

COPY



**UNITED
REPORTERS**

Transcript of the Hearing of

Date: July 29, 2014

Volume: I

Case: DOCKET NO. 449 - SITING COUNCIL

Printed On: August 7, 2014

UNITED REPORTERS, INC.

Phone: 866-534-3383

Fax: 877-534-3383

Email: info@unitedreporters.com

Internet: www.unitedreporters.com

<p style="text-align: center;">Page 1</p> <p style="text-align: center;">STATE OF CONNECTICUT CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Docket No. 449</p> <p>Message Center Management and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC, Application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of a Telecommunications Facility Located at Redding Tax Assessor Map 23, Lot 72, Redding Ridge Fire Department, 186 Black Rock Turnpike, Redding, Connecticut.</p> <p>Council Meeting held at the Redding Community Center, Community Room, 37 Lonetown Road, Redding, Connecticut, Tuesday, July 29, 2014, beginning at 3:05 p.m.</p> <p>H e l d B e f o r e:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">ROBERT STEIN, Chairperson</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Page 3</p> <p>1 A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.): 2 For Message Center Management and AT&T: 3 CUDDY & FEDER, LLP. 4 733 Summer Street, 5 Stamford, Connecticut 06901 6 (203) 969-9060 7 By: DANIEL M. LAUB, ESQ. 8 CHRISTOPHER B. FISHER, ESQ. 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Page 2</p> <p>1 A p p e a r a n c e s: 2 Council Members: 3 ROBERT HANNON, DEEP Designee 4 LARRY LEVESQUE, PURA Designee 5 DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR. 6 DR. MICHAEL W. KLEMENS 7 DR. BARBARA C. BELL 8 SENATOR EILEEN M. DAILY 9 PHILIP ASHTON 10 11 Council Staff: 12 MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ., 13 Executive Director and 14 Staff Attorney 15 MICHAEL PERRONE 16 Siting Analyst 17 18 For Cellco Partnership, d/b/a Verizon 19 Wireless: 20 ROBINSON & COLE LLP 21 280 Trumbull Street 22 Hartford, Connecticut 06103-3597 23 (860) 275-8200 24 By: KENNETH C. BALDWIN, ESQ. 25</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Page 4</p> <p>1 THE CHAIRPERSON: So this is a 2 hearing relative to Docket 449. Again, today 3 Tuesday, July 29, 2014, approximately 3:05. 4 That was a pretty quick special meeting. 5 And my name is Robert Stein. 6 I'm Chairman of the Connecticut Siting 7 Council. Other members of the Council here 8 are Mr. Hannon, who's the designee from the 9 Department of Energy and Environmental 10 Protection; Mr. Levesque, designee from the 11 Public Utilities Regulatory Authority; 12 Mr. Ashton; Dr. Klemens; Mr. Lynch; Dr. Bell; 13 and Senator Daily. 14 Members of the staff present 15 are Melanie Bachman, our Director of Staff 16 Attorney, and Michael Perrone, our siting 17 analyst. 18 This hearing is held pursuant 19 to provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut 20 General Statutes of the Uniform 21 Administrative Procedure Act upon an 22 application from Message Center Management, 23 Inc., and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC, for 24 a certificate of environmental compatibility 25 and public need for the construction,</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5</p> <p>1 maintenance, and operation of a 2 telecommunications facility located at 3 Redding, Tax Assessor Map Number 23, Lot 72, 4 at the Redding Ridge Fire Department, at 186 5 Black Rock Turnpike, in Redding, Connecticut. 6 Application was received by the Council on 7 May 19, 2014. 8 As a reminder to all, 9 off-the-record communication with a member of 10 the Council or a member of the council's 11 staff upon the merits of this application is 12 prohibited by law. 13 We have -- the parties and 14 intervenors are Message Center Management, 15 Inc., New Cingular Wireless, both 16 attorneys -- Laub and Attorney Fisher, and 17 also Cellco Partnership, d/b/a Verizon 18 Wireless, their attorney, Mr. Baldwin. 19 We will proceed in accordance 20 with the prepared agenda, copies of which are 21 available on the table in the back. Also 22 available there are copies of the Council's 23 Citizen Guide to Siting Council Procedures. 24 At the end of this afternoon 25 session we will recess and resume again at 7</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 7</p> <p>1 marked Roman numeral ID, items 1 through 57. 2 Does the applicant or 3 intervenor have any objections to the items 4 that Council has administratively noticed? 5 MR. LAUB: No objection, Mr. 6 Chairman. 7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Accordingly, 8 the Council hereby administratively notices 9 these existing documents, statements, 10 comments. 11 We'll now go to the appearance 12 by the applicant. 13 Attorney Laub, will you 14 present your witness panel for the purposes 15 of taking the oath? 16 MR. LAUB: Certainly, 17 Mr. Chairman. 18 Good afternoon. For the 19 record, Daniel Laub with the firm of Cuddy & 20 Feder, outside counsel for the applicants, 21 Message Center Management and AT&T. 22 Starting with my far left, the 23 Council's far right, Mr. Scott Chasse, who's 24 our consulting engineer on this project, 25 Mr. Dean Gustafson, and Mr. Michael</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 6</p> <p>1 p.m. here. The 7 p.m. hearing will be 2 reserved for the public to make brief oral 3 statements into the record. 4 I wish to note that parties 5 and intervenors are not allowed to 6 participate in the public comment session. 7 And I also wish to note for those who are 8 here and for the benefit of your friends and 9 neighbors who are unable to join us for the 10 public comment session, that you or they may 11 send written statements to the Council within 12 30 days of today, and such written statements 13 will be given the same weight as if spoken at 14 the hearing. 15 A verbatim transcript will be 16 made of this hearing deposited with the town 17 clerk's office in Redding for the convenience 18 of the public. 19 Is there any public official 20 here at this time who wishes to make a 21 statement? 22 (No response.) 23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. 24 I wish to call your attention 25 to those items shown on the hearing program</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 8</p> <p>1 Libertine, also with All-Points Technology, 2 who are environmental consultants in various 3 capacities and also soil scientists and 4 visual consultants. 5 To my immediate left is 6 Mr. David Vivian, who is a site acquisition 7 consultant for AT&T. 8 To my immediate right is 9 Mr. Chris Gelinas who is the national sales 10 manager for site acquisition and site 11 acquisition leasing for Message Center 12 Management. 13 And to my far right, the 14 Council's far left, is Mr. Martin Lavin, 15 radio frequency engineer with C Squared 16 Systems, a colleague of Mr. Wells, who you 17 all know very well. I would ask at this time 18 that they be sworn in. 19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. 20 Please rise. 21 22 23 24 25</p>

Page 9

1 MARTIN LAVIN,
2 CHRISTOPHER GELINAS,
3 DAVID VIVIAN,
4 MICHAEL LIBERTINE,
5 DEAN GUSTAFSON,
6 SCOTT CHASSE,
7 called as witnesses, being first duly
8 sworn by Melanie Bachman, were examined
9 and testified on their oaths as follows:
10 THE CHAIRPERSON: And would
11 you continue by presenting your exhibits.
12 MR. LAUB: Certainly,
13 Mr. Chairman.
14 Turning to Section II-B in the
15 hearing program, the exhibits for the -- for
16 the applicants include B-1, the application
17 for the certificate of environmental
18 compatibility, including the bulk file
19 exhibits, A though E;
20 Number 2, the applicant's
21 responses to Siting Council Interrogatory Set
22 1, dated July 3, 2014;
23 Applicant's responses to
24 Council Interrogatory Set 2, dated July 22,
25 2014;

Page 10

1 The Applicant's prefiled
2 statement of facts in lieu of direct
3 testimony, dated July 22, 2014;
4 The Affidavit of signposting
5 in keeping with the Council's regulations,
6 which was received July 22, 2014;
7 Also, Number 6 would be our
8 electronic presentation, which we'll be
9 providing tonight to the public, which was
10 received by the Council July 23, 2014, as
11 well as the resumes and professional
12 biographies of the witnesses of the -- of the
13 panel that was just sworn in.
14 I would ask, in turn, going
15 down, starting with Mr. Chasse and continuing
16 this way.
17 Have you prepared, did you
18 supervise, and are you otherwise familiar
19 with the materials I've described from the
20 hearing program.
21 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott
22 Chasse, yes.
23 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean
24 Gustafson, yes.
25 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike

Page 11

1 Libertine, yes.
2 THE WITNESS (Vivian): Dave
3 Vivian, yes.
4 THE WITNESS (Gelinas): Chris
5 Gelinas, yes.
6 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin
7 Lavin, yes.
8 MR. LAUB: And at this time,
9 do you have any corrections, modifications,
10 additions or clarifications to these
11 materials?
12 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott
13 Chasse, no.
14 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean
15 Gustafson, no.
16 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike
17 Libertine, no.
18 THE WITNESS (Vivian): Dave
19 Vivian, no.
20 THE WITNESS (Gelinas): Chris
21 Gelinas, no.
22 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin
23 Lavin, no.
24 MR. LAUB: And at this time,
25 do you accept -- do you put these forth as

Page 12

1 your sworn testimony today?
2 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott
3 Chasse, yes, I do.
4 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean
5 Gustafson, yes.
6 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike
7 Libertine, yes.
8 THE WITNESS (Vivian): Dave
9 Vivian, yes.
10 THE WITNESS (Gelinas): Chris
11 Gelinas, yes.
12 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin
13 Lavin, yes.
14 MR. LAUB: And at this time,
15 Mr. Chairman, I would request that these
16 exhibits be made full as part of the record.
17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Does the
18 intervenor object to the admission of the
19 applicant's exhibits?
20 MR. BALDWIN: No,
21 Mr. Chairman.
22 THE CHAIRPERSON: The
23 exhibits, therefore, are admitted.
24 (Applicants Exhibits II-B-1
25 through II-B-7: Received in evidence -

Page 13

1 described in index.)
2 THE CHAIRPERSON: We'll now
3 begin with cross-examination of the applicant
4 by staff.
5 Mr. Perrone.
6 CROSS-EXAMINATION
7 MR. PERRONE: Thank you,
8 Mr. Chairman.
9 Did you fly a balloon today?
10 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes,
11 we've had a -- a red weather balloon aloft
12 since about 7:45 this morning and will do so
13 until 6 p.m. tonight, as it was noticed.
14 Weather conditions have been a
15 little bit tenuous today. We had some
16 moments or some periods of time where the
17 balloon was aloft at its full height.
18 Unfortunately, we also had several times
19 where it was similar to when conditions were
20 during the site walk, where the balloon was
21 being suppressed quite a bit by the winds.
22 The winds are in the --
23 anywhere from seven to ten miles an hour, so
24 it's not been a perfect day for it, but we
25 did -- we did lose a balloon earlier in the

Page 14

1 day, and we just filled a new one as we were
2 leaving to try to maintain some height and
3 additional helium to try to keep it aloft.
4 MR. PERRONE: But, generally,
5 were you at the proposed height or perhaps
6 short of that?
7 THE WITNESS (Libertine):
8 Well, certainly the string was
9 tethered to the proposed height.
10 Unfortunately, the -- the winds are pushing
11 it down so that it -- it would get to its
12 full height for periods of time but then
13 would get pushed over. And you can see the
14 prevailing wind was over to -- behind the
15 trees away from the -- the existing tower.
16 MR. PERRONE: What is the
17 diameter of the balloon?
18 THE WITNESS (Libertine): A
19 little over 4 feet in diameter?
20 MR. PERRONE: Okay.
21 And the height, is that the
22 string height to the bottom of the balloon?
23 THE WITNESS (Libertine):
24 Yeah, the 150-foot tether is
25 to the bottom of the balloon so we have an

Page 15

1 additional 4 feet or so on top.
2 I'm not sure what the
3 approximate diameter was by the time we saw
4 it when we pulled that thing down, because it
5 was certainly fairly well deformed because of
6 the heat.
7 MR. PERRONE: Sure.
8 To date, other than Cellco,
9 have any other wireless carriers expressed an
10 interest in collocating on this facility?
11 THE WITNESS (Gelinas): At
12 this time, the only interest that's been
13 expressed are AT&T and Cellco. We have
14 spoken with all carriers, though.
15 MR. PERRONE: Has the town
16 expressed an interest in collocating any
17 other emergency services antennas on the
18 tower or just relocating the existing fire
19 department antennas?
20 THE WITNESS (Gelinas): We
21 had -- we have offered space to the town as
22 part of our discussions.
23 Currently, as we stand today,
24 no additional antennas or no additional
25 interest has been expressed other than the

Page 16

1 relocation of the existing antennas.
2 MR. PERRONE: What is the
3 status of your consultations with the State
4 Historic Preservation Office?
5 THE WITNESS (Libertine): We
6 are still awaiting a final determination from
7 the State Historic Preservation Office.
8 If I may, we do have a draft
9 determination from them. This was issued
10 back on July 14th, and was provided to me
11 personally upon a request to the SHPO to find
12 out what the status was before this meeting.
13 Again, it is not signed and it
14 is not official, but there -- it's -- it's an
15 odd letter in the sense that, in this case,
16 the language is somewhat new that I've seen.
17 I did bring a letter, a copy along, so I
18 could read it verbatim, at least the
19 pertinent part.
20 But, I guess, before I read
21 this, it might help the Council if I gave you
22 a little bit of a chronology of where we've
23 been in terms of the consultation process,
24 because this has been ongoing for quite a bit
25 of time.

