1	CERTIFIED COPY
2	STATE OF CONNECTICUT
3	CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL
4	
5	Docket No. 533
6	Tarpon Towers III, LLC, and Cellco Partnership
7	d/b/a Verizon Wireless Application for a Certificate
8	of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for
9	the Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of a
10	Telecommunications Facility and Associated Equipment
11	Located at 161 Conrad Street, Naugatuck,
12	Connecticut.
13	
14	Zoom Remote Council Meeting (Teleconference), on
15	Thursday, May 22, 2025, beginning at 2 p.m.
16	
17	Held Before:
18	ELIN S. KATZ, ESQ., THE CHAIR;
19	and JOHN MORISSETTE, THE VICE CHAIR
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

ſ	
1	Appearances:
2	Councilmembers:
3	ELIN S. KATZ, ESQ. (Chair)
4	JOHN MORISSETTE (Vice Chair)
5	
6	BRIAN GOLEMBIEWSKI,
7	DEEP Designee
8	
9	QUAT NGUYEN,
10	PURA Designee
11	
12	CHANCE CARTER
13	KHRISTINE HALL
14	BILL SYME
15	DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.
16	
17	Council Staff:
18	ADAM MARRONE,
19	Siting Analyst
20	
21	MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.,
22	Executive Director and Staff Attorney
23	
24	LISA FONTAINE
25	Administrative Support

Appearances:(cont'd)
For TARPON TOWERS III, LLC:
ROBINSON & COLE, LLP
280 Trumbull Street, TE 19
Hartford, Connecticut 06103
By: KENNETH C. BALDWIN, ESQ.
KBaldwin@rc.com
860.275.8345
For AT&T:
CUDDY & FEDER, LLP
445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th Floor
White Plains, New York 10601
By: KRISTEN M. MOTEL, ESQ.
KMotel@cuddyfeder.com
914.761.1300
For T-MOBILE:
PRINCE LOBEL TYE, LLP
One International Place, Suite 3700
Boston, Massachusetts 02110
By: DANIEL S. GLISSMAN, ESQ.
DGlissman@princelobel.com
617.456.8181

(Begin: 2:00 p.m.)

THE CHAIR: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. This public hearing is called to order this extremely cold and dreary Thursday, May 22, 2025, at 2 p.m.

My name is Elin Katz, Chair of the

Connecticut Siting Council. Other members of the

Council are John Morissette, Vice Chair; Brian

Golembiewski, designee for Commissioner Katie

Dykes, Department of Energy and Environmental

Protection; Quat Nguyen, designee for Marissa

Paslick Gillett, Public Utilities Regulatory

Authority; Chance Carter; Khristine Hall; Bill

Syme; and Daniel P. Lynch, Jr.

Members of the staff are Executive Director

Melanie Bachman, Siting Council Analyst Adam

Morrone, and Administrative Support Lisa Fontaine.

If you haven't already done so, I ask that everyone mute their computer audio or telephone right 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 of Tarpon Towers, III, LLC, and Cellco partnership d/b/a

1 Ver
2 env
3 the
4 tel
5 equ
6 Cor
7 Cou

Verizon Wireless for a certificate of environmental compatibility and public need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunications facility and associated equipment located at 161 Conrad Street, Naugatuck, Connecticut. This application was received by the Council on March 21, 2025.

The Council's legal notice of the date and time of this public hearing was published in the Republican American on April 7, 2025.

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 website and phone number.

As a reminder to all, off-the-record communications with a member of the Council or a member of the Council's staff upon the merits of this application are prohibited by law.

Just a reminder when you're speaking, to identify yourself for the Court Reporter.

The Applicant is Tarpon Towers, LLC, and Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless.

Could the Applicant's representatives please

1	identify yourselves and your affiliation?
2	ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Thank you, Chair Katz.
3	This is Ken Baldwin with Robinson & Cole. I
4	represent the Applicant Tarpon Towers III, LLC,
5	and Cellco Partnership doing business as Verizon
6	Wireless.
7	THE CHAIR: Thank you. We have two interveners.
8	First, New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC, in other
9	words AT&T. Could AT&T's representatives please
10	identify themselves and their affiliation?
11	ATTORNEY MOTEL: Yes. Good afternoon, Chair Katz.
12	Kristen Motel with Cuddy & Feder for New
13	Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC.
14	THE CHAIR: Thank you.
15	ATTORNEY MOTEL: Thank you.
16	THE CHAIR: And the second intervener is T-Mobile, LLC.
17	T-Mobile, could its representatives please
18	identify themselves and your affiliation?
19	ATTORNEY GLISSMAN: Good afternoon, Chair Katz.
20	Attorney Daniel Glissman with Prince Lobel
21	Tye, LLP, here on behalf of Intervener T-Mobile
22	Northeast, LLC.
23	Thank you.
24	THE CHAIR: Thank you, Attorney Glissman.
25	We will proceed in accordance with the

prepared agenda, a copy of which is available on the Council's website along with the 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 this public proceeding to listen, but no public comments 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 anyone may be removed from the evidentiary session or the public comment session at the discretion of the Council.

The 6:30 p.m. comment session is reserved for members of the public who signed up to make brief statements into the record. Please note that the Applicants, parties, and Interveners including their representatives, witnesses, and members are not allowed to participate in the public comment session.

I also wish to note for those who are listening and for the benefit of your friends and neighbors who are unable to join us today for the

public comment session that you or they may send
written comments to the Council within 30 days of
the date hereof, either by mail or by e-mail, and
that 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 website and deposited at the Naugatuck Town Clerk's office for the convenience of the public.

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

Let's turn first to administrative notice. It call your attention to those items on the hearing program marked as Roman numeral 1B, items 1 through 88. Does any party or intervener have an objection to the items the Council has administratively noticed?

Attorney Baldwin?

- ATTORNEY BALDWIN: No objection, Chair Katz.
- 21 THE CHAIR: Attorney Motel?

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- 22 ATTORNEY MOTEL: No objection. Thank you.
- 23 THE CHAIR: Attorney Glissman?
- 24 ATTORNEY GLISSMAN: No objection. Thank you.
- 25 | THE CHAIR: Thank you.

Accordingly, the Council hereby administratively notices these existing documents.

Will the Applicant present its witness panel for the purposes of taking the oath? And Attorney Bachman will administer the oath.

ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Thank you, Chair Katz.

Again, for the Applicant, Ken Baldwin with Robinson & Cole.

Our witnesses are listed in the hearing program under Roman two, subsection C, and they include Brett Buggeln and Ken Curley, both with Tarpon Towers III, LLC; Elizabeth Glidden and Alejandro Restrepo with Verizon Wireless; Robert Burns, professional engineer; Matt Gustafson, professional soil scientist with All-Points Technology here in our hearing room in Hartford; and then also on the Zoom call is Mike Libertine with All-Points Technology.

And I'd offer them to be sworn at this time.

THE CHAIR: Attorney Bachman, do you want to swear the witnesses?

ATTORNEY BACHMAN: Thank you, Chair Katz.

Could the witnesses please raise your right hand?

1	BRETT BUGGELN,
2	KENNETH CURLEY,
3	ELIZABETH GLIDDEN,
4	ALEJANDRO RESTREPO,
5	ROBERT BURNS,
6	MATTHEW GUSTAFSON,
7	MICHAEL LIBERTINE,
8	called as witnesses, being sworn by
9	THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, were examined and
10	testified under oath as follows:
11	
12	ATTORNEY BACHMAN: Thank you.
13	THE CHAIR: Attorney Baldwin, could you please begin by
14	verifying all exhibits by the appropriate witness?
15	ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Thank you, Chair Katz.
16	So we have four exhibits listed in the
17	hearing program under Roman two, subsection B,
18	including the application, the affidavit of
19	publication, our signed posting affidavit and the
20	responses to the Council's interrogatories dated
21	May 12th.
22	And I would ask my Witnesses, did you prepare
23	or assist in the preparation of the information
24	contained in those exhibits?
25	Ms. Glidden?

```
1
    THE WITNESS (Glidden): Yes.
2
    ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Mr. Buggeln?
3
    THE WITNESS (Buggeln): Yes.
4
    ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Mr. Curley?
5
    THE WITNESS (Curley): Yes.
6
    ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Mr. Restrepo?
7
    THE WITNESS (Restrepo): Yes.
8
    ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Mr. Burns?
9
    THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes.
10
    ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson?
11
    THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes.
12
    ATTORNEY BALDWIN: And do you have any corrections,
13
         modifications or clarifications to any of that
14
         information that you want to offer at this time?
15
              Ms. Glidden?
16
    THE WITNESS (Glidden):
17
    ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Mr. Buggeln?
18
    THE WITNESS (Buggeln):
19
    ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Mr. Curley?
20
    THE WITNESS (Curley):
21
    ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Mr. Restrepo?
22
    THE WITNESS (Restrepo): Yes, I do.
23
              So, in the application, I have a correction
24
         in the application under the introduction, page 2.
25
         On page 2, the first paragraph, we state the
```

quantity of radios and antennas. The quantity of radios in the application is ten. It should actually be 18 remote radio heads.

The second correction in the interrogatories, question 16 on page 6 and 7, it asks for the distances to five macros. We actually listed four. The missing location is Naugatuck four, by which Verizon refers to, and it is 3.38 miles to the southeast of the proposed location.

And that's all the corrections I have.

ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Thank you.

Mr. Burns?

THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes, I have two corrections. The first one is on the drawings. Drawing SP-1, SP-2 and CP-1 list the lease area incorrectly. The lease area is actually 7,760 square feet, as opposed to 6,916 square feet. The area of the compound is correct on the drawings.

