

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
SITING COUNCIL

* * * * *
 * * * * *
 NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS, LLC * MARCH 8, 2012
 AND NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS, PCS LLC * (1:05 p.m.)
 * * * * *
 APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF *
 ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND *
 PUBLIC NEED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, * DOCKET NO. 423
 MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF A *
 TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY *
 LOCATED OFF OF ROUTE 198, *
 WOODSTOCK, CONNECTICUT *
 * * * * *

BEFORE: ROBIN STEIN, CHAIRMAN

BOARD MEMBERS: Colin C. Tait, Vice Chairman
 Brian Golembiewski, DEP Designee
 Daniel P. Lynch, Jr.
 Edward S. Wilensky
 Philip T. Ashton
 James J. Murphy, Jr.
 Dr. Barbara Currier Bell

STAFF MEMBERS: Linda Roberts, Executive Director
 Christina Walsh, Siting Analyst
 Melanie Bachman, Staff Attorney

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE APPLICANTS, NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS, LLC
AND NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC:

CUDDY & FEDER LLP
 445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th Floor
 White Plains, New York 10601
 BY: LUCIA CHIOCCHIO, ATTORNEY
 CHRISTOPHER B. FISHER, ESQUIRE

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

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, held at the offices
5 of the Connecticut Siting Council, Ten Franklin Square,
6 New Britain, Connecticut, on March 8, 2012 at 1:05 p.m.,
7 at which time the parties were represented as
8 hereinbefore set forth . . .

9
10

11 CHAIRMAN ROBIN STEIN: Good afternoon
12 everybody. I'd like to call the meeting of the
13 Connecticut Siting Council to order this Thursday, March
14 8, 2012, at approximately 1:05.

15 My name is Robin Stein. I'm Chairman of
16 the Connecticut Siting Council.

17 This hearing is a continuation of a
18 hearing held on January 10, 2012 at the Woodstock Town
19 Hall in Woodstock, Connecticut. It's held pursuant to
20 the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General
21 Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act
22 upon an application from North Atlantic Towers LLC and
23 New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC for a Certificate of
24 Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 construction, maintenance, and operation of a
2 telecommunications facility located off of Route 198,
3 Woodstock, Connecticut. The application was received by
4 the Council on October 20, 2011.

5 A verbatim transcript will be made of the
6 hearing and deposited with the Town Clerk's Office in the
7 Woodstock Town Hall for the convenience of the public.

8 We will proceed in accordance with the
9 prepared agenda, copies of which are available on the
10 table.

11 I guess I should ask this even though I
12 don't see anybody, are there any members either from the
13 public or officials who would like to make a statement?
14 Hearing and seeing none, we'll now continue with the
15 appearance of the Applicants, North Atlantic Towers and
16 New Cingular Wireless.

17 The Applicant has submitted a new exhibit
18 since the January 10th hearing marked as Roman Numeral
19 II, Item B-10 on the hearing program. Attorney
20 Chiocchio, would you please begin by verifying the new
21 exhibit and verifying it by the appropriate sworn
22 witnesses.

23 MS. LUCIA CHIOCCHIO: Thank you, Chairman.
24 Our exhibit to verify -- (indiscernible) --

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, pull that
2 microphone up near you.

3 MS. CHIOCCHIO: Our responses to the
4 Siting Council interrogatories, Set II, dated February
5 22, 2012 -- no?

6 COURT REPORTER: No.

7 MS. CHIOCCHIO: I'll ask my witnesses a
8 series of questions to verify this exhibit. I'll start
9 with Mark Kiburz on the end. Did you prepare and assist
10 in the preparation of the materials and information
11 contained in the exhibit identified?

12 MR. MARK KIBURZ: Yes, I did.

13 MS. CHIOCCHIO: John.

14 MR. JOHN STEVENS: Yes, I did.

15 MS. CHIOCCHIO: John Favreau.

16 MR. JOHN FAVREAU: Yes, I did.

17 MS. CHIOCCHIO: Scott.

18 MR. SCOTT POLLISTER: Yes, I did.

19 MS. CHIOCCHIO: John.

20 MR. JOHN MARKUS-PINARD: Yes, I did.

21 MS. CHIOCCHIO: Do you have any
22 corrections or updates to any of the information
23 contained in the exhibit? Mark.

24 MR. KIBURZ: No, I do not.

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 MS. CHIOCCHIO: John.

2 MR. FAVREAU: Yes. I have two -- two
3 updates. Question 813, in my answer to the typo, the --
4 the number three, six inches or greater that it would be
5 removed. The new location or current location should be
6 166 instead of 156.

7 And my second clarification is Question 8
8 -- or Question 31. My answer says stone lined, it would
9 be where (indiscernible). And that should be 12 percent,
10 which would be similar on details to (indiscernible) D9.
11 That's it.

12 MS. CHIOCCHIO: Mr. Stevens.

13 MR. STEVENS: No clarifications.

14 MS. CHIOCCHIO: Scott.

15 MR. POLLISTER: No clarifications.

16 MS. CHIOCCHIO: John --

17 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: No clarifications.

18 MS. CHIOCCHIO: And is the information
19 contained therein true and accurate to best of your
20 knowledge?

21 MR. KIBURZ: Yes, it is.

22 MR. STEVENS: Yes, it is.

23 MR. FAVREAU: Yes, it is.

24 MR. POLLISTER: Yes.

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: Yes.

2 MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt this as
3 your testimony today?

4 MR. KIBURZ: Yes, I do.

5 MR. STEVENS: Yes, I do.

6 MR. FAVREAU: Yes, I do.

7 MR. POLLISTER: Yes, I do.

8 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: Yes, I do.

9 MS. CHIOCCHIO: We'd ask that the Council
10 accept (indiscernible).

11 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Yes. Any objections?
12 Hearing none, these are admitted.

13 (Whereupon, Applicant Exhibit No. 10 was
14 received into evidence.)

15 CHAIRMAN STEIN: We will now -- we'll now
16 go to cross-examination first starting with the staff --
17 which I expected to be there, but I guess Senator Murphy
18 decided he wanted to sit -- (laughter) -- so, Christina.

19 MS. CHRISTINA WALSH: Thank you, Chairman.
20 Just for the record for this docket, I wanted to confirm
21 that the originally proposed access road is now withdrawn
22 from Council consideration and the new access road is
23 what is being proposed?

24 MR. STEVENS: That is correct.

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 MS. WALSH: Would the amount of cut and
2 fill proposed for construction of the proposed site,
3 including the new access road, be the same as what was
4 previously proposed?

