

Transcript of the Hearing of

Date: December 4, 2014 Volume: I

Case: DOCKET NO. 452 - SITING COUNCIL

Printed On: December 15, 2014

UNITED REPORTERS, INC. Phone: (866) 534-3383 Fax: (877) 534-3383 Email: info@unitedreporters.com Internet: www.unitedreporters.com

Page 1

STATE OF CONNECTICUT CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Docket No. 452 Homeland Towers, LLC, 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 Salisbury Tax Assessor Map 16, Lot 5, 250 Canaan Road, Salisbury, Connecticut.

Council Meeting held at the Salisbury Town Hall, Upstairs Meeting Room, 27 Main Street, Salisbury, Connecticut, Thursday, December 4, 2014, beginning at 3:00 p.m.

Held Before:

ROBERT STEIN, Chairperson JAMES J. MURPHY, JR., Vice Chairperson

Ĩ			
	Page 2		Page 4
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	A p p e a r a n c e s: Council Members: DR. BARBARA BELL DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR. COMMISSIONER MICHAEL A. CARON, PURA Designee ROBERT HANNON, DEEP Designee Council Staff: MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ., Executive Director and Staff Attorney MICHAEL PERRONE Siting Analyst For New Cingular Wireless, PCS, LLC, and Message Center Management, Inc.: CUDDY & FEDER, LLP 445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th floor White Plains, New York 10601 By: LUCIA CHIOCCHIO, ESQ.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	THE CHAIRPERSON: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to call to order the meeting of the Connecticut Siting Council today, Thursday, December 4, 2014, at 3 p m. My name is Robin Stein. I'm chairman of the Siting Council. Other members of the Council today are Senator Murphy, Vice Chairman; Mr. Hannon, our designee from the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection; Commissioner Caron, designee from the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority; Dr. Bell; and Mr. Lynch. And members of the staff are Executive Director Melanie Bachman and Mr. Perrone, our siting analyst. This hearing is held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act upon an application from Homeland Towers, LLC, and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC, for a certificate of environmental compatibility and public need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a
	Page 3		Page 5
$1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 9 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \\ 24 \\ 25 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 1$	A p p e a r a n c e s:(cont'd) For The Town of Salisbury: JIM DRESSER, Second Selectman	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	telecommunication facility located at 250 Canaan Road in Salisbury, Connecticut. This application was received by the Council on October 7, 2014. As a reminder to all, off-the-record communication with a member of the Council or a member of the Council's staff upon the merits of this application is prohibited by law. Parties and intervenors to the proceeding are as follows: The applicant, Homeland Towers and New Cingular Wireless; Attorney Chiocchio from Cuddy & Feder; and a party is the Town of Salisbury and First Selectman Curtis Rand. We will proceed in accordance with the prepared agenda, copies of which are available here. Also available here are copies of the Connecticut Council's Citizen Guide to Siting Council Procedures. At the end of this afternoon's session, we will recess and resume again at 7 p m. The 7 p.m. hearing will be reserved for the public to make brief oral statements into the record. I wish to note that the

2 (Pages 2 to 5)

	Page 6		Page 8
1	parties, including their representatives and	1	comments.
2	witnesses, are not allowed to participate in	2	Okay. Are we ready for the
3	the public comment session.	3	presentation of the witness now for purposes
4	I also wish to note for those	4	of taking the oath?
5	who are here and for the benefit of your	5	MS. CHIOCCHIO: Sure. I'll
6	friends and neighbors who are unable to join	6	quickly introduce the panel. Starting with
7	us for the public comment session, that you	7	my far right, Martin Lavin of C Squared
8	or they may send written statements to the	8	Systems, RF engineer for AT&T Ray Vergati,
9	Council within 30 days of the date hereof,	9	of Homeland Towers, site acquisition
10	and such written statements will be given the	10	specialist. Moving to my left, Scott Chasse,
11	same weight as if spoken at the hearing.	11	All Points Technology, professional engineer;
12	If necessary, party	12	Dean Gustafson, also with APT, environmental
13	presentations may continue after the public	13	consultant, soil scientist; and Mike
14	comment session if time remains. A verbatim	14	Libertine, also with APT, environmental
15	transcript will be made of the hearing and	15	consultant and visual consultant.
16	deposited with the Town Clerk's Office in	16	SCOTT CHASSE,
17	Salisbury for the convenience of the public.	17	MICHAEL LAWTON,
18	First, is there any public	18	MARTIN LAVIN,
19	official who would like to make a statement	19	DEAN GUSTAFSON,
20	at this time?	20	RAYMOND VERGATI,
21	MR. DRESSER: Is this the time	21	called as a witnesses, being first duly
22	for intervenors from the Town of Salisbury?	22	sworn by Ms. Bachman, were examined and
23	THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Yes,	23	testified on their oaths as follows:
24	sir.	24	THE CHAIRPERSON: Now, go for
25	MR. DRESSER: I'll be very	25	the verification of the exhibits.
	D 7		
	Page 7		Page 9
1		1	
1 2	brief. My name is Jim Dresser. I'm a second selectman in Salisbury. Apologies from	1 2	Page 9 MS. CHIOCCHIO: The the applicant's exhibits in the hearing program
	brief. My name is Jim Dresser. I'm a second		MS. CHIOCCHIO: The the
2	brief. My name is Jim Dresser. I'm a second selectman in Salisbury. Apologies from	2	MS. CHIOCCHIO: The the applicant's exhibits in the hearing program
2 3 4 5	brief. My name is Jim Dresser. I'm a second selectman in Salisbury. Apologies from Curtis Rand, our First Selectman who's out of	2 3 4 5	MS. CHIOCCHIO: The the applicant's exhibits in the hearing program are identified under Roman Numeral II-B, 1
2 3 4	brief. My name is Jim Dresser. I'm a second selectman in Salisbury. Apologies from Curtis Rand, our First Selectman who's out of the country this week.	2 3 4	MS. CHIOCCHIO: The the applicant's exhibits in the hearing program are identified under Roman Numeral II-B, 1 through 7. So I will ask each of my
2 3 4 5 6 7	brief. My name is Jim Dresser. I'm a second selectman in Salisbury. Apologies from Curtis Rand, our First Selectman who's out of the country this week. And I just wanted to say I think we're registered as an intervenor. And I just wanted to say on behalf of the Town	2 3 4 5	MS. CHIOCCHIO: The the applicant's exhibits in the hearing program are identified under Roman Numeral II-B, 1 through 7. So I will ask each of my witnesses a series of questions with respect to those exhibits. And I'll start with Mike Libertine to my left.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	brief. My name is Jim Dresser. I'm a second selectman in Salisbury. Apologies from Curtis Rand, our First Selectman who's out of the country this week. And I just wanted to say I think we're registered as an intervenor. And I just wanted to say on behalf of the Town that we have no specific comments about the	2 3 4 5 6	MS. CHIOCCHIO: The the applicant's exhibits in the hearing program are identified under Roman Numeral II-B, 1 through 7. So I will ask each of my witnesses a series of questions with respect to those exhibits. And I'll start with Mike Libertine to my left. Did you prepare and assist in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	brief. My name is Jim Dresser. I'm a second selectman in Salisbury. Apologies from Curtis Rand, our First Selectman who's out of the country this week. And I just wanted to say I think we're registered as an intervenor. And I just wanted to say on behalf of the Town that we have no specific comments about the specifics of the tower, but there is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. CHIOCCHIO: The the applicant's exhibits in the hearing program are identified under Roman Numeral II-B, 1 through 7. So I will ask each of my witnesses a series of questions with respect to those exhibits. And I'll start with Mike Libertine to my left. Did you prepare and assist in the preparation of the exhibits as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	brief. My name is Jim Dresser. I'm a second selectman in Salisbury. Apologies from Curtis Rand, our First Selectman who's out of the country this week. And I just wanted to say I think we're registered as an intervenor. And I just wanted to say on behalf of the Town that we have no specific comments about the specifics of the tower, but there is definitely a need for cell service in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. CHIOCCHIO: The the applicant's exhibits in the hearing program are identified under Roman Numeral II-B, 1 through 7. So I will ask each of my witnesses a series of questions with respect to those exhibits. And I'll start with Mike Libertine to my left. Did you prepare and assist in the preparation of the exhibits as identified?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	brief. My name is Jim Dresser. I'm a second selectman in Salisbury. Apologies from Curtis Rand, our First Selectman who's out of the country this week. And I just wanted to say I think we're registered as an intervenor. And I just wanted to say on behalf of the Town that we have no specific comments about the specifics of the tower, but there is definitely a need for cell service in the Taconic region of Salisbury.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. CHIOCCHIO: The the applicant's exhibits in the hearing program are identified under Roman Numeral II-B, 1 through 7. So I will ask each of my witnesses a series of questions with respect to those exhibits. And I'll start with Mike Libertine to my left. Did you prepare and assist in the preparation of the exhibits as identified? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	brief. My name is Jim Dresser. I'm a second selectman in Salisbury. Apologies from Curtis Rand, our First Selectman who's out of the country this week. And I just wanted to say I think we're registered as an intervenor. And I just wanted to say on behalf of the Town that we have no specific comments about the specifics of the tower, but there is definitely a need for cell service in the Taconic region of Salisbury. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. CHIOCCHIO: The the applicant's exhibits in the hearing program are identified under Roman Numeral II-B, 1 through 7. So I will ask each of my witnesses a series of questions with respect to those exhibits. And I'll start with Mike Libertine to my left. Did you prepare and assist in the preparation of the exhibits as identified? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, I did.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	brief. My name is Jim Dresser. I'm a second selectman in Salisbury. Apologies from Curtis Rand, our First Selectman who's out of the country this week. And I just wanted to say I think we're registered as an intervenor. And I just wanted to say on behalf of the Town that we have no specific comments about the specifics of the tower, but there is definitely a need for cell service in the Taconic region of Salisbury. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. CHIOCCHIO: The the applicant's exhibits in the hearing program are identified under Roman Numeral II-B, 1 through 7. So I will ask each of my witnesses a series of questions with respect to those exhibits. And I'll start with Mike Libertine to my left. Did you prepare and assist in the preparation of the exhibits as identified? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, I did. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	brief. My name is Jim Dresser. I'm a second selectman in Salisbury. Apologies from Curtis Rand, our First Selectman who's out of the country this week. And I just wanted to say I think we're registered as an intervenor. And I just wanted to say on behalf of the Town that we have no specific comments about the specifics of the tower, but there is definitely a need for cell service in the Taconic region of Salisbury. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. CHIOCCHIO: The the applicant's exhibits in the hearing program are identified under Roman Numeral II-B, 1 through 7. So I will ask each of my witnesses a series of questions with respect to those exhibits. And I'll start with Mike Libertine to my left. Did you prepare and assist in the preparation of the exhibits as identified? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, I did. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	brief. My name is Jim Dresser. I'm a second selectman in Salisbury. Apologies from Curtis Rand, our First Selectman who's out of the country this week. And I just wanted to say I think we're registered as an intervenor. And I just wanted to say on behalf of the Town that we have no specific comments about the specifics of the tower, but there is definitely a need for cell service in the Taconic region of Salisbury. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. I wish to call your attention	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. CHIOCCHIO: The the applicant's exhibits in the hearing program are identified under Roman Numeral II-B, 1 through 7. So I will ask each of my witnesses a series of questions with respect to those exhibits. And I'll start with Mike Libertine to my left. Did you prepare and assist in the preparation of the exhibits as identified? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, I did. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	brief. My name is Jim Dresser. I'm a second selectman in Salisbury. Apologies from Curtis Rand, our First Selectman who's out of the country this week. And I just wanted to say I think we're registered as an intervenor. And I just wanted to say on behalf of the Town that we have no specific comments about the specifics of the tower, but there is definitely a need for cell service in the Taconic region of Salisbury. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. I wish to call your attention to those items shown on the hearing program	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. CHIOCCHIO: The the applicant's exhibits in the hearing program are identified under Roman Numeral II-B, 1 through 7. So I will ask each of my witnesses a series of questions with respect to those exhibits. And I'll start with Mike Libertine to my left. Did you prepare and assist in the preparation of the exhibits as identified? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, I did. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott Chasse, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	brief. My name is Jim Dresser. I'm a second selectman in Salisbury. Apologies from Curtis Rand, our First Selectman who's out of the country this week. And I just wanted to say I think we're registered as an intervenor. And I just wanted to say on behalf of the Town that we have no specific comments about the specifics of the tower, but there is definitely a need for cell service in the Taconic region of Salisbury. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. I wish to call your attention to those items shown on the hearing program marked as Roman Numeral I-D, items 1 through	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. CHIOCCHIO: The the applicant's exhibits in the hearing program are identified under Roman Numeral II-B, 1 through 7. So I will ask each of my witnesses a series of questions with respect to those exhibits. And I'll start with Mike Libertine to my left. Did you prepare and assist in the preparation of the exhibits as identified? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, I did. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott Chasse, yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	brief. My name is Jim Dresser. I'm a second selectman in Salisbury. Apologies from Curtis Rand, our First Selectman who's out of the country this week. And I just wanted to say I think we're registered as an intervenor. And I just wanted to say on behalf of the Town that we have no specific comments about the specifics of the tower, but there is definitely a need for cell service in the Taconic region of Salisbury. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. I wish to call your attention to those items shown on the hearing program marked as Roman Numeral I-D, items 1 through 59. Does the applicant or any party	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. CHIOCCHIO: The the applicant's exhibits in the hearing program are identified under Roman Numeral II-B, 1 through 7. So I will ask each of my witnesses a series of questions with respect to those exhibits. And I'll start with Mike Libertine to my left. Did you prepare and assist in the preparation of the exhibits as identified? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, I did. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott Chasse, yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	brief. My name is Jim Dresser. I'm a second selectman in Salisbury. Apologies from Curtis Rand, our First Selectman who's out of the country this week. And I just wanted to say I think we're registered as an intervenor. And I just wanted to say on behalf of the Town that we have no specific comments about the specifics of the tower, but there is definitely a need for cell service in the Taconic region of Salisbury. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. I wish to call your attention to those items shown on the hearing program marked as Roman Numeral I-D, items 1 through 59. Does the applicant or any party intervenor have any objection to the item	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. CHIOCCHIO: The the applicant's exhibits in the hearing program are identified under Roman Numeral II-B, 1 through 7. So I will ask each of my witnesses a series of questions with respect to those exhibits. And I'll start with Mike Libertine to my left. Did you prepare and assist in the preparation of the exhibits as identified? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, I did. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott Chasse, yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati, yes. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	brief. My name is Jim Dresser. I'm a second selectman in Salisbury. Apologies from Curtis Rand, our First Selectman who's out of the country this week. And I just wanted to say I think we're registered as an intervenor. And I just wanted to say on behalf of the Town that we have no specific comments about the specifics of the tower, but there is definitely a need for cell service in the Taconic region of Salisbury. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. I wish to call your attention to those items shown on the hearing program marked as Roman Numeral I-D, items 1 through 59. Does the applicant or any party intervenor have any objection to the item that the Council has administratively	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. CHIOCCHIO: The the applicant's exhibits in the hearing program are identified under Roman Numeral II-B, 1 through 7. So I will ask each of my witnesses a series of questions with respect to those exhibits. And I'll start with Mike Libertine to my left. Did you prepare and assist in the preparation of the exhibits as identified? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, I did. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott Chasse, yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati, yes. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	brief. My name is Jim Dresser. I'm a second selectman in Salisbury. Apologies from Curtis Rand, our First Selectman who's out of the country this week. And I just wanted to say I think we're registered as an intervenor. And I just wanted to say on behalf of the Town that we have no specific comments about the specifics of the tower, but there is definitely a need for cell service in the Taconic region of Salisbury. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. I wish to call your attention to those items shown on the hearing program marked as Roman Numeral I-D, items 1 through 59. Does the applicant or any party intervenor have any objection to the item that the Council has administratively noticed?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. CHIOCCHIO: The the applicant's exhibits in the hearing program are identified under Roman Numeral II-B, 1 through 7. So I will ask each of my witnesses a series of questions with respect to those exhibits. And I'll start with Mike Libertine to my left. Did you prepare and assist in the preparation of the exhibits as identified? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, I did. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott Chasse, yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati, yes. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, yes. MS. CHIOCCHIO: Do you have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	brief. My name is Jim Dresser. I'm a second selectman in Salisbury. Apologies from Curtis Rand, our First Selectman who's out of the country this week. And I just wanted to say I think we're registered as an intervenor. And I just wanted to say on behalf of the Town that we have no specific comments about the specifics of the tower, but there is definitely a need for cell service in the Taconic region of Salisbury. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. I wish to call your attention to those items shown on the hearing program marked as Roman Numeral I-D, items 1 through 59. Does the applicant or any party intervenor have any objection to the item that the Council has administratively noticed? MS. CHIOCCHIO: No objection.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. CHIOCCHIO: The the applicant's exhibits in the hearing program are identified under Roman Numeral II-B, 1 through 7. So I will ask each of my witnesses a series of questions with respect to those exhibits. And I'll start with Mike Libertine to my left. Did you prepare and assist in the preparation of the exhibits as identified? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, I did. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott Chasse, yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati, yes. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, yes. MS. CHIOCCHIO: Do you have any updates or clarifications or corrections
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	brief. My name is Jim Dresser. I'm a second selectman in Salisbury. Apologies from Curtis Rand, our First Selectman who's out of the country this week. And I just wanted to say I think we're registered as an intervenor. And I just wanted to say on behalf of the Town that we have no specific comments about the specifics of the tower, but there is definitely a need for cell service in the Taconic region of Salisbury. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. I wish to call your attention to those items shown on the hearing program marked as Roman Numeral I-D, items 1 through 59. Does the applicant or any party intervenor have any objection to the item that the Council has administratively noticed? MS. CHIOCCHIO: No objection. THE CHAIRPERSON: Accordingly,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. CHIOCCHIO: The the applicant's exhibits in the hearing program are identified under Roman Numeral II-B, 1 through 7. So I will ask each of my witnesses a series of questions with respect to those exhibits. And I'll start with Mike Libertine to my left. Did you prepare and assist in the preparation of the exhibits as identified? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, I did. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott Chasse, yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati, yes. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, yes. MS. CHIOCCHIO: Do you have any updates or clarifications or corrections to the information contained in the exhibits
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	brief. My name is Jim Dresser. I'm a second selectman in Salisbury. Apologies from Curtis Rand, our First Selectman who's out of the country this week. And I just wanted to say I think we're registered as an intervenor. And I just wanted to say on behalf of the Town that we have no specific comments about the specifics of the tower, but there is definitely a need for cell service in the Taconic region of Salisbury. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. I wish to call your attention to those items shown on the hearing program marked as Roman Numeral I-D, items 1 through 59. Does the applicant or any party intervenor have any objection to the item that the Council has administratively noticed? MS. CHIOCCHIO: No objection. THE CHAIRPERSON: Accordingly, the Council hereby administratively notices	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS. CHIOCCHIO: The the applicant's exhibits in the hearing program are identified under Roman Numeral II-B, 1 through 7. So I will ask each of my witnesses a series of questions with respect to those exhibits. And I'll start with Mike Libertine to my left. Did you prepare and assist in the preparation of the exhibits as identified? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, I did. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott Chasse, yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati, yes. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, yes. MS. CHIOCCHIO: Do you have any updates or clarifications or corrections to the information contained in the exhibits as identified?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	brief. My name is Jim Dresser. I'm a second selectman in Salisbury. Apologies from Curtis Rand, our First Selectman who's out of the country this week. And I just wanted to say I think we're registered as an intervenor. And I just wanted to say on behalf of the Town that we have no specific comments about the specifics of the tower, but there is definitely a need for cell service in the Taconic region of Salisbury. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. I wish to call your attention to those items shown on the hearing program marked as Roman Numeral I-D, items 1 through 59. Does the applicant or any party intervenor have any objection to the item that the Council has administratively noticed? MS. CHIOCCHIO: No objection. THE CHAIRPERSON: Accordingly,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. CHIOCCHIO: The the applicant's exhibits in the hearing program are identified under Roman Numeral II-B, 1 through 7. So I will ask each of my witnesses a series of questions with respect to those exhibits. And I'll start with Mike Libertine to my left. Did you prepare and assist in the preparation of the exhibits as identified? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, I did. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott Chasse, yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati, yes. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, yes. MS. CHIOCCHIO: Do you have any updates or clarifications or corrections to the information contained in the exhibits

3 (Pages 6 to 9)

UNITED REPORTERS, INC.

