

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Docket No. 449

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

Continued Public Hearing held at the
Connecticut Siting Council, 10 Franklin
Square, New Britain, Connecticut, Tuesday,
September 9, 2014, beginning at 1:02 p.m.

H e l d B e f o r e:

ROBERT STEIN,
Chairperson

1 A p p e a r a n c e s:

2 Council Members:

3 JAMES J. MURPHY, Vice Chairperson

4 DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.

5 DR. MICHAEL W. KLEMENS

6 DR. BARBARA C. BELL

7 SENATOR EILEEN M. DAILY

8 PHILIP ASHTON

9 ROBERT HANNON, DEEP Designee

10

11 Council Staff:

12 MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.,

13 Executive Director and

14 Staff Attorney

15

16 MICHAEL PERRONE

17 Siting Analyst

18

19 For Message Center Management, Inc. and

20 New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC:

21 CUDDY & FEDER, LLP

22 445 Hamilton Avenue

23 White Plains, New York 10601

24 BY: DANIEL M. LAUB, ESQ.

25

1 A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.):

2 For Cellco Partnership, d/b/a Verizon
3 Wireless:

4 ROBINSON & COLE, LLP

5 280 Trumbull Street

6 Hartford, Connecticut 06103-3597

7 (860) 275-8200

8 BY: KENNETH C. BALDWIN, ESQ.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Good
2 afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to
3 call to order this hearing of the Connecticut
4 Siting Council regarding Docket 449. Today
5 is Tuesday, September 9, 2014, 1:00 p.m. My
6 name is Robin Stein. I'm chairman of the
7 Siting Council.

8 This hearing is a continuation
9 of the hearing held on July 29, 2014, at the
10 Redding Community Center, 37 Lonetown Road,
11 Redding, Connecticut. It is held pursuant to
12 the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut
13 General Statutes and of the Uniform
14 Administrative Procedure Act upon an
15 application from Message Center Management,
16 Inc., and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC, for
17 a certificate of environmental compatibility
18 and public need for the construction and
19 maintenance and operation of a
20 telecommunications facility located at
21 Redding Tax Assessor Map 23, Lot 72, Redding
22 Ridge Fire Department at 186 Black Rock
23 Turnpike in Redding, Connecticut. This
24 application was received by the Council on
25 May 19, 2014.

1 A verbatim transcript will be
2 made of this hearing and deposited with the
3 Town Clerk's Office in the Redding Town Hall
4 for the convenience of the public.

5 We will proceed in accordance
6 with the prepared agenda, copies of which are
7 available here, to my right in the back.

8 And we'll continue with the
9 appearance of the Applicant, Message Center
10 Management, Inc., and New Cingular Wireless,
11 to verify the new exhibit marked as Roman
12 Numeral II, Item B.8 on the hearing program.

13 Attorney Laub, would you
14 please begin by verifying the new exhibit you
15 filed with the appropriate witnesses?

16 M A R T I N L A V I N,
17 C H R I S T O P H E R G E L I N A S,
18 M I C H A E L L I B E R T I N E,
19 S C O T T C H A S S E,
20 D A V I D V I V I A N,

21 having been previously duly sworn, were
22 examined and testified further on their
23 oaths as follows:

24 MR. LAUB: Certainly. Good
25 afternoon, Mr. Chairman, members of the

1 Council. I'm just going to ask Mr. Lavin, as
2 these interrogatories were strictly RF, radio
3 frequency related:

4 Mr. Lavin, did you prepare,
5 supervise and are you otherwise familiar with
6 the items recognized in the Council's agenda
7 as Item II, B., number 8, which are the
8 Applicant's response to the Council's
9 interrogatories, dated August 29, 2014?

10 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.

11 MR. LAUB: And do you have any
12 questions, additions or modifications for the
13 Council at this time?

14 THE WITNESS (Lavin): No.

15 MR. LAUB: And do you adopt
16 them as your sworn testimony today?

17 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.

18 MR. LAUB: With that,
19 Mr. Chairman, I'd offer it as a full exhibit.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

21 Does the Intervenor object to
22 the admission of the Applicant's exhibits?

23 MR. BALDWIN: No,

24 Mr. Chairman.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. The

1 exhibits are admitted.

2 (Applicants' Exhibit II-B-8:
3 Received in evidence - described in index.)

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: We'll begin
5 or I guess continue cross-examination of the
6 Applicant by Mr. Perrone.

7 MR. PERRONE: Thank you,
8 Mr. Chairman.

9 Did MCM consider extending the
10 existing lattice tower, or was that not
11 structurally feasible?

12 THE WITNESS (Chasse): It's
13 not structurally feasible.

14 MR. PERRONE: Mr. Libertine, I
15 understand back in the prior docket, the 334,
16 the viewshed analysis was done for about 120
17 feet. While the number of homes might have
18 changed, would that still be accurate to use
19 for the seasonal and year-round visibility
20 areas based on 120-foot assumption?

