they might have a
21 couple shots that would look similar to that, but
22 there is some intervening vegetation from the
23 residence itself.

24 MR. MERCIER: And looking at this, this photo, was
25 there any reason why the tower was located on the

1 slope rather than, you know, up beyond the first
2 large evergreen?

3 You know, up behind there, it seems like from
4 the site plan it's much flatter on top of the hill
5 rather than doing, you know, some site work along
6 the side of the hill. And maybe using some of the
7 existing vegetation at the south tower as the
8 potential screening.

9 **THE WITNESS (Vergati):** This is Ray with Homeland
10 Towers. The location where the tower is currently
11 proposed was looked at in a few ways, and
12 obviously in conjunction with the landlord.

13 What we were trying to accomplish is if you
14 look at how the tower is compared to the lookout
15 tower, we were trying to keep it kind of in line
16 closer toward the road and so not be totally up on
17 a higher flatter spot on the ridgeline. That's
18 the reason for the location.

19 **MR. MERCIER:** But wouldn't the tower up behind the
20 taller trees, you know, up towards the top behind
21 the existing lookout tower, wouldn't that provide
22 more mitigation, you know, for people driving down
23 this road?

24 **THE WITNESS (Gaudet):** Brian Gaudet with All-Points.

25 Yes, you would have, to your point, the

1 additional benefit of -- again, referencing photo
2 five -- some screening from the existing lookout
3 tower. You can see there's a short stand of trees
4 that's adjacent to the lookout tower and that
5 evergreen that you referenced before.

6 So it would. It would tuck back in there and
7 provide some, some screening to the lower portion
8 of the tower, again, for people driving on this
9 road. I think it, you know, it's obviously clear
10 from the field reconnaissance we did in the
11 viewshed mapping that there it's going to be an
12 impact here on Ague Spring Road regardless.

13 Mitigation efforts for visibility for this
14 site have really been focused on a couple other
15 factors. One, with this facility being -- this
16 property being so open, there's not much you can
17 do at the property to screen the tower itself.

18 The mitigation we've been looking at are
19 associated with the SHPO consultation that we've
20 been going through, as well as concerns knowing
21 that the vast majority, 60 -- almost 65 percent of
22 the visibility, predicted visibility of this
23 facility is on the river or over open water at
24 distances greater than a half mile, and a half
25 mile up to two.

1 So what we're doing there where the tower is
2 going to be sticking above the treelines where you
3 have the majority of visibility and resources both
4 scenic and historic that would have visual
5 impacts, the focus there is to minimize that
6 impact to those locations.

7 So through that process through the
8 consultations with SHPO, looking at some potential
9 stealth options, you know, how can we make this
10 thing as non-visible as possible? Painting this
11 tower some form of sky blue above the treeline is
12 the ideal mitigation for visual impacts here.

13 There's no way to avoid views from a 150-foot
14 tower. So obviously, we do what we can, but I
15 think in this location, again with that parcel
16 being so open there's not a lot you can do to --
17 to tuck it away.

18 I think the views, you know, the prominent
19 views as pointed out in photos four, five, six,
20 it's a very short stretch of road there primarily
21 in front of the host parcel that will have the
22 visibility. Beyond that it drops off pretty,
23 pretty quickly just due to the additional tree
24 covering topography in the area.

25 **MR. MERCIER:** Okay. Thank you. You mentioned

1 visibility from the river, and I could obviously
2 see on the map all the, you know, visibility from
3 that area. Obviously, there was no pictures taken
4 from the river itself -- but would, say, like
5 photo 38 or 31 be representative of river views,
6 you know, for boaters going up and down?

7 Although those were land-based photos, are
8 there any photographs that, you know, give a
9 general idea what the view from the river would
10 be?

11 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yeah, I think 45 is a good
12 depiction; 38, good depictions. We did fly a
13 drone when we were out there over the river to get
14 an idea of what those views would be like. I
15 forgot the height above water that we were flying,
16 but I want to say between 10 and 15 feet. At some
17 points it might have been more.

18 The tower will be visible from the river,
19 certainly more prominently from the western
20 shoreline as you move to the eastern shoreline.
21 Due to the topography and the trees you do drop
22 visibility as you approach the eastern shoreline.

23 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you.

24 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): (Unintelligible) --

25 MR. MERCIER: One other question -- oops. Sorry, go

1 ahead.

2 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): I was going to point you to we
3 have a photo from Haddam Meadows State Park, which
4 I think is a pretty good representative shot, as
5 well, along photo 31 -- just for your reference.

6 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you.

7 One other question I had, on the legend it
8 has a scenic highway listed, however when I was
9 looking at it I didn't see any local scenic roads.
10 And I believe those were on the Gateway Commission
11 interactive mapping site. It was Injun Hollow
12 Road and Rock Landing Road. And granted, you did
13 take photographs from those locations, you know,
14 comparing the roads.

15 But I was curious, is there a dataset you
16 used or that had the scenic roads? Is there a
17 local one or --

18 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yeah, so the scenic --

19 MR. MERCIER: I'm curious why those weren't added.

20 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yeah. This is, again, Brian
21 Gaudet with All-Points. The scenic was from the
22 CT-DOT scenic strips data layer, which it did
23 not -- sorry. The C-DOT -- CT-DOT state scenic
24 highways 2015, and was not. Again, that just
25 shows the state level ones.

1 MR. MERCIER: Well, did you typically -- do you
2 typically look for local scenic roads in the
3 conservation development plan, or other resources
4 such as the Gateway Commission site?