The second correction is on drawing CP-1 and the interrogatory response number 21. When we submitted, the Town had not finalized their antenna requirements. They have since finalized them. So, the Town will be requiring two 17-foot whips at the top of the antenna, and one -- top of the antenna? The top of the tower. And one

1	14-foot antenna whip at the top of the tower.
2	And those are the only corrections I have.
3	ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Thank you.
4	Mr. Gustafson?
5	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): No, I do not.
6	ATTORNEY BALDWIN: And with those corrections and
7	clarifications, is the information contained in
8	those exhibits true and accurate to the best of
9	your knowledge?
10	Ms. Glidden?
11	THE WITNESS (Glidden): Yes.
12	ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Mr. Buggeln?
13	THE WITNESS (Buggeln): Yes.
14	ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Mr. Curley?
15	THE WITNESS (Curley): Yes.
16	ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Mr. Restrepo?
17	THE WITNESS (Restrepo): Yes.
18	ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Mr. Burns?
19	THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes.
20	ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson?
21	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes.
22	ATTORNEY BALDWIN: And do you adopt the information
23	contained in those exhibits as your testimony in
24	this proceeding?
25	Ms. Glidden?

1 THE WITNESS (Glidden): Yes. 2 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Mr. Buggeln? 3 THE WITNESS (Buggeln): Yes. 4 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Mr. Curley? 5 THE WITNESS (Curley): Yes. 6 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Mr. Restrepo? 7 THE WITNESS (Restrepo): Yes. 8 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Mr. Burns? 9 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes. 10 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson? 11 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. 12 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Chair Katz, I offer them as full 13 exhibits. 14 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 15 Do any of the Interveners object to the 16 admission of the Applicants' exhibits? 17 Attorney Motel? 18 ATTORNEY MOTEL: No. Thank you, Chair Katz. 19 THE CHAIR: Attorney Glissman? 20 ATTORNEY GLISSMAN: No objections. Thank you. 21 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 22 The exhibits are admitted. 23 We will now begin with a cross-examination of 24 the Applicants by the Council, starting with 25 Mr. Morrone.

MR. MORRONE: Good afternoon. Thank you, Chair Katz.

My first question for the Applicant is if the Applicant has determined the location on the site for its equipment staging area or storage area during the time of construction?

THE WITNESS (Burns): This is Robert Burns with All-Points Technologies.

We haven't defined a location, but the area is such a size so that the staging will probably be within -- not probably, will be within the area where the -- either where the proposed compound is or slightly to the south near the -- near the second tank.

MR. MORRONE: Thank you.

THE WITNESS (Burns): You're welcome.

MR. MORRONE: And do you have an approximate number of how many construction vehicles and what type of vehicles will be expected to enter the site during construction?

THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns with All-Points.

Number of construction vehicles, I don't have an exact number. It would probably be a crane, some excavation equipment, and then mostly pickup trucks. So, it will be limited, but no, I don't have an exact number.

MR. MORRONE: Okay. And would any of that equipment need to be parked or operated from the street?

THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns with All-Points.

No.

Can I amend that answer? With the exception of the utilities when they're installed along the street, Eversource is going to require us to put in a pole and trench along the street. So, they may be in the street at that, when they're doing that piece of the construction.

- MR. MORRONE: Okay. Thank you.
- THE WITNESS (Burns): You're welcome.
 - MR. MORRONE: Next, is the Applicant aware of any pending changes to the applicable codes and standards that may be implemented prior to the commencement of construction for this, if this facility is approved?
 - THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns with All-Points.
 - No, all the codes and requirements are up to date, and I'm not aware of any changes that will be on the horizon.
 - MR. MORRONE: Okay. So, now referencing Exhibit 3, attached to the responses to the council interrogatory number nine, the Borough's special meeting minutes indicated a vote approving a

1	replacement water tank with antennas mounted to
2	the tank. At what point in the planning stages
3	did this change?
4	ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Mr. Morrone, just for clarification,
5	we have that in the hearing program as Exhibit 4,
6	our responses to the interrogatories.
7	I thought you
8	MR. MORRONE: Okay. Thank you.
9	ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Yeah, just it will help the
10	transcript. Thank you.
11	ATTORNEY BACHMAN: Excuse me. Attorney Baldwin, I
12	believe that Mr. Morrone was referring to the
13	exhibit that is attached to the interrogatories.
14	So, it may be Exhibit 3 attached to the
15	interrogatories that are actually Exhibit 4 on the
16	hearing program. Is that correct?
17	ATTORNEY BALDWIN: I think that's correct.
18	Thank you for the clarification.
19	MR. MORRONE: So, just to clarify, I'm referring to the
20	meeting minutes from the Borough of Naugatuck that
21	were included with the response to council
22	interrogatories.
23	ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Yes, thank you. I didn't mean to
24	confuse things. I think we were both right,
25	Mr. Morrone.

1 And could you refresh my recollection? Which 2 page of those minutes are you referring to? 3 A VOICE: Item six. 4 MR. MORRONE: One moment. 5 6 (Pause.) 7 8 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: I think we found it. 9 It's on page 5. 10 MR. MORRONE: Yes, page 5. 11 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: All right. I apologize for causing 12 the confusion. Could you ask the question again? 13 MR. MORRONE: Yes. On page 5 of Exhibit 3 within the 14 Council's -- the response to the Council's 15 interrogatories, the Borough voted to approve a 16 replacement water tank with antennas mounted to 17 the tank. 18 At what point in the planning stages did this 19 change, and was a new vote taken on the redesign? 20 THE WITNESS (Curley): This is Ken Curley for Tarpon 21 Towers. 22 After reviewing the document, I believe there 23 was a typo from the municipality. At no time did 24 we indicate replacing either water tanks.

plan since the beginning was to remove both tanks

25

in a phased approach with removing the first tank
where the proposed tower will be.

Once that tower is constructed, the equipment for T-Mobile that is on the southern tank would be moved to the proposed tower, and then the -- the second tank would be removed.

- MR. MORRONE: Okay. Just to be clear for the record, you're stating that the meeting minutes from the Borough are in error?
- THE WITNESS (Curley): Correct. Tarpon -- this is Ken Curley from Tarpon Towers.

At no point did Tarpon engage in any type of agreement with the Borough in replacing either water tanks. Our intentions have always been to remove the northern tank, put a cell tower in that spot, remove the second tank, and they would at -- the end of the property would only have one tower on it with no water tanks.

- MR. MORRONE: Thank you very much.
- THE WITNESS (Curley): Thank you.
- MR. MORRONE: Also referencing the same exhibit and page, it was stated that Tarpon Towers would remove one water tank at its expense at the cost of \$170,000, and the removal of the second tank would be deducted over time in the lease.

1 Is this accurate? 2 THE WITNESS (Curley): Ken Curley with Tarpon Towers. 3 Yes, that is accurate. 4 MR. MORRONE: And what is the total cost to Tarpon 5 Towers for the removal of both water tanks? 6 THE WITNESS (Curley): This is Ken Curley, Tarpon 7 Towers. 8 Tarpon Towers has estimated a cost of 9 \$385,000 to remove both the northern and southern 10 water tank. 11 MR. MORRONE: Going back to the minutes that we're 12 discussing, were the minutes approved by the 13 Borough? 14 THE WITNESS (Buggeln): Mister -- this is Brett Buggeln 15 of Tarpon Towers. 16 Mr. Marrone, I think that the discussion in 17 item six is not the same as the motion that was 18 then approved by the Borough, if that's the intent 19 of your question. 20 The motion, while imprecise, is more specific 21 in -- in and of itself to the plan that Mr. Curley 22 mentioned, which was to remove the first tank, put 23 up a new tower, a telecommunications tower, then 24 remove the southern tank so that the site, the 25 remaining structure at the site is the one -- is

one communications tower.

I think that if you look at the voting, where the voting occurred, that we're not disputing that the discussion or the minutes are incorrect.

We're indicating how they, if you read them, the end result was the motion that reflects the drawings that you see in front of you regarding the project.

THE WITNESS (Curley): Mr. Marrone, this is Ken Curley from Tarpon Towers.

To add? In the last sentence from item six, page 5, it indicated exactly what Mr. Buggeln just alluded to, that the two towers would be gone and replaced with the -- the one tower that were -- the two towers being water tanks, and be replaced with the one proposed telecommunications facility.

- MR. MORRONE: Okay. So, you're saying that there's ambiguity in the language between water tower and telecommunication tower?
- THE WITNESS (Curley): This is Ken Curley, Tarpon
 Towers.

Yes, they refer in this doc -- the document that we are referencing, item number six, page 5, under the voted section, they are indicating the two towers, and I believe they're referring to the

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

two towers as the two water tanks. MR. MORRONE: Okay. Thank you very much. THE WITNESS (Curley): You're welcome. MR. MORRONE: Moving on to the response to the council interrogatory number five, it stated that a geotechnical survey would be performed at the tower site.

Could you describe what type of actions are required for this investigation and whether the water tanks would need to be removed prior to performing the survey?

THE WITNESS (Burns): Bob Burns with All-Points.

No, the tanks would be in place. They would do one deep hole as -- as close as they could get to the area where the tower would be, and then they usually do two or three probes for the ten-foot borings, if you will, mainly because the deepest excavation is for the tower.

So, the tanks would be in place when that geotech is done. The geotech would be done; the towers would be designed as part of the D and M submission to the Council.

MR. MORRONE: Okay. And aside from the drilling, would any clearing or ground disturbance be required? THE WITNESS (Burns): For the construction?