21 THE WITNESS (Libertine): If
22 we were to assume 120-foot height, I think
23 that, yes, that generally we did field verify
24 that. That was done while I was at a prior
25 organization and several years ago, so the

1 techniques we used for the computer modeling
2 have changed substantially, but the field
3 verification was done at 120 feet, so I think
4 that, yes, that would remain consistent.

5 MR. PERRONE: Do you have any
6 updates or have you heard anything from SHPO?

7 THE WITNESS (Libertine): No,
8 we have not heard anything in addition to
9 what I have presented at the initial hearing.

10 MR. PERRONE: Okay. One
11 question I had asked last time. I don't know
12 if you have the answer. Regarding the
13 portable generator that AT&T is proposing,
14 would that have any type of fuel leakage
15 containment measures, double wall fuel tank
16 or --

17 THE WITNESS (Vivian): I'll
18 have to double-check on that. The portable
19 does not have the same containment measures
20 as far as the double hull that the fixed
21 generator does have. We can take that as a
22 posthearing submission for the Council.

23 MR. PERRONE: Okay.

24 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm going
25 to need your name at some point.

1 THE WITNESS (Vivian): This is
2 David Vivian.

3 THE COURT REPORTER: Thank
4 you.

5 Previously sworn?

6 THE WITNESS (Vivian): Yes.

7 THE COURT REPORTER: Thank
8 you.

9 MR. PERRONE: And one other
10 question I'd like to follow up on.

11 Mr. Libertine, I had asked
12 before, in the northern part of the study
13 area in the viewshed analysis in the
14 application right to the north there's a
15 trail system. Is that part of the same trail
16 system that's over on the Newtown side?

17 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes,
18 those are all one and the same.

19 MR. PERRONE: Okay.

20 And on to some RF questions.
21 For example, in the application with the 850
22 megahertz existing and proposed coverage,
23 sometimes we see some white space between the
24 proposed site and adjacent sites. Would you
25 still be able to hand off calls even with

1 that white space?

2 THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's
3 possible, but it's not -- we determine not
4 reliable service.

5 MR. PERRONE: Given that the
6 carriers are using multiple frequencies and a
7 lot more equipment these days, such as remote
8 radio heads, et cetera, are flush mounted
9 antennas, in general, becoming less practical
10 as an option?

11 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I would
12 think, in general, the impracticality of
13 stacking them vertically, we need four in
14 some places, three in others, plus the radio
15 heads all mounted there, it consumes a large
16 amount of power space, yes.

17 MR. PERRONE: At the last
18 hearing AT&T had noted that with a 120-foot
19 tower some other adjacent sites might have to
20 be made taller to compensate. Would you have
21 a rough idea of how many sites we'd be
22 talking about?

23 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I don't
24 have the future plans for the build-outs, so
25 I don't know. We're talking about not

1 existing sites being made taller, but perhaps
2 new sites, when they're proposed, having to
3 be somewhat taller.

4 MR. PERRONE: Also, I know we
5 had extensive discussions about 120 feet. In
6 the town comments there was some brief
7 reference to 110 feet. How would that
8 compare to 120?

9 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Not
10 favorably. You lose, even though smaller,
11 also in the production coverage, and also you
12 would be basically a two-carrier tower, no
13 way in the world to put a third one.

14 MR. PERRONE: Turning to the
15 tower elevation drawing, which is SP-3, I
16 understand the fire department antennas, it's
17 approximately 80 feet to the bottom of the
18 antennas. How far to the top of their
19 antennas?

20 THE WITNESS (Chasse): I
21 believe they're 12 foot.

22 MR. PERRONE: Okay. So that
23 brings us to about 92. So the center of
24 their antennas would be something like 86
25 feet?

1 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes.

2 MR. PERRONE: And lastly,
3 turning to set III interrogatories, on
4 questions 58 and 59 I had asked for some
5 coverage data. Could we get -- as a
6 Late-File can we get that data broken down by
7 street?

8 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.

9 MR. PERRONE: For 58 and 69.

10 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Sure.

11 MR. PERRONE: So that would be
12 a Late-File.

13 And that's all I have. Thank
14 you.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: So we'll
16 start with the Vice Chairman and see if we
17 have any additional questions.

18 THE VICE CHAIRPERSON: Thank
19 you. Mr. Chairman. First off, Mr. Chairman,
20 let me indicate for the record that on July
21 29th I read both transcripts of the afternoon
22 and evening hearing. Although I was not
23 here, I feel prepared to proceed.

24 Mr. Libertine, you have not
25 heard from SHPO. Is there any intention of

1 contacting SHPO?

2 THE WITNESS (Libertine):

3 Well, we, as you know, had gotten the
4 informal unsigned draft copy with their
5 preliminary determination. There will have
6 to be some consultation. At this point we
7 determined that it probably made sense to
8 follow through with this hearing, see what
9 the results were, and see what road we were
10 heading down so that we would be able to then
11 go with additional information to the office
12 and hopefully come up with some type of a
13 compromise.

14 THE VICE CHAIRPERSON: Well,
15 my next question is going to be what's your
16 attitude of the applicants going to be if you
17 didn't hear from SHPO, but apparently there
18 will be a follow-up, but are you going to
19 wait until after this Council makes its
20 decision?

