



HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 . . .Verbatim proceedings of a hearing  
2 before the State of Connecticut Siting Council in the  
3 matter of an application by North Atlantic Towers, LLC,  
4 and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC, (AT&T), held at the  
5 Woodstock Town Hall, 415 Route 169, Woodstock,  
6 Connecticut, on January 10, 2012 at 3:00 p.m., at which  
7 time the parties were represented as hereinbefore set  
8 forth . . .

9  
10

11 CHAIRMAN ROBIN STEIN: Good afternoon  
12 everybody. I'd like to call to order the meeting of the  
13 Connecticut Siting Council.

14 We're here for Docket No. 423 today,  
15 Tuesday, January 10, 2012, so just a little bit after  
16 3:00.

17 My name is Robin Stein. I'm the Chairman  
18 of the Connecticut Siting Council. Other members of the  
19 Council are Vice Chairman Colin Tait; Brian Golembiewski,  
20 the designee from the Department of Energy and  
21 Environmental Protection; Larry Levesque, the designee  
22 from the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority; also Mr.  
23 Ashton; Dr. Bell; Senator Murphy; Mr. Lynch.

24 Members of the staff are Linda Roberts,

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 Executive Director; Melanie Bachman, staff attorney;  
2 Christina Walsh, Siting Analyst. The court reporter is  
3 Gail Gregoriades and the audio technician Aaron  
4 DeMarest.

5 This hearing is held pursuant to the  
6 provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General  
7 Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act  
8 upon an application of North Atlantic Towers, LLC, and  
9 New Cingular Wireless PS -- PCS, LLC, for a Certificate  
10 of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the  
11 construction, maintenance, and operation of a  
12 telecommunications facility located off of Route 198,  
13 Woodstock, Connecticut. This application was received by  
14 the Council on October 20, 2011.

15 This application is governed by the  
16 Telecommunications Act of 1996, which is administered by  
17 the Federal Communications Commission. The act prohibits  
18 this Council from considering the health effects of radio  
19 frequency emissions on human health and wildlife to the  
20 extent the emissions from towers are within the federal  
21 acceptable safe limit standard, which standard is also  
22 followed by the State Department of Public Health. The  
23 federal act also prohibits the Council from  
24 discriminating between and amongst providers of

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 functionally equivalent services. This means that if one  
2 carrier already provides service for an area, other  
3 carriers of the right to compete and provide service in  
4 the same area.

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

9 The parties and intervenors to the  
10 proceeding are the Applicant New Cingular Wireless and  
11 North Atlantic Towers, its representative is Attorney  
12 Chiochio from Cuddy and Feder, and -- Chris Fisher is  
13 not here, huh?

14 MS. LUCIA CHIOCCIO: That's correct.

15 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Alright. We'll proceed  
16 in accordance with the prepared agenda, copies of which  
17 are available here.

18 At the end of this afternoon's session,  
19 we'll -- we will recess and resume again at 7:00 p.m.  
20 And for those in the audience, the 7:00 p.m. portion of  
21 this hearing is specifically reserved for the public to  
22 make comments.

23 And I also want to note for those who are  
24 here and for the benefit of your friends and neighbors

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 who will be unable to join us for the evening session,  
2 that you or they may send written statements to the  
3 Council within 30 days hereof; and such written  
4 statements will be given the same weight as if spoken at  
5 the hearing.

6 If necessary, the presentation this  
7 afternoon may continue after the public session if time  
8 remains.

9 A verbatim transcript will be made of this  
10 hearing and deposited with the Town Clerk's Office in  
11 Woodstock for the convenience of the public.

12 Do we -- is there any public official who  
13 wishes to speak at this time?

14 Okay. We have a -- we have a motion --  
15 the Applicant's Motion for Protective Order dated January  
16 4, 2012. I'd like to ask Staff Attorney Bachman to  
17 comment.

18 MS. MELANIE BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr.  
19 Chairman.

20 On January 4th the Applicant filed a  
21 Motion for Protective Order for the amount of the lease.  
22 Staff recommends that the motion be granted on the basis  
23 of the conclusions of law in Docket 366.

24 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Do I have a motion?

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 MR. JAMES J. MURPHY, JR.: So moved, Mr.  
2 Chairman.

3 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Second?

4 MR. PHILIP T. ASHTON: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN STEIN: The motion is seconded.  
6 Any further discussion? Hearing and seeing none, all  
7 those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying  
8 aye.

9 VOICES: Aye.

10 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Opposed? Abstentions?  
11 The motion carries.

12 I want to call your attention to those  
13 items shown on the hearing program marked Roman Numeral  
14 I-D, 1 through 46. Does the Applicant have any objection  
15 to the items that the Council has administratively  
16 noticed?

17 MS. CHIOCCHIO: No objection.

18 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Accordingly, the Council  
19 hereby administratively notices these existing documents,  
20 statements, and comments.

21 Okay, we have comments from the state  
22 agencies, the Department of Public Health, dated December  
23 2, 2011; the Department of Transportation, dated January  
24 4, 2012; and additional comments from the Department of

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 Health, dated December 27, 2011. And we also have  
2 municipal comments from the Woodstock Conservation  
3 Commission received on December 30, 2011.

4 We'll now go to the appearance by the  
5 Applicant. Would you present your witness power -- panel  
6 for the purposes of taking the oath please.

7 MS. CHIOCCHIO: Thank you, Chairman. To  
8 my extreme left is Mr. John Stevens, next to him Mark  
9 Kiburz, next to him John Favreau. On my right John  
10 Markus-Pinard and to his right Scott Pollister.

11 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Okay. They'll take the  
12 oath at this point.

13 MS. BACHMAN: Please raise your right  
14 hand.

15 (Whereupon, the Applicant's witness panel  
16 was duly sworn in.)

17 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Do you want to -- before  
19 we begin by verifying the exhibits, do you have an  
20 exhibit that you want to show on the wall behind us?

21 MS. CHIOCCHIO: Yes, thank you, Chairman.  
22 We have a brief, about six-minute video of the site walk  
23 for the Council Members that were unable to make the site  
24 walk this afternoon.

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 CHAIRMAN STEIN: So I believe that -- yes,  
2 Mr. Lynch.

3 MR. DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.: Attorney  
4 Chiocchio, could you just identify which panel members  
5 are North Atlantic Towers and which are AT&T?

6 MS. CHIOCCHIO: Sure. Scott Pollister is  
7 with C-Squared Systems. He is AT&T's RF engineer. John  
8 Markus-Pinard is a Site Acquisition Specialist for AT&T.  
9 John Favreau is with Infinigy Engineering and he was --  
10 he worked on the visual and environmental on this site.  
11 Mike -- Mark Kibertiz --

12 A VOICE: Kiburz.

13 MS. CHIOCCHIO: Kibertiz -- I'm sorry --

14 A VOICE: Kiburz.

15 MS. CHIOCCHIO: Kiburz.

16 A VOICE: There you go.

17 MS. CHIOCCHIO: Sorry. He is the wetlands  
18 biologist also with Infinigy Engineering and worked on  
19 the environmental due diligence. John Stevens is with  
20 Infinigy Engineering and North Atlantic Towers site  
21 engineer and also site acquisition for North Atlantic  
22 Towers.

23 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Okay, I think this  
24 requires two things; (1) that the members of the Siting



HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 Council that are in the way of your presentation have to  
2 move; and also somebody has to hit the lights I guess.

3 (Whereupon, a video of the afternoon site  
4 walk was played.)

5 MR. JOHN STEVENS: Maybe I can just  
6 narrative some of this as we go along. This is -- this  
7 is the existing driveway for the landlord going up  
8 towards the house. So the first 400 feet -- or first 525  
9 feet of the access road is on -- is on the parent parcel,  
10 the landlord's parcel. So we're going to go around the  
11 corner of his house. It then leaves and goes to a second  
12 parcel, which we'll talk about in a second, but this is  
13 walking up the existing driveway to his house.

14 (video continues)

15 MR. STEVENS: Now we're going to turn left  
16 and leave the driveway and go to the left of the -- of  
17 the plantings. So here's where we leave the driveway.

18 A VOICE: Where is the house?

19 MR. STEVENS: The house is to the right  
20 about -- about 150 feet to the right.

21 A VOICE: So this -- is this where the  
22 driveway ends?

23 MR. STEVENS: No. This is still -- this  
24 is still on the parent parcel. The owner of the property

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 owns two pieces of property. This is on the first piece  
2 of property. The landlord owns both properties, so this  
3 is -- he has two -- two properties. The smaller property  
4 where his house is you cross that first and then go to  
5 the second property that he also owns, which is  
6 landlocked.

7 (video continues)

8 MR. STEVENS: So his house is to the  
9 right.

10 A VOICE: (Indiscernible) -- house on the  
11 left?

12 MR. STEVENS: That's the neighboring  
13 property. The property line is roughly in the tree line  
14 there.

15 (video continues)

16 MR. STEVENS: I believe when we hit this  
17 hedgerow here, it goes on to the second piece of property  
18 owned by the landlord. We -- (indiscernible) -- a wall  
19 at this point.

20 (video continues)

21 A VOICE: (Indiscernible) --

22 MR. STEVENS: Four thousand feet --

23 (video continues - voices in background  
24 indiscernible)

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 MR. STEVENS: Now at this point we head  
2 downhill to the wetland area. This is the -- this is the  
3 thickest growth we go through. Another 500 feet beyond  
4 here we -- we get back on an old woods road.

5 (video continues)

6 MR. STEVENS: It gets a whole lot more  
7 exciting in about five minutes. We come to an open over-  
8 grown field here just before the wetlands.

9 (video continues)

10 MR. STEVENS: Okay, here's the -- a  
11 wetlands crossing. This is the lowest portion of the  
12 site. From it rises to almost exactly 200 feet to the  
13 proposed tower location.