	Page 10		Page 12
1	Libertine, no.	1	would amond nortially the tree survey to
1 2		2	would amend partially the tree survey to indicate that it's more like 35 trees to be
3	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean	3	felled, 11 in the 14-plus, 10-plus in the
4	Gustafson, no.	4	
5	THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott	5	10-14, and 10-plus in the 6 to 10 range. And
	Chasse, yes.	6	that will be finalized once the surveyors get
6 7	On detail 1SP3 of the French	6 7	a chance to get out there in the next week or
8	mattress cross-section, the elevation section	8	two.
8 9	that's noted at the top of the detail, it	9	THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray
9 10	says "Elevation at section line." It	10	Vergati, no corrections.
10	actually gave the elevation. And it should	11	THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin
12	have been just the section number, which is	12	Lavin, no corrections. MS. CHIOCCHIO: Is the
12	station zero plus 30. Also, as a result of the	13	
14	relocation	14	information contained therein true and
14		15	accurate, to the best of your belief and
15	MR. HANNON: Can you repeat that, please?	16	knowledge? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike
17		17	
18	THE WITNESS (Chasse): I'm sorry. Yes, detail 1SP3.	18	Libertine, yes.
18	•	10	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes.
20	MS. CHIOCCHIO: It's actually Exhibit Number 4.	20	THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott
20		20	· · · · · ·
21	THE WITNESS (Chasse): Exhibit 4?	21	Chasse, as amended, yes.
22	MS. CHIOCCHIO: In the	22	THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray
23 24		23	Vergati, yes. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin
24 25	supplemental submission.	24	
20	This is Exhibit 4, the	20	Lavin, yes.
	Page 11		Page 13
1		1	_
1	supplemental submission with the updated	1	MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you
2	supplemental submission with the updated drawing.	2	MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt this as your testimony in this
2 3	supplemental submission with the updated drawing. THE WITNESS (Chasse): That	2 3	MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt this as your testimony in this proceeding today?
2 3 4	supplemental submission with the updated drawing. THE WITNESS (Chasse): That should be station zero plus 30, instead of	2	MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt this as your testimony in this proceeding today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike
2 3	supplemental submission with the updated drawing. THE WITNESS (Chasse): That should be station zero plus 30, instead of elevation 864.75.	2 3 4	MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt this as your testimony in this proceeding today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike Libertine, yes.
2 3 4 5	supplemental submission with the updated drawing. THE WITNESS (Chasse): That should be station zero plus 30, instead of elevation 864.75. MR. HANNON: Thank you.	2 3 4 5	MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt this as your testimony in this proceeding today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike Libertine, yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean
2 3 4 5 6	supplemental submission with the updated drawing. THE WITNESS (Chasse): That should be station zero plus 30, instead of elevation 864.75. MR. HANNON: Thank you. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And	2 3 4 5 6	MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt this as your testimony in this proceeding today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike Libertine, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7	supplemental submission with the updated drawing. THE WITNESS (Chasse): That should be station zero plus 30, instead of elevation 864.75. MR. HANNON: Thank you. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And then, as a result of the archaeological find,	2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt this as your testimony in this proceeding today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike Libertine, yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	supplemental submission with the updated drawing. THE WITNESS (Chasse): That should be station zero plus 30, instead of elevation 864.75. MR. HANNON: Thank you. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt this as your testimony in this proceeding today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike Libertine, yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott Chasse, as amended, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	supplemental submission with the updated drawing. THE WITNESS (Chasse): That should be station zero plus 30, instead of elevation 864.75. MR. HANNON: Thank you. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And then, as a result of the archaeological find, we relocated the facility approximately	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt this as your testimony in this proceeding today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike Libertine, yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	supplemental submission with the updated drawing. THE WITNESS (Chasse): That should be station zero plus 30, instead of elevation 864.75. MR. HANNON: Thank you. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And then, as a result of the archaeological find, we relocated the facility approximately 107 feet to the southwest. And as a result	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt this as your testimony in this proceeding today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike Libertine, yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott Chasse, as amended, yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	supplemental submission with the updated drawing. THE WITNESS (Chasse): That should be station zero plus 30, instead of elevation 864.75. MR. HANNON: Thank you. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And then, as a result of the archaeological find, we relocated the facility approximately 107 feet to the southwest. And as a result of that, at that time, we assessed the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt this as your testimony in this proceeding today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike Libertine, yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott Chasse, as amended, yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	supplemental submission with the updated drawing. THE WITNESS (Chasse): That should be station zero plus 30, instead of elevation 864.75. MR. HANNON: Thank you. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And then, as a result of the archaeological find, we relocated the facility approximately 107 feet to the southwest. And as a result of that, at that time, we assessed the existing survey that we had. We had trees	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt this as your testimony in this proceeding today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike Libertine, yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott Chasse, as amended, yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati, yes. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	supplemental submission with the updated drawing. THE WITNESS (Chasse): That should be station zero plus 30, instead of elevation 864.75. MR. HANNON: Thank you. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And then, as a result of the archaeological find, we relocated the facility approximately 107 feet to the southwest. And as a result of that, at that time, we assessed the existing survey that we had. We had trees picked up as well as the necessary topography	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt this as your testimony in this proceeding today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike Libertine, yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott Chasse, as amended, yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati, yes. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	supplemental submission with the updated drawing. THE WITNESS (Chasse): That should be station zero plus 30, instead of elevation 864.75. MR. HANNON: Thank you. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And then, as a result of the archaeological find, we relocated the facility approximately 107 feet to the southwest. And as a result of that, at that time, we assessed the existing survey that we had. We had trees picked up as well as the necessary topography from our base mapping in order to do the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt this as your testimony in this proceeding today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike Libertine, yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott Chasse, as amended, yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati, yes. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, yes. MS. CHIOCCHIO: We would ask
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	supplemental submission with the updated drawing. THE WITNESS (Chasse): That should be station zero plus 30, instead of elevation 864.75. MR. HANNON: Thank you. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And then, as a result of the archaeological find, we relocated the facility approximately 107 feet to the southwest. And as a result of that, at that time, we assessed the existing survey that we had. We had trees picked up as well as the necessary topography from our base mapping in order to do the move, redesign the site.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt this as your testimony in this proceeding today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike Libertine, yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott Chasse, as amended, yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati, yes. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, yes. MS. CHIOCCHIO: We would ask that the Council accept the exhibits as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	supplemental submission with the updated drawing. THE WITNESS (Chasse): That should be station zero plus 30, instead of elevation 864.75. MR. HANNON: Thank you. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And then, as a result of the archaeological find, we relocated the facility approximately 107 feet to the southwest. And as a result of that, at that time, we assessed the existing survey that we had. We had trees picked up as well as the necessary topography from our base mapping in order to do the move, redesign the site. However, based on our field	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt this as your testimony in this proceeding today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike Libertine, yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott Chasse, as amended, yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati, yes. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, yes. MS. CHIOCCHIO: We would ask that the Council accept the exhibits as identified.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	supplemental submission with the updated drawing. THE WITNESS (Chasse): That should be station zero plus 30, instead of elevation 864.75. MR. HANNON: Thank you. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And then, as a result of the archaeological find, we relocated the facility approximately 107 feet to the southwest. And as a result of that, at that time, we assessed the existing survey that we had. We had trees picked up as well as the necessary topography from our base mapping in order to do the move, redesign the site. However, based on our field observations and our walk, it's clear that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt this as your testimony in this proceeding today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike Libertine, yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott Chasse, as amended, yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati, yes. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, yes. MS. CHIOCCHIO: We would ask that the Council accept the exhibits as identified. THE CHAIRPERSON: Does the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	supplemental submission with the updated drawing. THE WITNESS (Chasse): That should be station zero plus 30, instead of elevation 864.75. MR. HANNON: Thank you. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And then, as a result of the archaeological find, we relocated the facility approximately 107 feet to the southwest. And as a result of that, at that time, we assessed the existing survey that we had. We had trees picked up as well as the necessary topography from our base mapping in order to do the move, redesign the site. However, based on our field observations and our walk, it's clear that not all of the trees in the 6- to 14-inch	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt this as your testimony in this proceeding today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike Libertine, yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott Chasse, as amended, yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati, yes. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, yes. MS. CHIOCCHIO: We would ask that the Council accept the exhibits as identified. THE CHAIRPERSON: Does the party intervenor have any objection to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	supplemental submission with the updated drawing. THE WITNESS (Chasse): That should be station zero plus 30, instead of elevation 864.75. MR. HANNON: Thank you. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And then, as a result of the archaeological find, we relocated the facility approximately 107 feet to the southwest. And as a result of that, at that time, we assessed the existing survey that we had. We had trees picked up as well as the necessary topography from our base mapping in order to do the move, redesign the site. However, based on our field observations and our walk, it's clear that not all of the trees in the 6- to 14-inch diameter or caliber were picked up during that initial survey, as that trees that are shown on the survey were peripheral to where	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt this as your testimony in this proceeding today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike Libertine, yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott Chasse, as amended, yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati, yes. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, yes. MS. CHIOCCHIO: We would ask that the Council accept the exhibits as identified. THE CHAIRPERSON: Does the party intervenor have any objection to the admission of the applicant's exhibits?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	supplemental submission with the updated drawing. THE WITNESS (Chasse): That should be station zero plus 30, instead of elevation 864.75. MR. HANNON: Thank you. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And then, as a result of the archaeological find, we relocated the facility approximately 107 feet to the southwest. And as a result of that, at that time, we assessed the existing survey that we had. We had trees picked up as well as the necessary topography from our base mapping in order to do the move, redesign the site. However, based on our field observations and our walk, it's clear that not all of the trees in the 6- to 14-inch diameter or caliber were picked up during that initial survey, as that trees that are shown on the survey were peripheral to where the original location was.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt this as your testimony in this proceeding today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike Libertine, yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott Chasse, as amended, yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati, yes. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, yes. MS. CHIOCCHIO: We would ask that the Council accept the exhibits as identified. THE CHAIRPERSON: Does the party intervenor have any objection to the admission of the applicant's exhibits? MR. DRESSER: No. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. (Exhibits II-B-1 through
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	supplemental submission with the updated drawing. THE WITNESS (Chasse): That should be station zero plus 30, instead of elevation 864.75. MR. HANNON: Thank you. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And then, as a result of the archaeological find, we relocated the facility approximately 107 feet to the southwest. And as a result of that, at that time, we assessed the existing survey that we had. We had trees picked up as well as the necessary topography from our base mapping in order to do the move, redesign the site. However, based on our field observations and our walk, it's clear that not all of the trees in the 6- to 14-inch diameter or caliber were picked up during that initial survey, as that trees that are shown on the survey were peripheral to where the original location was.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt this as your testimony in this proceeding today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike Libertine, yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott Chasse, as amended, yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati, yes. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, yes. MS. CHIOCCHIO: We would ask that the Council accept the exhibits as identified. THE CHAIRPERSON: Does the party intervenor have any objection to the admission of the applicant's exhibits? MR. DRESSER: No. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	supplemental submission with the updated drawing. THE WITNESS (Chasse): That should be station zero plus 30, instead of elevation 864.75. MR. HANNON: Thank you. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And then, as a result of the archaeological find, we relocated the facility approximately 107 feet to the southwest. And as a result of that, at that time, we assessed the existing survey that we had. We had trees picked up as well as the necessary topography from our base mapping in order to do the move, redesign the site. However, based on our field observations and our walk, it's clear that not all of the trees in the 6- to 14-inch diameter or caliber were picked up during that initial survey, as that trees that are shown on the survey were peripheral to where the original location was. I've already been on the horn to have the surveyor go back out and pick	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt this as your testimony in this proceeding today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike Libertine, yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott Chasse, as amended, yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati, yes. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, yes. MS. CHIOCCHIO: We would ask that the Council accept the exhibits as identified. THE CHAIRPERSON: Does the party intervenor have any objection to the admission of the applicant's exhibits? MR. DRESSER: No. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. (Exhibits II-B-1 through II-B-7: Received in evidence - described in index.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	supplemental submission with the updated drawing. THE WITNESS (Chasse): That should be station zero plus 30, instead of elevation 864.75. MR. HANNON: Thank you. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And then, as a result of the archaeological find, we relocated the facility approximately 107 feet to the southwest. And as a result of that, at that time, we assessed the existing survey that we had. We had trees picked up as well as the necessary topography from our base mapping in order to do the move, redesign the site. However, based on our field observations and our walk, it's clear that not all of the trees in the 6- to 14-inch diameter or caliber were picked up during that initial survey, as that trees that are shown on the survey were peripheral to where the original location was.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you adopt this as your testimony in this proceeding today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike Libertine, yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson, yes. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott Chasse, as amended, yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): Ray Vergati, yes. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin Lavin, yes. MS. CHIOCCHIO: We would ask that the Council accept the exhibits as identified. THE CHAIRPERSON: Does the party intervenor have any objection to the admission of the applicant's exhibits? MR. DRESSER: No. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. (Exhibits II-B-1 through II-B-7: Received in evidence - described in

4 (Pages 10 to 13)

UNITED REPORTERS, INC.

info@unitedreporters.com (866) 534-3383 www.unitedreporters.com

	Page 14		Page 16
1	exhibits are admitted, we'll now begin with	1	it is. It's at the new proposed location.
2	the cross-examination of the applicants,	2	MR. PERRONE: Did you fly it
3	starting with Mr. Perrone.	3	to the monopole height of 150 or the treetop
4	CROSS-EXAMINATION	4	height of 157?
5	MR. PERRONE: Thank you,	5	THE WITNESS (Libertine): What
6	Mr. Chairman.	6	we do is we actually tether the string to the
7	First, I'd like to start out	7	full 157-foot height, so the top of the
8	with a general question. I understand the	8	monopine, and then the four-foot balloon is
9	supplemental submission with the revised	9	actually above that. So it's a little bit
10	location that was filed on the same date as	10	higher than the proposed height.
11	the first set of interrogatories. Are the	11	MR. PERRONE: Okay.
12	responses to the first set of interrogatories	12	THE WITNESS (Libertine): So
13	all based on the revised location or or at	13	the bottom of the balloon represents the tip
14	least accurate for that location?	14	of the faux branching at the 157-foot height.
15	THE WITNESS (Libertine): This	15	MR. PERRONE: Okay. To date,
16	is Mike Libertine. From our environmental	16	have any other wireless wireless carriers
17	perspective, yes, they are. They're they	17	expressed an interest in collocating on this
18	were they were done concurrently, so	18	tower?
19	they they do relate to the new location.	19	THE WITNESS (Vergati): It's
20	THE WITNESS (Chasse):	20	my understanding that Verizon has expressed
21	Scott Scott Chasse. On behalf of the	21	an interest for the proposed facility.
22	engineering aspects of the project, that,	22	MR. PERRONE: Okay.
23 24	yes, the new location was considered in those	23 24	A VOICE: Has or has not? Excuse me.
24 25	responses.	24	
20	MR. PERRONE: Okay.	25	THE WITNESS (Vergati): They
	Page 15		Page 17
1		1	
1 2	Mr. Libertine, did you fly a	1	asked.
2	Mr. Libertine, did you fly a balloon today?	2	asked. A VOICE: Thank you.
2 3	Mr. Libertine, did you fly a balloon today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes.		asked.
2 3 4	Mr. Libertine, did you fly a balloon today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. There's been a red helium-filled balloon at	2 3	asked. A VOICE: Thank you. MR. PERRONE: Could you give us the current status of the consultations
2 3	Mr. Libertine, did you fly a balloon today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. There's been a red helium-filled balloon at the site, at the proposed location of the	2 3 4	asked. A VOICE: Thank you. MR. PERRONE: Could you give
2 3 4 5	Mr. Libertine, did you fly a balloon today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. There's been a red helium-filled balloon at	2 3 4 5	asked. A VOICE: Thank you. MR. PERRONE: Could you give us the current status of the consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office?
2 3 4 5 6	Mr. Libertine, did you fly a balloon today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. There's been a red helium-filled balloon at the site, at the proposed location of the site, tethered to 157 feet since about seven o'clock this morning.	2 3 4 5 6	asked. A VOICE: Thank you. MR. PERRONE: Could you give us the current status of the consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office? THE WITNESS (Libertine):
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Mr. Libertine, did you fly a balloon today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. There's been a red helium-filled balloon at the site, at the proposed location of the site, tethered to 157 feet since about seven o'clock this morning. We did lose one balloon early this morning where it was a little bit	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	asked. A VOICE: Thank you. MR. PERRONE: Could you give us the current status of the consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Certainly. There has been a submission made, approximately two weeks ago, right before Thanksgiving, for what they consider to be a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Mr. Libertine, did you fly a balloon today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. There's been a red helium-filled balloon at the site, at the proposed location of the site, tethered to 157 feet since about seven o'clock this morning. We did lose one balloon early this morning where it was a little bit blust more blustery then things calmed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	asked. A VOICE: Thank you. MR. PERRONE: Could you give us the current status of the consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Certainly. There has been a submission made, approximately two weeks ago, right before Thanksgiving, for what they consider to be a Section 106 Review Consultation package.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Mr. Libertine, did you fly a balloon today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. There's been a red helium-filled balloon at the site, at the proposed location of the site, tethered to 157 feet since about seven o'clock this morning. We did lose one balloon early this morning where it was a little bit blust more blustery then things calmed down a little bit later on. And by the time	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	asked. A VOICE: Thank you. MR. PERRONE: Could you give us the current status of the consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Certainly. There has been a submission made, approximately two weeks ago, right before Thanksgiving, for what they consider to be a Section 106 Review Consultation package. That is in front of the SHPO. Because of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Mr. Libertine, did you fly a balloon today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. There's been a red helium-filled balloon at the site, at the proposed location of the site, tethered to 157 feet since about seven o'clock this morning. We did lose one balloon early this morning where it was a little bit blust more blustery then things calmed down a little bit later on. And by the time we got to the site walk, it was actually	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	asked. A VOICE: Thank you. MR. PERRONE: Could you give us the current status of the consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Certainly. There has been a submission made, approximately two weeks ago, right before Thanksgiving, for what they consider to be a Section 106 Review Consultation package. That is in front of the SHPO. Because of the location change and some other things, it was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Mr. Libertine, did you fly a balloon today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. There's been a red helium-filled balloon at the site, at the proposed location of the site, tethered to 157 feet since about seven o'clock this morning. We did lose one balloon early this morning where it was a little bit blust more blustery then things calmed down a little bit later on. And by the time we got to the site walk, it was actually fairly straight in the air. So we'll keep	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	asked. A VOICE: Thank you. MR. PERRONE: Could you give us the current status of the consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Certainly. There has been a submission made, approximately two weeks ago, right before Thanksgiving, for what they consider to be a Section 106 Review Consultation package. That is in front of the SHPO. Because of the location change and some other things, it was delayed unfortunately, so we have not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Mr. Libertine, did you fly a balloon today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. There's been a red helium-filled balloon at the site, at the proposed location of the site, tethered to 157 feet since about seven o'clock this morning. We did lose one balloon early this morning where it was a little bit blust more blustery then things calmed down a little bit later on. And by the time we got to the site walk, it was actually fairly straight in the air. So we'll keep that up until four o'clock this afternoon.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	asked. A VOICE: Thank you. MR. PERRONE: Could you give us the current status of the consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Certainly. There has been a submission made, approximately two weeks ago, right before Thanksgiving, for what they consider to be a Section 106 Review Consultation package. That is in front of the SHPO. Because of the location change and some other things, it was delayed unfortunately, so we have not received any input yet on their response.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Mr. Libertine, did you fly a balloon today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. There's been a red helium-filled balloon at the site, at the proposed location of the site, tethered to 157 feet since about seven o'clock this morning. We did lose one balloon early this morning where it was a little bit blust more blustery then things calmed down a little bit later on. And by the time we got to the site walk, it was actually fairly straight in the air. So we'll keep that up until four o'clock this afternoon. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	asked. A VOICE: Thank you. MR. PERRONE: Could you give us the current status of the consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Certainly. There has been a submission made, approximately two weeks ago, right before Thanksgiving, for what they consider to be a Section 106 Review Consultation package. That is in front of the SHPO. Because of the location change and some other things, it was delayed unfortunately, so we have not received any input yet on their response. MR. PERRONE: Would the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Mr. Libertine, did you fly a balloon today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. There's been a red helium-filled balloon at the site, at the proposed location of the site, tethered to 157 feet since about seven o'clock this morning. We did lose one balloon early this morning where it was a little bit blust more blustery then things calmed down a little bit later on. And by the time we got to the site walk, it was actually fairly straight in the air. So we'll keep that up until four o'clock this afternoon. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And the diameter of the balloon?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	asked. A VOICE: Thank you. MR. PERRONE: Could you give us the current status of the consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Certainly. There has been a submission made, approximately two weeks ago, right before Thanksgiving, for what they consider to be a Section 106 Review Consultation package. That is in front of the SHPO. Because of the location change and some other things, it was delayed unfortunately, so we have not received any input yet on their response. MR. PERRONE: Would the proposed facility be located within the Upper
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Mr. Libertine, did you fly a balloon today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. There's been a red helium-filled balloon at the site, at the proposed location of the site, tethered to 157 feet since about seven o'clock this morning. We did lose one balloon early this morning where it was a little bit blust more blustery then things calmed down a little bit later on. And by the time we got to the site walk, it was actually fairly straight in the air. So we'll keep that up until four o'clock this afternoon. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And the diameter of the balloon? THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	asked. A VOICE: Thank you. MR. PERRONE: Could you give us the current status of the consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Certainly. There has been a submission made, approximately two weeks ago, right before Thanksgiving, for what they consider to be a Section 106 Review Consultation package. That is in front of the SHPO. Because of the location change and some other things, it was delayed unfortunately, so we have not received any input yet on their response. MR. PERRONE: Would the proposed facility be located within the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Corridor?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Mr. Libertine, did you fly a balloon today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. There's been a red helium-filled balloon at the site, at the proposed location of the site, tethered to 157 feet since about seven o'clock this morning. We did lose one balloon early this morning where it was a little bit blust more blustery then things calmed down a little bit later on. And by the time we got to the site walk, it was actually fairly straight in the air. So we'll keep that up until four o'clock this afternoon. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And the diameter of the balloon? THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's a four-foot diameter.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	asked. A VOICE: Thank you. MR. PERRONE: Could you give us the current status of the consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Certainly. There has been a submission made, approximately two weeks ago, right before Thanksgiving, for what they consider to be a Section 106 Review Consultation package. That is in front of the SHPO. Because of the location change and some other things, it was delayed unfortunately, so we have not received any input yet on their response. MR. PERRONE: Would the proposed facility be located within the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Corridor? THE WITNESS (Libertine): This
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Mr. Libertine, did you fly a balloon today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. There's been a red helium-filled balloon at the site, at the proposed location of the site, tethered to 157 feet since about seven o'clock this morning. We did lose one balloon early this morning where it was a little bit blust more blustery then things calmed down a little bit later on. And by the time we got to the site walk, it was actually fairly straight in the air. So we'll keep that up until four o'clock this afternoon. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And the diameter of the balloon? THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's a four-foot diameter. MR. PERRONE: Four foot. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	asked. A VOICE: Thank you. MR. PERRONE: Could you give us the current status of the consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Certainly. There has been a submission made, approximately two weeks ago, right before Thanksgiving, for what they consider to be a Section 106 Review Consultation package. That is in front of the SHPO. Because of the location change and some other things, it was delayed unfortunately, so we have not received any input yet on their response. MR. PERRONE: Would the proposed facility be located within the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Corridor? THE WITNESS (Libertine): This is all part of that corridor, this this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Mr. Libertine, did you fly a balloon today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. There's been a red helium-filled balloon at the site, at the proposed location of the site, tethered to 157 feet since about seven o'clock this morning. We did lose one balloon early this morning where it was a little bit blust more blustery then things calmed down a little bit later on. And by the time we got to the site walk, it was actually fairly straight in the air. So we'll keep that up until four o'clock this afternoon. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And the diameter of the balloon? THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's a four-foot diameter. MR. PERRONE: Four foot. And you said red?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	asked. A VOICE: Thank you. MR. PERRONE: Could you give us the current status of the consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Certainly. There has been a submission made, approximately two weeks ago, right before Thanksgiving, for what they consider to be a Section 106 Review Consultation package. That is in front of the SHPO. Because of the location change and some other things, it was delayed unfortunately, so we have not received any input yet on their response. MR. PERRONE: Would the proposed facility be located within the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Corridor? THE WITNESS (Libertine): This is all part of that corridor, this this general area so, yes, the answer would be,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Mr. Libertine, did you fly a balloon today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. There's been a red helium-filled balloon at the site, at the proposed location of the site, tethered to 157 feet since about seven o'clock this morning. We did lose one balloon early this morning where it was a little bit blust more blustery then things calmed down a little bit later on. And by the time we got to the site walk, it was actually fairly straight in the air. So we'll keep that up until four o'clock this afternoon. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And the diameter of the balloon? THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's a four-foot diameter. MR. PERRONE: Four foot. And you said red? THE WITNESS (Libertine):	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	asked. A VOICE: Thank you. MR. PERRONE: Could you give us the current status of the consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Certainly. There has been a submission made, approximately two weeks ago, right before Thanksgiving, for what they consider to be a Section 106 Review Consultation package. That is in front of the SHPO. Because of the location change and some other things, it was delayed unfortunately, so we have not received any input yet on their response. MR. PERRONE: Would the proposed facility be located within the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Corridor? THE WITNESS (Libertine): This is all part of that corridor, this this general area so, yes, the answer would be, yes, it is.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Mr. Libertine, did you fly a balloon today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. There's been a red helium-filled balloon at the site, at the proposed location of the site, tethered to 157 feet since about seven o'clock this morning. We did lose one balloon early this morning where it was a little bit blust more blustery then things calmed down a little bit later on. And by the time we got to the site walk, it was actually fairly straight in the air. So we'll keep that up until four o'clock this afternoon. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And the diameter of the balloon? THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's a four-foot diameter. MR. PERRONE: Four foot. And you said red? THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's yes, we use red, yeah.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	asked. A VOICE: Thank you. MR. PERRONE: Could you give us the current status of the consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Certainly. There has been a submission made, approximately two weeks ago, right before Thanksgiving, for what they consider to be a Section 106 Review Consultation package. That is in front of the SHPO. Because of the location change and some other things, it was delayed unfortunately, so we have not received any input yet on their response. MR. PERRONE: Would the proposed facility be located within the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Corridor? THE WITNESS (Libertine): This is all part of that corridor, this this general area so, yes, the answer would be, yes, it is. MR. PERRONE: How would it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Mr. Libertine, did you fly a balloon today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. There's been a red helium-filled balloon at the site, at the proposed location of the site, tethered to 157 feet since about seven o'clock this morning. We did lose one balloon early this morning where it was a little bit blust more blustery then things calmed down a little bit later on. And by the time we got to the site walk, it was actually fairly straight in the air. So we'll keep that up until four o'clock this afternoon. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And the diameter of the balloon? THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's a four-foot diameter. MR. PERRONE: Four foot. And you said red? THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's yes, we use red, yeah. MR. PERRONE: And that's in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	asked. A VOICE: Thank you. MR. PERRONE: Could you give us the current status of the consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Certainly. There has been a submission made, approximately two weeks ago, right before Thanksgiving, for what they consider to be a Section 106 Review Consultation package. That is in front of the SHPO. Because of the location change and some other things, it was delayed unfortunately, so we have not received any input yet on their response. MR. PERRONE: Would the proposed facility be located within the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Corridor? THE WITNESS (Libertine): This is all part of that corridor, this this general area so, yes, the answer would be, yes, it is. MR. PERRONE: How would it impact the National Heritage area?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Mr. Libertine, did you fly a balloon today? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. There's been a red helium-filled balloon at the site, at the proposed location of the site, tethered to 157 feet since about seven o'clock this morning. We did lose one balloon early this morning where it was a little bit blust more blustery then things calmed down a little bit later on. And by the time we got to the site walk, it was actually fairly straight in the air. So we'll keep that up until four o'clock this afternoon. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And the diameter of the balloon? THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's a four-foot diameter. MR. PERRONE: Four foot. And you said red? THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's yes, we use red, yeah.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	asked. A VOICE: Thank you. MR. PERRONE: Could you give us the current status of the consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Certainly. There has been a submission made, approximately two weeks ago, right before Thanksgiving, for what they consider to be a Section 106 Review Consultation package. That is in front of the SHPO. Because of the location change and some other things, it was delayed unfortunately, so we have not received any input yet on their response. MR. PERRONE: Would the proposed facility be located within the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Corridor? THE WITNESS (Libertine): This is all part of that corridor, this this general area so, yes, the answer would be, yes, it is. MR. PERRONE: How would it

5 (Pages 14 to 17)

UNITED REPORTERS, INC.