5 MR. STEVENS: No --

6 COURT REPORTER: You're going to have to
7 actually speak very loud and into the microphone --

8 MR. STEVENS: Yeah, not working?

9 COURT REPORTER: Not well.

10 MR. STEVENS: Okay. The number is
11 different. I think the previous number was 4,000 cubic
12 yards. The current number would be 400 cubic yards a
13 balance site (indiscernible) --

14 MS. WALSH: Balance --

15 MR. STEVENS: Yeah.

16 MS. WALSH: Okay. Response 13 of Exhibit
17 10 refers to an amount of disturbance in that table.
18 Could you just explain what disturbance refers to?

19 MR. STEVENS: Sure. We calculated
20 disturbance as any area that we would have construction
21 vehicles on, including the existing road where we're not,
22 quote, "disturbing," but we are adding gravel to the top
23 of it, so -- but we include that in disturbance. So it's
24 any area where construction activity would occur.

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 MS. WALSH: Okay, so that -- those numbers
2 may be different -- once construction is done, there may
3 be less area disturbed?

4 MR. STEVENS: Slightly less, yes.

5 MS. WALSH: Is it correct that there would
6 be two crossings of wetlands along the new access road?

7 MR. KIBURZ: That is correct.

8 MS. WALSH: And what type of culvert?

9 MR. KIBURZ: We'd use elliptical culverts,
10 one 15-inch, one 36-inch elliptical culverts.

11 MS. WALSH: Referring to Exhibit 10 again,
12 the response to No. 25 discusses an area of wetland
13 disturbance, so it would be twenty-five hundred square
14 feet. And then Attachment 2 behind that same exhibit
15 mentions an area of wetland disturbance, so it would be
16 thirty-one hundred square feet. Are these referring to
17 the same measured area or is there some difference that
18 we should be looking at?

19 MR. KIBURZ: The disturbances were
20 calculated based on the right-of-way, which is 20 feet.
21 That 20-foot right-of-way crosses the length of the
22 wetlands that we need to cross. So there's two
23 crossings. There's one short crossing where there's
24 already a ditch line dug by the loggers when they were

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 doing their work. And then there's a second one where --
2 along the logging road, there was nothing put in. I
3 believe it's about 110 feet by 20 feet. The worse case
4 scenario is approximately thirty-one hundred square feet.
5 It would be more -- it would be more like 21 -- or
6 twenty-five hundred square feet where the actual
7 disturbance would be, grading and (indiscernible).

8 MS. WALSH: So the measurement of thirty-
9 one hundred square feet was just being conservative on
10 your part?

11 MR. KIBURZ: Correct.

12 MS. WALSH: Do you have an estimate on how
13 much the new proposed access road would cost or add to
14 the cost of the project, assuming -- I guess the
15 difference in costs between the old access road and the
16 new access road --

17 MR. STEVENS: Yeah, the -- the -- the new
18 access road is approximately seventeen hundred and fifty
19 feet shorter. I would say the net -- the approximate
20 savings of that would be probably \$60,000.00.

21 MS. WALSH: In Exhibit 10 behind Tab 3
22 there are photos of I believe an existing tree tower
23 that's in place in New York?

24 MR. STEVENS: Yes, that correct.

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 MS. WALSH: What's the height of that
2 structure?

3 MR. STEVENS: That tree -- that monopine
4 is a hundred feet. And just to clarify, the first two
5 pictures shown, which are over -- over the existing
6 house, are the actual construction tower. The third,
7 fourth -- the third and fourth pictures that were done by
8 the Hoebich(phonetic) Group are -- those are simulations.
9 So what I tried to do is to show -- to do the simulation
10 and then the last two pictures are the actual tree tower
11 construction. I tried to show the fact that
12 (indiscernible) the rest of the profile, but in large
13 part it -- it looks similar to what the simulations show.

14 MS. WALSH: And would a -- would a tree
15 tower at the proposed location look similar in terms of
16 antennas extending outside of the branches?

17 MR. STEVENS: It could. These antennas
18 provide a 12-foot 6-inch center towards the top of the
19 tree, so they're basically at the edge of the canopy.
20 You could pull in a little bit, but it would probably
21 look very similar.

22 MS. WALSH: And would this be the
23 manufacturer that you would likely use for construction
24 of a monopine at the location?

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 MR. STEVENS: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Mr. Lynch, do you have a

3 --

4 MR. DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.: Mr. Stevens --

5 MR. STEVENS: Yes --

6 MR. LYNCH: -- you said --

7 COURT REPORTER: The microphone please --

8 MR. LYNCH: Oh. Mr. Stevens, just a
9 clarification. You said the first two pictures were the
10 actual tree. And then later on you said the last two
11 pictures were the actual tree?

12 MR. STEVENS: Yes. That's correct, yes.
13 The pictures were the ones that were done by the Hoebich
14 Group --

15 MR. LYNCH: Alright. And so the first two
16 and the last two are both the actual tree?

17 MR. STEVENS: Correct.

18 MR. LYNCH: Thank you.

19 MS. WALSH: Just to confirm, on -- also on
20 Exhibit 10 in Response 34 there's an estimated expected
21 year-round visibility and seasonal visibility for the
22 proposed tower. Is the acreage that's estimated for
23 leaf-off conditions in addition to the acreage that's
24 estimated for leaf-on conditions?

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 MR. FAVREAU: I believe if I understand
2 your question correctly, the 134 acre estimate were leaf-
3 on as compared to the number of (indiscernible) leaf-off?
4 Is that what you're asking?

5 MS. WALSH: Right. Is -- is the --

6 MR. FAVREAU: Yeah --

7 MS. WALSH: -- one hundred -- are they --
8 would they be added together to show --

9 MR. FAVREAU: No. The 139 is an estimate.
10 Five additional acres that would be -- that would have
11 visibility during leaf-off.

12 MS. WALSH: Okay.

13 MR. FAVREAU: So the 134 acres, plus an
14 additional five --

15 MS. WALSH: Five acres. And then in
16 regards to the consultation with the Department of Energy
17 and Environmental Protection for a determination of the
18 presence of endangered, threatened, or special concern
19 species, was -- what you sent them were the maps that
20 were included in Attachment 2? I think there was three
21 maps.

22 MR. KIBURZ: We had sent them the original
23 road and then the new proposed road. That was at a time
24 of transition between the two sites. So what we tried to

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 do was cover both bases.

2 MS. WALSH: Okay. So their -- their
3 analysis included both roads --

4 MR. KIBURZ: Correct --

5 MS. WALSH: -- and their determination of
6 no -- no effect would be for either --

7 MR. KIBURZ: That is correct.

8 MS. WALSH: Okay. Thank you very much.

9 No further questions.

10 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Thank you. Professor
11 Tait.

12 MR. COLIN C. TAIT: No questions at this
13 time.

14 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Mr. Wilensky.

15 MR. EDWARD S. WILENSKY: Yes. There's --
16 did you go to the historical society? And what was the
17 answer to this being a historical or a non-historical
18 district? I think there were some questions or some
19 letters concerning that. Is this a historical district?