14 (video continues)

15 MR. STEVENS: And here we go left. You  
16 can see the stonewall is to the left over there. We go  
17 between the stonewalls, which is an old woods road, and  
18 continue on that woods road all the way up to the site.

19 (video continues - voices in background  
20 indiscernible)

21 MR. STEVENS: Almost there.

22 (video continues)

23 MR. STEVENS: Here we are.

24 (voices in background indiscernible)

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I just would like to say  
2 for the record that the following members, Professor  
3 Tait, Mr. Golembiewski, Dr. Bell, and myself -- who did I  
4 miss, anybody -- plus members of the staff did walk to  
5 the site earlier today, and the walk was far more  
6 enjoyable than watching this.

7 Anyway, so -- let's see -- Attorney, you  
8 have a number of filings that you want to enter into the  
9 record?

10 MS. CHIOCCHIO: Yes, thank you, Chairman.  
11 As listed in the hearing program under Roman Numeral II-  
12 B, 1 through 9, I'll ask my witnesses a series of  
13 questions with respect to those exhibits. And I'll start  
14 with John Stevens to my left. Did you prepare and assist  
15 in the preparation of the materials and documents listed  
16 in the hearing program?

17 MR. STEVENS: Yes.

18 MS. CHIOCCHIO: Mark.

19 MR. MARK KIBURZ: Yes.

20 MS. CHIOCCHIO: John.

21 MR. JOHN FAVREAU: Yes.

22 MS. CHIOCCHIO: John Markus --

23 MR. JOHN MARKUS-PINARD: Yes.

24 MR. SCOTT POLLISTER: Yes.

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 MS. CHIOCCHIO: Do you have any  
2 corrections or updates or clarifications to the  
3 information contained therein?

4 MR. STEVENS: John Stevens. No.

5 MR. KIBURZ: Mark Kiburz. No.

6 MR. FAVREAU: John Favreau. No.

7 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: John Markus-Pinard.  
8 No.

9 MR. POLLISTER: Scott Pollister. No.

10 MS. CHIOCCHIO: Is the information  
11 contained therein true and accurate to the best of your  
12 knowledge and belief?

13 MR. STEVENS: John Stevens. Yes.

14 MR. KIBURZ: Mark Kiburz. Yes.

15 MR. FAVREAU: John Favreau. Yes.

16 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: John Markus-Pinard.  
17 Yes.

18 MR. POLLISTER: Scott Pollister. Yes.

19 MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt this  
20 information as your testimony today?

21 MR. STEVENS: John Stevens. Yes.

22 MR. KIBURZ: Mark Kiburz. Yes.

23 MR. FAVREAU: John Favreau. Yes.

24 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: John Markus-Pinard.

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 Yes.

2 MR. POLLISTER: Scott Pollister. Yes.

3 MS. CHIOCCHIO: We ask that the Council  
4 accept the exhibits -- oh, I'm sorry -- and we have an  
5 additional -- No. 10 is the site walk video which we'll  
6 submit as Exhibit No. 10.

7 CHAIRMAN STEIN: (Indiscernible) --

8 AUDIO TECHNICIAN: Mr. Chairman, your  
9 microphone.

10 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Sorry. So the Council  
11 will accept those and make them part of the record.

12 (Whereupon, Applicant Exhibit Nos. 1  
13 through 10 were received into evidence as full  
14 exhibits.)

15 CHAIRMAN STEIN: We'll now begin with the  
16 cross-examination by staff. Mrs. -- Christina, you ready  
17 for cross-examination? Thank you.

18 MS. CHRISTINA WALSH: Thank you, Mr.  
19 Chairman.

20 Would the tower setback radius be within  
21 the property boundaries of the host property?

22 MR. STEVENS: Yes, it would be.

23 MS. WALSH: Do you know how far the tower  
24 is from the nearest property boundary?

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 MR. STEVENS: Give me one second please.

2 (pause)

3 MR. STEVENS: The -- is your question from  
4 the tower to the property line or the fence?

5 MS. WALSH: From the tower to the nearest  
6 property line?

7 MR. STEVENS: Approximately 135 feet --  
8 I'm sorry, 150 feet.

9 MS. WALSH: One hundred and fifty feet?

10 MR. STEVENS: Yes.

11 MS. WALSH: The SHPO -- the State Historic  
12 Preservation Office letter that's behind Tab 7 of the  
13 application mentions the construction of a 3,200 foot  
14 access road. Was this a different access road that was  
15 originally contemplated or was the number that they had  
16 written in their letter wrong, because the application  
17 states that the new portion of the access road will be  
18 4,265 feet, and those numbers don't --

19 MR. STEVENS: Yeah, the 4,275 feet --  
20 actually the total length using the existing driveway is  
21 forty-nine hundred feet, and that is the correct number.

22 MS. WALSH: So where did the State  
23 Historic Preservation Office get their 3,200 foot access  
24 road that was part of their letter?

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 MR. STEVENS: Yeah, that -- that may have  
2 been our initial road design where we didn't follow the  
3 woods road as closely.

4 MS. WALSH: So you had a different road  
5 design that you had submitted to them previously?

6 MR. STEVENS: I suspect that's what the  
7 reason was, yes.

8 MS. WALSH: And it was on the same  
9 property generally following the same --

10 MR. STEVENS: Yes. It -- it was always on  
11 the same property.

12 MS. WALSH: Okay. You don't have any more  
13 to offer about what their --

14 MR. STEVENS: I don't. It could have been  
15 a mistake.

16 MR. FAVREAU: Yeah -- this is John  
17 Favreau. I believe we submitted the revised drawings  
18 with the revised road design to SHPO. And to my  
19 recollection, we did receive a response from them. But I  
20 will need to look into that, but I'm virtually certain  
21 that we did receive -- I know we resubmitted.

22 MS. WALSH: Okay. Referring to the  
23 application, Tab 2, there's -- at the end of that section  
24 there's an aerial photograph and an existing tower list.



HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 Which sites of those listed is AT&T currently located  
2 on?

3 MR. POLLISTER: Alright, give me one  
4 second and I'll -- I'll answer that.

5 (pause)

6 AUDIO TECHNICIAN: A microphone please.

7 MR. POLLISTER: Sure. I just want to make  
8 sure this -- (pause) -- right, okay. The ones that AT&T  
9 are currently located on are No. 2, No. 3, No. 4, No. 6,  
10 and No. -- No. 7.

11 COURT REPORTER: One moment please.

12 (pause - tape change)

13 MS. WALSH: Okay. Is the Applicant aware  
14 of the tower -- the site at 445 Prospect Street?

15 MR. POLLISTER: I believe that's the -- is  
16 that the new -- that's not Prospect -- what's --

17 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: That's the new Verizon  
18 tower, is that correct?

19 MS. WALSH: Well I'm not testifying, but  
20 that would be -- right. Could you just identify what the  
21 distance and direction is from the proposed site to that  
22 site that was in question?

23 MR. POLLISTER: Yeah, I believe that's  
24 actually -- I'm sorry, let me find that data report --

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 (pause) -- yeah, this -- this is the -- the new Verizon  
2 site. It's 7.3 miles to the northeast.

3 MS. WALSH: Okay, thank you. Referring to  
4 the Council interrogatory responses, Question 4, could  
5 you provide the address of the last entry of the table  
6 that's part of that response? I believe it just says  
7 Ashford.

8 MR. POLLISTER: Do you guys know?

9 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: Yeah, the -- the  
10 address is 229 to 231 Ashford Center Road in Ashford.

11 MS. WALSH: Okay, thank you. And the  
12 entry just beneath that where it says Route 190 in  
13 Woodstock, is that referring to the proposed site?

14 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: That is correct.

15 MS. WALSH: Could the proposed tower -- or  
16 it's currently proposed at 150 feet, but could it be  
17 built to 110 feet and designed to be expandable to  
18 accommodate future carriers at another time?

19 MR. STEVENS: Yes.

20 MS. WALSH: Is -- how feasible is it to  
21 install utilities underground to the proposed site?

22 MR. STEVENS: It's -- it's feasible. It  
23 would require more site disturbance. Typically the depth  
24 of utilities will -- say it's 30 inches to trench it, but

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 it is feasible.

2 MS. WALSH: How much disturbance would  
3 already be part of the proposed site because of the  
4 building of the access road? Would it be significantly  
5 greater disturbance than --

6 MR. STEVENS: I would say no. No, it  
7 wouldn't be outside the existing area of disturbance. We  
8 would put it within the road right-of-way, right off the  
9 edge of the pavement, so it wouldn't require any more  
10 significant clearing.

11 MS. WALSH: So it would be possible --

12 MR. STEVENS: Yes --

13 MS. WALSH: -- if the Council ordered --

14 MR. STEVENS: Yes.

15 MS. WALSH: In Infinigy's response to the  
16 DPH comments regarding the Mansfield Hollow Reservoir  
17 Watershed, on page 2 there's a spill prevention plan  
18 section and it states that the City of Waterbury Water  
19 Department would be contacted in the event of a spill.  
20 And I'm just wondering why -- why the City of Waterbury?

21 MR. FAVREAU: I'm sorry, that -- that was  
22 an oversight. It would not be submitted to the City of  
23 Waterbury.

24 MS. WALSH: Okay, could you correct that

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 please?

2 MR. FAVREAU: Yes, I will. I will correct  
3 that and resubmit --

4 A VOICE: (Indiscernible) --

5 MR. FAVREAU: The Windham Water Board.

6 And that will be corrected --

7 MS. WALSH: Okay, thank you --

8 MR. FAVREAU: -- and resubmitted.

9 MS. WALSH: Are you familiar with the  
10 Woodstock Conservation comments -- Conservation  
11 Commission comments --

12 MR. STEVENS: Yes --

13 MS. WALSH: -- that were submitted to the  
14 Council? Referring to those comments, on what's labeled  
15 as page 3 there's a coverage map that says it was  
16 obtained from the AT&T website. Could you define in the  
17 -- define in the legend what best, good, and moderate  
18 coverage would be in terms of signal level?