Page 17

1 Back at the end of 2013, I
2 contacted the SHPO to make them aware of this
3 site and to give them a little bit of
4 background, because as I'm sure everyone is
5 aware, there had been a previous proposal at
6 this particular property.

7 After the first of the year, I
8 was contacted by the SHPO and asked if they'd
9 get a little bit more information. I
10 provided them a copy of the original letter
11 that they had -- their office had issued back
12 in 2006 on behalf of Sprint for a 120-foot
13 tall tower.

14 There was a little bit of
15 silence for a while. And then, around
16 mid-March we received comments from the local
17 historian. And, at that time, the SHPO had
18 contacted me again and said that they had
19 also received that letter and had asked if we
20 had done any visuals. And I said we were
21 actually about to go out and do them. And
22 they asked if we would cover several of the
23 areas and specific resources that were in
24 that letter from the town. And -- and we
25 did.

Page 19

1 visit on 6/24/2014, this office has
2 determined that the undertaking, as proposed,
3 would result in an adverse effect to
4 potential National Register of Historic
5 Places' sites.

6 However, a reduction in the
7 height of the 150-foot monopole tower to 120
8 feet would reduce the visual impact beneath
9 the threshold of an indirect adverse effect.
10 Therefore, in the opinion of this office, the
11 proposed undertaking will have no adverse
12 effect on contributing resources eligible for
13 listing in a potential National Register of
14 Historic Places district with the following
15 conditions, and those are: One, the
16 monopole, the 150-foot monopole be reduced in
17 height to 120 feet; the 120-foot monopole and
18 associated equipment within a roughly
19 47-foot-by-50-foot fenced compound will be
20 designed and installed to be as nonvisible as
21 possible; and three, if not in use for six
22 consecutive months, the monopole and
23 associated equipment shall be removed by the
24 telecommunications facility owner, and the
25 removal shall occur within 90 days of the end

Page 18

1 And we did notify the office,
2 at that time, the day we would be out
3 floating. They, unfortunately, could not
4 make it that day. So we ended up putting
5 together a more formal submission in early
6 April that included all that information,
7 including the photos and the photo
8 simulations and the visual maps and,
9 essentially, our report that's in the
10 application.

11 We did not hear for a while
12 from the SHPO, so I called them mid-May and
13 got an e-mail requesting -- or actually a
14 letter requesting a site visit. That was at
15 the end of May when we got that request. The
16 visit was finally performed on June 24th.
17 And representatives from Message Center
18 Management and APT were there to,
19 essentially, walk the site and show them the
20 site. And the SHPO representative did a
21 reconnaissance on their own.

22 And then we received this
23 letter on July 11th or -- I'm sorry -- the
24 14th, excuse me. And, essentially, the
25 letter says that, after the reconnaissance

Page 20

1 of such six-month period.

2 So, in a nutshell, what we
3 have is an informal or unofficial letter
4 saying that a 150-foot monopole is not going
5 to be approved by this particular office, but
6 120 feet would be acceptable. And that's
7 where we stand today without a signed letter
8 but, essentially, the informal determination.

9 MR. PERRONE: Do you have a
10 timeline on when you -- if or when you may
11 expect a final letter?

12 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I
13 anticipated we were going to have it before
14 this meeting, but -- so I have not seen it.

15 So at this point it could be
16 this week. It could be next month -- well,
17 next month is Friday. So it's just --
18 there -- in defense of the office, I know
19 they're down to very short staff and they've
20 got a lot on their plate. So I think they
21 may have felt as though by getting this
22 letter out to me this may have satisfied what
23 I needed, and so they may be taking their
24 time to -- to actually finalize it.

25 MR. PERRONE: Okay.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 21</p> <p>1 Turning to the comments from 2 the Department of Public Health, I understand 3 that DPH offered a number of recommendations 4 to protect public drinking water. Would AT&T 5 be able to comply with these recommendations, 6 AT&T and MCM? 7 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean 8 Gustafson. Yes, and those are codified in 9 the wetland function value assessment that we 10 supplied the Council in response to 11 interrogatories. And those -- the details of 12 those are included in the attached wetland 13 protection program. 14 MR. PERRONE: Is the project 15 within the shaded area of the natural 16 diversity database? 17 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): No. 18 MR. PERRONE: The letter from 19 DEEP, D-E-E-P, they mentioned they don't 20 expect any impacts to state designated 21 species. Would any other species, like 22 federally designated, be impacted? 23 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): No. 24 We've done an analysis of federally listed 25 species, and there would be no impact to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 23</p> <p>1 have the width of the monopole at the base 2 and the top? 3 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes. 4 The approximate dimensions would be somewhere 5 in the 4- to 5-foot diameter at the base and 6 about 27 to 30 inches at the top. 7 MR. PERRONE: And would it 8 have the gray -- gray galvanized finish? 9 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes, 10 that is what's proposed. 11 MR. PERRONE: Okay. 12 Were any other, perhaps, 13 stealth designs considered, or a brown 14 finish, or any -- any alternative designs? 15 THE WITNESS (Chasse): No, 16 there were not. 17 MR. PERRONE: Okay. One 18 second. 19 And going back to the site 20 plan, how tall would that retaining wall be? 21 I see the length of it on the diagram. 22 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes. 23 It's approximately 3-and-a-half-foot tall at 24 the southwestern -- or excuse me, 25 southeastern corner.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 22</p> <p>1 federally listed species with this 2 development. 3 MR. PERRONE: Okay. 4 In the viewshed analysis, I 5 understand that there's actually two hiking 6 trails. There's one to the east and there's 7 one to the far north. Which one is to the -- 8 in the northern part of the study area? 9 THE WITNESS (Libertine): 10 There's quite a series of 11 trail systems in the town. And if I may, I 12 think I may have to take that as a homework. 13 I know the Aspetuck Valley trail system is to 14 the east, but it may actually also be part of 15 that trail system to the north. But I can 16 confirm that. I just don't have that right 17 in front of me. 18 MR. PERRONE: Okay. 19 Now, I understand abutting 20 properties to the site are zoned R2. Is the 21 subject property also zoned R2? 22 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott 23 Chasse. Yes. 24 MR. PERRONE: Okay. 25 As far as the monopole, do you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24</p> <p>1 MR. PERRONE: Okay. 2 And I understand the fire 3 department has an existing aboveground 4 propane tank for their use. Would that be 5 moved out of the way of the proposed 6 compound? 7 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes. 8 MR. PERRONE: Okay. 9 Also, Mr. Chasse, could you 10 summarize some of what we discussed at the 11 field review with regard to the existing 12 compound and the construction phasing? 13 THE WITNESS (Chasse): 14 Certainly. As we briefly 15 discussed in the field, the intent here is to 16 keep the fire department system up and 17 running during the course of the proposed 18 development. 19 Therefore, the proposed tower 20 foundation and tower erection would occur 21 prior to cutting the fire department's 22 existing inventory over to the new structure. 23 Once that's done, then the 24 existing 80-foot lattice tower can be 25 decommissioned, and the existing foundations</p>

Page 25

1 that are there are three 4-foot diameter,
2 13-foot deep concrete caissons that they
3 could be ground down a little bit below
4 grade. And in that future location, we're
5 looking at putting two 12-by-15 slabs on top
6 of them. So the existing foundations
7 basically can stay.
8 MR. PERRONE: And I understand
9 AT&T would be using a portable generator.
10 Would you bring it to the site, like, in the
11 case of an outage, or would it be left there
12 all the time?
13 THE WITNESS (Vivian): That
14 would be on -- that would be an on-call
15 basis. It would not be there permanently.
16 MR. PERRONE: Okay.
17 And based on the existing
18 site, there was no room for a permanent
19 generator?
20 Okay.
21 MR. LAUB: Maybe I can help
22 with that one.
23 We have had discussions for a
24 permanent generator. This, in our opinion,
25 is clearly a site that will not lend

Page 26

1 itself -- we've all been there -- It will not
2 lend itself to multiple generators for each
3 carrier.
4 We've had conversations both
5 with the fire department about upgrading the
6 existing generator at site or bringing in a
7 second common generator for carrier use and
8 sharing the existing fuel source. So those
9 conversations are still ongoing.
10 MR. PERRONE: Okay.
11 So, as it stands now, they
12 would be separate, but there are some
13 discussions on potentially a shared one?
14 THE WITNESS (Gelinas): There
15 are discussions on a shared generator. In
16 the interim, what we've designed is a quick
17 connect, backer board for temporary generator
18 deployment.
19 MR. PERRONE: Like the
20 permanent generators, would the portable also
21 have, like, a double-walled fuel tank or some
22 other containment measure?
23 THE WITNESS (Vivian): I'm
24 not -- I'm not positive about the safety
25 features on the cart, so I'll take that as a

Page 27

1 homework.
2 MR. PERRONE: Okay.
3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Excuse me.
4 I'd rather wait to the end when my questions
5 will have been asked by somebody else --
6 shared -- this shared generator, would you
7 object to a condition by the Siting Council,
8 if this were to be approved in whatever form,
9 of requiring a shared generator? I'm trying
10 to --
11 THE WITNESS (Gelinas): We'd
12 like to propose it as part of D and M.
13 THE CHAIRPERSON: That's
14 what -- so is that a yes or -- or a no?
15 Why -- why -- I try to be as
16 straightforward in my question.
17 MR. LAUB: I think -- I think
18 the difficulty, Mr. Chairman, is that it's --
19 there's a lot of logistical considerations
20 out at the site, considering the existing
21 infrastructure, that Message Center does not
22 have any -- does not currently have the lease
23 area to put in -- to put in a common
24 generator. That would have to be assessed by
25 the fire department as well as what the fire

Page 28

1 department has to do.
2 The fire department would have
3 to do -- we would have to work a lot with the
4 fire department regarding their existing
5 infrastructure, which the discussions have
6 taken place, but it's -- it's not something
7 we -- we could accomplish.
8 If that was a condition --
9 currently, as it stands, if that were a
10 condition of approval, I don't think Message
11 Center has the capacity to install a common
12 generator due to the lease area and other
13 infrastructure in the area. So we wouldn't
14 be -- we wouldn't have the capacity now.
15 That's why those backup ones are reliable.
16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.
17 Well, hopefully, if we get to
18 that point, you'll have a more definitive
19 answer when we get there.
20 Yes. We have a follow-up
21 question from Dr. Klemens.
22 DR. KLEMENS: Well, actually,
23 one of the few questions I had.
24 You're -- you, in your
25 testimony or your application, you say

Page 29

1 there's not room for a permanent generator.
2 And I don't know if it's pertinent, but I
3 looked at the intervenors, and they wish to
4 put a permanent generator in. So I don't
5 understand why we can't have a shared
6 permanent generator in there.
7 I mean, that's sort of the
8 recommendation, the two-storm panel, not to
9 be shuffling around portable generators. So
10 it seems to me, you have three users on site
11 potentially, the fire department, AT&T and
12 Verizon. And, certainly, a shared generator
13 is -- apparently should be able to work for
14 all of you. And it should be able to be
15 built to the specifications that Mr. Perrone
16 asked about, double-walled protection,
17 particularly if you look at the lay of the
18 land and see there's a wetland and a public
19 water drinking supply right below the
20 firehouse, it seems to me there's a solution
21 there on all three generation issues.
22 THE WITNESS (Gelinas): In
23 regard to the generator, I think what I -- if
24 I didn't say what I had intended to say, was
25 that there was not room for multiple