20 MR. FAVREAU: It is not a national
21 registered listed historical district, no.

22 MR. WILENSKY: How about in the -- in the
23 -- in the vicinity of the tower -- in the vicinity of the
24 proposal is there -- where is there a historic district

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 in Woodstock? Do you know of one? Is it in any close
2 proximity to this tower proposal?

3 MR. FAVREAU: Not within one half mile of
4 the proposed tower location, which is the established
5 area of potential effect that was looked at through the
6 Section 106 review process.

7 MR. WILENSKY: So in other words, within a
8 half-mile you say that it is not -- not a historic
9 district?

10 MR. FAVREAU: Correct.

11 MR. WILENSKY: Okay. The other question I
12 have, you're proposing a 150-foot tower? Is that what
13 you're proposing here?

14 MR. STEVENS: Yes.

15 MR. WILENSKY: And the question is what is
16 the least height that you can have to service this
17 application? Because I know there was a hundred -- you
18 had talked about 110 feet, you talked about 150 feet.
19 What would be the least height you can --

20 MR. POLLISTER: (Indiscernible) --

21 COURT REPORTER: Do you have that
22 microphone in front of you --

23 MR. POLLISTER: Yes --

24 COURT REPORTER: You're going to have to

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 really speak into it.

2 MR. POLLISTER: So from AT&T's coverage
3 standpoint, we looked at the differences between 150 feet
4 and 110 feet. And there are some differences between the
5 two. So we're giving up coverage in some areas. At 110
6 feet we're still providing primary coverage to the area.
7 So I guess our minimum height would be one -- one-ten.
8 One-fifty allows us to provide a little bit better
9 coverage and allows for future co-location of other --
10 other potential --

11 MR. WILENSKY: Could you go with 140 or
12 130 or 120? Because we just talked about 150 and 110 --

13 MR. POLLISTER: Sure --

14 MR. WILENSKY: -- and not much for what's
15 in between.

16 MR. POLLISTER: Yeah, we could. We could
17 go in between that. Again, our minimum -- our definite
18 minimum is one-ten. That provides the basic primary
19 coverage we need for this area. Anything above that
20 obviously helps. And at one-fifty was our original
21 application because we thought it provided the most
22 efficient coverage for this area, as well as provided for
23 co-location. So in between, yes, we could go in between.
24 One-fifty is optimum, one-ten is our minimum.

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 MR. WILENSKY: So the only carrier at the
2 present time interested is one, right? AT&T?

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

4 MR. WILENSKY: There are -- there are no
5 other carriers who have expressed an interest in this
6 tower at the present time?

7 MR. STEVENS: Not -- not at this moment,
8 no.

9 MR. WILENSKY: Okay. Thank you, Mr.
10 Chairman.

11 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Mr. Ashton.

12 MR. PHILIP T. ASHTON: Just confirming
13 the -- with the new road you are proposing to go
14 underground?

15 MR. STEVENS: Yes, we are.

16 MR. ASHTON: And -- with the utilities I
17 should say.

18 MR. STEVENS: Yes -- yes.

19 MR. ASHTON: My notes indicate that at the
20 last hearing you had proposed a six-day backup for an
21 emergency generator. Is that true or is that two days
22 now?

23 MR. STEVENS: It's -- six days was wrong.
24 We -- I think we debated back and forth. In fact we

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 didn't have the right answer and have gone back since
2 then. And the backup -- the tank capacity is 210
3 gallons, with a two-day capacity.

4 MR. ASHTON: Is there anything magic
5 about 210 versus 500 for example? This is propane, is it
6 not?

7 MR. STEVENS: No, this is diesel.

8 MR. ASHTON: Diesel?

9 MR. STEVENS: Diesel. I think the two-ten
10 -- no, there's -- there's nothing magic between the two
11 of them. The two-ten is a standard integrated belly tank
12 with a generator for one unit. I don't know if there's a
13 500-gallon belly tank. We could provide a 500-gallon
14 tank (indiscernible).

15 MR. ASHTON: Is there any battery backup
16 included in that or is it an automatic flow over with a
17 momentary loss of signal?

18 MR. STEVENS: Well there is a -- typically
19 a -- Scott, a four-hour battery backup associated with
20 the site?

21 MR. POLLISTER: Yeah, it ranges around on
22 the load as to how much the battery provides us. Four --
23 four to six, maybe as much as eight hours.

24 MR. ASHTON: So the battery charge would

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 designate when -- or if the generator came on, is that
2 fair to say?

3 MR. STEVENS: No, actually the generator
4 would kick on with a loss of power. The battery would
5 cover certain things. It's -- you know, during that --
6 during that transition -- you know, that couple of second
7 transition, presumably it takes care of it, but it's --
8 it's augmented. It's sometimes used by the technicians
9 when they disconnect power. It's -- it's just another
10 level of ensuring that you constantly have power at the
11 site.

12 MR. ASHTON: That's it, Mr. Chairman.
13 Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Senator Murphy.

15 MR. JAMES J. MURPHY, JR.: Just a few
16 questions, Mr. Chairman.

17 In -- Mr. Stevens, in responding to Miss
18 Walsh's questions about the reduction in the costs of the
19 access road, did you take into account the change from
20 the original overhead to underground in giving us that
21 50,000 dollar figure?

22 MR. STEVENS: No, I didn't. I didn't
23 consider that.

24 MR. MURPHY: Do you have a ballpark for

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 us? I know you testified in Woodstock that it would cost
2 more to go underground.

3 MR. STEVENS: It would cost more to go
4 underground. And I think the 50 to 70,000 dollars
5 perhaps last time was a longer road, I'm going to -- I'm
6 going to guess on a shorter road it might save me -- or
7 it may be another 30,000 dollars in additional costs.

8 MR. MURPHY: So you may have a total
9 savings of about 30 --

10 MR. STEVENS: Thirty thousand --

11 MR. MURPHY: -- the original proposal --

12 MR. STEVENS: Right, the original design -
13 -

14 MR. MURPHY: -- the overhead versus the
15 short and under --

16 MR. STEVENS: Yes.

17 MR. MURPHY: Okay. And the only other
18 thing that I really had in mind is in the material that I
19 accumulated since the last hearing and that I reviewed
20 last night, there's a letter from Mr. Pinard to the DOT.
21 Is that supposed to go in? Is that something --

22 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: Sure. We -- we
23 resubmitted a letter to the DOT --

24 MR. MURPHY: Right --

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: -- letting them know
2 that we evaluated the site and it couldn't work from a
3 radio frequency perspective. We also included
4 (indiscernible).