5 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): If there's readily available GIS
6 datasets for that area they would be incorporated.
7 I would have to look into this one and see if
8 there, there was anything, if there was a reason
9 we didn't show any local ones on this particular
10 site.

11 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you.

12 I have no other questions. Thank you.

13 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Mercier.

14 We'll now continue with cross-examination of
15 the Applicant by Mr. Silvestri, followed by
16 Mr. Nguyen.

17 Good afternoon, Mr. Silvestri.

18 MR. SILVESTRI: Good afternoon, Mr. Morissette. Good
19 afternoon to all.

20 Mr. Burns, I'd like to have a quick followup
21 on your conversations with Mr. Mercier. When you
22 mentioned SP2 and the access way that's depicted
23 on that, that's what's actually being proposed and
24 not the access ways that are on the farmland soils
25 drawing under tab 13, or under tab 16, or the

1 wetlands figure as well. Is that correct?

2 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes, what's on the site plan is
3 what -- what is being proposed.

4 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you.

5 Then possibly also for Mr. Burns, the diesel
6 generator is proposed 50 kilowatts. Any
7 consideration for using propane?

8 THE WITNESS (Burns): The diesel generator was used
9 here to try and keep the compound as small as
10 possible and try and fit as many carriers in there
11 as we could. There were no diesel restrictions on
12 this property.

13 As you know, Mr. Silvestri, if we were to go
14 with a propane tank there are offset issues that
15 we would have to, you know, slide the equipment
16 around to make sure that it -- that it fit in
17 there, but that's the reason.

18 MR. SILVESTRI: No, understood. But just one followup
19 to that, is there natural gas anywhere around that
20 area?

21 THE WITNESS (Burns): I can't say a hundred percent
22 sure, but I'm -- it is extremely doubtful if there
23 is. We can check on that and get back to you, but
24 I -- I doubt it.

25 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you.

1 Thank you for the response.

2 THE WITNESS (Burns): You're welcome.

3 MR. SILVESTRI: And I'm not sure who this one is for,
4 but if you look at page 10 of the application
5 there is a section number two, tower sharing. And
6 it says Homeland will design the proposed tree
7 tower.

8 What's a tree tower?

9 THE WITNESS (Vergati): This is Ray with Homeland
10 Towers. I think that's just a typo. It should
11 just be the proposed -- it should have been
12 monopole tower.

13 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you.

14 All right. Mr. Gaudet, a couple questions
15 for you, and good afternoon as well.

16 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Good afternoon.

17 MR. SILVESTRI: When you mentioned painting the tower
18 above the treeline a sky blue, what would be the
19 color of the tower below the treeline?

20 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): In this instance I believe
21 leaving it galvanized steel would -- would be
22 sufficient. Again, where the tower is going to be
23 seen sort of in the immediate vicinity, painting
24 it brown isn't going to really mask it. That
25 could certainly be an option.

1 You know the kind of standard is what we've
2 seen in the past, but again, with no real
3 immediate tree coverage around this tower
4 discussions have been primarily focusing on the --
5 the top part of the tower and painting it a sky
6 blue that would have a more matte finish,
7 non-reflective finish.

8 Beyond that, you know, again these -- the
9 mitigation from the visual standpoints here were
10 really focused on resources that were at distance.

11 So that was the primary discussion.

12 MR. SILVESTRI: No, understood. Thank you.

13 Out of curiosity, any idea at what height
14 that the tower would have the sky blue painting
15 starting?

16 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Probably 60, 60 feet, between 60
17 and 70.

18 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you.

19 Then also while I have you I'd like to
20 reference the two photo number fives. And could
21 you explain the perspective in those photos where
22 the lattice tower appears to be higher or taller
23 than the proposed monopole?

24 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): So it's -- again, the last tower
25 here is significantly closer in distance to the

1 viewpoint here. You know, we're 323 feet from the
2 proposed tower.

3 If you give me one second?

4 You know, here you're sort of looking --
5 you're not looking straight. I'll explain this by
6 pointing to photo six where the monopole is
7 significantly over the lookout tower.

8 So here you're looking at an angle in photo
9 six where it's basically straight, straight on
10 that's at a 50, 50 millimeter focal length. Photo
11 five you're sort of skewed more, I call it,
12 towards the -- there where you're looking at them
13 a little bit more side by side, but you've got
14 that separating distance still between towers
15 making the lookout tower closer to you in this
16 location.

17 And again with the topography here I think
18 this is where you're looking at it. This photo
19 was also taken at a 35 millimeter focal length.
20 Sometimes that can have an effect as, you know, on
21 the outer edges of those photos.

22 MR. SILVESTRI: No, I could definitely see the
23 difference in photos number six, and that's why I
24 posed the question for number five. So I
25 understand that it just looks weird.

1 I'll leave it at that.

2 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yeah, and I've got a little more
3 information here from Mr. Burns who just did some
4 quick calculations. So it's 160-foot separating
5 distance between the two structures. The ground
6 elevation is also 13 feet higher at the lookout
7 tower than the proposed.

8 MR. SILVESTRI: Understood, thank you.

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

10 MR. SILVESTRI: And I think this is for you also.

11 You kept mentioning SHPO.

12 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yes.

13 MR. SILVESTRI: Are consultations going on with SHPO
14 continuously right now?

15 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yeah, so we've had some pretty
16 extensive consultations with them throughout the
17 process going through the -- the NEPA process
18 here. It started back -- initially they had --
19 they had requested for some viewshed mapping,
20 which we provided to them.