19 MR. POLLISTER: The best answer I have for  
20 this question is there's no -- I don't know the absolute  
21 number that these equate to. These are relative measures  
22 that this map is not intended to specifically depict  
23 coverage to a high level of accuracy. This is more of a  
24 marketing map that's used for the website. And in fact

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 there's actually a legal disclaimer that points to this  
2 map being as just a first round of -- a first round of --  
3 an estimate of the coverage in that area. So, I don't --  
4 I don't know the actual numbers that these -- the signal  
5 strength that these equate to.

6 MS. WALSH: Okay, so are you still  
7 testifying that there's currently no existing coverage  
8 for AT&T in the area of the proposed site?

9 MR. POLLISTER: Yes, we are definitely  
10 testifying that there is a significant gap in AT&T's  
11 coverage gap -- in AT&T's coverage area where the  
12 proposed site is located.

13 MS. WALSH: And the gap means below what  
14 signal level of threshold?

15 MR. POLLISTER: Sure. A gap below neg 84  
16 is the coverage level that is defined as reliable for  
17 AT&T.

18 MS. WALSH: Do you have any information  
19 about what signal level is actually available within that  
20 area at this time?

21 MR. POLLISTER: I don't. It ranges from -  
22 - it -- if you look at the coverage maps that we  
23 submitted, I think you'll see that there are a lot of  
24 areas that are much -- that are below that level. And

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 that ranges from -- you know, I'd have to look at the  
2 actual numbers, but I'm sure that ranges from, you know,  
3 neg 110 to -- you know, up to just below that level. So  
4 in a sense there's large areas that are below the  
5 threshold level of varying degrees, some very poor and  
6 some -- some just -- you know, some a little bit below  
7 that level.

8 MS. WALSH: Okay, thank you. In the  
9 application, again behind Tab 8, there's a letter from  
10 North Atlantic Towers offering space on the proposed  
11 facility to the Town of Woodstock. Was there a response  
12 from the town regarding that?

13 MR. STEVENS: We've received no response  
14 yet.

15 MS. WALSH: Okay. And also in the  
16 application behind Tab 3, under Section 3G, it states  
17 there's 179 trees with a diameter of six inches or  
18 greater that would have to be removed for the proposed  
19 project. And in the responses to the Council's  
20 interrogatories it states that number is 466 trees with a  
21 diameter of six inches or greater. Could you just  
22 clarify which is correct?

23 MR. STEVENS: Yeah. We -- we believe  
24 conservatively that the higher number is more accurate.

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 So the -- so the 466 would be more accurate than the 170  
2 something.

3 MS. WALSH: Okay, so 466 is the number  
4 that's --

5 MR. STEVENS: Yes, that's correct.

6 MS. WALSH: Okay. And do you have  
7 information about what the existing height of the tree  
8 canopy is on the site?

9 MR. KIBURZ: The average canopy height is  
10 75 feet -- 70 to 75 --

11 MS. WALSH: Seventy-five --

12 MR. KIBURZ: -- depending on the species.

13 MS. WALSH: Who would be the certificate  
14 holder if the proposed site was approved?

15 MR. STEVENS: It would be North Atlantic  
16 Towers.

17 MS. WALSH: Okay. And I have a few  
18 visibility questions. From how many acres would the  
19 proposed site be visible in leaf-off conditions? I saw  
20 in the visibility map it mentions leaf-on conditions I  
21 believe. Is there any --

22 MR. FAVREAU: John Favreau. Based on the  
23 recent leaf-off visibility study that was conducted I  
24 believe in early December, we determined that there

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 really was not much of a variation. It's very difficult  
2 to put an exact number on the difference in terms of  
3 acres from our field study. But in comparing the  
4 visibility study that was conducted in August when in  
5 full leaf-on conditions compared to the December  
6 visibility study, it was very -- very minimal difference  
7 in terms of overall visibility.

8 MS. WALSH: So you don't have a specific  
9 different in acreage in leaf-on versus leaf-off  
10 conditions?

11 MR. FAVREAU: A specific number? No, I do  
12 not.

13 MS. WALSH: Okay. And do you attribute  
14 that to topography or evergreen type of trees or is there  
15 any -- do you --

16 MR. FAVREAU: Intervening -- intervening  
17 vegetation. Even in leaf-off conditions there were  
18 several areas where despite the fact that the leaves were  
19 off, the density of the existing trees was such that it  
20 would -- it would make visibility very difficult to  
21 discern.

22 MS. WALSH: There are -- there were a  
23 number of photosimulations in the application that show a  
24 tower at 150 feet and there was no corresponding



HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 photosimulations for a 110-foot tower. Is that saying in  
2 other words that the 110-foot tower would not be visible  
3 at that location?

4 MR. FAVREAU: No, we did not complete a  
5 110-foot tower for every single corresponding location.

6 MS. WALSH: So it -- so a 110-foot tower  
7 may be visible from a location if a 150-foot tower was  
8 visible from that location, but you didn't necessarily  
9 provide that? Is that what you're saying?

10 MR. FAVREAU: We chose locations that were  
11 most likely -- where there was most likely apt to be  
12 visibility of a 110-foot tower. Yes, it was -- it was  
13 selectively the locations from where the 110-foot tower  
14 simulations were selected -- let me start that over. The  
15 rationale for selection of which views to create 110-foot  
16 simulations from was based on those locations where even  
17 a 110-foot tower would have a chance of being seen. So I  
18 can't demonstrate 100 percent that in every location that  
19 does not have a simulation it won't be seen, but we  
20 deliberately chose those locations that were most likely,  
21 for instance the area around Shaw Road.

22 MS. WALSH: Okay, so you -- you chose the  
23 sites based on your experience and didn't necessarily  
24 provide a photosimulation for -- you didn't go through

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 all of the sites that you did a 150-foot photosimulation  
2 for and also do a 110-foot simulation --

3 MR. FAVREAU: I mean there were several  
4 locations where a 150-foot sim reduced to 110 feet would  
5 be invisible. So there's no point in doing a simulation  
6 --

7 MS. WALSH: But there was no -- but --

8 MR. FAVREAU: -- for that --

9 MS. WALSH: -- but that's not necessarily  
10 the case is what I'm getting from what you're saying?

11 MR. FAVREAU: I'm not sure I understand.

12 MS. WALSH: Okay, I -- my question was you  
13 did a number of 150-foot photosimulations --

14 MR. FAVREAU: From every location --

15 MS. WALSH: -- and --

16 MR. FAVREAU: -- where the 150-foot  
17 balloon was visible, yes, we did a photosimulation --

18 MS. WALSH: Okay --

19 MR. FAVREAU: -- right.

20 MS. WALSH: And there were some  
21 simulations at 110 feet also?

22 MR. FAVREAU: That's correct.

23 MS. WALSH: But there were not  
24 photosimulations at 110 feet for every site that had a

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 photosimulation at 150 feet?

2 MR. FAVREAU: That's correct.

3 MS. WALSH: So my original question was is  
4 that saying in other words that the tower visibility  
5 would disappear for all those sites -- for all those  
6 photosimulations that you did not provide --

7 MR. FAVREAU: I -- I can't say that  
8 unequivocally --

9 MS. WALSH: -- of 110 --

10 MR. FAVREAU: -- no.

11 MS. WALSH: Okay.

12 MR. FAVREAU: We wanted to provide to the  
13 Council with a representative number of locations that  
14 had the most sensitive visibility.

15 MS. WALSH: Okay. In the supplemental  
16 filing for visibility there was a simulated tree tower  
17 design. Could you provide some information about -- from  
18 your experience about how a tree tower design would blend  
19 into the existing area and the backdrop?

20 MR. FAVREAU: At a tower height of 150,  
21 from several locations it would not blend in very well  
22 because of the extent to which it extends above the  
23 existing tree line. In my experience, branch designs fit  
24 well at locations where the tower is not really extending

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 very high above the existing tree line.

2 MS. WALSH: So in your opinion would a  
3 110-foot tower be better suited for a simulated tree  
4 tower?

5 MR. FAVREAU: Yes, it would.

6 MS. WALSH: And does the top of that tree  
7 structure have to extend above the top of the tower?

8 MR. FAVREAU: Minimally, yes, in order to  
9 provide --

10 MS. WALSH: By how --

11 MR. FAVREAU: -- the illusion of a tree.

12 MS. WALSH: -- how many feet? Do you have  
13 an estimate?

14 MR. STEVENS: Yes. It typically goes  
15 about six to ten feet beyond the top of the tower to  
16 create, as John said, the final crown of the tree.

17 MS. WALSH: Okay. And would that type of  
18 structure be able to be extended in the future if  
19 necessary?

20 MR. STEVENS: Adding 40 feet would be very  
21 difficult. We'd have to take all the branching off and  
22 redo the branching, so it -- so it looks like a tree, so  
23 you don't --

24 MS. WALSH: Right --

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 MR. STEVENS: -- you've tapered it at 110.  
2 And now you go to 150 and you have to take those branches  
3 off and start again at a wider taper and go up.

4 MS. WALSH: Okay, so an additional 10 or  
5 20 feet may be easier --

6 MR. STEVENS: It would be easier, yes.  
7 Yes.

8 MS. WALSH: In both the application and  
9 the supplemental visibility filings, at Photo Location  
10 22, which is somewhere near the Chamberlain Mill site, is  
11 the distance of that photo location also 1.9 miles as it  
12 was in Photo Location 21? It didn't have a distance  
13 listed on that photo.