5 MR. MURPHY: I -- yes. Did DOT contact
6 you about the potential site? How did this come about?
7 All I know is I -- I got this copy of the letter and --

8 MS. CHIOCCHIO: Bring that mic up closer.

9 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: When we did our
10 initial search ring, that was identified as a potential
11 site. And I had originally reached out to the Office of
12 Communications. After that point, we determined from a
13 radio frequency perspective that it was not a viable
14 candidate. So we were asked to submit a letter to the
15 DOT seeking a response that (indiscernible) interest.
16 Since we evaluated the site and generated the propagation
17 map, I submitted the letter anyways to let them know that
18 we evaluated the site.

19 MR. MURPHY: Okay. And -- and the site as
20 you demonstrated doesn't fit the bill for --

21 MR. MARKUS-PINARD: Correct.

22 MR. MURPHY: I have no other questions,
23 Mr. Chairman.

24 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Thank you. Mr.

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 Golembiewski.

2 MR. BRIAN GOLEMBIEWSKI: I have no
3 questions, thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Mr. Lynch.

5 MR. LYNCH: Just one follow-up to Mr.
6 Ashton's question on the generator. Now that -- you have
7 monthly maintenance to the site. How often -- I think I
8 asked this the last time -- is the generator topped off?
9 Is it topped off in that monthly visit or do you have to
10 have a regular schedule or you call when it gets low?

11 MR. STEVENS: Two things. As part of the
12 technician's checklist per se is that you verify or re-
13 verify the level of the fuel tank even though it is
14 remotely monitored. It's topped off during a -- you
15 know, during (indiscernible). I don't know the exact
16 (indiscernible) when it's hauled in. It -- it wouldn't
17 be fueled every month though.

18 MR. LYNCH: But isn't it tested every
19 month for a certain period of time?

20 MR. STEVENS: Yeah, it's actually tested
21 every week --

22 MR. LYNCH: Oh, okay --

23 MR. STEVENS: -- for 15 minutes.

24 MR. LYNCH: Alright. Thank you. No more

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 questions, Mr. Chairman.

2 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Dr. Bell.

3 DR. BARBARA C. BELL: Thank you, Mr.
4 Chairman.

5 I guess this is for Mr. Pollister. I've
6 having some trouble with the coverage maps and trying to
7 determine whether this tower is timely. Your -- I guess
8 my first lead-off question is what are the towers that
9 this tower is supposed to hand-off to?

10 MR. POLLISTER: So from a hand-off
11 perspective --

12 COURT REPORTER: Mr. Pollister, bring that
13 microphone up as close as you can.

14 MR. POLLISTER: So from a hand-off
15 perspective there's -- there's kind of three primary --
16 three primary towers in that general vicinity that AT&T
17 is located on. To the north is the newly built what's
18 referred to as the Sherman Road site, which is a Verizon
19 built site, so a hand-off to the north along 198 to the
20 north.

21 Heading east, there's a site on Coatney
22 Hill Road that hands off along -- along 171.

23 And then to the south there isn't great
24 coverage there, but there's some partial coverage, where

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 they hand-off to a couple of different sites on Route 44
2 in Eastford or the existing site in Ashford,
3 (indiscernible). But those -- those are like further --
4 further south. So those are the three primary hand-offs.

5 DR. BELL: Three -- you're actually
6 counting four, but you're referring to the ones to the
7 southeast and the southwest as one --

8 MR. POLLISTER: Yeah --

9 DR. BELL: -- and one is at 71 Ashford
10 Road and one is at 38 Route 44 -- Old Route 44? One is
11 1262 and one is 5702?

12 MR. POLLISTER: Yeah. So -- so the
13 existing towers -- so to the south you're asking?

14 DR. BELL: Yes.

15 MR. POLLISTER: Yes. The existing towers
16 to the south, one is 38 Route 44 --

17 DR. BELL: Right --

18 MR. POLLISTER: -- and then the other one
19 is on 229 Ashford Center Road in Ashford.

20 DR. BELL: Yeah -- okay. So -- there are
21 various pieces of paper that are describing the
22 neighborhood -- towers in the neighborhood and existing
23 towers. There's a table at question -- No. 37 in your
24 recent -- in your exhibit for today, Exhibit 10, that is

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 a version of a table that's in the application, which is
2 behind Tab 2, and it's described as the existing tower
3 list. And then there's a map on -- behind Tab 1 of the
4 original application, which is described as Map of
5 Distance to Neighbor Sites. And then there are your
6 coverage maps. So you -- there are problems with all of
7 these. They do not agree with one another either in the
8 tower sites as listed, and there's one problem with
9 distance, which is significant and I need to get a
10 comment on that, but -- but I guess the main place to
11 start would be under the coverage maps themselves, not on
12 these lists, but just on the coverage maps that you've
13 done for the application and for subsequent evaluations,
14 you only take into account for -- when you show existing
15 coverage, you only show the Sherman Road and Coatney Hill
16 sites providing coverage. You don't show the other two
17 sites to the south that you just mentioned, nor the 71
18 Ashford Road site that is on the map, the list.

19 And so I don't understand just as a
20 foundation why if those are handoff towers and you're on
21 them and they're within five miles, which is offered as a
22 crucial dividing point because some of the sites on your
23 list are beyond five miles, why if they're in the
24 vicinity are none of these other sites, the south sites -

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 - and there's another one too, which I'll get to in a
2 minute --

3 MR. POLLISTER: Sure --

4 DR. BELL: -- why are these not even
5 listed or shown as providing any coverage at all
6 existing?

7 MR. POLLISTER: Sure. So let me try to
8 answer that. The first -- the first answer I'd offer is
9 all of the existing facilities that are shown on the
10 distance map were included in the coverage analysis that
11 show coverage for this area. The map that was provided -
12 - the subsequent map was provided to show coverage gaps
13 in the -- in a zoomed in area for the proposed facility
14 was just that. We zoomed in -- and those -- those other
15 sites are on that map -- in this analysis there is off
16 the zoom of the map. And the reason we do that is
17 because we really want to show -- we really want to
18 highlight the coverage objective area for the proposed
19 site and not -- because if you zoom way out, you may lose
20 some of that detail as to what roads are being covered,
21 what part of the town we're (indiscernible) and
22 surrounding towns are being covered. So it's not like
23 those -- and I'd have to look at discrepancies
24 (indiscernible) and go back and forth (indiscernible)

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 addresses and --

2 DR. BELL: And I'll get to that --

3 MR. POLLISTER: Yes. So -- but beyond the
4 -- to answer your -- I think your primary question is --
5 we do include all of those surrounding sites in our
6 analysis in terms of providing coverage. For instance if
7 you'll look at the coverage map of existing coverage, you
8 see coverage coming from the south. Those are towers,
9 those facilities on -- in Ashford and Eastford as we
10 mentioned that are turned on, for lack of a better word,
11 in the propagation analysis, and they're providing
12 coverage into this analysis. We're just zooming in to
13 provide a better level of detail for what we're proposing
14 to cover from the application.