21 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I
22 think our preference would be to do that. We
23 have two -- I won't say competing but two
24 parallel paths here.

25 THE VICE CHAIRPERSON: I

1 understand your problem. I just want to ask
2 what you feel the ground might be like, and I
3 guess I've got it.

4 THE WITNESS (Libertine):

5 Well --

6 THE VICE CHAIRPERSON: You'd
7 really prefer us to do our thing, whatever we
8 are going to do, first?

9 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I
10 think we'd have a better opportunity then to
11 say we feel we've proven need. Here's a
12 decision that was made at the Siting Council;
13 now we need to sit down and see if we can
14 make something work for you folks as well
15 because there are some avenues that can be
16 pursued.

17 THE VICE CHAIRPERSON: I think
18 that's enough said.

19 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I
20 don't mean to be squirrely. We're kind of in
21 a bind here.

22 THE VICE CHAIRPERSON: I know
23 where you're coming from.

24 Mr. Lavin, a matter of
25 curiosity, you're not an employee of either

1 of the Applicants, are you?

2 THE WITNESS (Lavin): No,
3 C Squared Systems.

4 THE VICE CHAIRPERSON: An
5 independent group?

6 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.

7 THE VICE CHAIRPERSON: And is
8 yourself or your employer, or however the
9 arrangement is, are you able to provide
10 through your model propagations of what would
11 be out there if the tower were flush mounted?

12 THE WITNESS (Lavin): We can
13 model antennas at any height. My employer,
14 Tony Wells, the gentleman you usually see
15 here for AT&T.

16 THE VICE CHAIRPERSON: Right.

17 THE WITNESS (Lavin): We can
18 model antennas at any height as long as we
19 know what power, what type of antenna they
20 are, any height we can model coverage.

21 THE VICE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.
22 So if we were to ask sometime when
23 there's discussion about flush mounted,
24 because we constantly hear how it's not as
25 strong --

1 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.

2 THE VICE CHAIRPERSON: --
3 propagations could be provided if we
4 requested it?

5 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.
6 Once the carrier determines what heights
7 they'll need, we can show each of those
8 heights actually.

9 THE VICE CHAIRPERSON: I can
10 understand that providing it with all the
11 different varieties of antennas, but it is
12 possible, at least for you to do that?

13 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Uh-huh.

14 THE VICE CHAIRPERSON: Do you
15 think that others could do that as well? Is
16 that part of -- would it be pretty standard
17 in your trade, so to speak?

18 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Every RF
19 plot is based on an antenna at a certain
20 power at a certain height. Anyone who can
21 answer that question for any antenna can
22 answer it for any height.

23 THE VICE CHAIRPERSON: I think
24 that's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

1 Dr. Bell?

2 DR. BELL: Thank you,
3 Mr. Chairman.

4 I'd like to hear a little bit
5 more about the relation between this proposed
6 tower and the one farther north at Dittmar
7 Road. I think it's CT 5515, but it's not on
8 the coverage plot that we have because it's
9 too far north.

10 My first question is: Is the
11 tower operational?

12 THE WITNESS (Gelinas):
13 Dittmar Road, yes, it is.

14 DR. BELL: Do the coverage
15 maps that we're seeing include coverage from
16 Dittmar Road even though the tower itself is
17 not on the coverage maps?

18 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Any site
19 that has coverage into the area of these
20 maps, its coverage is included --

21 DR. BELL: Okay.

22 THE WITNESS (Lavin): --
23 whether they're --

24 DR. BELL: Can you tell us
25 whether -- can you tell -- do you have a way

1 of telling from the maps themselves how much
2 of the coverage coming down from the north
3 is --

4 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Just by
5 looking at the map --

6 DR. BELL: -- in the area?

7 THE WITNESS (Lavin): -- I can
8 tell with the tool. Once the map is made,
9 it's all just two colors. I have to go back
10 to the tool and what we use for propagation
11 and see which ones --

12 DR. BELL: You're not really
13 that familiar with it?

14 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Not
15 that -- I've done at least two tiers of sites
16 outward.

17 DR. BELL: Okay. And is it or
18 isn't it a handoff tower?

19 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I would
20 have to go back to the application, not
21 instantly. It is listed as a potential
22 handoff candidate, 4 Dittmar Road, CT 5515,
23 if that's the same one.

24 DR. BELL: So it is a
25 potential one?

1 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.

2 DR. BELL: I don't quite
3 understand Dittmar -- it's a different one
4 that I need to ask about. Okay. It's 98
5 feet?

6 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.

7 DR. BELL: All right.

8 Now, the tower at the garage,
9 which is that's -- I'm calling it the tower
10 at the garage. I think it's the one on Great
11 Oak Drive, and it's 2546.

12 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.

13 DR. BELL: And it's relatively
14 new. So that tower is on the coverage map,
15 so we can see the coverage from it. Can you
16 refresh my memory about what height we
17 approved that tower at, somebody, probably
18 not Mr. Lavin?

19 THE WITNESS (Vivian): This is
20 David Vivian. It was an 180-foot flag pole
21 without the flag.

22 DR. BELL: Yes.

23 THE WITNESS (Vivian): And
24 AT&T can top, I think, three bays on that.
25 And so we showed the center line at the top

1 bay, which is 177 feet.