1 Robert Burns again. 2 MR. MORRONE: For the geotechnical survey? 3 THE WITNESS (Burns): No, no clearing will be required. 4 That whole area is clear. 5 MR. MORRONE: Thank you. 6 THE WITNESS (Burns): You're welcome. 7 MR. MORRONE: All right. Now, referencing the updated 8 site sheet, SP-1, a setback radius of 46 feet is 9 shown. Now, because this is so close to a 10 residential road, if a yield point is engineered 11 at 104 feet above ground level, does the Applicant believe this is sufficient for all the tower 12 13 sections and associated equipment to remain within 14 the property boundaries in the event of a 15 structural failure? 16 THE WITNESS (Burns): This is Robert Burns with 17 All-Points. The short answer is yes. The closest 18 19 property line is that front property line and it's 20 46 feet from the tower. So, the tower would 21 collapse upon itself. 22 MR. MORRONE: Okay. And the residents directly across 23 from that shortest property line, Number 134 Craig 24 Circle, do you have the distance to that 25 residence?

```
1
    THE WITNESS (Burns): This is Robert Burns with
2
         All-Points.
3
              I do not have the distance to that residence
4
         off -- offhand.
5
    A VOICE: That's not true.
6
    THE WITNESS (Burns): That's not true. Hold on.
7
8
                               (Pause.)
9
10
    THE WITNESS (Burns): Ken, do you know where the
11
         residence list is on here?
12
    A VOICE: Four.
13
    THE WITNESS (Burns): Four?
14
15
                               (Pause.)
16
17
    THE WITNESS (Burns): If that's okay, can we come back
18
         to that? It was included as part of the
19
         submission for the thousand-foot residence list,
20
         but --
21
    MR. MORRONE: Of course.
22
    THE WITNESS (Burns): -- I can come back to that.
23
    MR. MORRONE: Okay. Then my next question would be,
24
         there seems to be a mix of proposed platform
25
         styles among the carriers between square and
```

1 triangular. How would this mixture affect the 2 visibility of the tower? 3 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Mr. Libertine? 4 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Could you repeat the question? I'm sorry. I was distracted for a 5 6 moment. 7 MR. MORRONE: Yes. Multiple types of platform styles 8 have been proposed for this tower among the 9 carriers, both square and triangular. How would 10 this affect the visibility of the tower? 11 THE WITNESS (Libertine): In general, it -- it will not 12 affect the overall visibility in the sense that 13 from any distances you're going to see multiple 14 platforms. They won't be symmetrical, certainly. 15 So, it really does come down to a matter of the --16 the styles of each of those. 17 So, it will -- it will appear a bit irregular 18 as you look at each of the levels, but beyond 19 that, it really won't affect the visibility from a 20 standpoint of increased visibility. 21 MR. MORRONE: Thank you. 22 THE WITNESS (Libertine): You're welcome. 23 MR. MORRONE: That is all of the questions I have for 24 the Applicant at this time. 25 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Morrone.

Vice Chair Morissette, any questions?

THE VICE CHAIR: Thank you, Chair Katz, and good afternoon, panel.

My first question has to do with tab eight with the site search. Now, if I look at the sites that were reviewed in relation to the site that was picked, the site that was selected is to the west, and all the other sites are to the east of the river.

Can you please explain to me why there were no sites identified closer to the area or the selected site?

THE WITNESS (Restrepo): Yes. This is Alejandro Restrepo with Verizon Wireless.

So, the location that was selected, obviously, to the west being outside of the original search area, it really comes down to as we've gotten different lists of sites or groupings of sites from our site acq', we look at them and determine how does it fit within our needs.

When this property was brought to us, we found that this actually was a better solution to fix some of the troubles we have within the city of Naugatuck. Some of the locations to the east were ruled out either by RF design, meaning they

1 didn't meet the specific needs we were -- we were 2 looking for, or they were ruled out by the 3 property owners themselves. 4 THE VICE CHAIR: So, it just happened to work out that 5 this site worked actually from an RF perspective 6 as a better site for you than on the east? 7 Is that correct? 8 THE WITNESS (Restrepo): That is correct. 9 THE VICE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. 10 What are the heights of the existing water 11 tanks? 12 THE WITNESS (Burns): This is Robert Burns with 13 All-Points. 14 The northern tank is -- the northern tank is 15 60 feet, and the southern tank is 65 feet from the 16 ground. 17 THE VICE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. 18 THE WITNESS (Burns): You're welcome. 19 THE VICE CHAIR: Mr. Burns, while I have you, can we go 20 over the heights again? 21 So, my understanding is that the tower is 22 going to be 158 feet. The Town wants to add 23 17-foot whip antennas on top. Is there also, 24 being built in to accommodate, a 20-foot 25 extension?

1 THE WITNESS (Burns): It's Robert Burns with All-Points 2 again. 3 That the tower itself is 150 feet. 4 THE VICE CHAIR: Okay. 5 THE WITNESS (Burns): And I believe that the tower is 6 being designed for a 20-foot extension. That is 7 correct, the foundation of the tower itself. 8 THE VICE CHAIR: So if I get this right, if I have 150 9 feet plus the 20-foot extension plus the 17-foot 10 whip antennas, we're at 187. 11 Correct? 12 THE WITNESS (Burns): That's correct. 13 THE VICE CHAIR: Am I looking at that correctly? 14 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes. 15 THE VICE CHAIR: Okay. And then the yield point is at 16 104. So, it's 73 feet with a 46-foot property 17 line. So, the yield point doesn't quite work. 18 Am I looking at that incorrectly? 19 THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns with All-Points. 20 With the future extension, the yield point is insufficient. That is correct. 21 22 THE VICE CHAIR: Okay. So, would you build in a 23 sufficient yield point, or would you do that 24 later? 25 THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns with All-Points.

1 If the tower is extended -- and that's an 2 if -- then the yield point would need to be 3 adjusted so that it would fall within the property 4 line. 5 THE VICE CHAIR: Okay. So, you would do that later? 6 All right. Great. 7 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes, sir. 8 THE VICE CHAIR: Thank you. 9 Okay. Is there natural gas in the street? 10 THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns with All-Points. 11 I don't believe there's natural gas in the 12 I don't know that for a fact. 13 THE VICE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. 14 Okay. I'd like to go to photo sims in tab 15 nine, specifically photo seven. Is the house that 16 is closest to the tower, is that 134 Craig Circle? 17 THE WITNESS (Libertine): This is Mike Libertine with 18 All-Points. 19 Bear with me, Mr. Morissette. I've got a 20 cross-reference that with the abutters. 21 THE VICE CHAIR: Certainly. THE WITNESS (Libertine): Which, of course I'm having 22 23 trouble opening right at the moment, so bear with 24 me. 25 Mr. Morissette, while we're waiting ATTORNEY BALDWIN:

1 for Mr. Libertine, we might as well fill the time 2 with we have a response to that closest residence 3 across the street that was asked about. 4 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yeah, the -- the tower to the 5 residence across the street at 134 Craig Circle, I 6 believe it is, it's 120 feet to the house and 90 7 feet to their property line from the tower. 8 THE VICE CHAIR: Thank you. 9 I was also curious about that as well. 10 THE WITNESS (Libertine): And to confirm, 11 Mr. Morissette, that is 134 Craig Circle. 12 THE VICE CHAIR: Okay. 13 THE WITNESS (Libertine): That's one and the same. 14 THE VICE CHAIR: Okay. So, Conrad Street actually runs 15 across the page in front of the house at 134 Craig 16 Circle, and then you have the two towers? 17 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Correct, that Conrad Street 18 separates that parcel from the tower parcel. 19 THE VICE CHAIR: Okay. Great. Thank you. 20 Okay. What I'd like to do is look at SP-1, 21 and it has to do with the site in relation to 134 22 Craig Circle and 171 Conrad Street. 23 Now, is there a reason -- what is the reason 24 why the location of the site is where it is, 25 versus moving it into the middle of the site away

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

from the property line?

THE WITNESS (Curley): This is Ken Curley with Tarpon Towers.

To mitigate the impact of the property with the removal of the tanks, the intentions were to keep the site within the same compound area that the -- that the two tanks currently occupy -- or excuse me, the current area of the northern tank. With the removal of the second tank, that area will be graded and seeded accordingly to allow it to -- to be a grassed area.

By pushing this site further back into the property, there would be additional tree removal and clearing that would -- that we would -- we would prefer not to do.

THE VICE CHAIR: Do you know if the Town has any future plans for the site?

THE WITNESS (Curley): Ken Curley, Tarpon Towers.

At this moment I do not have any plan or idea, or know of any plan or ideas that the Town have for the property.

THE VICE CHAIR: Okay. Well, obviously based on the photo in photo seven of the simulation, and the length of 120 feet from the property, from the resident to the tower, and the other at 171, is

1 that something that may be possible to investigate 2 moving it further into the property away from both 3 property lines? 4 THE WITNESS (Curley): This is Ken Curley, Tarpon 5 Towers. 6 Yes, it's something that we are willing to 7 investigate and look into. 8 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mr. Morissette? 9 THE VICE CHAIR: Yes. 10 THE WITNESS (Libertine): This is Michael Libertine 11 with All-Points, if I may? 12 THE VICE CHAIR: Sure. 13 THE WITNESS (Libertine): We -- actually, the team have 14 discussed this at length. It's a balancing act. 15 I think Mr. Curley said it best. If -- if we 16 start thinking about pushing it further away from 17 Conrad Street and those residences, we do have to 18 clear quite a bit of trees. 19 And what happens is there there are other 20 residential receptors on the -- well, I guess that 21 would be the east side of the parcel. 22 THE VICE CHAIR: Uh-huh? 23 THE WITNESS (Libertine): A fairly narrow parcel. So, 24 we may actually be just kind of creating and 25 opening up more room or -- or more visibility to

1 more people. 2 So again, it's kind of a balancing act. I 3 think the idea was to use the space that's already 4 been cleared, both to minimize any additional 5 environmental impacts, but also to facilitate 6 construction and demolition activities that are 7 planned, because this has to be sequenced 8 correctly. 9 So, that was -- that was the thought process 10 that was behind it. 11 THE VICE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. That's helpful. 12 Now, the residents to the east and northeast, 13 is that senior housing? Is that what that is? 14 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I know it's multi unit. 15 I'm not sure if it's senior housing per se. 16 THE VICE CHAIR: Well, I was looking for a place. 17 That's why I'm asking. 18 THE WITNESS (Libertine): You'll get great coverage, 19 Mr. Morissette. 20 THE VICE CHAIR: I know there's no problems with phone 21 coverage. Okay. 22 So, we don't know if it's senior? 23 THE WITNESS (Curley): Ken Curley, Tarpon Towers. 24 We know that it is the Borough of Naugatuck 25 Housing Authority. As far as the residents that

1 are there that are being housed, we don't know if it's what -- if it's seniors or if it's open to --2 3 to the public. 4 THE VICE CHAIR: Okay. Well, thanks. 5 The point is, is it's multi-unit. Yeah, I 6 can see the struggle here. Because you know that 7 the Borough is supporting the site, wants to 8 remove the tanks, and it's a disturbed location. 9 However, it's awfully close to those two, two 10 resident properties. So, I'll leave it at that. 11 And that concludes my questioning for this 12 afternoon. And thank you, panel, for your 13 responses. 14 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Mr. Morissette, or Chair Katz, if we 15 could? We're quick responding to homework 16 assignments, which I'm happy about. We do have an 17 answer to the natural gas question. THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes, Robert --18 19 Thank you, yeah. Please go ahead. THE CHAIR: 20 THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns with All-Points. 21 There is no natural gas in the street. 22 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 23 THE WITNESS (Burns): According to Eversource's 24 website. 25 THE CHAIR: Thank you.

