

STATE OF CONNECTICUT CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Docket No. 499

Homeland Towers, LLC and New Cingular

Wireless PCS, LLC d/b/a AT&T application for a

Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and

Public Need for the construction, maintenance, and

operation of a telecommunications facility located

at 16 Coote Hill Road, Sherman, Connecticut.

VIA ZOOM AND TELECONFERENCE

Public Hearing held on Tuesday,

May 25, 2021, beginning at 2 p.m.

via remote access.

Held Before:
JOHN MORISSETTE, Presiding Officer

Reporter: Lisa L. Warner, CSR #061

1	Appearances:
2	Council Members:
3	ROBERT HANNON
4	Designee for Commissioner Katie Dykes Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
5	ROBERT SILVESTRI
6	DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.
7	LOUANNE COOLEY
8	
9	Council Staff:
10	MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ. Executive Director and
11	Staff Attorney
12	ROBERT MERCIER Siting Analyst
13	LISA FONTAINE
14	Fiscal Administrative Officer
15	
16	For Homeland Towers LLC & AT&T:
17	CUDDY & FEDER, LLP 445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th Floor
18	White Plains, New York 10601 BY: LUCIA CHIOCCHIO, ESQ.
19	KRISTEN M. MOTEL, ESQ.
20	
21	Also present: Aaron Demarest, Zoom co-host
22	
23	**All participants were present via remote access.
24	***(Inaudible) - denotes breaks in speech due to
25	interruptions in audio or echo.
- 1	

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MORISSETTE: This remote public hearing is called to order this Tuesday, May 25, 2021, at 2 p.m. My name is John Morissette, member and presiding officer of the Connecticut Siting Council. Other members of the Council are Robert Hannon, designee of Commissioner Katie Dykes, the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection, Robert Silvestri, Louanne Cooley, and Daniel P. Lynch, Jr.

Members of the staff are Melanie Bachman, executive director and staff attorney; Robert Mercier, siting analyst; and Lisa Fontaine, fiscal administrative officer.

As everyone is aware, there is currently a statewide effort to prevent the spread of the Coronavirus. This is why the Council is holding this remote public hearing, and we ask for your patience. If you haven't done so already, I ask that everyone please mute their computer audio and/or telephones now.

This hearing is held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act upon an application from Homeland Towers, LLC and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC

doing business as AT&T for a Certificate of
Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for
the construction, maintenance, and operation of a
telecommunications facility located at 16 Coote
Hill Road, Sherman, Connecticut. This application
was received by the Council on March 12, 2021.

The Council's legal notice of the date and time of this remote public hearing was published in the Danbury News-Times on April 15, 2021. Upon the Council's request, the applicants erected a sign near the intersection of Coote Hill Road and Route 37 so as to inform the public of the name of the applicant, the type of facility, the remote public hearing date, and contact information for the Council, which included website and telephone number.

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

The parties and intervenors of the proceeding are as follows: Applicants, Homeland Towers, LLC, represented by Lucia Chiocchio, and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC d/b/a AT&T, represented by Christopher B. Fisher, Esq.

We will proceed in accordance with the prepared agenda, a copy of which is available on the Council's Docket No. 499 webpage, along with the record of this matter, the public hearing notice, instructions for public access to this remote public hearing, and the Council's Citizens Guide to Siting Council Procedures. Interested parties may join any session of this public hearing 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 any person may be removed from the remote evidentiary session or the public comment session at the discretion of the Council.

The 6:30 p.m. public comment session is reserved for the public to make brief statements into the record. I wish to note that the applicants, parties and intervenors, including their representatives, witnesses and members, are not allowed to participate in the public comment session. I also wish to note for those who are listening and for the benefit of your friends and neighbors who are unable to join us for this

remote public comment session, that you or they
may send written statements to the Council within
3 days of the date hereof either by mail or by
email, and such written statements will be given
the same weight as if spoken during the remote
public comment session.

A verbatim transcript of this remote public hearing will be posted on the Council's Docket No. 499 webpage and deposited with the Sherman Town Clerk's Office for the convenience of the public.

Please be advised that the Council's project evaluation criteria under the statute does not include consideration of property values.

And please note that we will take a 10 to 15 minute break at a convenient juncture around 3:30 p.m.

We do have a motion. A motion on May 18, 2021 was received. Stan Greenbaum submitted a request for intervenor status. Attorney Bachman may wish to comment.

Attorney Bachman.

MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr.

Morissette. As you indicated, Mr. Greenbaum

requested intervenor status on May 18th, and staff

```
1
   recommends approval. Thank you.
2
               MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
3
   Bachman.
4
               Is there a motion to grant intervenor
5
   status?
6
               MR. SILVESTRI: This is Robert
7
   Silvestri, Mr. Morissette. I'll move approval.
8
               MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
9
   Silvestri.
10
               Is there a second?
11
               MS. COOLEY: This is Louanne Cooley. I
12
   will second the motion.
13
               MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Ms. Cooley.
14
   Is there any discussion?
15
               Mr. Silvestri.
16
               MR. SILVESTRI: No discussion. Thank
17
   you.
18
               MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr.
19
   Hannon, any discussion?
2.0
               MR. HANNON: Second.
21
               MR. MORISSETTE: Any discussion, Mr.
22
   Hannon? Mr. Hannon, any discussion?
23
               MR. HANNON: I have no discussion other
24
   than I have a time lag.
25
               MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Hannon.
```

1 We'll take that into account. 2 Mr. Lynch, any discussion? Mr. Lynch, 3 any discussion? 4 (No response.) 5 MR. MORISSETTE: Ms. Cooley, any 6 discussion? 7 MS. COOLEY: No, I have no discussion. 8 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. I have no 9 discussion. We'll go back to Mr. Lynch. 10 Mr. Lynch, do you have any discussion? 11 MR. LYNCH: I guess I can't be heard 12 here so --13 MR. MORISSETTE: I hear you now. 14 MR. LYNCH: All right. No discussion. 15 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Lynch. 16 We have a motion and a second for intervenor 17 status. 18 Mr. Silvestri, how do you vote? 19 MR. SILVESTRI: Vote to approve. Thank 20 you. 21 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr. 22 Hannon, how do you vote? Mr. Hannon, how do you 23 vote? 24 MR. HANNON: Vote to approve. 25 Hopefully, sometime you'll hear me.

1	MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Hannon.
2	Mr. Lynch, how do you vote?
3	MR. LYNCH: Vote approval.
4	MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Ms.
5	Cooley, how do you vote?
6	MS. COOLEY: Vote to approve. Thank
7	you.
8	MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. And I also
9	vote to approve. We have a unanimous decision.
10	MR. HANNON: Approve, but there's going
11	to be a problem today.
12	MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Hannon.
13	The motion is approved unanimously for intervenor
14	status.
15	I wish to call your attention to those
16	items shown on the hearing program ranked as Roman
17	Numeral 1-C, Items 1 through 79, that the Council
18	has administratively noticed. Does any party or
19	intervenor have an objection to the items that the
20	Council has administratively noticed?
21	Attorney Chiocchio?
22	MS. CHIOCCHIO: No objection. Thank
23	you.
24	MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr.
25	Greenbaum, any objection?

1	MR. GREENBAUM: No objection. Thank
2	you.
3	MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you.
4	Accordingly, the Council hereby administratively
5	notices these items.
6	(Administrative Notice Items I-C-1
7	through 1-C-79: Received in evidence.)
8	MR. MORISSETTE: We'll move on to the
9	appearance by the applicant. Will the applicants
10	present their witness panel for purposes of taking
11	the oath, and Attorney Bachman will administer the
12	oath.
13	MS. CHIOCCHIO: Thank you, presiding
14	officer.
15	MR. MORISSETTE: I'm sorry, you're on
16	mute, Attorney Chiocchio.
17	MS. CHIOCCHIO: Okay. Can you hear me
18	now?
19	MR. MORISSETTE: Yes.
20	MS. CHIOCCHIO: We're getting some
21	feedback and we're just trying to thank you. I
22	think we've resolved the feedback issue. I'll
23	start again for the record.
24	MR. MORISSETTE: Very good.
25	MS. CHIOCCHIO: For the record, I'm

1 Lucia Chiocchio with Cuddy & Feder, I'm joined by 2 my colleague, Kristin Motel, and we represent the 3 applicants. The applicants' witnesses today 4 include Raymond Vergati, regional manager, 5 Homeland Towers; Harry Carey, external affairs 6 with AT&T; Robert Burns, professional engineer, 7 project manager with All Points Technology 8 Corporation; Michael Libertine, LEP, director of 9 siting and permitting, All Points Technology 10 Corporation; Dean Gustafson, professional soil 11 scientist and senior wetlands scientist, All 12 Points Technology Corporation; Brian Gaudet, 13 project manager, All Points Technology 14 Corporation; Martin Lavin, radio frequency engineer, C Squared Systems, on behalf of AT&T; 15 16 and Dan Stebbins with AT&T FirstNet. 17 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney 18 Chiocchio. 19 Attorney Bachman, please administer the 20 oath. 21 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, gentlemen. 22 Could you please raise your right hand. 23 24

25

11

1 RAYMOND VERGATI, 2 HARRY CAREY, 3 ROBERT BURNS, 4 MICHAEL LIBERTINE, 5 DEAN GUSTAFSON, 6 BRIAN GAUDET, 7 MARTIN LAVIN, 8 DAN STEBBINS, 9 called as witnesses, being first duly sworn 10 (remotely) by Ms. Bachman, were examined and 11 testified on their oath as follows: 12 Thank you. MS. BACHMAN: MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney 13 14 Bachman. 15 Attorney Chiocchio, could you please 16 begin by verifying all the exhibits by the 17 appropriate sworn witnesses? 18 MS. CHIOCCHIO: Thank you. 19 DIRECT EXAMINATION 20 MS. CHIOCCHIO: The exhibits for the 21 applicants are listed in the hearing program under 22 Roman Numeral II-B, Items 1 through 6. I'll ask 23 each of my witnesses a series of questions 24 regarding those exhibits and ask that each 25 identify themselves and answer each question

```
1
   individually. Did you prepare or assist in the
2
   preparation of the items identified as exhibits?
3
               THE WITNESS (Vergati): I did.
4
   Vergati, Homeland Towers.
5
               THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Brian Gaudet.
6
   Yes.
7
               THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns.
8
   Yes.
9
               THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin.
10
   Yes.
11
               THE WITNESS (Gustafson):
                                          Dean
12
   Gustafson. Yes.
13
               THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike
14
   Libertine.
                Yes.
15
               THE WITNESS (Carey): Harry Carey.
16
   Yes.
17
               THE WITNESS (Stebbins): Dan Stebbins.
18
   Yes.
19
               MS. CHIOCCHIO: Do you have any updates
20
   or corrections to the information contained within
21
   those exhibits?
22
               THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati.
23
   The only update is Interrogatory Question 20
24
   regarding the town running an analysis for placing
25
   antennas at the top of the tower. I did speak
```

```
1
   yesterday with the town's consultant, Ralph
2
   Mondello, and he confirmed that the microwave link
3
   to the doner site at East Mountain in Wingdale,
4
   New York looks like it can be completed; and if it
5
   can't, they can go up on that tower.
6
               MS. CHIOCCHIO: Thank you.
7
               THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Brian Gaudet.
8
   No corrections.
9
               THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns.
                                                      No
10
   corrections.
11
               THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin.
                                                      No
12
   corrections.
13
               THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean
14
   Gustafson. No corrections.
15
               THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike
16
   Libertine. No corrections.
17
               THE WITNESS (Carey): Harry Carey.
                                                    No
18
   corrections.
19
               THE WITNESS (Stebbins): Dan Stebbins.
20
   No corrections.
21
               MS. CHIOCCHIO: Is the information
22
   contained in those exhibits true and accurate to
23
   the best of your belief?
24
               THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati.
25
   Yes.
```

```
1
               THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Brian Gaudet.
2
   Yes.
3
               THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns.
4
   Yes.
5
               THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin.
6
   Yes.
7
               THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean
8
   Gustafson.
               Yes.
9
               THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike
10
   Libertine. Yes.
11
               THE WITNESS (Carey): Harry Carey.
12
   Yes.
13
               THE WITNESS (Stebbins): Dan Stebbins.
14
   Yes.
15
               MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt these
16
   exhibits as your testimony in this proceeding?
17
               THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati.
18
   Yes.
19
               THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Brain Gaudet.
20
   Yes.
21
               THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns.
22
   Yes.
23
               THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin.
24
   Yes.
25
               THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean
```