21 At which point the SHPO, under their purview,
22 does have the ability to extend into the area of
23 potential effect for visual impacts if deemed
24 appropriate. In this instance they deemed an
25 adverse impact due to the visibility of the

1 proposed facility to two historic districts a mile
2 and a mile and three quarters away, respectively.

3 As part of that, you know, the first --
4 obviously, the first thing that we look at is to
5 avoid an impact. In this case I think, you know,
6 as detailed by Mr. Vergati's site search summary
7 the amount of time that he spent in this area
8 trying to find a suitable location for Verizon's
9 coverage needs, there's nowhere else to really go
10 to put a tower that's going to not have a visual
11 impact while meeting coverage needs.

12 So since avoidance couldn't be done, we then
13 moved to -- to mitigation. What can we do to
14 lessen the impact? And that's where the
15 discussions on what type of, for lack of a better
16 term, stealthing can we do? What can we do to
17 lessen that visual impact?

18 And throughout that discussion, you know,
19 your typical stealth designs monopines don't work.
20 You're so high above the treeline here, especially
21 with those perspectives down at distance where
22 you're looking up towards the ridgeline. And
23 again, with it being at a pretty significant
24 distance, the tower itself as proposed has a
25 pretty minimal footprint as far as the width when

1 you're looking at it on the horizon.

2 So we felt that the best option here would be
3 to paint it, again a sky blue to let it blend into
4 the background a little bit better for those
5 distant resources.

6 **MR. SILVESTRI:** Very good.

7 **THE WITNESS (Gaudet):** That project -- that we've
8 continued to move past that. We are working on a
9 memorandum of agreement right now between Homeland
10 Towers and the Haddam Historical Society to
11 provide additional mitigation. Homeland Towers is
12 committed to contributing to the Haddam Historical
13 Society capital improvement project. That is
14 going through the process right now with the FCC,
15 state SHPO, Haddam Historical Society and Homeland
16 Towers.

17 Once that is complete and that memorandum
18 agreement is in place we will submit that to the
19 SHPO, at which point we expect to have a condition
20 of painting the tower, but we will have a
21 determination that the adverse effect has been
22 mitigated to those historic resources.

23 **MR. SILVESTRI:** Very good. Thank you for your
24 response.

25 Mr. Stevens, I believe you're up next.

1 Good afternoon.

2 **THE WITNESS (Stevens):** Good afternoon.

3 **MR. SILVESTRI:** Looking at the coverage plots --

4 **THE WITNESS (Stevens):** Yes?

5 **MR. SILVESTRI:** And say, most notably with the 850
6 megahertz I could see an improved coverage to the
7 west and to the south of the proposed site, but I
8 don't necessarily see any improvement to the north
9 or to the east.

10 Could you explain why that is?

11 **THE WITNESS (Stevens):** Yes, so because of our coverage
12 objective and where the site is located it's --
13 it's a somewhat unusual situation, but we are only
14 going to have sectors or our equipment facing
15 south and west to be able to cover Route 154.

16 We don't have equipment in the normal
17 configuration where we try to equally cover all
18 directions around our site. So the reason why you
19 see very little impact around the site and the --
20 to the north and to the east is due to that.

21 **MR. SILVESTRI:** Understood. And kind of related to
22 that, would -- at some point in the future would
23 you either add or try to redirect to try to cover
24 more to the north and east?

25 **THE WITNESS (Stevens):** It's a possibility, but we

1 have -- we do have, you know, other sites in the
2 area that are covering those regions right now,
3 and we don't have -- we don't have as great a need
4 in those areas that we think this site would be
5 able to fix due to its location and the topology.

6 So --

7 MR. SILVESTRI: At this point --

8 THE WITNESS (Stevens): -- right now we do not -- we
9 don't anticipate adding to the design right now.

10 MR. SILVESTRI: At this point in time?

11 THE WITNESS (Stevens): Correct.

12 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you.

13 And I'm not sure who this question is
14 directed to, but the question I have is, was a
15 phase two completed for the site?

16 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): This is Brian Gaudet. I'm
17 assuming you're referencing for cultural resource?

18 MR. SILVESTRI: That is correct.

19 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): As opposed to a phase two
20 environmental site assessment?

21 MR. SILVESTRI: No, cultural.

22 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yeah a phase two would not be
23 necessary. We completed a phase 1B investigation
24 that was submitted to the SHPO. They agreed with
25 our findings that no additional investigations

1 were warranted at that time.

2 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you.

3 And I think my last set of questions is
4 directed toward Mr. Brogie.

5 Good afternoon, Mr Brogie.

6 THE WITNESS (Brogie): Good afternoon, Mr. Silvestri.

7 Nice to see you.

8 MR. SILVESTRI: Nice to see you again, yeah.

9 For clarification, does the topography from
10 the proposed tower location slope down to the
11 wetlands and the man-made pond?

12 THE WITNESS (Brogie): Yes.

13 MR. SILVESTRI: It does? Okay. So do you know if
14 existing stormwater runoff gets intercepted by
15 what seems to be the dirt road, kind of, between
16 the proposed tower location and the wetlands?

17 THE WITNESS (Brogie): The hay field is -- is pretty
18 thick. There's no evidence of any directed or
19 concentrated overland flows of stormwater.

20 And I think that that dirt road is -- is
21 barely a dirt road. It's more like a path across
22 the grass. I didn't see any evidence of any kind
23 of erosion going on there at all. I'd say -- like
24 I say, it's very thickly vegetated. Even with
25 slopes there's no -- no concentrated stormwater

1 going off that way.