1	Mr. Morissette, were you seeking additional
2	information on the possibility of moving away from
3	Conrad Street? Were you seeking a late file? Or
4	did they answer your questions?
5	THE VICE CHAIR: Well, I think if we as a council
6	decides that we want to investigate that further,
7	I would request a condition if this is approved as
8	part of the D and M plan.
9	THE CHAIR: Okay.
10	THE VICE CHAIR: So, I'll kind of let the other
11	Councilmembers think about it as well.
12	So, thank you.
13	THE CHAIR: All right. Thank you.
14	Thank you very much, Mr. Vice Chair.
15	THE VICE CHAIR: Thank you for the response on the
16	natural gas.
17	THE CHAIR: All right. Turning next to
18	Mr. Golembiewski.
19	MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Thank you, Chair Katz.
20	I apologize I am sick currently, but I am
21	working remotely. So, I will not infect anyone at
22	this hearing.
23	But so, my concerns are very similar to
24	Mr. Morissette. It really comes down to those two
25	properties, and then I think kind of the overall

visibility of the tower. My experience is we have had towers that have been similarly visible, but usually in, like, a commercial or industrial setting.

I guess my first question -- and I'm not sure if I did not see it in the interrogatories, but if it is, I apologize -- but how many of the houses would have year-round visibility of the tower?

And how many would have seasonal visibility of the tower?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): This is Mike Libertine with All-Points.

I do not have that readily available. I
would have to do a query to actually get an
accurate number for that, which we certainly can.
MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. I would appreciate that.

That that is something I'm weighing in regards to the visibility, and I guess that leads me into my next question, Mr. Libertine.

I guess it seems like it's smack dab in the middle of a neighborhood. And maybe, you know, more recently we've been able to see, you know, see proper -- larger properties that are sort of somewhat further away from residences.

You know, what is -- overall, how intrusive

do you -- would you characterize this in a neighborhood? And then in that answer, do you consider the removal of the tanks kind of visual mitigation?

And then finally, the plantings; I saw that they're proposed for six feet. I was just wondering what the mature height would be, and whether, you know, a tree that would grow 50 feet is even possible for a site like this? Or, you know, is it sort of -- you know you don't really want trees growing that close to your compound. So, it really is just going to be screening, you know, low, lower screening.

And then I noticed that the fence is sort of this industrial fence. And would, you know, a different type of fence soften at least the look on Conrad Street to some extent?

I know there's a lot in there. Sorry.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): No, it's okay. Mike

Libertine.

I'm going to attempt to answer them all, and if I miss something or am not spot on with getting what you want to -- want me to get to, please interrupt.

First things first. Yes, it's -- it's a

neighborhood. We do have towers at the end of cul-de-sacs throughout Connecticut, so it's not totally uncommon. I -- I think here, you know, the site works and it works for the Borough where there's already some existing infrastructure. So, from that standpoint, it is a good site.

I do -- to answer your question about visual mitigation, I think photo seven kind of says it all. Those tanks are in pretty, pretty serious rusted condition and deteriorated, so near views I think are going to be improved. Certainly, you've got a much taller structure, but it's much slimmer. The area will be cleaner and well kept.

I agree, I think some form of a fence that might be more in keeping with the neighborhood could certainly be considered. At the very least some type of slats visually would soften the effect.

Honestly, the -- any type of planting or treatment on the fence is really designed to obstruct any of the ground equipment. There's not much we can do in terms of the -- the monopole.

You know, monopoles and these type of facilities have become generally more of the landscape over the past, certainly 10, 15 years,

infrastructure. So, you know, easy for me to say. I don't live in the neighborhood, so I can understand how some people might not agree with that. But I do think overall it's a general improvement to the site while providing the -- the Town and the carriers with, you know, much-needed improved coverage for the area.

So, I'm not sure if I answered all those questions adequately or not, but by all means if you want to follow up, I -- I don't think we could get a tree or trees there that would grow sufficiently to do much.

Yeah, you said it. We -- there are -- there are hindrances in terms of allowing trees to get too tall and too bulky in those areas because they do start to get in and interfere with the compound and the tower itself. But again, they're really designed more to screen the -- I guess I'd call it the, you know, the 12 to 14 feet of the equipment and the ice bridge that might be going over there so you're not seeing that lower infrastructure, which is at ground level, certainly and, you know, could be visually intrusive.

MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. Is there any benefit to

painting the tower or requiring a certain color for the antennas? Or just leaving it, you know, basically the stainless?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): I -- I think from the term,
you know, we've -- we've obviously worked through
this on a lot of sites and typically when we're
talking about some type of painting, it's when we
have the right conditions.

Here I think a standard steel pole and antennas makes the most sense because I think any type of painting or an attempt to camouflage is only going to heighten the, certainly the near views, and that's what we're really talking about. Right? We've got -- most of the views are going to be in that immediate area of a quarter mile to a third of a mile from the site.

The good news is that there it's -- it is somewhat limited in terms of the time of year. There's sufficient tree cover in the neighborhood so that during this time of year the existing trees are doing a pretty good job of really softening any of the views.

It's really some select views where you've got the tower actually eclipsing the tree canopy where you'll see the upper portions of it, aside

from right in that immediate area of -- of view seven where we're looking kind of right at it and kind of giving you more or less what I call the worst-case scenario.

But I just don't see any kind of painting or camouflaging really being successful in this particular instance.

MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: All right. Thank you,
Mr. Libertine.

My questions now are about yield points. So, as I understand, a yield point is you are basically putting a weaker section in your tower so that if it fails, it would fall on the property.

So, I know I've heard people say, oh, it will fold in on itself -- but am I assuming the yield point assumes that it will detach and that's why it's the measurement to the property line?

THE WITNESS (Burns): This is Robert Burns with All-Points.

Just to clarify, they're not actually designing a weaker point. They're actually strengthening it, strengthening up on either side of the point. So if -- if it does fold, it will fold on itself.

7

10

11

8

9

12

13

14

16

15

17 18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

where the yield point was irrelevant? THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns with All-Points.

MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. How about foundation failure?

Are you aware of any actual foundation failures

It is tubular steel. Tubular steel tends to bend as opposed to break. And in addition, the interior of that monopole will have many cables which will also support the fact that it will fold on itself. That's the short answer, but -- but as far as the tower itself snapping, if you will? Highly unlikely.

MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. I know -- I think Mr. Marrone was getting to this point. So, if this -- for God, you know, this happens -- right? Do the antennas and the radio heads, would they fly off and become projectiles potentially?

THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns with All-Points.

No, all the mounts are designed to withstand the applicable wind loads. So, anything that would happen and -- and actually, I would say in some cases they're over designed. The regulations have you design for maybe 130 miles an hour, and the manufacturer's recommendations are for substantially more than that.

I've been doing this 30, almost 40 years and

I cannot recall a situation where the foundation fails. The foundation is designed with certain factors of safety within the federal guidelines for the design of a tower foundation.

MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. All right. That's good to know.

My next question is related to the noise. I think in one of the previous hearings I asked about the cumulative noise that would be generated from the site, and I think the answer was that that calculation isn't done. And so, I guess the only thing that could be cumulative would be the fans or the cooling systems if there was multiple carriers, and that they would -- if they had backup generators, they would be tested at different times.

Is that accurate? Is that a good understanding?

THE WITNESS (Burns): This is Robert Burns with All-Points.

Yes, that's an accurate understanding.

MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. Are there ways to apply

measures to the equipment buildings that would mitigate sound if need be?

THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns with All-Points.

1 That, the difficult part is they're not 2 actually buildings. These are cabinets. They, 3 most of the cabinets come with sound enclosures. 4 The generator itself comes with a sound enclosure. 5 There are certain site designs you can do, whether 6 you put up sound attenuation blankets can be done. 7 The type of fence also helps if the fence has 8 slats that -- that prevent some of the sound as 9 well. 10 So, I don't know if that answered your 11 question, but the answer is yes. 12 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: So, that they can be retrofitted. 13 Is that what you said? They're like a prefab 14 structure? 15 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yeah. Well, they are designed 16 as-is for --17 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Oh, okay. 18 THE WITNESS (Burns): -- sound attenuation. 19 Particularly, the generator comes with a 20 sound attenuation cover. 21 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. 22 THE WITNESS (Burns): But if additional sound 23 attenuation is needed, there are things that can 24 be done within the compound to do -- to alleviate 25 some additional sound.