1 Gustafson. Yes. 2 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike 3 Libertine. Yes. 4 THE WITNESS (Carey): Harry Carey. 5 Yes. 6 THE WITNESS (Stebbins): Dan Stebbins. 7 Yes. 8 MS. CHIOCCHIO: Thank you. We ask that 9 the Council accept the applicants' exhibits. 10 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney 11 Chiocchio. 12 Does any party or intervenor object to 13 the admission of the applicants' exhibits? 14 Mr. Greenbaum. 15 MR. GREENBAUM: I was not able to 16 understand Mr. Vergati's reply regarding Item 17 Number 20 on the interrogatory. 18 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr. 19 Vergati, could you please restate your correction 20 for Interrogatory Number 20? 21 THE WITNESS (Vergati): Sure. I had 22 the opportunity -- the question basically asked 23 about the town running any analysis for replacing 24 antennas at the top of the tower. And they did 25 run an analysis. They do need the top of the

```
1
   tower for the whip antennas. But they did
2
   complete their microwave link analysis to the
3
   other site where they'd be shooting the microwave,
4
   which is in Wingdale, New York, and they confirmed
   to me that it looks like the microwave path from
5
6
   Coote Hill Road to Wingdale, New York would work.
7
   And if it didn't, they have the opportunity to go
8
   up higher on the Wingdale tower. They're
9
   currently located at an elevation at 70 feet, and
10
   they could go higher. So it will work for the
11
   town's public safety having a microwave dish at
12
   the top of the tower.
13
               MR. GREENBAUM: Thank you.
14
               MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
15
   Vergati.
16
               Mr. Greenbaum, do you object to the
17
   admission of any of the applicants' exhibits?
18
               MR. GREENBAUM: No, I do not.
19
               MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. The
20
   exhibits are hereby admitted.
21
               (Applicants' Exhibits II-B-1 through
22
            Received in evidence - described in
   II-B-6:
23
   index.)
24
                                    Excuse me, this is
               THE COURT REPORTER:
25
   the court reporter. Why can't I see the
```

witnesses? Why can't I see the witnesses on the screen? The camera is turned away from them.

MR. MORISSETTE: I would ask the witnesses to please relocate your camera so we can see who's talking. And please announce who you are before you answer questions.

THE COURT REPORTER: I appreciate that. Thank you.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you.

MS. CHIOCCHIO: When the individual witness answers, they'll be in the camera view, and they'll identify themselves before responding to a question.

MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Let's continue. We will now begin the cross-examination of the applicant by the Council starting with Mr. Mercier.

Mr. Mercier.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

MR. MERCIER: Thank you. I'm going to start off asking questions about the proposed access to the site, and essentially I'll be referring mostly to site plan SP-4 in application attachment 4. And if you're using the Council's weblink, that's PDF page number 74. Of course, my

screen went blank, so give me a second.

Okay. I'll start off just asking regarding Coote Hill Road that extends from the state highway. Does Homeland have an easement or access agreement for use of Coote Hill Road to get to the property at 16 Coote Hill Road?

THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati, regional manager, Homeland Towers. Yes, we did a letter agreement with Mr. Jones back in June of 2020 in regards to primarily the stone pillars that are on the entrance of Coote Hill leading out onto Route 37 south. The pillars were very narrow. And we had talked with Mr. Jones that during construction it would make sense if we could separate the pillars, and he agreed to that.

We did not need an agreement. We looked at the deed. We have rights like anybody else even though it is a private road. We looked at the deed. There's no restrictions that would not allow us or any of our tenants to use the road both for ingress and egress. And the letter with Mr. Jones is more or less to compensate him for our use and basically separating those stone pillars. Since that time, one of the stone pillars has been taken out by a moving truck and

no longer exists to give you an idea how narrow it
was. But to answer your question, yes, we did a
letter agreement with Mr. Jones.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you. Now, referring to the site plan, I just have some general questions regarding the road. The site plan states that the road will be 12 feet wide. Is that only the travel surface?

THE WITNESS (Burns): For the record,
Robert Burns from All Points Technologies. The
travel surface is 12 feet wide, but then it slopes
down after that. So the answer is yes.

MR. MERCIER: During construction what is like the typical width you might need to accommodate your construction equipment such as ROW construction corridor, would it be 15 feet wide, 20 feet wide to install this -- go ahead.

THE WITNESS (Burns): I'm sorry. The access drive is designed to be able to handle the construction equipment, so 12 feet should be fine.

MR. MERCIER: Right. I guess I'm asking how much room do you need on either side of the 12 feet to construct the road and drainage features, do you need to go out to 20 feet, like a 20 foot corridor through the woods, or 15 feet?

I'm just trying to get a sense of how much space you actually need to construct the road.

THE WITNESS (Burns): The road itself can be construct -- it is a difficult question to answer because there's sections of the road where we're almost at grade, there's sections of the road where we're filling, and we're also adding the culvert. So I'm not sure if this is going to answer your question, but we will need the area within the limits of disturbance to construct the road.

MR. MERCIER: Okay, fair enough. I noticed in the field review photographs that were submitted as part of the interrogatories there looked to be maybe a woods road or some type of logging road or ATV road following the route of the proposed access road or adjacent to it. Is that the case, there's some type of existing road that almost goes to the compound area?

THE WITNESS (Burns): There is an existing, I don't know if I'd call it a logging road. In some cases it's a path. But yes, there's an existing road through the woods, a path or a logging road through the woods.

MR. MERCIER: Now, was the intent just

to follow that path, was it advantageous to follow that or not?

THE WITNESS (Burns): In some cases, yes. Some of this depended on the number of trees that were in the area because, you know, a logging path may not have the same radiuses on the turns. The turns have to be designed for vehicles. So the road was laid out per the landlord's request as well as the wetlands and trying to maintain that logging path as much as possible without impacting many of the mature trees that are out there.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you. I'm trying to get a sense of how you're going to construct the road from its beginning along the driveway. Is the intent to go through and clear and grub the entire road initially, or are you going to do it in phases such as the first phase will go to the first wetland crossing and then you finish the road there and then move up the hill, what's the sequence you propose?

THE WITNESS (Burns): I think working with the contractor to see how much he can get done in a day. We certainly wouldn't want to clear more than he could stabilize within a

standard period of time. My gut says we'd probably do up until the first, first or second culvert, which isn't necessarily a crossing, and then move beyond that. But I do think he'll be able to construct this fairly quickly. So his loggers or his tree people will probably be out ahead of him, and then he'll come in with his construction equipment afterward. So it will be done in phases. I think during the D&M plan we can better outline sort of a phased construction and a construction sequence, but I would say that's probably the best way I could explain how to do that.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. What types of construction vehicles would be required at the site, you know, that includes excavators, maybe a crane for the tower? I'm just trying to get a sense of what types of vehicles.

as the tower, I mean, we're definitely going to need a crane. They'll probably have a bulldozer out there, a small excavator, mainly because those culverts aren't extraordinarily deep, as well as a backhoe and a front-end loader. And then obviously, you know, once we're pouring concrete,

we'll need concrete vehicles up there. It is just a 12 foot gravel road, so it's not like we're going to need major highway equipment up there.

MR. MERCIER: Understood. Just for the crane or maybe the concrete truck, I assume you need to have a stable gravel road in place for that equipment to get up there; is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Burns): Yeah, the gravel road will be built before the compound, for sure.

MR. MERCIER: I was looking at the route of the roadway on the plan here. It does, you know, the trees are marked with little Xs, and there's obviously some trees adjacent to the road that are not being cleared in pretty close proximity. What's your sense of potential root damage to some of these adjacent trees that could kill them through, you know, by trenching for the drainage system or the electrical system connection, that is?

THE WITNESS (Burns): Well, I think the electrical, we've tried to maneuver on a side where it doesn't impact as many trees. I think we've done a pretty good job identifying which trees will definitely need to be removed. The other ones, a plan will be put in place on

protection of those trees, anything close, but I do think he can build this without having to remove more trees than are on this plan, that are shown being removed on this plan.

MR. MERCIER: Right. Just in your experience, you think some root damage will maybe kill some other trees or --

THE WITNESS (Burns): You know, it's difficult to say, Bob. I think that, you know, some of this is, some of these areas are actually in fill, so we won't be excavating near the roots. I do think there may be some root damage, but the hope is that it's -- not the hope, the plan is that it's the outer edges of the roots so it won't impact the integrity of the tree.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you. Now, where the access road starts coming off the existing paved driveway it looks like a sharp 90-degree turn. Is that turn adequate, as designed, for all the construction equipment you plan to use at this site?

THE WITNESS (Burns): Yeah. So I think that there's a radius in there. It will be a 90, but the radius making that left turn coming up the driveway will be larger than a normal radius, so

long story short, the answer to that is yes it should be sufficient.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Then we're starting to go uphill here. There's a small ledge that's shown. I believe you said you intend to chip that. That's in the first section there. Is that a long duration project, just chipping some ledge to accommodate the road, or would even blasting be better or required?

THE WITNESS (Burns): The objective is to do all the construction without any blasting at all. Until he gets in there, he, being the contractor, and looks at what the rock actually consists of, he will be better able to tell how long the chipping process will take place, but I think this site can be constructed without blasting. But until a geotechnical investigation is done, I can't be a hundred percent certain that that's the case, but the objective here is to do this without blasting.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Now the road turns to the east and starts heading uphill, and there's an embankment there adjacent to the wetlands. The embankment, is that electric -- excuse me -- erosion control blanket on the embankment?

THE WITNESS (Burns): The erosion control blanket will be on any slopes greater than 3 to 1. We've tried to grade these out to be 3 to 1 or greater, but there are portions of this at 2 to 1 which we will have to put a blanket on. The area adjacent to the wetlands we tried to stay as close as we could to existing grade so there will be very little grading on that side. I do realize there's a couple areas here where we will have to grade. Most of the grading that's taking place is on the south side of the driveway. But if it is steeper than 3 to 1, we will be putting down an erosion control blanket.

MR. MERCIER: Now, is the blanket a permanent feature, or do you remove that and use other stabilization measures after construction is completed?

THE WITNESS (Burns): It's a permanent feature that they seed and then eventually it disintegrates. In addition, the project will have the compost filter socks on them, which essentially acts like a silt fence does. We just think it's a better product closer to wetlands. And so they'll have that as well to protect the wetlands.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Now the road
reaches the first wetland crossing, which you have
one pipe there. Is there actually water flowing
in there, or is that just like a wetland soil only

type of situation?

THE WITNESS (Burns): If I'm not mistaken, and I can have Dean come up and maybe answer that, but I believe it's an intermittent watercourse. And if there is water there, it doesn't really flow, but I think it's seasonal, if I'm not mistaken. I can have Dean come up and confirm that.

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Thank you,
Bob. Dean Gustafson, All Points Technology.
Actually, both stream crossings are intermittent
streams with very little bordering vegetated
wetlands. And both features are highly seasonal.
You'll see a little bit of flows during the early
spring period, but it will be dry for extended
periods of time starting now through the rest of
the summer.

MR. MERCIER: Okay, yes, I was looking at the field review photographs and I didn't really see anything there. That makes sense. Thank you.

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): You're welcome.

MR. MERCIER: Now, when you go to install a wetland crossing, will there be a temporary mat or something there first, or are you going to just install it from the west side and then work your way across the culvert and continue construction up the hill? I'm just kind of curious how you do the crossing without mucking things up too much.

THE WITNESS (Burns): So I think, you know, obviously the contractor will be responsible for means and methods, but the best way for him to do this is progress from west to east and put down whatever matting is applicable or he deems applicable without, you know, rutting up the entire area. A pre-construction meeting will happen beforehand with him understanding that no areas outside the limit of disturbance shall be disturbed during construction for any reason.

MR. MERCIER: Just a little bit to the left of the west of the crossing there's a notation for a stone wall. Are you taking out a lot of stone wall; and if you do, are you going to repurpose it on the site or are you going to

dispose of it somewhere?

THE WITNESS (Burns): So I believe there is -- not I belive. There is a stone wall there. The stone wall will be removed within the two limits of disturbance and can be repurposed on site or removed depending on, you know, if the landlord wants them to rebuild a portion of the wall or not. So either way, depending on, you know, I guess what the landlord or the property owner would desire.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you. Just going back to that embankment near the stone wall, there's a bunch of trees shown right at the edge of the embankment. What are your thoughts about, you're going to excavate that area, that hillside, and you might dig into some more roots there and potentially undermine those trees, and maybe a wind storm, you know, the ground is no long longer stable there. Do you think that's a problem given the amount of trees right at the top of that embankment?