2 MR. SILVESTRI: Yeah -- that I should have gave you a
3 reference. I was looking at figure two on the
4 wetlands report.

5 THE WITNESS (Brogie): Yeah. I'm looking at that, too.
6 Uh-huh.

7 MR. SILVESTRI: Yeah, so you've got that, that kind of
8 curved path road -- whatever you want to call
9 it -- that comes in.

10 THE WITNESS (Brogie): Yeah.

11 MR. SILVESTRI: Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

12 THE WITNESS (Brogie): You're welcome.

13 MR. SILVESTRI: And Mr. Morissette, I'm just checking
14 to see if I have everything else.

15 And I am good at this point.

16 Thank you, and thank the panel.

17 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Silvestri.

18 We'll now continue with cross examination by
19 Mr. Nguyen followed by Mr. Golembiewski.

20 Good afternoon, Mr. Nguyen.

21 MR. NGUYEN: Good afternoon, Mr. Morissette.

22 Thank you.

23 I have a few questions addressed to the
24 panel. So if anyone can jump in that would be
25 okay. Then let me start with asking the lattice

1 tower -- or the existing one is probably in the
2 record somewhere. But if you could, someone could
3 help me to understand what is that, the status of
4 that lattice tower? Do you know about it?

5 THE WITNESS (Vergati): This is Ray with Homeland
6 Towers. It's an existing, what we call, lattice
7 or lookout tower throughout the record. It's 73
8 feet, 6 inches tall.

9 It's my understanding it was an old
10 transmission line tower that was dismantled at
11 another location and put up here roughly 50
12 some-odd years ago. It's been on the property for
13 quite some time. As I mentioned earlier, Nextel
14 did use the lattice tower for some period in the
15 late '90s to the early 2000s before they
16 de-installed their antennas. I think it was with
17 the Nextel/Sprint merger when they decommissioned
18 the site possibly.

19 But currently right now the landlord uses
20 this lookout tower. He climbs it frequently,
21 although I don't know how safe it is for him to
22 climb. It does have pegs on it, but he climbs it
23 and he's passionate about it. It's kind of an
24 interesting situation. He -- he climbs the tower
25 and does photography from it towards the western

1 views for sunsets and so forth.

2 It's been there for so long everybody knows
3 that's the lookout tower right off the road there.
4 That's its current use.

5 MR. NGUYEN: So conceptually, for any wireless carrier
6 to co-locate the equipment on that tower, that
7 would not be advised?

8 THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yeah. We, you know, Verizon as
9 part of my alternate site analysis -- I think it's
10 listed as number two. Verizon looked at the
11 structure, and being only 73 and a half feet tall
12 it was not adequate in height to provide the
13 adequate coverage for Verizon's coverage gap to
14 remedy it.

15 In addition, I will say I don't know how
16 structurally sound that tower is these days being
17 so old and looking at it. We didn't run a
18 structural analysis on it, but the fact that
19 Verizon could not use it we ruled it out,
20 obviously.

21 MR. NGUYEN: Yeah. Mr. Vergati, while I have you, in
22 response to question number two it appears that
23 you have a constant conversation with the First
24 Selectman Mr. McGarry regarding the Town's support
25 of the project. Am I right?

1 THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yeah this is Ray from Homeland.
2 Just to provide a brief history, we started this
3 quest with the Town in 2016 with the prior First
4 Selectwoman Lizz Milardo. They're very supportive
5 of Homeland bringing service, in fact, so much
6 they did two ground leases with Homeland towers.

7 Bob McGarry has taken over as the First
8 Selectman. I've had a wonderful relationship with
9 Bob. He recognizes the need for this tower. We
10 speak often. I believe he even sent a letter
11 supporting this facility this morning to the
12 Siting Council. I received a copy from Bob.

13 Bob is also a first responder himself, and
14 this Town has been, for all intents and purposes,
15 screaming for public safety coverage for 25 plus
16 years. Bob has told me stories and I've read
17 about them of fatal accidents on 154, bank
18 robberies with the resident trooper not being able
19 to make cell phone calls.

20 So I'll just sum it up and say that the --
21 the Town of Haddam, the prior First Selectwoman
22 and the current First Selectman Bob McGarry have
23 been extremely supportive of -- of this
24 application and our efforts to bring reliable
25 service and public safety to the Town.

1 MR. NGUYEN: Thank you. And then you go back to that
2 lattice tower. Mr. Gaudet, you mentioned about a
3 discussion with SHPO and the adverse effect of the
4 proposed tower.

5 I'm curious as to -- with the existing
6 lattice tower here, is that part of the equation
7 when you talk about an adverse effect? Or there's
8 not an adverse effect at all?

9 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): There was no discussion with the
10 SHPO regarding the existing lookout tower. From
11 when we did the field reconnaissance -- I've been
12 in the area as well -- you can't really see that
13 lookout tower from, certainly from the western
14 shoreline of the river.

15 So obviously, as you get further away, you
16 know it's -- it is half the height roughly of the
17 proposed facility. I'd just say you can't see it
18 above the treeline there.

19 MR. NGUYEN: Thank you.

20 With respect to the application SP1, on the
21 upper left-hand corner there was a legend that
22 indicated there's a geopoint of plus or minus 90
23 feet with respect to 60 feet from the distance
24 from the tower to the property line.

25 THE WITNESS (Burns): I'm sorry. What -- this is

1 Robert Burns. I don't -- can you repeat the
2 question? I don't understand the question.

3 MR. NGUYEN: Yeah, sure. On the application SP1 --

4 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yeah?