14 MR. FAVREAU: Bear with me for a moment --  
15 Photo 22 in the supplemental submission --

16 MS. WALSH: In --

17 MR. FAVREAU: -- the supplemental balloon  
18 float?

19 MS. WALSH: In both of them. I believe  
20 it's the same in both.

21 (pause)

22 MR. FAVREAU: Within probably 20 feet,  
23 yes, it's the same -- it's the same location --

24 A VOICE: (Indiscernible) --

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 MR. FAVREAU: Yeah, it's right in front --  
2 right in front of the building.

3 MS. WALSH: Could -- could somebody  
4 provide a description of today's balloon flight,  
5 including weather conditions and the height the balloon  
6 reached?

7 MR. FAVREAU: Yes. This morning the  
8 balloon was up in the air at 7:45 a.m.

9 The weather conditions were clouds --  
10 mixed clouds and sun. The winds were out of the  
11 south/southwest, ranging around five to eight miles an  
12 hour is the estimate.

13 The balloon anchor point was situated 21.5  
14 feet to the southeast of the stake I believe due to the  
15 presence of tree canopy immediately above the stake  
16 location itself. Based on the updates that I received  
17 from our representative at the balloon location, the  
18 balloon continued to be floated in the air at  
19 approximately -- well at 150 feet to the top of the  
20 balloon. The tether was 147 feet above the ground level  
21 and it varied with position. There was some deflection  
22 reported this morning and into the afternoon due to  
23 increasing breezes. But as of 2:30 this afternoon, I  
24 believe it was still in the air. I did receive reports

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 that the balloon popped a few times due to the  
2 significant wind that developed early this afternoon.  
3 It was replaced at least twice. I believe, John, you  
4 were out there as well. But the last I knew, as of 2:30  
5 this afternoon, it was -- it was still in the air at 150  
6 feet.

7 MS. WALSH: Okay. And do you intend to  
8 keep it flying until --

9 MR. FAVREAU: 4:00 p.m.

10 MS. WALSH: 4:00 p.m. If -- if the  
11 balloons keep popping, do you keep attempting to put up  
12 new balloons or --

13 MR. FAVREAU: Yes.

14 MS. WALSH: Okay. Some coverage  
15 questions. Did AT&T perform a coverage analysis at 110  
16 feet above ground level from the proposed site?

17 MR. POLLISTER: Scott Pollister. Yes, we  
18 did.

19 MS. WALSH: Okay. Could this be provided  
20 to the Council or is it already in the application that I  
21 --

22 MR. POLLISTER: I don't think it's in the  
23 application. We can provide -- we can provide a coverage  
24 map for that. I don't have it with me today, but we can

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 provide that.

2 MS. WALSH: Could you assess the  
3 difference in coverage between 147 feet and -- I'm  
4 assuming AT&T would locate at 107 feet if it was a lower  
5 tower --

6 MR. POLLISTER: Sure. The -- so the  
7 difference between the coverage areas at the currently  
8 proposed 147 feet versus the absolute minimum of 107, I  
9 can -- the best way I can describe it in terms of  
10 statistics and area in road coverage is from a -- from  
11 just, you know, a talking standpoint. So at 147 antenna  
12 centerline, the proposed site covers an incremental area  
13 of 6.04 miles -- square miles. At 107 feet, that -- that  
14 is reduced to 3.82 square miles. Population covered is  
15 again reduced from 775 to 556. In terms of road  
16 distances covered, again at 147 feet we're projected to  
17 cover just under five miles at -- sorry -- 4.8. And at  
18 107 feet -- this is just the major -- the major roads,  
19 the -- you know, U.S. -- the route number is 197 and 171  
20 -- at 107 feet that is projected to be reduced to 4.33  
21 square miles.

22 MR. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman.

23 CHAIRMAN STEIN: (Indiscernible) --

24 MR. LYNCH: Mr. Pollister, you could



HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 actually have a centerline at 110, you don't have to go  
2 down to 107, is that correct?

3 MR. POLLISTER: We could, but if the tower  
4 is limited to 110, typically we don't like the antennas  
5 to poke above the tower, so --

6 MR. LYNCH: But they could go above the  
7 tower?

8 MR. POLLISTER: They can. We would rent  
9 at 107.

10 MR. LYNCH: Thank you.

11 MS. WALSH: Thank you. Just a question --  
12 would the lower height open up any gaps along any major  
13 roadways?

14 MR. POLLISTER: At the lower height, it is  
15 not projected that any major gaps will open up along any  
16 of the major roads. Again, we are compromising some loss  
17 in area coverage obviously as I stated, but you don't  
18 lose any coverage along any major roadways.

19 MS. WALSH: Okay, thank you. Okay, some  
20 environmental questions. Did AT&T or Infinigy complete a  
21 wetlands report for the proposed site?

22 MR. KIBURZ: We collected all the data and  
23 then we provided it as part of our NEPA as an overview,  
24 that we recognize that there are wetlands there. We have

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 not filed any permits other than our brief conversation  
2 with the Army Corps in reference to the programmatic  
3 agreements on where we should proceed and what we should  
4 do. So the answer is no, we have no wetland -- official  
5 wetland report, but we have done all the background  
6 work.

7 MS. WALSH: And so were the wetlands --  
8 was there a field survey and wetlands were delineated and  
9 --

10 MR. KIBURZ: That is correct --

11 MS. WALSH: -- and soil types and --

12 MR. KIBURZ: That's correct.

13 MS. WALSH: Is this something that you  
14 could provide to the Council or do you have a report in  
15 your office that you could submit?

16 MR. KIBURZ: I could provide the Army  
17 Corps data forms that I used.

18 MS. WALSH: Based on the letter behind  
19 Tab 4 of the application, it's from Infinigy to North  
20 Atlantic Towers and there's a list of conditions that  
21 must be met for the wetland crossing to fall under the  
22 less stringent Army Corps of Engineers permit. And does  
23 -- does the proposed crossing meet those conditions?

24 MR. KIBURZ: At this juncture we believe

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 that is correct.

2 MS. WALSH: Okay. Is it still not in its  
3 final design as I believe it was stated somewhere else in  
4 that section that it was not in its final design, the  
5 wetland crossing?

6 MR. KIBURZ: The design questions -- we --  
7 we have designed this to try to minimize the 5,000 square  
8 foot disturbance with a bottomless arch culvert. So that  
9 is the design we're going to use. And we will do every  
10 effort to stay under the 5,000 feet to meet the  
11 programmatic agreements of the Army Corps.

12 MS. WALSH: On the following page there's  
13 a few bullet points and it states that AC -- or the Army  
14 Corps of Engineers will be willing to allow the less  
15 stringent review if you fall within those certain  
16 conditions --

17 MR. KIBURZ: Mmm-hmm --

18 MS. WALSH: -- but you would still need  
19 state approval I believe. Have you started any  
20 consultations with the Department of Energy and  
21 Environmental Protection?

22 MR. KIBURZ: Not at this time.

23 MS. WALSH: And would -- would you  
24 typically get a permit from them for this type of

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 crossing?

2 MR. KIBURZ: Yes, we would.

3 MS. WALSH: When would you do that? Would  
4 that be if the site is approved or --

5 MR. KIBURZ: Basically, yes.

6 MS. WALSH: And going back to the  
7 Woodstock Conservation Commission comments, on page 4 it  
8 mentions Atlantic Cedar Swamp. Is that the swamp that's  
9 -- or the wetland that's proposed to be crossed by the  
10 access road or --

11 MR. KIBURZ: No.

12 MS. WALSH: Is it some place -- do you  
13 know where it is on the property?

14 MR. KIBURZ: It is to the northwest of our  
15 project and it's in a different drainage basin.

16 MS. WALSH: Okay. Do you have an estimate  
17 of how far from the site area --

18 MR. KIBURZ: Not off the top of my head,  
19 no.

20 MS. WALSH: But it's on the host property  
21 to the northwest of the site that -- the area that would  
22 be disturbed by the proposed project?

23 MR. STEVENS: Just give us one second to  
24 find where it's located --

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 MR. KIBURZ: It's right there.

2 MR. STEVENS: There?

3 MR. KIBURZ: Yeah.

4 (pause)

5 MR. STEVENS: So the -- you want the  
6 distance from the access road or from the tower  
7 location?

8 MS. WALSH: I would -- I would prefer the  
9 distance from any area impacted by the proposed facility.  
10 So if the access road is closer --

11 MR. STEVENS: Yeah, it's -- the access  
12 road is closer, and it's roughly one thousand feet away.

13 MR. KIBURZ: Mmm-hmm.

14 MS. WALSH: Thank you. The NEPA review  
15 included in the application states that the Natural  
16 Diversity Database shows no state or federal listed  
17 species on the proposed site. Was there any further  
18 consultation with the Department of Energy and  
19 Environmental Protection for that?

20 MR. KIBURZ: We are currently in that. We  
21 have submitted to them and asked them for a consultation  
22 to verify what species. There's a bubble about a half-  
23 mile away. So in due diligence we're just checking to  
24 make sure we're not going to impact any species.

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 MS. WALSH: Okay, thank you. And would  
2 you submit any correspondence from the DEEP following  
3 when you receive it?

4 MR. KIBURZ: Yes, we would.

5 MS. WALSH: How would the proposed  
6 facility impact the Quinebaug Shetucket River National  
7 Heritage Corridor that Woodstock is part of?

8 MR. KIBURZ: You want my opinion or the  
9 people's opinion?

10 MS. WALSH: Just is there any -- any  
11 resources important to that corridor that would be  
12 impacted by the proposed facility?

13 MR. KIBURZ: Not that I'm aware of.

14 MS. WALSH: What type of resources are  
15 close by that are in -- is there -- is there specific --

16 MR. KIBURZ: Could you define resources?

17 MS. WALSH: Resources meaning any  
18 important feature of the corridor as defined by the  
19 mapping of the National Park Service?