THE WITNESS (Burns): I think the short answer is it could be, but I don't think that we'll be digging into the roots enough to impact that. You know, the slope will be stabilized, the

trees will be protected, and I don't think that -and, in addition, it's not that large of a
embankment there that I think that it can be done
in such a way, you know, as long as they're
protected during construction that it will be
okay.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. I believe you said you're using silt socks which I saw noted on the plan here. Now, going up the road where the compound is after the second crossing, you know, I kind of see the silt fence, I guess, on the lower limit of disturbance. I believe that's it. It just looks like it's running parallel to the slope. Is there any concern that the water is just going to channelize along that fence and just kind of flow down into the wetland; and if so, what kind of measures can you put that are intermediary to prevent that?

THE WITNESS (Burns): So the compost filter socks, the idea is that water will flow through them and will withhold the sediment. In addition, if the slope is great enough where, for example, adjacent to the compound they can put more than one row up, so that if for any reason the water on that slope gets through the first,

the second one will pick up the water and the sediment. And they'll probably be spaced, I'm thinking, you know, 8 to 10 feet in between them. So they won't be stacked together. There will be a space in between.

MR. MERCIER: Right. How about in the area of the wetland crossing, you know, you're going uphill and the silt fence will be parallel to the road, so won't the water just run down the edge of the silt fence into the wetland?

THE WITNESS (Burns): Well, the other thing they do when they install those is they can put in J-hooks, in other words, take the filter sock and kind of curve it around so that it will not channel it. And you kind of have one that comes off at an angle and then you start another one right behind it so that a series of those wouldn't allow sort of a channel of any significance to run down the side of that sock. It would be the same if we were putting in a silt fence, it acts the same.

MR. MERCIER: Right. During construction who is responsible for inspecting the erosion control barriers and other things at the site on a daily basis and a weekly basis?

THE WITNESS (Burns): I know that there will be a statement of special inspections for certain things that will get built, the concrete, the tower stacking, the steel, that sort of thing. The maintenance schedule can include a stormwater inspection. As a matter of fact, sort of standard procedure is after a significant rainfall those stormwater appliances need to be inspected and repaired, as needed, by the contractor.

MR. MERCIER: Okay.

THE WITNESS (Burns): It certainly can be written in that the stormwater can be, or the sediment control devices can be inspected in a periodic way by a third-party inspector.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you. Okay. Once the site is constructed and operational, I'm just trying to get a sense of stormwater drainage at that time. So looking at the compound area, I see a swale to the north/northeast, then it kind of runs along the east side of the road down to the wetland crossing. Is the road going to be pitched to the swale in the compound?

THE WITNESS (Burns): Yeah, the road is not built with a crown. The road is pitched to the swale. It runs within the grass swale.

Within the grass swale approximately every 100 feet is a stone check dam which will not only slow down the stormwater but will allow the sediment to be -- prevent it from going further to the point where it eventually gets to the wetlands where there will be a riprap apron which will flow into the wetland area.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Moving downhill to the first wetland crossing coming up, the single culvert, the area to the east, it's that isolated island, I guess they call it, between the two wetlands, if water is flowing downhill, is there any type -- I don't see any feature there that's stopping it or collecting it before it hits the wetland. Is there a feature there I just can't see?

THE WITNESS (Burns): So right now the topography runs from south to north, so it actually runs, in that area, runs across our driveway. There will be the compost socks. And for the most part, we're at grade in that area. There will be a line of the compost filter socks on the downhill side of the north side of the compound.

MR. MERCIER: I'm talking after

1 construction is completed once you remove those. 2 THE WITNESS (Burns): Well, once --3 MR. MERCIER: The water --4 THE WITNESS (Burns): I'm sorry. 5 MR. MERCIER: I'm sorry. Will the 6 water, it's just designed to run off the road --7 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes. 8 MR. MERCIER: -- as overland flow to 9 the wetland? 10 THE WITNESS (Burns): That's correct, 11 yes. 12 MR. MERCIER: How about the area to the 13 west of the crossing, it looks like there's two 14 small basins, I guess I'll call them, I'm not 15 really sure. Can you just describe what you're 16 trying to do here with the drainage features to 17 control flow because I don't really see a lot of 18 slope there either. 19 THE WITNESS (Burns): To the west of 20 the second crossing? 21 MR. MERCIER: The one with the single 22 culvert. 23 THE WITNESS (Burns): Okay. So the 24 idea is we're putting in a grass-lined swale on 25 the southern side of the road there. The road

will be pitched to that swale. Those will also have stone check dams. They'll run to two very small culverts, they're 12-inch culverts, and flow across and then eventually overlay and make it to the wetlands there.

MR. MERCIER: What's the purpose of the two little basins if the pitch is not that much?

THE WITNESS (Burns): Well, I think the grading is a bit deceiving here. There are no basins here. First of all, there's no catch basins, and they're not detention basins either. They're graded. The swale comes to a low point. At that point the culvert picks them up and they cross the road and then overland to the wetlands.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Yeah, the size looks deceiving on the screen at times.

THE WITNESS (Burns): Yeah, I think that the scale on this is a little tough to read too. I'll be honest.

MR. MERCIER: Once the site is completed, what's the access road maintenance inspection protocol, how often are you going out there to inspect the check dams and the culverts and things of that nature?

THE WITNESS (Burns): I don't know if

there's a maintenance plan in place yet.

Certainly there can be. I would say on a quarterly, you know, basis that the road can be inspected and the, you know, the check dams can be inspected to make sure they're still in decent shape and that the grass has definitely taken hold, the turf has been established within the swales.

MR. MERCIER: I'm just trying to get a sense, you know, for your other sites what's your usual interval, you know, is that going to be applied here.

THE WITNESS (Burns): I would say yes.

I mean, I'm speaking for Homeland now, but they do
do periodic inspection on their sites. And being
that this is one that will have some design
features to it, you know, the swale and the stone
check dams, this is definitely one they would
inspect on a regular basis.

MR. MERCIER: For the access road itself, do you know what the slope is at the steepest section, I guess I'd call it?

THE WITNESS (Burns): Yeah, the steepest section on here is right around 9 percent. I don't have a profile in front of me,

1 but I do know it's in the neighborhood of 9 2 percent. 3 MR. MERCIER: Would that be up near the 4 compound? 5 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes, I believe 6 so. 7 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Let's see. On the 8 May 18th supplemental filing on page 3, it just 9 stated there would be one visit per month to the 10 I wasn't sure. That was part of my 11 previous question. Was that for Homeland Towers 12 itself or is that for AT&T? THE WITNESS (Burns): I think that's 13 14 for the carriers, the operation people, to make 15 sure that their facilities are running, the radio 16 equipment works, et cetera, et cetera. That's for 17 the individual carriers. 18 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Would you know, if 19 they're doing tenant changeouts, does another 20 crane have to be brought to the site or like a 21 boom truck or something? 22 THE WITNESS (Burns): If another 23 carrier comes to the site? 24 No. Meaning if AT&T came MR. MERCIER: 25 and wanted to, you know, they're on this tower,

they're proposed to be on this tower, if they want to do a changeout two years from now, what type of equipment would they need to do that, is it another crane I guess I'm asking?

it depends on what they'll be changing out, if it's something they can climb the tower and do it that way, they won't need a crane. I think they would probably try to do this without providing a crane on site to do any kind of changeout. If another carrier comes on site and wants to put up antennas, that would be a different story, but if we're just changing out radio heads or squid boxes, which are small, they could probably do that by climbing the tower.

MR. MERCIER: If there was another carrier, then what type of equipment do you think they'd need?

THE WITNESS (Burns): If another carrier came to the site, obviously you'd need concrete trucks to pour any type of slabs they would put up there, and you would probably need a crane to put up their antennas.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you. I have a few questions regarding the DEEP Natural Diversity

Data Base letter that was in application, attachment 10, and I think the letter was dated October 6, 2020. One of the species listed in the letter was the box turtle. And I'm just curious, is the site suitable habitat for the box turtle?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yeah, it contains enough habitat qualities that box turtle could be encountered on the site. They could be migrating from other adjacent habitats. And the box turtle during the summer period will look for wetland systems to aestivate in, and certainly the site wetlands provide suitable habitat, a summering habitat. So there is the potential that box turtle could be encountered during construction.

And the recommendations that are contained within the referenced DEEP letter are consistent with what we've employed on numerous other projects, including projects that have been previously approved by the Council, which generally consist of setting up isolation barriers, as needed, to cordon off the construction area from possible migrating turtles, making the contractor aware of the potential presence of the box turtle, what they look like,

what to do if you encounter them, and then periodic monitoring during construction to make sure those protective measures are being adhered to by the contractor.

MR. MERCIER: Yes. That's correct.

One of the things they did mention was use of a qualified herpetologist, which for other projects I've been involved with they use an environmental monitor in their recommendation. I wasn't sure if they explained to you why they wanted a qualified herpetologist, or are these two terms the same, a monitor and a herpetologist?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): So that tends to be typical language that comes with these NDDB letters. And it is just kind of a precaution that whoever is doing the monitoring on site is fully aware of the type of herpetofauna that are located or potentially located on the site and have the proper experience to ensure that those protective measures are implemented properly.

You know, I'm a wetland biologist, professional soil scientist. I'm not a certified herpetologist, but I have been working with rare species for over 30 years throughout Connecticut and have implemented these plans on probably

hundreds of projects across the state coordinated with the NDDB. So even though they reference a qualified herpetologist, I think I have the credentials to make sure that the plan gets properly implemented for this project.

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

MR. MERCIER: Yes. Thank you. One of the other species was the hognose snake. I'm just curious if you believe this site has habitat for that species.

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): So as you're aware reading through the docket on this project and the various surveys that were accomplished, particularly the slimy salamander, I talked with Dennis Quinn who performed the slimy salamander surveys, and the site does have some -- or really the surrounding area does have some potential for hognose snake. Typically, they prefer gravelly or sandier soils, so the site really doesn't contain the soil qualifications for that species, but it has been documented in the vicinity of the project. So DEEP tends to be conservative. And just on the outside chance that we may encounter the species, they want to just bring it to our attention. So I think there's a fairly low probability that we'll encounter hognose on this

site, but we will still probably implement the protection measures and BMPs as noted in the NDDB letter.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you. I had a question regarding that slimy salamander analysis. I think in an interrogatory response, one of the responses, there was an attachment 11 to the response, it kind of showed the 300 foot buffers and the 600 foot buffers from some location off the map. One thing I noticed on the map, I'm not sure if you're familiar with it, there was a orangy yellow box, it looks like, around a residence. I wasn't sure what that was supposed to denote, if you know that.

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Can you describe that again? The inset? Are you talking about like the bottom right-hand corner of the figure?

MR. MERCIER: Yeah. So it looks like there's a gray area that's a house, and then there's just basically an orange box around the house.

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. Thank you for that clarification. The area that's grayed out is associated with a residential

development in that location of the project vicinity. The light orange or yellow shading surrounding that is in an area that is considered an impact from that development, so it's essentially perforated the forest to that location, and that's generally the 300 foot perforation buffer around that development, that existing development.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. So not only is there a buffer around the critical area, which I see, there's also basically you're saying this area around the house is also less optimal for the slimy salamander?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. So with the, as you're familiar with the core forest analysis, surrounding any type of perforation or development there is a 300 foot essentially impact buffer associated with that, and that's what's reflected there is that that forest surrounding that residential building has been compromised to a certain degree. And with respect to the sensitivity of the slimy salamander, which requires these kind of larger core forested moist habitats for their survival, we just wanted to make sure -- we analyzed essentially the entire

project vicinity to show areas where it's already been compromised.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. I was confusing the two 300 foot buffers. I see what you're saying.

So looking at this map, so I suppose to the right of the house, you know, the circle, the two buffer lines to your site, and to butt out against, that means there's another area of critical habitat probably not shown on this figure.

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Correct, yeah. And actually, the core habitat for slimy salamander is located kind of the center bottom of this figure, and that's represented by kind of the crosshatching. It's identified in the legend as Zone 1 as core habitat, and you can see that crosshatching just to the left or to the west of that residential house that you were referencing.

MR. MERCIER: Correct. I'm also assuming there's one off to the right which you can't see; is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Correct.

MR. MERCIER: Is it possible to get a copy of that study?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. I don't see any reason why we -- you know, we've released it to Natural Diversity Data Base. I will just need to confirm with the author, Dennis Quinn, because it potentially contains some sensitive habitat information regarding the slimy salamander. It's a protected species, so we may have to -- I can work with Lucia on the proper means to provide it to the Council, but it may not be able to be disseminated to the general public without some redactions.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Understood.

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): We're just concerned about releasing information that, you know, that unsavory folks may use for poaching the species or impacting it.

MR. MERCIER: Understood. Thank you.

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): You're

welcome.

MR. MERCIER: Now, looking at this slimy salamander map, you know, I'm looking at the site and how it crosses the two wetlands, and it goes to the southwest. I guess this is another question for maybe Ray or somebody. Why was that location chosen rather than just going straight up

from the second wetland crossing and stopping at the similar elevation there instead of hooking it all around to the south of the wetland? Does that make sense? I was wondering if you could move the site to basically the northeast rather than southwest once you cross the wetland.

THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati,
Homeland Towers. We had looked at some locations
when we ran into the potential habitat for the
salamander. We worked with the landlord, where
they wanted to have it as well. We wanted to have
it on the right side of the property where it was
originally located. The elevation and the
topography also lended itself well for that
location that we chose as an alternate or revised
compound location. I believe we lose a little bit
of ground elevation going towards the wetlands.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you.

Earlier today there was a clarification of what
the town needed for their microwave dish. And I'm
just looking at Site Plan CP-1 which shows the
Town of Sherman antennas at the top of the
facility, proposed facility. Do you know what the
timeline is for them to install their equipment at
the top of the tower, is this a few years out or

as soon as it's completed, if it's approved?

THE WITNESS (Vergati): This is Ray

Vergati, Homeland Towers. All indications is that
they would install immediately. I believe they've
already even purchased the equipment. They were
attempting over the past few years to do some work
on a water tank that is in town, and unfortunately
were not able to work with the underlying landlord
for access. So they've had this equipment
in-house, from my understanding. It's critical
from the public safety standpoint. And I believe,
and I'll let the town speak for themselves, but I
believe they would install immediately upon
completion of the tower, if so approved.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you. The other question I have has to do with a little bit lower down on the tower, it's Litchfield County Dispatch. I guess that's the same question. Do they intend to locate on this facility; and if so, at what time?

THE WITNESS (Vergati): We've had conversations with Mr. Soule, Mr. Dan Soule, on this particular project. All indications, they've installed on our prior towers pretty quickly after it's been built. I could find it out as a

1 homework assignment from Mr. Soule, but I believe 2 the intention would be that they would install 3 immediately upon completion of the tower when it's 4 tenant ready. 5 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. I have a 6 couple questions on the radio frequency analysis 7 report and that was in application attachment 1. 8 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, C 9 Squared Systems. 10 MR. MERCIER: Looking at the coverage 11 plots, I saw two sites that didn't have any 12 identifying AT&T numbers, so I was wondering if 13 you can just clarify what they were for me. It 14 goes to the existing 700 megahertz coverage plot. 15 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I see one, yes, 16 at the top. The location has gone off the edge 17 there. 18 MR. MERCIER: Yes. 19 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Only the bottom 20 half of the letters are shown. Apologies for 21 that. 22 MR. MERCIER: It was just a 23 corresponding chart, so I was just trying to match 24 them up. 25 THE WITNESS (Lavin): To confirm

against our chart here, we can provide updated
plots as a homework assignment to get the
identifier under the site in that case.

MR. MERCIER: That could be done instead, if that's easier.

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Just to make sure I get it right the first time rather than trying to figure out exactly what direction and how far it is. Just based on that, I'd have to use the direction of the distance, so better to get it right the first time and just identify those two.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. The other one was on, it looks like it's in New York so --

THE WITNESS (Lavin): The other one,
Route 22, yes, I see it, it must be Patterson over
there. I'm showing NW2813 on the chart as
attachment 2 in the report on page 7. I'll submit
a revised response with those sites labeled.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you. In the text of the report on page 1, the second to the last paragraph, it states the site will provide improved 4G LTE coverage for AT&T as well as provide FirstNet public safety services. So when you're designing the site, whose needs come first, is it FirstNet has, do you go for a certain height

for FirstNet services, or are you strictly concerned about AT&T and then FirstNet just comes on later?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): FirstNet and AT&T work together on these sites to figure out, prioritize which ones they want to build. FirstNet coverage and 4G LTE coverage go hand in hand. FirstNet service is provided by 4G LTE technology. Enhancement to one is enhancement to the other. So there's no priority treatment to providing 4G LTE service to customers. It's the same as providing FirstNet coverage to customers.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. So for the FirstNet program there's no minimum requirement, that would just be AT&T proposed to locate here and FirstNet is going to come along basically?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. Well,

FirstNet will be there when the site launches.

FirstNet is working with AT&T to prioritize which

sites on the AT&T build plan are prioritized, but

when they're built FirstNet and regular customers,

commercial customers, get the same coverage.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you. And just to clarify, when AT&T's system is operating so is FirstNet, it's on standby when it's needed?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): FirstNet's band

14 spectrum is available for commercial service.

It's used by both public service and commercial customers. But if there's any kind of emergency -- actually, there's always priority for public service, and if there's a major emergency, public safety users can take over band 14 entirely.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you.

THE WITNESS (Lavin): But there is another 4G 700 megahertz carrier in this area, so that would still be available to public, to commercial users, regular customers.

MR. MERCIER: Now, in Interrogatory
Response 8 it mentioned two large communities in
the area of the tower, it was Timber Trails and
Deer Run Shores. Do you know where these are in
relation to the facility? I'm just trying to get
a sense if your proposed facility will reach these
two communities or partially reach them. I
couldn't find them on the map.

THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati,
Homeland Towers. The Timber Trails Neighborhood
Association is located slightly southwest from the
proposed facility. I'm not exactly sure where the

Deerfield Shores may be located, but I can certainly find that out for you.

MR. MERCIER: Yes, if you can do

MR. MERCIER: Yes, if you can do that and report back for a homework assignment, that would be great. Thank you.

THE WITNESS (Vergati): Absolutely.

MR. MERCIER: And I just only had a few more questions on the visibility analysis of the project.

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Brian Gaudet with All Points.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you. For Coote Hill Road itself, I believe it showed, photo 18, it was at the southeast, you know, the chart you provided said 1 to 20 feet could be seasonally visible from this road, Coote Hill Road. I'm just trying to determine, is photo 18 in front of the host property?

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yes, the white house that you see is the host property's residence.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Are there any other areas on Coote Hill Road, be it some residences or the road itself, where the tower would be visible year round?

1 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): There's really 2 not much visibility on Coote Hill there. Where 3 the tower is located, you know, tucked back into 4 the woods and a pretty significant tree line in 5 the area, there is not any anticipated visibility, 6 seasonal or year round, other than essentially 7 right outside of the 16 Coote Hill driveway. 8 MR. MERCIER: Okay. I was looking at 9 one of the aerial maps that was provided in the 10 application. It showed a house, we talked about 11 it with Mr. Gustafson, there's a house on top of 12 the ridge basically south. 13 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yeah. 14 MR. MERCIER: Would that house be able 15 to see the tower sticking up through the 16 vegetation or seasonally? 17 18 but we're not predicting any visibility there

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): It's possible, based on the viewshed analysis.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MERCIER: And so that measures, what, tree density and height above trees, things of that nature?

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Tree density, any other intervening structures out here, you know, primarily between where the proposed

facility would be and that residence, you're taking into account topography as well as the tree density.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you. Hold on for a second, please.

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Sure.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Going to photo 26 of your visibility analysis, this was Route 37, it's kind of a picture through some trees, and there's a water body, and I believe that's the lake down below. Do you anticipate, based on this picture, would there be year-round views from certain areas of that lake?

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yeah, I think along that sort of northwestern shoreline, you know, if we were standing on the other side of these trees in the foreground, I think you would have some year-round visibility there. I'm not sure if there's any shoreline right there, but again, I think that a lot of that year-round visibility is going to be primarily at the treetop. It's not expected to extend significantly above from that specific location.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. And just looking at photo 28, do you know if that's like a beach

1 area or a picnic ground or is that just an opening in the trees along the road? 2 3 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): This, I believe, 4 is at the Lake Mauweehoo Club. We don't 5 typically -- I wasn't in the vehicle for this 6 shot. We don't typically go onto private 7 property, but it's probably right at the pull-off, 8 I would guess there's a driveway there. 9 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you. I have 10 no other questions at this time. Thank you. 11 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. 12 Mercier. We'll now continue with 13 cross-examination by Mr. Silvestri, and then we 14 will follow by Mr. Lynch. 15 Mr. Silvestri. 16 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. 17 Morissette. Mr. Vergati, I'd like to go back, if 18 we could, to the microwave that you were talking 19 about with the update to Interrogatory Number 20. 20 I have to get it straight that the microwave would 21 be used by the town; is that correct? 22 THE WITNESS (Vergati): That is my 23 understanding that the microwave would be used by 24 the town, not by Litchfield County Dispatch, LCD. 25 MR. SILVESTRI: And it would be

installed on the proposed tower, is that also correct?

THE WITNESS (Vergati): The microwave dish would be installed on Homeland's proposed tower at 16 Coote Hill Road, and the length or the shot would go to an existing tower located in Wingdale, New York, where there's an existing dish at 70 feet, and that dish that's in New York can be raised, if needed.

MR. SILVESTRI: Great. Thank you for the clarification. The other only one I have, how would that antenna work in conjunction with FirstNet, does that supplement it or replace it, or what's the tie-in between the two?

THE WITNESS (Vergati): I think the microwave dish and the municipal whips are purely for the town's public safety needs and highway, fire, and it's my understanding that it would not tie into FirstNet, but I would certainly have Martin Lavin, the RF engineer, confirm that.

Would you like Mr. Lavin to confirm that?

MR. SILVESTRI: Yes. And then we could go on to a couple other questions that I do have.

Thank you.

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, C

1 Squared Systems. The interconnection for FirstNet 2 is done the same as AT&T's system via fiber, so it 3 would be independent of the microwave. 4 quessing that microwave is for their current radio 5 systems, voice systems, and operate independently 6 of FirstNet. 7 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you for the clarification. I think I need Mr. Vergati 8 9 back on this one. I'm going to reference drawing 10 SP-1. If you look at that drawing, Mr. Vergati, 11 there's a legend box, if you will, that says 12 Subject Parcel MBL: 51-28. And I'll wait a second 13 until you pull that drawing up. 14 THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati, 15 Homeland Towers. I'm on sheet SP-1. 16 MR. SILVESTRI: Do you see that legend 17 box, Subject Parcel MBL: 51-28? 18 THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes, I do. 19 MR. SILVESTRI: All right. If you 20 follow that to the right, there's a line and a 21 black dot. Good so far? 22 THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes. 23 MR. SILVESTRI: The question I have for 24 you, in that area around that black dot, was the

potential installation of the cell tower thought

25

of in putting in that area rather than crossing the wetlands?

THE WITNESS (Vergati): To answer your

question, we looked at a number of locations on the property in conjunction, obviously, with the landlord, and it was difficult enough to find an interested landlord, certainly one that would lease to us. The landlord's preference, obviously, was not to have the tower so close to their house. They've got 19 acres. We worked with them and located it in the back portion of the property. But yes, we did look at that, and it certainly gets it closer toward the house, but it was not the wishes of the landlord.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you for that reply. I'm not sure who the next ones are going to be directed to, but the first one I have, I just want to verify that the propane tank is going to be 500 gallons; is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Vergati): That is correct.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. And it's also going to be connected to a 15 kW generator, also correct?

THE WITNESS (Vergati): That is

correct.

MR. SILVESTRI: A question on the generator. The Council has seen, oh, 25 kW and sometimes even larger kilowatt generators. Is 15 kilowatts sufficient for what you foresee as power to the cell tower either with the one carrier or with the proposed four carriers?

THE WITNESS (Vergati): I'll turn that over to Mr. Burns.

THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns, All Points. The 15 kW generator is currently what AT&T is using within this market. It is strictly for their equipment only for the backup to their walk-in cabinet and their radio equipment only, and the 500 gallon propane tank will fuel that generator.

MR. SILVESTRI: When you say "this market," what do you mean by this market?

THE WITNESS (Burns): Connecticut and standard generators they use within different markets. And in Connecticut right now they're using a 15 kW generator, which admittedly is on the small side, but it is sufficient for what their use is on this particular site.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay, I'll leave it at

that. Thank you. With the combination of the 15 kW generator and 500 gallon propane tank, I believe the estimated expected hours of operation is around 112. Related question to that, it's not quite three days, but with a somewhat remote location what would be provisions for refueling that tank?

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

THE WITNESS (Burns): So a couple things. First, that would be the generator running at 100 percent would be, I think it's about 4.7 days, somewhere in that neighborhood. Typically, these sites don't run at 100 percent, they run probably 80 percent, so it gives you a little more than that. I don't know offhand what AT&T's protocol is, but the carriers in general typically keep their eye on significant weather events, and when those weather events are about to occur, they implement their operations people to make sure that their tanks are, let's say, topped off and full and ready for any kind of event like that. Other than that, to be honest, I'm not exactly certain. What we could get from AT&T is a non-storm event what is their typical time frame between fill-ups, let's say.

Did I answer your question? You look

like --

MR. SILVESTRI: Kind of. I might come back to that one.