Page 30

1 generators, individual generators for each
2 carrier. There just simply isn't that room.
3 With regard to the
4 double-walled design for the containment of
5 fuel on the site, that is only as it relates
6 to a temporary, roll-up generator, which has
7 very specific limitations in deployment, per
8 our -- our agreement with the fire
9 department.
10 Other than that, the fuel
11 source would be propane. There is a -- there
12 is a requirement that there not be diesel
13 permanently on site at this -- at this
14 location in our agreement with the fire
15 department.
16 DR. KLEMENS: Okay.
17 Because I thought -- maybe I
18 misread it. I thought that Verizon is
19 proposing a diesel generator.
20 MR. BALDWIN: Dr. Klemens,
21 Mr. Chairman, we are going to clarify that
22 response when -- when it's our turn. But
23 just to foreshadow that, there was a
24 misunderstanding on our part at the time
25 those responses were submitted that we will

Page 31

1 clarify later on this evening.
2 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you,
3 Mr. Baldwin.
4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
5 Mr. Perrone.
6 MR. PERRONE: Okay.
7 Back to AT&T's portable
8 generator, because the interrogatory response
9 had indicated diesel with about a 48-hour run
10 time. So if you switched to propane, would
11 you have a different run time on the
12 portable?
13 THE WITNESS (Vivian): No, but
14 it's basically -- for the portables, you
15 know, carting them and you need to have
16 diesel fuel, so that's the only time that
17 we're allowed -- allowed to bring diesel fuel
18 on site.
19 MR. PERRONE: So the portable
20 is for --
21 THE WITNESS (Vivian): The
22 portable is -- is on a cart.
23 MR. PERRONE: Right.
24 THE WITNESS (Vivian): And
25 that will be diesel -- diesel fuel. And --

Page 32

1 and if you bring in a full cart, it operates
2 for about 48 hours before you have to refuel
3 it.
4 MR. PERRONE: All right.
5 So the limitation requiring
6 propane, that's based on a permanent
7 generator?
8 THE WITNESS (Vivian):
9 Correct. That's correct.
10 MR. PERRONE: Okay.
11 I understand that there's an
12 irregular lease area. Is that because the
13 lease area is the compound itself plus
14 another rectangular area for the utility
15 board and --
16 THE WITNESS (Vivian): Yes.
17 MR. PERRONE: Okay.
18 And that smaller, rectangular
19 area would not be fenced?
20 THE WITNESS (Vivian): Not as
21 proposed.
22 MR. PERRONE: Okay.
23 And the Interrogatory Response
24 Number 1 had mentioned the search ring was
25 relocated. Did the size of the search ring

Page 33

1 remain the same?
2 THE WITNESS (Vivian):
3 Essentially, yes, although the
4 search ring size, once it was relocated, was
5 more -- find something in -- in a more
6 southwesterly direction. We were grasping at
7 straws, essentially.
8 MR. PERRONE: And I understand
9 there was some discussions about 120 feet as
10 the height. How would 120 feet work in terms
11 of coverage and handoff?
12 THE WITNESS (Lavin): One
13 hundred and twenty feet, I think we've --
14 we've looked at that. It would be inferior
15 in coverage. The 150 feet was a good balance
16 between visibility and coverage. One hundred
17 and twenty feet would -- we'd lose quite a
18 bit of population, road, and area coverage.
19 It is -- 150 feet is
20 definitely very much preferred by AT&T.
21 Also, it shortens up the overall tower. And
22 it would basically, I think, leave us unable
23 to put a -- certainly unable to put a fourth
24 carrier on, 120 feet wouldn't.
25 As we discussed in the public

Page 34

1 information meeting, we would be pushing for
2 a tenant down basically at the same level as
3 the town's antennas which cannot move. They
4 are licensed at that height. We can't move
5 those up or down. So they have to be at the
6 level that they are.
7 MR. PERRONE: So 150 feet is
8 still your minimum to meet your objective?
9 THE WITNESS (Lavin): To limit
10 the height of any -- as we move forward, you
11 know, there's a gap still on Cross Road. A
12 hundred and fifty feet makes that as small as
13 we think it can be practically, 120 feet
14 opens it up. And it may also affect the rest
15 of the network as we go down areas around
16 near those.
17 Some of the sites might have
18 to be made taller to make up for lack of
19 coverage around the periphery for this site.
20 THE CHAIRPERSON: I think
21 Mr. Lynch has a follow up.
22 MR. LYNCH: Yes, Mr. Lavin.
23 You skirted around it little bit, but the
24 bottom line, does 120 feet work or not work?
25 THE WITNESS (Lavin): If it

Page 35

1 comes down to that, then I think AT&T would
2 still go with 120, but we would be opening up
3 gaps. We would be potentially making
4 surrounding subsequent sites have to be
5 taller or closer. It's hard to say what the
6 overall impact -- we haven't designed the
7 rest of the network around it.
8 It's not without a cost.
9 MR. LYNCH: Okay.
10 THE WITNESS (Lavin): And we
11 lose at least the fourth occupant. And when
12 the third is awfully close to the fire
13 department's antennas, they are very low-band
14 antennas. They probably have very wide
15 beamwidths. I don't know what their concerns
16 are about us getting closer and closer and
17 closer on top of them.
18 MR. LYNCH: So you're talking
19 about interference with their frequency?
20 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Not so
21 much the frequency, but just putting all that
22 metal in front of their antennas, that if
23 they're low band, it probably has a very wide
24 vertical beamwidth and may have more
25 stringent requirements for getting the

Page 36

1 antennas above them, away from them.
2 Right now, they've got nothing
3 but open space above them.
4 MR. LYNCH: But would that
5 prohibit -- I know you can't speak for
6 Verizon -- but would it likely prohibit
7 Verizon going down to 110 feet?
8 THE WITNESS (Lavin): In terms
9 of interfering with the fire department, I
10 don't -- I don't think 110 feet would be a
11 problem with them, still down at 80, but the
12 third and definitely the fourth would just be
13 impossible. And the third might be closer
14 than they want us.
15 MR. LYNCH: Okay. We'll come
16 back and revisit it with Verizon.
17 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Sure.
18 MR. LYNCH: But from what I
19 understand, you're saying that AT&T would
20 probably still go ahead and build this
21 facility?
22 THE WITNESS (Lavin):
23 Reluctantly --
24 MR. LYNCH: Or not AT&T, I
25 mean, the Message Center.

Page 37

1 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I -- I
2 don't only speak for AT&T in terms going on
3 the tower, if Message Center Management --
4 THE WITNESS (Gelinias): Right.
5 And to Martin's point, I think the concern,
6 from our standpoint, would be the limitation
7 of collocation ability as we approach the
8 fire department's antennas.
9 The fire department has a
10 designation of primary occupant in our
11 agreement, which -- which clarifies that
12 regardless of who comes on the site, they
13 will not interfere with the primary occupant,
14 that being public safety, the fire
15 department.
16 So, as -- as Martin indicates,
17 as we encroach into that 80-foot level, if we
18 were to build this facility knowing that it
19 would -- it would really be capable of
20 satisfying the needs of two or perhaps three
21 carriers, we then lend ourselves potentially
22 for another site.
23 MR. LYNCH: Thank you.
24 And thank you, Mr. Chairman.
25 MR. PERRONE: In the previous

Page 38

1 tower approval, in Docket 334, the tower
2 height was about 121 feet. Is it correct to
3 say that that was for Sprint, a different
4 carrier with -- with different needs?
5 THE WITNESS (Gelinias): All
6 that is accurate. It was by Sprint,
7 different carrier.
8 MR. PERRONE: About how much
9 additional height would be required for
10 flush-mounted antennas, about 20?
11 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I
12 haven't looked into that specifically. AT&T
13 would probably require at least three
14 positions on the tower. I can't speak for
15 Verizon, especially. If it's 120, that's
16 definitely, sort of, game over for any other
17 collocators. And it also greatly
18 complicates -- well, flush mounting without a
19 ray dome is not so bad. A flagpole with
20 stealth installation puts a ray dome over
21 everything which greatly complicates
22 collocating the fire department's antennas.
23 They're depicted in the
24 drawings as being sort of like little panels
25 that can fit right up tight. And looking

Page 39

1 today, I realize one has four ground radials
2 around it. It's going to occupy a lot more
3 space and would have to -- I've -- I've never
4 really seen anyone hang an external antenna
5 on a stealth -- a stealth ray dome. And it
6 would have to stand way out from there,
7 basically ruining the whole thing.
8 MR. PERRONE: Mr. Chasse,
9 do -- let's see -- does MCM plan to
10 incorporate the noise mitigation measures
11 recommended in the noise analysis?
12 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes.
13 MR. PERRONE: Okay. Okay.
14 I understand you gave a
15 construction timeline in terms of weeks. In
16 terms of your -- what would be your
17 construction schedule, roughly, if approved,
18 post D and M?
19 THE WITNESS (Vivian):
20 Approximately six to eight
21 weeks.
22 MR. PERRONE: Okay.
23 And, lastly, Mr. Libertine, I
24 understand we have the -- the acreages of
25 seasonal and year-round views for the tower.

Page 40

1 Would you have an estimate of the number of
2 homes with year-round and seasonal views?
3 THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's
4 an estimate, but we are probably in the
5 neighborhood for year-round views of less
6 than -- about a handful. So we're probably
7 talking five or six.
8 And in terms of seasonal,
9 probably somewhere in the neighborhood of an
10 additional eight to ten all -- all well
11 within a half mile or less of the property.
12 MR. PERRONE: Thank you.
13 That's all I have.
14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
15 We'll now go to
16 cross-examination by members of the Council.
17 Dr. Bell.
18 DR. BELL: Thank you, Mr.
19 Chair.
20 On page 15 of the
21 application -- it's just a housekeeping
22 question.
23 In the middle of the top
24 paragraph it says "Closing the coverage gaps
25 and providing reliable wireless services in

Page 41

1 Western Farmington requires a tower site that
2 can provide reliable", and so forth. Clearly
3 Western Farmington is wrong.
4 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Clearly
5 an error.
6 DR. BELL: But my question is,
7 is the several thousand acres that ends the
8 sentence is that also wrong, or is that
9 correct with respect to Redding?
10 MR. LAUB: And apologies,
11 first, for the error.
12 DR. BELL: I'm trying to find
13 the page numbers here.
14 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Our
15 incremental coverage, that's -- so at 850
16 megahertz was 8 square miles and there's 640
17 acres in a square mile, so 5,120. So it is
18 several thousand, yes, acres.
19 DR. BELL: So that would be a
20 correct when applying to Redding?
21 THE WITNESS (Lavin): That
22 still applies, yes.
23 DR. BELL: Thank you.
24 In the -- in Tab 1 of the
25 application, you talk about the various sites

Page 42

1 that you -- I have that Tab 1. I guess it's
2 Tab 2.
3 For some reason I've got the
4 wrong reference. We'll skip that one.
5 On the maps, the coverage
6 maps, we find only two actual sites that are
7 marked on the area, delimited by the coverage
8 map, that are providing coverage.
9 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.
10 DR. BELL: And that's for the
11 existing coverage maps, and then you show the
12 proposed coverage, and so forth.
13 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.
14 DR. BELL: But my question is,
15 you have five sites that you're going to hand
16 off to.
17 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Uh-huh.
18 DR. BELL: And when you're
19 showing on those coverage maps the existing
20 coverage, are -- is some of the existing
21 coverage being provided by the three other
22 handoff sites?
23 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.
24 When we do the existing coverage, we take not
25 just the ones you can see on the map, but the

Page 43

1 next tier and usually the next tier out
2 beyond that out, yes.
3 DR. BELL: Yes. So they --
4 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Every
5 site that covers the area is included,
6 whether it's in the plot's area or not.
7 DR. BELL: Okay.
8 Can you, sort of, show us
9 approximately where those handoff sites are,
10 the northeast, west, southwest, whatever it
11 is?
12 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Let's
13 see. The list is there, but I don't have
14 directions to them. If we have more --
15 there's the neighbor plot. The plots only
16 show those two offhand. I don't remember
17 exactly where they are. We could take that
18 as a homework item.
19 DR. BELL: Okay.
20 THE WITNESS (Lavin): It
21 doesn't have to -- have a look at the
22 latitude and longitude.
23 DR. BELL: The last -- this is
24 a question, I guess, for Mr. Gustafson.
25 The -- in the application that

Page 44

1 I have, the last page of the section -- your
2 section -- tell me which section yours is.
3 For some reason I'm coming up with the
4 wrong --
5 MR. LAUB: Are you referring
6 to Tab 4 of the application?
7 There's Mr. Gustafson's
8 wetland -- additional wetlands investigation?
9 DR. BELL: Yes. Yes. Thank
10 you.
11 We'll refer to your wetland --
12 what I'm looking for is your wetland
13 protection plan. In the application that I
14 have, you mentioned the wetland protection
15 plan. You've mentioned it today, but I
16 didn't see where it was.
17 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That
18 was in response to interrogatories.
19 DR. BELL: Oh, okay. So it's
20 in a response?
21 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes.
22 DR. BELL: That's probably why
23 I was having some problems.
24 THE CHAIRPERSON: What tab is
25 it in the response?