1 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: So, putting some measure between 2 said generator and a property line? 3 THE WITNESS (Burns): That's correct. 4 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. All right. I guess that 5 answers that question. That's all I have. 6 Thank you, Chair Katz. Thank you, panel. 7 THE WITNESS (Burns): Thank you. 8 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Golembiewski. 9 Turning next to Mr. Nguyen. 10 Thank you, Chair Katz, and good afternoon, MR. NGUYEN: 11 panel. 12 First of all, I truly appreciate staff and 13 the Councilmembers for many of the questions that 14 they asked. Just a few clarifications for me. 15 Now, T-Mobile currently used the tank or the 16 tank structure to place its equipment for its 17 wireless services. Now, for the record could you 18 explain conceptually why not -- what led to 19 replacing the tanks if they were using them for 20 wireless services for Verizon and other carriers? 21 THE WITNESS (Restrepo): Yeah. This is Alejandro 22 Restrepo, Verizon Wireless. 23 So, from a standpoint of height or, you know, 24 need from Verizon's standpoint, a higher 25 centerline is -- was needed than what could be

1 adequately used from the water tanks themselves. 2 So, we went to that 140-foot level based on what 3 was available and what we needed. 4 MR. NGUYEN: With respect to the backup generator --5 and I understand there's no natural gas available. 6 The backup generator is currently proposed to use 7 Is that correct? diesel. 8 THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns with All-Points. 9 Yes, the generator, Verizon's generator 10 that's shown here is proposed to be a diesel 11 generator. That is correct. 12 MR. NGUYEN: And then, why diesel instead of propane 13 gas, for example? 14 THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns with All-Points. 15 From a design standpoint we are given the specification by Verizon. If there is no diesel 16 17 restrictions, their preference is to go with a 18 diesel generator. 19 MR. NGUYEN: Is there any advantage from diesel as a 20 fuel source versus propane gas, for example? 21 THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns with All-Points. 22 The only advantage would be if you put in a 23 larger propane tank the generator could run for a 24 longer period of time. The generator being 25 proposed is with a 229-gallon belly tank.

1 Say you put in a 50-kW generator and you put 2 in a thousand-gallon propane tank, you could 3 probably -- not probably. You get more run time 4 out of it. 5 MR. NGUYEN: Now moving on to the yield point -- and I 6 know now many questions have been asked. And you 7 testified earlier that a yield point, you can let 8 it be redesigned there should there be an 9 extension in the future. Is that correct? 10 THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns with All-Points. 11 Yes. 12 MR. NGUYEN: Now, it's my understanding that the yield 13 point is usually pre-propagated by the 14 manufacturer before it's installed. So, how can 15 that be redesigned should there be an extension in 16 the future? Do you have to set the whole tower 17 up? THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns with All-Points. 18 19 No, the work would be done either on the 20 existing tower or on the extension itself, 21 depending on at what level that yield point would 22 be needed. 23 THE WITNESS (Buggeln): Mr. Nguyen, this --24 Commissioner Nguyen, this is Brett Buggeln at 25 Tarpon Towers.

Typically, when we design the part of a tower for an extension we, on the existing tower, put what's called a bolt circle on the top of it, so that the new extent -- the extension is in fact bolted to that existing tower because of the equipment that's already on the tower. If it was a slip joint, then we would have to take all the existing equipment off, put the -- put the slip joint on.

But -- and also, but the point is, is that with that kind of design those bolts can then become a weak point in the tower as well. And then that section would then lean over, as Mr. Burns has -- has stated about the remainder of the tower.

So, essentially you're form -- you're keeping the integrity of the yield point on the existing tower and that bolt point becomes yet another yield point to keep that additional 20 feet or 15 feet in this example on the property as indicated.

MR. NGUYEN: Thank you for that clarification.

THE WITNESS (Buggeln): Thank you.

MR. NGUYEN: One last question regarding the extension.

Is that an immediate decision that will be implemented as part of the construction relatively

sooner? Or it's just a proposal by that time?

THE WITNESS (Buggeln): Commissioner Nguyen, this is

Brett Buggeln at Tarpon Towers.

The extension is merely a design consideration when engineering the entire site to accommodate as many government and -- and commercial users as possible. If you look at this application, we have AT&T and T -- T-Mobile, two other prominent commercial users already situated down the existing tower's length, which minimizes the -- the likelihood that we would need an extension in the future. There simply isn't a market for that, for that feature or for use of that feature.

And obviously, with -- with the Borough of Naugatuck at the top of the tower, then that would require them, you know, changes to their system as well if there was a need for an addition of 20 feet.

- MR. NGUYEN: All right. Thank you. Thank you for that clarification.
- THE WITNESS (Buggeln): You're welcome.
 - MR. NGUYEN: But what I'm asking, is there -- the need for that extension, would that be part of the design? Should this -- I mean, where it would be

1 implemented should -- this application is approved 2 and --3 THE WITNESS (Buggeln): Commissioner, this is --4 MR. NGUYEN: The extension will be done immediately? 5 Or it's just reserved for the future? 6 THE WITNESS (Buggeln): Commissioner, this is Brett 7 Buggeln at Tarpon Towers. 8 We would -- we would account for the 9 extension, the possible extension of the tower at 10 the stages of doing that design, which would be at 11 the D and M plan stage in terms of the tower 12 drawings. 13 However, in the future we -- we have a hard 14 time seeing that it would be something immediately 15 or near-future implemented. 16 MR. NGUYEN: Okay. Thank you, panel. 17 THE WITNESS (Buggeln): You're welcome. 18 MR. NGUYEN: And that's all I have, Chair Katz. 19 Thank you. 20 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen. Thank you, panel. 21 Moving on to Mr. Carter. Questions for the 22 panel? MR. CARTER: Thank you, Chair Katz. And I'd like to 23 24 thank the panel and thank my fellow councilmembers 25 and staff for their great questions because once

again, I'm not going to take long.

I just have one question looking at the historic resources determination. I just want to confirm that SHPO has been notified, and has there been any communication from SHPO regarding the proposed site?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Hi. This is Mike Libertine with All-Points.

To the best of my knowledge, the SHPO has not been directly consulted as of yet. Verizon takes the lead on providing for the Section 106 of the -- the NEPA process themselves as it gets closer to an approval.

So, that's a separate piece that we personally are not involved in, so I don't know. That's why we provide the upfront information to the Council so they can understand exactly what, if any, resources are in proximity to the site and if there's visibility associated with it.

But to answer your question simply, I don't believe that they -- that process has been initiated to date.

MR. CARTER: Thank you.

That's the only question that I have, Madam Chair. So, I will reserve my time back to you.

1 Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Carter.

Moving on to Ms. Hall.

MS. HALL: Hi. Good afternoon, everyone. And I want to thank Mr. Morrone and my fellow councilmembers for all the questioning. It helps really to bring things into more clarity. Just a couple of very quick questions.

We have AT&T and T-Mobile as Interveners in this matter, which seems to indicate that they're going to be interested in putting equipment on the pole. Will they be able to locate on the pole without that 20-foot extension? And is that 20-foot extension something that would be -- come along for additional users above and beyond T-Mobile and AT&T?

THE WITNESS (Curley): This is Ken Curley, Tarpon
Towers.

Ms. Hall, currently at this time we have T-Mobile and AT&T. Both Interveners have inquired about heights currently under the 140-foot RAD center that Verizon is proposing. We have AT -- or excuse me, T-Mobile proposing at the centerline of 128 feet, and AT&T below that proposing at the centerline of 116 feet.

As Mr. Buggeln indicated earlier, with the three commercial carriers, major commercial carriers at this current point and in the foreseeable future, we don't see a need for any of the commercial carriers to go beyond the proposed RAD centers, especially with the -- the Borough of Naugatuck locating at the top of the tower.

MS. HALL: Great. Thank you for that.

And so -- but hypothetically, who might -what kind of demand might come in that would
require the additional 20-foot extension?

THE WITNESS (Curley): This is Ken Curley, Tarpon
Towers.

Currently, the only other commercial carrier that we have activity with throughout our other -- our portfolio is Boost Mobile/Dish Wireless. And they, you know, they would -- would look at the RAD center of 104 feet. It would be up to them to provide a need for beyond that, but in our experience they have been accommodating our -- our towers without extension.

MS. HALL: Great. That helps. Thank you very much.

THE WITNESS (Curley): You're welcome.

MS. HALL: I read through things. I did not see comments or indication of comments coming back

1	from neighbors. Specifically, have you gotten any
2	feedback from 134 Craig Circle?
3	THE WITNESS (Curley): Excuse me. This is Ken Curley,
4	Tarpon Towers.
5	We have sent out certified mail to the
6	setting the seven abutting properties. One
7	property, the certified receipt was returned to
8	us, and we, at the CSC regulations, sent regular
9	mail.
10	The only party that had reached out was
11	Ms. Ortiz to the northern, northern property line.
12	MS. HALL: Okay. Thank you.
13	THE WITNESS (Curley): Thank you.
14	MS. HALL: I have no further questions. Thank you.
15	THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Hall. Thank you, panel.
16	Turning next to Mr. Syme.
17	MR. SYME: Thank you. Most of my concerns have been
18	addressed, the visibility, property lines,
19	breakpoints, and I didn't see any environmental
20	concerns. So, as far as I'm I'm good to go.
21	Thank you.
22	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Syme.
23	Mr. Lynch?
24	MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
25	I'm going to start out first with this

fallacy about yield points. You know, Mr. Burns, you said that -- have you ever -- let me start out this way.

Have you ever seen a tower, other than a lattice tower, a monopole collapse on itself?

THE WITNESS (Burns): This is Robert Burns with All-Points.

Mr. Lynch, I've never seen a monopole collapse at all. I've never seen one fail.

MR. LYNCH: That's what I was getting at, because I think yield points are useless.