1 visibility associated with the facility is 1 for fuel, like a double-walled fuel tank or a 1 fairly limited. And in addition to that, we 2 1 withich that site lies, a combination of the 2 fairly strong amount of conifers, it should 2 fairly strong amount of conifers, it should 3 bore areas where it will be visible, but 9 overall, I believe that it's - i's not 10 going to be any kind of an aesthetic 11 take-away from - from the corridor. 12 MR. PERRONE: (Aay, And I 13 understand frammounts are proposed instead 14 the tower, it works bes if you can are proposed instead 15 actually two T-arms would fit easier within the tree 16 T-arm sound fit easier within the tree 17 THE WITNESS (Chasse): It's 18 the same. Not much difference. 19 of the lower, it works bes if you can are squid 20 page 19 21 mount all the RHs and additional 22 mount all the RHs and additional 23 apourtenances to. So it's adout a 24 MR. PERRONE: M		Page 18		Page 20
2 fairly Imited. And in addition to that, we 2 recessed bowl underneath for oil and coolant 3 have used the concealment option of using the 3 4 monopine. And because of the setting within 3 5 which that site lies, a combination of the 5 6 fairly strong amount of conifers, it should 5 7 blend in pretty well. Certainly, there are 6 8 some areas where it will be visible, but 7 9 overall, I believe that it's - it's not 9 10 going to be any kind of an aesthetic 10 11 take-away from from the corridor. 11 12 MR, PERRONE: Okay. And I 11 13 understand T-arm mounts randard with 16 14 the low-profile platform. Is that because 17 15 actually two T-arms that are proposed for the 19 12 T-arm arm sambid for the antennas, and then 10 12 T-arm - with with some squid 20 14 the Restroptice right below it, ray may from the wethilities to go along the north side of the atomas, and then antence 15 actually two T-ar	1	visibility associated with the facility is	1	for fuel, like a double-walled fuel tank or a
3 have used the concealment option of using the monopine. And because of the setting within 5 3 spills? 4 monopine. And because of the setting within 5 4 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes. 5 which that site lies, a combination of the 6 5 The information provided by AT&T indicates that their discel helly tanks are 7 6 bine of inperty well. 7 the with the set is some 7 7 The WITNESS (Chasse): Yes. 10 going to be any kind of an aesthetic 11 take-away from from the corridor. 10 12 MR, PERRONE: Okay. And I 11 block box. 13 understand T-arm mounts are proposed instead 14 16 MR, PERRONE: Inthe cost figures. 14 the tree tower? 17 THE WITNESS (Chasse): It's 18 18 14 THE WITNESS (Chasse): It's 19 18 MR PERRONE: Inchase, could you summarize for the ower, it would fit easier within the tree 10 15 THE WITNESS (Chasse): It's 13 11 11 14 MR PERRONE: Inchase, could you summarize for the own in would remain the same. Not much difference. 12 16 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Ana apurtenances to. So it's indicated it's 3 12 please approximately 1400 feet away, plus the 510 foor tof the road. So i				
4 monopine. And because of the setting within 4 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes. 5 the information provided by AT&T indicates 5 6 fairly strong amount of conifers, it should 5 The information provided by AT&T indicates 7 blend in pretty well. Certainly, there are 7 double-walled containment. There's alarm 9 overall, I believe that it's - it's not 9 block - box. 10 going to be any kind of an aesthetic 10 moterstand T-arm mounts are proposed instead 13 understand T-arm mount standard with 16 7 mumbers would fit easier within the tree 14 of the low-profile platform. Is that because 17 THE WITNESS (Chasse): It's 18 muthers would site asier within the tree 16 material, or is the T-arm mount standard with 16 7 THE WITNESS (Chasse): It's 18 muthers would fite means. 19 cost figures, in our opinion, would remain the same. Not much difference. 17 arm assembly for the antennas, and then 20 20 MR. PERRONE: WR. Chasse): As 21 mount all the RHs and additional 1 please - approximately 1400 feet away, plus 23 actuall	3		3	spills?
6 faitly strong amount of confiers, it should 6 that their diesel belty tanks, are 7 blend in pretty well. Certainly, there are 7 8 some areas where it will be visible, but 7 9 overall, I believe that ifs - ifs not 9 10 going to be any kind of an aesthetic 10 11 take-away from from the corridor. 11 12 MR, PERRONE: Okay. And I 12 13 understand T-arm mounts are proposed instead 14 of the low-profile platform. Is that because 14 or would they change? 16 material, or is the T-arm mount standard with 16 17 there tower? 17 18 THE WITNESS (Chasse): It's 18 19 actually two T-arms what are proposed for the 20 20 of the tower, it works best if you can have a 21 21 of the tower, it works best if you can have a 22 23 another T-arm with with some squid 23 24 mount all the RHs and additional 24 24 mount all the RHs and addititonal 24 24			4	- -
7 blend in pr for the verifies where it will be visible, but 7 double-walled containment. There's alarm 8 some areas where it will be visible, but 8 9 overall, I believe that it's it's not 10 going to be any kind of an aesthetic 10 11 take-away from from the corridor. 11 12 MR, PERRONE: Okay. And I 12 13 understand T-arm mounts are proposed instead 14 14 of the low-profile platform. Is that because 14 15 T-arms would fit easier within the tree 15 16 mather J-arm mount standard with 17 17 the tree tower? 17 18 THE WITNESS (Chasse): It's 18 19 actually two T-arms. that are proposed for the antennas, and then 21 20 T-arm assembly for the antennas, and then 22 21 mount all the RHs and additional 22 22 mount all the RHs and additional 23 23 appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's 24 24 mount all the RHs and additional 11 25 THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a 25 26 THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a 27 asthetic standpoint, they tend to work	5	which that site lies, a combination of the	5	The information provided by AT&T indicates
8 some areas where it will be visible, but overall, I believe that it's - it's not take-away from from the corridor. 8 systems in place, as well as an overfill block box. 11 take-away from from the corridor. 10 original application had the cost figures. 12 MR. PERRONE: Okay. And I 12 Do you expect the being that the tower location has changed, do you expect the cost numbers would still be approximately the same or would they change? 14 or the low-profile platform. Is that because 14 13 15 T-arms sould fit casier within the tree material, or is the T-arm mount standard with 16 16 17 THE WITNESS (Chasse): It's actually two T-arms that are proposed for the 10 16 18 THE WITNESS (Chasse): It's actually two T-arms shat the maintenance 22 17 19 actually two T-arms that are proposed for the 10 10 20 loading that ATAF has. And being at the top 21 21 21 actually two T-arms shat the mean another T-arm -with - with some squit 23 22 24 mount all the RHs and additional 24 23 24 mount all the RHs and additional 33 24 24 mount all the RHs and additional 44 10 25 mount all the RHs and additional 45 <	6	fairly strong amount of conifers, it should	6	that their diesel belly tanks are
9 overall, I believe that ifs - ifs not 9 block box. 10 going to be any kind of an aeshetic 10 11 take-away from from the corridor. 11 12 MR. PERRONE: Okay. And I 11 13 understand T-arm mounts are proposed instand 13 14 of the low-profile platform. Is that because 14 15 T-arm sould fit easier within the tree 15 16 actually two T-arms that are proposed for the 16 10 actually two T-arms that are proposed for the 17 10 for the ower, it works best if you can have a 18 11 actually two T-arms that are proposed for the 19 12 T-arm assembly for the antennas, and then 11 12 T-arm assembly for the antennas, and then 12 12 mount all the RHs and additional 12 13 appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's 14 14 mount all the RHs and additional 11 15 THE WTINESS (Chasse): And 11 16 in addition to thai, the point of having the 14 16 in addition to thai, the point of having the 14 16 bitt, I mean, from the origram singhy oblicated it's 15	7	blend in pretty well. Certainly, there are	7	double-walled containment. There's alarm
10 going to be any kind of an aesthetic 10 MR. PERRONE: I understand the 11 take-away from from the corridor. 11 12 MR. PERRONE: Okay. And I 12 13 understand T-arm mounts are proposed instead 13 14 of the low-profile platform. Is that because 14 17 material, or is the T-arm mount standard with 16 18 THE WITNESS (Chasse): I's 18 19 actually two T-arms shat are proposed for the 20 20 of the tower, it works best if you can have a 21 21 of the tower, it works best if you can have a 21 22 T-arm assembly for the antennas, and then 22 23 another T-arm - with - with some squid 23 24 boxes, and then another T-arm right below it, 24 25 within a couple feet, that you can actually 25 26 roard appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's 3 3 actually ot wo T-arms. 3 4 MR. PERRONE: Chasse): And 1900-foot un for the utilities from the 5 THE WITNESS (Chasse): And 1 <t< td=""><td></td><td>some areas where it will be visible, but</td><td></td><td></td></t<>		some areas where it will be visible, but		
11 take-away from from the corridor. 11 original application had the cost figures. 12 MR. PERRONE: Okay. And I 12 13 understand T-arm mounts are proposed instead 13 14 of the low-profile platform. Is that because 14 15 T-arms would fit easier within the tree 14 16 matrial, or is the T-arm mount standard with 16 17 the tree tower? 17 18 THE WITNESS (Chasse): It's 18 19 actually two T-arms that are proposed for the 19 20 loading that AT&T has. And being at the top 10 21 of the tower, it works best if you can have a 21 22 T-arm assembly for the antennas, and then 22 23 another T-arm right below it, 24 24 boxes, and then another T-arm right below it, 24 24 boxes, and then another T-arm right below it, 24 24 mount all the RHs and additional 24 3 actually on two T-arms. 11 4 MR. PERRONE: Okay. 11 5 THE WITNESS (Chasse): And		·		
12 MR. PERRONE: Okay. And I 12 Do you expect the - being that the lower 13 understand T-arm mounts are proposed instead 13 Interval of the low-profile platform. Is that because 14 of the low-profile platform. Is that because 14 Interval of the cost mumbers would still be approximately the same or would they change? 16 material, or is the T-arm mount standard with the tree tower? 17 The WITNESS (Chasse): It's 19 actually two T-arms that are proposed for the cost, and then another T-arm right below it, 24 18 MR. PERRONE: Mr. Chasse, could you summarize for us how the utility service would run? 21 T-arm assembly for the antennas, and then another T-arm right below it, 24 24 THE WITNESS (Chasse): As proposed, the telphone service, right now, the nearest demarc is at the maintenance facility approximately - one moment, 25 22 T-arm assembly for the antennas, and then actually 24 The WITNESS (Chasse): As proposed, the telphone service, right now, the nearest demarc is at the maintenance facility approximately - one moment, 25 23 another T-arm right below it, 24 24 24 T-arm Sensend by Chestrice it's approximately it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to or the soath act and the you can't actually on two T-arms. 25 <				
13 understand T-arm mounts are proposed instead of the low-profile platform. Is that because for anterial, or is the T-arm mount standard with the tree tower? 13 location has changed, do you expect the cost numbers would still be approximately the same or would they change? 16 material, or is the T-arm mount standard with the tree tower? 14 numbers would still be approximately the same or would they change? 18 THE WITNESS (Chasse): It's actually two T-arms that are proposed for the loading that AT&T has. And being at the top of the tower, it works best if you can have a another T-arm -with with some squid to boxes, and then another T-arm right below it, within a couple feet, that you can actually 13 location has changed, do you expect the cost numbers would still be approximately the same or would they change? 12 Tarm assembly for the antennas, and then another T-arm with with some squid the boxes, and then another T-arm right below it, within a couple feet, that you can actually 13 proposed, the telephone service, right now, the nearest demarc is at the maintenance facility approximately 1400 feet away, plus the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garge along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south side, which will put it further away from the wetlands to the souch is, and run the wets and the bouth size and whave consulted with the power authorities and they'se indicated thar we can put a silo tap at that point, right in front of where the proposed access forive up into the wook is, and run the utilitius sy there. So the power run is about a 50				
14 of the low-profile platform. Is that because 14 numbers would still be approximately the same or would they change? 15 T-arms would fit easier within the tree 15 or would they change? 18 THE WITNESS (Chasse): It's 16 in the same. Not much difference. 19 actually two T-arms that are proposed for the 10 20 loading that AT&T has. And being at the top 20 21 rarm assembly for the antennas, and then 21 22 rarm assembly for the antennas, and then 22 23 another T-arm - with with some squid 24 24 boxes, and then another T-arm right below it, 25 25 within a couple feet, that you can actually 25 26 actually on two T-arms. 29 27 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Chasse): 29 28 actually on two T-arms. 29 29 Page 19 Page 21 10 mount all the RHs and additional 1 3 actually on two T-arms. 1900-foot run for the willities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the uillities top along the north side of the south side, which will put it furt				
15 T-arms would fit easier within the tree 15 or would they change? 16 material, or is the T-arm mount standard with 16 THE WITNESS (Vergati): The 17 the tree tower? 17 THE WITNESS (Chasse): It's 18 19 actually two T-arms that are proposed for the 19 0 NR. PERRONE: Mr. Chasse, 20 the tower, it works best if you can have a 21 service would run? could you summarize for us how the utility 21 atother T-arm - with with some squid 22 The WITNESS (Chasse): As proposed, the telephone service, right now, 24 boxes, and then another T-arm right below it, 24 page 19 Page 19 Page 21 1 mount all the RHs and additional 1 please approximately 1400 feet away, plus the neades 0 is is about a 24 actually on two T-arms. 10 1 please approximately 1400 feet away, plus 24 mount all the RHs and additional 1 please approximately 1400 feet away, plus 25 THE WITNESS (Chasse): And 10 10 10 was suggested thap erhaps we reroute the 26 in addition to that, I mean, from a purely				
16 material, or is the T-arm mount standard with 16 THE WITNESS (Vergati): The cost figures, in our opinion, would remain the tree tower? 18 THE WITNESS (Chasse): It's 16 cost figures, in our opinion, would remain the tree tower? 19 actually two T-arms that are proposed for the loading that AT&T has. And being at the top 19 cost figures, in our opinion, would remain the the the tworks best if you can have a a nother T-arm - with - with some squid 10 the tower, it works best if you can have a a another T-arm right below it, within a couple feet, that you can actually 22 T-arm assembly for the antennas, and then another T-arm right below it, within a couple feet, that you can actually 23 THE WITNESS (Chasse): As proposed, the telephone service, right now, the acarest demare is at the maintenance facility approximately one moment, 20 mount all the RHs and additional a appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's a actually on two T-arms. 1 1 please approximately 1400 feet away, plus the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities for m the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south. 1 1 10 THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a 10 1 THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a 10 1 2 the RERONE: Would the bigger the work is account of the true avay from the wetlands to the soult, us is becaris of the fram with the abi				
17 the tree tower? 17 cost figures, in our opinion, would remain the same. Not much difference. 18 THE WITNESS (Chasse): It's and then actually two T-arms that are proposed for the tower, it works best if you can have a T-arm assembly for the antennas, and then another T-arm right below it, within a couple feet, that you can actually 17 cost figures, in our opinion, would remain the same. Not much difference. 20 1 another T-arm - with with some squid 20 could you summarize for us how the utility service would run? 21 asother T-arm with with some squid 21 service would run? 21 23 another T-arm right below it, within a couple feet, that you can actually 24 proposed, the telephone service, right now, the nearest demarc is at the maintenance facility approximately 1400 feet away, plus the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities tog along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities tog along the curb side of the south. 1 please approximately 1400 feet away, plus the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foor run for the utilities form the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities tog along the curb side of the south. 10 THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a follow up on that, the point of having the two is because of the branching. You can't apt and form there, it just physically isn't to ut he shore braicing and the bigger the ability to put the branches in for the tree. 10				
18 THE WITNESS (Chasse): It's 18 the same. Not much difference. 19 actually two T-arms that are proposed for the top 19 MR. PERRONE: Mr. Chasse, 21 of the tower, it works best if you can have a 19 MR. PERRONE: Mr. Chasse, 22 T-arm assembly for the antennas, and then 20 rould you summarize for us how the utility service would run? 23 another T-arm -with - with some squid 21 proposed, the telephone service, right now, 24 boxes, and then another T-arm right below it, 25 proposed, the telephone service, right now, 24 mount all the RHs and additional 21 please - approximately 1400 feet away, plus 25 actually on two T-arms. 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It 3 actually on two T-arms. 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It 4 MR. PERRONE: Okay. 1 will put if furthera way from the wetlands to 5 THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a 10 THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a 11 follow up on that, the point of having the 11 pilperform there, it just physically isn't 12 12				
19actually two T-arms that are proposed for the loading that AT&T has. And being at the top19MR. PERRONE: Mr. Chasse, could you summarize for us how the utility service would run?21of the tower, it works best if you can have a T-arm assembly for the antennas, and then another T-arm -with -with some squid boxes, and then another T-arm right below it, within a couple feet, that you can actually19MR. PERRONE: Mr. Chasse, could you summarize for us how the utility service would run?21another T-arm -with with some squid boxes, and then another T-arm right below it, within a couple feet, that you can actually21THE WITNESS (Chasse): As proposed, the telephone service, right now, the nearest demarc is at the maintenance facility approximately one moment,221mount all the RHs and additional appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms.1please approximately 1400 feet away, plus the 510 foor of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south side, which will put it further away from the wetlands to the south.10THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a follow up on that, the point of having the uplatform there, it just physically isn't enough space. You didn't fear with the ability to put the branches in for the tree. platform there, it just physically isn't enough space. You didn't fear with the ability to put the branches in for the tree. for accommodate a future expansion? THE WITNESS (Chasse): As accommodate a future expansion?1011MR. PERRONE: Would				
20 loading that AT&T has. And being at the top of the tower, it works best if you can have a another T-arm - with with some squid boxes, and then another T-arm right below it, within a couple feet, that you can actually 20 could you summarize for us how the utility service would run? 21 T-arm assembly for the antennas, and then another T-arm with with some squid boxes, and then another T-arm right below it, within a couple feet, that you can actually 21 could you summarize for us how the utility service would run? 22 THE WITNESS (Chasse): And in addition to that, I mean, from a purely aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work better because they can be concealed a little bit. It's ust less steel. 21 please approximately 1400 feet away, plus the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south side, which will put it further away from the wetlands to the south. 10 THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a follow up on that, the point of having the platform there, it just physically isn't enough space. You didn't fear with the ability to put the branches in for the tree. If accommodate a future expansion? 10 And then, there's an existing primary high-voltage line that runs underground on the west side of the existing service road that goes down to the boathouse, and we have consulted with the power authorities and they've indicated that we can put a silo tap at that point, right in front of where the proposed access drive up into the woods, is, and run the utilities up there. So the power run is about a 500-foot.				
21 of the tower, it works best if you can have a 21 service would run? 22 T-arm assembly for the antennas, and then 22 3 another T-arm right below it, 23 4 boxes, and then another T-arm right below it, 25 yithin a couple feet, that you can actually 24 boxes, and then another T-arm right below it, 25 within a couple feet, that you can actually 24 1 mount all the RHs and additional 25 3 actually on two T-arms. 1 4 MR. PERRONE: Okay. 1 5 THE WITNESS (Libertine): And 1 6 in addition to that, I mean, from a purely 3 aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work 5 better because they can be concealed a little 9 the follow up on that, the point of having the 11 11 follow up on that, the point of having the 11 12 put all of the knee bracing and the bigger 12 13 put all of the knee bracing and the bigger 13 14 ability to put the branches in for the tree. 14 16 ability to put the branches in for the				
22T-arm assembly for the antennas, and then another T-arm with some squid boxes, and then another T-arm right below it, within a couple feet, that you can actually22THE WITNESS (Chasse): As proposed, the telephone service, right now, the nearest demarc is at the maintenance facility approximately one moment,Page 19Page 211mount all the RHs and additional appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms.14MR, PERRONE: Okay. 5Page 105THE WITNESS (Libertine): And 616in addition to that, I mean, from a purely aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work beit. It's just less steel.1010THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a follow up on that, the point of having the put all of the knee bracing and the bigger put all of the knee braching. You can't monopole and foundation be designed to accommodate a future expansion?22THE WITNESS (Chasse): As proposed, it's a six carrier, 150-foot structure, but they could be designed to accommodate more.2324MR. PERRONE: Would the24MR. PERRONE: Would the23				
23another T-arm with with some squid boxes, and then another T-arm right below it, within a couple feet, that you can actually23proposed, the telephone service, right now, the nearest demarc is at the maintenance facility approximately one moment,24boxes, and then another T-arm right below it, within a couple feet, that you can actually23proposed, the telephone service, right now, the nearest demarc is at the maintenance facility approximately one moment,25mount all the RHs and additional appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms.1please approximately 1400 feet away, plus the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south side, which will put it further away from the wetlands to the south.10THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a follow up on that, the point of having the two is because of the branching. You can't pat all of the knee bracing and the bigger platform there, it just physically isn't enough space. You din't fear with the ability to put the branches in for the tree. MR. PERRONE: Would the monopole and foundation be designed to accommodate a future expansion? THE WITNESS (Chasse): As a commodate a future expansion?2021proposed, it's a six carrier, 150-foot structure, but they could be designed to accommodate more.2123accommodate more.2324MR. PERRONE: Would the24				
24boxes, and then another T-arm right below it, within a couple feet, that you can actually2425the nearest demarc is at the maintenance facility approximately one moment,21Page 19Page 211mount all the RHs and additional appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms.1please approximately 1400 feet away, plus the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south, side, which will put if further away from the wetlands to the south.10THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a follow up on that, the point of having the two is because of the branching. You can't follow up on that, the point of having the two is because of the branching. You can't follow up on that, the point of the tree. follow up on that, the point of the tree. ability to put the branches in for the tree. for the wet side of the existing service road that goes down to the boathouse, and we have consulted with the power authorities and they've indicated that we can put a silo tap at that point, right in front of where the proposed access drive up into the woods is, and run the utilities up there. So the power run is about a 500-foot.10THE WITNESS (Chasse): As proposed, it's a six carrier, 150-foot accommodate a future expansion?24MR. PERRONE: Would the23accommodate more.24MR. PERRONE: Would the24MR. PERRONE: Would the				
25within a couple feet, that you can actually25facility approximately one moment,Page 19Page 211mount all the RHs and additional appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms.1please approximately 1400 feet away, plus the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south side, which will put it further away from the wetlands to the south.0THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a in addition to that, I mean, from a purely aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work better because they can be concealed a little bit. It's just less steel.1010THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a follow up on that, the point of having the two is because of the branching. You can't platform there, it just physically isn't enough space. You didn't fear with the ability to put the branches in for the tree. monopole and foundation be designed to accommodate a future expansion?1011MR. PERRONE: Would the accommodate more.1112monopole and foundation be designed to accommodate more.2024MR. PERRONE: Would the2123accommodate more.2324MR. PERRONE: Would the24				
Page 19Page 211mount all the RHs and additional appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms.1please approximately 1400 feet away, plus the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south side, which will put it further away from the wetlands to the south.0THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a follow up on that, the point of having the two is because of the branching. You can't put all of the knee braing and the bigger platform there, it just physically isn't enough space. You didn't fear with the ability to put the branches in for the tree.10And then, there's an existing primary high-voltage line that runs underground on the west side of the exaisting service road that goes down to the boathouse, and we have consulted with the power authorities and they've indicated that we can put a slio tap at that point, right in front of where the proposed access drive up into the woods is, and run the utilities up there.10THE WITNESS (Chasse): As accommodate a future expansion?1011MR. PERRONE: Would the accommodate a future expansion?1112the branches in for the tree. accommodate a future expansion?1213proposed, it's a six carrier, 150-foot accommodate more.2124MR. PERRONE: Would the2124MR. PERRONE: Would the24				
1mount all the RHs and additional1please approximately 1400 feet away, plus2appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's2the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a3actually on two T-arms.31900-foot run for the utilities from the4MR. PERRONE: Okay.4maintenance garage along the curb line. It5THE WITNESS (Libertine): And5was suggested that perhaps we reroute the6in addition to that, I mean, from a purely6utilities to go along the north side of the7aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work7access road instead of the south side, which8better because they can be concealed a little8will put it further away from the wetlands to9bit. It's just less steel.9410THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a10And then, there's an existing11follow up on that, the point of having the11primary high-voltage line that runs12two is because of the branching. You can't12and we have consulted with the power13put all of the knee bracing and the bigger13service road that goes down to the boathouse,14platform there, it just physically isn't14and we have consulted with the power15enough space. You didn't fear with the15put all oit ap at that point, right in front16monopole and foundation be designed to18the woods is, and run the utilities up there.19accommodate a future expansion?19So the power run is about a 5				
2appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's2the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a3actually on two T-arms.31900-foot run for the utilities from the4MR. PERRONE: Okay.4maintenance garage along the curb line. It5THE WITNESS (Libertine): And5was suggested that perhaps we reroute the6in addition to that, I mean, from a purely6utilities to go along the north side of the7aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work7access road instead of the south side, which8better because they can be concealed a little9utilities to go along the north side of the9bit. It's just less steel.9the south.10THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a10And then, there's an existing11follow up on that, the point of having the11primary high-voltage line that runs12two is because of the branching. You can't12service road that goes down to the boathouse,14platform there, it just physically isn't14and we have consulted with the power15enough space. You didn't fear with the15authorities and they've indicated that we can16ability to put the branches in for the tree.16put a silo tap at that point, right in front17MR. PERRONE: Would the17of where the proposed access drive up into18monopole and foundation be designed to18the woods is, and run the utilities up there.20THE WITNESS (Chasse): As20MR. PERRONE: Would the<		Page 19		Page 21