5 MR. NGUYEN: On the upper left-hand corner --

6 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yeah?

7 MR. NGUYEN: There was an indication that there would
8 be a yield point of 90, plus or minus 60 feet.

9 THE WITNESS (Burns): Correct.

10 MR. NGUYEN: And this is with respect to a 60 feet
11 property line up by the north?

12 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes.

13 MR. NGUYEN: Earlier you corrected in question number
14 27 when that I believe you mentioned 30 feet
15 property line.

16 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes, the -- the equipment. The
17 equipment in that question -- the equipment in the
18 question is 35 feet. The tower itself is 62 feet
19 from that property line.

20 MR. NGUYEN: So there will be a yield point --

21 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes.

22 MR. NGUYEN: -- consideration in your design here.

23 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes.

24 MR. NGUYEN: And in speaking about the compound, I also
25 see that there's three future equipment areas in

1 the compound.

2 THE WITNESS (Burns): Correct.

3 MR. NGUYEN: And what would they be used for?

4 THE WITNESS (Burns): What would they be used for?

5 MR. NGUYEN: Yes.

6 THE WITNESS (Burns): If other future carriers want to
7 co-locate on this pole those spaces would be for
8 them; AT&T, T-Mobile, Dish, et cetera. And we
9 even included a small space on there in case the
10 municipality wanted to put equipment in the
11 compound.

12 MR. NGUYEN: So it's for their equipment?

13 THE WITNESS (Burns): Correct.

14 MR. NGUYEN: Is there any consideration of a type of
15 battery storage in the compound.

16 THE WITNESS (Burns): I'm sorry. On what storage?

17 MR. NGUYEN: Battery, battery storage.

18 THE WITNESS (Burns): Battery storage? No, there's
19 no -- no consideration for battery storage here.

20 MR. NGUYEN: I believe that's all I have. A lot of
21 questions have been asked. Thank you, gentlemen.

22 And thank you, Mr. Morissette.

23 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen.

24 At this point we're going to take a 12-minute
25 break and we will reconvene at 3:35. And we will

1 continue with cross-examination by
2 Mr. Golembiewski followed by Mr. Carter.

3 We will see you at 3:35. Thank you.

4
5 (Pause: 3:23 p.m. to 3:35 p.m.)

6
7 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you everyone.

8 Is the Court Reporter back with us?

9 THE REPORTER: I am, and we are on the record.

10 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Very good. We will
11 now continue with cross-examination of the
12 Applicant by Mr. Golembiewski, followed by
13 Mr. Carter.

14 Good afternoon, Mr. Golembiewski.

15 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Good afternoon, Mr. Morissette.

16 Can everyone hear me?

17 THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes, we can hear you just fine.

18 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: All right. Thank you. I had only a
19 few questions. One is regarding the visibility
20 study. I just wanted to get in the record two
21 questions.

22 One is, how would the Applicant characterize
23 the view of the tower from Haddam Meadows State
24 Park and the trails associated with it?

25 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): So photo 33 -- this is Brian

1 Gaudet with All-Points. If you look at photo 33
2 under attachment nine, which is the visibility
3 analysis, that is taken from the -- right at
4 that -- if you're familiar with the park, that's
5 sort of the first parking area when you come in
6 off the road -- where you can see, you know,
7 generally we're talking distances about a mile and
8 a quarter, a mile or so.

9 It will be visible from Haddam Meadows State
10 Park primarily year round for many portions of it.
11 Obviously, when you get to those areas in the
12 trails where there's tree coverage between
13 yourself and the river, they might obscure the
14 views a little bit, but I would suspect that the
15 vast majority of the park will have some
16 year-round views where there is predicted
17 visibility.

18 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. Thank you. Also to the west
19 of the tower site there's a state park called
20 George Dudley Seymour State Park.

21 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yes.

22 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: And on the visibility map there is a
23 blue trail that is shown.

24 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Uh-huh?

25 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: And it does appear that there's some

1 visibility sort of east of it and west of it.

2 How would you characterize views from someone
3 utilizing that trail?

4 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): I think from the trail itself,
5 again that trail system does kind of wind in
6 through the woods until you get down to the
7 open -- so I'll call it, more almost like a marshy
8 area.

9 Obviously, where it's open and there's no
10 surrounding tree coverage adjacent to the trail
11 you will have some year-round views there.

12 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. So I'm going to move on to
13 the site plan, and specifically plan sheet -- it's
14 SP2, and it's called the partial site plan.

15 And as I look at the tower development it
16 appears that there's cuts on the northern end of
17 the compound that appear to go right to the
18 property line. And I'm wondering if that is, you
19 know, my experience with development is they
20 usually don't grade right up to someone's property
21 line.

22 So I was just wondering if that is -- if
23 that's what I'm seeing, if that property line is
24 approximate and not exact.

25 THE WITNESS (Burns): The grading will go right up to

1 the property line. You are correct.

2 This is Robert Burns with APT.

3 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): And Brian Gaudet with
4 All-Points. One of the conditions -- as you can
5 see, there's the stone wall there, too, on the
6 mapping.

7 One of the conditions that we have from the
8 SHPO is that there will be high visibility marking
9 and some contractor awareness not to disturb those
10 stone walls, as I was saying.

11 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. So I guess leading to my next
12 question is, you do not believe there will be any
13 adverse effect to the abutting property from that
14 grading?

15 THE WITNESS (Burns): That's correct. And if need be,
16 during the D and M, I can slide that little
17 parking area down by five feet or so to bring that
18 grading more onto our property.