THE WITNESS (Burns): Okay.

MR. SILVESTRI: But let me move on, but thank you.

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

MR. SILVESTRI: What I'd like to have you look at right now is Figure 3 with the compound plan. There are areas that identified for municipal equipment and the potential for three future carriers. Is there room within those areas for adding additional emergency generators with sufficient setback space for additional propane tanks?

THE WITNESS (Burns): Adding generators, yes. Propane tanks I would say yes as well. The middle site may get a little squeezed with the 10 foot offset, but we can put a manual shut-off valve on the propane tank which allows us to go to a bit of a smaller spark zone. So long story short, I think there's sufficient room there for generators and the fueling devices -- fueling tanks.

MR. SILVESTRI: Should there be space constraints, has there been any thoughts, should the tower be approved, to share a larger tank, if you will, with the additional carriers?

THE WITNESS (Burns): The one thing I'd like to point out before I answer that question is that there's also, this lease area is significantly larger than the compound. So, if need be, we could bump out the fenced-in areas to put in additional propane tanks as well.

As far as shared generators, Ray, do you want to handle that one?

I will say that typically the carriers don't have a shared generator because of differing equipment as well as it gets messy on sort of how do you gauge the fueling and that sort of thing.

But maybe, Ray, do you want to answer that one?

THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati,
Homeland Towers. Homeland, as the builder of the
tower itself and compound, we do not get into
the -- provide the generators or the fuel source.
That's the responsibility of the carrier. Each
carrier has their own specifications, and I'm sure
as many are aware, they operate their own network

independently. They don't share. And that's a good thing in a sense that, if you have four carriers on a site and they are all sharing one generator slash fuel source and that had an issue, all four carriers go down. I think it's been shown and proven that it's nice to have each carrier to have their own backup generation. Ιt creates redundancy. If one carrier goes down, they all don't go down. MR. SILVESTRI: So essentially you're avoiding a single source of failure, would that be correct?

THE WITNESS (Vergati): That is. We're building in redundancy. And, you know, it's something that, as a tower developer, we don't want the responsibility, the legal responsibility of touching the carriers' first class network. That's their responsibility. We don't want to be sending a dispatch out to fix their network problem, something that we don't do, obviously. We provide the pole, utilities to the site, fence, compound, and that's it.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Vergati.

THE WITNESS (Vergati): I want to just

circle back really quick on a homework assignment that Bob had given me. And just to confirm, the Deerfield Shores is off 39. It's a private community. It's on the western side of Lake Candlewood. And the Timber Trails, as I mentioned, is southwest, and that's about 137 homes on Timber Trails.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. I will thank you for him. Thank you.

New question for you. Going back to the application, page 23, there's the review of the Sherman zoning regulations. The proposal regarding maximum height is in Section 356.3Eii, and it states that the proposed tower height is 170 feet or minimum needed to provide service. The question for you, what is the minimum height needed to provide service?

THE WITNESS (Vergati): I will defer that question to Martin Lavin, the RF engineer.

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, C
Squared Systems. We have done height analysis on
this. If we move down from the antenna centerline
of 166 feet, we do lose coverage, especially on
Route 39, which we have no way of recovering. So
in terms of public safety and FirstNet service,

that is the height we need to get the coverage we have to have out of the site.

MR. SILVESTRI: So the tower height will be 170 and the centerline height would be what again?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): 166.

MR. SILVESTRI: 166. Thank you. Then related to that, if I have my numbers correctly, the proposed viewpoint for the tower is at 68 feet. And I believe that that would come about from the 102 feet from the tower to the property line; would that be correct?

THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns, All Points. Yes, that's correct, the closest property line is 102 feet from the tower.

MR. SILVESTRI: And the yield point proposed would be 68?

THE WITNESS (Burns): That's correct.

MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you. All right. New topic, and again, I'm not sure who it's proposed to, but in the site search summary, Site Number 28 is listed as 0 Route 37 South in Sherman, Connecticut, and it was rejected to the quote/unquote extensive presence of wetlands. My question, how do the wetlands on Site 28 impede

THE WITNESS (Vergati): I'll have
Mr. Gaudet speak to that. I will tell you I think

on the viewsheds it will not be visible, and the

fact that the ground elevation on Wagon Wheel is

potential construction, and how do those wetlands differ from those that are on the preferred site?

THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati,
Homeland Towers. I had sent in a response to an
interrogatory, an aerial map, I believe, showing
the wetlands on that parcel. While we're crossing
two intermittent streams on the subject parcel,
the map that was sent in shows that, if I recall,
roughly 90 percent of this particular parcel was
wet, and the only place for a tower would be
literally abutting Route 37 south, and then you
would have obviously visual impact on this
particular parcel. Not a good site.

MR. SILVESTRI: All right. Thank you for the clarification, Mr. Vergati. Also, Site Number 31 was investigated on Wagon Wheel Road, yet there were no photographs or visual simulations of views of the preferred site that were presented in the application. So the question I have for you, why were no photographs taken from Wagon Wheel Road?

roughly 550 feet, so it's set way down, and there's a very intervening terrain ridge between the subject parcel and Wagon Wheel, so I'll let Mr. Gaudet speak on that, but the views would be nonexistent.

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

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Give me one second to get my bearings here on where Wagon Wheel Road is. I'll explain while I'm getting that up what our process is, particularly now during the COVID times. We typically send out one team pre-COVID. We'd have three people in a car, one person driving, one person taking photographs, one person spotting to see where the building was visible. We are now down to three separate cars, three individuals with cameras. So for safety reasons, we have to target our locations that we take photographs from a little bit better. And in doing so, we have a preliminary viewshed map that's put together ahead of the final product that you see in the application. We use that to target areas of where predicted visibility may be, and we also continue to drive the entire area, but we really focus primarily where we're expected to see something.

I'm just looking to see where Wagon

Wheel is now. Okay, yes, so the topography there, there's that deadend down off Leach Hollow Road, if I'm seeing the map correctly here. The topography goes down substantially towards the water there. There is no predicted visibility in that gully.

MR. SILVESTRI: So nobody traveled that just based on your estimate, if you will, or prediction due to the topography that nothing would be visible from that road?

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): I would say that it is very likely that they drove down that road and probably took a photo or two as well. Not every photo -- we take hundreds of photos while we go and do these two-mile study areas. Not everyone of them can make it in, otherwise this packet would be quite a substantial bit larger. So we sort of have to use our best guess and judgment to look at, you know, the entirety of the study area, what are areas that could have some visual impacts. And those areas that we think might have a visual impact that don't, we really try and pick and choose precisely where the non-visibility shots are.

MR. SILVESTRI: I hear what you're

saying. I just found it kind of interesting that with other photos that are present in the package that we received you do have "not visible from this location." I thought it might follow suit that, okay, if you didn't have anything visible at Wagon Wheel, you might have a picture that says "not visible from this location." That's where I'm coming from.

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yeah. When we perform our visibility analysis and our drive test, we're not looking necessarily at the site search summary provided by Homeland Towers. So there's no correlation to what photos we take and what's on the site search summary, if that makes sense.

MR. SILVESTRI: All right. Let me move on from there, but I want to stay with potential visual impact, if you will. Has there been any attempt to quote/unquote camouflage the tower specifically by having a monopine instead of a monopole or by having a watch tower or something else?

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): I think in this area, first I'll say the visibility here is good, as far as the site goes, it's almost as good as

you can get. There's less than a half a percent of predicted visibility. It's really focused in two main pockets. Where the tower is visible above the tree line or at the tree line, there's no -- it's mainly deciduous forest. There's no pine trees in the area, so a monopine, while it might blend in in some locations, I think overall where that tower sticks up a little bit higher above the tree line is going to stick out like a sore thumb. At the distances where the tower is visible above the tree line is a pretty small profile compared to the greater width of the views. So a monopine, you'd add, you increase that visibility by creating branching that goes out farther than the antenna arrays.

The watch tower design is very similar as well. You're talking a 170 foot fire watch tower. I'm not a structural engineer, but I would -- I think it's safe to say that structurally you would have to build that out substantially wider at the top of that tower for it to work. So again, you're creating more of a visual impact in those cases.

MR. SILVESTRI: Anything on potential paint colors that could help quote/unquote

minimize visual impact?

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

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): You know, we sort of discussed, you know, paint the bottom brown, the top sky blue, which can work certainly to help diminish some of the views I think nearer to the site, you know, where potential abutting property owners, neighbors, are looking up through the trees it can help to camouflage it a bit. The galvanized steel gray finish tends to weather over time pretty nicely, and it blends in a little bit better in all weather conditions, where sky blue is, you know, maybe if we were down in sunny Florida and there's blue skies all year round, that's not such a bad thing. Up here where we tend to have some pretty gray seasons, the galvanized finish does a good job blending in year round as opposed to just on certain days and certain weather conditions.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you for your response. I have kind of a follow-up question is my next one to some questions that were posed by Mr. Mercier. Let me start with the first one I have and then we'll continue on with the second. Some resident comments as well as the P&Z commission voiced concerns about a history of

problems with runoff and erosion at the site and surrounding parcels. So the first question I have for you, if the project is approved, how would construction and access and post-construction not exacerbate and possibly improve existing conditions and concerns?

THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns, All Points. Well, construction would proceed in accordance with a detailed sequence of construction which would incorporate the sediment erosion control measures as shown on the drawings. Post-construction, I believe a time frame for a periodic inspection of those measures, mainly the swales and the check dams, should be performed perhaps quarterly by Homeland, and that's what I would recommend.

MR. SILVESTRI: All right. Let me pose a part two that there's also concern about the size and nature of Coote Hill Road regarding access for construction vehicles, drainage pipes, slopes and additional access. These were summarized in a November 30, 2020 letter by Mr. Peter Kuring that was written to Mr. Vergati and that we have on file. And I'm curious if any responses were provided to Mr. Kuring; and if not,

how would you respond to those concerns?

THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati,
Homeland Towers. I've had correspondence with
Peter Kuring who's a resident on Coote Hill Road.
I explained to him that this is an unmanned
facility. Yes, certainly during construction
there will be vehicles that traverse Coote Hill
Road to access the site, but once the site is
constructed, being an unmanned facility, we don't
have FedEx trucks going to the site, we don't have
UPS trucks going to the site. We just have very
little vehicular traffic.

And, you know, it's very convenient for people to pick on us. And I just want to point out to Council members, if we were building a home, we wouldn't be going through some of the questions that Peter asked or other folks asked. I choose my words carefully in the sense that I know Mr. Kuring has just finished putting in an inground pool, has a bulldozer sitting on his property. And I don't know if he was scrutinized during that process and had questions from the zoning enforcement officer or others questioning the construction or crossing the bridge with a cement truck or asking for a bond for the bridge.

So I just point that out in fairness, because when I see someone make a false statement, I feel the need to correct it on the record. So my conversations with Peter have been cordial, but he understands obviously where we're coming from.

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

MR. SILVESTRI: I do understand, Mr. Vergati, that if you were building a house we wouldn't be here tonight.

THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes. And I'll say that we play by a different set of rules. You know, I can't clear trees because of potential habitat for an Indiana bat, I have to go through -- you know, if I want to build a house with a salamander present, I don't know if, as a residential home builder, I'd be scrutinized. So we play by a different set of rules, obviously, when it comes to towers, and we respect that, and we adhere as best we can. But we're not bringing in a septic system, we're not putting down pesticides, there's no potable water. We don't have daily deliveries for trucks. I'm not having a lot of activity at the site. We're an unmanned vacant tenant for the most part.

MR. SILVESTRI: And again, from the construction aspect of it, we do look at traffic

concerns, what might happen. The question I have related to you, if need be, would you be looking to local PD, for example, to try to regulate traffic to make sure it's clear during construction that you could get your equipment in and that residents could be able to go in and out without any problems?

THE WITNESS (Vergati): Absolutely.

I've had conversations already with the town. And during construction, if the site is approved, we'll have the appropriate flagger safety orange vests out at the Coote Hill, Route 37 intersection. It's a death trap that road, the way people travel on it, and the rollovers, and we recognize that. And that's partly the reason, when I originally approached Mr. Jones, we wanted to separate those stone pillars so we have a wider swinging access for the construction vehicles. But, by all means, we have no issue working either with the state police or local police and having a flagger during construction.

MR. SILVESTRI: All right. Thank you.

I want to move on. Just a heads-up to Mr.

Morissette, I only have three more questions. I

know you're looking to take a break, so hopefully

I can finish these and then move on.

I'm not sure who this question would be directed to, but I've been reading about the predicted uptick in solar flares. The question I have for you, does solar flares interfere with cell service; and if so, what preventative measures can be taken?

THE WITNESS (Vergati): That's an interesting question. I think it's the first time I've heard that. Maybe Mr. Lavin can elaborate on that from an RF standpoint.