I want to go back to start out with the -again, I think this is Mr. Burns again -- on the
wind speed. Now, I think I heard you say earlier
that here you're using 130 miles an hour. But
that would not -- would that not take out the
antennas also?

Because I've seen photos of the last hurricane in Florida where you just had a nude monopole. The antennas were gone.

THE WITNESS (Burns): Mr. Lynch, Robert Burns from All-Points.

Per the TIA regulations, the -- the wind speed, I believe in this area, and we -- it was one of the interrogatories -- is 130 miles an hour

1 that they need to be designed. The manufacturer's 2 recommendations are to design to 150. So, they 3 are designed above and beyond the required federal 4 regulations. 5 MR. LYNCH: All right. I saw the 150. That was my 6 next question. Why are you using 130 and not 150? 7 THE WITNESS (Burns): I think you misunderstood. 8 federal regulation is 130, but we design them to 9 150 --10 MR. LYNCH: Oh. 11 THE WITNESS (Burns): -- because that's what the 12 manufacturers are requiring for their equipment. 13 MR. LYNCH: Oh, I did misunderstand. 14 Thank you very much. 15 THE WITNESS (Burns): You're welcome. 16 MR. LYNCH: I also -- well, now I can't read my own 17 notes here. 18 Now, you mentioned earlier -- or someone, one 19 on the panel mentioned that the Town was, the 20 Borough was going to go on with whip antennas. 21 Now, I heard -- I thought I heard three different 22 antennas. Would that be for fire, police, and 23 emergency services? Or are they all incorporated 24 in? 25 THE WITNESS (Burns): This is Robert Burns with

All-Points.

I do not know what each of the antennas will be used for. They've only stated to us what they're going to require for antennas at the top of the tower.

THE WITNESS (Curley): This is --

THE WITNESS (Burns): Hold on. Mr. Curley may have a supplement to that.

THE WITNESS (Curley): This is Ken Curley, Tarpon
Towers.

At this time, our understanding, the Borough of Naugatuck is -- is going to be participating in the Connecticut statewide system and -- and that the equipment that's going to be located at the top of the tower will be -- will allow them to participate in the Connecticut statewide communications system.

- MR. LYNCH: And all those antennas are going to be omni-whip ones? Whip antennas?
- THE WITNESS (Curley): Mr. Lynch, this is Ken Curley,
 Tarpon Towers. Yes.
- MR. LYNCH: Now, I also noticed that with the three carriers on the tower you have a twelve-foot separation between each one. Now, is that separation from the top of one antenna? I mean,

1 from the bottom of one antenna to the top of 2 another? Or if they get any closer, does it cause 3 interference? 4 THE WITNESS (Burns): This is Robert Burns at 5 All-Points. 6 The twelve-foot separation is from centerline 7 of antenna to centerline of antenna. 8 MR. LYNCH: And that would not cause any separation, 9 Mr. Burns -- I mean, any interference? 10 THE WITNESS (Restrepo): This is Alejandro Restrepo 11 from Verizon. 12 It would not. 13 MR. LYNCH: That's all I was wondering. 14 Okay. Now, I noticed that this is a capacity 15 tower. Now, could you break down for me -- I 16 didn't see it in the interrogatories there, you know, what that capacity is going to be used for? 17 18 Is it going to be used for phone? 19 Data? Streaming? Can you can give me a 20 percentage of what's going to be alleviated, you 21 know, by -- from other towers? 22 Now, just as a followup, does streaming and 23 data require a higher frequency than phone and 24 texting? 25 THE WITNESS (Restrepo): Yes. This is Alejandro

Restrepo from Verizon Wireless.

So, the -- I'll start with the -- your latter question there. So, not higher frequencies that support the data. It's really bandwidth. So, some of the higher --

MR. LYNCH: Okay. There --

THE WITNESS (Restrepo): Some of the higher frequencies tend to have more bandwidth, so they're larger pieces of frequency than some of those lower pieces of spectrum that, you know, Verizon or any of the carriers tend to have.

So, for Verizon, our C-band spectrum in the 3.7 range has about 200 megahertz, 180 -- it depends -- 160. It depends on where you are in megahertz. So, that's that bandwidth and those can provide those higher bit rates or, you know, higher throughputs, higher speeds, you know, for that end user.

Most of our usage comes in data, but what we've seen on many of our tower locations where you -- we are limited in our bandwidth, where our users are consuming too much, it does have some impact to our voice services, which then can impact emergency services, you know, people trying to make those calls.

We do have some -- some things in place that allow those calls to go through, but if there is an overwhelming number of users trying to make calls while many people are downloading, it becomes a problem.

We did state that we have some congestion at a few of our sites. I think in the interrogatories -- I've got to find the question.

Let me see.

Question 20, we speak to our Naugatuck west facility, which is southwest of the proposed facility. It does have some higher drop rates -- or excuse me, not so much higher drop rates, but higher ineffective attempts. And our data speeds are now starting to fall on that site, which then, you know, we're looking for that next site. And this specific site will offload that, but also provide our 5G services to the surrounding community.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you.

Now, if I heard you correctly, the largest band that you have is for data. Now, is that increasing with the advent of all the streaming that's going on?

THE WITNESS (Restrepo): So, our -- Alejandro Restrepo

1 from Verizon Wireless.

So, the -- the bandwidth that we have is based on, you know, auctions and what Verizon tends, you know, looks at as its next piece of property. The -- the usage or the consumption tends to drive the need for, you know, different purchases of bandwidth.

So, really the need comes from things like streaming, but not necessarily only streaming.

MR. LYNCH: Now, with the -- it seems with the advent of all this data increase that you're actually going to have to build out your network, you know, to accomplish that.

Now, are there any leases coming up for additional bandwidth from the feds?

THE WITNESS (Restrepo): Alejandro Restrepo from Verizon Wireless.

I do not know what is on the horizon with the FCC at this moment, but if there is one I'm sure there are people within Verizon that are looking at it.

MR. LYNCH: I think those are all my questions, Madam Chairwoman.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Lynch. Thank you, panel.

I just have a couple questions myself, more

in the nature of followups to what Mr. Morrone and my other councilmembers had discussed.

You mentioned to Ms. Hall that you had heard or had been approached by one of the neighbors. Can you give us an indication of was she just making an inquiry? Was she complaining? Was it supportive? Can you give us a sense of the nature of the conversation?

THE WITNESS (Curley): Chairwoman Katz, this is Ken Curley, Tarpon Towers.

The conversation with Ms. Ortiz via -- via counsel indicated an inquiry to the -- this project and the proposed site, asking about the health concerns and the impact to human and wildlife. And there was nothing further other than the impact to her property and her well-being relating to health, animals, and the project.

THE CHAIR: So when you talk about health, are you talking about concerns about an RF factor?

Or was she more specific?

THE WITNESS (Curley): This is Kenneth Curley, Tarpon
Towers.

Yes, to the RF effects of the telecommunication facility.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you.

6

8 9

7

10 11

13

12

15

14

17

16

18 19

20

21 22

23

25

24

And I know we -- moving on to another topic, this is something we've all been -- or a number of us have mentioned the location of, the potential location of the tower on the site. I just have a few more questions about that.

If I'm looking at the photo log from your interrogatory responses, this sort of shows the area and the existing water towers it looks like with the square. Is that the bounds of the property, the square that's shown in that photo log?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): This is Mike Libertine. Yes, Chair, it is.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah, I would agree.

THE CHAIR: And then if you go to, let's say, the drone photograph, photo four, it looks like the rest of the property, at least from what you can see in these photos, has pretty heavy tree cover.

Is that correct?

THE CHAIR: Yeah, I know. Because it looks like ideally you take the tower and sort of put it in the middle of that property. So, you're sort of equally distant from any of the -- you're certainly further from those homes, and then equidistant from any other, the surrounding

structures.

And I believe you said you haven't considered doing that because of the amount of trees that would need to be cleared. Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): We -- we had considered looking, and we had looked at moving that tower more centrally located. But yes, our concern was that there would be extensive tree clearing, which would then -- it certainly would help push it away from Conrad Street, but would also start to thin things out and potentially open up more views to the east.

And so, the combination of the earthwork and removal of the trees with the -- the fact that we would be moving it basically closer to other residences, and the fact that we've got basically a cleared pad today, that was more or less, I think, the -- the rationale for kind of leaving it where -- where it was, or where it's proposed, excuse me.

THE CHAIR: But if you did do some clearing, presumably you could do some replanting as well.

THE WITNESS (Buggeln): Madam Chair?

THE CHAIR: Couldn't you?

THE WITNESS (Buggeln): Madam Chair, this is Brett

Buggeln at Tarpon Towers.

I think that along with yourself and the suggestion from other -- other councilmembers that we could move the tower back into the parcel away from the road, I think that we would have to be mindful of, as you pointed out in photo four, not removing any of those larger trees that are providing the cover as you see up the pole, particularly because they are -- provide such, maybe not long distance, but other interim distance coverage of the pole itself. So, we would be willing to explore that.

I think that our only sort of ring fence on that would be to make sure that we're not taking away a lot of that existing natural tall tree cover of 70 to 85-foot, I think -- if

Mr. Libertine agrees with that idea, so.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): I agree.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you.

That's all the questions that I have right now.

22 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Chair Katz?

23 | THE CHAIR: Yes, please?

ATTORNEY BALDWIN: Excuse the interruption. I know that Mike Libertine has been able to gather some

2
 3

of the additional information, I think our last short-term homework assignment that we'd like to get on the record -- if you don't mind?

THE CHAIR: Yes, absolutely.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Thank you, Attorney Baldwin.

Yeah. Mike Libertine from All-Points.

In response to Mr. Golembiewski's request for, I -- I have an approximate number of residential properties within -- I'll call it the neighborhood -- within about a half mile or so of the proposed tower.

You're talking about -- and -- and again, I want to qualify this because I'm using what is on the viewshed map that's been overlaid onto Google Earth. We've used a KMZ file so I can get an approximation.