Page 45

1 DR. BELL: Is it the first
2 response or that second?
3 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It's
4 the last tab, Tab 12.
5 DR. BELL: Yeah.
6 THE WITNESS (Libertine): And
7 it's actually in the rear of that.
8 DR. KLEMENS: You don't have
9 it.
10 DR. BELL: That's -- that's
11 what I'm supposing is my problem. I have a
12 page that says "Wetland Protection Plan"
13 but -- okay. Good. So my -- my version was
14 just lacking it for some reason. I'll catch
15 up with that later.
16 Thank you.
17 THE WITNESS (Gustafson):
18 You're welcome.
19 DR. BELL: I have a question
20 that's pretty detailed, and I'm not going to
21 ask it in a very detailed way. But I'm going
22 to say what my thought process was. Okay?
23 There are two related
24 questions in the response, in the
25 interrogatories, that we gave to you. One is

Page 46

1 Question Number 30 and one is Question
2 Number 52. And one of them asks about the
3 incremental coverage from 150 to 140, or 140
4 to 150, whatever you want to say. And the
5 other one asks you to specify gaps along the
6 secondary -- and the main roads and the
7 secondary roads. So that makes sense.
8 You -- you ask a question --
9 in one type of question you ask what's the
10 difference between 140 and 150 to determine a
11 difference. That's one sensible question to
12 ask. But another sensible question to ask is
13 what's the size of the gaps, because you may
14 have an increment of .2 of a square mile
15 between 140 or 150. That doesn't seem all
16 that much. But if the gaps are very small,
17 then .2 of a square-mile would be a fairly
18 large increment in coverage.
19 In this case it's the
20 opposite, as far as I can determine, which is
21 that the incremental coverage is very small
22 compared to the overall size of the gaps.
23 And it's -- the detailed part of this is why
24 I'm outlining it in general, because the
25 detailed part of it is tricky. You have to

Page 47

1 flip the pages going back to the answers of
2 32 and -- and -- sorry -- 30 and 52. Now
3 you're flipping pages all over the place.
4 But the really difficult part
5 is that you are specifying two different sets
6 of main roads and probably two different sets
7 of secondary roads in the answers to those
8 questions. I only speculate about the
9 secondary because I couldn't -- I couldn't
10 flip the pages. I would spend too much time
11 flipping the pages, so I just narrowed the --
12 my own pursuit of this logical question, or
13 set of questions that I outlined to you.
14 I just decided that to cut the
15 question down to size, I would just work with
16 the main roads. And that's when I found out
17 that you were specifying, as your proposed
18 area of coverage, two different sets of main
19 roads, which, I believe, had some overlap,
20 but again, I don't want to get too much down
21 into the weeds.
22 So -- but I got the impression
23 from -- as doing as much as detail work as I
24 could, that the incremental value of going
25 from 140 feet to 150 feet was very small in

Page 48

1 relation to the overall size of the gaps that
2 could be covered. And I guess I'm asking you
3 if that is a correct inference from the
4 materials that I've gotten. If I, sort of,
5 keep the main road sets try and roughly
6 constant?
7 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yeah. I
8 think -- I think I know what you mean.
9 There's -- it's a lot more scientific and
10 very deterministic to do 150, 140, 130, 120.
11 The eternal problem we have
12 with defining existing gap is, especially in
13 a rural area, the area of the plot is only
14 about 15 square miles. It's about 3 miles
15 high, 5 miles wide, roughly speaking.
16 In a rural area, when you talk
17 about the existing gap, it's sort of how you
18 look at it. And the coverage, there's so
19 many places that you could keep going and
20 find a lack of coverage. It's sort of how
21 big do you want it to be?
22 It's really hard to define,
23 especially when there's patchy coverage,
24 especially at 1900 megahertz, how you're
25 looking at it.

Page 49

1 We maybe overestimate -- you
2 want the overall existing coverage gap. I
3 mean, I can keep going, probably, most of the
4 way to Hartford and keep finding little areas
5 to extend down into that don't have coverage.
6 I don't have a clear end. It's not a nice
7 oval or square or roundish hole. The gaps in
8 coverage just kind of keep going. It's not
9 so much -- it's a slightly different question
10 to ask, what's addressable by this site?
11 We may be taking it as a very
12 wide definition. I often wonder, as we're
13 doing these things, just how applicable it is
14 to the addressing -- what we're trying to
15 address when we say "the existing gap in
16 Redding." But if you look on the maps at the
17 edges, there's always white areas where,
18 obviously, the gaps can keep going and a huge
19 area opens up.
20 Is that something we want to
21 consider, something we don't want to
22 consider? It's somewhat -- in determining
23 the existing coverage gap, it's almost a
24 little -- there's a lot of different ways to
25 look at it. It's very well set in terms of

Page 50

1 what the coverage levels are, but you can
2 just keep going, especially at 1900
3 megahertz, and take, you know, a
4 10-mile-by-10-mile square and say that's my
5 area, and this is how much of it does or
6 doesn't have coverage.
7 DR. BELL: Well, you -- a
8 very, very short response to that is, in the
9 first instance, when you answer Question
10 Number 30, you actually cover the -- you give
11 the data for 700, 850 and 1900.
12 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.
13 DR. BELL: In the second bunch
14 of material when you answer Question
15 Number 52, you answer only for 700 and 19 --
16 yes, 700 and 1900. Eight fifty is somehow
17 missing, at least in my version of the -- in
18 the booklet I have.
19 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Okay.
20 DR. BELL: So that's a very
21 short response to the question.
22 But my main response to the
23 question is all we have to deal with is the
24 gaps that you've given us in this -- in these
25 tables. And I'm looking at a gap to be

Page 51

1 covered on main roads of 16.74 square miles.
2 That's roughly 17 square miles.
3 And I'm looking at the 700.
4 If we just take 700, and we pretend the roads
5 are the same, then the gap -- then the
6 coverage at 150 is only -- is only .2 of a
7 square mile. And so I'm comparing with
8 the -- with all the figures, understanding
9 that you can't tell me all the gaps, but I'm
10 just going with the figures I have in the
11 booklet before me. We're looking at .2 in a
12 17-mile gap.
13 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Uh-huh.
14 DR. BELL: And that's why I'm
15 saying, it seems to me as if that's a very
16 small increment.
17 THE WITNESS (Lavin): It is a
18 small percentage of the overall coverage gap.
19 I just -- it's a matter of where you end the
20 coverage gap. If you look at the -- in a --
21 in a -- an urban area you would probably have
22 a well-defined coverage gap. There would be
23 a continuous border of coverage around it,
24 and you can say there's my gap.
25 Here, there are hilltops that

Page 52

1 are covered in various places. The site
2 density is very low. And it's a matter of
3 where you say you want to stop because you
4 can always keep finding -- if you go five
5 miles out and, you know, there's two
6 hilltops, but between it there's a lack of
7 coverage, do I consider that to be my
8 existing gap?
9 I think, it may be -- we may
10 need to provide more information on exactly
11 how we looked at this and what the overall
12 area is that we considered. We don't -- we
13 try not restrict ourselves to just say my
14 existing coverage gap happens to coincide
15 with the amount of coverage I got in this
16 part of it.
17 DR. BELL: Well, do you
18 understand, when I outline the logic of where
19 I was coming from --
20 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.
21 DR. BELL: -- the kinds of
22 questions?
23 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Uh-huh.
24 I think it may be --
25 DR. BELL: We're just trying

Page 53

1 to get a sense of the --
2 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.
3 DR. BELL: -- of what you
4 think the gap is and whether you think the
5 increment is small or large.
6 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
7 the increment is significant in Redding. We
8 could probably produce plots that depict the
9 overall area we looked at as the existing
10 coverage gap, which extends well beyond
11 Redding, and more clearly illustrate exactly
12 the whole area we took in of, say, 87 or 108
13 square miles, as opposed to just the 15 miles
14 of the plot, just in terms of area that
15 there's plenty of coverage gaps beyond that.
16 And if we -- I think if we
17 could produce a plot that would show the area
18 we considered, and that would make it
19 clearer.
20 DR. BELL: Well, all I'll say
21 is, if you can deal with the logic of my
22 questions --
23 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.
24 DR. BELL: -- that we can
25 approach this from two directions. One is

Page 54

1 looking at it in increments of coverage, and
2 one is looking at how much of the gap is
3 filled.
4 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.
5 DR. BELL: Those are two
6 logical approaches to understanding the
7 coverage benefits.
8 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.
9 DR. BELL: And if you can make
10 the case that the coverage benefits are
11 significant --
12 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Uh-huh.
13 Which I think the incremental coverage is.
14 DR. BELL: Then please try to
15 do so. At the moment, it looks to me as if
16 they're not too significant, and that's why
17 I'm pursuing this line of questioning.
18 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I can
19 see -- yeah. I see what you're saying about
20 that, compared to what we portrayed as the
21 existing gap. But we may be, in our
22 engineering way, considering too much of an
23 area around there that also has gaps in
24 coverage that would be served by the next
25 couple of sites that would come along with,

Page 55

1 whenever they're designed.
2 We may be being too -- a
3 little too analytical or trying to be -- not
4 constrict ourselves to this small area. This
5 is -- I think this is very significant in
6 terms of what one site in this area can --
7 can accomplish. But I think --
8 DR. BELL: That's my question
9 Mr. Chair. Thank you.
10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Dr. Klemens.
11 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you,
12 Mr. Chairman.
13 Actually, this is a great
14 segue to my questions. You saw the
15 submission of Diane Taylor from the Redding
16 Planning Commission, she -- the letter that's
17 in the record. You have seen that?
18 I will explain it. Sure.
19 I'll be happy to explain it.
20 There is a map that you, I
21 guess, presented at sometime at an
22 informational meeting, which is not included
23 in the application, which shows the proposed
24 120-foot coverage area and the proposed
25 150-foot coverage area. It has your logo on

Page 56

1 it, and it was -- it was supplied by the
2 Applicant.
3 And what's very interesting is
4 what they have done. And this is where it
5 bothers -- they have actually imported from
6 the town GIS what is actually covered in the
7 coverage and the difference between the blue,
8 which is proposed 120, and the purple, which
9 is the proposed 150. They've actually shown
10 the roads and the dwellings or residences.
11 Now it's a bit hard to read because they used
12 red on purple, which is not the best color
13 contrast.
14 But the best I can see, there
15 are only ten structures that are going to be
16 put in -- will receive coverage between the
17 120- and the 150-foot height, and most of the
18 150-foot height, the majority of it, the
19 purple, seems to be on river valleys and
20 wetlands and that.
21 So this is, sort of,
22 follows -- this is sort of getting at what
23 Dr. Bell was asking in a somewhat different
24 way. And now we have SHPO talking about 120
25 feet. So I don't see -- could you explain to

Page 57

1 me what the benefit is really of the 150
2 feet?
3 THE WITNESS (Lavin): By our
4 analytical method, we saw the -- for 120
5 that's not --
6 MR. LAUB: While Mr. Lavin is
7 looking for his information, yes, we did
8 provide that plot account. I thought it was
9 in the record. If it's not, we can certainly
10 provide it to the Council. It was requested
11 as part of the consultation.
12 DR. KLEMENS: Right. Well,
13 it's in the record because actually the --
14 the -- I believe it's in the record
15 because -- is it in the record, Attorney
16 Bachman?
17 DR. BELL: Yes, it's in that.
18 MR. LAUB: As part of sworn
19 testimony, so it's part of the record from
20 the applicant.
21 DR. KLEMENS: But it's very
22 interesting to see when they've imported from
23 the town GIS what actually -- how many houses
24 or structures will actually receive cell
25 service between the two.

Page 58

1 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I
2 haven't seen the analysis. I don't have
3 access to their -- to the data they have. We
4 work off of 2010 census blocks in terms of
5 population. Our tool devised those blocks
6 into covered and not covered.
7 And we can, based on the
8 uniform distribution of population within
9 those census blocks, which is as close as we
10 can get in terms of resolution, we divide
11 each block into covered and not covered
12 percentages and distribute the underlying
13 population among those two, and that's how we
14 count up.
15 DR. KLEMENS: So you -- so you
16 model the population?
17 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Based on
18 census blocks from the 2010 census data.
19 DR. KLEMENS: So you don't
20 actually look where the actual dwellings
21 might be that would be --
22 THE WITNESS (Lavin): No. We
23 don't have access to the dwelling database.
24 That's -- the census is the best available
25 information we have on population.