20 MR. KIBURZ: As far as --

21 A VOICE: Close by --

22 MR. KIBURZ: -- close by? We do know it's  
23 in a greenway area, but we were unable to locate any  
24 trails directly associated with the parent parcel if

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 that's the kind of information you're looking for. I  
2 know there's -- there's canoeing access to one of the  
3 local ponds and the streams.

4 MS. WALSH: Okay. And finally, for the  
5 use of a proposed generator as backup power for the  
6 proposed site, would -- would AT&T have to apply for an  
7 air permit from the Department of Energy and  
8 Environmental Protection?

9 MR. STEVENS: No, they would not. They  
10 fall beneath the threshold.

11 MS. WALSH: Okay. What's the threshold?

12 MR. STEVENS: I don't know exactly. I can  
13 get the answer for you, but it typically involves a  
14 certain amount of output power. But I can get you the  
15 exact answer, I don't have it with me. But I know I've  
16 answered this question under previous testimony and it  
17 was -- it did not require an air permit. I'll get you  
18 the exact information.

19 MS. WALSH: Okay, thank you. I have no  
20 further questions at this time. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Thank you. Before  
22 turning it over to the other Council Members, I just have  
23 one clarification. Is there any discussion of  
24 potentially another access-way? And if so, could you

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 tell us what the status is if you --

2 MR. STEVENS: Yes. Three days ago we were  
3 contacted by an adjacent landowner who we had contacted  
4 during the process of looking for a tower location, and  
5 he had expressed no interest at that time. Seeing our  
6 application being filed, he did call us back again three  
7 days ago and offered his land for a much shorter access,  
8 access and utility easement. It's about 2,000 linear  
9 feet shorter. We don't have -- there's -- there's no  
10 deal yet. We are in conversation. And you know, given  
11 the fact that it's 2,000 feet shorter and there's no  
12 wetland crossing, we would hope we could reach agreement  
13 in the next couple of weeks.

14 CHAIRMAN STEIN: So time-wise this, would  
15 be within the next couple of weeks you're hoping to --

16 MR. STEVENS: Yes, I would think so.

17 CHAIRMAN STEIN: It's a rather  
18 significant, from your description, difference.

19 MR. STEVENS: Yes, it is.

20 CHAIRMAN STEIN: At this point, Professor  
21 Tait, do you have questions?

22 MR. COLIN C. TAIT: (Indiscernible) --

23 AUDIO TECHNICIAN: Microphone.

24 MR. TAIT: On page 2 of your summary, you



HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 mentioned a low-profile platform. Would you describe  
2 it?

3 MR. STEVENS: Yes. On -- on the plans  
4 that were submitted in the package we did not show a low-  
5 profile, we showed a conventional antenna separation off  
6 -- off the tower. A low-profile involves making the  
7 platform that the antennas are attached a little tighter  
8 to the pole. As opposed to maybe a 10-foot face, it  
9 might be a 5-foot face, and again pulled maybe within  
10 five feet of the tower.

11 MR. TAIT: It's still a platform?

12 MR. STEVENS: It is still a platform --

13 MR. TAIT: And not a T-arm?

14 MR. STEVENS: That would be another  
15 alternative. A T-arm is not a platform, but an arm --  
16 literally an arm like a lamp post that comes off the  
17 tower and holds the antennas.

18 MR. TAIT: Which is more visible from --

19 MR. STEVENS: The platform would be more  
20 visible.

21 MR. TAIT: And is there any reason you  
22 couldn't use a T-arm?

23 MR. STEVENS: We could use as T-arm.

24 MR. TAIT: On page 3 of your application

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 you say the utilities to serve the proposed facility will  
2 extend from the utility pole on the property. That can  
3 be aboveground or underground?

4 MR. STEVENS: The plans currently show  
5 utilities going aboveground.

6 MR. TAIT: All the way from --

7 MR. STEVENS: All the way from the  
8 existing utility pole on the landlord's property up to  
9 the site.

10 MR. TAIT: It would be a pole about how  
11 tall?

12 MR. STEVENS: The poles are typically 40 -  
13 - 40 to 45 feet tall, separated, if it's a straight run,  
14 every two to three hundred feet, but on corners to put a  
15 pole in the corner.

16 MR. TAIT: In your site search, which is  
17 Tab 2, No. 7, you contacted the Connecticut DOT. Would  
18 that site work?

19 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: From a -- from a site  
20 acquisition perspective, I was the one who contacted DOT  
21 --

22 MR. TAIT: I guess from your RF person  
23 would this site work?

24 MR. POLLISTER: We did not -- we did not

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 run the analysis for No. 7 because it -- it was not  
2 available.

3 MR. TAIT: Could you do so for us?

4 CHAIRMAN STEIN: A follow-up. When you  
5 say not available, was that because DOT said it was not  
6 available or because they didn't respond?

7 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: We -- we sent a letter  
8 -- (indiscernible) -- and followed it up with the Office  
9 of Communications Department at the DOT to hold  
10 conversations with them, and I did not receive any  
11 interest from the DOT, so we moved on.

12 MR. TAIT: Do we have a letter from the  
13 DOT --

14 MR. MURPHY: No, it's DEP.

15 MR. TAIT: DEP, okay, and not -- so -- do  
16 you know who you talked to?

17 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: I do not have a  
18 specific name. I know that they -- there was a news  
19 bulletin posted on the DOT website that advised me to  
20 reach out to the Office of Communications with a phone  
21 number for any -- (indiscernible) -- on the property.

22 MR. TAIT: And you did so?

23 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: Yes, I did.

24 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I'd just like to

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 reiterate we would like to see the analysis --

2 MR. TAIT: Yes. We're interested in other  
3 state properties that might be available, a sister agency  
4 might be of interest to us.

5 Again on your site search you list a  
6 search area with 11 ID numbers. You say Watertown  
7 search, I assume you mean Woodstock?

8 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: That is correct.  
9 That's -- that's an error.

10 MR. TAIT: And how many miles does that  
11 cover your site search? How far up did you go to get  
12 those 11?

13 COURT REPORTER: One moment please.

14 (pause - tape change)

15 MR. TAIT: You must have some line at  
16 which you stop doing that?

17 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: We did. I'm just  
18 going to measure --

19 MR. TAIT: Okay --

20 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: -- the furthest one  
21 away.

22 (pause)

23 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: I would say the  
24 furthest one is between 1.5 and two miles away that we

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 evaluated.

2 MR. TAIT: So within two miles -- is it  
3 fair to say within two miles that's what your  
4 identification area was?

5 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: Correct.

6 MR. TAIT: Okay. I had a nice walk this  
7 afternoon and it seems to me that I remember two wetland  
8 crossings. I was helped twice -- as an old man and  
9 gimpy, I was hand held from a very nice gentleman who got  
10 me across two places, both of which had water.

11 MR. KIBURZ: I had looked at that when I  
12 originally did my delineation and it kind of petered out  
13 in the woods and it evaporated. I was under the  
14 assumption that it was a water bog that had never been  
15 filled in, collecting water from somewhere. I followed  
16 it upstream and it kind of disappears too. So it's a  
17 feature and I -- when I looked at that, the second one, I  
18 just considered that it was just an upland drainage  
19 feature.

20 MR. TAIT: Which you could cover without a  
21 culvert or anything?

22 MR. KIBURZ: I believe that we have a  
23 culvert recommended for that area.

24 MR. TAIT: For both places?

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 MR. KIBURZ: The first area we're going to  
2 be putting in a 48-by-88 inch bottomless culvert --

3 MR. TAIT: Yes --

4 MR. KIBURZ: -- yes.

5 MR. TAIT: And the second crossing?

6 MR. STEVENS: There's actually -- actually  
7 three culvert crossings when we did the stormwater  
8 management analysis, and that is one of them. I think  
9 that has -- is getting a 36-inch culvert. There's one  
10 more --

11 MR. TAIT: A typical round one?

12 MR. STEVENS: A typical -- yeah, a  
13 typical round one. The other one I think is a 24-inch  
14 culvert.

15 MR. KIBURZ: But we'll make sure that that  
16 stuff is buried 15 percent for any aquatic or in the  
17 event that there's anything in the area.

18 MR. TAIT: Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Senator Murphy.

20 MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

21 Just -- just a few items. Frankly, when I read the  
22 application, I was surprised that your utilities were  
23 overhead because lately they're all underground and  
24 suspected that maybe you had an easement problem between

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 the road and this property. But that is apparently not  
2 the case?

3 MR. STEVENS: No, that's not the case.  
4 It's -- it's -- it's cheaper to go overhead. That --  
5 that was the reason.

6 MR. MURPHY: But in answer to a prior  
7 question, it is feasible to do it underground?

8 MR. STEVENS: Yes, it is.

9 MR. MURPHY: And in your negotiations for  
10 the potential new route in, I assume you'll have the  
11 ability to do underground as well?

12 MR. STEVENS: Yes, that's -- that's  
13 correct.

14 MR. MURPHY: If you had to. Just out of  
15 curiosity, from some of the things that you said in  
16 response to my question during the little flick we saw,  
17 is there one or two tracks between the property that  
18 you're leasing from the three gentlemen and the road or  
19 just one?

20 MR. STEVENS: There's just one -- one  
21 parcel that has a house on it.

22 MR. MURPHY: Okay. Is -- again from what  
23 you said is one or more of the owners of which you're  
24 leasing for your tower the owner of the property in

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 front?

2 MR. STEVENS: Yeah. I believe it's --  
3 it's the exact same ownership. They just changed -- they  
4 hold it -- they hold it in a different name, maybe for  
5 tax reasons.