2 DR. BELL: And did that -- is
3 that the height that the tower went up at, or
4 was the tower extended at some process during
5 the -- during or after installation?

6 THE WITNESS (Vivian): No. It
7 was stacked at the 180. AT&T, during the
8 process of form versus function discussion
9 with both the planning board and the first
10 selectman, said we could use 150 feet, but
11 they preferred the form of the flag pole. So
12 we said, well, we'll need 30 feet higher. So
13 that's what we ended up going with is 180
14 foot stack, if you will.

15 DR. BELL: Okay. Thank you
16 for refreshing my memory.

17 MR. LAUB: It's a town-owned
18 property, so that's why that was part of the
19 lease negotiations.

20 DR. BELL: Right.

21 So on the table that's in the
22 application on page 8, the tower is at --
23 that tower is at 167, but I guess the
24 difference must be on the map it's at 177,
25 but I guess the difference is where the

1 center line of the antennas are, it really
2 doesn't have to do with the height of the
3 tower, per se. Correct?

4 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes, we
5 modeled the lower set of antennas.

6 DR. BELL: Thank you. Those
7 are my questions, Mr. Chairman.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
9 Mr. Ashton.

10 MR. ASHTON: Just a couple.

11 Mr. Libertine, there has been
12 some comment that the 150-foot high tower is
13 obtrusive, whereas one at 120 foot would not
14 be. What would be your opinion as to the
15 possibility, from an environmental standpoint
16 first, then I'm not quite sure who's going to
17 take the ball, but from a physical
18 construction standpoint of putting two towers
19 on that site at the 120-foot site?

20 THE WITNESS (Libertine): If
21 we use that assumption, would you also be
22 talking about doing some type of a
23 concealment with an internal array or close
24 contact, or are we still talking about a full
25 array?

1 MR. ASHTON: That would be
2 what the carriers perceive their need is.

3 THE WITNESS (Libertine):
4 Well, from a visibility standpoint, I think
5 introducing a second tower, regardless of
6 whether it's a -- whatever is on top, a
7 horizontal array, a close contact array, or
8 an interior arrangement, I think from my
9 perspective, it would be visually intrusive.
10 We would be adding just a second facility 120
11 feet in the air. This site, from all the
12 work that I've done over the years out there
13 is, regardless of whether it's 120 or 150,
14 it's not overly visible outside the immediate
15 area. And so I'm of the opinion a single
16 pole, providing they can get the full array
17 so that they can get their maximum coverage
18 and allow for collocation, makes the most
19 sense. There's really minimal difference
20 between 120 and 150 feet when we talk about
21 overall visibility. It's really just the
22 character of the view.

23 So I guess the easiest answer
24 to your question, from my perspective,
25 introducing a second tower, I think, would be

1 unnecessary and would be just visually
2 intrusive at that point.

3 MR. ASHTON: Thank you for
4 that.

5 Do you have any comments on
6 the physical construction?

7 THE WITNESS (Chasse):
8 Absolutely. Spatially speaking, this is a
9 very tight site, between the underground
10 storage water tank, the underground propane
11 tank, the existing utilities, the septic
12 field, the existing structure, reserved areas
13 for the fire department to stockpile their
14 plowed snow, and so forth, that it would be
15 very difficult to put two towers in this
16 location.

17 MR. ASHTON: Thank you.
18 Nothing further.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
20 Go to Dr. Klemens.

21 DR. KLEMENS: Just one
22 question. We heard testimony that the fire
23 department was actually open to working with
24 you to use -- to create a fuel source from a
25 propane tank, and we heard then that the

1 temporary generator proposed by AT&T doesn't
2 have redundancy and a double hull, and there
3 are wetlands all around it. So could we
4 explore that in greater detail? I think I'd
5 like to hear your comments on using a shared
6 propane fuel source for both carriers as well
7 as the fire department.

8 THE WITNESS (Gelinas): I can
9 probably address that. Since the initial
10 hearing we've had multiple conversations with
11 the fire department as well as been out to
12 the site to reevaluate. Our plan at this
13 point would then -- and they have been
14 receptive to it -- is to bring in a second
15 permanent propane-fired generator at the
16 site. We would not connect into the existing
17 fire department generator. We would bring in
18 a permanent propane-fired unit and tie into
19 the -- do exactly that, tie into the existing
20 2,000 gallon propane tank underground.

21 DR. KLEMENS: And would that
22 generator be available for other carriers
23 also to use?

24 THE WITNESS (Gelinas): That's
25 its sole purpose for shared use.

1 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you. No
2 further questions, Mr. Chairman.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: That was a
4 helpful answer.

5 Senator Daily?

6 SENATOR DAILY: I don't have
7 any additional questions.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Hannon?

9 MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr.
10 Chairman. I do have one question. And,
11 Mr. Lavin, you drew the short straw today.