15 DR. BELL: Okay, I understand that and
16 that explains that aspect of it. Then let's go to some
17 specifics. There's a tower at 71 Ashford Road in Easton
18 -- Eastford -- which is on the distance map in the -- in
19 the original application behind Tab 1, and it's on the
20 list of existing towers. It's given as a Sprint/Nextel
21 tower. Its distance is given on the map -- or distances
22 to neighbor sites as four miles -- 4.88 miles. It's
23 given on the list as 3.17 miles, which is a significant
24 difference. And its height is given on the list at one-

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 eighty and on your -- I guess that one -- yeah, that one
2 is -- that -- that's -- on both -- your more recent table
3 is given at one-eighty. Okay. If that's on your map as
4 in the neighboring area and it's only 3.17 miles distant,
5 which it may not be, I don't know, you'll have to correct
6 that, you're not on it, I understand that, although
7 you're not on it according to your most recent exhibit,
8 but in the previous hearing you testified that you were
9 on it. So I'm mystified about that. But it -- why
10 wouldn't that be a possible tower for you to connect with
11 or even to go on because it seems quite near at 3.17 to
12 the proposed tower?

13 MR. POLLISTER: So -- I guess let me
14 answer that last part. We didn't -- we did look at the
15 (indiscernible). If I mislead the last time, I
16 apologize. The correct answer to the (indiscernible) the
17 Ashford Road site (indiscernible). We did look at this
18 for potential coverage into this area. And unfortunately
19 (indiscernible). It unfortunately does not -- does not
20 coverage our coverage objective, primarily Route 131 and
21 198, through -- through the center there (indiscernible).
22 We did look at that analysis and it doesn't actually
23 cover the objective for both sites.

24 DR. BELL: Okay. So where is 229 Ashford

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 Road, the one that you said that you would hand-off to in
2 relation to 71 Ashford Road, because that -- the 229
3 Ashford Road while it is -- while it is on the list is
4 not on the map of distances to neighbor sites? Can you -
5 - if you -- if you look at the distances map, could you
6 sort of describe where it is?

7 MR. POLLISTER: Sure. I just hope I'm
8 using -- so to answer your question to describe where it
9 is, it's approximately, according to my rough
10 calculation, maybe a mile and a half south -- mostly
11 south of 71 presumably, but much closer to Route 44. And
12 I think it is -- if I'm referring to the same distance
13 map, but you may be in the original report that we
14 submitted -- it is on that map listed as -- by CT5702.

15 DR. BELL: Okay, that -- maybe that's the
16 problem because --

17 MS. CHIOCCHIO: I think I may see where
18 the error --

19 DR. BELL: -- because that's -- that's
20 listed as 71 Ashford Road.

21 MR. POLLISTER: Oh -- okay. Sorry.

22 DR. BELL: So that's the -- actually 5702
23 is the site that you will hand-off to or that you're
24 planning to maybe, and is the one that is 4.71 miles

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 away. Okay --

2 MR. POLLISTER: Uh -- yeah, correct. I
3 think we just had the wrong address on the distance map
4 (indiscernible).

5 DR. BELL: Okay. Now there are two other
6 sites that I have specific questions about. One is the
7 site at Swede Town Road, which the public talked about
8 and we inquired about. And in the previous testimony you
9 said that it was a Verizon site, but you weren't sure of
10 the status. My question today is how far away is that
11 site from the proposed site? Do you know the location of
12 that one? And is it -- is Swede Town Road the correct --
13 or an address you can identify?

14 MR. POLLISTER: Yes. Well let me see if I
15 can clarify that a little bit. Swede Town Road also
16 known as -- it has a few other names - (indiscernible) --
17 is a -- was a proposed Verizon facility. When this --
18 when we first applied for this application, the town
19 recommended that we -- they were aware of a Verizon
20 proposal or a potential proposal in this area and they
21 asked us to look into it. We called Verizon and received
22 some information regarding where that facility is
23 located, get the coordinates so we could run the
24 analysis, which we did. And to answer the second part of

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 your question, so it doesn't -- it's over -- so let me
2 get you the distance, the approximate distance from our
3 location --

4 A VOICE: Do you need a scale?

5 MR. POLLISTER: Hold on one second -- no,
6 I -- I have the -- I just want to make sure it's the
7 right one -- yeah, so it's about 3 point -- three and a
8 half miles or so southeast about. And -- so -- and then
9 to answer the second part of your question, the status of
10 that is -- we don't know what the status is. Again, we
11 were asked to evaluate it. It's potentially a future
12 site that AT&T could locate on if it's approved, if
13 Verizon does get that certificate approved, but it
14 wouldn't be something that would offer or alleviate the
15 need for the proposed site.

16 DR. BELL: So it's -- it's not the Babbitt
17 Hill Road site that's on this distance map in the
18 original application --

19 MR. POLLISTER: That's correct, it's --

20 DR. BELL: -- and we don't -- we don't
21 have any confusion there?

22 MR. POLLISTER: No. That's
23 (indiscernible).

24 DR. BELL: Okay. But it's a future site

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 planned by Verizon and you would go on it if you had the
2 chance?

3 MR. POLLISTER: Again, we don't know the
4 current status of it. We were asked at one point in time
5 to evaluate it. So I don't know if it's still planned or
6 if it's scrapped or what the story is, but we did look at
7 it. It may be a future proposal --

8 DR. BELL: Okay. Now my next question is
9 about Quasset Road, which isn't on your distance map, but
10 is on your list of existing towers, that there are two
11 sites on Quasset Road listed on your existing tower list
12 in the original application. One of them you testified
13 you were on, but you have corrected that now to say you
14 are not on it, which is the American Tower that's going
15 to be taken down. The one -- the Verizon tower that was
16 the subject of our Docket 415, you're not on either, but
17 you're planning to go on there you testified. Since it's
18 on your list, we see that it's 4.90 miles from the
19 proposed site. Can you describe where that is in
20 relation to the other sites that I'm looking at on the
21 distance map because it's not on there?

22 MR. POLLISTER: Sure, I can do that. So
23 on the distance map if you look at the upper right most
24 site (indiscernible) listed as 1246, the Coatney Hill

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 Road site --

2 DR. BELL: Right --

3 MR. POLLISTER: -- so it's -- so from
4 there it's southeast slightly, on the south side of 171 -
5 - or 198. Sort of on the south side of that. So it's
6 approximately maybe a mile or a little bit more than a
7 mile or two -- probably close to two miles southeast of
8 that 1246 site, just south --

9 DR. BELL: So -- okay, so the line to the
10 Coatney Hill site goes up to the northeast. And then
11 there's a line down to Connecticut 10 -- CT1 -- 1050 at
12 Tyrone Road. So it's roughly -- if you bisected that
13 angle --

14 MR. POLLISTER: Sure, that's -- that's a
15 good approximation --

16 DR. BELL: Is that a good approximation?

17 MR. POLLISTER: Yeah, it's a good
18 approximation. It's almost (indiscernible) of the
19 proposed site. So yeah, bisecting that angle, you're
20 right.