19 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. I would -- I think that would
20 be a good idea. I mean, I don't know exactly what
21 the normal town setback for development is, but I
22 would imagine it's at least 15 feet, 10 to 15
23 feet.

24 So yeah, if you could move the grading to off
25 the property line to some extent I think that

1 would be very helpful.

2 **THE WITNESS (Burns):** I think that's definitely doable.

3 **MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI:** Great. All right. Get to one more
4 question. So this is -- I think I know the answer
5 to this, but I just -- I think I want to ask it
6 anyway.

7 So I understand that the lattice tower is
8 existing and that its current use is by the
9 property owner for, I guess, views and taking
10 photographs. My thought is, you know, we always
11 want to leave a site with one tower. Having a
12 private property person using portions of your
13 tower, I'm -- I guess, I'm asking the question, I
14 would assume that's an incompatible use?

15 **THE WITNESS (Vergati):** This is Ray with Homeland
16 Towers. I would underscore incompatible use.
17 It's a major liability, and our towers are
18 designed where they can't be climbed by an
19 individual; so only qualified tower climbers.

20 **MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI:** So two towers is basically -- it's
21 got to be two towers, then?

22 **THE WITNESS (Vergati):** It doesn't have to be two
23 towers. The landlord's preference is to keep the
24 lattice tower there because they use it. They
25 enjoy it, obviously, but it doesn't have to

1 remain.

2 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay.

3 THE WITNESS (Vergati): Just their preference.

4 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: All right. I guess I was a little
5 unclear -- did the Gateway Commission actually
6 provide any comments verbal or written on the
7 proposal?

8 THE WITNESS (Vergati): This is Ray Vergati, Homeland
9 Towers. Yeah, we received some comments from the
10 Gateway Commission yesterday.

11 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. Are they in the record, or
12 they will be in the record? Or?

13 MR. BALDWIN: I believe -- this is Ken Baldwin,
14 Mr. Golembiewski. I believe they were submitted
15 to the Council and the Applicant simultaneously
16 late yesterday.

17 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. All right. Wonderful.

18 Thank you.

19 MR. BALDWIN: Sorry, Tuesday.

20 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. I had one more question in
21 regards to, were there any existing commercial or
22 industrial zoned areas in the search ring?

23 THE WITNESS (Vergati): This is Ray with Homeland
24 Towers. I'd have to take a look again at the
25 zoning map. I'm happy to do that as a homework

1 assignment, but it's -- it's primarily pretty
2 rural.

3 Quite possibly there might be some industrial
4 commercial zones on the west side of the river.
5 The Town has a transfer station that they have
6 there, and that may be zoned for industrial use.

7 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. And that does not meet your
8 coverage requirements, that site?

9 THE WITNESS (Vergati): We had -- and again, I've been
10 working with the Town since 2016. That transfer
11 site is actually part of my alternate site
12 analysis. It's listed as number eleven. The Town
13 was not interested in -- in having that, or
14 leasing that property to Homeland Towers.

15 They did enter into two leases with us; one
16 at the firehouse at 439 Saybrook Road and which is
17 number three on the ASA, alternate site analysis;
18 and the other is Jail Hill Road, number nine on
19 the site analysis.

20 But Mr. Gaudet just pulled up a zoning map.

21 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): This is Brian Gaudet with
22 All-Points. That area, the area of Haddam east of
23 the river is essentially entirely zoning
24 residential two.

25 There appears to be one industrial two zone

1 located further south, but it does appear based on
2 the parcel mapping that that would be associated
3 with the Connecticut Yankee facility.

4 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. All right. I have my last
5 question. I know there's some landscaping
6 proposed. Will that have any effect on the views
7 from photos four, five and six from the visibility
8 study?

9 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): This is Brian Gaudet with
10 All-Points. You can see that, the landscaping in
11 the photo simulations for those where we're
12 talking kind of your six to seven-foot evergreen
13 planting just to help screen the compounds a
14 little bit.

15 But I wouldn't say it would have a
16 significant impact if you're talking about
17 screening the -- the tower itself from views
18 immediately out on the east front road.

19 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. Thank you, panel. Thank you,
20 Mr. Morissette. That's all I have.

21 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Golembiewski.

22 Just so you're aware, Mr. Golembiewski, that
23 the Gateway Conservation letter submitted by the
24 Applicant will be considered public comment as
25 part of the record.

1 We'll now continue with cross-examination of
2 the Applicant by Mr. Carter.

3 Good afternoon, Mr. Carter.

4 **MS. BACHMAN:** Excuse me, Mr. Morissette. If I could
5 just clarify please?

6 **THE HEARING OFFICER:** Certainly. Please do.

7 **MS. BACHMAN:** This is partially my fault for having to
8 testify before the legislative committee
9 yesterday, but we did receive the Gateway
10 Commission comments. They're not a party.
11 They're not a state agency. So they're a limited
12 appearance statement, and you will receive them in
13 your mail packets on Friday.

14 And an hour before the hearing began we did
15 get a letter from the First Selectman in support
16 of the tower, which will also be in your mail
17 packets and in the record after the hearing.

18 Thank you.

19 **THE HEARING OFFICER:** Thank you.

20 Mr. Carter, good afternoon.

21 **MR. CARTER:** Good afternoon, Mr. Morissette. And good
22 afternoon, my fellow council members and thank you
23 to the panel for your time, and also the staff of
24 course.