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, C
Squared Systems. As an amateur astronomer, I have
heard about them. I do not know any specific
impacts on our service as opposed to any others.
I know in terms of, yeah, it's more of a concern
for amateur radio and shortwave bands. Over long
distance communications there's a sunspot cycle of
11 to 12 years, and it comes and goes, and
alternately enhances and ruins the long-distance
communication on the long wavelengths. I don't
know of any impact on our systems. I don't know
of any measures taken at AT&T to mitigate anything
that might happen.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you for the

reply. I know the electricity industry looks at that very, very seriously because there's been disruptions, particularly with transformers, transmission lines and that type of thing, but I did want to pose the question on cell towers. Thank you.

THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think that might be related, the length of their lines is, of course, miles and tens of miles and hundreds of miles in terms of picking up that interference from space. Ours is, of course, quite a lot smaller.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. New question for you: The cell tower, as we discussed, would contain provisions for FirstNet. Could someone briefly describe how FirstNet operates but, in particular, if any specific equipment would be required by first responders, do first responders have to go out and purchase any type of new equipment to be connected to FirstNet?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): I'm just checking with Colonel Stebbins. In terms of equipment on the tower, it's 4G LTE. It's another radio just like the other 700 megahertz radio. It will be

there at launch. There is nothing specific on the tower. It's a subscription service as far as I know. The local fire, police, ambulance have to subscribe to the service. To give FirstNet service a priority, specifically they have to have FirstNet equipment that will be recognized by the system as FirstNet and be given priority. They will probably be using their own phones at other times. Those won't necessarily get priority service the way an actual FirstNet piece of equipment will.

MR. SILVESTRI: So if I understood that correctly, if you're looking at preferred service, you'd need a subscription and some type of specific equipment?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): You need subscriber access. Whichever local public safety entity has subscribed will issue those, purchase and issue those units to their employees so when they have emergency communications their communications will be immediately recognized as having priority.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. The last question I have references the draft document from the Public Safety Communications Committee.

Without going into too much specifics, they do mention that they would prefer that the developer consider the NLT property on Mauweehoo Hill as an alternative location to the Coote Hill site.

Could someone comment about the Mauweehoo Hill? I hope I pronounced that right.

THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati, Homeland Towers. It's a B plus effort on pronouncing it. It's "Mauweehoo Road." And actually the NLT, the Naromi Land Trust, which I believe now they're the Northwest Connecticut Land Conservancy I believe is their acronym or their name, they merged with the Weantinoge Land Trust up in Kent. And just from a history standpoint, these two sites that are located off Mauweehoo Road there's no street frontage. Access is from Wagon Wheel. And I've met with Naromi Land Trust over the years. They will not do a cell tower lease on their properties. I've done presentations for them, I've done field visits with them, I've done proposals with them.

And there are two takes. One, they were concerned with the health and safety, perceived health and safety of having a facility on Naromi property or the Naromi Land Trust

property. And the second being that they were concerned that if they were to allow a cell tower on land trust property that in the future people who want to donate the property would be apprehensive with the potential of a cell tower come to an open space property.

I want to go a little further in this.

I've worked with two administrations there in

Sherman, prior First Selectman Clay Cope, existing

First Selectman Don Lowe. He's also had, Mr. Lowe

has had numerous conversations with the Naromi

folks, the land trust. The Wagon Wheel sites

don't work. The RF engineer has ruled them out.

Naromi, or the land trust, is not interested.

And I understand Mr. Greenbaum who is intervening on this wants to keep pushing the two Wagon Wheel sites, 26 Wagon Wheel and 28 Wagon Wheel. And it's like Ground Hog Day. It's just kicking the can. They were looked at ten years ago, they were looked at five years ago, we looked at them again. We don't have an interested landlord, we don't have it working for the network, and we have serious access issues coming up from Wagon Wheel where there's 20 percent plus grades on a rock, granite, terrain side of a

1 mountain. 2 I've walked this property on two 3 occasions with the town, with land trust folks. 4 And, look, if we can build it there, I would love 5 nothing more than to entertain it, but it's been 6 ruled out on a number of items. So I just want to 7 make everyone aware of that, obviously. I know 8 Mr. Greenbaum thinks differently, and we'll 9 certainly hear from him on that, but we have 10 looked at it extensively. So has AT&T. 11 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you for your 12 reply. Mr. Morissette, that's all the 13 14 questions that I do have. Thank you. 15 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Silvestri. Before we take a break, however, I 16 17 would like to move on to Mr. Lynch to give him an 18 opportunity before we take a break. 19 Mr. Lynch. 20 MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. 21 I have to leave early so I appreciate it. I have 22 a few follow-up questions. Can I be heard? 23 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, you can, Mr. 24 Please continue. Lynch. 25 MR. LYNCH: Sorry about that. Just a

follow-up question to Mr. Silvestri's inquiries on the propane tanks and the size of the compound. It's my understanding, I looked at your compound plan, and it's my understanding from the people that put propane tanks in on properties that there has to be a space between the tank and the structure of at least 15 feet. And I don't see that here. And if you add more tanks, I don't see that there's enough room as Mr. Silvestri was inquiring about.

THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati,
Homeland Towers. I believe the spark zone that
you're referring to is not 15 feet, but it may be
10 feet, meaning the spark zone radius is 10 feet
from any other structures or electronics. I'll
look at Mr. Burns and ask him. I'll turn that
over to Mr. Burns. That's more of an engineering
question.

THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns, All Points. The spark zone from a propane tank is 10 feet. That's 10 feet from the fill valve on the tank to any other potential source of ignition. So a concrete pad is not a potential source of ignition but any other piece of equipment could be. And there are ways to, from 500 gallon tanks

and below, to reduce that by half by incorporating fill valves on the -- manual shut-off valves on the propane tank, but this one in particular has a 10 foot spark zone.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you for the correction. I knew there had to be a distance. I just didn't know what it was. But it looks like the concrete pad that your equipment building is on, it looks like that's within 10 feet. I'm looking at your compound plan. I think it's CP-1 or something.

THE WITNESS (Burns): Yeah, if you look at drawing C-1, which is the following drawing, there's actually a blowup of that area with the 10 foot spark zone shown on it, and that equipment cabinet is 10 feet away from the edge of the propane tank. And the fill valve can actually sit in the center on the top. We're just being conservative because we don't know what type of tank we'll actually put in.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you for the clarification. But another follow-up to Mr. Silvestri, if other carriers come in and add propane tanks rather than diesel for their backup generators, would you have to expand the compound

to accommodate them?

answer to that is I would say the next two carriers the answer would be no because they would more than likely take the two outer spaces. The third carrier coming in may have to depending if he wants a propane tank or wants to put the manual shut-off valve on the propane tank. So the fourth carrier in, if you count AT&T as the first, we may need to expand the fence, but there may be ways around it. So I know that's not a yes or a no, but it's the way I envision this compound being filled.

MR. LYNCH: Now, with that explanation, you're talking about the last carrier that comes in going down on the tower, what if it wants to go up, would that still apply?

THE WITNESS (Burns): For the propane tank?

MR. LYNCH: Yes. Well, yes.

THE WITNESS (Burns): The propane tank only fuels the generator which only supplies backup for the equipment on the ground. So it has no bearing on where they are actually on the tower.

MR. LYNCH: All right. Thank you for that clarification.

THE WITNESS (Burns): You're welcome.

MR. LYNCH: Now, I mentioned the tower can be expanded. Would that -- it can go up, I guess, 10 percent, so we're looking at maybe going up another 20 feet. How would that impact what's happening with the town and the equipment that's going on the top of the tower? So would that have to be moved higher or relocated somewhere on the tower?

THE WITNESS (Burns): A crystal ball answer to that would be they would need to move to the top, but there is plenty of room on this tower for four carriers, which is all that's in the market right now. But if it did need to be expanded, I think that they would probably have to go to the top.

MR. LYNCH: The reason I ask, because it is a rather remote location, and I'm sure the other two carriers that we're talking about may have similar problems to AT&T so they may look to go higher rather than lower is the only reason I'm inquiring.

THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati,

Homeland Towers. As Bob mentioned, we don't have a crystal ball to understand the future heights and needs by carriers at times, but I did receive written correspondence back from the Verizon Wireless engineer stating that if they were to come to the tower that they would accept the 150 foot, 6 antenna RAD center, and the tower would not need to be increased for Verizon's needs. That could always change in the future, obviously, as networks expand and retract to some extent, but all indications is that the facility at 170 would be adequate and sufficient for public safety and three or four carriers.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Mr. Vergati.

Going back to the maintenance on the site, is that something that, either Homeland Towers or AT&T, is that something you contract out or do you have an in-house service?

THE WITNESS (Vergati): Homeland Towers would contract that out. Typical maintenance is spraying during the season for weeds, but we don't really encounter much weeds between the weed barriers put down and the crushed stone in the compound. We need to make sure, obviously, that a tree hasn't fallen on the fence and damaged it

where it would need to be fixed. But I can speak 1 2 for Homeland. That is contracted out to various 3 construction companies. I'll let AT&T speak on 4 their behalf. 5 MR. LYNCH: Well, when they get up, they can speak on it. I have a question, 6 7 Interrogatory Number 9 you state that you see no 8 reason for blasting. But if you do have to blast, 9 would you notify the surrounding area that there 10 would be blasting on a certain date? 11 THE WITNESS (Vergati): We'd work with 12 the town on that. I'm not sure how the town 13 handles that, if there happens to be blasting. We 14 have not completed a geotech, to my knowledge, to 15 this date which may require or not require it, but 16 I believe we could provide notice as a courtesy, 17 and if the town has a certain requirement we can 18 work hand in hand with the town on that. 19 MR. LYNCH: Thank you. I think most 20 towns do have that requirement. Would you check 21 just to make sure? 22 THE WITNESS (Vergati): Homework

MR. LYNCH: Now, question Interrogatory
Number 10 talks about vandalism. And I noticed

assignment, absolutely.

23

24

25

1 you increased the height of your fences to 8 feet. 2 But it says you, within the compound you have a silent, you know, security alarm. Does that go to 3 4 a private security service or is it tied into 5 either the PD or the state police? 6 THE WITNESS (Vergati): I believe it's 7 tied into the carrier, the NOC, which is the Network Operating Center. If the alarm is 8 9 tripped, it goes to the 24/7 carrier network 10 center. 11 MR. LYNCH: Sorry, I didn't catch the 12 last part. 13 THE WITNESS (Vergati): Sure. 14 believe, if there's an alarm that's on the 15 equipment that is tripped for vandalism or 16 security purposes, that alarm will go to the 17 carriers. They have what they call a Network 18 Operating Center, a NOC, which is manned 24/7 by 19 live operators. And if that is tripped, they will 20 get a phone call automatically to dispatch 21 maintenance folks to that particular cell site. 22 MR. LYNCH: Thank you. Now, as far 23 as -- you already answered that. Sorry. 24 Now, this is probably a question for 25 If other sources of fuel were available for AT&T.

the emergency generator such as natural gas, would that get a priority over propane?

THE WITNESS (Vergati): I don't know the true answer to that question. To the best of my knowledge, there's no natural gas along Coote Hill Road and on the subject parcel, but I think it's carrier specific on how they look to their fuel source for backup, be it propane, natural gas, diesel. I think if this were a facility built in a Route 1 type scenario in a parking lot and there was natural gas readily available, they may go that route, it avoids refilling tanks and so forth, but that's a carrier specific question, I believe, and a site specific question.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you. Going back to security for a second for Homeland, when we talk about vandalism, have any of your sites ever been vandaled, had a vandalism problem, and how do you handle that?

THE WITNESS (Vergati): We had a site during the construction phase in Ridgefield,

Connecticut that had vandalism during the construction phase of air being let out of construction vehicles and so forth. I have to say we've been very fortunate in the fact that our

sites have not been vandalized. Of course, from our perspective, it's just a steel tower, a fence 8 foot tall with typical anti, mesh, climbing. We've been pretty lucky, knock on wood. So to answer that question, no, I don't believe we've had any vandalism on our sites.

MR. LYNCH: Now, just a follow-up to that. You know, I've asked this before so I already know the answer, but I'm just getting it on the record. Has Homeland and also AT&T provided enough liability coverage in case there's an accident?

THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes. Our underlying ground lease has sufficient coverages, AAA, as far as the insurance goes, more than adequate. Being in the tower business for 20 years, it's a non-issue for us to carry the insurance requirements.

MR. LYNCH: Like I said, I knew the answer. I just wanted to get it on the record. I also want to compliment you for slipping in the pandemic part of your -- in the beginning of your application, very clever.

THE WITNESS (Vergati): It's reality, unfortunately.