Page 59

1 DR. KLEMENS: Well, I think
2 you should, maybe, next time when you come
3 back, if there is a next time, you should
4 look at this because it's quite instructive.
5 It, sort of, follows on the questions that
6 Dr. Bell was asking.
7 And I think we've already -- a
8 lot of it's already been discussed about, you
9 know, the coverage. The issue now that SHPO
10 is potentially -- I understand that letter is
11 not signed yet, but if SHPO says, it's 120
12 feet, it's 120 feet. Correct, Mr. Libertine?
13 THE WITNESS (Libertine):
14 Well, not necessarily.
15 It's -- the consultation for a NEPA
16 compliance is one of the components why we
17 reach out to SHPO. The other is, obviously
18 because they're a sister agency to a state
19 agency and our -- we're required also to
20 reach out to consultant as part of your
21 process.
22 To answer your question,
23 there -- there are mechanisms to petition
24 that formally with the FCC, provided we can
25 establish need and other arguments. So it's

Page 60

1 something we would like to avoid, obviously.
2 But it doesn't necessarily cap it at 120
3 feet, I guess is the easiest way to answer
4 that question.
5 DR. KLEMENS: It doesn't cap
6 it, but would you agree, it presents a
7 certain -- if the letter is signed, presents
8 a serious challenge to overcome?
9 THE WITNESS (Libertine): It
10 certainly presents us with a significant
11 challenge, yes.
12 DR. KLEMENS: And just to
13 follow on the other SHPO one that I was so
14 interested in, 442, I think it was, would the
15 -- would twin towers work on this site,
16 because you have two carriers that are going
17 to want to be there?
18 THE WITNESS (Libertine):
19 Yeah, I think we might be
20 constrained with room to really even consider
21 something like that right now.
22 DR. KLEMENS: I would think
23 you would be.
24 THE WITNESS (Libertine):
25 Yeah. Yeah, because we need

Page 61

1 some separation. I'm not sure you could
2 really -- well, I don't want to speak, but I
3 think --

4 THE WITNESS (Chasse): On
5 similar applications, on a, say, a
6 transmission line collocation where you've
7 got an H-frame and you have two carriers on
8 the same structure, it's more or less about
9 27-foot horizontal separation that we've --
10 there's not a lot of room on the site for
11 that.

12 DR. KLEMENS: No, I think
13 that's an important thing to note.

14 One last question: In your
15 professional opinion, two carriers could --
16 although I've seen -- everybody, you want
17 150, and I know that a Verizon can't --
18 Verizon could live with 120 but would prefer
19 140. But if you have a 120-foot tower there,
20 would you be able to, in your professional
21 opinion, put those two carriers on, and would
22 they function?

23 Because there's testimony here
24 that -- probably not going to be other --
25 other collocation. It's one of the other

Page 62

1 things that was brought up in the letter from
2 the planning commission, that there's not --
3 I think we got a letter from T-Mobile that
4 they're not interested. And so I think
5 you're really looking with -- with two
6 carriers on this tower.

7 THE WITNESS (Gelinas): I
8 think the -- the letters that may have been
9 received were probably in the current market
10 conditions. We've spoken with both T-Mobile
11 and Sprint. And concern from our, our
12 vantage point would be for collocation in the
13 future.

14 We've had facilities where
15 collocation has been immediate. And we've
16 had facilities where additional carriers have
17 come on three, five and six years later.

18 DR. KLEMENS: And in your
19 opinion, at 120 feet, they would -- you
20 said -- someone said maybe a third could get
21 on, but that's pretty much it with the town's
22 equipment.

23 THE WITNESS (Gelinas): The
24 town equipment is at 80 feet. I think
25 what -- if we assume a 10-foot stacking

Page 63

1 separation and work our way down, we cannot
2 have interference with the public safety
3 facilities.

4 And we begin to get that, or
5 we -- from a -- from a leasing standpoint --
6 I won't speak to an engineering standpoint --
7 we begin to run into space constraints by the
8 time we hit the third carrier.

9 DR. KLEMENS: So if we talk
10 about towers of the future -- and this is
11 what I was grappling with. On one hand, I
12 can see people want this tower to be 120
13 feet. And I can understand why you would
14 like it to be taller.

15 Is this really talking about
16 trying to reduce proliferation of towers?
17 We've already heard testimony that, well,
18 we're going to have to raise towers somewhere
19 else to make up for this gap. Are we
20 really -- if it's -- if it becomes 120-foot
21 tower, are we really creating a tower that is
22 almost, in a sense, very soon to be obsolete?
23 And is this -- if you can only get a 120-foot
24 tower, is this the best place -- is this --
25 what I'm trying to say is, if we build a

Page 64

1 hundred -- I'm being very inarticulate here.

2 What I'm trying to say, are we
3 are we building -- at 120 feet, if that's all
4 you can build here, is there really a tower
5 that is useful to be built long term, and is
6 it just going to add to the proliferation of
7 towers around the state because it's a
8 marginally useful tower?

9 THE WITNESS (Gelinas): I'm
10 not really sure from an engineering
11 standpoint, but each carrier would have to
12 speak for themselves with regard to the
13 functionality of the facility.

14 From our experience, from the
15 development standpoint, as it interrelates
16 with the engineering standpoint, if the
17 facility -- given the fact that this is an
18 existing tower, in our opinion, it made sense
19 for facility at this location given that we
20 had two carriers that were interested.

21 For T-Mobile and Sprint, we
22 have -- we have provided the information to
23 both carriers. Neither have the budget;
24 however, Sprint has said, you know, we'll
25 look at it again when the budgets come around

Page 65

1 for 2015, 2016.
2 More directly to your question
3 about the proliferation, I think, certainly
4 from our experience from a development
5 standpoint, lower creates more and taller
6 creates less, from a -- from a usage ability.
7 DR. KLEMENS: That's very
8 helpful. I think that's an important point.
9 Thank you.
10 I have no further questions,
11 Mr. Chairman.
12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Senator
13 Daily.
14 SENATOR DAILY: No, I don't
15 have any questions at this point in time.
16 Thank you.
17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Ashton.
18 MR. ASHTON: Thank you,
19 Mr. Chairman.
20 I'd like to go back, Mr.
21 Libertine, and make sure I understand the
22 SHPO review as it stands. I know we have a
23 draft letter. It's not cast in concrete.
24 But as I thought I heard you say that a
25 structure 150-foot high causes potential

Page 66

1 problems with a property that might be
2 eligible for national recognition. Is that
3 correct?
4 THE WITNESS (Libertine): That
5 is correct.
6 MR. ASHTON: It is not -- the
7 property has not yet received any national
8 recognition?
9 THE WITNESS (Libertine): It
10 is -- that is correct. It's not only not
11 listed or received a nomination, it's not a
12 state listed site, as well, or has been
13 inventoried.
14 MR. ASHTON: I'm just a poor
15 simple engineer, but doesn't that statement
16 almost apply to every single tower in the
17 state of Connecticut, in that I've got
18 properties that might be listed, have a
19 potential to be listed, have a potential of
20 conflict? I mean, this is -- this is the
21 height of irresponsibility, isn't it?
22 That's not your question.
23 That's mine.
24 THE WITNESS (Libertine): No,
25 I understand. The last piece was a comment.

Page 67

1 MR. ASHTON: I don't want you
2 to answer that. That puts you on the spot.
3 But to me, it's, you know, I
4 understand SHPO's relationship with the
5 State. I really do, and I applaud that. But
6 by the same token, and maybe perhaps for a
7 possibility, to me, is reaching a little bit,
8 and I really have problems with that kind of
9 a decision tying up a cell tower, where we're
10 looking for things like emergency response,
11 coverage, data transmission, and all the rest
12 of it. It's part and parcel of the fabric of
13 a modern society.
14 Okay. You've answered my
15 question with that, though. So this is a,
16 maybe perhaps type of thing. In no
17 particular order, the utilities at the
18 site -- and I guess, Mr. Chasse, I'm looking
19 at you for this. Is that -- are you the
20 first vice president in that?
21 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes.
22 MR. ASHTON: Okay.
23 I think I heard that the
24 existing facility, the pole will be replaced.
25 A new high-voltage line distribution line,

Page 68

1 which I think in this area is -- I can't
2 remember -- it's 13,000 volts, I believe --
3 would be run to the pole. You're going to
4 have to run new communication to the pole.
5 Is that correct?
6 THE WITNESS (Chasse): That's
7 correct, yes.
8 MR. ASHTON: And it goes
9 underground from that. There would be a
10 transformer there, and underground from that
11 point, to a meter board and switch panel in
12 the back of the fire department near the
13 proposed site.
14 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Correct.
15 MR. ASHTON: Is that fair?
16 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes.
17 MR. ASHTON: Okay.
18 My first question is, why on
19 earth can't it come underground off the pole
20 on the west side of Black Rock Turnpike, and
21 forget the new pole on the fire station site.
22 THE CHAIRPERSON: We actually
23 did a utility consult. We hired McPhee
24 Electric to order power service with CL&P,
25 and we actually went through a couple

Page 69

1 iterations.
2 There was a couple of concerns
3 regarding crossing and trenching across the
4 existing drive to bring power in from that
5 side of the -- of the parcel, as well as
6 setting a new pole, doing an overhead shot
7 across the -- Black Rock onto a new pole.
8 There were sightline issues. And I guess
9 when the fire service is called, they pretty
10 much park wherever they can park on there,
11 and they use that little grassy knoll area.
12 MR. ASHTON: Well, I
13 understand that, but we're not talking a
14 year-long trench -- open trench, are we?
15 THE WITNESS (Chasse): No. I
16 was talking about another pole location.
17 MR. ASHTON: Well, okay.
18 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Maybe I
19 misunderstood.
20 MR. ASHTON: Let me -- are you
21 telling me that CL&P, my favorite company, is
22 requiring a new pole on the west side of
23 Black Rock Turnpike in order to tap it for
24 underground?
25 THE WITNESS (Chasse): No, on

Page 70

1 the eastern side. On site, there's an
2 existing snap pole there, 4259.
3 MR. ASHTON: Yep.
4 THE WITNESS (Chasse): And
5 that -- that's the pole that will be
6 replaced.
7 MR. ASHTON: Right. I
8 understand that. And my comment or question
9 is, why can't you eliminate 4259 replacement
10 and go to the west side of the turnpike, and
11 underground off an existing pole there,
12 trenching across Black Rock Turnpike, boring
13 across it?
14 THE WITNESS (Chasse): That
15 would be an alternative, yes.
16 MR. ASHTON: There's no
17 technical reason why that can't be done?
18 THE WITNESS (Chasse): No.
19 MR. ASHTON: Okay. It just --
20 it would reduce the clutter a little bit in
21 front of the firehouse, wouldn't it?
22 I see Mr. Libertine is
23 answering that question with a nod. I'll
24 accept it without pressing.
25 Okay. So you've got power to

Page 71

1 a location now, we'll call 4259. And they're
2 putting a three -- I assume, a three-phase
3 transformer there. Isn't it? Isn't your
4 power to the site three-phase?
5 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Single
6 phase.
7 MR. ASHTON: It's
8 single-phased, everybody?
9 THE WITNESS (Vivian): Yes.
10 MR. ASHTON: And how big a
11 load are you talking about here?
12 THE WITNESS (Chasse): For
13 this particular facility, four carriers, we'd
14 be putting in an 800 amp service.
15 MR. ASHTON: A what? An
16 eight?
17 THE WITNESS (Chasse): An 800
18 amp service.
19 MR. ASHTON: And that's single
20 phase?
21 THE WITNESS (Chasse): For --
22 it's only a 145-foot run. So the
23 transformers --
24 MR. ASHTON: No, no. It's not
25 the distance. It's the ampacity. If you

Page 72

1 have an 800 -- if you have an eight -- if you
2 have a hundred amp service, it's single
3 phase. No argument. If you have 200 amp,
4 it's probably single phase.
5 If you have 800 amp, it's
6 single phase?
7 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes,
8 sir.
9 MR. ASHTON: Are you sure
10 about that?
11 THE WITNESS (Chasse): That's
12 the intent, is a step-down transformer from
13 primary to secondary and running a 120 --
14 excuse me a 120/240 volt service.
15 MR. ASHTON: The 120/240,
16 well, I understand.
17 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes.
18 MR. ASHTON: Wouldn't it pay
19 to move the transformer a little closer to
20 the site, or is it because of the access
21 issues?
22 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes.
23 It's twofold. The paving -- excuse me -- the
24 plowing operations that the fire department
25 does in order to clear their -- their drive