3actually on two T-arms.31900-foot run for the utilities from the4MR. PERRONE: Okay.4maintenance garage along the curb line. It5THE WITNESS (Libertine): And5was suggested that perhaps we reroute the6in addition to that, I mean, from a purely6utilities to go along the north side of the7aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work7access road instead of the south side, which8better because they can be concealed a little8will put it further away from the wetlands to9bit. It's just less steel.91010THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a10And then, there's an existing11follow up on that, the point of having the11primary high-voltage line that runs12two is because of the branching. You can't12underground on the west side of the existing13put all of the knee bracing and the bigger13service road that goes down to the boathouse,14platform there, it just physically isn't14and we have consulted with the power15enough space. You didn't fear with the15authorities and they've indicated that we can18monopole and foundation be designed to18the woods is, and run the utilities up there.19accommodate a future expansion?19So the power run is about a 500-foot.20THE WITNESS (Chasse): As20MR. PERRONE: All right. I21proposed, it's a six carrier, 150-foot21saw the silo on the drawing. How how tall <td>1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	1			
4MR. PERRONE: Okay.4maintenance garage along the curb line. It5THE WITNESS (Libertine): And5was suggested that perhaps we reroute the6in addition to that, I mean, from a purely6utilities to go along the north side of the7aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work7access road instead of the south side, which8better because they can be concealed a little8will put it further away from the wetlands to9bit. It's just less steel.9the south.10THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a10And then, there's an existing11follow up on that, the point of having the11primary high-voltage line that runs12two is because of the branching. You can't12underground on the west side of the existing13put all of the knee bracing and the bigger13service road that goes down to the boathouse,14platform there, it just physically isn't14and we have consulted with the power15enough space. You didn't fear with the15authorities and they've indicated that we can16ability to put the branches in for the tree.16put a silo tap at that point, right in front17MR. PERRONE: Would the17of where the proposed access drive up into18monopole and foundation be designed to18the woods is, and run the utilities up there.19accommodate a future expansion?19So the power run is about a 500-foot.20THE WITNESS (Chasse): As20MR. PERRONE:	-			please approximately 1400 feet away, plus
5THE WITNESS (Libertine): And5was suggested that perhaps we reroute the6in addition to that, I mean, from a purely6utilities to go along the north side of the7aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work7access road instead of the south side, which8better because they can be concealed a little8will put it further away from the wetlands to9bit. It's just less steel.910THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a10THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a10And then, there's an existing11follow up on that, the point of having the11primary high-voltage line that runs12two is because of the branching. You can't12underground on the west side of the existing13put all of the knee bracing and the bigger13service road that goes down to the boathouse,14platform there, it just physically isn't14and we have consulted with the power15enough space. You didn't fear with the15authorities and they've indicated that we can16ability to put the branches in for the tree.16put a silo tap at that point, right in front17MR. PERRONE: Would the17of where the proposed access drive up into18monopole and foundation be designed to20MR. PERRONE: All right. I21proposed, it's a six carrier, 150-foot21saw the silo on the drawing. How how tall22structure, but they could be designed to23THE WITNESS (Chasse): Two and24MR. PERRONE: Would the<	2	appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's	2	the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a
6in addition to that, I mean, from a purely aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work6utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south side, which8better because they can be concealed a little8will put it further away from the wetlands to the south.9bit. It's just less steel.9the south.10THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a10And then, there's an existing primary high-voltage line that runs11follow up on that, the point of having the two is because of the branching. You can't put all of the knee bracing and the bigger1313put all of the knee bracing and the bigger1314platform there, it just physically isn't1415enough space. You didn't fear with the ability to put the branches in for the tree.1616ability to put the branches in for the tree.1617MR. PERRONE: Would the1718monopole and foundation be designed to accommodate a future expansion?1920THE WITNESS (Chasse): As2021proposed, it's a six carrier, 150-foot2123accommodate more.2324MR. PERRONE: Would the2324MR. PERRONE: Would the2424MR. PERRONE: Would the24	2 3	appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms.	2 3	the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the
7aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work7access road instead of the south side, which8better because they can be concealed a little8will put it further away from the wetlands to9bit. It's just less steel.9the south.10THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a10And then, there's an existing11follow up on that, the point of having the11primary high-voltage line that runs12two is because of the branching. You can't12underground on the west side of the existing13put all of the knee bracing and the bigger13service road that goes down to the boathouse,14platform there, it just physically isn't14and we have consulted with the power15enough space. You didn't fear with the15authorities and they've indicated that we can16ability to put the branches in for the tree.16put a silo tap at that point, right in front17MR. PERRONE: Would the17of where the proposed access drive up into18monopole and foundation be designed to18the woods is, and run the utilities up there.19accommodate a future expansion?19So the power run is about a 500-foot.20THE WITNESS (Chasse): As20MR. PERRONE: All right. I21proposed, it's a six carrier, 150-foot21saw the silo on the drawing. How how tall22structure, but they could be designed to23THE WITNESS (Chasse): Two and24MR. PERRONE: Would the24a half, three feet. <td>2 3 4</td> <td>appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms. MR. PERRONE: Okay.</td> <td>2 3 4</td> <td>the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It</td>	2 3 4	appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms. MR. PERRONE: Okay.	2 3 4	the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It
8better because they can be concealed a little8will put it further away from the wetlands to9bit. It's just less steel.9the south.10THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a10And then, there's an existing11follow up on that, the point of having the11primary high-voltage line that runs12two is because of the branching. You can't12underground on the west side of the existing13put all of the knee bracing and the bigger13service road that goes down to the boathouse,14platform there, it just physically isn't14and we have consulted with the power15enough space. You didn't fear with the15authorities and they've indicated that we can16ability to put the branches in for the tree.16put a silo tap at that point, right in front17MR. PERRONE: Would the17of where the proposed access drive up into18monopole and foundation be designed to18the woods is, and run the utilities up there.19accommodate a future expansion?19So the power run is about a 500-foot.20THE WITNESS (Chasse): As20MR. PERRONE: All right. I21proposed, it's a six carrier, 150-foot21saw the silo on the drawing. How how tall22structure, but they could be designed to23THE WITNESS (Chasse): Two and24MR. PERRONE: Would the24a half, three feet.	2 3 4 5	appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And	2 3 4 5	the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the
9bit. It's just less steel.9the south.10THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a10And then, there's an existing11follow up on that, the point of having the11primary high-voltage line that runs12two is because of the branching. You can't12underground on the west side of the existing13put all of the knee bracing and the bigger13service road that goes down to the boathouse,14platform there, it just physically isn't14and we have consulted with the power15enough space. You didn't fear with the15authorities and they've indicated that we can16ability to put the branches in for the tree.16put a silo tap at that point, right in front17MR. PERRONE: Would the17of where the proposed access drive up into18monopole and foundation be designed to18the woods is, and run the utilities up there.19accommodate a future expansion?19So the power run is about a 500-foot.20THE WITNESS (Chasse): As20MR. PERRONE: All right. I21proposed, it's a six carrier, 150-foot21saw the silo on the drawing. How how tall22structure, but they could be designed to23THE WITNESS (Chasse): Two and24MR. PERRONE: Would the24a half, three feet.	2 3 4 5 6	appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And in addition to that, I mean, from a purely	2 3 4 5 6	the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the
10THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a10And then, there's an existing11follow up on that, the point of having the11primary high-voltage line that runs12two is because of the branching. You can't12underground on the west side of the existing13put all of the knee bracing and the bigger13service road that goes down to the boathouse,14platform there, it just physically isn't14and we have consulted with the power15enough space. You didn't fear with the15authorities and they've indicated that we can16ability to put the branches in for the tree.16put a silo tap at that point, right in front17MR. PERRONE: Would the17of where the proposed access drive up into18monopole and foundation be designed to18the woods is, and run the utilities up there.19accommodate a future expansion?19So the power run is about a 500-foot.20THE WITNESS (Chasse): As20MR. PERRONE: All right. I21proposed, it's a six carrier, 150-foot21saw the silo on the drawing. How how tall22structure, but they could be designed to23THE WITNESS (Chasse): Two and24MR. PERRONE: Would the24a half, three feet.	2 3 4 5 6 7	appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And in addition to that, I mean, from a purely aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work	2 3 4 5 6 7	the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south side, which
11follow up on that, the point of having the11primary high-voltage line that runs12two is because of the branching. You can't12underground on the west side of the existing13put all of the knee bracing and the bigger13service road that goes down to the boathouse,14platform there, it just physically isn't14and we have consulted with the power15enough space. You didn't fear with the15authorities and they've indicated that we can16ability to put the branches in for the tree.16put a silo tap at that point, right in front17MR. PERRONE: Would the17of where the proposed access drive up into18monopole and foundation be designed to18the woods is, and run the utilities up there.19accommodate a future expansion?19So the power run is about a 500-foot.20THE WITNESS (Chasse): As20MR. PERRONE: All right. I21proposed, it's a six carrier, 150-foot21saw the silo on the drawing. How how tall22structure, but they could be designed to23THE WITNESS (Chasse): Two and24MR. PERRONE: Would the24a half, three feet.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And in addition to that, I mean, from a purely aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work better because they can be concealed a little	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south side, which will put it further away from the wetlands to
12two is because of the branching. You can't12underground on the west side of the existing13put all of the knee bracing and the bigger13service road that goes down to the boathouse,14platform there, it just physically isn't14and we have consulted with the power15enough space. You didn't fear with the15authorities and they've indicated that we can16ability to put the branches in for the tree.16put a silo tap at that point, right in front17MR. PERRONE: Would the17of where the proposed access drive up into18monopole and foundation be designed to18the woods is, and run the utilities up there.19accommodate a future expansion?19So the power run is about a 500-foot.20THE WITNESS (Chasse): As20MR. PERRONE: All right. I21proposed, it's a six carrier, 150-foot21saw the silo on the drawing. How how tall22structure, but they could be designed to23THE WITNESS (Chasse): Two and24MR. PERRONE: Would the24a half, three feet.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And in addition to that, I mean, from a purely aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work better because they can be concealed a little bit. It's just less steel.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south side, which will put it further away from the wetlands to the south.
13put all of the knee bracing and the bigger13service road that goes down to the boathouse,14platform there, it just physically isn't14and we have consulted with the power15enough space. You didn't fear with the15authorities and they've indicated that we can16ability to put the branches in for the tree.16put a silo tap at that point, right in front17MR. PERRONE: Would the17of where the proposed access drive up into18monopole and foundation be designed to18the woods is, and run the utilities up there.19accommodate a future expansion?19So the power run is about a 500-foot.20THE WITNESS (Chasse): As20MR. PERRONE: All right. I21proposed, it's a six carrier, 150-foot21saw the silo on the drawing. How how tall23accommodate more.23THE WITNESS (Chasse): Two and24MR. PERRONE: Would the24a half, three feet.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And in addition to that, I mean, from a purely aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work better because they can be concealed a little bit. It's just less steel. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south side, which will put it further away from the wetlands to the south. And then, there's an existing
14platform there, it just physically isn't14and we have consulted with the power15enough space. You didn't fear with the15authorities and they've indicated that we can16ability to put the branches in for the tree.16put a silo tap at that point, right in front17MR. PERRONE: Would the17of where the proposed access drive up into18monopole and foundation be designed to18the woods is, and run the utilities up there.19accommodate a future expansion?19So the power run is about a 500-foot.20THE WITNESS (Chasse): As20MR. PERRONE: All right. I21proposed, it's a six carrier, 150-foot21saw the silo on the drawing. How how tall22structure, but they could be designed to23THE WITNESS (Chasse): Two and24MR. PERRONE: Would the24a half, three feet.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And in addition to that, I mean, from a purely aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work better because they can be concealed a little bit. It's just less steel. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a follow up on that, the point of having the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south side, which will put it further away from the wetlands to the south. And then, there's an existing primary high-voltage line that runs
15enough space. You didn't fear with the ability to put the branches in for the tree. 1715authorities and they've indicated that we can put a silo tap at that point, right in front17MR. PERRONE: Would the 1817of where the proposed access drive up into18monopole and foundation be designed to 1918the woods is, and run the utilities up there.19accommodate a future expansion? THE WITNESS (Chasse): As19So the power run is about a 500-foot.20THE WITNESS (Chasse): As20MR. PERRONE: All right. I21proposed, it's a six carrier, 150-foot structure, but they could be designed to accommodate more.23THE WITNESS (Chasse): Two and 2424MR. PERRONE: Would the24a half, three feet.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And in addition to that, I mean, from a purely aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work better because they can be concealed a little bit. It's just less steel. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a follow up on that, the point of having the two is because of the branching. You can't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south side, which will put it further away from the wetlands to the south. And then, there's an existing primary high-voltage line that runs underground on the west side of the existing
16ability to put the branches in for the tree.16put a silo tap at that point, right in front17MR. PERRONE: Would the17of where the proposed access drive up into18monopole and foundation be designed to18the woods is, and run the utilities up there.19accommodate a future expansion?19So the power run is about a 500-foot.20THE WITNESS (Chasse): As20MR. PERRONE: All right. I21proposed, it's a six carrier, 150-foot21saw the silo on the drawing. How how tall23accommodate more.23THE WITNESS (Chasse): Two and24MR. PERRONE: Would the24a half, three feet.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And in addition to that, I mean, from a purely aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work better because they can be concealed a little bit. It's just less steel. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a follow up on that, the point of having the two is because of the branching. You can't put all of the knee bracing and the bigger	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south side, which will put it further away from the wetlands to the south. And then, there's an existing primary high-voltage line that runs underground on the west side of the existing service road that goes down to the boathouse,
17MR. PERRONE: Would the17of where the proposed access drive up into18monopole and foundation be designed to18the woods is, and run the utilities up there.19accommodate a future expansion?19So the power run is about a 500-foot.20THE WITNESS (Chasse): As20MR. PERRONE: All right. I21proposed, it's a six carrier, 150-foot21saw the silo on the drawing. How how tall23accommodate more.23THE WITNESS (Chasse): Two and24MR. PERRONE: Would the24a half, three feet.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And in addition to that, I mean, from a purely aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work better because they can be concealed a little bit. It's just less steel. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a follow up on that, the point of having the two is because of the branching. You can't put all of the knee bracing and the bigger platform there, it just physically isn't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south side, which will put it further away from the wetlands to the south. And then, there's an existing primary high-voltage line that runs underground on the west side of the existing service road that goes down to the boathouse, and we have consulted with the power
19accommodate a future expansion?19So the power run is about a 500-foot.20THE WITNESS (Chasse): As20MR. PERRONE: All right. I21proposed, it's a six carrier, 150-foot21saw the silo on the drawing. How how tall22structure, but they could be designed to22is that?23accommodate more.23THE WITNESS (Chasse): Two and24MR. PERRONE: Would the24a half, three feet.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And in addition to that, I mean, from a purely aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work better because they can be concealed a little bit. It's just less steel. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a follow up on that, the point of having the two is because of the branching. You can't put all of the knee bracing and the bigger platform there, it just physically isn't enough space. You didn't fear with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south side, which will put it further away from the wetlands to the south. And then, there's an existing primary high-voltage line that runs underground on the west side of the existing service road that goes down to the boathouse, and we have consulted with the power authorities and they've indicated that we can
20THE WITNESS (Chasse): As20MR. PERRONE: All right. I21proposed, it's a six carrier, 150-foot21saw the silo on the drawing. How how tall22structure, but they could be designed to22is that?23accommodate more.23THE WITNESS (Chasse): Two and24MR. PERRONE: Would the24a half, three feet.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And in addition to that, I mean, from a purely aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work better because they can be concealed a little bit. It's just less steel. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a follow up on that, the point of having the two is because of the branching. You can't put all of the knee bracing and the bigger platform there, it just physically isn't enough space. You didn't fear with the ability to put the branches in for the tree. MR. PERRONE: Would the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south side, which will put it further away from the wetlands to the south. And then, there's an existing primary high-voltage line that runs underground on the west side of the existing service road that goes down to the boathouse, and we have consulted with the power authorities and they've indicated that we can put a silo tap at that point, right in front of where the proposed access drive up into
21proposed, it's a six carrier, 150-foot21saw the silo on the drawing. How how tall22structure, but they could be designed to22is that?23accommodate more.23THE WITNESS (Chasse): Two and24MR. PERRONE: Would the24a half, three feet.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And in addition to that, I mean, from a purely aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work better because they can be concealed a little bit. It's just less steel. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a follow up on that, the point of having the two is because of the branching. You can't put all of the knee bracing and the bigger platform there, it just physically isn't enough space. You didn't fear with the ability to put the branches in for the tree. MR. PERRONE: Would the monopole and foundation be designed to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south side, which will put it further away from the wetlands to the south. And then, there's an existing primary high-voltage line that runs underground on the west side of the existing service road that goes down to the boathouse, and we have consulted with the power authorities and they've indicated that we can put a silo tap at that point, right in front of where the proposed access drive up into the woods is, and run the utilities up there.
22structure, but they could be designed to22is that?23accommodate more.23THE WITNESS (Chasse): Two and24MR. PERRONE: Would the24a half, three feet.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And in addition to that, I mean, from a purely aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work better because they can be concealed a little bit. It's just less steel. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a follow up on that, the point of having the two is because of the branching. You can't put all of the knee bracing and the bigger platform there, it just physically isn't enough space. You didn't fear with the ability to put the branches in for the tree. MR. PERRONE: Would the monopole and foundation be designed to accommodate a future expansion?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south side, which will put it further away from the wetlands to the south. And then, there's an existing primary high-voltage line that runs underground on the west side of the existing service road that goes down to the boathouse, and we have consulted with the power authorities and they've indicated that we can put a silo tap at that point, right in front of where the proposed access drive up into the woods is, and run the utilities up there. So the power run is about a 500-foot.
23accommodate more.23THE WITNESS (Chasse): Two and24MR. PERRONE: Would the24a half, three feet.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And in addition to that, I mean, from a purely aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work better because they can be concealed a little bit. It's just less steel. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a follow up on that, the point of having the two is because of the branching. You can't put all of the knee bracing and the bigger platform there, it just physically isn't enough space. You didn't fear with the ability to put the branches in for the tree. MR. PERRONE: Would the monopole and foundation be designed to accommodate a future expansion? THE WITNESS (Chasse): As	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south side, which will put it further away from the wetlands to the south. And then, there's an existing primary high-voltage line that runs underground on the west side of the existing service road that goes down to the boathouse, and we have consulted with the power authorities and they've indicated that we can put a silo tap at that point, right in front of where the proposed access drive up into the woods is, and run the utilities up there. So the power run is about a 500-foot. MR. PERRONE: All right. I
24 MR. PERRONE: Would the 24 a half, three feet.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And in addition to that, I mean, from a purely aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work better because they can be concealed a little bit. It's just less steel. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a follow up on that, the point of having the two is because of the branching. You can't put all of the knee bracing and the bigger platform there, it just physically isn't enough space. You didn't fear with the ability to put the branches in for the tree. MR. PERRONE: Would the monopole and foundation be designed to accommodate a future expansion? THE WITNESS (Chasse): As proposed, it's a six carrier, 150-foot	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south side, which will put it further away from the wetlands to the south. And then, there's an existing primary high-voltage line that runs underground on the west side of the existing service road that goes down to the boathouse, and we have consulted with the power authorities and they've indicated that we can put a silo tap at that point, right in front of where the proposed access drive up into the woods is, and run the utilities up there. So the power run is about a 500-foot. MR. PERRONE: All right. I saw the silo on the drawing. How how tall
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And in addition to that, I mean, from a purely aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work better because they can be concealed a little bit. It's just less steel. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a follow up on that, the point of having the two is because of the branching. You can't put all of the knee bracing and the bigger platform there, it just physically isn't enough space. You didn't fear with the ability to put the branches in for the tree. MR. PERRONE: Would the monopole and foundation be designed to accommodate a future expansion? THE WITNESS (Chasse): As proposed, it's a six carrier, 150-foot structure, but they could be designed to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south side, which will put it further away from the wetlands to the south. And then, there's an existing primary high-voltage line that runs underground on the west side of the existing service road that goes down to the boathouse, and we have consulted with the power authorities and they've indicated that we can put a silo tap at that point, right in front of where the proposed access drive up into the woods is, and run the utilities up there. So the power run is about a 500-foot. MR. PERRONE: All right. I saw the silo on the drawing. How how tall is that?
25 proposed backup generator have containinent 25 MK. PEKKONE: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And in addition to that, I mean, from a purely aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work better because they can be concealed a little bit. It's just less steel. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a follow up on that, the point of having the two is because of the branching. You can't put all of the knee bracing and the bigger platform there, it just physically isn't enough space. You didn't fear with the ability to put the branches in for the tree. MR. PERRONE: Would the monopole and foundation be designed to accommodate a future expansion? THE WITNESS (Chasse): As proposed, it's a six carrier, 150-foot structure, but they could be designed to accommodate more.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south side, which will put it further away from the wetlands to the south. And then, there's an existing primary high-voltage line that runs underground on the west side of the existing service road that goes down to the boathouse, and we have consulted with the power authorities and they've indicated that we can put a silo tap at that point, right in front of where the proposed access drive up into the woods is, and run the utilities up there. So the power run is about a 500-foot. MR. PERRONE: All right. I saw the silo on the drawing. How how tall is that? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Two and
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	appurtenances to. So it's indicated it's actually on two T-arms. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And in addition to that, I mean, from a purely aesthetic standpoint, they tend to work better because they can be concealed a little bit. It's just less steel. THE WITNESS (Chasse): And a follow up on that, the point of having the two is because of the branching. You can't put all of the knee bracing and the bigger platform there, it just physically isn't enough space. You didn't fear with the ability to put the branches in for the tree. MR. PERRONE: Would the monopole and foundation be designed to accommodate a future expansion? THE WITNESS (Chasse): As proposed, it's a six carrier, 150-foot structure, but they could be designed to accommodate more. MR. PERRONE: Would the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the 510 foot of the road. So it's about a 1900-foot run for the utilities from the maintenance garage along the curb line. It was suggested that perhaps we reroute the utilities to go along the north side of the access road instead of the south side, which will put it further away from the wetlands to the south. And then, there's an existing primary high-voltage line that runs underground on the west side of the existing service road that goes down to the boathouse, and we have consulted with the power authorities and they've indicated that we can put a silo tap at that point, right in front of where the proposed access drive up into the woods is, and run the utilities up there. So the power run is about a 500-foot. MR. PERRONE: All right. I saw the silo on the drawing. How how tall is that? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Two and a half, three feet.