21 DR. BELL: So that -- Verizon is building
22 the Quasset Road site as I understand. I mean we
23 approved it, we know that much. We did the D&M also and
24 it -- I believe that they're building it. And you would

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 like to go on that you testified. I don't believe you've
2 applied to us for tower sharing, but maybe you have. But
3 you did not -- you did not include that as an existing
4 site to show coverage into this general area, even though
5 that would be close enough presumably to be a handoff
6 site --

7 MR. POLLISTER: I'm sorry (indiscernible)

8 DR. BELL: -- with --

9 MR. POLLISTER: -- (indiscernible) so let
10 me answer that question. We didn't include it because it
11 actually isn't approved, the Quasset site for AT&T at
12 this point. It could be something that AT&T would
13 consider in the future to locate off. But right now at
14 this stage or when we applied for this site, it wasn't --
15 or simply not part of the funds built in for AT&T. At
16 some point in time it may be in the future
17 (indiscernible). So to add -- to add to that response,
18 while we could have included in the coverage analysis
19 future sites, one reason why we didn't -- or one -- one
20 reason why it shouldn't really impact the analysis is
21 because it's so far. Because if you look at again the
22 distance map which was just referenced, that 1246 site is
23 probably a mile and a half or so closer to the proposed
24 area than that one would be. So it -- if -- if the 1246

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 site isn't -- that's on the air and that was in our
2 analysis, so that one is not providing adequate coverage
3 for the proposed area as you can tell from our submitted
4 coverage map that shows coverage without the proposed
5 facility. So that one isn't providing coverage
6 (indiscernible) area. And along that -- then the -- the
7 87 West Quasset Road site, which is even further away
8 from the proposed coverage objective, is likely to not --
9 also not provide coverage in that area. Does that --
10 does that help you (indiscernible).

11 DR. BELL: I think yes, but if we didn't
12 include the Quasset Road site and we didn't include the
13 Swede Town Road site, which is even more hypothetical, I
14 understand exactly what you're saying. Then really if --
15 if those towers had been included, just purely on a
16 hypothetical basis, we'd be looking at some -- we'd be
17 looking at some improved coverage just from existing --
18 or from those towers with the other ones that already
19 exist into the area, would we not? And your argument is
20 that it wouldn't be sufficient however to cover all of
21 the objectives that you're trying to cover with the
22 proposed tower?

23 MR. POLLISTER: That's correct. It -- it
24 definitely wouldn't. You may get some incidental

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 overshooting coverage from those other facilities into
2 the -- somewhat into the view of the coverage map that we
3 submitted when we zoomed in and showed you what areas
4 were not covered. You know, the analysis we've run on
5 those sites, there's no way that it would fill in the
6 objective for the proposed facility in -- in that area.

7 DR. BELL: Okay. I have just one more
8 question to ask because I'm backing out of the weeds now.
9 When -- when you order -- or any other carrier comes to
10 us and says that you would accept a shorter height, for
11 various reasons you'd be able to have primary coverage
12 but there would be more efficient coverage at a higher
13 level and so forth, usually we talk about that in terms
14 of well gaps would open up along roads at the lower
15 height or gaps would open up in certain developed areas
16 where you want in-building coverage and so forth and so
17 on --

18 (pause - tape stopped)

19 DR. BELL: So I understand that type of
20 reasoning. What's a little harder for me to understand
21 is sort of another line of reasoning, which has to do
22 with handoff -- towers that you hand-off to. Because we
23 understand that there's a certain amount of overlap in
24 any network plan that you design, that you make. But if

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 you are to accept say -- and we have to think of a circle
2 in terms of hand-off, so I know it's not an exact circle,
3 but we're just kind of thinking of square -- square mile
4 type of picture. If you accept say a halving of your
5 square mileage, just for the sake of a hypothesis, it's
6 hard for me to see how on the basis of handoff
7 possibilities how that works because that would suggest
8 that there was so much overlap in the original design
9 that you could handle a lot of pairing down of that, in
10 fact quite a hard to understand amount of pairing down.
11 Do you see what I'm -- the line of thinking that I'm
12 trying to take?

13 MR. POLLISTER: Sure. The only thing -- I
14 can offer a couple of -- again explain how the minimum
15 height was derived at -- or where we came up with that if
16 that may help answer the question, but -- you are correct
17 there are -- there is a certain amount of overlap that
18 needs to be provided between the sites so that when a
19 mobile subscriber is traveling along a route from one
20 area to another, they'll have sufficient reliable
21 coverage as they transition from one cell site to
22 another. So what we looked at, at 150 feet we're -- at
23 150 feet we provide a fairly good coverage footprint, we
24 fill in a lot of the area -- regardless of the road, we

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 fill in just a lot of geographic area, so where there are
2 homes or where people may be hiking or traveling, just
3 out and about, in their homes or whatnot, we provide a
4 fair amount of coverage. If you go above that height,
5 you begin to see very -- very much incremental
6 improvements happening. So that's sort of where 150 was
7 developed. Below 150 -- and we also took into account
8 potential future co-locaters. Below that height, what we
9 did is we looked at -- at 150 we provide sort of an
10 optimal, the most we can get out of -- get out of the
11 site. We sort of lowered the height and ran the analysis
12 again. And only at a hundred and -- anything below 110
13 feet we start to see gaps along major thru-ways. So if
14 you look at the difference between 110 feet and anything
15 lower than that, you start to see gaps that open up on
16 major routes in this area, specifically Route 198. So
17 that's sort of where the 110 feet was developed in terms
18 of what our minimum height is.

19 At one-fifty we provide -- we provide that
20 same level -- we provide -- not the same -- we provide
21 adequate coverage to those same roads, but also fill in
22 some of the surrounding geographic area. There's a lot
23 of -- you know, a lot of recent studies that show more
24 and more residential homes are going wireless only --

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 wireless only homes. I think the percentage is 25 --
2 roughly 25 percent or something like that. In addition
3 to an additional 60 percent -- 60 percent or so that are
4 wireless and landline, they (indiscernible) only -- only
5 like -- (indiscernible) about 15 or 18 percent that are
6 landline only. So by reducing the coverage from -- or
7 the height of the proposed site from one-fifty to one-
8 ten, we shrink in some of those residential areas
9 providing coverage, which we ultimately didn't want to
10 do, but if you look -- you asked us what our primary
11 objective was, and we want to make sure people are
12 covered along the primary routes in this area. So that's
13 sort of an answer I hoped that helps answer that
14 question.