Page 73

1 for their access of vehicles impacts this
2 particular area. So they were very
3 particular about what and where you could put
4 things in that -- in that location.
5 The other aspect of it is the
6 serviceability of the transformer by the
7 power company.
8 MR. ASHTON: Okay. It's a
9 difficult area back -- around in back of the
10 building.
11 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes.
12 MR. ASHTON: Okay. I can
13 accept that. I'm surprised it's a single
14 phase. I have troubles accepting an overhead
15 crossing Black Rock Turnpike, so I'm going to
16 argue against that.
17 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Okay.
18 MR. ASHTON: On the map, which
19 is sheet SP, Sam Peter 1, behind Tab 3, there
20 is shown a note right on the west side of the
21 building in what I would call a parking area.
22 It says, quote, connect to existing
23 generator. What does that mean?
24 Do you see it?
25 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Oh,

Page 74

1 yes. Yes.
2 MR. ASHTON: What are we
3 connecting to, existing generator?
4 THE WITNESS (Chasse): That is
5 going to be the relocation of the propane
6 line that goes from the 2,000 gallon,
7 underground storage tank on the northeast
8 portion by the compound. The underground
9 service for that piping goes right through
10 the proposed facility. So it needs to be
11 rerouted and then reconnected to the
12 generator, the existing generator.
13 MR. ASHTON: Okay.
14 And the existing generator, is
15 that that little box that shows just below
16 the note there, where the arrow is, in the
17 southwest corner of the drawing at that
18 point?
19 THE WITNESS (Chasse): I
20 believe it's further up around the corner,
21 not shown on the survey.
22 MR. ASHTON: Okay.
23 I'm going to ask a few more
24 questions just because I want to be clear
25 here. It's -- the drawing shows, on the

Page 75

1 north of the proposed site, a couple of
2 underground tanks. One is a water storage.
3 The other is a -- existing underground
4 propane tank. How big is that tank? Do you
5 know?
6 THE WITNESS (Chasse): 2,000
7 gallons.
8 MR. ASHTON: 2,000 gallons.
9 And that's to provide heat,
10 hot water, and generator fuel for the
11 existing firehouse. Is that fair to say?
12 THE WITNESS (Chasse): I
13 believe it services the generator for the
14 firehouse.
15 MR. ASHTON: It just services
16 the generator?
17 THE WITNESS (Chasse): That's
18 my understanding, yes.
19 MR. ASHTON: What would be the
20 chance of using that as a source of fuel for
21 a combined generator?
22 THE WITNESS (Chasse): That
23 would be viable. It would depend on the
24 running loads and how long of a time.
25 MR. ASHTON: Yeah. Right.

Page 76

1 THE WITNESS (Chasse):
2 Obviously, it would --
3 MR. ASHTON: I see.
4 It's kind of in an awkward
5 location there. And I don't know whether
6 anybody's looked at that tank for corrosion
7 problems. My experience with propane is that
8 you get atmospheric corrosion. You have to
9 take care of it.
10 Underground, I don't know how
11 old that tank is, but it could be a real --
12 it could be past its useful life. I would be
13 inclined to suggest that's something to be
14 considered as you get that tank out of there.
15 It's in an awkward location to begin with,
16 and put it in a location that -- where it
17 might be easier access for everybody.
18 Now, the other thing that I
19 thought I heard out in the field was
20 something somebody mentioned, and it might
21 have been you, 30,000 ohms resistance?
22 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes.
23 MR. ASHTON: Tell me little
24 bit about that. What is --
25 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Well --

Page 77

1 MR. ASHTON: -- is that the
2 resistance to ground, to earth?
3 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes.
4 MR. ASHTON: Don't you
5 consider that fairly high?
6 THE WITNESS (Chasse): In our
7 business that's fairly low.
8 MR. ASHTON: Really?
9 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yeah.
10 We've -- I've seen a couple million. So
11 that's actually pretty good numbers.
12 MR. ASHTON: In my business, I
13 consider that sky high.
14 THE WITNESS (Chasse): A
15 standard ground system with copper and ground
16 rod should be adequate for grounding out the
17 site.
18 MR. ASHTON: Is that ground
19 tied into the electric facilities?
20 THE WITNESS (Chasse):
21 Separate ground for the electric facility.
22 MR. ASHTON: There is a
23 separate ground.
24 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes.
25 MR. ASHTON: There's no cross

Page 78

1 connection at all?
2 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes,
3 that's correct. It has it's own -- the
4 transformer will be grounded out, as will the
5 backboard and the -- the master span, or CSC.
6 MR. ASHTON: Okay.
7 You're going to -- I think I
8 also heard that you're going to put a 35-foot
9 deep caisson to support the existing -- the
10 proposed tower.
11 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Correct.
12 MR. ASHTON: Would that not
13 knock down the 30,000 ohm resistance if you,
14 you know, put some coiled copper at the
15 bottom of that?
16 THE WITNESS (Chasse): The
17 groundwater was observed almost near the
18 bottom of that. The groundwater is fairly
19 deep here. It's like 30 -- over 30 feet
20 below grade. So we're not going to get the
21 benefit of that.
22 MR. ASHTON: Yeah.
23 Is the ground water very high
24 resistance itself?
25 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yeah.

Page 79

1 MR. ASHTON: Pretty pure?
2 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yeah.
3 MR. ASHTON: No --
4 THE WITNESS (Chasse):
5 That's --
6 MR. ASHTON: -- if you threw
7 50 pounds of salt in the bottom of that
8 caisson, would that help matters?
9 THE WITNESS (Chasse): The
10 concrete probably wouldn't like that, but
11 yes.
12 MR. ASHTON: Okay. I thought
13 that there -- there might be a chance to --
14 and my thinking was that that's a very high
15 figure.
16 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yep.
17 MR. ASHTON: Because I'm used
18 to 10 ohms, not 30,000.
19 THE WITNESS (Chasse): For --
20 this is resistivity testing as opposed to
21 resistance. This is the in situ availability
22 of conductance for the soil.
23 MR. ASHTON: Okay. Okay. I
24 got it. Yeah.
25 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Okay.

Page 80

1 MR. ASHTON: All right. Your
2 35-foot deep caisson, have you done -- you
3 said you've done some geotechnical work in
4 there. Is the -- is the ground -- will
5 that -- will that work for that tower
6 support?
7 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes,
8 sir.
9 MR. ASHTON: Not too slimy and
10 slippery?
11 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Glacial
12 till at about 12 feet below grade.
13 MR. ASHTON: Yep.
14 THE WITNESS (Chasse): And it
15 was medium density down in -- I believe the
16 water was at about 30, 31 feet down.
17 MR. ASHTON: Yep.
18 THE WITNESS (Chasse): And the
19 terminator of the boring, about 40 feet. And
20 we sent that information or Message Center
21 sent that to a tower vendor, and they've
22 given us a preliminary design --
23 MR. ASHTON: Fine.
24 THE WITNESS (Chasse): -- that
25 I had mentioned earlier.

Page 81

1 MR. ASHTON: Only galvanized
2 finished that was considered for this
3 structure?
4 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes.
5 MR. ASHTON: Again, I guess
6 I'm revealing my little biases, but did you
7 find -- did you check out the costing of a
8 weathering steel and whether that might be
9 cheaper than galvanized, which requires
10 painting after 20 years?
11 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Uh-huh.
12 I would have to defer to Message Center for
13 that. I don't believe that that was
14 considered when the tower was investigated.
15 THE WITNESS (Gelinis): That
16 was not considered.
17 MR. ASHTON: I'm sorry?
18 THE WITNESS (Gelinis): That
19 was not reviewed as part of this.
20 MR. ASHTON: In another docket
21 entirely, not a telecom docket, we had sworn
22 testimony that weathering steel is cheaper
23 than galvanized. And I have to confess to a
24 bias against galvanizing (a) because it
25 requires maintenance after a period of time,

Page 82

1 and (b) because a painter was killed on a
2 galvanized bridge or an un-weathering steel
3 bridge close to my house. And I don't like
4 the idea of killing painters. And I do like
5 the idea of avoiding maintenance. So I
6 suggest and recommend to you, you consider
7 alternatives that don't require maintenance
8 down the road.
9 I would comment that -- that a
10 backup generator that does involve multiple
11 parties, philosophically, doesn't seem too
12 shocking to me, because you already have a
13 major investment on the site that is shared,
14 that is common structure. And if you can
15 work out a deal with a common structure, I
16 don't know why it isn't possible, reasonably,
17 to work out a deal with a common generator
18 besides. And I'll pose that to you, and
19 Council will let its own feelings be known.
20 Is this proposal driven by the
21 desire for coverage, capacity, or both?
22 I'm not sure who -- Mr. Lavin,
23 I guess you're it.
24 THE WITNESS (Lavin): It will
25 result in improved capacity, but is mainly

Page 83

1 driven by coverage.
2 MR. ASHTON: I'm sorry?
3 THE WITNESS (Lavin): It is
4 mainly driven by coverage, though there will
5 be added capacity.
6 MR. ASHTON: Coverage. Okay.
7 Okay.
8 I think those are my
9 questions.
10 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you,
12 Mr. Ashton.
13 Mr. Hannon.
14 MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr.
15 Chair.
16 Going back to some of the
17 maps, SP1, SP2, I've got some questions
18 there. I thought I heard earlier that the
19 retaining wall was 2 and a half feet high?
20 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Three
21 and a half feet.
22 MR. HANNON: Okay. I just
23 wanted to make sure --
24 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yeah.
25 MR. HANNON: -- because that's

Page 84

1 what I saw here.
2 In terms of some of the
3 erosion and sedimentation control measures
4 that are being proposed, you've got the, sort
5 of, northern end of that material at a 634
6 elevation, the lower end at about a 627
7 elevation. And some of that runs outside of
8 that existing fence line. And if you stood
9 by that fence line, that slope drops off
10 pretty quickly. How are you proposing to put
11 that in?
12 THE WITNESS (Chasse): We were
13 going to seed it with, like, a six-inch,
14 nine-inch notch, actually seat the -- the
15 wattle down, so --
16 MR. HANNON: But how are you
17 going to put the notch in?
18 Because I'm not sure you
19 can --
20 THE WITNESS (Chasse): You
21 wouldn't be able to get machinery. It would
22 have to be done by hand.
23 MR. HANNON: Or is it going to
24 be by hand.
25 THE WITNESS (Chasse): It

Page 85

1 would have to be done by hand.
2 MR. HANNON: Okay. And then
3 some of the things that we had talked about
4 briefly on the site was that there's the
5 proposed -- or the line from the propane tank
6 that has to be relocated. And I think you
7 had mentioned that that is going to be on the
8 outside of the compound?
9 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes.
10 MR. HANNON: What about the
11 roof meters?
12 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Those
13 will need to be rerouted as well.
14 MR. HANNON: Do you have any
15 idea of what the amount of water is coming
16 out of there, and is that is going to require
17 some type of riprap at the end of the outlet,
18 or what are you proposing to do there?
19 THE WITNESS (Chasse): The
20 current 4-inch PVC that's coming off of that
21 doesn't have any energy dissipation at the
22 end of it. I would -- would be inclined to
23 put something in just as an extra measure.
24 MR. HANNON: Okay.
25 And then, I see a note that

Page 86

1 you're talking about the existing 80-foot
2 lattice tower is to be removed. I think this
3 is just, sort of, a common-sense comment, but
4 there's no comment on the plans to remove the
5 chain-link fence surrounding that tower, but
6 yet, you, on several occasions, you've
7 identified removing the tower but not the
8 chain-link fence. I think that should
9 probably be done.
10 I'm also a little concerned
11 about the amount of area that's available
12 between the, I guess, east side of the
13 retaining wall and the slope, and how all of
14 this material is kind of going to work
15 together in that area with the erosion
16 control measures. So that may be something
17 you need to just take a little closer look
18 at. It's such a tight area, and sequencing,
19 I think, is going to be a very significant
20 impact over there.
21 A couple of the other things.
22 There are some comments in Section 4 which
23 deals with the environmental assessment. And
24 the statement under -- it's on the first
25 page, under C: "No tree removal clearing and

Page 87

1 grading will be required for the facility."
2 But yet, earlier on, on
3 page -- where -- or I guess it's at Tab 3,
4 Number 3, Facilities G, talks about you've
5 got 20 yards of fill for the compound.
6 You've got 80 cubic yards of crushed stone
7 coming in. So that, to me, is also a full
8 material. You're taking 55 cubic yards out
9 of trench excavation material. What are you
10 doing with the trench excavation material?
11 Is that staying on site or being reused?
12 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Reused.
13 MR. HANNON: So that the 20
14 cubic yards of fill and the 80 yards of the
15 stone, that's in addition to reusing --
16 THE WITNESS (Chasse): The 55.
17 MR. HANNON: The 55?
18 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes.
19 MR. HANNON: Okay. So there's
20 a fair amount of material that going to end
21 up being brought in.
22 THE WITNESS (Chasse): It's
23 about four or five truckloads.
24 MR. HANNON: Okay.
25 And then, the other -- in the

Page 88

1 responses, there's a comment answer to Number
2 36. You've got the no permanent backup
3 generator because of the space constraints
4 and that the provisions are incorporated in
5 the design to use the temporary portable
6 generators. Can you just give me a -- I know
7 you talked about it a little bit. Can you
8 give me a little better idea as to what
9 these --
10 THE WITNESS (Chasse):
11 Honestly, I couldn't -- I couldn't hear the
12 end of your --
13 MR. HANNON: Okay. I'm sorry.
14 It talks about how you'll be using the
15 portable generators.
16 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes.
17 MR. HANNON: Can you give me a
18 little more detail about the portable
19 generators?
20 I know you talked about it
21 earlier, but just maybe a little bit more in
22 the way of the specifics.
23 THE WITNESS (Chasse): I,
24 actually, during the site visit, had meant to
25 point out at the northeast corner of the

Page 89

1 existing fire department is where we were
2 planning to put in a -- a manifold of sorts,
3 which would be a staging area. And this has
4 been accepted by the fire department as an
5 area where they could afford to have these
6 temporary or portable generators.