12 In reading the response to
13 Question 57 on the third submittal that just
14 came in, can you please go into a little more
15 detail for me? I'm not so much concerned
16 necessarily about whether calls are dropped
17 in a vehicle, but it's more sort of the two
18 park areas. So can you please give me a
19 little more detail in terms of what the
20 strength would be for cell phone coverage in
21 the two state parks at the 120 versus the
22 150?

23 THE WITNESS (Lavin):

24 Essentially at -- I believe it's Putnam State
25 Park that's served by the site right next to

1 it, and the difference wouldn't be -- either
2 height there's no difference in coverage
3 there. There is no coverage really coming
4 from the new site. And the Collis P.
5 Huntington State Park, coverage has improved
6 somewhat, and of course on the property, the
7 building and vehicle don't really apply for
8 hikers, but there would be certainly a
9 greater chance of, if you were injured or
10 something in an area, laying on the ground
11 and trying to make a call out, this site
12 would provide some improvement in your
13 ability to reach and assisting a call for
14 help.

15 MR. HANNON: That was one of
16 the questions also raised by one of the
17 gentlemen that has been on a number of the
18 rescue walks out there and looking for lost
19 hikers, things of that nature. So I just
20 want make sure I've got a better
21 understanding coverage would be better in
22 that area at 150 versus the 120?

23 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.

24 MR. HANNON: Thank you. I
25 have no further questions.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Lynch?

2 MR. LYNCH: I know you're
3 going to find this hard to believe,
4 Mr. Chairman, but I don't have any questions.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: We're not
6 done yet, but, okay.

7 MR. LYNCH: Well, Dr. Klemens
8 asked my question and did such a great job of
9 eliciting a useful answer that I thank you,
10 sir.

11 MR. KLEMENS: Thank you. I'm
12 surprised and delighted.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: And we'll
14 see what the intervenor has to say on that
15 subject. But I guess I just have one
16 question.

17 We received a letter -- there
18 was a husband and wife actually speaking in
19 favor of possibly as much as 150-foot height,
20 and they specifically talked about -- and you
21 may have answered this -- the Hopewell Woods
22 Road, Beck Road, and Redding Recycling
23 Center, and also the Huntington State Park
24 where they said the signal coverage is weak.
25 Can you tell us, will the 150-foot versus the

1 120-foot tower make a difference there?

2 THE WITNESS (Lavin): For
3 Huntington State Park, yes. For the other
4 two places I don't know where they are so --

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay,
6 well --

7 THE WITNESS (Lavin): -- I
8 can't speak to those.

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: I assume
10 it's in that general area.

11 THE WITNESS (Lavin): In that
12 general area there are improved coverage
13 levels from 150 versus 120.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.
15 So now, Attorney Baldwin,
16 cross-examination of the Applicant?

17 MR. BALDWIN: We have no
18 questions, Mr. Chairman.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
20 (Witnesses excused.)

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: So, we'll
22 now proceed with the appearance of the
23 Intervenor Cellco Partnership, d/b/a Verizon
24 Wireless. And so we'll start with the
25 swearing in of, Attorney Baldwin, your

1 witnesses, please.

2 MR. BALDWIN: Thank you.
3 Mr. Chairman. We have two witnesses to
4 present this afternoon. We had a late
5 substitution for Ms. Carter, Carlo Centore,
6 with the engineering firm of Centek
7 Engineers, and Ryan Ulanday, radio frequency
8 engineer with Verizon Wireless. And I'd
9 offer them to be sworn.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Please rise.

11 C A R L O C E N T O R E ,

12 R Y A N U L A N D A Y ,

13 called as witnesses, being first duly
14 sworn by the Chairperson, were examined
15 and testified on their oaths as follows:

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Attorney

17 Baldwin, would you please verify the exhibits
18 you filed and also by the appropriate
19 witnesses?

20 MR. BALDWIN: Yes,

21 Mr. Chairman. We have four exhibits listed
22 in the hearing program, including our request
23 to intervene, our responses to the Council
24 interrogatories, Set I, II and III, Section
25 Roman III, B, items 1 through 4 in the

1 hearing program.

2 For Mr. Centore, Mr. Ulanday,
3 did you prepare or assist in the preparation
4 of the information contained in those
5 exhibits?

6 THE WITNESS (Centore): Yes, I
7 did.

8 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): Yes, I
9 did.

10 MR. BALDWIN: And do you have
11 any corrections or modifications to offer to
12 any of those exhibits at this time?

13 THE WITNESS (Centore): I do
14 not.

15 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): I do
16 have four corrections. The first three would
17 be on Exhibit Number 2. On our response on
18 Question Number 7 where Cellco intends to
19 install six remote radio heads, it was stated
20 that we're only installing three.

21 And the second correction
22 would be on Question Number 21 on the same
23 exhibit. Our response would be Cellco's
24 minimum design pressure signal strength is
25 negative 85 dBm for in-vehicle and 75 dBm for

1 in-building.

2 And then the third correction
3 would be on Question Number 30 on the table
4 showing our coverage footprint. Under 850
5 megahertz on 140 feet, it should be 17.05
6 square miles and 130 feet it should be 16.25
7 square miles.