6 MR. MURPHY: Alright. So there really is  
7 no problem legally getting through there then?

8 MR. STEVENS: No, there is -- there is  
9 not.

10 MR. MURPHY: Okay. The other problem I  
11 have with this file is the propagations done, Mr.  
12 Pollister, indicate that AT&T's coverage objectives are  
13 satisfied at 107 feet?

14 MR. POLLISTER: The -- the major coverage  
15 objectives are satisfied. Again as I mentioned, we are  
16 losing coverage in terms of population in square miles,  
17 so there's -- it's not like we're not giving up  
18 something. When I say primary objectives, the major  
19 routes are satisfied and --

20 MR. MURPHY: But you previously testified  
21 in response to an earlier question that there's no  
22 significant gap --

23 MR. POLLISTER: Not along the major roads  
24 --



HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 MR. MURPHY: -- between 107 and 147?

2 MR. POLLISTER: Not along the major roads,  
3 correct.

4 MR. MURPHY: I realize that there's a  
5 letter from Verizon dated June 11th from the property  
6 manager indicating that they'd like to go on this tower  
7 at 140 feet, but what is it in all this material and the  
8 testimony that I've heard or I'm going to hear that  
9 justifies to me as a Council member from finding as a  
10 matter of fact that there's a need for a 150-foot tower  
11 at this location? That's -- that's my bottom -- that's --  
12 - to get through all the other questions, I might come  
13 to, that's -- that's the bottom line.

14 MR. POLLISTER: Uh --

15 MR. STEVENS: The --

16 MR. POLLISTER: Go ahead.

17 MR. STEVENS: The answer to that is the  
18 site is designed to accommodate any and all comers for  
19 co-location. And with the typical 10-foot separation  
20 and, you know, five very active -- well, five -- five  
21 active licensees in the market, we took the lowest  
22 elevation that AT&T could use and added four on top, and  
23 then flip-flopped it to give AT&T the advantage of taking  
24 the top spot if all five show up. Assuming that the

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 lowest elevation is 110, 107 foot, it's really the lowest  
2 level that would be acceptable for any carrier, and  
3 that's how we got to the height.

4 MR. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman --

5 MR. MURPHY: I -- I -- I realize that  
6 that's probably how you did it, but how do we as Council  
7 members know how many others are going to come on? And  
8 what is there that is to convince me that Verizon really  
9 needs 140 feet --

10 MR. STEVENS: Verizon --

11 MR. MURPHY: -- other than this letter.

12 MR. STEVENS: Yes. And I would suspect --  
13 and I can't speak for them entirely, but I would suspect  
14 they simply took the second available spot realizing AT&T  
15 was over them. Given the frequency band that they have  
16 in this market and in many cases the same as AT&T, they  
17 would probably have -- I'm not sure where they are on  
18 other sites, but if they have a similar footprint as  
19 AT&T, they could take the next height up.

20 MR. MURPHY: Well let me ask you this  
21 question; when they were told that this tower was going  
22 to be available and you were going to be putting it up or  
23 filing an application to put it up, let me put it that  
24 way, did you indicate to them that you were making an

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 application for 150 or a 110-foot tower?

2 MR. STEVENS: One hundred and fifty.

3 MR. MURPHY: And so you suspect that  
4 they'd just drop 10 feet and say we'll take 140?

5 MR. STEVENS: Yes, that's --

6 MR. MURPHY: Which leads me --

7 MR. STEVENS: -- that would be the  
8 standard --

9 MR. MURPHY: -- which leads me to believe  
10 that they're just grabbing the highest they can get, and  
11 it may be that they'd be satisfied with less than 140 in  
12 their propagations. I mean that's as speculative as  
13 they're saying that they need 140. That's -- I'm just --  
14 I raise that point blank that that's -- that's the  
15 question that I have in reading this application over. I  
16 have nothing else at this time.

17 MR. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman.

18 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Mr. Lynch.

19 MR. LYNCH: Following up on Senator  
20 Murphy's, I have the same concern. And Miss Carter is  
21 very well aware of the process, and if they were going to  
22 be interested in this tower, they would be here declaring  
23 that they need 107 or 147 or 137. And I see no reason to  
24 bank antenna sites. So I agree with Senator Murphy that

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 it may not be necessary to go to 150 feet --

2 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I think --

3 MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

4 CHAIRMAN STEIN: That was more of a  
5 statement than a question I think. Dr. Bell.

6 DR. BARBARA C. BELL: Thank you, Mr.  
7 Chairman.

8 It's mentioned in the application that  
9 AT&T reviewed a site called proposed on Swedetown Road.  
10 What's the status of that possible tower?

11 MR. POLLISTER: Do you know where --  
12 where exactly in the application you're looking at right  
13 now?

14 DR. BELL: I think it's the -- it's the  
15 section where you describe your dealings with the  
16 municipality. Yeah, it's page 23. It's down at the  
17 bottom. There's a three line paragraph at the bottom and  
18 it says specifically the telecommunications task force  
19 inquired about the feasibility of co-locating on an  
20 existing tower at Sherman Road and on a proposed tower at  
21 Swedetown Road. And then at the top of the next page,  
22 beginning in the following paragraph, we're on page 24  
23 now, it says AT&T's RF engineers previously analyzed the  
24 Sherman Road and Swedetown Road locations and concluded

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 that they were not viable, and so forth. I see Swedetown  
2 Road on the map -- on one of the coverage maps and it's  
3 down to the southeast, but I don't see any marking there  
4 that there's a proposed tower or anything about it.

5 MR. POLLISTER: If I'm -- if I'm looking  
6 at the right site or correctly interpreting what you're  
7 saying, I believe that's a Verizon proposed site and the  
8 town -- the adjacent town to the southwest, Pomfret. So  
9 that -- that's a proposed tower by Verizon -- by Verizon  
10 Wireless. Obviously, if you're looking at the coverage  
11 map, it doesn't satisfy the coverage objective for this  
12 proposed site.

13 DR. BELL: Okay. So you're saying that  
14 you think it's a proposed -- a tower proposed by Verizon.  
15 Do you know -- you don't know anything about the status  
16 of it? How -- how come you're using the word proposed?  
17 I -- as far as I'm aware, we don't have a proposal from  
18 Verizon. So are you talking about some conversation you  
19 had with Verizon that it was speculative?

20 MR. POLLISTER: That facility was  
21 requested or inquired about through the town and we --  
22 and that's how we -- that's why we -- that's why we  
23 analyzed that location.

24 DR. BELL: So the only knowledge that you

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 have of it comes through the telecommunications  
2 committee, is that correct? They provided you with some  
3 information? You didn't get the information from Verizon  
4 you're telling me, is that correct?

5 MR. POLLISTER: That's correct, yeah.

6 DR. BELL: So somehow the  
7 telecommunications committee knew about this proposed  
8 tower, told you that it was proposed and gave you the  
9 latitude and the longitude to identify the tower, is that  
10 correct, or did you call up Verizon after the  
11 telecommunications committee identified something on  
12 Swedetown Road and then did you call up Verizon? I -- I  
13 guess I'm asking Mr. Pinard. You're responsible for site  
14 acquisition, correct --

15 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: That's correct --

16 DR. BELL: -- but this isn't acquiring a  
17 site though --

18 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: That's correct --

19 DR. BELL: -- this is just inquiring about  
20 a site. I'm just trying to get a line on --

21 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: Right, so --

22 DR. BELL: -- on what the status is.

23 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: The Swedetown Road,  
24 the proposed site is right near Ragged Hill Road, if

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 that's correct, which is an existing tower. So, I  
2 believe it was -- it was looked at and was found not to  
3 be viable.

4 DR. BELL: I'm not asking about -- I -- I  
5 -- I know it's not viable from your point of view. I'm  
6 not --

7 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: I do not know if it's  
8 built or not if that's -- if that's the question, I do  
9 not know.

10 DR. BELL: Moving along, following up on  
11 the question about a low-profile platform, I guess, Mr.  
12 Stevens, you commented on that?

13 MR. STEVENS: I guess I did.

14 DR. BELL: The Council of course gets  
15 these references all the time and -- but what we thought  
16 was a low-profile platform was simply a platform without  
17 a rail -- a rail to the extent that what we call a  
18 regular platform has a visible and substantial railing  
19 around it. So -- then there are low-profile platforms,  
20 our terminology and not yours, that don't have the  
21 substantial railing around. And what you were describing  
22 seemed yet another category. You were describing  
23 something that actually decreased the sector length of  
24 the platform and pulled it back towards the tower. Am I

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 correctly describing your description?

2 MR. STEVENS: Yeah. Maybe I'll try to do  
3 a better job since I don't think I did that the first  
4 time. So I'll start with the largest platform, and in my  
5 terminology would be a large triangle. From an  
6 engineering standpoint, we like that because it has -- it  
7 has a platform for the technicians to actually stand on  
8 and work on as opposed to not being able to stand up  
9 there and work on it. It does have a railing --  
10 typically two railings so the antennas attach both top  
11 and bottom to. The grating behind it, it's -- it's the  
12 one that's probably most readily seen in most states,  
13 it's -- it's a large triangle.

14 Going smaller, the next step down, and in  
15 my terminology is a low-profile platform, it gets rid of  
16 a lot of the grating, you know, less steel. It's still  
17 a triangle shape, it still has a top and lower railing,  
18 but has less room for the technicians to stand. They  
19 typically work on the outside of it at that point.

20 Going down to a T-arm mount, those are --  
21 it would be three T-arms if we have three sectors on a  
22 tower, and it's literally a steel arm that reaching off  
23 the tower and the antennas are attached on the face of  
24 that. It limits your flexibility because the antennas --



HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 you can't have a full 10-foot separation and structurally  
2 you can't make it that strong. So the antennas are  
3 pulled in closer, but it's simply just one arm that  
4 reaches out.