MR. LYNCH: Now, as far as utilities coming into the site are concerned, you provide the utilities coming in from the outside to the compound; is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes, Homeland Towers will provide electrical utilities, in this case Eversource is the provider in this area, will bring utilities and trench, lay the conduit, bring utilities all the way up to the site at the demarc point, put in the meter backboard where the carriers will effectively plug and play on their own, they'll have their own meter account. We don't use electricity on the site, but we'll certainly bring it up to them where they can have access.

The same thing with the phone. We don't get involved with bringing the actual fiber or copper to the site. What we will do is typically the utilities run in the same trench, Eversource and Frontier, and we will provide that conduit for the telco circuits to be pulled to the site for the carriers' use.

MR. LYNCH: I'm not as concerned with electrical as I am with the phone because, if that trunk phone line goes out of service, the whole

cell site is down. So is that your responsibility or would that transfer over to AT&T to get that phone service back up and running again so they can actually start operating?

THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yeah, I think it's certainly the responsibility of the local telco provider if the site goes down. We can't control, obviously, if there's an aerial where there's phone circuits on a telephone pole and a tree takes it down. Obviously, we'd like to do everything underground ourselves to harden the site, but if the site were to go down and it could not operate effectively, again, going back to that network operating center, they will get an alarm to dispatch a tech to troubleshoot the issue at hand.

I've seen sites before where the carriers and/or public safety will have a microwave dish for some redundant backhaul, meaning if the site were to go down and a phone call cannot be put through, through a landline into the network, that they could literally backhaul the traffic to another tower site, assuming that site is still operable, and effectively keeping that cell tower intact for

carriers and certainly for the public safety aspect.

MR. LYNCH: You answered the second part of my question, but I'll add something to it. This, I guess, would be more of a question for AT&T. Is there an agreement in place with Frontier to get a priority to get a dead cell site up and operating?

THE WITNESS (Vergati): Could you repeat the question?

MR. LYNCH: The reason I ask is, there's no one there that remembers when SNET was still operating, but they had an agreement with the -- well, they were the carrier themselves, they had a priority agreement to get dead cell sites up and operating. I was just wondering whether anything like that exists with Frontier and the carriers. And, like I say, it's more of a question for AT&T. They can put it on the record later.

THE WITNESS (Vergati): I don't know the true answer. What I can tell you in my experience as a tower developer, when a site has gone down, be it telco and/or power, ice storms or whatnot, the town hall or the police department,

their phones start to ring and they get notice of that, and they'll make the appropriate phone calls as well. These become life savers, these cell towers. And I don't know if there's a priority to bring a cell site up, but I would think from a priority standpoint getting a house lit with telco circuits versus getting a cell tower lit with telco circuits, I think they'll pick the cell tower first.

MR. LYNCH: Now, I have two more questions, and one of them may be for strictly AT&T and the other one for Homeland, so I'll ask the Homeland one first. As I went through the application, I didn't see any -- I could have missed it so bear with me -- any reference to any research being done by Native American tribes like the, you've got the Schaghticokes out where you are in Sherman, you've got Golden Hill. I'm just wondering, do they have any priority as far as any rights to the agricultural land -- not actually agricultural, not agricultural, excuse me, archeology as far as the site is concerned?

THE WITNESS (Vergati): I believe we've done a Phase 1 and the archeological reports.

They've gone out there and done their shovel test

pits. I don't believe there have been any issues with that whatsoever.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you. And my last question is, seeing that you're close to the New York border, again, I think this is more AT&T, do the antennas have to be angled to a certain degree so as they don't interfere with anything going in and out of New York?

THE WITNESS (Vergati): I'll turn that question over to Mr. Lavin, the RF engineer.

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, C
Squared Systems. For FirstNet, no, AT&T has the
band 14 everywhere in the United States, so there
are no license boundaries. I don't think the
other 700, as far as I know, has a license
boundary problem with New York State. The only
potential one, and I'm not sure, would be cellular
A and B band 850. That's just the one. The other
bands would be reoriented to
accommodate (inaudible) --

MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Mr. Lavin. I was just curious. I know in the past that used to be a problem.

Mr. Morissette, I'm all done. And I have to leave, so I will check the transcript for

1 what happened after I had to leave. 2 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good, Mr. Lynch. 3 Thank you for your questions. We will now break 4 and return at 4:20. And I apologize for keeping 5 everyone so long for their break, but 4:20 we'll 6 be back. Thank you. 7 (Whereupon, a recess was taken from 8 4:06 p.m. until 4:20 p.m.) 9 MR. MORISSETTE: Welcome back, 10 everyone. We will resume with cross-examination 11 by Mr. Hannon. 12 Mr. Hannon. Mr. Hannon, you're on 13 Mr. Hannon? All right. You are breaking mute. 14 up and your feedback is delayed. I'm sorry, Mr. 15 Hannon, we can't hear you. 16 Mr. Hannon, at this time we're going to 17 move on to Ms. Cooley. If you could log off and 18 log back in, maybe that can correct your issues. 19 Ms. Cooley, we will continue with 20 cross-examination by yourself. Thank you. 21 MS. COOLEY: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. 22 I only have a few questions. Most of mine have 23 been answered in responses to Mr. Silvestri and 24 also Mr. Mercier. 25 But my first question has to do with

1 the wetlands themselves on the site. It appears 2 that the bulk of the wetlands to the southwest are 3 on a plateau. Was there any indication that there 4 were vernal pools in this area at all? 5 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Good 6 afternoon. Dean Gustafson, All Points Technology. 7 We did look at all of the wetland areas located on 8 the subject property to determine if there were 9 any supporting vernal pool habitat and none exists 10 or are supported by the wetland systems on the 11 subject property. 12 MS. COOLEY: Thank you. What about, 13 could you tell, or did you have any access to any 14 of the adjacent property? THE WITNESS (Gustafson): So to the 15 16 degree that we could view adjacent properties from 17 the property boundary, we did that, but we did not 18 enter onto any of the adjoining private 19 properties. 20 MS. COOLEY: And no vernal pools were 21 apparent from what you could ascertain? 22 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That's 23 correct, we didn't observe any vernal pools 24 immediately adjacent to the property either. 25 MS. COOLEY: Very good. Thank you. I

appreciate that.

answer that.

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): You're welcome.

MS. COOLEY: Now, my next question had to do with the trees on the site that will be taken out to build the road. Was there any indication that there were trees that would have, that might not need to be removed but would need to have limbs removed to allow access for some of the larger trucks? Is there a lot of trimming that's planning to be done?

THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns, All Points Technologies. The trees that are to remain closest to the road, probably in the areas where the access drive is almost at grade, probably require some limb trimming, but that's it.

MS. COOLEY: And what time of year are you anticipating that this work would be done?

THE WITNESS (Burns): Do we have a restriction for clear clearing? I'll have Dean

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Again, Dean Gustafson, All Points. For protection of the bat species, listed bat species, there's the northern long-eared bat, little brown bat, red bat, to

1 impact, to mitigate for any potential impacts by 2 construction of the facility, there's a 3 time-of-year restriction for tree clearing. So 4 tree clearing can only occur during the dormant 5 period for those species, November 1st through 6 March 30th. 7 MS. COOLEY: Okay. And the tree 8 limbing or trimming would also occur at that time? 9 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That's 10 correct. 11 MS. COOLEY: All right. Thank you. 12 Let me see if there were any other follow-ups. 13 Mr. Morissette, I believe my fellow 14 Siting Council members have asked all the other 15 questions that I was interested in. It's one of 16 the nice things about being at the end of the 17 queue here. So thank you very much. 18 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Ms. Cooley. 19 We'll now continue with -- try again with 20 cross-examination by Mr. Hannon. 21 Mr. Hannon, were you able to correct 22 your connectivity issue? Mr. Hannon? I'm sorry, 23 Mr. Hannon, but we're still unable to hear you. 24 (No response.) 25 MR. MORISSETTE: We will move on. Ι

have a couple of follow-up questions. In the meantime, Mr. Hannon, maybe you could call the phone number to gain phone access, maybe that would be helpful.

Okay. A couple follow-up questions for me. I would like to go to attachment 1 to the application having to do with the coverage gaps. In particular, I would like to go to -- just give me one second -- page 9 of the coverage analysis, which is the existing and proposed 700 megahertz coverages.

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, C Squared Systems.

MR. MORISSETTE: Hi, Mr. Lavin. I'm curious as to north of the proposed site there is a coverage gap below State Highway 39. Why is that?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): The terrain, we can see over the terrain to get down to 39. I think you're talking about the white interval between State Highway 39 and the site itself?

MR. MORISSETTE: Yes.

THE WITNESS (Lavin): The terrain drops down. That's the east facing side of the hill there. And once we get to the edge of that orange

there, it drops off too much for us to -- it's shadowed down to the highway, but then flattens out a bit for the state highway itself, and we're able to reach the highway itself, but not that intervening area because of the slope of the land.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So it kind of shoots over the gully, if you will?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. There's a depression there, essentially, in the profile, and it loses that area and then it comes back to the highway.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. While you're on the stand, there were comments, I believe it was from RCC Consulting, about reducing the height of the proposed facility to 120 feet. Do you have any comments on that and what your reaction to that is?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): I've only seen the presentation they've done. I don't know what technology it was done for eight or nine years ago. I don't know what exact location they had up here. I don't know -- I think their thresholds are on there -- I don't know what power they used or antennas or anything else. My estimation of coverage from here is that it does decline greatly

with decreasing height, especially along Route 39, and then as you go lower Route 37 starts to lose coverage too. I believe they're talking about 80 feet up there or something of that nature. I think that would be very highly ineffective at covering this area. You'd be down near the treetop levels adjacent to the site itself, as far as I know, and all the way down the slope to the roads, and you'd lose a great deal of signal height. In particular, their analysis in what they call the Coote Hill site versus height, I think they're fairly optimistic about what -- overly optimistic about what it would cover.

MR. MORISSETTE: So at a height of 120 feet that means the additional carriers would be --

THE WITNESS (Lavin): The additional carriers would be pushed down even further. If we, in our current configuration with platforms or gate bows (phonetic), or having the antennas externally on a triangular platform, we would be pushing them down, and we'd be 116, maybe 106, 96, and I don't see how you'd cover very much that you need to from here at those levels.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. I would

like to change topics. There was discussion about moving the facility away from the property boundary. I would like to get a reaction -- I think it would be Mr. Vergati -- as to how you landed where you landed on the site and whether there is a possibility to move the project site away from the property line and whether that is viable.

THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati,
Homeland Towers. We had worked in conjunction
with the landlord, RF, with Dean and the
environmental folks to keep away from any
habitats, and cognizant of we didn't want to lose
too much elevation. When we did relocate the
facility due to the potential habitat, we went
from, I believe, an elevation of 902.4 to roughly
878 in elevation, so we lost roughly 22 feet in
elevation to begin with.

So we kept it on the right side is where the terrain stays higher. And on this particular subject property it was the wishes of the landlord, they use the property extensively for walking trails and so forth, and didn't want us, per se, to be in their use of the property. So we had to pick the best location with a

1 combination, again, of everyone's input, landlord, 2 RF, and the environmental folks. 3 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. My next 4 question is relating to the culverts and the water 5 crossings. I think that's for Mr. Gustafson. 6 Good afternoon. 7 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): 8 afternoon. 9 MR. MORISSETTE: The access road, based 10 on the photos in the photo log from the field 11 review, first of all, it appeared very dry so when 12 the photos were taken it was what time of year 13 again? 14 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): I'll confer 15 with my colleague to get you the correct answer 16 here. April 20th of this year. 17 MR. MORISSETTE: You would think that 18 April 20th it would be somewhat wet. But anyway, 19 so the road, the access road, that is not an 20 existing road, it's basically a trail at this 21 point? 22 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Correct. 23 MR. MORISSETTE: So to build it, the 24 culverts are not existing at this point in time, 25 correct?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That's correct.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. And you would install culverts at both crossings for the newly installed access road?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That's correct, yes. And we would be utilizing natural stream crossing design standards approved by DEEP and the Army Corps of Engineers. Effectively, we'll bed the culverts a foot deep into the stream bed and then place stream bed material within the culverts. So what this effectively does is maintain the existing hydraulic connection both upstream and downstream of these highly seasonal intermittent watercourse features, and also allow for any aquatic organism movement underneath the proposed access road through those natural stream bed materials contained within the culverts once they're installed.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. All my other questions have been asked by my fellow Council members as well.

We will now go back to Mr. Hannon to see if he has been able to connect with us to continue with his cross-examination.

MR. HANNON: Time will tell. Can you hear me?

MR. MORISSETTE: I can hear you. Thank you, Mr. Hannon.