This doesn't mean that somebody -- when I say someone may have year-round or seasonal visibility, it's not like they're going to look out their bay window and see the tower. It's just somewhere on the property there will be visibility of a portion of the tower.

I'd say from a year-round visibility standpoint, we're probably talking in the neighborhood of about 35 properties. And if we

talk about seasonal, when the leaves are off the trees, then that probably doubles into the 70 to 75 residential property range. Some of that may be overlapping on the same properties.

And I would just point to the attachment nine to the application, which is the visibility analysis. If you flip through to some of the select seasonal visibility photographs -- and I would point out photos 1, 3, 8, 10, 11, 18, 24, and 25 as examples, it gives you a pretty good idea of, kind of, the -- the, I guess, the -- the scope of what seasonal visibility could actually look like. Some are almost obscured where you really wouldn't even notice a tower. Others you can see through some of the vegetation when the leaves are off the trees when we did take the pictures.

So, I think those photo simulations in those photos will give kind of a good representation of what seasonal is when we talk about that many homes who -- or that many properties that may have some portion of the visibility falling on the parcel itself.

So, I hope that's whole -- I hope that's helpful.

1	THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Libertine.
2	Okay. So, let's continue with cross. Do we
3	have Attorney Motel, do you have any
4	cross-examination for the panel?
5	ATTORNEY MOTEL: No cross-examination from us.
6	Thank you, Chair Katz.
7	THE CHAIR: Thank you.
8	Attorney Glissman, any cross-examination from
9	you?
10	ATTORNEY GLISSMAN: No cross-examination from us
11	either. Thank you, Chair Katz.
12	THE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you.
13	This is probably a good time to take a break
14	before we move on to AT&T's panel. So, let's take
15	a 15-minute break until, let's say, 3:40. Does
16	that work for folks?
17	All right. So we shall adjourn until then.
18	
19	(Pause: 3:25 p.m. to 3:40 p.m.)
20	
21	THE CHAIR: Good afternoon, folks. Back on the record
22	after our break.
23	We will now move to the appearance by New
24	Cingular Wireless, AT&T. Will the Intervener
25	please present its witness panel for purposes of

1	taking the oath? And Attorney Bachman will
2	administer the oath.
3	ATTORNEY MOTEL: Thank you, Chair Katz.
4	For the record, Kristen Motel with Cuddy &
5	Feder, on behalf of the Intervener AT&T.
6	The Witnesses we have are here with me today,
7	Martin Lavin, radiofrequency engineer, C Squared
8	Systems on behalf of AT&T and Aidan Griffin,
9	project manager from Smartlink, LLC.
10	THE CHAIR: Thank you.
11	Attorney Bachman, will you swear the
12	witnesses please.
13	ATTORNEY BACHMAN: Thank you, Chair Katz.
14	Could the Witnesses please raise their right
15	hand?
16	MARTIN LAVIN,
17	AIDAN GRIFFIN,
18	called as witnesses, being sworn by
19	THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, were examined and
20	testified under oath as follows:
21	
22	ATTORNEY BACHMAN: Thank you.
23	THE CHAIR: Thank you.
24	So, let's begin by verifying all the exhibits
25	by the sworn witnesses.

1 ATTORNEY MOTEL: Yes. We have two exhibits to offer, 2 which are identified in the hearing program as --3 under item 3B. They include AT&T's request for 4 intervenor status, as well as AT&T's responses to 5 the Council's interrogatories. I will ask my 6 witnesses to verify those. 7 Did you prepare or assist in the preparation 8 of the exhibits identified. 9 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin. Yes. 10 THE WITNESS (Griffin): Aidan Griffin. Yes. 11 ATTORNEY MOTEL: Do you have any updates or corrections to the exhibits identified? 12 13 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin. No. 14 THE WITNESS (Griffin): Aidan Griffon. No. 15 ATTORNEY MOTEL: Is the information contained in the 16 identified exhibits true and accurate to the best 17 of your belief? 18 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin. Yes. 19 THE WITNESS (Griffin): Aidan Griffon. Yes. 20 ATTORNEY MOTEL: And do you adopt these exhibits as 21 your testimony? 22 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin. Yes. 23 THE WITNESS (Griffin): Aidan Griffon. Yes. 24 ATTORNEY MOTEL: Chair Katz, we respectfully request 25 these exhibits be admitted into evidence.

1 THE CHAIR: Okay. Does any party or intervenor object 2 to the admission of AT&T's exhibits? 3 Attorney Baldwin? 4 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: No objection. 5 THE CHAIR: Attorney Glissman? 6 ATTORNEY GLISSMAN: No objection. Thank you. 7 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 8 Okay. The exhibits are admitted. 9 We'll now begin with cross-examination of 10 AT&T by the Council. Mr. Marrone? 11 MR. MORRONE: Thank you, Chair Katz. 12 I just have one question for the Intervenor 13 AT&T. Would the deployment of the proposed 14 facility be sufficient to address AT&T's coverage 15 and capacity concerns? Or would an additional 16 facility be required in the near term to offload 17 any traffic? THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin on behalf of AT&T. 18 19 It addresses our current concerns. I don't 20 know of any current plans for additional sites in 21 the area. 22 Thank you very much. MR. MORRONE: 23 That's all the questions I have at this time. 24 Thank you, Mr. Marrone, and thank you, THE CHAIR: 25 panel.

1 Vice Chair Morissette, questions? THE VICE CHAIR: Thank you, Chair Katz. Good 2 3 afternoon, panel. 4 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Good afternoon. 5 THE VICE CHAIR: Mr. Lavin, just one quick question for The search ring as part of Exhibit 1; now 7 this site is not in the center, but I take it it's 8 close enough to provide the adequate coverage that 9 you're looking for? 10 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes, it is. 11 THE VICE CHAIR: Okay. Do you find that this site, 12 similar to Verizon, that it's not -- it's a little 13 bit to the west than what you were expecting, but 14 it's more than adequate? 15 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin. 16 Yes, the height certainly makes it a very 17 good candidate. THE VICE CHAIR: Okay. Just one last question. On 18 19 that exhibit in the right-hand corner there's A, 20 B, C, D, E, and F. And it says, friend something. 21 What -- what's that? What is that supposed 22 to mean? 23 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Which exhibit is that? 24 THE VICE CHAIR: The first exhibit, Exhibit 1. 25 THE WITNESS (Lavin): From the interrogatory response?

1	THE VICE CHAIR: Yes.
2	
3	(Pause.)
4	
5	THE WITNESS (Griffin): Aidan Griffin.
6	These sites were evaluated, but it wasn't
7	believed to be high enough, those candidates, to
8	support the coverage that's needed.
9	THE VICE CHAIR: So, the term "friend" and it's cut
10	off. What is that referring to?
11	THE WITNESS (Griffin): That said friendly.
12	THE VICE CHAIR: Friendly?
13	THE WITNESS (Griffin): That was all that was there.
14	THE VICE CHAIR: Okay. It's not that important, but
15	thank you anyways. That's all the questions I
16	have.
17	Thank you, Chair Katz, and thank you, panel.
18	THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Vice Chair.
19	Mr. Golembiewski?
20	MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Thank you, Chair Katz.
21	THE CHAIR: Any questions for the panel?
22	MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: I have no questions.
23	Thank you.
24	THE CHAIR: Thank you.
25	Mr. Nguyen, any questions?

1 MR. NGUYEN: Thank you, Chair Katz. 2 No questions. Thank you. 3 THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr. Carter, any questions. 4 5 MR. CARTER: Thank you, Madam Chair. 6 I have no questions for this panel. 7 Thank you. 8 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 9 Ms. Hall, any questions? 10 MS. HALL: I also have no questions. Thank you. 11 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 12 Mr. Syme, any questions? 13 You're on mute. 14 MR. SYME: I have none. 15 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 16 Mr. Lynch, any questions for the panel? MR. LYNCH: Just one, and that is, I believe -- I think 17 18 this is for Mr. Lavin. You've heard that the 19 largest use of the bandwidth for Verizon was on 20 data. Is that the same thing for AT&T? 21 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes, absolutely. 22 MR. LYNCH: All right. That's my question, Madam 23 Chair. 24 THE CHAIR: Thank you Mr. Lynch. 25 All right. And I also have no questions for

1	this panel, but we'll continue with
2	cross-examination of AT&T by the Applicants.
3	Attorney Baldwin, any questions?
4	ATTORNEY BALDWIN: No. No questions, Chair Katz.
5	Thank you.
6	THE CHAIR: Thank you. Okay.
7	And T-Mobile, Attorney Glissman, any
8	questions for the panel?
9	ATTORNEY GLISSMAN: No questions. Thank you.
10	THE CHAIR: Okay. Well, gentlemen, thank you very much
11	for your help.
12	And I guess with that we will yes?
13	Anything else?
14	
15	(No response.)
16	
17	THE CHAIR: We'll move on to the appearance by T-Mobile
18	Northeast. Will the Intervener present its
19	witness panel for purposes of taking the oath?
20	ATTORNEY GLISSMAN: Good afternoon. Thank you, Chair
21	Katz, and it's a pleasure to be before you all
22	this afternoon. Thank you for having us.
23	For the record, my name is Daniel Glissman.
24	I'm an attorney with Prince Lobel Tye, here on
25	behalf of the Intervener T-Mobile Northeast, LLC.