5 DR. BELL: Okay. So in your terminology  
6 if we start with a -- at the extreme close in level with  
7 something like a flush mount, what would be the distance  
8 of that as opposed to what you're describing as the  
9 distance of a low profile platform away from the tower?

10 MR. STEVENS: Just to clarify one more  
11 point, a flush mount can also mean an antenna attached  
12 directly to the pole itself, the monopole, only standing  
13 off maybe a couple of inches. In that case you're  
14 limited to three antennas, you know, one per sector  
15 because you're flush mounted against the pole.

16 I think I've got your question right, so  
17 going inward from a large -- from the biggest one for the  
18 10-foot face, it's about 10 to 12-foot off the pole, into  
19 a low profile and maybe five foot off the pole and maybe  
20 a five to eight foot face, to a T-arm and again probably  
21 a five to eight foot face again, to a flush mount and no  
22 extension off the pole meaning -- meaningful.

23 DR. BELL: Okay, thank you, that helps.  
24 On the -- a question on the monopine. The simulation

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 that you have looks a certain way. My question is if the  
2 Council were to go to a monopine design, could that  
3 design that's simulated be -- look different from -- more  
4 like a real pine tree than what is simulated in the  
5 picture?

6 MR. STEVENS: It -- they're -- they're  
7 actually pretty good -- they're -- there are pretty  
8 products now for stealthing and makes it look like a real  
9 pine tree as opposed to 10 years ago where the technology  
10 was awful. The challenge is, as I think John Favreau  
11 described on a pine tree sticking above the horizon, is  
12 if it's not back-dropped by anything, it looks like a big  
13 pine tree sticking way above the horizon.

14 DR. BELL: Yeah, I -- I heard that answer  
15 --

16 MR. STEVENS: Yeah, okay --

17 DR. BELL: -- and I respect that answer -  
18 -

19 MR. STEVENS: Yeah --

20 DR. BELL: -- but there are a number of  
21 views however where that isn't the case --

22 MR. STEVENS: Yeah --

23 DR. BELL: -- there are only a couple of  
24 views really where that -- where it stands out --

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 MR. STEVENS: Yeah --

2 DR. BELL: -- and would not blend in. So  
3 I'm asking a different question --

4 MR. STEVENS: Okay, I'm sorry --

5 DR. BELL: -- I'm asking simply -- I think  
6 you were trying to address it with the first part of your  
7 answer --

8 MR. STEVENS: Okay --

9 DR. BELL: -- which was that the  
10 technology has improved. You could --

11 MR. STEVENS: Yes --

12 DR. BELL: -- you could work on the design  
13 --

14 MR. STEVENS: Yeah --

15 DR. BELL: -- to make it look more  
16 realistic than what's provided in the simulation, which  
17 looks more like the old technology?

18 MR. STEVENS: Okay, yeah. And in fact, we  
19 could provide photographs of that. The ones we've  
20 recently built in the last six months I think look very  
21 good. We could show you actual pictures of the ones that  
22 --

23 MR. TAIT: Could you supply those --

24 MR. STEVENS: Yes, we could --

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 MR. TAIT: -- as a late file?

2 MR. STEVENS: Yes.

3 MR. TAIT: Give us a variety of the ones  
4 that you propose might suit this site.

5 MR. STEVENS: Yes. In fact what I'll do  
6 is I'll provide a simulation and I'll provide a picture  
7 of the actual construction and you can compare the two.

8 MR. TAIT: Is there any one nearby that we  
9 could see?

10 MR. STEVENS: New Hampshire would be the  
11 closest.

12 MR. MURPHY: A nice fieldtrip.

13 DR. BELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, those  
14 are my questions.

15 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Mr. Lynch, would you like  
16 to --

17 MR. LYNCH: I'll start with the backup  
18 generator. The -- I know -- Verizon when they deal with  
19 their generator, it runs once a month for 50 minutes or a  
20 half-hour. Is that also true for AT&T?

21 MR. STEVENS: Yes, roughly the same thing.

22 MR. LYNCH: Now how often is the tank  
23 refilled? It said in the application as needed. But  
24 does that mean that -- like there's a light that goes on

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 in our car that says low on fuel or do you have some type  
2 of regular schedule for --

3 MR. STEVENS: There's two things with the  
4 fuel tank. As needed is correct. It typically has to be  
5 refueled if there's a power outage and the generator  
6 actually goes into service. There is -- typically an  
7 AT&T technician goes once a quarter to visit the site  
8 anyway and checks the level. And there is also a remote  
9 level monitoring that goes back to their network  
10 operations center.

11 MR. LYNCH: Alright. That being the case  
12 then, if it (a) goes on and off for 15 minutes or half an  
13 hour once a month, the only time that we really have six  
14 hours of backup power is when the fuel tank is topped  
15 off, wouldn't that be correct?

16 MR. STEVENS: That's correct, yes.

17 MR. LYNCH: So the -- the new storm panel  
18 is going to hit you with this one --

19 MR. STEVENS: Yeah --

20 MR. LYNCH: -- so I'll just leave it at  
21 that, but that's what you're going to be dealing with --

22 MR. STEVENS: Right, we'll --

23 MR. LYNCH: -- because you could be -- you  
24 know, if it's not -- if you go six or eight months

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 without topping it off, you could be down to, you know,  
2 half of your six hours.

3 MR. STEVENS: Right, that's correct, and  
4 then --

5 MR. LYNCH: Presumably half.

6 MR. STEVENS: Right -- right. And then we  
7 -- and then we have an arm wrestling match on the size of  
8 the tank at that point.

9 MR. LYNCH: Right. Now the landowner is -  
10 - what is it -- Woodland Towers LLC?

11 MR. STEVENS: Yeah, Woodstock Towers --

12 MR. LYNCH: Woodstock --

13 MR. STEVENS: Yeah.

14 MR. LYNCH: Okay, Woodstock Towers. Now  
15 that sounds to me like they were in the -- did they  
16 solicit you to put a tower on this site?

17 MR. STEVENS: No. We contacted them  
18 first.

19 MR. LYNCH: And then they formed the LLC?

20 MR. STEVENS: That's correct.

21 MR. LYNCH: Alright, okay. Also, I find -  
22 - there's a new section that I haven't seen before in the  
23 application, the United States Policy and Law. It does a  
24 good job explaining what some of the Council -- some of

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 the questions some of the Council Members have been  
2 asking over the time period. So I guess somebody is  
3 listening. But it also goes on -- and I don't know if  
4 it's setting us up for denial and appeal, but -- my  
5 question is I find it very interesting and I found it  
6 very useful. But I also want to find out -- you talk  
7 about long-term LTE and then you talk about WiMAX. What  
8 is WiMAX?

9 MR. POLLISTER: WiMAX is -- WiMAX is a  
10 different technology that other operators are proposing  
11 to install or make available to the public. It's similar  
12 -- you can look at the differences between GSM and CDMA.  
13 It's a different technology. It's a different -- it's a  
14 different 4G technology.

15 MR. LYNCH: You know, what I found  
16 interesting is that when you were talking about LTE and  
17 the long-term evaluation, that you say in this section  
18 that eventually it's going to take over everything. It's  
19 going to take over cellular, PCS, and everything will be  
20 rolled into LTE. Is that correct? And --

21 MR. POLLISTER: As you know, it's very  
22 difficult to predict far into the future in the wireless  
23 industry. The current projections are that most wireless  
24 providers are taking an LTE type path to their 4G

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 deployments. So --

2 MR. LYNCH: If you want to keep up with  
3 marketing, you --

4 MR. POLLISTER: Correct.

5 MR. LYNCH: The -- the -- you know, does  
6 AT&T -- I'm still in a learning process here when it  
7 comes to files and clouds, alright. Is that something  
8 that you would store on an AT&T system or with Verizon  
9 or, you know, whatever it is under 4G? Would that -- do  
10 people pay for the use of the clouds? Is that something  
11 you do or does that come from Google or somebody else?

12 MR. POLLISTER: In most cases LTE provides  
13 you the ability to access large amounts of information or  
14 run applications that require large bandwidths. So when  
15 you're talking about cloud type applications or cloud  
16 type storage, the LTE is really your vehicle to access  
17 that data and sort of makes it possible. When you're  
18 talking about large amounts of data or applications that  
19 need fast bandwidth, LTE is again what makes that  
20 connection possible.

21 And to answer the second part of your  
22 question, I believe AT&T and/or Verizon may offer cloud  
23 type of services. I'm not a hundred percent sure of what  
24 they could be, but there's a lot of people that are



HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 offering cloud type services. Whether it's storage or  
2 whether it's other things of that nature, I think there  
3 are a lot of people that are offering cloud type  
4 applications.

5 MR. LYNCH: Now in Connecticut Verizon  
6 does not yet have LTE -- I mean -- excuse me -- AT&T does  
7 not yet have LTE. When do they presume to bring it into  
8 the state or out of the municipalities and out to  
9 Woodstock?

10 MR. POLLISTER: I think there are some  
11 areas of Connecticut that there are -- that they're  
12 implementing LTE -- installing and deploying LTE now.  
13 This site in particular is going to -- it's specified to  
14 include the LTE equipment and the LTE antenna. So as  
15 they're preparing new sites, they are -- they are  
16 preparing those for LTE. In addition, they're going back  
17 to all their old coverage areas and sort of rolling out  
18 new phases of them as they go. I don't have any real  
19 projections or real timelines as to when they would do  
20 more rollouts for LTE in Connecticut at this point.

21 MR. LYNCH: But it is coming is what  
22 you're saying?

23 MR. POLLISTER: It definitely is. There  
24 are definitely projects going on right now to convert a

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 bunch of their network over to LTE as we speak.

2 MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3 MR. ASHTON: Let me go back and pick up  
4 where Danny began. Also one of the things that caught my  
5 eye was the six-day generator supply. That's the first  
6 time I can recall AT&T or any carrier putting one in for  
7 that long of a duration. Can somebody explain why --  
8 what's going on?