7 So, basically, you would have
8 a manifold system set up against the wall,
9 each with having a generator nipple to be
10 able to plug. The carriers come in, bring in
11 a portable, which would be diesel fueled, and
12 be able to plug that in.

13 In consideration of Verizon
14 and AT&T's facility, the conduits would
15 already be installed to be able to go over to
16 their facilities and hook up to their
17 automatic -- or manual transfer switch to be
18 able to use those generators in an emergency,
19 if they needed it.

20 MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you.

21 THE WITNESS (Chasse): You're
22 welcome.

23 MR. HANNON: And then, also in
24 the responses, in Tab 7, I'd like your
25 explanation on the last sentence where McPhee

Page 91

1 could not be upgraded, you know, would --
2 would the recommendation be to bring in --
3 not recommendation, but what is the
4 likelihood of -- of -- our discussions had
5 been the potential to bring in a second
6 common generator.

7 So you would have one for the
8 fire department, which is already there and
9 they already use. And then bring in a
10 separate one simply for carrier use.

11 Now, there are a lot of --
12 we've been out to the parcel. We've all seen
13 it. There are a lot of items in play out
14 there. Bringing in a second generator would
15 require the expansion of the existing
16 compound, which we currently have not
17 negotiated and which comes with some -- some
18 hair on it.

19 It's -- there's a water tank,
20 a 20,000 gallon water tank in the ground.
21 We've just discussed the existing propane
22 tank.

23 I think if we are able to come
24 to those -- those agreements -- Mr. Ashton
25 had asked about sharing of the existing fuel

Page 90

1 is saying that they feel that the cellular
2 carriers -- the cellular carriers should have
3 their own independent generator. It's not
4 plural.

5 So are they making a
6 recommendation that there be a single
7 generator for the site, or are they implying
8 that may be a single generator for each
9 carrier?

10 That sentence is a little
11 ambiguous.

12 THE WITNESS (Gelinias): In our
13 discussions with McPhee, I don't think -- in
14 fact, I know McPhee is not recommending a
15 common generator. The discussion and the
16 analysis was always posed based on one of two
17 scenarios, either tying into the existing
18 fire department generator -- and we ran the
19 test to see if that was capable of
20 accommodating the load, which we now know
21 it's not. It would need to be upgraded.

22 The second scenario which we
23 had discussed with McPhee as part of the
24 analysis was, if this generator could not
25 accommodate them and, if for some reason it

Page 92

1 source. That had been part of the
2 discussions as well.

3 So I don't think McPhee was
4 recommending it. It was posed to them as one
5 of two scenarios for this location.

6 MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you.

7 And then, I -- I do have one
8 other question which I asked in the field and
9 forgot to ask it now. But on Map SP-2, there
10 are a number of grounding boxes that are set
11 up around the existing tower. Can you
12 explain what will happen to those?

13 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Upon a
14 successful cutover for the fire department's
15 equipment on the current lattice tower over
16 to the new monopole, the compound and the
17 existing ground system, as well as the
18 lattice tower, will be decommissioned.

19 Those circles you see are
20 ground testing wells. So you can reach down
21 in -- because the ground ring is usually
22 about 30 inches below grade and it allows you
23 an opportunity to open the cover, reach down,
24 you can test your ground to make sure that
25 things are appropriate. That will all be

Page 93

1 decommissioned as part of the demolition plan
2 that we'll put together with the D and M.
3 MR. HANNON: Thank you.
4 I have no further questions.
5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
6 Mr. Levesque.
7 MR. LEVESQUE: My questions
8 were taken care of. Thank you.
9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
10 Mr. Lynch.
11 MR. LYNCH: I have one or two.
12 But before -- before I start beating a dead
13 horse from earlier questions, in the
14 application, on page 10, you address the --
15 no, you don't have to look. I'm just -- I'm
16 making a comment.
17 The -- you address the
18 question of texting for 911, And you gave me
19 a website to look for. And it's the second
20 or third time I've see that in the
21 application. I just want to thank you.
22 And, Mr. Lavin, on page 8, we
23 have the -- in the middle of the -- well, it
24 would be the second full paragraph. We have
25 the WiMAX. And Mr. Wells has explained this

Page 94

1 to me one time before, but could you go over
2 that again.
3 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I just
4 have to read the section here.
5 That was a -- it's not part of
6 AT&T's plan -- not part of AT&T's plan that
7 I'm aware of.
8 MR. LYNCH: I still didn't
9 hear you, sorry.
10 THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's not
11 part of AT&T's plan that I'm aware of.
12 MR. LYNCH: And if I remember
13 Mr. Well's comment, it's not something he
14 prefers anyhow. Is that correct?
15 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yeah.
16 MR. LYNCH: I didn't mean to
17 put you on the spot.
18 And while I have you here, I'm
19 going to start beating some dead horses.
20 And -- oh, no. Before that.
21 The -- your maximum
22 permissible exposure, you list a couple of
23 different places as 4 -- or 6.4 percent of
24 the overall -- with all your antennas at
25 maximum yield. And I'll ask the same

Page 95

1 question about Verizon, too. Theirs was 26.4
2 percent, and you have similar equipment.
3 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Uh-huh.
4 MR. LYNCH: Why is there such
5 a difference? That's part one.
6 And part two is, if I wanted
7 to get the total for both AT&T's maximum
8 permissible exposure and Verizon, would I
9 simply add the two percentages together, or
10 is there another formula?
11 THE WITNESS (Lavin): If you
12 have -- basically, they are additive. I
13 think we came to the -- the OET65, which is
14 the document from the FCC that specifies
15 these things, does not specify exactly --
16 MR. LYNCH: You're fading. I
17 still can't hear, sorry.
18 THE WITNESS (Lavin): OET65,
19 the FCC specifies the limits. It does not,
20 in every detail, specify how they're to be
21 calculated. We, I think, include -- we might
22 include 10 percent, 10 dB of antenna
23 discrimination. I don't know exactly if
24 Verizon does or not.
25 MR. LYNCH: We'll get to that.

Page 96

1 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Our
2 powers are a little different. Yeah.
3 MR. LYNCH: But I, simply to
4 get the total, I would just add the two
5 percentages together. Is that correct?
6 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes,
7 they are additive.
8 MR. LYNCH: Thank you.
9 Now, while I have you here,
10 you -- you answered a question earlier from
11 Dr. Klemens about lowering the height to 120.
12 And he asked you if that were creating an
13 obsolete situation down the road in a year or
14 two. Would that -- could you elaborate a
15 little bit more on that because I think
16 that's a possibility.
17 And would the same scenario
18 apply too, if we added flush mount antennas
19 to this facility?
20 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think,
21 in terms of obsolescence, it's hard to say.
22 My feeling would be that 150 feet would be
23 more robust for LTE and any other future
24 technologies. Height, in terms of RF, is
25 always -- gives you more flexibility and more

Page 97

1 future proofness.
2 As the years go on, we stress
3 the RF link more and more and more. We keep
4 turning up more things that we used to pay no
5 attention to in the RF path.
6 MR. LYNCH: Could you speak
7 up? You're fading on me. I'm sorry. I'm
8 going deaf anyhow.
9 THE WITNESS (Lavin): We used
10 to -- every time we pushed from analogue to
11 digital, to 3G to 4G, we find we're stressing
12 and putting more and more emphasis on having
13 a very good RF path. And it gets more and
14 more -- we find more and more things as we
15 go.
16 Intermodulation products and
17 things like that that used to be not a
18 problem are a problem now. The tiniest
19 little bits of noise generated that -- where
20 we could ignore before are now, you know,
21 like, make or break things in here.
22 And as an RF engineer, height
23 is one of the things I know that will make it
24 far more -- much easier to cope with whatever
25 technologies are coming down the line.

Page 98

1 MR. LYNCH: That's all right.
2 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yeah.
3 MR. LYNCH: Now, my second --
4 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Oh, and
5 flush mount?
6 MR. LYNCH: -- question -- no,
7 you answered. You're all set. I understood
8 what you said.
9 My second inquiry relates back
10 to where -- talking to Dr. Bell about, and
11 that's gaps. Now, we're no longer in the
12 world of "can you hear me now." So I'd like
13 to get a different -- or find out what the
14 real interpretation of a gap is, because
15 you're really covering an area to bring
16 pretty much data services and voice and
17 texting.
18 So -- and the priority from --
19 I'm not going to put you on the spot here,
20 but previous witnesses have testified that
21 the new priority is actually delivering data
22 service.
23 THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's --
24 it's what drives our design. But there's
25 still a lot of can-you-hear-me areas out

Page 99

1 here.
2 MR. LYNCH: Yeah, but -- how
3 do you -- my question, I guess, is, how do
4 you evaluate a gap when you're covering an
5 area and now a specific spot?
6 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Uh-huh.
7 MR. LYNCH: Or does a specific
8 residential area have the same concern as a
9 highway gap?
10 THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's all
11 served by the same site. We're running
12 into -- I think we may -- we may need to
13 increase the -- the number of exhibits we
14 put -- we give you now. We're talking across
15 three separate frequencies now, where we
16 always used to talk about one, two or
17 possibly three possibly different
18 technologies. And 700, or 850 especially
19 covers much better than 1900. 1900 gaps are
20 huge. And I think we may -- we may need to
21 develop a way of showing you more of the area
22 and more of the gap. It's hard to say where
23 it ends at 1900 because it's just --
24 MR. LYNCH: Oh, I understand.
25 But I think you -- we -- you and I are both

Page 100

1 heading in the right -- it is evolving.
2 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.
3 MR. LYNCH: Then how do we
4 interpret how it's evolving --
5 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Uh-huh.
6 MR. LYNCH: -- you know,
7 because you have the different frequencies,
8 you know, the higher, the lower, the 700.
9 Is there going to be -- when
10 this goes into effect, is there going to be
11 voice IP on the 700 or is it just going to be
12 data service?
13 THE WITNESS (Lavin):
14 Everything that goes in, I think, will be --
15 I'm not sure if 850 will be the usual voice
16 service. 700 and 1900 go in as long-term
17 evolution, which will carry voice over LTE
18 when AT&T and probably Verizon are --
19 MR. LYNCH: That's just what
20 you both are saying, yes.
21 THE WITNESS (Lavin): When we
22 nail it down well enough, then it's going to
23 be an offer to the public.
24 MR. LYNCH: But I hope you
25 understand where I'm coming from. I think

Page 101

1 the -- your -- your industry is evolving and
2 so quickly. It's like a tsunami that we're
3 getting hit with here.
4 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Uh-huh.
5 MR. LYNCH: And we're like at
6 the beginning of it, and the wave is just
7 coming in.
8 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yeah.
9 What we call 4G, it's named long-term
10 evolution for a reason. We used to have amps
11 and everyone did the same thing. And then
12 when we went to digital, everyone split up.
13 And Europe and America, and even within
14 America, we had different systems, and
15 everyone is converging back together again to
16 LTE.
17 MR. LYNCH: So thank you. And
18 Verizon is going to get the same questions
19 later on.
20 So -- and my last point here
21 is, Mr. Libertine, with SHPO, did they
22 actually go out and do a field review on --
23 on the site, or do they sit in the office and
24 go over computers and look at charts, and so
25 on and so forth?