15 DR. BELL: But that really goes back to
16 the prior thinking, which is gaps in roads or building
17 areas or so forth. What I'm asking is what is the point
18 at which you can no longer have any overlap and thus no
19 handoff in a given direction? In other words, I mean you
20 could build a tower out in the middle of nowhere and it
21 would be no good because it couldn't hand-off to
22 anything. You have to have something to hand-off with.
23 What I'm asking -- towards -- and you have to have -- to
24 do that you have to have some overlap. And explain to me

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 in terms of that criterion how would you know when you no
2 longer -- how do you measure when you no longer are able
3 to have enough overlap to hand-off to anything in a given
4 direction?

5 MR. POLLISTER: Sure. So the -- to answer
6 that question, what I would say is our minimum -- AT&T's
7 minimum -- our coverage criteria is -- for this area is
8 negative 82 dBm for reliable in-vehicle coverage. So
9 what we're saying is if your signal strength is -- if the
10 predicted signal strength from the facility when we run
11 our analysis is greater than negative 82 dBm, then it's
12 likely to be a reliable call or data session or -- you
13 know, they're both kind of the same thing for the mobile
14 subscriber. So what we're looking for is -- when we look
15 at the analysis, we look for did the propose facility and
16 any of the adjacent handoff sites -- the primary handoff
17 sites primarily meet that coverage objective combined.
18 So whether it's -- whether that negative 82 dBm is met
19 from an adjacent neighbor site or whether it's met from
20 the proposed site itself, as long as a continuous area
21 where a combination of both of them meet that minimum
22 criteria, then it's determined to be a sufficient
23 handoff. And for this area we prioritized the roads, the
24 primary roads over the general housing, sort of

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 residential areas, because we know there's compromises.
2 At one-fifty we, you know, solve just about as much as we
3 can from this site. At one-ten, it's potentially a
4 little bit less visible, but then you're also dealing
5 with potential co-location -- or lack of co -- or you
6 know, potential co-location. So we looked at it and sort
7 of prioritized our needs as -- or AT&T's needs as -- at a
8 minimum we need to make sure the roads are covered
9 reliably as people travel on these routes, and that
10 they're -- that they're covered at that minimum level.
11 So when we compare -- to answer your -- to go back to
12 your original question, when we compare the adjacent site
13 to the proposed facility and look at the combined signal
14 strength for those -- for that analysis, we want to make
15 sure that every place along major routes in areas that we
16 want to cover is at least negative 82 dBm or better.

17 MR. LYNCH: Barbara, can I ask a question?
18 Mr. Pollister, am I hearing you right that as the primary
19 site signal disintegrates from neg 82, by coming on to
20 another site it could bolster that back up to 182 -- I
21 mean to neg 82?

22 MR. POLLISTER: What the -- what the
23 mobile or the handset is doing is it's making a decision
24 as to which facility it will communicate -- its primary

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 communications will be (indiscernible). You know,
2 (indiscernible). It makes those decisions based on the
3 received signal -- not only the received signal strength
4 from the proposed site or any of the other existing
5 towers, so it makes that decision constantly measuring
6 each of the facilities to say which one is the best one
7 that I can connect you and communicate with from a signal
8 strength as well as from -- they also measure quality.
9 So they're measuring quality and signal strength. Even
10 though you have sufficient signal strength, in some cases
11 the quality is poor enough that you may not want to be
12 using the highest signal strength when the quality is
13 poor. So the mobile is actually making decisions as to
14 which tower you communicate at any (indiscernible) as it
15 travels.

16 MR. LYNCH: Thank you. Okay, Barbara.

17 DR. BELL: I think we've gone about as far
18 as we can go with that set of questions.

19 A simple comment: I think that there are
20 enough -- there are enough corrections of names and
21 distances and so forth that I can easily see why the good
22 people of Woodstock knowing that there are a lot of
23 towers around, have trouble understanding sometimes why
24 these towers that are there can't handle the area.

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 That's just a -- that's -- I'm just making a comment
2 because it is -- it is confusing, especially when you --
3 when you add in certain uncertainties about budget -- the
4 companies budgets and so forth. But I appreciate your
5 correction of the record in terms of names and distances.
6 Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

7 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Thank you. Professor
8 Tait.

9 MR. TAIT: You said that it was not in a
10 historic district. Are there any historic roads? Your
11 new access road goes out to a state highway do I
12 understand?

13 A VOICE: Yep.

14 MR. TAIT: I need them to say that.

15 MR. STEVENS: Give me one second please --
16 it goes out to County Route 171 --

17 MR. TAIT: County route or state route?

18 MR. STEVENS: I have it recorded as a
19 county road.

20 A VOICE: No, it's a state --

21 MR. TAIT: I -- I don't think we have
22 county routes in Connecticut.

23 MR. STEVENS: I stand corrected. It would
24 be a state road.

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 MR. TAIT: 171?

2 MR. STEVENS: Yes.

3 MR. TAIT: Have you talked to DOT about
4 access on that state highway?

5 MR. STEVENS: We have not filed for a curb
6 cut permit. There is an existing curb cut permit, but we
7 haven't filed for it (indiscernible).

8 MR. TAIT: Would you explain that name,
9 sir?

10 MR. STEVENS: I think it's an existing --
11 it's an existing woods road cut right now, so it may not
12 be a real curb cut --

13 MR. TAIT: So you've --

14 MR. STEVENS: -- but we have not applied
15 ourselves.

16 MR. TAIT: So DOT has not approved it as
17 curb cut?

18 MR. STEVENS: Correct.

19 MR. TAIT: Okay. Is 171 in that area a
20 scenic highway or a scenic road?

21 MR. STEVENS: Not that I am aware.

22 MR. TAIT: Is anybody aware whether
23 that's a scenic -- a town scenic road or a state scenic
24 highway?

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 MR. FAVREAU: I have done some research on
2 Woodstock scenic roads and got some information that I
3 pulled off the internet. And the only scenic road --
4 designated scenic road in the Town of Woodstock within
5 two miles of the proposed facility is Barber Road.

6 MR. TAIT: Thank you.

7 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Mr. Chairman. Can you
8 make -- just distinguish between national, state, and
9 municipal? So when you -- because I -- I think initially
10 you were talking about national designations
11 historically. And now you just talked -- that's a state
12 is -- what you're just saying is a state recognized or
13 federal?

14 MR. FAVREAU: Well the town --

15 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay, so --

16 MR. FAVREAU: -- the Town of Woodstock
17 designated road.

18 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: So Barber Road is town
19 designated?

20 MR. FAVREAU: Correct.

21 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay.

22 MR. TAIT: And 171 is not a state
23 designated high -- scenic highway?

24 MR. FAVREAU: Correct.

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. Got it.

2 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Any other questions from
3 -- yes.