6 (Pages 18 to 21)

UNITED REPORTERS, INC.

	Page 22		Page 24
1	Mr. Gustafson, in general, how	1	MR. LYNCH: Yeah, yeah.
2	does the revised tower location affect	2	Mr. Gustafson, I remember
3	wetland buffer distances?	3	reading I maybe read it in the New York
4	My understanding is the	4	Times or something that there is a virus
5	closest distance to the access road would	5	or some type of thing that is attacking bats,
6	still remain at 8 feet, but it would change	6	and is would that have any implication
7	with respect to the compound?	7	here?
8	THE WITNESS (Gustafson):	8	I don't know if it's a virus
9	That's correct. I mean, it's a fairly minor	9	or a disease, or whatever it is, that it's
10	change. It increases the buffer to the more	10	affecting the the bat community.
11	northern wetland system, identified as	11	THE WITNESS (Gustafson):
12	Wetland 1.	12	Yeah, it's a white nosed it's called "the
13	The the nearest point for	13	white-nose syndrome" and it's affecting a lot
14	Wetland 2, from the compound, is 113 feet.	14	of the the native bat species that inhabit
15	And for the most part, it it doesn't	15	Connecticut and and the surrounding
16	change all that significantly from the	16	Northeast.
17	original location. So it doesn't change any	17	Some of some of the effects
18	of our conclusions with respect to wetland	18	of of that have resulted in in
19	evaluation or impact analysis.	19	diminished populations, significant
20	MR. PERRONE: And then,	20	diminishment in populations in certain bat
21	turning to the Department of Energy and	21	species, one of them being the northern
22	Environmental Protection letter in the	22	long-eared bat, which is a candidate species
23	application, the August 10, 2014, it mentions	23	for federal listing that has the potential
24	a state-listed bat species. Would that be an	24	for utilizing this part part of Salisbury.
25	endangered, threatened or a special-concern	25	The measures that we're
	Page 23		Page 25
			5
1	species?	1	
1 2	species? THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It	1 2	putting in to protect the state-listed species would also be equally protective of
			putting in to protect the state-listed
2	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It wasn't identified specifically by the natural diversity database, but based on our	2	putting in to protect the state-listed species would also be equally protective of
2 3 4 5	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It wasn't identified specifically by the natural diversity database, but based on our experience with other projects, including	2 3	putting in to protect the state-listed species would also be equally protective of that potential federal species bat. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. I was just curious. That's all.
2 3 4 5 6	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It wasn't identified specifically by the natural diversity database, but based on our experience with other projects, including other previous telecom projects that have	2 3 4 5 6	putting in to protect the state-listed species would also be equally protective of that potential federal species bat. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. I was just curious. That's all. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yeah.
2 3 4 5 6 7	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It wasn't identified specifically by the natural diversity database, but based on our experience with other projects, including other previous telecom projects that have been before this Commission, we expect	2 3 4 5 6 7	putting in to protect the state-listed species would also be equally protective of that potential federal species bat. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. I was just curious. That's all. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yeah. You're welcome.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It wasn't identified specifically by the natural diversity database, but based on our experience with other projects, including other previous telecom projects that have been before this Commission, we expect they're a state listed, special-concern	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	putting in to protect the state-listed species would also be equally protective of that potential federal species bat. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. I was just curious. That's all. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yeah. You're welcome. MR. PERRONE: And also
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It wasn't identified specifically by the natural diversity database, but based on our experience with other projects, including other previous telecom projects that have been before this Commission, we expect they're a state listed, special-concern species.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	putting in to protect the state-listed species would also be equally protective of that potential federal species bat. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. I was just curious. That's all. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yeah. You're welcome. MR. PERRONE: And also mentioned in the DEEP letter is about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It wasn't identified specifically by the natural diversity database, but based on our experience with other projects, including other previous telecom projects that have been before this Commission, we expect they're a state listed, special-concern species. If the Commission remembers,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	putting in to protect the state-listed species would also be equally protective of that potential federal species bat. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. I was just curious. That's all. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yeah. You're welcome. MR. PERRONE: And also mentioned in the DEEP letter is about retaining large diameter trees. Were the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It wasn't identified specifically by the natural diversity database, but based on our experience with other projects, including other previous telecom projects that have been before this Commission, we expect they're a state listed, special-concern species. If the Commission remembers, for Docket 438 for Voluntown, a Verizon	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	putting in to protect the state-listed species would also be equally protective of that potential federal species bat. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. I was just curious. That's all. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yeah. You're welcome. MR. PERRONE: And also mentioned in the DEEP letter is about retaining large diameter trees. Were the larger trees maintained, to the extent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It wasn't identified specifically by the natural diversity database, but based on our experience with other projects, including other previous telecom projects that have been before this Commission, we expect they're a state listed, special-concern species. If the Commission remembers, for Docket 438 for Voluntown, a Verizon application, we had red bat and silver-haired	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	putting in to protect the state-listed species would also be equally protective of that potential federal species bat. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. I was just curious. That's all. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yeah. You're welcome. MR. PERRONE: And also mentioned in the DEEP letter is about retaining large diameter trees. Were the larger trees maintained, to the extent possible?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It wasn't identified specifically by the natural diversity database, but based on our experience with other projects, including other previous telecom projects that have been before this Commission, we expect they're a state listed, special-concern species. If the Commission remembers, for Docket 438 for Voluntown, a Verizon application, we had red bat and silver-haired bat, a special-concern species. So provided	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	putting in to protect the state-listed species would also be equally protective of that potential federal species bat. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. I was just curious. That's all. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yeah. You're welcome. MR. PERRONE: And also mentioned in the DEEP letter is about retaining large diameter trees. Were the larger trees maintained, to the extent possible? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It wasn't identified specifically by the natural diversity database, but based on our experience with other projects, including other previous telecom projects that have been before this Commission, we expect they're a state listed, special-concern species. If the Commission remembers, for Docket 438 for Voluntown, a Verizon application, we had red bat and silver-haired bat, a special-concern species. So provided the Council approves this project, we would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	putting in to protect the state-listed species would also be equally protective of that potential federal species bat. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. I was just curious. That's all. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yeah. You're welcome. MR. PERRONE: And also mentioned in the DEEP letter is about retaining large diameter trees. Were the larger trees maintained, to the extent possible? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes, they were.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It wasn't identified specifically by the natural diversity database, but based on our experience with other projects, including other previous telecom projects that have been before this Commission, we expect they're a state listed, special-concern species. If the Commission remembers, for Docket 438 for Voluntown, a Verizon application, we had red bat and silver-haired bat, a special-concern species. So provided the Council approves this project, we would implement our recommendations to avoid tree	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	putting in to protect the state-listed species would also be equally protective of that potential federal species bat. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. I was just curious. That's all. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yeah. You're welcome. MR. PERRONE: And also mentioned in the DEEP letter is about retaining large diameter trees. Were the larger trees maintained, to the extent possible? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes, they were. MR. PERRONE: Also,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It wasn't identified specifically by the natural diversity database, but based on our experience with other projects, including other previous telecom projects that have been before this Commission, we expect they're a state listed, special-concern species. If the Commission remembers, for Docket 438 for Voluntown, a Verizon application, we had red bat and silver-haired bat, a special-concern species. So provided the Council approves this project, we would implement our recommendations to avoid tree clearing between November 1st and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	putting in to protect the state-listed species would also be equally protective of that potential federal species bat. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. I was just curious. That's all. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yeah. You're welcome. MR. PERRONE: And also mentioned in the DEEP letter is about retaining large diameter trees. Were the larger trees maintained, to the extent possible? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes, they were. MR. PERRONE: Also, Mr. Gustafson, were there any consultations
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It wasn't identified specifically by the natural diversity database, but based on our experience with other projects, including other previous telecom projects that have been before this Commission, we expect they're a state listed, special-concern species. If the Commission remembers, for Docket 438 for Voluntown, a Verizon application, we had red bat and silver-haired bat, a special-concern species. So provided the Council approves this project, we would implement our recommendations to avoid tree clearing between November 1st and March 30th or sorry to recommend tree	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	putting in to protect the state-listed species would also be equally protective of that potential federal species bat. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. I was just curious. That's all. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yeah. You're welcome. MR. PERRONE: And also mentioned in the DEEP letter is about retaining large diameter trees. Were the larger trees maintained, to the extent possible? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes, they were. MR. PERRONE: Also, Mr. Gustafson, were there any consultations with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It wasn't identified specifically by the natural diversity database, but based on our experience with other projects, including other previous telecom projects that have been before this Commission, we expect they're a state listed, special-concern species. If the Commission remembers, for Docket 438 for Voluntown, a Verizon application, we had red bat and silver-haired bat, a special-concern species. So provided the Council approves this project, we would implement our recommendations to avoid tree clearing between November 1st and March 30th or sorry to recommend tree clearing be performed between the period of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	putting in to protect the state-listed species would also be equally protective of that potential federal species bat. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. I was just curious. That's all. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yeah. You're welcome. MR. PERRONE: And also mentioned in the DEEP letter is about retaining large diameter trees. Were the larger trees maintained, to the extent possible? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes, they were. MR. PERRONE: Also, Mr. Gustafson, were there any consultations with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife? THE WITNESS (Gustafson): We
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It wasn't identified specifically by the natural diversity database, but based on our experience with other projects, including other previous telecom projects that have been before this Commission, we expect they're a state listed, special-concern species. If the Commission remembers, for Docket 438 for Voluntown, a Verizon application, we had red bat and silver-haired bat, a special-concern species. So provided the Council approves this project, we would implement our recommendations to avoid tree clearing between November 1st and March 30th or sorry to recommend tree clearing be performed between the period of November 1st and March 30th to avoid any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	putting in to protect the state-listed species would also be equally protective of that potential federal species bat. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. I was just curious. That's all. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yeah. You're welcome. MR. PERRONE: And also mentioned in the DEEP letter is about retaining large diameter trees. Were the larger trees maintained, to the extent possible? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes, they were. MR. PERRONE: Also, Mr. Gustafson, were there any consultations with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife? THE WITNESS (Gustafson): We have reached out to the New England division
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It wasn't identified specifically by the natural diversity database, but based on our experience with other projects, including other previous telecom projects that have been before this Commission, we expect they're a state listed, special-concern species. If the Commission remembers, for Docket 438 for Voluntown, a Verizon application, we had red bat and silver-haired bat, a special-concern species. So provided the Council approves this project, we would implement our recommendations to avoid tree clearing between November 1st and March 30th or sorry to recommend tree clearing be performed between the period of November 1st and March 30th to avoid any potential impact with a bat species. And we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	putting in to protect the state-listed species would also be equally protective of that potential federal species bat. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. I was just curious. That's all. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yeah. You're welcome. MR. PERRONE: And also mentioned in the DEEP letter is about retaining large diameter trees. Were the larger trees maintained, to the extent possible? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes, they were. MR. PERRONE: Also, Mr. Gustafson, were there any consultations with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife? THE WITNESS (Gustafson): We
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It wasn't identified specifically by the natural diversity database, but based on our experience with other projects, including other previous telecom projects that have been before this Commission, we expect they're a state listed, special-concern species. If the Commission remembers, for Docket 438 for Voluntown, a Verizon application, we had red bat and silver-haired bat, a special-concern species. So provided the Council approves this project, we would implement our recommendations to avoid tree clearing between November 1st and March 30th or sorry to recommend tree clearing be performed between the period of November 1st and March 30th to avoid any potential impact with a bat species. And we would implement that on the development	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	putting in to protect the state-listed species would also be equally protective of that potential federal species bat. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. I was just curious. That's all. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yeah. You're welcome. MR. PERRONE: And also mentioned in the DEEP letter is about retaining large diameter trees. Were the larger trees maintained, to the extent possible? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes, they were. MR. PERRONE: Also, Mr. Gustafson, were there any consultations with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife? THE WITNESS (Gustafson): We have reached out to the New England division of U.S. Fish and Wildlife regarding our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It wasn't identified specifically by the natural diversity database, but based on our experience with other projects, including other previous telecom projects that have been before this Commission, we expect they're a state listed, special-concern species. If the Commission remembers, for Docket 438 for Voluntown, a Verizon application, we had red bat and silver-haired bat, a special-concern species. So provided the Council approves this project, we would implement our recommendations to avoid tree clearing between November 1st and March 30th or sorry to recommend tree clearing be performed between the period of November 1st and March 30th to avoid any potential impact with a bat species. And we would implement that on the development management plan.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	putting in to protect the state-listed species would also be equally protective of that potential federal species bat. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. I was just curious. That's all. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yeah. You're welcome. MR. PERRONE: And also mentioned in the DEEP letter is about retaining large diameter trees. Were the larger trees maintained, to the extent possible? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes, they were. MR. PERRONE: Also, Mr. Gustafson, were there any consultations with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife? THE WITNESS (Gustafson): We have reached out to the New England division of U.S. Fish and Wildlife regarding our the recommendations from DEEP. We haven't received consultation back. But based on our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It wasn't identified specifically by the natural diversity database, but based on our experience with other projects, including other previous telecom projects that have been before this Commission, we expect they're a state listed, special-concern species. If the Commission remembers, for Docket 438 for Voluntown, a Verizon application, we had red bat and silver-haired bat, a special-concern species. So provided the Council approves this project, we would implement our recommendations to avoid tree clearing between November 1st and March 30th or sorry to recommend tree clearing be performed between the period of November 1st and March 30th to avoid any potential impact with a bat species. And we would implement that on the development	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	putting in to protect the state-listed species would also be equally protective of that potential federal species bat. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. I was just curious. That's all. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yeah. You're welcome. MR. PERRONE: And also mentioned in the DEEP letter is about retaining large diameter trees. Were the larger trees maintained, to the extent possible? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes, they were. MR. PERRONE: Also, Mr. Gustafson, were there any consultations with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife? THE WITNESS (Gustafson): We have reached out to the New England division of U.S. Fish and Wildlife regarding our the recommendations from DEEP. We haven't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It wasn't identified specifically by the natural diversity database, but based on our experience with other projects, including other previous telecom projects that have been before this Commission, we expect they're a state listed, special-concern species. If the Commission remembers, for Docket 438 for Voluntown, a Verizon application, we had red bat and silver-haired bat, a special-concern species. So provided the Council approves this project, we would implement our recommendations to avoid tree clearing between November 1st and March 30th or sorry to recommend tree clearing be performed between the period of November 1st and March 30th to avoid any potential impact with a bat species. And we would implement that on the development management plan. MR. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	putting in to protect the state-listed species would also be equally protective of that potential federal species bat. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. I was just curious. That's all. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yeah. You're welcome. MR. PERRONE: And also mentioned in the DEEP letter is about retaining large diameter trees. Were the larger trees maintained, to the extent possible? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes, they were. MR. PERRONE: Also, Mr. Gustafson, were there any consultations with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife? THE WITNESS (Gustafson): We have reached out to the New England division of U.S. Fish and Wildlife regarding our the recommendations from DEEP. We haven't received consultation back. But based on our experience working with the northern

7 (Pages 22 to 25)