8 And the last correction would
9 be on Exhibit Number 3, Question Number 41.
10 On the table showing the population coverage
11 for 850 megahertz at 140 feet, it should be
12 4,470 population, and then at 130 feet it
13 should be 4,237 population. That's it.

14 MR. BALDWIN: With those
15 corrections, is the information contained in
16 those exhibits true and accurate to the best
17 of your knowledge, Mr. Centore?

18 THE WITNESS (Centore): Yes,
19 it is.

20 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Ulanday?

21 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): Yes.

22 MR. BALDWIN: And do you adopt
23 the information in those exhibits as your
24 testimony today?

25 THE WITNESS (Centore): I do.

1 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): I do.

2 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman, we
3 offer them as full exhibits.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Does the
5 Applicant have any objection?

6 MR. LAUB: No objection,
7 Mr. Chairman.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: The exhibits
9 are therefore admitted.

10 (Intervenor's Exhibits III-B-1
11 through 4: Received in evidence - described
12 in index.)

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: We'll now go
14 with the cross-examination starting with
15 Mr. Perrone.

16 MR. PERRONE: Thank you,
17 Mr. Chairman.

18 Could you give us an update on
19 Cellco's backup generator plans? Would you
20 use the shared generator or have a propane
21 generator --

22 THE WITNESS (Centore): We're
23 amenable to using the shared generator.

24 MR. PERRONE: So my
25 understanding is that Cellco's minimum

1 required height is 120 feet, but with AT&T at
2 150, you would take 140 to the next stop?

3 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): That's
4 correct.

5 MR. PERRONE: Now, I had asked
6 AT&T about 120 feet. In that scenario that
7 would push Cellco down to 110 feet. What
8 would be the consequences of Cellco being at
9 110 feet?

10 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): We
11 would be looking at lesser coverage footprint
12 compared to the 140 that we would be given.

13 MR. PERRONE: Would that
14 possibly require additional sites to
15 compensate or additional height at other
16 sites?

17 THE WITNESS (Ulanday):
18 Actually, right now, we're looking at still
19 adding more sites towards the north and south
20 of our proposed location, so I'd say we'd
21 still need more.

22 MR. PERRONE: All right.
23 We'll put coverage aside for the moment, but
24 let's talk about spacing. I understand the
25 fire department antennas they're about 86

1 feet at the center, 92 feet at the top. What
2 would be the absolute lowest Cellco could go
3 where they wouldn't interfere with the fire
4 department antennas?

5 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): I
6 believe we have the standard of providing 10
7 feet minimum distance between antennas of
8 different carriers and different frequency
9 bands, so I'd say 10 feet.

10 MR. PERRONE: Okay. So if
11 they're at 86, you'd be roughly 96?

12 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): Ten
13 feet between the highest, I mean, the top of
14 their antennas and the bottom of our antennas
15 should be 10 feet.

16 MR. PERRONE: Okay. So 10
17 feet from the 92 to the bottom --

18 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): Yes,
19 that's correct.

20 MR. PERRONE: And your
21 antennas are about 8 feet tall?

22 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): Eight
23 feet.

24 MR. PERRONE: So it would be
25 10 plus -- because the top of theirs is 92,

1 then another 10, the bottom of your
2 antennas --

3 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): It's
4 not even 10 feet.

5 MR. PERRONE: So about one --

6 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): Six.

7 MR. PERRONE: About 106?

8 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): Uh-huh.

9 MR. PERRONE: Okay. How much
10 additional height would be required for flush
11 mounted antennas?

12 THE WITNESS (Ulanday):
13 Actually, for doing flush mounted, you would
14 need more height because we're eliminating
15 the possibility of installing remote radio
16 heads on the top of the tower. So I'd say if
17 we go for a flush mount, we would prefer the
18 140 and 150 for AT&T.

19 MR. PERRONE: One question I
20 had asked AT&T before, are flush mounted
21 antennas becoming less of a viable option
22 today given all the additional frequencies
23 and additional equipment?

24 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): It's
25 not actually more of the viable, but it's

1 more of providing better coverage for the
2 subscribers for the public because, by
3 installing remote radio heads on the tower
4 because of losses caused by the cables,
5 copper cables so --

6 MR. PERRONE: Okay. Did
7 Cellco finalize its lease with MCM, or is
8 that still being negotiated?

9 MR. BALDWIN: Maybe we can
10 rely on Mr. Gelinas for that answer.

11 THE WITNESS (Gelinas): It's
12 finalized.

13 MR. PERRONE: And are you
14 finding more and more of your traffic is data
15 rather than voice?

16 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): Yes,
17 definitely.

18 MR. PERRONE: Thank you.
19 That's all I have.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
21 We'll now continue with questions from the
22 Council.

23 Senator Murphy.

24 THE VICE CHAIRPERSON: You
25 indicate that the lease has been finalized

1 with Verizon?

2 THE WITNESS (Gelinas): That's
3 correct.

4 THE VICE CHAIRPERSON: Is it
5 dependent upon a location on the tower?

6 THE WITNESS (Gelinas): They
7 have leased the 120-foot level at this
8 point -- 140-foot level, I apologize,
9 140-foot level at this point.