4 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: I just had one for Mr.
5 Pollister. And -- and I guess this is just a follow-up
6 to Dr. Bell. In this case you are -- the tower -- you
7 can reduce the height of your tower because your target
8 or your goal is at least to cover all the main roadways
9 in this gap? Is that what you said, that you had that
10 flexibility because that's -- that was acceptable to
11 you?

12 MR. POLLISTER: That's -- that's primarily
13 (indiscernible) we made our decision as to
14 (indiscernible) -- that's definitely our minimum height.
15 An ideal situation (indiscernible) and it sort of
16 compromises (indiscernible) and a number of other factors
17 (indiscernible). But from our (indiscernible) the
18 minimum one-ten primarily based on -- we prioritized the
19 routes to make sure that they have (indiscernible).

20 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. And would it
21 also -- a factor of that would be that it was -- it's a
22 sparsely populated gap?

23 MR. POLLISTER: That -- obviously that's a
24 factor that we're weighing in (indiscernible) not as

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 congested or populated (indiscernible), so it's not as
2 high a priority. So as we (indiscernible) square
3 mileage, that doesn't equate to (indiscernible) --
4 (indiscernible) for homes or schools (indiscernible).

5 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. And so you --
6 you're getting to my question, is in some cases based on
7 the demographics or how highly developed an area is, you
8 may not have that same flexibility that you have here?

9 MR. POLLISTER: That is -- that is
10 definitely correct.

11 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay, great. Thank
12 you.

13 CHAIRMAN STEIN: I guess now I have to ask
14 a question on that beaten subject. Your answer on A41 or
15 Question 41, the three charts, looking at cellular and
16 700 megahertz, the in-vehicular or in-vehicle you show a
17 loss of cellular 30 -- almost 37 percent, and 700 40
18 percent. That's -- that's linear miles? What -- what
19 is -- or square miles? It says I guess square miles, but
20 --

21 MR. POLLISTER: Sure. So that -- those
22 charts in 41 represent square miles of area. So that --
23 so those charts are in area, so square miles.

24 CHAIRMAN STEIN: So it really doesn't -- I

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 mean you answered the question, but you -- I guess we
2 didn't pose the question because we didn't -- at least I
3 didn't know maybe what was your priority because
4 obviously if you -- well from what you said if you were
5 losing close to 40 percent of your -- I would call of
6 your road from a linear standpoint, to me I would think
7 that would be very significant.

8 MR. POLLISTER: Correct, yeah, it would
9 be. Actually when you look at the -- when you look at
10 the previous question, A40, which addresses --

11 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Okay --

12 MR. POLLISTER: -- the gaps, although it's
13 not (indiscernible) that -- that -- that question asks in
14 miles in gaps (indiscernible) -- I'm sorry --

15 CHAIRMAN STEIN: But did that -- but did
16 that compare -- did that --

17 MR. POLLISTER: That's -- that's the
18 (indiscernible) -- if you look at those roads today
19 currently, the existing sites as well as the future --
20 not the future any more, but the Sherman Road site, which
21 was recently installed, look at that without the
22 proposed, those are gaps along some of those major routes
23 --

24 CHAIRMAN STEIN: That's existing today?

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 MR. POLLISTER: Existing gaps, correct.

2 CHAIRMAN STEIN: But we don't have the
3 table showing the different -- or do we --

4 MR. POLLISTER: No --

5 CHAIRMAN STEIN: -- showing the gap at
6 one-fifty versus one-ten?

7 MR. POLLISTER: Correct. So -- you don't
8 have that there, but I do have numbers that were provided
9 in the RF report --

10 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Well, I -- I guess my --
11 the bottom line question, so you don't have to give us
12 that -- so from AT&T -- I don't know what you call it --
13 a business decision -- if this Council were to approve
14 the height at 110 feet, that would be acceptable?

15 MR. POLLISTER: I mean today yes, that is
16 -- the basic answer is yes, it is. But ideally our --

17 CHAIRMAN STEIN: No, I -- I heard the
18 ideal --

19 MR. POLLISTER: (indiscernible) --

20 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Could he go through the
21 numbers for that chart?

22 CHAIRMAN STEIN: So -- we'll follow up --
23 I'm not going to make it to Mianus in time for --

24 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Mr. Pollister, do you -

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 - do you have those numbers? (indiscernible)

2 MR. POLLISTER: Sure. So --

3 (indiscernible) --

4 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Quickly.

5 MR. POLLISTER: Well Attachment 1 in the
6 application there was a -- there was an RF analysis
7 report that was created. In there is a chart on page 4
8 that refers to the linear miles (indiscernible) roads
9 (indiscernible) at 147 feet and at 97 feet.

10 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay, good. I got it.

11 MR. POLLISTER: Okay.

12 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Where's -- where's that?

14 I'm --

15 A VOICE: In the application --

16 CHAIRMAN STEIN: That's it?

17 (pause)

18 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Okay, any -- any other
19 questions? Attorney Chiocchio --

20 MS. CHIOCCHIO: No, thank you --

21 CHAIRMAN STEIN: -- would you like to give
22 us a lengthy -- no? No.

23 Okay, before closing this hearing, the
24 Siting Council announces that briefs and proposed

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 findings fact may be filed with the Council no later than
2 April 9th of this year. The submission of briefs or
3 proposed findings of fact are not required by the
4 Council, but rather we leave it to the choice of the
5 Applicants.

6 I also announce that any state agencies
7 desiring to submit additional comments, so that could
8 include DOT if you desire to pursue that, pursuant to
9 General Statute 16-50j should submit their comments no
10 later than March 22nd.

11 Anyone who has not become a party or
12 intervenor, but who desires to make his or her views
13 known to the Council, may file written statements with
14 the Council within 30 days of the date hereof.

15 The Council will issue draft findings of
16 fact. And thereafter, parties and intervenors, which
17 there are none, may identify errors or inconsistencies
18 between the Council's draft findings of the fact and the
19 record. However, no new information, no new evidence, no
20 new argument, and no reply briefs without our permission
21 will be considered.

22 Copies of this transcript will be filed at
23 the Woodstock Town Clerk's Office.

24 And I hereby declare this meeting and this

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

1 hearing adjourned. Thank you.

2 MS. CHIOCCHIO: Thank you.

3

4 (Whereupon, the hearing adjourned at 2:11

5 p.m.)

HEARING RE: NORTH ATLANTIC TOWERS/NEW CINGULAR
MARCH 8, 2012

INDEX OF WITNESSES

PAGE

APPLICANT'S PANEL OF WITNESSES:

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

Direct Examination by Ms. Chiocchio	4
Cross-Examination by Council Staff	6
Cross-Examination by Council Members	13

INDEX OF APPLICANT EXHIBITS

	NUMBER	PAGE
Responses to CSC Interrogatories, Set II, dated 2/22/12	10	6