	Page 26		Page 28
1	clearing, that will be equally protective of	1	acreages would be pretty close?
2	the species. But upon receipt of that	2	THE WITNESS (Libertine):
3	consultation, we'll forward that information	3	Yeah, it would be very comparable.
4	to the Council.	4	MR. PERRONE: Okay. Would the
5	MR. PERRONE: Okay.	5	monopole or tree trunk have the standard gray
6	Now, turning to some RF	6 7	galvanized color?
7 8	questions. I understand the interrogatories are based on the revised location, however	8	THE WITNESS (Chasse): That is what's proposed right now.
9	the the coverage plots in the application,	9	MR. PERRONE: Okay.
10	would those still be approximately correct	10	THE WITNESS (Chasse): It can
11	for the revised?	11	be painted brown.
12	THE WITNESS (Lavin): Pretty	12	THE WITNESS (Libertine):
13	much correct.	13	And and one thing that if if there is
14	MR. PERRONE: Okay.	14	some interest in considering painting, I
15	THE WITNESS (Lavin): They	15	would say that the really, the upper
16	would be very much correct. Yeah, it's a	16	portions would be probably the most important
17	de minimus type of move. Yeah, there are.	17	because, again, because of where it's
18	MR. PERRONE: Okay.	18	located, it's very difficult to really see
19	Would the proposed tower	19	that, even this time of year there's fairly
20	provide any coverage to portions of the	20 21	good cover. So I'm not sure that the and
21 22	Appalachian Trail or is that trail too far south?	21	I'm not sure that can be done, you know, if it's a matter of the manufacturer of painting
22	THE WITNESS (Lavin): I don't	22	just a portion of the pole or whether the
23	know where it's located offhand, so I	24	whole pole. That that part, I don't know
25	couldn't say exactly.	25	how that works.
	couldn't suy chucky.		
	Doco 27		
	Page 27		Page 29
1		1	
1 2	THE WITNESS (Libertine): Just	1 2	MR. PERRONE: Okay.
2 3 4	THE WITNESS (Libertine): Just for your information, it's about a mile and three quarters to the south of the school property itself, just on the west side of the	2 3 4	MR. PERRONE: Okay. And lastly, I understand we were given the distance of the closest inhabited building, the trustee house. Is it
2 3 4 5	THE WITNESS (Libertine): Just for your information, it's about a mile and three quarters to the south of the school property itself, just on the west side of the Housatonic River.	2 3 4 5	MR. PERRONE: Okay. And lastly, I understand we were given the distance of the closest inhabited building, the trustee house. Is it fair to say that the tower would be more than
2 3 4 5 6	THE WITNESS (Libertine): Just for your information, it's about a mile and three quarters to the south of the school property itself, just on the west side of the Housatonic River. THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's	2 3 4 5 6	MR. PERRONE: Okay. And lastly, I understand we were given the distance of the closest inhabited building, the trustee house. Is it fair to say that the tower would be more than 250 feet from any building that students
2 3 4 5 6 7	THE WITNESS (Libertine): Just for your information, it's about a mile and three quarters to the south of the school property itself, just on the west side of the Housatonic River. THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's possible. We we can verify that.	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. PERRONE: Okay. And lastly, I understand we were given the distance of the closest inhabited building, the trustee house. Is it fair to say that the tower would be more than 250 feet from any building that students would occupy?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS (Libertine): Just for your information, it's about a mile and three quarters to the south of the school property itself, just on the west side of the Housatonic River. THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's possible. We we can verify that. MR. PERRONE: Mr. Libertine,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. PERRONE: Okay. And lastly, I understand we were given the distance of the closest inhabited building, the trustee house. Is it fair to say that the tower would be more than 250 feet from any building that students would occupy? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS (Libertine): Just for your information, it's about a mile and three quarters to the south of the school property itself, just on the west side of the Housatonic River. THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's possible. We we can verify that. MR. PERRONE: Mr. Libertine, would there be much of a visibility change	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. PERRONE: Okay. And lastly, I understand we were given the distance of the closest inhabited building, the trustee house. Is it fair to say that the tower would be more than 250 feet from any building that students would occupy? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes. The yes, the closest occupiable building
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE WITNESS (Libertine): Just for your information, it's about a mile and three quarters to the south of the school property itself, just on the west side of the Housatonic River. THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's possible. We we can verify that. MR. PERRONE: Mr. Libertine, would there be much of a visibility change between the two locations? Would it be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. PERRONE: Okay. And lastly, I understand we were given the distance of the closest inhabited building, the trustee house. Is it fair to say that the tower would be more than 250 feet from any building that students would occupy? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes. The yes, the closest occupiable building would be the maintenance garage that you saw
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS (Libertine): Just for your information, it's about a mile and three quarters to the south of the school property itself, just on the west side of the Housatonic River. THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's possible. We we can verify that. MR. PERRONE: Mr. Libertine, would there be much of a visibility change between the two locations? Would it be negligible or would it drop slightly because	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. PERRONE: Okay. And lastly, I understand we were given the distance of the closest inhabited building, the trustee house. Is it fair to say that the tower would be more than 250 feet from any building that students would occupy? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes. The yes, the closest occupiable building would be the maintenance garage that you saw there, and that was 775 feet away.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS (Libertine): Just for your information, it's about a mile and three quarters to the south of the school property itself, just on the west side of the Housatonic River. THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's possible. We we can verify that. MR. PERRONE: Mr. Libertine, would there be much of a visibility change between the two locations? Would it be negligible or would it drop slightly because of the ground elevation?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. PERRONE: Okay. And lastly, I understand we were given the distance of the closest inhabited building, the trustee house. Is it fair to say that the tower would be more than 250 feet from any building that students would occupy? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes. The yes, the closest occupiable building would be the maintenance garage that you saw there, and that was 775 feet away. MR. PERRONE: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS (Libertine): Just for your information, it's about a mile and three quarters to the south of the school property itself, just on the west side of the Housatonic River. THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's possible. We we can verify that. MR. PERRONE: Mr. Libertine, would there be much of a visibility change between the two locations? Would it be negligible or would it drop slightly because of the ground elevation? THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. PERRONE: Okay. And lastly, I understand we were given the distance of the closest inhabited building, the trustee house. Is it fair to say that the tower would be more than 250 feet from any building that students would occupy? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes. The yes, the closest occupiable building would be the maintenance garage that you saw there, and that was 775 feet away. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Chasse): The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS (Libertine): Just for your information, it's about a mile and three quarters to the south of the school property itself, just on the west side of the Housatonic River. THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's possible. We we can verify that. MR. PERRONE: Mr. Libertine, would there be much of a visibility change between the two locations? Would it be negligible or would it drop slightly because of the ground elevation? THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's going to really be a mostly negligible	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. PERRONE: Okay. And lastly, I understand we were given the distance of the closest inhabited building, the trustee house. Is it fair to say that the tower would be more than 250 feet from any building that students would occupy? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes. The yes, the closest occupiable building would be the maintenance garage that you saw there, and that was 775 feet away. MR. PERRONE: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS (Libertine): Just for your information, it's about a mile and three quarters to the south of the school property itself, just on the west side of the Housatonic River. THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's possible. We we can verify that. MR. PERRONE: Mr. Libertine, would there be much of a visibility change between the two locations? Would it be negligible or would it drop slightly because of the ground elevation? THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. PERRONE: Okay. And lastly, I understand we were given the distance of the closest inhabited building, the trustee house. Is it fair to say that the tower would be more than 250 feet from any building that students would occupy? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes. The yes, the closest occupiable building would be the maintenance garage that you saw there, and that was 775 feet away. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Chasse): The nearest off-site residence is over 2180 feet
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS (Libertine): Just for your information, it's about a mile and three quarters to the south of the school property itself, just on the west side of the Housatonic River. THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's possible. We we can verify that. MR. PERRONE: Mr. Libertine, would there be much of a visibility change between the two locations? Would it be negligible or would it drop slightly because of the ground elevation? THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's going to really be a mostly negligible negligible change. It's it's not significant enough of a move. It's within about a hundred feet or so, so we didn't see	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. PERRONE: Okay. And lastly, I understand we were given the distance of the closest inhabited building, the trustee house. Is it fair to say that the tower would be more than 250 feet from any building that students would occupy? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes. The yes, the closest occupiable building would be the maintenance garage that you saw there, and that was 775 feet away. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Chasse): The nearest off-site residence is over 2180 feet away, 2,180 off-site. MR. PERRONE: Does does the Town of Salisbury have any plans to collocate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS (Libertine): Just for your information, it's about a mile and three quarters to the south of the school property itself, just on the west side of the Housatonic River. THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's possible. We we can verify that. MR. PERRONE: Mr. Libertine, would there be much of a visibility change between the two locations? Would it be negligible or would it drop slightly because of the ground elevation? THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's going to really be a mostly negligible negligible change. It's it's not significant enough of a move. It's within about a hundred feet or so, so we didn't see that there was a real big difference.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. PERRONE: Okay. And lastly, I understand we were given the distance of the closest inhabited building, the trustee house. Is it fair to say that the tower would be more than 250 feet from any building that students would occupy? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes. The yes, the closest occupiable building would be the maintenance garage that you saw there, and that was 775 feet away. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Chasse): The nearest off-site residence is over 2180 feet away, 2,180 off-site. MR. PERRONE: Does does the Town of Salisbury have any plans to collocate on the tower for emergency services antennas?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS (Libertine): Just for your information, it's about a mile and three quarters to the south of the school property itself, just on the west side of the Housatonic River. THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's possible. We we can verify that. MR. PERRONE: Mr. Libertine, would there be much of a visibility change between the two locations? Would it be negligible or would it drop slightly because of the ground elevation? THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's going to really be a mostly negligible negligible change. It's it's not significant enough of a move. It's within about a hundred feet or so, so we didn't see that there was a real big difference. We did run an in-house	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. PERRONE: Okay. And lastly, I understand we were given the distance of the closest inhabited building, the trustee house. Is it fair to say that the tower would be more than 250 feet from any building that students would occupy? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes. The yes, the closest occupiable building would be the maintenance garage that you saw there, and that was 775 feet away. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Chasse): The nearest off-site residence is over 2180 feet away, 2,180 off-site. MR. PERRONE: Does does the Town of Salisbury have any plans to collocate on the tower for emergency services antennas? THE WITNESS (Vergati): When I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS (Libertine): Just for your information, it's about a mile and three quarters to the south of the school property itself, just on the west side of the Housatonic River. THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's possible. We we can verify that. MR. PERRONE: Mr. Libertine, would there be much of a visibility change between the two locations? Would it be negligible or would it drop slightly because of the ground elevation? THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's going to really be a mostly negligible negligible change. It's it's not significant enough of a move. It's within about a hundred feet or so, so we didn't see that there was a real big difference. We did run an in-house visibility map based on the new location and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. PERRONE: Okay. And lastly, I understand we were given the distance of the closest inhabited building, the trustee house. Is it fair to say that the tower would be more than 250 feet from any building that students would occupy? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes. The yes, the closest occupiable building would be the maintenance garage that you saw there, and that was 775 feet away. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Chasse): The nearest off-site residence is over 2180 feet away, 2,180 off-site. MR. PERRONE: Does does the Town of Salisbury have any plans to collocate on the tower for emergency services antennas? THE WITNESS (Vergati): When I initially sat down with First Selectman Rand,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS (Libertine): Just for your information, it's about a mile and three quarters to the south of the school property itself, just on the west side of the Housatonic River. THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's possible. We we can verify that. MR. PERRONE: Mr. Libertine, would there be much of a visibility change between the two locations? Would it be negligible or would it drop slightly because of the ground elevation? THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's going to really be a mostly negligible negligible change. It's it's not significant enough of a move. It's within about a hundred feet or so, so we didn't see that there was a real big difference. We did run an in-house visibility map based on the new location and it was essentially the same footprint as what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. PERRONE: Okay. And lastly, I understand we were given the distance of the closest inhabited building, the trustee house. Is it fair to say that the tower would be more than 250 feet from any building that students would occupy? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes. The yes, the closest occupiable building would be the maintenance garage that you saw there, and that was 775 feet away. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Chasse): The nearest off-site residence is over 2180 feet away, 2,180 off-site. MR. PERRONE: Does does the Town of Salisbury have any plans to collocate on the tower for emergency services antennas? THE WITNESS (Vergati): When I initially sat down with First Selectman Rand, we discussed public safety. He had put me in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS (Libertine): Just for your information, it's about a mile and three quarters to the south of the school property itself, just on the west side of the Housatonic River. THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's possible. We we can verify that. MR. PERRONE: Mr. Libertine, would there be much of a visibility change between the two locations? Would it be negligible or would it drop slightly because of the ground elevation? THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's going to really be a mostly negligible negligible change. It's it's not significant enough of a move. It's within about a hundred feet or so, so we didn't see that there was a real big difference. We did run an in-house visibility map based on the new location and it was essentially the same footprint as what we have gotten before. So I don't anticipate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. PERRONE: Okay. And lastly, I understand we were given the distance of the closest inhabited building, the trustee house. Is it fair to say that the tower would be more than 250 feet from any building that students would occupy? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes. The yes, the closest occupiable building would be the maintenance garage that you saw there, and that was 775 feet away. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Chasse): The nearest off-site residence is over 2180 feet away, 2,180 off-site. MR. PERRONE: Does does the Town of Salisbury have any plans to collocate on the tower for emergency services antennas? THE WITNESS (Vergati): When I initially sat down with First Selectman Rand, we discussed public safety. He had put me in touch with the Fire Chief, Mr. Wilson, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS (Libertine): Just for your information, it's about a mile and three quarters to the south of the school property itself, just on the west side of the Housatonic River. THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's possible. We we can verify that. MR. PERRONE: Mr. Libertine, would there be much of a visibility change between the two locations? Would it be negligible or would it drop slightly because of the ground elevation? THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's going to really be a mostly negligible negligible change. It's it's not significant enough of a move. It's within about a hundred feet or so, so we didn't see that there was a real big difference. We did run an in-house visibility map based on the new location and it was essentially the same footprint as what we have gotten before. So I don't anticipate it's going to be much different than what we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. PERRONE: Okay. And lastly, I understand we were given the distance of the closest inhabited building, the trustee house. Is it fair to say that the tower would be more than 250 feet from any building that students would occupy? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes. The yes, the closest occupiable building would be the maintenance garage that you saw there, and that was 775 feet away. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Chasse): The nearest off-site residence is over 2180 feet away, 2,180 off-site. MR. PERRONE: Does does the Town of Salisbury have any plans to collocate on the tower for emergency services antennas? THE WITNESS (Vergati): When I initially sat down with First Selectman Rand, we discussed public safety. He had put me in touch with the Fire Chief, Mr. Wilson, and their emergency coordinator, Ms. Jacquie
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS (Libertine): Just for your information, it's about a mile and three quarters to the south of the school property itself, just on the west side of the Housatonic River. THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's possible. We we can verify that. MR. PERRONE: Mr. Libertine, would there be much of a visibility change between the two locations? Would it be negligible or would it drop slightly because of the ground elevation? THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's going to really be a mostly negligible negligible change. It's it's not significant enough of a move. It's within about a hundred feet or so, so we didn't see that there was a real big difference. We did run an in-house visibility map based on the new location and it was essentially the same footprint as what we have gotten before. So I don't anticipate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. PERRONE: Okay. And lastly, I understand we were given the distance of the closest inhabited building, the trustee house. Is it fair to say that the tower would be more than 250 feet from any building that students would occupy? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes. The yes, the closest occupiable building would be the maintenance garage that you saw there, and that was 775 feet away. MR. PERRONE: Okay. THE WITNESS (Chasse): The nearest off-site residence is over 2180 feet away, 2,180 off-site. MR. PERRONE: Does does the Town of Salisbury have any plans to collocate on the tower for emergency services antennas? THE WITNESS (Vergati): When I initially sat down with First Selectman Rand, we discussed public safety. He had put me in touch with the Fire Chief, Mr. Wilson, and

8 (Pages 26 to 29)

| Page 30Page 321for public safety, especially down toward the
lakes.1SENATOR MURPHY: adequately
service?3In addition, I have spoken to
LCD, Litchfield County Dispatch, Dan Soule.1SENATOR MURPHY: adequately
service?4LCD, Litchfield County Dispatch, Dan Soule.4SENATOR MURPHY: Which leads
me to my follow-up, I really don't really
there's anead for other carriers, and
there's an ead for other carriers, and
ther's ead in there with
ther's carriers and
ther's and have.11Washington site, which would basically be
ther's and I funce.1112there whip antennas, two at the top and a
this for ther course.1213third located further down. And that would
ther's and I funce.1314there's an interest in
the course.1415you were designed to be tar.1516there's end for moopine. Hence's in
approve in the least1417these beer fer of charge, if
the beer is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town And you're prepared to allo

 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

--
--|--|--|---|---|--|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|---|--|----------------------------
---|----------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|---|--
--|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|---|--
---|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| 2 lakes. 2 service? 3 In addition, I have spoken to 3 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Ub-huh. 4 LCD, Litchfield County Dispatch, Dan Soule. 4 SENATOR MURPHY: Which leads 5 And Dan is in the process of running 5 me to my follow-up. I really don't really 6 have a problem with this application. 7 7 the toid me, as early as yesterday, that 7 8 the ist looks secclell for them next week. 7 10 same antenna setup as they did in our 7 11 Washington site, which would basically be 11 11 12 questions from the council. 12 questions from the Council. 13 diterently. 14 they beir three-county channels that they 14 14 have for repeaters in the area. 16 designed so that it can go higher than 15 THE WITNESS (Lawin): 18 THE WITNESS (Lawin): 18 16 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. 16 designed to the tainmainteget to 18 17 Thake You. SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you. 16 18 SENATOR MURPHY: Well, if we<

 | | Page 30 | | Page 32 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 In addition, I have spoken to 3 THE WITNESS (Larin); Ub-huh, 4 LCD, Litchfield County Dispatch, Dan Soule, 4 SENATOR MURPHY: Which leads 6 propagation maps. He'll have them next week. 5 me to my follow-up. I really don't really 7 But he told me, as eardly as yesterday, that 6 have a problem with this application. 10 they would forsee that they would have the 9 that's my concern about, not today, but 11 they would forsee that they would have the 10 that's my concern about, not today, but 12 there whip antennas, two at the top and a 11 In response to the initial 12 there whip antennas, two at the top and a 11 In response to the initial 13 third located further down. And that would 13 indicated that the tower could be designed 14 designed so that it can go higher than 150 feet? 11 14 me to usy other as a 150 feet? 11 15 THE WITNESS (Chasse). As it 11 150 feet? 14 geing to be more design? 11 150 feet? 15 met own go on the space free of charge, if <td< th=""><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>· · ·</th></td<>

 | | | | · · · | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 LCD, Lichfield County Dispatch, Dan Soule. 4 SENATOR MURPHY: Which leads 5 And Dan is in the process of running 5 me to my follow-up. 1 really don't really 6 propagation maps. He'll have them next week. 6 have a problem with this application. 7 But he toil me, as early as yesterday, that 7 There's certainly in need out here. But 9 they would foresee that they would have the 9 that's my concern about, not today, but 10 same antenna setup at the y doil no or 10 what's what's down the road here. 11 Washington site, which would basically be 11 In response to the initial 12 three-courty channels that they 11 questions from the Council. 12 16 MR, PERRONE: Thank you. 16 designed to be taller and have additional 17 THE WTINESS (Chasse): As it 13 14 18 THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. 14 150 feet? 150 foret? 19 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you. 150 feet? 150 feet? 150 feet? 10 guestions from the Council. 22 SENATOR MURPHY: Well, if we 21

 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 propagation maps. He'll have them next week. 6 have a problem with this seplication. 7 But he told me, as early as yesterday, that 7 There's creatinly in need out here. But there's a need for other carriers, and 9 they would foresce that they would basically be 10 that's my concern about, not today, but there's a need for other carriers, and 11 Washington site, which would basically be 11 In response to the initial 12 three whip anetnas, two at the top and a 12 uperstons from staff. Mr. Chasse, you 13 third located further down. And that would 13 indicated that the tower could be designed 14 help their three-county channels that they 14 differently. I thought he was driving at how 16 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. 16 designed so that it can go higher than 17 Thak you. 16 the design ig designed as a 20 We'll now proceed with 20 10 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you, 23 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you, 23 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you, 23 SENATOR MURPHY: Well, if we aprove it, the design is going to come 24 the town. And you're prepared to allow the 2 THE WITNESS (V

 | 4 | | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 But he told me, as early as yesterday, that 7 There's certainly in need out here. But 8 the site looks excellent for them and that 8 9 the site looks excellent for them and that 8 10 same antenna setup as they did in our 10 11 Washington site, which would bascially be 9 12 there whip antennas, two at the top and a 12 13 third located further down. And that would 13 14 help their three-county channels that they 14 16 MR. PERNONE: Thank you. 15 17 That's all I have. 17 18 THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. 18 19 Thank you. 15 20 We'll now proceed with 20 21 guestion from the Council. 14 22 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you, 23 23 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you, 24 24 the town. And you're prepared to allow the town to go on the space free of charge, if 14 3 the town to go on the space free of charge, if 3 4 the space is available? 3 5 THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes, we would agree to that. 6 we would agree to that. 6

 | 5 | | 5 | me to my follow-up. I really don't really | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 the site looks excellent for them and that 8 there's a need for other carriers, and 9 they would foresee that they would have the same antenna setup as they did in our 10 what'swhat's down the road here. 11 Washington site, which would basically be 11 In response to the initial 12 there whip antennas, two at the top and a 12 questions from staff. Mr. Chasse, you 13 third located further down. And that would 13 indicated that the tower could be designed 14 help their three-county channels that they 14 differently. I thought he was driving at how 15 you were designing the base. Is i being designed so that it can go higher than 15 16 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. 16 designed so that it can go higher than 16 11 That's all I have. 17 THE WITNESS (Chasse): As it 17 20 Well now proceed with 20 150-foor monopine. However, it could be 21 guestions from the Council. 21 50-foor monopine. However, it could be 23 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you, 23 SENATOR MURPHY 11 24 question, apparently there is an interest i

 | б | | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 they would foresee that they would have the
same antenna setup as they did in our 10 10 washington site, which would basically be
three whip antennas, two at the top and a 10 11 Washington site, which would basically be
three whip antennas, two at the top and a 11 12 third boards further down. And that would 11 14 help their three-county channels that they
have for repeaters in the area. 12 16 MR. PERNONE: Thank you. 16 17 That's all have. 17 18 THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. 19 19 Thank you. 10 20 We'll now proceed with 20 21 geisnot form the Council. 11 22 Senator Murphy. 22 23 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you, 24 24 Mr. Chairman. 24 25 In follow up to the last 25 26 We would agree to that. 25 27 SENATOR MURPHY: Mere is an interest in 1 2 the town. And you're prepared to allow the
the space is available? 1 31 question, apparently there is an interest in 1 26 We would agree to that. 26 31 Guestion form the kine would agree to tha

 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 same antenna setup as they did in our 10 what's what's down the road here. 11 Washington site, which would basically be 11 In response to the initial questions from staff, Mr. Chasse, you 13 third located further down. And that would 13 indicated that the tower could be designed 14 help their three-county channels that they 14 indicated that the tower could be designed 16 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. 15 ioticated that the tower could be designed 17 That's all 1 have. 17 150 feet? 18 THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. 18 stands now, no. It's being designed as a 19 they down proceed with 20 150-foot moopine. However, it could be 21 questions from the Council. 21 stands now, no. It's being designed as a 22 Senator Murphy. 23 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you, 24 24 Mr. Chairman. 24 sporve it, the design is going to come pretty quick. What's it going to be? Is it 25 In follow up to the last 11 going to be more design? THE WTINESS (Vergati): We 26 we would agree to that. 11 sporve it, the design

 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 Washington site, which would basically be
three whip antennas, two at the top and a
three which and that would
help heir three-county channels that they
have for repeaters in the area.
MR. PERRONE: Thank you.
That's all have. 11 In response to the initial
questions from staff, MR. Chasse, you
indicated that the tower could be designed
differently. I thought he was driving at how
you were designing the base. Is it being
designed so that it can go higher than

 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 there whip antennas, two at the top and a 12 questions from staff, Mr. Chasse, you 13 third located further down. And that would 13 indicated that the tower could be designed 14 help their three-county channels that they 14 indicated that the tower could be designed 15 have for repeaters in the area. 15 you were designing the base. Is it being 16 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. 16 designed so that it can go higher than 17 That's all I have. 17 That You. 18 18 THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. 18 THE WITNESS (Chasse): As it 19 SENATOR MURPHY. 20 Isofoot monopine. However, it could be 20 We'll now proceed with 20 Isofoot monopine. However, it could be 21 questions from the Council. 21 stadas now. on. It's being designed as a 23 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you, 23 SENATOR MURPHY: Well, if we 24 Mr. Chairman. 24 sprorve it, the design is going to come 25 In follow up to the last 1 going to be more design? We ould look to the Council, as far as what your wishese were, for future collo

 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 third located further down. And that would 13 indicated that the over could be designed 14 help their three-county channels that they 14 differently. I thought he was driving at how 15 have for repeaters in the area. 15 16 MR. PERKONE: Thank you. 16 designed so that it can go higher than 17 That's all I have. 17 150 feet? 18 THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. 19 stands now, no. It's being designed as a 20 We'll now proceed with 20 150-foot monopine. However, it could be 21 questions from the Council. 21 carriers. 23 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you, 24 SENATOR MURPHY: Wall, if we 24 Mr. Chairman. 24 SENATOR MURPHY: Well, if we 25 In follow up to the last 25 going to be more design? 24 the space is a vailable? 4 your wishes were, for future collocation if 3 you wishes were, for future collocation if your wishes were, for future collocation if 4 the space is a vailable? 5 you wishes were, for future collocation if 7 SENATOR

 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14help their three-county channels that they
have for repeaters in the area.14differently. I thought he was driving at how
you were designing the base. Is it being
designed so that it can go higher than16MR, PERRONE: Thank you.1617That's all I have.1718THE CHAIRPERSON: All right.1819Thank you.1920We'll now proceed with
questions from the Council.2023SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you,
SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you,2124Mr. Chairman.2425I follow up to the last2526Page 31Page 3127Page 31Page 3328Page 31Page 3329Page 31Page 3320we would agree to that.2021question, apparently there is an interest in
the space is available?123SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
9336we would agree to that.2037SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
8738We'n WITNESS (Leryi): Yes,
9939responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
101010location?1111THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
101012we - we - we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
the ava another site to pick up what we lost
the ava another site to pick up what we lost
the ava con