9 (multiple voices in background,  
10 indiscernible)

11 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Which is it, because I  
12 think in the written material it says six days --

13 A VOICE: It says six days --

14 CHAIRMAN STEIN: -- so -- and you said six  
15 hours. So which is it? Was it a typo or --

16 A VOICE: Six -- six days --

17 CHAIRMAN STEIN: That's a very significant  
18 question --

19 MR. STEVENS: Sure --

20 CHAIRMAN STEIN: -- in view of the storms  
21 and the storm pattern which is really --

22 MR. ASHTON: That's why I'm asking --

23 CHAIRMAN STEIN: -- (indiscernible) --  
24 told the Siting Council that we should get some

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 consistency, but -- so which is it?

2 MR. STEVENS: Why don't we -- if we could  
3 check on that and get back to you after dinner because I  
4 don't -- I don't know the answer right now. We heard  
5 word that it was six days, but we just want to verify  
6 that --

7 MR. ASHTON: That would very --

8 MR. STEVENS: -- before we say that's  
9 emphatically true.

10 MR. ASHTON: That's -- that was, by the  
11 way, in the December 20th responses to the Siting Council  
12 Interrogatories, Set 1, and it was Question and Answer  
13 No. 13. So I did read the material.

14 The other one that threw me a little bit  
15 was that -- Question and Answer No. 23 talked about  
16 overhead power supply -- overhead utilities to this site.  
17 And Mr. Stevens, you said, quote, "It's cheaper to go  
18 underground," close quote.

19 A VOICE: No --

20 A VOICE: No --

21 MR. STEVENS: No --

22 MR. LYNCH: No, overhead.

23 MR. ASHTON: Pardon me, overhead. I beg  
24 your pardon. It's cheaper to go overhead. I would like

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1       you to produce a cost estimate with substantial detail  
2       signed by a PE or somebody who knows what they're doing,  
3       delineating the relative cost of overhead and  
4       underground. And I'd also like an explanation as to what  
5       is the cost of an outage due to trees coming down, such  
6       as we've experienced recently, and whether or not  
7       underground would be susceptible to that same kind of  
8       damage. Given the fact that you're talking about roughly  
9       two-thirds of a million-dollar installation and by your  
10      estimate a \$50,000.00 utility cost, I have great problems  
11      believing it's that -- it's a critical item in your  
12      budget, and I'd like you to enlighten me a little bit on  
13      that.

14                   MR. STEVENS: Absolutely. I don't suppose  
15      it would be good enough for me to tell you that I'd  
16      happily go underground at this point --

17                   MR. ASHTON: I'm sorry?

18                   MR. STEVENS: I don't suppose it would be  
19      good enough for me to tell you I'd happily go underground  
20      at this point --

21                   MR. ASHTON: You would be happy to go  
22      underground?

23                   MR. STEVENS: Yes.

24                   MR. ASHTON: Okay, so we can forget the

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 overhead then?

2 MR. STEVENS: Yes.

3 MR. ASHTON: Okay. That's -- well forget  
4 my request --

5 A VOICE: (Indiscernible) --

6 MR. ASHTON: We're making progress. Is  
7 there any town use of this proposed facility proposed by  
8 the town?

9 MR. STEVENS: Not at this time. We --  
10 we've offered space, but the town --

11 MR. ASHTON: Okay --

12 MR. STEVENS: -- hasn't said they need it  
13 yet.

14 MR. ASHTON: Is -- I did not get a chance  
15 to walk the site. I've got a little problem with my face  
16 being on appearances sake and it doesn't -- but from the  
17 video it looked to me though that that whole site had  
18 been extensively cut for wood. Is that a reasonable --  
19 and not too long ago -- is that a reasonable --

20 MR. KIBURZ: There's an existing trail  
21 that we believe was a logging road --

22 MR. ASHTON: Yeah --

23 MR. KIBURZ: -- and yes, the trees have  
24 been thinned out and it looks like it has been

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 maintained.

2 MR. ASHTON: Because I see a lot of stumps  
3 in there -- large stumps.

4 Visibility -- one thing that would be very  
5 helpful to I think the Council and certainly to me, and  
6 we've done it in the past, is where we -- if a tower is  
7 visible from the location, whatever it is, X, Y, Z, we  
8 talk about roughly a percent of the tower, is it the top  
9 10 percent, 50 percent, the whole thing, or what. If we  
10 could quantify that, that does make it much easier to  
11 render a judgment on is visibility a consequential item.  
12 So I'd be grateful if you could go back and at least do  
13 some work to try and sharpen that.

14 You mentioned the FAA review. And in some  
15 of the correspondence that has come into the Council,  
16 which I presume you have copies of, there is mention of a  
17 small airport that I'd never heard of before here in the  
18 area. Do you have knowledge of where that airport is?  
19 And I was looking for it possibly on the viewshed  
20 analysis map. And it's the one that's at the back of Tab  
21 5 in the original application.

22 MR. FAVREAU: Yes. It is indicated on the  
23 viewshed analysis map. It is northeast of the proposed  
24 tower, almost two miles to the northeast, and it's

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 identified --

2 MR. ASHTON: Oh, I see --

3 MR. FAVREAU: -- as landing strip --

4 MR. ASHTON: -- landing strip up there.

5 Okay. That it was -- the FAA was cognizant of that  
6 landing strip when they made their finding?

7 MR. STEVENS: I'm sure they were. I mean  
8 that's kind of their purview of who they keep track of  
9 and their responsibility. If it's -- if it's a -- if --  
10 I don't know the exact -- if it's a noted landing strip,  
11 if it's recorded with the FAA, they have jurisdiction  
12 over it.

13 MR. ASHTON: Do you know whether or not  
14 the town has any prohibition on new manmade structures in  
15 the heritage or historical areas?

16 MR. FAVREAU: I do not know the answer to  
17 that --

18 MR. ASHTON: You don't know that. Could  
19 you find that out?

20 MR. FAVREAU: Yes.

21 MR. ASHTON: I think it's a simple yeah or  
22 nay type answer.

23 And Mr. Tait asked for certain information  
24 concerning a monopine, but I didn't hear whether or not

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 he had asked for the incremental cost of putting up a  
2 monopine. So I think that would flush out Mr. Tait's  
3 request.

4 MR. STEVENS: Mr. Ashton, do you want the  
5 answer on that?

6 MR. ASHTON: If you know it offhand,  
7 fine.

8 MR. STEVENS: Yes. A -- let me give you  
9 an example -- it won't be the exact one, but it will give  
10 you an idea of magnitude. On one we just priced up, a  
11 conventional one was roughly 30,000, the pine tree was  
12 80,000.

13 MR. ASHTON: So two and a half times.

14 MR. STEVENS: Two and a half times as  
15 much, yes.

16 MR. ASHTON: Thank you. I think that was  
17 it -- (pause) -- yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, those  
18 are my questions.

19 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Thank you, Mr. Ashton. I  
20 think right now we're going to break -- you have just two  
21 quick questions?

22 (pause)

23 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Okay. Mr. Levesque, why  
24 don't you do yours and then we'll break for dinner.



HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 MR. LARRY LEVESQUE: The monopines, Mr.  
2 Stevens, is there just one maker of them?

3 MR. STEVENS: No, there's actually many  
4 makers --

5 MR. LEVESQUE: Oh. So it's not a matter  
6 of less suppliers and --

7 MR. STEVENS: No --

8 MR. LEVESQUE: -- and jacking the price  
9 up?

10 MR. STEVENS: No. It's just -- the  
11 difference in cost is the -- is the branching.

12 MR. LEVESQUE: Can you take a look at the  
13 150-foot monopole simulation, the photos, Photo 5 --

14 MR. FAVREAU: Which report? What --

15 MS. CHIOCCHIO: The one in the application  
16 --

17 MR. LEVESQUE: The -- the application.

18 (pause)

19 MR. LEVESQUE: You know, it's the ones  
20 with the -- later in with the tower -- do you have it?

21 MR. STEVENS: Yes.

22 MR. LEVESQUE: Now do you see -- do you  
23 see the pine tree or trees, there could be two or three  
24 of them, to the left of your --

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

1 MR. STEVENS: Yes --

2 MR. LEVESQUE: -- simulated --

3 MR. STEVENS: Yes --

4 MR. LEVESQUE: -- you're going to submit  
5 an example -- can you make it look something like that?

6 MR. STEVENS: Yeah, it would look  
7 something like that. Yes.

8 MR. LEVESQUE: I thought that was like a -  
9 - a good example. That's it, Mr. Chairman.

10 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Thank you. Okay, we're  
11 going to break until 7:00 p.m., at which time we'll have  
12 the opportunity for the public input, and we'll continue  
13 the evidentiary hearing either after that or at some  
14 future date. Thank you.

15

16 (Whereupon, the hearing adjourned at 5:04  
17 p.m.)

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR  
 JANUARY 10, 2012 (3:00 PM)

INDEX OF WITNESSES

PAGE

APPLICANT'S PANEL OF WITNESSES:

John Stevens  
 John Favreau  
 Mark Kiburz  
 John Markus-Pinard  
 Scott Pollister

Direct Examination by Ms. Chiocchio	12
Cross-Examination by Council Staff	14
Cross-Examination by Council Members	20

INDEX OF APPLICANT EXHIBITS

	NUMBER	PAGE
Application with bulk filings	1	14
Responses to CSC Interrogatories	2	14
Updated Visual Report	3	14
Response to DPH	4	14
Affidavit of Publication	5	14
Resumes of Favreau, Kiburz, Wells, Pinard and Stevens	6	14
Affidavit of Notice Sign Posting	7	14
Resume of Pollister	8	14
Affidavit of Balloon Float	9	14
Video of Site Walk	10	14