25 I'm not going to take up a lot of time

1 because luckily a lot of the questions that I've
2 had have been answered. I actually only have one
3 question, and it is in reference to the wetlands
4 delineation report.

5 Looking at page 3 at the conclusions and
6 recommendations, I see that there is actually --
7 well, actually it's on page 4. There's a mention
8 of erosion control measures that need to be taken
9 during and after construction to maintain slope
10 stability.

11 I just wanted to get some elaboration
12 regarding the erosion control measures, what's
13 being proposed. And also, does the SHPO and the
14 stone walls have any impact on erosion control?

15 **THE WITNESS (Burns):** So Robert Burns with APT. The
16 erosion control measures here specified are on the
17 toe of slope. On the southwest side it will be
18 lined with silt fence, and all the slopes that are
19 proposed greater than three to one will have
20 erosion control blankets on them, and they'll be
21 seeded.

22 And no, they won't have any impact on -- for
23 existing stone wall, or the stone wall won't have
24 any impact on them.

25 **MR. CARTER:** Perfect. Thank you. With that --

1 THE WITNESS (Burns): (Unintelligible.)

2 MR. CARTER: Oh, sorry. Go ahead.

3 THE WITNESS (Burns): No. I just said, you're welcome.

4 MR. CARTER: Oh, perfect. With that, Mr. Morissette, I
5 will yield my time back. Thank you.

6 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Carter.

7 Okay. I'm going to start my questioning
8 relating to the plots, the coverage plots. And if
9 I could go to the existing and proposed 700
10 megahertz coverage plot -- and I believe it's
11 Mr. Stevens, and it is also in relation to page 7,
12 the footnote.

13 The footnote on page 7 states Cello's
14 existing gap in wireless service along Route 154
15 is significantly larger than four miles. If
16 approved, the Haddam north facility would cover
17 four miles, a portion of Route 154. An additional
18 cell tower would be needed to fill the remaining
19 gap along 154 and adjoining areas to the south.

20 Using the coverage map can you give me an
21 idea of the area in which the new cell tower could
22 possibly be?

23 THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure. So this is Wes Stevens,
24 Verizon. So everything you said is absolutely
25 correct. It's unfortunately such a large run of

1 road that you can't fill in the entire gap that we
2 currently have unreliable service along Route 154.

3 Primarily where we would be looking to fill
4 in that gap would be closer to that eastern
5 section of the current gap. So where the road
6 goes from mostly an east and southeast direction
7 where it turns to go directly south, I believe
8 where it intersects with Route 82, I believe that
9 is, anywhere in that area or across the river to
10 the east pointing in that direction -- yeah. Oh,
11 yes.

12 So the -- the Tylerville Cemetery that was
13 referenced earlier.

14 **THE HEARING OFFICER:** Uh-huh?

15 **THE WITNESS (Stevens):** So to the north there, the bend
16 in 154, starting in that area -- again, the
17 currently proposed tower will not be able to fully
18 solve that coverage issue.

19 From -- from that area south is, again, an
20 area we're targeting. So any proposed tower
21 either along that road or close by in that area,
22 or something, again across the -- the river to the
23 east pointing in that direction could be used to
24 fix that coverage gap in that area.

25 **THE HEARING OFFICER:** Thank you. Is the intent to

1 go -- with the new tower to go down to Chester and
2 Deep River? Or is that too?

3 THE WITNESS (Stevens): For parts of Chester, yes.

4 It's -- it's right around the Chester border where
5 our coverage starts to improve again.

6 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay.

7 THE WITNESS (Stevens): But we would definitely be
8 considering that.

9 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. So that, that essentially
10 would fill the gap between the Tylerville Cemetery
11 and the Haddam three coverage that is shown on the
12 coverage map. Okay. Great. Thank you.

13 THE WITNESS (Stevens): You're welcome.

14 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. I would like to go to page
15 11 of the introduction, and this has to do with
16 the visual impact. And this would be Mr. Gaudet.

17 Down at the bottom of the page in the next to
18 last paragraph that starts with, according to the
19 visual report; my question is relating to the last
20 sentence in that paragraph. It basically says the
21 Haddam north facility tower will be visible
22 through the trees from an additional 255 acres, or
23 3.17 percent of the 2-mile radius area.

24 I'm not exactly sure what that means. Could
25 you kindly explain it to me?

1 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Sure thing. Brian Gaudet with
2 All-Points. That is your -- what we typically
3 reference as your seasonal views.

4 THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, this is seasonal. Okay.

5 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yeah through -- through the
6 treeline.

7 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Great. Thank you. Thank
8 you for that clarification.

9 Okay. Now I'd like to go to on page 2, site
10 location map, which is in section one. And this
11 has to do with the questioning or the comment I
12 made earlier about the CY property.

13 Now my understanding is that the CL&P lattice
14 structures are north of this, of the CY property
15 and I just want to get some clarification of where
16 that property is. Now if -- and when I say CY,
17 it's Connecticut Yankee Nuclear Powerplant that
18 has been retired.

19 Now if I look at the map on page 2, on the
20 lower right-hand corner there's -- it looks like a
21 transmission line corridor. I believe if you go
22 further north around the 300-foot ground level
23 mark, that's about where CY is -- if you could
24 help me out on this. Is that correct? Is that in
25 the general location that I'm looking at here?

1 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): So it's Brian Gaudet. I'll
2 reference you here. Looking down at that bottom
3 right-hand corner, looking at the site location
4 map it's a topo.

5 THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah.

6 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): There is -- do you see where it
7 says Haddam Neck?