 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 have for repeaters in the area. 15 16 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. 16 17 That's all I have. 17 18 THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. 18 19 Thank you. 19 20 We'll now proceed with 20 21 questions from the Council. 21 22 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you, 23 23 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you, 24 24 Mr. Chairman. 24 25 In follow up to the last 25 Page 31 SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I dowthe thown to gooing to be more

 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. 16 designed so that it can go higher than 17 That's all I have. 17 150 feet? 18 THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. 19 19 Thank you. 10 150 feet? 20 We'll now proceed with 20 150-foot monopine. However, it could be 21 questions from the Council. 20 150-foot monopine. However, it could be 22 Senator Murphy. 23 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you, 23 24 Mr. Chairman. 25 In follow up to the last 26 Page 31 Page 33 Page 33 11 question, apparently there is an interest in 1 going to be more design? THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes, 6 we would agree to that. 5 7 SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin, 7 8 What do you consider the minimum height to 8 9 service AT&T at this height, at this 9 10 Iocation? 11 11 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think 10 12

 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 That's all I have. 17 150 feet? 18 THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. 18 The WTNESS (Chasse): As it 19 Thank you. 10 stands now, no. It's being designed as a 20 We'll now proceed with 20 stands now, no. It's being designed as a 21 guestions from the Council. 20 stands now, no. It's being designed as a 22 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you, 24 stands now, no. It's being designed as a 23 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you, 24 stands now, no. It's being designed as a 24 Mr. Chairman. 20 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you, 24 25 In follow up to the last 23 SENATOR MURPHY: Well, if we approve it, the design is going to come pretty quick. What's it going to be? Is it 26 we would agree to that. 1 going to be more design? 3 the space is available? 2 THE WTINESS (Vergati): We would look to the Council, as far as what 3 your wishes were, for future collocation if you felt that it was appropriate to have a 6 4 service AT&T at this height, at this 10 AT&T feels that they're up there where it's 10 the

 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. 18 THE WITNESS (Chasse): As it stands now, no. It's being designed as a 20 We'll now proceed with 19 stands now, no. It's being designed as a 21 questions from the Council. 21 designed to be taller and have additional 22 Senator Murphy. 22 sENATOR MURPHY: Well, if we 23 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you, 23 SENATOR MURPHY: Well, if we 24 Mr. Chairman. 24 approve it, the design is going to come 25 In follow up to the last 25 SENATOR MURPHY: Well, if we Page 31 Page 31 Page 33 1 question, apparently there is an interest in 1 2 the town. And you're prepard to allow the 2 THE WITNESS (Vergati): We 3 town to go on the space free of charge, if 3 would look to the Council, as far as what 4 the space is available? 4 your wishes were, for future collocation if 5 THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes, 6 design in place for extension. 7 SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin, 7 SENATOR MURPHY: Well

 | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20We'll now proceed with
questions from the Council.20150-foot monopine. However, it could be
designed to be taller and have additional
carriers.23SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you,
SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you,
2422SENATOR MURPHY: Well, if we
approve it, the design is going to come
pretty quick. What's it going to be? Is it24Mr. Chairman.
124SENATOR MURPHY: Well, if we
approve it, the design is going to come
pretty quick. What's it going to be? Is it25In follow up to the last1going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
63the space is available?1going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
64the space is available?2SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
87SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
87SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
88we would agree to that.
97SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
89service AT&T at this height, at this
10101010location?11THE WITNESS (Lawin): I think
1111THE WITNESS (Lawin): I think
121112responses, we showed some loss in the area of
141215coverage, Given the difficulty building out
1416here, we reall ywanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
1417SENATOR MURPHY: So the
proposed height at which you're coming on
2418have another site to pick up what we lost
that we would consider.19from 146. I think that's our

 | 18 | THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. | 18 | THE WITNESS (Chasse): As it | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21questions from the Council.
Senator Murphy.21designed to be faller and have additional
carriers.23SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.23SENATOR MURPHY: Well, if we
approve it, the design is going to come
pretty quick. What's it going to be? Is it24In follow up to the last2325In follow up to the last2426Question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
to wn to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?1going to be more design?3THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.1going to be to the council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.7SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?810Iocation?10AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
the were we can. I don't know if we'd ever
181119from 146. I think that's our - our minimum
that we would consider.182021SENATOR MURPHY: So the
proposed height at which you're coming on
this pole, you consider to be the minimum
that we would consider.2122proposed height at which you're coming on
this pole, you consider to be the minimum
to22Right. It certainly would if we're
taking about another 20 feet, we'

 | 19 | | 19 | stands now, no. It's being designed as a | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 Senator Murphy. 22 carriers. 23 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you, 23 SENATOR MURPHY: Well, if we 24 Mr. Chairman. 24 approve it, the design is going to come 25 In follow up to the last 24 approve it, the design is going to be? Is it Page 31 Page 31 Page 33 1 question, apparently there is an interest in 1 going to be more design? 2 THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes, 3 would look to the Council, as far as what 4 the space is available? 5 THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes, 6 we would agree to that. 6 design in place for extension. 7 SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin, 7 8 what do you consider the minimum height to 8 10 location? 10 AT&T feels that they're up there where it's 11 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think 11 the lowest spot they could go to, it's not 12 we we, in our interrogatory 15 kind of, the time to talk about it. And 13 responses, we showed some loss in the area of 16 well,

 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.23SENATOR MURPHY: Well, if we
approve it, the design is going to come
pretty quick. What's it going to be? Is it24In follow up to the last24approve it, the design is going to come
pretty quick. What's it going to be? Is it25I question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
stown to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?1Page 332THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.1going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you service AT&T at this height, at this
location?1SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
there, we really wanted to make this cover as
from 146. I think that's our our minimum
that we would consider.1321SENATOR MURPHY: So the
proposed height at which you're coming on
this pole, you consider to be the minimum
that we would consider.1422Proposed height at which you're coming on
this pole, you consider to be the minimum
tto24

 | | * | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24Mr. Chairman.24approve it, the design is going to come
pretty quick. What's it going to be? Is it25In follow up to the lastPage 31Page 331question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
stown to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?1going to be more design?5THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.1going to be connel, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.7SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?810Infe WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we - we - we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as
from 146. I think that's our our minimum
that we would consider.2421SENATOR MURPHY: So the
proposed height at which you're coming on
this pole, you consider to be the minimum
to2422proposed height at which you're coming on
this pole, you consider to be the minimum
to24

 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25In follow up to the last25pretty quick. What's it going to be? Is itPage 31Page 31Page 331question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
stown to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?1going to be more design?2THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.1going to be council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.7SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?810Iocation?1011THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
ve we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, Given the difficulty building out
thave another site to pick up what we lost
from 146. I think tha's our our minimum
that we would consider.1121SENATOR MURPHY: So the
proposed height at which you're coming on
this pole, you consider to be the minimum
to2522Right. It certainly would if we're
taking oging to set to open up some new

 | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Page 31Page 331question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?1going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
your delt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.7SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?5SENATOR MURPHY: Wr. Lavin,
the WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, Given the difficulty building out
there, we really wanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
much as we can. I don't know if me'd ever
much as we can. I don't know if me'd ever
much as we can. I don't know if me'd ever
much as we can. I don't know if me'd ever
much as we can. I don't know if me'd ever
much as we can. I don't know if me'd ever
much as we can. I don't know if me'd ever
much as we can. I don't know if me'd ever
much as we can. I don't know if me'd ever
much as we can. I don't know if me'd ever
much as we can. I don't know if me'd ever
much as we can. I don't know if me'd ever
much as we can. I don't know if me'd ever
much as we can. I don't know if me'd ever
much as we can. I don't know if me'd ever
much as we can. I don't know if me'd ever
much as we can. I don't know if me'd ever
much as we can. I don't know if me'd ever
much as we can. I don't know if

 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?1going to be more design?2the town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?1going to be more design?4the space is available?4your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.7SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?7SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
location?10Location?10AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
thave another site to pick up what we lost
that we would consider.1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum
that we would consider.20THE WITNESS (Libertine):
THE WITNESS (Libertine):20proposed height at which you're coming on
this pole, you consider to be the minimum
this pole, you consider to be the minimum
to21THE WITNESS (Libertine):
THE WITNESS (Libertine):23the vould consider.20Right. It certainly would if we're
talking about another 20 feet, we're

 | 20 | In follow up to the last | 20 | pretty quick. What's it going to be? is it | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2the town. And you're prepared to allow the2THE WITNESS (Vergati): We3town to go on the space free of charge, if3would look to the Council, as far as what4the space is available?4your wishes were, for future collocation if5THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,5you felt that it was appropriate to have a6we would agree to that.6design in place for extension.7SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,7SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't8what do you consider the minimum height to9service AT&T at this height, at this9service AT&T at this height, at this9here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if10location?10AT&T feels that they're up there where it's11THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think11the lowest spot they could go to, it's not12we we we, in our interrogatory12going to be all that attractive for other13responses, we showed some loss in the area of13carriers coming along and they're going to be14coverage. Given the difficulty building out14looking to be higher. And I think this is,16here, we really wanted to make this cover as1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.20retailly certainly would if we're21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22

 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3town to go on the space free of charge, if3would look to the Council, as far as what4the space is available?4your wishes were, for future collocation if5THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,5you felt that it was appropriate to have a6we would agree to that.6design in place for extension.7SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,7SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't8what do you consider the minimum height to8know what the wishes would be of everybody9service AT&T at this height, at this9here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if10location?10AT&T feels that they're up there where it's11THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think11the lowest spot they could go to, it's not12we we we, in our interrogatory12going to be all that attractive for other13coverage, some road coverage and population14looking to be higher. And I think this is,14coverage. Given the difficulty building out15kind of, the time to talk about it. And16here, we really wanted to make this cover as1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're<

 | | Page 31 | | Page 33 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4the space is available?4your wishes were, for future collocation if5THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,5your wishes were, for future collocation if6we would agree to that.6design in place for extension.7SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,7SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't8what do you consider the minimum height to8know what the wishes would be of everybody9service AT&T at this height, at this9here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if10location?10AT&T feels that they're up there where it's11THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think11the lowest spot they could go to, it's not12we we we, in our interrogatory12going to be all that attractive for other13responses, we showed some loss in the area of13carriers coming along and they're going to be14coverage, some road coverage and population14looking to be higher. And I think this is,15coverage. Given the difficulty building out15kind of, the time to talk about it. And16here, we really wanted to make this cover as16well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but

 | 1 | _ | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.5you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.7SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
87SENATOR MURPHY: Wrl. J don't
88what do you consider the minimum height to
9889service AT&T at this height, at this
109910location?10AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
1111THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
12111112we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
1413carriers coming along and they're going to be
1416here, we really wanted to make this cover as
1616well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
1717If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost
that we would consider.1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum
2019If we're
talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new

 | | question, apparently there is an interest in the town. And you're prepared to allow the | 2 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6we would agree to that.6design in place for extension.7SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,7SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't8what do you consider the minimum height to8know what the wishes would be of everybody9service AT&T at this height, at this9here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if10location?10AT&T feels that they're up there where it's11THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think11the lowest spot they could go to, it's not12we we we, in our interrogatory12going to be all that attractive for other13responses, we showed some loss in the area of13carriers coming along and they're going to be14coverage, some road coverage and population14looking to be higher. And I think this is,15coverage. Given the difficulty building out15kind of, the time to talk about it. And16here, we really wanted to make this cover as16well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about anoth

 | 2
3 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if | 2
3 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
87SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
88what do you consider the minimum height to
98know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
1010location?10AT&T feels that they're up there where it's11THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think11the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other12we we we, in our interrogatory12going to be all that attractive for other13responses, we showed some loss in the area of
1413coverage, some road coverage and population14coverage. Given the difficulty building out15kind of, the time to talk about it. And16here, we really wanted to make this cover as
1616well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential
area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on
2322Right. It certainly would if we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new

 | 2
3
4 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available? | 2
3
4 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8what do you consider the minimum height to
98know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if9service AT&T at this height, at this9here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if10location?10AT&T feels that they're up there where it's11THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think11the lowest spot they could go to, it's not12we we we, in our interrogatory12going to be all that attractive for other13responses, we showed some loss in the area of13carriers coming along and they're going to be14coverage, some road coverage and population14looking to be higher. And I think this is,15coverage. Given the difficulty building out15kind of, the time to talk about it. And16here, we really wanted to make this cover as16well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're <tr <="" td=""><td>2
3
4
5</td><td>question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,</td><th>2
3
4
5</th><td>going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a</td></tr> <tr><td>9service AT&T at this height, at this9here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if10location?10AT&T feels that they're up there where it's11THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think11the lowest spot they could go to, it's not12we we we, in our interrogatory12going to be all that attractive for other13responses, we showed some loss in the area of13carriers coming along and they're going to be14coverage, some road coverage and population14looking to be higher. And I think this is,15coverage. Given the difficulty building out15kind of, the time to talk about it. And16here, we really wanted to make this cover as16well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new</td><td>2
3
4
5
6</td><td>question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.</td><th>2
3
4
5
6</th><td>going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.</td></tr> <tr><td>10location?10AT&T feels that they're up there where it's11THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think11the lowest spot they could go to, it's not12we we we, in our interrogatory12going to be all that attractive for other13responses, we showed some loss in the area of13carriers coming along and they're going to be14coverage, some road coverage and population14looking to be higher. And I think this is,15coverage. Given the difficulty building out15kind of, the time to talk about it. And16here, we really wanted to make this cover as16well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new</td><td>2
3
4
5
6
7</td><td>question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,</td><th>2
3
4
5
6
7</th><td>going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't</td></tr> <tr><td>11THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think11the lowest spot they could go to, it's not12we we we, in our interrogatory12going to be all that attractive for other13responses, we showed some loss in the area of13carriers coming along and they're going to be14coverage, some road coverage and population14looking to be higher. And I think this is,15coverage. Given the difficulty building out15kind of, the time to talk about it. And16here, we really wanted to make this cover as16well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new</td><td>2
3
4
5
6
7
8</td><td>question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to</td><th>2
3
4
5
6
7
8</th><td>going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody</td></tr> <tr><td>13responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population13carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And15coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever15kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum
that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on
2322Right. It certainly would if we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new</td><td>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9</td><td>question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this</td><th>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9</th><td>going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if</td></tr> <tr><th>14141415coverage. Given the difficulty building out15kind of, the time to talk about it. And16here, we really wanted to make this cover as16well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new</th><th>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10</th><th>question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you
consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?</th><th>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10</th><th>going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's</th></tr> <tr><td>15coverage. Given the difficulty building out15kind of, the time to talk about it. And16here, we really wanted to make this cover as16well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new</td><td>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12</td><td>question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory</td><th>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12</th><td>going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other</td></tr> <tr><td>16here, we really wanted to make this cover as16well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new</td><td>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13</td><td>question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of</td><th>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13</th><td>going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be</td></tr> <tr><td>17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.2021SENATOR MURPHY: So the2122proposed height at which you're coming on2223this pole, you consider to be the minimum2324to24</td><td>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14</td><td>question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population</td><th>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14</th><td>going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,</td></tr> <tr><td>18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new</td><td>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15</td><td>question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out</td><th>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15</th><td>going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And</td></tr> <tr><td>19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential
area, I realize, but still let's20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new</td><td>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16</td><td>question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as</td><th>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16</th><td>going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr.
Libertine.</td></tr> <tr><td>20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new</td><td>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17</td><td>question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever</td><th>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17</th><td>going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.
If it were to go up 15 or</td></tr> <tr><td>21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new</td><td>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18</td><td>question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
have another site to pick up what we lost</td><th>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18</th><td>going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.
If it were to go up 15 or
20 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?</td></tr> <tr><td>22proposed height at which you're coming on
this pole, you consider to be the minimum22Right. It certainly would if we're
talking about another 20 feet, we're
certainly going to start to open up some new24to24</td><td>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19</td><td>question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
have another site to pick up what we lost
from 146. I think that's our our minimum</td><th>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19</th><td>going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.
If it were to go up 15 or
20 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?
I mean, this is not like the big residential</td></tr> <tr><td>23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new</td><td>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20</td><td>question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
have another site to pick up what we lost
from 146. I think that's our our minimum
that we would consider.</td><th>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20</th><td>going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.
If it were to go up 15 or
20 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?
I mean, this is not like the big residential
area, I realize, but still let's</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21</td><td>question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
have another site to pick up what we lost
from 146. I think that's our our minimum
that we would consider.
SENATOR MURPHY: So the</td><th>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21</th><td>going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.
If it were to go up 15 or
20 feet,
what's the effect on the visibility?
I mean, this is not like the big residential
area, I realize, but still let's
THE WITNESS (Libertine):</td></tr> <tr><td>25 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. 25 areas. Most likely, my guess is that we're</td><td>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23</td><td>question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
have another site to pick up what we lost
from 146. I think that's our our minimum
that we would consider.
SENATOR MURPHY: So the
proposed height at which you're coming on</td><th>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23</th><td>going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.
If it were to go up 15 or
20 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?
I mean, this is not like the big residential
area, I realize, but still let's
THE WITNESS (Libertine):
Right. It certainly would if we're
talking about another 20 feet, we're</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24</td><td>question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
have another site to pick up what we lost
from 146. I think that's our our minimum
that we would consider.
SENATOR MURPHY: So the
proposed height at which you're coming on
this pole, you consider to be the minimum
to</td><th>2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24</th><td>going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.
If it were to go up 15 or
20 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?
I mean, this is not like the big residential
area, I realize, but still let's
THE WITNESS (Libertine):
Right. It certainly would if we're
talking about another 20 feet, we're
certainly going to start to open up some new</td></tr> | 2
3
4
5 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes, | 2
3
4
5 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a | 9service AT&T at this height, at this9here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if10location?10AT&T feels that they're up there where it's11THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think11the lowest spot they could go to, it's not12we we we, in our interrogatory12going to be all that attractive for other13responses, we showed some loss in the area of13carriers coming along and they're going to be14coverage, some road coverage and population14looking to be higher. And I think this is,15coverage. Given the difficulty building out15kind of, the time to talk about it. And16here, we really wanted to make this cover as16well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new | 2
3
4
5
6 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that. | 2
3
4
5
6 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension. | 10location?10AT&T feels that they're up there where it's11THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think11the lowest spot they could go to, it's not12we we we, in our interrogatory12going to be all that attractive for other13responses, we showed some loss in the area of13carriers coming along and they're going to be14coverage, some road coverage and population14looking to be higher. And I think this is,15coverage. Given the difficulty building out15kind of, the time to talk about it. And16here, we really wanted to make this cover as16well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new | 2
3
4
5
6
7 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is
available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin, | 2
3
4
5
6
7 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't | 11THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think11the lowest spot they could go to, it's not12we we we, in our interrogatory12going to be all that attractive for other13responses, we showed some loss in the area of13carriers coming along and they're going to be14coverage, some road coverage and population14looking to be higher. And I think this is,15coverage. Given the difficulty building out15kind of, the time to talk about it. And16here, we really wanted to make this cover as16well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody | 13responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population13carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And15coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever15kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum
that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on
2322Right. It certainly would if we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if | 14141415coverage. Given the difficulty building out15kind of, the time to talk about it. And16here, we really wanted to make this cover as16well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location? | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's | 15coverage. Given the difficulty building out15kind of, the time to talk about it. And16here, we really wanted to make this cover as16well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other | 16here, we really wanted to make this cover as16well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be | 17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.2021SENATOR MURPHY: So the2122proposed height at which you're coming on2223this pole, you consider to be the minimum2324to24 | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population |
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is, | 18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And | 19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential
area, I realize, but still let's20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine. | 20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.
If it were to go up 15 or | 21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
have another site to pick up what we lost | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.
If it were to go up 15 or
20 feet, what's the effect on the visibility? | 22proposed height at which you're coming on
this pole, you consider to be the minimum22Right. It certainly would if we're
talking about another 20 feet, we're
certainly going to start to open up some new24to24 | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
have another site to pick up what we lost
from 146. I think that's our our minimum | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.
If it were to go up 15
or
20 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?
I mean, this is not like the big residential | 23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
have another site to pick up what we lost
from 146. I think that's our our minimum
that we would consider. | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.
If it were to go up 15 or
20 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?
I mean, this is not like the big residential
area, I realize, but still let's | | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
have another site to pick up what we lost
from 146. I think that's our our minimum
that we would consider.
SENATOR MURPHY: So the | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.
If it were to go up 15 or
20 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?
I mean, this is not like the big residential
area, I realize, but still let's
THE WITNESS (Libertine): | 25 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. 25 areas. Most likely, my guess is that we're | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
have another site to pick up what we lost
from 146. I think that's our our minimum
that we would consider.
SENATOR MURPHY: So the
proposed height at which you're coming on | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.
If it were to go up 15 or
20 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?
I mean, this is not like the big residential
area, I realize, but still let's
THE WITNESS (Libertine):
Right. It certainly would if we're
talking about another 20 feet, we're | | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
have another site to pick up what we lost
from 146. I think that's our our minimum
that we would consider.
SENATOR MURPHY: So the
proposed height at which you're coming on
this pole, you consider to be the minimum
to | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.
If it were to go up 15 or
20 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?
I mean, this is not like the big residential
area, I realize, but still let's
THE WITNESS (Libertine):
Right. It certainly would if we're
talking about another 20 feet, we're
certainly going to start to open up some new |
| 2
3
4
5