Page 102

1 THE WITNESS (Libertine): In
2 this case they actually did come visit the
3 site. There was not a balloon flown that
4 day, but they were provided the visual report
5 as well.
6 MR. LYNCH: And what would be
7 the scenario if a 150 tower -- foot tower was
8 approved instead of their recommended
9 120-foot tower? Would we be in court.
10 THE WITNESS (Libertine): No.
11 I don't believe it would be a court issue.
12 It would be matter, then, of -- we would have
13 conflicting height requirements, I guess, for
14 lack of a better term. And, at that point,
15 there would have to be a determination made
16 by Message Center -- Message Center
17 Management if they would like to pursue going
18 to the FCC to see if there could be some
19 meeting of the minds to, you know, overturn
20 that initial ruling. There are avenues that
21 could be pursued.
22 MR. LYNCH: Who's ruling would
23 they overturn, ours or SHPO?
24 THE WITNESS (Libertine):
25 SHPO. Yeah, they would no -- they would have

Page 103

1 control over the SHPO's determination, but
2 not the Siting Council's.
3 MR. LYNCH: Thank you.
4 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
5 DR. KLEMENS: I'll try to be
6 very brief.
7 Mr. Lavin, I was very
8 interested in your response that this is
9 not -- this is about coverage and not
10 capacity. And I've been sitting here looking
11 at this map that was submitted. I don't know
12 if it's -- if it's in the record.
13 I'm looking at the topographic
14 map and seeing that almost all the areas that
15 are in purple are at a certain topographic
16 elevation. They're about 500 to 600 feet.
17 This is looking at your -- Mr. Libertine's
18 map.
19 And almost all those areas in
20 that topographic -- these very steep outcrop
21 ledges. Almost all of them are not
22 uninhabited. A lot of them are associated
23 with the Little River. And there's almost a
24 complete correlation between the purple and
25 those -- and those outcroppings, which

Page 104

1 there's no houses on hardly at all.
2 And the only road I can see
3 that -- there's about 1000 feet at the Cross
4 Highway, which is going to get service in
5 this. So I still don't think the 150 feet is
6 getting you much of real coverage.
7 The gap, the places you're
8 covering are steep, steep ledges. And I
9 don't know if there may even be on
10 Aquarion -- I don't know. They may be
11 watershed property. That's just -- I hope
12 you could maybe look at this and try to
13 reconcile this because it doesn't make sense
14 to me.
15 That's my question. Can you
16 look at it and present, look at these and try
17 to reconcile this purple with the actual
18 landscape?
19 THE WITNESS (Lavin): We can
20 look at those areas in more detail. I mean,
21 in terms of roads and population coverage, I
22 mean, that's the census data to the
23 resolution that we had. If the town has more
24 detailed data that we can bring into our
25 tool, we can look at those -- the dwellings,

Page 105

1 for instance.
2 DR. KLEMENS: That would be
3 very helpful, at least for my perspective, on
4 the issue of what you gain at 150 feet --
5 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Uh-huh.
6 DR. KLEMENS: --
7 notwithstanding the fact of the size of the
8 tower and its obsolescence.
9 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yeah.
10 Yeah. I don't know. Some certain areas may
11 never be developed, or we may be covering
12 certain areas that might be developed.
13 DR. KLEMENS: Those areas,
14 looking from my perspective, are totally
15 undevelopable steep slopes. Thank you.
16 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Just
18 a couple of questions. The underground
19 utilities going to the site, they're going to
20 pass fairly near -- there's a row of pine
21 trees. Will the trenching affect those pine
22 trees?
23 THE WITNESS (Chasse): You
24 know, if they're within the drip line and we
25 could have some hand excavation done for

Page 106

1 those, but then, once you get past the side
2 of the building, you're quite a bit away
3 from that row.
4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.
5 THE WITNESS (Chasse): But
6 there -- the row of trees is not the property
7 line, but at the very beginning of it. We
8 would be within the 5 feet shot of that. So
9 that will have to be done by hand.
10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.
11 Just one -- one more question
12 on SHPO. Did they, in addition to talking
13 about the height, did they also talk in that
14 draft letter about the type of mount that
15 they would be requiring?
16 THE WITNESS (Libertine): No,
17 sir. It was nothing specific. They just
18 made a -- kind of a general statement that it
19 should be as spatially unobtrusive as
20 possible, which gives us some -- a lot of
21 latitude.
22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.
23 And I guess the homework
24 assignment really is in -- in addition to
25 this, and I'll just mention it since we have

Page 107

1 representatives from both -- or not both --
2 two -- two other carriers here. I think it's
3 becoming increasingly challenging to make a
4 case understand -- comprehensible case on
5 both coverage in some of the rural areas that
6 we've discussed and also, in this case,
7 not -- but in others, capacity.
8 So I just urge you to think
9 about that in future applications. And I
10 don't know. I'll discuss it later with,
11 maybe, members of the Council staff. If
12 there's some way that we can, particularly as
13 we're moving into newer technologies, it just
14 seems that discussions are -- I'd get --
15 probably get hit by the person on my right if
16 I said increasingly obtrusive, but it's
17 getting really challenging. So something --
18 something to think about.
19 Okay. We'll now go to
20 cross-examination by the intervenor.
21 MR. LAUB: Mr. Chairman,
22 sorry. If I could -- if I may, because I
23 think, just as far as some of the testimony
24 regarding the common generator, I just -- I
25 think, if I can give Mr. Gelinias 40 seconds

Page 108

1 to just follow up on -- just clarify some of
2 the --
3 THE CHAIRPERSON: To tell us
4 why he's totally in favor of the proposal,
5 sure.
6 MR. LAUB: Well, because I
7 know we've -- we've discussed it internally
8 quite a bit. There are just a lot of
9 logistical challenges. There's, first of
10 all, Mr. Gelinias, this -- this property, your
11 proposal is subject to a lease with the
12 fire -- fire district. Correct?
13 THE WITNESS (Gelinias): Yes.
14 That would be correct.
15 MR. LAUB: Okay.
16 And then can you just bullet
17 point for the Council, because I think we've
18 talked about them at various points, but just
19 bullet point in one, concise moment what the
20 logistical considerations that are just, you
21 know, why -- why we're at where we're at.
22 THE WITNESS (Gelinias): Sure.
23 I think, historically
24 speaking, when -- when these same questions
25 have come up on previous applications, we've

Page 109

1 indicated that our preference, along with
2 carrier preference, is separate independent
3 generators. They operate them. They
4 maintain them. Each one is responsible for
5 their own, and therefore, is in control of
6 their own -- their own network.

7 This particular site we equate
8 to working inside a phone booth. It's a very
9 small lot. There are underground lines in
10 this particular location. I think what we're
11 trying to decide and what we're trying to
12 negotiate is which of the two scenarios,
13 being tying into the existing generator or
14 bringing in a second generator for common
15 use.

16 I don't think there's even a
17 discussion that we've had at this particular
18 facility about bringing in separate and
19 independent generators. We just don't have
20 the room. Having said that, there are a lot
21 of -- and we have discussed it with carriers
22 and -- and there are, you know, those
23 dialogues are ongoing. Having said that,
24 there is a lot -- there is a lot to be done
25 at this location.

Page 110

1 As Mr. Chasse has testified,
2 we -- we had to go out there with
3 ground-penetrating radar to identify the
4 various items that are -- are underground
5 between propane lines and water tanks and
6 propane tanks and septic fields, et al, and
7 other.

8 What we want to be careful of
9 is -- we being MCM -- from a development
10 standpoint, if we're contemplating the
11 reduction in the ability to co-locate by
12 reduction -- potential reduction in height,
13 then, clearly, that has to be justified by
14 carrier RF support.

15 But if we talk about a
16 reduction in collocation ability while
17 driving up some of the other development
18 costs, we just want to be careful -- we being
19 MCM -- from a development standpoint, when we
20 start talking about underground utilities
21 across Black Rock Turnpike, when we talk
22 about relocating a 20,000 gallon water tank.

23 Point well taken on the
24 propane tank. We've not explored that. But
25 if -- if we're being asked to now relocate

Page 111

1 that, we have set agreements in place with
2 the carriers, and we rapidly approach a point
3 where these are -- these are not -- it's not
4 developable. It's cost prohibitive, I will
5 say.

6 But, I think, in this
7 instance, the question was asked to me, and I
8 would like to address it directly: If the
9 decision was put out with the condition of a
10 common generator, would you accept it? The
11 challenge we have on it being a condition,
12 and I hope you respect, it is that neither
13 scenario is in our control.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: We've --
15 we -- one, you've already told us; two, we're
16 going to -- have to continue this hearing in
17 any case. So you'll have, hopefully, at the
18 next -- the continuation, which will be at
19 some future date, you'll have more
20 information.

21 We so -- we certainly respect
22 the issue that there were lease requirements
23 and your -- you know, the fire company,
24 obviously, is key. So I don't think the
25 Council is about to put conditions that -- on

Page 112

1 it which would probably on -- well, a
2 condition that would -- would force
3 compliance by a potential third party with
4 that, so I don't think you need to continue
5 other than you've made a very good case for a
6 shared -- a shared generation facility.

7 But, Attorney Laub, I think,
8 you know, you'll have another opportunity if
9 you don't think it's gotten through. But I
10 think the message has gotten through and --

11 MR. LAUB: Understood,
12 Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. And
14 I'd like to -- since -- Attorney Baldwin, do
15 you have cross-examination.

16 MR. BALDWIN: I have no
17 questions, Mr. Chairman.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.
19 Therefore, we're going to take
20 a break. We'll resume the -- the public --
21 the public portion of the hearing at 7 p.m.
22 And I guess we'll see everybody back then.
23 Thank you.

24 (Whereupon, the above
25 proceedings were adjourned at 4:58 p.m.)

Page 113	Page 115
<p>1 CERTIFICATE 2 I hereby certify that the foregoing 112 3 pages are a complete and accurate 4 computer-aided transcription of my original 5 verbatim notes taken of the Council Meeting 6 in Re: DOCKET NO. 449, MESSAGE CENTER 7 MANAGEMENT AND NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, 8 LLC, FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL 9 COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE 10 CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATION OF A 11 TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY LOCATED AT 12 REDDING TAX ASSESSOR MAP 23, LOT 72, REDDING 13 RIDGE FIRE DEPARTMENT, 186 BLACK ROCK 14 TURNPIKE, REDDING, CONNECTICUT, which was 15 held before ROBERT STEIN, Chairperson, at the 16 Redding Community Center, Community Room, 37 17 Lonetown Road, Redding, Connecticut, on 18 July 29, 2014.</p> <p>19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p> <p>Robert G. Dixon, CVR-M 857 Court Reporter UNITED REPORTERS, INC. 90 Brainard Road, Suite 103 Hartford, Connecticut 06114</p>	<p>1 I N D E X (Cont'd.) 2 EXHIBIT DESCRIPTION PAGE 3 II-B-2 Applicant's Responses to 13 4 Council Interrogatories, Set I, 5 dated July 3, 2014 6 7 II-B-3 Applicant's Responses to 13 8 Council Interrogatories, Set II, 9 dated July 20, 2014 10 11 II-B-4 Applicant's Prefiled Statement 13 12 of Facts in lieu of Direct 13 Testimony, dated July 22, 2014 14 15 II-B-5 Affidavit of Sign Posting, 13 16 dated July 22, 2014 17 18 II-B-6 Electronic Presentation 13 19 Hard copy, received July 23, 2014 20 21 II-B-7 Resumes and Professional 13 22 received July 23, 2014 23 a) Scott Chasse 24 b) Dean Gustafson 25 c) Christopher Gelinias d) Martin Lavin e) Michael Libertine f) David Vivian</p>
<p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p> <p>Page 114</p> <p>I N D E X WITNESSES MARTIN LAVIN CHRISTOPHER GELINAS DAVID VIVIAN MICHAEL LIBERTINE DEAN GUSTAFSON SCOTT CHASSE Page 9 EXAMINERS: Mr. Perrone Page 13</p> <p>EXHIBITS (Received in evidence.) EXHIBIT DESCRIPTION PAGE II-B-1 Application for a Certificate 13 of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need, received May 19, 2014 along with bulk filing attachments: a.) Technical Report to the Town of Redding b.) Town of Redding Plan of Conservation and Development, effective 12/29/08 c.) Town of Redding, Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations, effective 4/25/13 d.) Town of Redding, Zoning Regulations effective 2/1/86 including amendments through 10/29/07 e.) Town of Redding Zoning Map</p>	