8 THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah, yeah.

9 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Right next to Haddam you see
10 substation.

11 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay.

12 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): That is the Eversource Haddam
13 Neck substation, so aptly named.

14 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay.

15 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): And the CY property is south of
16 that.

17 THE HEARING OFFICER: South of that? Okay. So the
18 substation is about 250 feet at ground level. So
19 if I go to the west, it goes up to 300 feet. And
20 your site ground elevation is -- what?

21 403, I think it is?

22 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yes.

23 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. So this area, I'll call
24 it, doesn't appear to be acceptable because of its
25 ground elevation. Is that correct?

1 THE WITNESS (Stevens): This is Wesley Stevens from
2 Verizon. Yes, it's a combination of both
3 significantly lower elevation, but also farther
4 away from the target gaps on -- especially on the
5 western parts of Route 154.

6 THE HEARING OFFICER: Uh-huh.

7 THE WITNESS (Stevens): So it would be a further
8 distance to cover.

9 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Great. I just wanted to
10 make sure that that information was on the record
11 so there was no confusion that that was a
12 possibility when it's not.

13 Okay. I just want to go back and confirm the
14 SHPO letter did talk about the stone wall and
15 protecting it, protecting it and marking it during
16 construction with high visibility fencing being
17 sure that there's no impact during construction.

18 I just want to confirm for the record that
19 you are committing to do that?

20 THE WITNESS (Burns): This is Robert Burns with APT.

21 Yes, that wall will not be touched.

22 THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good.

23 So there's two walls. Right?

24 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Two walls, correct.

25 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes, that's correct.

1 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. So both walls won't be
2 touched. Right?

3 THE WITNESS (Burns): That's correct.

4 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Burns.

5 Okay. Mr. Burns, I think this is for you as
6 well. So there's going to be a net cut. Are you
7 expecting to export the extra cut to off site?

8 THE WITNESS (Burns): Right now it's designed where the
9 extra cut will be taken off site. If we can lose
10 it on the site we certainly will, if it's
11 suitable, but right now it's being proposed to
12 being removed from the site.

13 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Anything removed off site
14 will have to be tested and handled accordingly?

15 THE WITNESS (Burns): That's correct.

16 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Thank you.

17 Okay. That concludes my questioning for this
18 afternoon. Since we have a little bit of time I
19 will go through the Council again to see if
20 there's any follow-up questions, and then we'll
21 convene for the public comment session.

22 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Morissette, but before you do that if
23 I could interrupt there?

24 There was one -- I'm not sure if it was a
25 homework assignment, but there was a lingering

1 question about natural gas Mr. Silvestri asked.
2 We do have some additional information on that,
3 and Mr. Vergati can offer that at this time.

4 **THE HEARING OFFICER:** That would be wonderful. Thank
5 you. I don't want any homework assignments.
6 Thank you.

7 **THE WITNESS (Vergati):** This is Ray with Homeland
8 Towers. During the twelve-minute break I reached
9 out to the homeowner asking him that specific
10 question, if there's any gas present.

11 He responded there's -- there's no gas,
12 there's no sewer, there's no water in that area.
13 He's a volunteer fireman, so he was speaking
14 pretty much in the know.

15 So to answer your question, we don't believe
16 there's any natural gas or gas out there on the
17 street.

18 **THE HEARING OFFICER:** Very good. Thank you. Okay.

19 We'll now go through the Council.

20 Mr. Mercier, any follow-up questions?

21 Mr. Mercer?

22 **MR. MERCIER:** Yes. I have no questions. Thank you.

23 **THE HEARING OFFICER:** Okay. Thank you.

24 Mr. Silvestri, any follow-up questions?

25 **MR. SILVESTRI:** Thank you, Mr. Morissette. I was going

1 to ask for the followup on the natural gas, but
2 they beat me to it. So I'll thank you. I have
3 nothing else. Thanks again.

4 THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good. Thank you,
5 Mr. Silvestri.

6 Mr. Nguyen, any follow-up questions?

7 MR. NGUYEN: I don't have any. Thank you.

8 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Mr. Golembiewski?

9 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: I have no follow-up questions.

10 Thank you.

11 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Mr. Carter?

12 MR. CARTER: As of now I have no followup. I may once
13 we get our packets.

14 THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Carter, there won't be
15 another opportunity to ask questions. This is it.

16 MR. CARTER: Well, no further questions. Thank you.

17 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.

18 Okay. And I have no followup. So that
19 concludes our hearing for this afternoon. The
20 Council will recess until 6:30 p.m, at which time
21 we will commence with the public comment session
22 of this public hearing.

23 So thank you, everyone, for your responses
24 and your questions, and we will see you after
25 dinner at 6:30. Thank you, everyone.

(End: 3:59 p.m.)

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing 84 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. 520, HOMELAND TOWERS, LLC AND 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 124 AGUE SPRING ROAD, HADDAM, CONNECTICUT, which was held before JOHN MORISSETTE, Member and Presiding Officer, on March 21, 2024.



Robert G. Dixon, CVR-M 857
Notary Public
My Commission Expires: 6/30/2025

INDEX

WITNESSES

PAGE

Raymond Vergati
Manny Vicente
Wesley Steven
Robert Burns
Martin Brogie
Brian Gaudet 9

(EXAMINER)

By Mr. Baldwin 10

EXAMINERS

By Mr. Mercier 15
By Mr. Silvestri 47
By Mr. Nguyen 58
By Mr. Golembiewski 65
By Mr. Carter 73
By The Hearing Officer 75

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25