10 THE VICE CHAIRPERSON: What's
11 the effect of the lease if it's not approved
12 for that height?

13 THE WITNESS (Gelinas): It
14 would require Verizon's approval and an
15 amendment to the existing agreement.

16 THE VICE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.
17 A question for Verizon, if you can answer it:
18 If the tower is not approved for, say,
19 anything higher than 130 feet, what would be
20 Verizon's attitude towards going on this
21 tower, if you know?

22 THE WITNESS (Ulanday):
23 Actually, we'll still take whatever we can
24 take because there's no other structure out
25 there right now that can accommodate our

1 antennas, so whatever the Council decides, we
2 would still take whatever we can get.

3 THE VICE CHAIRPERSON: Thank
4 you.

5 No further questions,
6 Mr. Chairman.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
8 Dr. Bell?

9 DR. BELL: Thank you,
10 Mr. Chair.

11 Is Verizon on the two towers I
12 was mentioning before, that is, the tower at
13 Dittmar Road and the tower at the garage at
14 the Redding town property, and are those
15 potential handoff towers for you as well as
16 for AT&T?

17 THE WITNESS (Ulanday):
18 Actually, I was looking at the Dittmar
19 location, and we are not on that tower.

20 DR. BELL: And are not planned
21 to be or you're not currently?

22 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): I
23 cannot answer specifically right now. I have
24 to check our design, but it's good to know
25 that we have that option right here, so I can

1 take a look.

2 DR. BELL: And what about the
3 other tower, the one at Great Oaks Road?

4 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): No,
5 not yet. We're not on that one, but we can
6 check. We can check our designs and take a
7 look.

8 DR. BELL: Okay. Because I'm
9 just trying to determine if you have the same
10 coverage possibilities more or less from
11 those towers.

12 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): All
13 right.

14 DR. BELL: Thank you.
15 That's my question, Mr. Chair.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Ashton?

17 MR. ASHTON: Thank you.

18 Is it fair to say that
19 propagation and height is a zero sum game and
20 that, insofar as you are forced to go to a
21 lower position on one tower, there is a
22 concomitant requirement that, to maintain
23 coverage, you have to go to a higher position
24 on other towers or more intermediate
25 structures; is that fair to say?

1 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): That's
2 correct.

3 MR. ASHTON: So that, if you
4 were forced here to come down to 120, there's
5 going to be, according to Mr. Newton and the
6 laws of physics, a reaction elsewhere?

7 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): That's
8 true. That's correct.

9 MR. ASHTON: Do you have any
10 preference as to fuel for an emergency
11 generator, diesel versus propane versus
12 whatever, or is it the same thing?

13 THE WITNESS (Centore):
14 There's no preference only in that, if
15 there's any environmental concerns, they shy
16 away from diesel where there's a sensitive
17 area, and that's Verizon's policy.

18 MR. ASHTON: Have you ever had
19 a diesel spill?

20 THE WITNESS (Centore): Not
21 that I'm personally aware of.

22 MR. ASHTON: Nothing further.
23 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
25 Dr. Klemens?

1 DR. KLEMENS: I have just a
2 few questions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3 Mr. Ulanday, you stated that
4 Cellco is placing or plans to place towers
5 north and south of this; that's in the works.
6 So does it really matter whether you're at
7 the 110 or 140 foot on this tower? What are
8 the real implications? I know I've never
9 seen anyone say they want to go lower. What
10 are the real-life implications?

11 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): Right
12 now we don't have specific plans or concrete
13 plans of putting up towers north and south of
14 it, but I was just looking at our coverage
15 footprint north and south of it, I'm still
16 looking at coverage gaps, so I was thinking
17 we still need more towers north and south.

18 DR. KLEMENS: So they're not
19 towers really planned yet?

20 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): No,
21 not yet. Our design engineers --

22 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you. And
23 I have a question about the maps, and I think
24 I understand what's there. I think the
25 portions of the state parks that are unserved

1 or uncovered by service are that sort of
2 light tan color; am I reading that correctly?
3 I see that you have -- those areas are still
4 not going to be covered. Correct?

5 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): Yes,
6 that's correct.

7 DR. KLEMENS: So that tan
8 coloration is analogous to the light blue
9 coloration that is uncovered areas outside?

10 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): Yes,
11 that's correct. It's uncovered.

12 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Is that
14 your --

15 MR. KLEMENS: Thank you. I'm
16 sorry. Yes, no further questions,
17 Mr. Chairman.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Senator
19 Daily?

20 SENATOR DAILY: Thank you very
21 much. My questions in regard to coverage
22 have been asked and answered.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
24 Mr. Hannon?

25 MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr.

1 Chairman.

2 I'll ask you basically the
3 same question I asked the other gentleman
4 over here. The coverage difference between
5 say 140 and 110 at the state park areas, how
6 much more reliability would you have at the
7 140 versus the 110?

8 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): We
9 have -- we're looking at lesser coverage
10 comparing 140 to 110, and definitely we have
11 more reliable service if we could go with the
12 higher plan center.

13 MR. HANNON: And would that be
14 pretty much for both of the state parks?

15 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): Yes,
16 that's true for both state parks.