1 We have two witnesses on our witness panel 2 today, both of whom are joining virtually. The 3 first is Matthew Bandle, Site Acquisition Project 4 Manager from Northeast Site Solutions, LLC; and 5 the second is Ryan Monte de Ramos, radiofrequency 6 engineer and contractor for T-Mobile. 7 I would offer them both to be sworn at this 8 time. Thank you. 9 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 10 Attorney Bachman, could you swear the 11 Witnesses, please? 12 ATTORNEY BACHMAN: Thank you, Chair Katz. 13 Will the witnesses please raise your right 14 hand? 15 MATTHEW BANDLE, d e 16 RYAN MONTE RAMOS, 17 called as witnesses, being sworn by 18 THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, were examined and 19 testified under oath as follows: 20 21 ATTORNEY BACHMAN: Thank you. 22 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Attorney Bachman. 23 Mr. Glissman, could you begin by verifying 24 the exhibits by the appropriate sworn witness? 25 ATTORNEY GLISSMAN: Yes. Thank you, Chair Katz.

1 We have two exhibits to identify today reflected under Roman numeral four of the agenda 2 3 today. The first is Roman numeral four, 4 subsection B, numbers one and two. The first is 5 T-Mobile's request to intervene dated April 24, 6 2025; and the second is number two, T-Mobile's 7 responses to the Council's interrogatories dated 8 May 15, 2025. I offer these exhibits for 9 identification purposes at this time, subject to 10 verification by the Witnesses. 11 To the witness panel, did you prepare or 12 assist in the preparation of the materials listed 13 in the hearing program under Roman numeral four, 14 subsections B, sections one and two? 15 Mr. Ramos? 16 THE WITNESS (Monte de Ramos): Yes, this is Ryan Monte 17 de Ramos. I do. 18 ATTORNEY GLISSMAN: Mr. Bandle? 19 THE WITNESS (Bandle): Yes. This is Matthew Bandle. 20 Yes. 21 ATTORNEY GLISSMAN: Do you have any corrections, 22 amendments or modifications to these exhibits to 23 offer at this time? 24 Mr. Ramos? 25 THE WITNESS (Monte de Ramos): Ryan Monte de Ramos,

1	yes oh, no. I'm sorry. No.
2	ATTORNEY GLISSMAN: Thank you.
3	Mr. Bandle?
4	THE WITNESS (Bandle): Matthew Bandle. No.
5	ATTORNEY GLISSMAN: And is the information contained in
6	these exhibits true and accurate to the best of
7	your knowledge and belief?
8	Mr. Ramos?
9	THE WITNESS (Monte de Ramos): This is Ryan Monte de
10	Ramos. I do.
11	MR. LYNCH: Mr. Bandle?
12	THE WITNESS (Bandle): Matthew Bandle. Yes.
13	ATTORNEY GLISSMAN: Do you adopt the information
14	contained in these exhibits as your testimony in
15	this proceeding?
16	Mr. Ramos?
17	THE WITNESS (Monte de Ramos): Ryan Monte de Ramos.
18	Yes.
19	ATTORNEY GLISSMAN: Mr. Bandle?
20	THE WITNESS (Bandle): Matthew Bandle. Yes.
21	ATTORNEY GLISSMAN: Madam Chair, I offer these as full
22	exhibits. Thank you.
23	THE CHAIR: Thank you.
24	Any objection to the admission of T-Mobile's
25	exhibits? Attorney Baldwin?

1 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: No objection. 2 THE CHAIR: Attorney Motel? 3 ATTORNEY MOTEL: No objection. 4 THE CHAIR: Okay. Therefore, the exhibits are 5 admitted. 6 We will now begin with cross-examination of 7 T-Mobile by the Council. Mr. Morrone? 8 MR. MORRONE: Thank you, Chair Katz. 9 I'd like to start by referencing the response 10 to council interrogatory number five. The models 11 of the antenna were provided, but not the number 12 How many antennas does T-Mobile of antennas. 13 intend to install at the facility? 14 THE WITNESS (Bandle): Matthew Bandle for T-Mobile. 15 A total of six antennas are currently 16 proposed. MR. MORRONE: Thank you. 17 18 And referencing the response to council 19 interrogatory number ten, T-Mobile states that it 20 would not recover the costs associated with 21 relocating its facility to a new facility. 22 However, within interrogatory ten -- I'm sorry, 23 however, interrogatory ten asked for how the costs 24 of the new installation and co-location of the 25 equipment would be recovered.

1 THE WITNESS (Bandle): Matthew Bandle for T-Mobile. 2 Those will be recovered through normal 3 business operations continuing with the site. 4 MR. MORRONE: Okay. Thank you. 5 And lastly, would the deployment of the 6 proposed facility be sufficient to address 7 T-Mobile's coverage and capacity concerns? 8 would an additional facility be required in the 9 near term to offload traffic? 10 THE WITNESS (Monte de Ramos): This is Ryan Monte de 11 Ramos from T-Mobile. 12 Yes, it will be sufficient to address the 13 coverage and capacity issue in our -- around the 14 area. 15 Thank you. MR. MORRONE: 16 That's all of my questions at this time. 17 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Marrone. 18 Mr. Vice Chair, questions for this panel? 19 THE VICE CHAIR: Thank you, Chair Katz. 20 I have no questions at this time. Thank you. 21 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 22 Mr. Golembiewski, questions for the panel? 23 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: I have no questions, Chair Katz. 24 Thank you. 25 THE CHAIR: Mr. Nguyen?

MR. NGUYEN: Yeah. Thank you, Chair Katz.

Just one quick question. As I mentioned earlier that T-Mobile currently used a tank on a structure to replace equipment for wireless services, and the response to interrogatory number 14 mentioned that T-Mobile would reduce the height of the proposed tower for its 5G technology.

Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Monte de Ramos): Yes. The current

T-Mobile installation, due to the fact that we're

trying to upgrade it and because of the structural

issues on the tower we are able to upgrade it.

That's why we have some capacity issue.

So, this new tower with an additional height where we are proposed to be deployed at 128 feet will, not just address the capacity issue, but rather will be able to upgrade our site to 5G.

MR. NGUYEN: And why? If you could explain why?
Why is it?

THE WITNESS (Monte de Ramos): Right now there is a structural issue on the existing tower. I mean -- I'm sorry, the water tank. And T-Mobile has attempted to upgrade their existing facility on the water tank. Unfortunately, there is some structural issues that prohibits us from upgrading

1 our existing facility on the water tank. 2 And I believe, Matt, if you can expand on 3 that structural issue on top of the tower? 4 THE WITNESS (Bandle): Sure. Matthew Bandle for 5 T-Mobile. 6 We did attempt to install an upgraded 7 installation in 2021. The tank failed 8 structurally with those additional loadings. 9 as Ryan was discussing, we were unable to get the 10 newer technologies to facilitate the 5G upgrades. 11 MR. NGUYEN: So, the 5G upgrade or 5G deployment would 12 need a height -- or be at a higher elevation for 13 T-Mobile to deploy 5G? 14 THE WITNESS (Monte de Ramos): Not only a higher 15 elevation, but we need to replace the existing 16 antenna, add additional radio, which will add 17 additional capacity on the existing 18 infrastructure, the water tank, which is, as per 19 Matt explained, it's -- we will have -- we will be 20 unable to hold those additional loading. 21 MR. NGUYEN: Thank you. Thank you, panel. 22 That's all I have, Chair Katz. 23 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen. 24 Mr. Carter, any questions? 25 Thank you, Madam Chair. MR. CARTER:

1 I have no questions. 2 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 3 Ms. Hall, any questions for the panel? 4 MS. HALL: I too have no questions. Thank you so much. 5 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 6 Mr. Syme? 7 MR. SYME: I have none. Thank you. 8 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 9 Mr. Lynch? 10 MR. LYNCH: Only one question. You've heard me ask 11 both Verizon and AT&T if the largest use of their 12 bandwidth is data. 13 Is that also applied to T-Mobile? 14 THE WITNESS (Monte de Ramos): It is the same. 15 MR. LYNCH: Now -- oh, nevermind. I'll save it for 16 another time. 17 I'm all done, Madam Chair. THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Lynch. 18 19 And I, too, have no questions at this time, 20 but we'll move to cross-examination by the 21 Applicants. 22 Attorney Baldwin, do you have any questions 23 for the panel? 24 ATTORNEY BALDWIN: I have no questions. Thank you. 25 THE CHAIR: Thank you.

And then cross-examination by AT&T. Attorney Motel, do you have any cross-examination? ATTORNEY MOTEL: No questions. Thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank you. All right. Well, then thank you very much, everyone. The Council will recess until 6:30, at which time we will commence with the public comment session of this public hearing. Thanks, everyone. (End: 3:58 p.m.)

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 hearing in Re: DOCKET NO. 533, TARPON TOWERS III, 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 AND ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT LOCATED AT 161 CONRAD STREET, NAUGATUCK, CONNECTICUT, which was held before ELIN S. KATZ, ESQ., THE CHAIR; and JOHN MORISSETTE, THE VICE CHAIR, on May 22, 2025.

Robert G. Dixon, CVR-M 857

Notary Public

My Commission Expires: 6/30/2025

1	INDEX	
2	WITNESSES (Tarpon Towers)	PAGE
3	Brett Buggeln Kenneth Curley	
4	Elizabeth Glidden Alejandro Restrepo Robert Burns	
5	Matthew Gustafson Michael Libertine	10
6	(EXAMINATION)	
7	By Attorney Baldwin	10
8	By Mr. MarroneBy The Vice Chair (Morissette)	26
9	By Mr. GolembiewskiBy Mr. Nguyen	35 45
10	By Mr. Carter	50
11	By Ms. HallBy Mr. Lynch	
12	By The Chair (Katz)	
13	WITNESSES (New Cingular Wireless/AT&T)	PAGE
14 15	Martin Lavin Aidan Griffin	69
13	(EXAMINATION)	
16	By Attorney Motel	70
17	By Mr. Marrone	
18	By The Vice Chair (Morissette)	
19		
20	WITNESSES (T-Mobile Northeast)	PAGE
21	Matthew Bandle Ryan Monte de Ramos	76
22	(EXAMINATION)	
23	By Attorney Glissman	
24	By Mr. MarroneBy Mr. Nguyen	
25	By Mr. Lynch	