MR. HANNON: Hallelujah. It's been an interesting afternoon. That's all I can say.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Make it quick so you don't lose it.

MR. HANNON: I know. I do have some questions. For the record, on page 4 you talk about AT&T will deploy FirstNet, and on page 13 of the application AT&T will deploy Enhanced 911. Can you just briefly explain the difference between those two programs just so that it's on the record?

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, C
Squared Systems. FirstNet is for public safety
communications between public safety groups and,
technically-speaking, possibly out to the rest of
the world. And E911 is people having emergencies
contacting public safety answering points, or
PSAPs, and reporting their emergencies. I guess
the difference is, if you had an emergency, you
would call 911 and report it to a PSAP. They
would refer it to the proper first responders, and

those first responders might use FirstNet in order to get out to your location and assist you.

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

MR. HANNON: Thanks. I just wanted to get it on the record because you're talking two different programs.

On page 21 of the application there's a statement that says "no marking or lighting of the tower." So I understand that. But there was a discussion a little bit earlier in the day about the possibility of the tower being extended, so here's my question on this: Right now the existing tower is 170 feet high and it will accommodate the municipal whip antennas that extend another 22 feet, so it gets up to about 192. My recollection of sort of the magical number is 200 feet. So if this tower were to be extended 20 feet now brings the tower up to 192, but the antennas still have to be replaced at the top of the antenna, and that now goes up to about 212. Is that going to trigger any lighting or marking on the tower? I understand it's a hypothetical, but I'm just curious about that.

THE WITNESS (Lavin): There would have to be another FAA study, I know, and it would have to be the case that it's possible to put the

antennas on standoffs at their current level because they would have be to relicensed too. They'd be licensed for 170 feet, and the FCC would want to -- they'd have to get another license from the FCC to go up another 20 feet. It's also possible to put standoffs at that level on each side of the tower to put the whip antennas far enough from the tower itself to avoid having to raise them, but that's -- it would have to be a study based on the specifics of the application.

MR. HANNON: Thank you. I appreciate that. On page 16 there's a statement that says approximately 1,663 cubic yards of fill material are needed for the site. Does that include or does it not include the 712 cubic yards of crushed stone that need to be brought in?

THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns, All Point Technologies. Let me get to my notes here. So on the site there is 1,663 cubic yards of fill required. There's also 968 cubic yards of excavation that will happen which could, depending on the material, whether it meets spec, drop the amount of fill to 695 cubic yards. That does not include the stone.

MR. HANNON: Okay. All right. I was

just curious as to whether it included it or not.

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

My next question goes to page 17, and there's a statement that says that the two wetland crossings, you're crossing within the narrowest features of the wetland. That's not actually accurate to the second crossing. But here's kind of where I'm going with my question on this. Based on Tab 4, Map SP-2 -- and I understand, I think Dean is the one that said earlier today that these were intermittent streams on the site -that the first wetland crossing is about 10 feet of wetlands based on the scale, and the second wetland crossing, where you actually have it located, is about 30 to 35 feet wide wetland edge to wetland edge. And I know that on that second crossing there's a spot a little bit further to I quess like the east that's like 15 to 17 feet. So why can't you use that narrower wetland area on the second crossing? That's my first question on this.

THE WITNESS (Burns): For the record,
Robert Burns, All Points. At the narrowest part
there is a gigantic, and that's not an engineering
term, but a very large boulder there that we are
trying to miss because of the construction of the

road would be made difficult. It's also a boulder that the landlord wants to keep and it has some kind of value to him.

MR. HANNON: Okay. No, that's fine. I was just curious as to why you moved it away from the narrower neck --

THE WITNESS (Burns): Go ahead. I'm sorry.

MR. HANNON: I was going to say, so having said that, I guess one of the things that I've started taking a closer look at is have you considered installing any bottomless concrete box culverts and basically staying out of the wetlands altogether instead of installing pipe, working in the wetland area, because I think there are some ways that you may be able to mitigate working at all in the wetlands. So has that been even thought of in the engineering design of the roadway?

THE WITNESS (Burns): The pipes have been sized to pass a 100-year storm, so any kind of box culvert there would be a bit of an overkill. But with that being said, in order to even install that box culvert, we'd still have to go into that wetland to put that box culvert down.

So we feel that this is the minimal impact to the wetland by putting in the twin, at least on the second crossing, the twin 24 inch pipes and in the first crossing a single 24 inch pipe.

MR. HANNON: Let me take this down the road a little bit. And again, I don't know how often these communication towers might be dismantled because whether there's a change in technology so that it's no longer needed, would you be required to go back and sort of reestablish the existing wetlands as it is today versus having gone in and put in the piping? I'm just curious.

THE WITNESS (Burns): So are you asking if for some reason this tower needs to be removed if the wetlands would be reestablished in that area?

MR. HANNON: Yes. Would you have to go back and sort of put the wetlands back into their natural state?

THE WITNESS (Burns): I'm not sure offhand what the Council's requirements are for that.

MR. HANNON: Okay. No, I just thought I would ask. It came across my mind. Now, I know that the location of the tower was moved to try

and avoid any direct impacts to the slimy salamander habitat. And I'm assuming that after everything was worked out that's sort of the reason why you got that 79 feet from the nearest wetland boundary after trying to stay clear of the slimy salamander area?

THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes, sir.

MR. HANNON: And with respect to the other state-listed species, does Homeland agree to incorporate the best management plan recommended by DEEP including the tree clearing limits?

THE WITNESS (Burns): The answer to that is yes, and that this will also require a stormwater pollution control permit from DEEP because we're disturbing more than one acre. So that any requirements that come with that in terms of monitoring and best management is included in this project.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you. Behind Tab 1 the only coverage maps that I saw had to deal with the 700 megahertz. Is that the primary purpose of this particular cell tower project is to enhance the 700 service? I think there were comments earlier that there may be other antennae added, but it almost appears to me with the maps

that were shown that this is primarily for 700 megahertz.

THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, C Squared Systems. 700 megahertz is our best coverage, and it defines our footprint, so that's that's why we show it.

MR. HANNON: Okay. So what's the coverage with some of the other --

THE WITNESS (Lavin): 850 megahertz would be slightly less. 1,900, 2,100 and/or 2,300 would be considerably less. They are mainly there to grab whatever they can in terms of capacity which helps the 700 megahertz system reach as far as it can by being as lightly loaded as possible.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you. Tab 6, page 3, it mentions that a wetland protection plan will be implemented during construction. That will include an environmental monitor to maintain proper erosion sedimentation control measures throughout the entire duration of construction. Two questions on that. Are you looking at the environmental monitor as somebody different than the contractor doing the work; and two, has this plan been developed yet?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): The first

part, Dean Gustafson, All Points, the first part of your question is the answer is yes, it's an independent compliance, environmental compliance monitor. So the contractor is responsible for day-to-day monitoring, but through the wetland protection plan we'll have an independent wetland scientist perform compliance monitoring on a regular basis, including a pre-construction meeting with the contractor, to make them aware of the sensitive nature of the project area, what precautions need to be taken as far as protection of wetland resource areas. The plan itself has not been developed, but it will be included in the D&M plan should the Council approve the facility. But we have, All Points has submitted very similar wetland protection plans in several other dockets that have been approved by the Council, and they're follow similar formats.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you.

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): You're

welcome.

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

MR. HANNON: On sort of the same line on page 4 and 5 it talks about an invasive species plan. And has that been completed or would that be submitted at the time of the D&M plan?

1 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That would be 2 submitted at the D&M plan phase as well. We felt 3 that based on the current characteristics of the 4 forest, the general lack of invasive species 5 contained in the understory and the sensitive 6 nature of the habitats as far as them supporting 7 rare species, that this is an appropriate site to 8 employ an invasive species protection plan. And 9 it's really for precautions for the contractor to 10 take to ensure that they're not bringing on 11 materials that contain invasive species during 12 construction of the facility. So we've prepared 13 similar plans on other much larger projects, not 14 necessarily that have been in front of the 15 Council, but have been approved by DEEP as well as 16 the Army Corps of Engineers, and will be providing 17 a protection plan that meets those regulatory 18 standards. 19

Thank you. MR. HANNON:

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): You're welcome.

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HANNON: On Tab 10, page 2, the way that this is stated is, it states that Homeland would consider the following additional U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service voluntary conservation

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

MR. HANNON: And part of the reason I

measures where appropriate and as the project schedule allows. One, can you define what you mean by "where appropriate," and second, define what you mean "as the project schedule allows"?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): So that is fairly standard language that we include in our compliance for northern long-eared bat. However, with this particular project there are two other bat species. State listed northern long-eared bat is both state and federally listed. But with the protection measures for little brown bat and red bat, the recommended protection measures by the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection, the Natural Diversity Data Base letter, we have agreed to a time-of-year tree clearing restriction, so trees can only be removed from the period November 1st through March 30th. So that overrides the language with respect to northern long-eared bat. But that tree clearing restriction is protective of all three bat species. So it's not voluntary at this point because of the engagement with the Connecticut Those will be an absolute requirement for DEEP. the project to proceed.

was asking that is because Tab 10, page 3, I
believe it's All Points that makes a statement
Homeland will implement the recommendations. So
I'm seeing on page 2, yeah, we'll consider it, but
on page 3 you're saying yes they will do it. So
I'm just trying to make sure that what's being
proposed with these protection plans will in fact
be implemented.

will. And I apologize for the confusion. Your first reference is to the conservation measures that are provided by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service with respect to protection of northern long-eared bat, and those are entirely voluntary in nature. But to the degree of this project, we do need to adhere to that time-of-year restriction for little brown bat and red bat. So in this particular instance we probably should have clarified the earlier language and synched it up with what's actually required for this site. So I apologize for the confusion.

MR. HANNON: Okay. And I actually think that's the end of my questions while I still have a connection.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Hannon.

MR. HANNON: Thank you.

MR. MORISSETTE: We heard you loud and clear. Next on the agenda is the continuation of the cross-examination of the applicant by Mr. Greenbaum. However, due to the time, I do want to make sure that Mr. Greenbaum has adequate time to pursue his line of questioning. So we will postpone his questioning until the continuation of the hearing on June 24th at 2 p.m.

So at this time we will be breaking for dinner. The Council will recess until 6:30 p.m., at which time we will commence the public comment session of this remote public hearing. Thank you all, and enjoy your dinner.

(Whereupon, the witnesses were excused, and the above proceedings were adjourned at 4:53 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE FOR REMOTE HEARING

2.1

I hereby certify that the foregoing 119 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original stenotype notes taken of the Remote Public Hearing in Re: DOCKET NO. 499, HOMELAND TOWERS, LLC AND NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC d/b/a AT&T APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATION OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY LOCATED AT 16 COOTE HILL ROAD, SHERMAN, CONNECTICUT, which was held before JOHN MORISSETTE, PRESIDING OFFICER, on May 25, 2021.

Lisa L. Warner, CSR 061 Court Reporter

Tisa Warelle

1	INDEX	
2		
3	WITNESSES: (Sworn on page 12)	
4	RAYMOND VERGATI HARRY CAREY	
5	ROBERT BURNS MICHAEL LIBERTINE	
6	DEAN GUSTAFSON BRIAN GAUDET	
7	MARTIN LAVIN DAN STEBBINS	
8	EXAMINERS:	PAGE
9	Ms. Chiocchio (Direct)	12
10	Mr. Mercier (Start of cross)	18
11	Mr. Silvestri	56
12	Mr. Lynch	82
13	Ms. Cooley	97
14	Mr. Morissette	100
15	Mr. Hannon	107
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	Index: (Cont'd)	
2		
3	APPLICANTS' EXHIBITS	
4	(Received in evidence)	
5	EXHIBIT DESCRIPTION P	AGE
6 7	<pre>II-B-1 Application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need filed by Homeland Towers, LLC and</pre>	17
8	New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T), received March 12, 2021, and attachments and bulk file exhibits including:	
9	Bulk file exhibits:	
10 11	a. Town of Sherman Plan of Conservation and Developmentb. Town of Sherman Zoning	
12	Regulations c. Town of Sherman Zoning map d. Town of Sherman Inland Wetlands	
13 14	and Watercourses Regulations e. Technical report	
15	<pre>II-B-2 Applicants' Affidavit of Publication, dated March 24, 2021.</pre>	17
16 17	<pre>II-B-3 Signed protective order, dated May 6, 2021.</pre>	17
18	<pre>II-B-4 Applicants' responses to Council interrogatories, Set One, dated May 11, 2021.</pre>	17
19 20	II-B-5 Applicants' supplemental submission, dated May 18, 2021.	17
21	II-B-6 Applicants' response to Stan Greenbaum's adjournment request and relate	17 ed
22	comments, dated May 18, 2021.	
24	*All exhibits retained by the Council.	
25		