17 MR. HANNON: Thank you. I
18 have no further questions.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Lynch?

20 MR. LYNCH: If I heard your
21 answer to Senator Murphy correctly, there's
22 no other options right now for Verizon, so
23 you would go lower on the tower?

24 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): Yes,
25 it is.

1 MR. LYNCH: Is that correct?

2 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): That's
3 correct.

4 MR. LYNCH: Why would you
5 sacrifice better coverage and not go out to
6 another search ring and look to build another
7 tower where you can deliver better data
8 services?

9 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): Right
10 now we don't have any -- there's no other
11 structures out there, so whatever we can get
12 from this proposal right here, that's how we
13 would plan the next site north or south or --

14 MR. LYNCH: I'm not asking
15 that. I'm asking to plan an alternative site
16 to this one in the relatively same general
17 area where you can go to 140 feet and not
18 have to build another tower somewhere else.
19 I guess it's not an option, but it seemed to
20 be a better business practice, but thank you,
21 Mr. Chairman.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
23 I just want to -- on Question Number 20 which
24 is on -- I don't know which one of these it
25 is -- which was a question about the lowest

1 height -- I just want to clarify this --
2 could achieve coverage objectives, and the
3 answer was the lowest 120, although you'd
4 prefer 140. Is that still your answer? The
5 reason I ask that is, obviously, if we were
6 to do what some of those in the community had
7 asked for, 120, that would put you down to
8 110. But 120, is that still the lowest?
9 Because you also said we'll take anything,
10 which is a dangerous answer.

11 THE WITNESS (Ulanday): I
12 mean, anything reasonable. I mean, if AT&T
13 gets approved with 120, we'll take the next
14 available height that we can get.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: That's
16 almost as dangerous as the other one, but
17 anyway.

18 Okay. I think that's all the
19 questions. We did get an answer about the
20 shared, so you're willing on the propane.
21 That I did hear, is that correct, as far as
22 the generators? You're on board?

23 THE WITNESS (Centore): Yes.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Sorry. I
25 was in a hurry to go home, I guess.

1 Cross-examination from the
2 Applicant?

3 MR. LAUB: None, Mr. Chairman.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank
5 you.

6 Before closing this hearing,
7 the Siting Council announces that briefs and
8 proposed findings of fact may be filed with
9 the Council by either the Applicant or
10 Intervenor no later than October 9, 2014.
11 Submission of briefs or proposed findings of
12 fact is not required by the Council, but we
13 leave it to your choice.

14 Anyone who has not become a
15 party or intervenor, but who decides to make
16 his or her views known to the Council, may
17 file written statements with the Council
18 within 30 days of the date hereof.

19 The Council will issue draft
20 findings of fact, and thereafter parties and
21 intervenors may identify errors or
22 inconsistencies between the Council's draft
23 findings of fact and the record; however, no
24 new information, no new evidence or arguments
25 and no reply briefs, without our permission,

1 will be considered. Again, copies of the
2 transcript will be filed at the Redding Town
3 Clerk's Office. Therefore, I declare the
4 hearing adjourned, and thank you all for your
5 participation.

6 (Whereupon, the witnesses were
7 excused, and the above proceedings were
8 adjourned at 1:49 p.m.)

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

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

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing 112 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original stenotype notes taken of the Continued Public Hearing in Re: DOCKET NO. 449, 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, which was held before ROBERT STEIN, Chairperson, at the Connecticut Siting Council, 10 Franklin Square, New Britain, Connecticut, on September 9, 2014.

Lisa L. Warner, L.S.R. 061

Court Reporter

UNITED REPORTERS, INC.

90 Brainard Road, Suite 103

Hartford, Connecticut 06114

1 I N D E X

2 WITNESSES MARTIN LAVIN

3 CHRISTOPHER GELINAS

4 MICHAEL LIBERTINE

5 SCOTT CHASSE

6 DAVID VIVIAN Page 162

7 EXAMINERS:

8 Mr. Laub Page 162

9 Mr. Perrone Page 164

10

11 WITNESSES CARLO CENTORE

12 RYAN ULANDAY Page 186

13 EXAMINERS:

14 Mr. Baldwin Page 186

15 Mr. Perrone Page 189

16

17 APPLICANTS' EXHIBITS

18 (Received in evidence)

19 EXHIBIT DESCRIPTION PAGE

20 II-B-8 Applicants' responses to

21 Council interrogatories,

22 Set III, 8/29/14 164

23

24

25

1 I N D E X (Cont'd.)

2 INTERVENOR'S EXHIBITS

3 (Received in evidence)

4 EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
5 III-B-1	Cellco's request to	
6	intervene, 5/28/14	189
7 III-B-2	Cellco's responses to	
8	Council interrogatories,	
9	Set I, 7/3/14	189
10 III-B-3	Cellco's responses to	
11	Council interrogatories,	
12	Set II, 7/22/14	189
13 III-B-4	Cellco's responses to	
14	Council interrogatories,	
15	Set III, 9/2/14	189

16

17 Reporter's Note: All exhibits were retained
18 by the Council.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25