 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes, | 2
3
4
5 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9service AT&T at this height, at this9here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if10location?10AT&T feels that they're up there where it's11THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think11the lowest spot they could go to, it's not12we we we, in our interrogatory12going to be all that attractive for other13responses, we showed some loss in the area of13carriers coming along and they're going to be14coverage, some road coverage and population14looking to be higher. And I think this is,15coverage. Given the difficulty building out15kind of, the time to talk about it. And16here, we really wanted to make this cover as16well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new

 | 2
3
4
5
6 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that. | 2
3
4
5
6 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10location?10AT&T feels that they're up there where it's11THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think11the lowest spot they could go to, it's not12we we we, in our interrogatory12going to be all that attractive for other13responses, we showed some loss in the area of13carriers coming along and they're going to be14coverage, some road coverage and population14looking to be higher. And I think this is,15coverage. Given the difficulty building out15kind of, the time to talk about it. And16here, we really wanted to make this cover as16well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new

 | 2
3
4
5
6
7 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin, | 2
3
4
5
6
7 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think11the lowest spot they could go to, it's not12we we we, in our interrogatory12going to be all that attractive for other13responses, we showed some loss in the area of13carriers coming along and they're going to be14coverage, some road coverage and population14looking to be higher. And I think this is,15coverage. Given the difficulty building out15kind of, the time to talk about it. And16here, we really wanted to make this cover as16well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new

 | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population13carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And15coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever15kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum
that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on
2322Right. It certainly would if we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new

 | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14141415coverage. Given the difficulty building out15kind of, the time to talk about it. And16here, we really wanted to make this cover as16well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new

 | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location? | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15coverage. Given the difficulty building out15kind of, the time to talk about it. And16here, we really wanted to make this cover as16well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new

 | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16here, we really wanted to make this cover as16well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new

 | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever17If it were to go up 15 or18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.2021SENATOR MURPHY: So the2122proposed height at which you're coming on2223this pole, you consider to be the minimum2324to24

 | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is, | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18have another site to pick up what we lost1820 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new

 | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19from 146. I think that's our our minimum19I mean, this is not like the big residential
area, I realize, but still let's20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new

 | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20that we would consider.20area, I realize, but still let's21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new

 | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.
If it were to go up 15 or | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21SENATOR MURPHY: So the21THE WITNESS (Libertine):22proposed height at which you're coming on22Right. It certainly would if we're23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new

 | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
have another site to pick up what we lost | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.
If it were to go up 15 or
20 feet, what's the effect on the visibility? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22proposed height at which you're coming on
this pole, you consider to be the minimum22Right. It certainly would if we're
talking about another 20 feet, we're
certainly going to start to open up some new24to24

 | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
have another site to pick up what we lost
from 146. I think that's our our minimum | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.
If it were to go up 15 or
20 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?
I mean, this is not like the big residential | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23this pole, you consider to be the minimum23talking about another 20 feet, we're24to24certainly going to start to open up some new

 | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
have another site to pick up what we lost
from 146. I think that's our our minimum
that we would consider. | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.
If it were to go up 15 or
20 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?
I mean, this is not like the big residential
area, I realize, but still let's | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|

 | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
have another site to pick up what we lost
from 146. I think that's our our minimum
that we would consider.
SENATOR MURPHY: So the | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.
If it were to go up 15 or
20 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?
I mean, this is not like the big residential
area, I realize, but still let's
THE WITNESS (Libertine): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. 25 areas. Most likely, my guess is that we're

 | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
have another site to pick up what we lost
from 146. I think that's our our minimum
that we would consider.
SENATOR MURPHY: So the
proposed height at which you're coming on | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.
If it were to go up 15 or
20 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?
I mean, this is not like the big residential
area, I realize, but still let's
THE WITNESS (Libertine):
Right. It certainly would if we're
talking about another 20 feet, we're | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|

 | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24 | question, apparently there is an interest in
the town. And you're prepared to allow the
town to go on the space free of charge, if
the space is available?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): Yes,
we would agree to that.
SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Lavin,
what do you consider the minimum height to
service AT&T at this height, at this
location?
THE WITNESS (Lavin): I think
we we we, in our interrogatory
responses, we showed some loss in the area of
coverage, some road coverage and population
coverage. Given the difficulty building out
here, we really wanted to make this cover as
much as we can. I don't know if we'd ever
have another site to pick up what we lost
from 146. I think that's our our minimum
that we would consider.
SENATOR MURPHY: So the
proposed height at which you're coming on
this pole, you consider to be the minimum
to | 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24 | going to be more design?
THE WITNESS (Vergati): We
would look to the Council, as far as what
your wishes were, for future collocation if
you felt that it was appropriate to have a
design in place for extension.
SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I don't
know what the wishes would be of everybody
here, but it's, you know, my reaction is, if
AT&T feels that they're up there where it's
the lowest spot they could go to, it's not
going to be all that attractive for other
carriers coming along and they're going to be
looking to be higher. And I think this is,
kind of, the time to talk about it. And
well, we'll start with Mr. Libertine.
If it were to go up 15 or
20 feet, what's the effect on the visibility?
I mean, this is not like the big residential
area, I realize, but still let's
THE WITNESS (Libertine):
Right. It certainly would if we're
talking about another 20 feet, we're
certainly going to start to open up some new | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

9 (Pages 30 to 33)

	Page 34		Page 36
1		1	
1 2	probably going to look at the areas that you now where we've either seen it with	1 2	perspective, monopines can be extended. It certainly could be extended as a monopine.
3		3	However, now now we get into the aesthetic
4	balloon or had predicted you would see it, those areas will certainly expand.	4	issue, which is a separate discussion.
5	So, for instance, if we have	5	THE WITNESS (Chasse): Which I
6	an area that might be an eighth of a mile	6	wanted to dovetail off of as well.
7	long along a road, that's probably going to	7	If it's going to be a
8	open up. And it could conceivably double the	8	truncated pole or a monopine at this point,
9	visibility in some some of those isolated	9	say, it's designed for 180 foot, and we build
10	areas.	10	150 for now and waiting for someone to come,
11	My bigger concern, again, I	11	the extent of the branching and the
12	don't think it's going to be an overall large	12	receptors, where they're going to be located,
13	acreage for a footprint that we're talking	13	some of them are perpendicular, some of them
14	about. I would start to question the use of	14	are are hinged down at a certain angle,
15	a monopine when we start talking about a	15	the length of them, you're basically going to
16	height of 170 feet or that neighborhood. I	16	have a branching scenario at the top of the
17	think now we're honestly, we're we're	17	tree, a little hat sitting on the top, that's
18	probably pushing the height of a monopine	18	not going to look as aesthetic, because
19	when you're talking 157, 160 feet. That's	19	you're basically it looks like you've
20	probably about the maximum that you'd want to	20	topped the tree. You put a little topper on
21	really consider that. I think, at that	21	it, when you really need that other 30 feet
22	point, what happens is, if we go higher with	22	or 20 feet to feather in the branchings to
23	a faux tree, it stars it starts to really	23	give it the true
24	not do the job of what the concealment is	24	SENATOR MURPHY: So, in
25	really designed for. So, in that case,	25	essence, if it goes up any higher, it's a new
23	Teany designed for. 50, in that case,	23	essence, if it goes up any ingher, it's a new
	Page 35		Page 37
1		1	
1 2	because it's broader and it it can	1 2	ballgame, so to speak?
1 2 3	because it's broader and it it can actually draw the eye more, so I would be a		ballgame, so to speak? THE WITNESS (Libertine):
2	because it's broader and it it can actually draw the eye more, so I would be a proponent, if we were going to consider that,	2	ballgame, so to speak?
2 3	because it's broader and it it can actually draw the eye more, so I would be a	2 3	ballgame, so to speak? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah. I mean, again, these can be
2 3 4	because it's broader and it it can actually draw the eye more, so I would be a proponent, if we were going to consider that, you might want to consider a monopine a	2 3 4	ballgame, so to speak? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah. I mean, again, these can be retrofitted in the field. But, I think, to
2 3 4 5	because it's broader and it it can actually draw the eye more, so I would be a proponent, if we were going to consider that, you might want to consider a monopine a monopole.	2 3 4 5	ballgame, so to speak? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah. I mean, again, these can be retrofitted in the field. But, I think, to Scott's point, that it would it would be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	because it's broader and it it can actually draw the eye more, so I would be a proponent, if we were going to consider that, you might want to consider a monopine a monopole. One of the challenges we may	2 3 4 5 6	ballgame, so to speak? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah. I mean, again, these can be retrofitted in the field. But, I think, to Scott's point, that it would it would be in addition to going, let's I was going to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	because it's broader and it it can actually draw the eye more, so I would be a proponent, if we were going to consider that, you might want to consider a monopine a monopole. One of the challenges we may have and Mr. Vergati may want to jump in is that I know there have been discussions all along from the beginning of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ballgame, so to speak? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah. I mean, again, these can be retrofitted in the field. But, I think, to Scott's point, that it would it would be in addition to going, let's I was going to throw 20 feet out there if later on someone came and said, we want the 20 feet, I think, as Scott indicated, we're probably
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	because it's broader and it it can actually draw the eye more, so I would be a proponent, if we were going to consider that, you might want to consider a monopine a monopole. One of the challenges we may have and Mr. Vergati may want to jump in is that I know there have been discussions all along from the beginning of this being a monopine, and I know that that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	ballgame, so to speak? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah. I mean, again, these can be retrofitted in the field. But, I think, to Scott's point, that it would it would be in addition to going, let's I was going to throw 20 feet out there if later on someone came and said, we want the 20 feet, I think, as Scott indicated, we're probably talking about reestablishing 50 feet of that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	because it's broader and it it can actually draw the eye more, so I would be a proponent, if we were going to consider that, you might want to consider a monopine a monopole. One of the challenges we may have and Mr. Vergati may want to jump in is that I know there have been discussions all along from the beginning of this being a monopine, and I know that that may be driven by the landlord.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	ballgame, so to speak? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah. I mean, again, these can be retrofitted in the field. But, I think, to Scott's point, that it would it would be in addition to going, let's I was going to throw 20 feet out there if later on someone came and said, we want the 20 feet, I think, as Scott indicated, we're probably talking about reestablishing 50 feet of that tree faux branching to really make it look
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	because it's broader and it it can actually draw the eye more, so I would be a proponent, if we were going to consider that, you might want to consider a monopine a monopole. One of the challenges we may have and Mr. Vergati may want to jump in is that I know there have been discussions all along from the beginning of this being a monopine, and I know that that may be driven by the landlord. SENATOR MURPHY: You mean a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	ballgame, so to speak? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah. I mean, again, these can be retrofitted in the field. But, I think, to Scott's point, that it would it would be in addition to going, let's I was going to throw 20 feet out there if later on someone came and said, we want the 20 feet, I think, as Scott indicated, we're probably talking about reestablishing 50 feet of that tree faux branching to really make it look like a tree or at least to resemble a tree.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	because it's broader and it it can actually draw the eye more, so I would be a proponent, if we were going to consider that, you might want to consider a monopine a monopole. One of the challenges we may have and Mr. Vergati may want to jump in is that I know there have been discussions all along from the beginning of this being a monopine, and I know that that may be driven by the landlord. SENATOR MURPHY: You mean a monopole, not a monopine?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	ballgame, so to speak? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah. I mean, again, these can be retrofitted in the field. But, I think, to Scott's point, that it would it would be in addition to going, let's I was going to throw 20 feet out there if later on someone came and said, we want the 20 feet, I think, as Scott indicated, we're probably talking about reestablishing 50 feet of that tree faux branching to really make it look like a tree or at least to resemble a tree. It it can be done. I don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	because it's broader and it it can actually draw the eye more, so I would be a proponent, if we were going to consider that, you might want to consider a monopine a monopole. One of the challenges we may have and Mr. Vergati may want to jump in is that I know there have been discussions all along from the beginning of this being a monopine, and I know that that may be driven by the landlord. SENATOR MURPHY: You mean a monopole, not a monopine? THE WITNESS (Libertine):	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	ballgame, so to speak? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah. I mean, again, these can be retrofitted in the field. But, I think, to Scott's point, that it would it would be in addition to going, let's I was going to throw 20 feet out there if later on someone came and said, we want the 20 feet, I think, as Scott indicated, we're probably talking about reestablishing 50 feet of that tree faux branching to really make it look like a tree or at least to resemble a tree. It it can be done. I don't want to give the impression it can't be done,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	because it's broader and it it can actually draw the eye more, so I would be a proponent, if we were going to consider that, you might want to consider a monopine a monopole. One of the challenges we may have and Mr. Vergati may want to jump in is that I know there have been discussions all along from the beginning of this being a monopine, and I know that that may be driven by the landlord. SENATOR MURPHY: You mean a monopole, not a monopine? THE WITNESS (Libertine): We've always lead with a monopine here	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	ballgame, so to speak? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah. I mean, again, these can be retrofitted in the field. But, I think, to Scott's point, that it would it would be in addition to going, let's I was going to throw 20 feet out there if later on someone came and said, we want the 20 feet, I think, as Scott indicated, we're probably talking about reestablishing 50 feet of that tree faux branching to really make it look like a tree or at least to resemble a tree. It it can be done. I don't want to give the impression it can't be done, but there are some logistical considerations.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	because it's broader and it it can actually draw the eye more, so I would be a proponent, if we were going to consider that, you might want to consider a monopine a monopole. One of the challenges we may have and Mr. Vergati may want to jump in is that I know there have been discussions all along from the beginning of this being a monopine, and I know that that may be driven by the landlord. SENATOR MURPHY: You mean a monopole, not a monopine? THE WITNESS (Libertine): We've always lead with a monopine here excuse me yes. And I think that was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	ballgame, so to speak? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah. I mean, again, these can be retrofitted in the field. But, I think, to Scott's point, that it would it would be in addition to going, let's I was going to throw 20 feet out there if later on someone came and said, we want the 20 feet, I think, as Scott indicated, we're probably talking about reestablishing 50 feet of that tree faux branching to really make it look like a tree or at least to resemble a tree. It it can be done. I don't want to give the impression it can't be done, but there are some logistical considerations. SENATOR MURPHY: And I guess
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	because it's broader and it it can actually draw the eye more, so I would be a proponent, if we were going to consider that, you might want to consider a monopine a monopole. One of the challenges we may have and Mr. Vergati may want to jump in is that I know there have been discussions all along from the beginning of this being a monopine, and I know that that may be driven by the landlord. SENATOR MURPHY: You mean a monopole, not a monopine? THE WITNESS (Libertine): We've always lead with a monopine here excuse me yes. And I think that was because of some discussions early on with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	ballgame, so to speak? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah. I mean, again, these can be retrofitted in the field. But, I think, to Scott's point, that it would it would be in addition to going, let's I was going to throw 20 feet out there if later on someone came and said, we want the 20 feet, I think, as Scott indicated, we're probably talking about reestablishing 50 feet of that tree faux branching to really make it look like a tree or at least to resemble a tree. It it can be done. I don't want to give the impression it can't be done, but there are some logistical considerations. SENATOR MURPHY: And I guess my last question, kind of, goes back to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	because it's broader and it it can actually draw the eye more, so I would be a proponent, if we were going to consider that, you might want to consider a monopine a monopole. One of the challenges we may have and Mr. Vergati may want to jump in is that I know there have been discussions all along from the beginning of this being a monopine, and I know that that may be driven by the landlord. SENATOR MURPHY: You mean a monopole, not a monopine? THE WITNESS (Libertine): We've always lead with a monopine here excuse me yes. And I think that was because of some discussions early on with either the landlord and/or the town.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	ballgame, so to speak? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah. I mean, again, these can be retrofitted in the field. But, I think, to Scott's point, that it would it would be in addition to going, let's I was going to throw 20 feet out there if later on someone came and said, we want the 20 feet, I think, as Scott indicated, we're probably talking about reestablishing 50 feet of that tree faux branching to really make it look like a tree or at least to resemble a tree. It it can be done. I don't want to give the impression it can't be done, but there are some logistical considerations. SENATOR MURPHY: And I guess my last question, kind of, goes back to the bats. I guess, is your intention, once the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	because it's broader and it it can actually draw the eye more, so I would be a proponent, if we were going to consider that, you might want to consider a monopine a monopole. One of the challenges we may have and Mr. Vergati may want to jump in is that I know there have been discussions all along from the beginning of this being a monopine, and I know that that may be driven by the landlord. SENATOR MURPHY: You mean a monopole, not a monopine? THE WITNESS (Libertine): We've always lead with a monopine here excuse me yes. And I think that was because of some discussions early on with either the landlord and/or the town. SENATOR MURPHY: Well, kind	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	ballgame, so to speak? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah. I mean, again, these can be retrofitted in the field. But, I think, to Scott's point, that it would it would be in addition to going, let's I was going to throw 20 feet out there if later on someone came and said, we want the 20 feet, I think, as Scott indicated, we're probably talking about reestablishing 50 feet of that tree faux branching to really make it look like a tree or at least to resemble a tree. It it can be done. I don't want to give the impression it can't be done, but there are some logistical considerations. SENATOR MURPHY: And I guess my last question, kind of, goes back to the bats. I guess, is your intention, once the Council, if it approves this, to go right
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	because it's broader and it it can actually draw the eye more, so I would be a proponent, if we were going to consider that, you might want to consider a monopine a monopole. One of the challenges we may have and Mr. Vergati may want to jump in is that I know there have been discussions all along from the beginning of this being a monopine, and I know that that may be driven by the landlord. SENATOR MURPHY: You mean a monopole, not a monopine? THE WITNESS (Libertine): We've always lead with a monopine here excuse me yes. And I think that was because of some discussions early on with either the landlord and/or the town. SENATOR MURPHY: Well, kind of, my next question was going to be, if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	ballgame, so to speak? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah. I mean, again, these can be retrofitted in the field. But, I think, to Scott's point, that it would it would be in addition to going, let's I was going to throw 20 feet out there if later on someone came and said, we want the 20 feet, I think, as Scott indicated, we're probably talking about reestablishing 50 feet of that tree faux branching to really make it look like a tree or at least to resemble a tree. It it can be done. I don't want to give the impression it can't be done, but there are some logistical considerations. SENATOR MURPHY: And I guess my last question, kind of, goes back to the bats. I guess, is your intention, once the Council, if it approves this, to go right ahead and build it right away or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	because it's broader and it it can actually draw the eye more, so I would be a proponent, if we were going to consider that, you might want to consider a monopine a monopole. One of the challenges we may have and Mr. Vergati may want to jump in is that I know there have been discussions all along from the beginning of this being a monopine, and I know that that may be driven by the landlord. SENATOR MURPHY: You mean a monopole, not a monopine? THE WITNESS (Libertine): We've always lead with a monopine here excuse me yes. And I think that was because of some discussions early on with either the landlord and/or the town. SENATOR MURPHY: Well, kind of, my next question was going to be, if someone comes along and said, we want to go	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ballgame, so to speak? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah. I mean, again, these can be retrofitted in the field. But, I think, to Scott's point, that it would it would be in addition to going, let's I was going to throw 20 feet out there if later on someone came and said, we want the 20 feet, I think, as Scott indicated, we're probably talking about reestablishing 50 feet of that tree faux branching to really make it look like a tree or at least to resemble a tree. It it can be done. I don't want to give the impression it can't be done, but there are some logistical considerations. SENATOR MURPHY: And I guess my last question, kind of, goes back to the bats. I guess, is your intention, once the Council, if it approves this, to go right ahead and build it right away or THE WITNESS (Gustafson):
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	because it's broader and it it can actually draw the eye more, so I would be a proponent, if we were going to consider that, you might want to consider a monopine a monopole. One of the challenges we may have and Mr. Vergati may want to jump in is that I know there have been discussions all along from the beginning of this being a monopine, and I know that that may be driven by the landlord. SENATOR MURPHY: You mean a monopole, not a monopine? THE WITNESS (Libertine): We've always lead with a monopine here excuse me yes. And I think that was because of some discussions early on with either the landlord and/or the town. SENATOR MURPHY: Well, kind of, my next question was going to be, if someone comes along and said, we want to go up, what are you guys going to? And I guess	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ballgame, so to speak? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah. I mean, again, these can be retrofitted in the field. But, I think, to Scott's point, that it would it would be in addition to going, let's I was going to throw 20 feet out there if later on someone came and said, we want the 20 feet, I think, as Scott indicated, we're probably talking about reestablishing 50 feet of that tree faux branching to really make it look like a tree or at least to resemble a tree. It it can be done. I don't want to give the impression it can't be done, but there are some logistical considerations. SENATOR MURPHY: And I guess my last question, kind of, goes back to the bats. I guess, is your intention, once the Council, if it approves this, to go right ahead and build it right away or THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Well, at the at very least, we would get
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	because it's broader and it it can actually draw the eye more, so I would be a proponent, if we were going to consider that, you might want to consider a monopine a monopole. One of the challenges we may have and Mr. Vergati may want to jump in is that I know there have been discussions all along from the beginning of this being a monopine, and I know that that may be driven by the landlord. SENATOR MURPHY: You mean a monopole, not a monopine? THE WITNESS (Libertine): We've always lead with a monopine here excuse me yes. And I think that was because of some discussions early on with either the landlord and/or the town. SENATOR MURPHY: Well, kind of, my next question was going to be, if someone comes along and said, we want to go up, what are you guys going to? And I guess you've been thinking about it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ballgame, so to speak? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah. I mean, again, these can be retrofitted in the field. But, I think, to Scott's point, that it would it would be in addition to going, let's I was going to throw 20 feet out there if later on someone came and said, we want the 20 feet, I think, as Scott indicated, we're probably talking about reestablishing 50 feet of that tree faux branching to really make it look like a tree or at least to resemble a tree. It it can be done. I don't want to give the impression it can't be done, but there are some logistical considerations. SENATOR MURPHY: And I guess my last question, kind of, goes back to the bats. I guess, is your intention, once the Council, if it approves this, to go right ahead and build it right away or THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Well, at the at very least, we would get the trees cleared so the area is ready for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	because it's broader and it it can actually draw the eye more, so I would be a proponent, if we were going to consider that, you might want to consider a monopine a monopole. One of the challenges we may have and Mr. Vergati may want to jump in is that I know there have been discussions all along from the beginning of this being a monopine, and I know that that may be driven by the landlord. SENATOR MURPHY: You mean a monopole, not a monopine? THE WITNESS (Libertine): We've always lead with a monopine here excuse me yes. And I think that was because of some discussions early on with either the landlord and/or the town. SENATOR MURPHY: Well, kind of, my next question was going to be, if someone comes along and said, we want to go up, what are you guys going to? And I guess you've been thinking about it. THE WITNESS (Libertine):	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	ballgame, so to speak? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah. I mean, again, these can be retrofitted in the field. But, I think, to Scott's point, that it would it would be in addition to going, let's I was going to throw 20 feet out there if later on someone came and said, we want the 20 feet, I think, as Scott indicated, we're probably talking about reestablishing 50 feet of that tree faux branching to really make it look like a tree or at least to resemble a tree. It it can be done. I don't want to give the impression it can't be done, but there are some logistical considerations. SENATOR MURPHY: And I guess my last question, kind of, goes back to the bats. I guess, is your intention, once the Council, if it approves this, to go right ahead and build it right away or THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Well, at the at very least, we would get the trees cleared so the area is ready for construction.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	because it's broader and it it can actually draw the eye more, so I would be a proponent, if we were going to consider that, you might want to consider a monopine a monopole. One of the challenges we may have and Mr. Vergati may want to jump in is that I know there have been discussions all along from the beginning of this being a monopine, and I know that that may be driven by the landlord. SENATOR MURPHY: You mean a monopole, not a monopine? THE WITNESS (Libertine): We've always lead with a monopine here excuse me yes. And I think that was because of some discussions early on with either the landlord and/or the town. SENATOR MURPHY: Well, kind of, my next question was going to be, if someone comes along and said, we want to go up, what are you guys going to? And I guess you've been thinking about it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ballgame, so to speak? THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah. I mean, again, these can be retrofitted in the field. But, I think, to Scott's point, that it would it would be in addition to going, let's I was going to throw 20 feet out there if later on someone came and said, we want the 20 feet, I think, as Scott indicated, we're probably talking about reestablishing 50 feet of that tree faux branching to really make it look like a tree or at least to resemble a tree. It it can be done. I don't want to give the impression it can't be done, but there are some logistical considerations. SENATOR MURPHY: And I guess my last question, kind of, goes back to the bats. I guess, is your intention, once the Council, if it approves this, to go right ahead and build it right away or THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Well, at the at very least, we would get the trees cleared so the area is ready for

10 (Pages 34 to 37)

UNITED REPORTERS, INC.

	Page 38		Page 40
1	next question. So the the trees are going	1	hold onto that, and we'll go to the other
2	to be cleared by the end of March, those that	2	example, so you can see what I'm talking
3	need to be cleared, from the soon-to-be 2015.	3	about.
4	THE WITNESS (Gustafson):	4	Then, there's
5	Yeah. And the	5	Connecticut 2413, which is not on the map or
6	SENATOR MURPHY: Because I'm	6	the table, but is mentioned in another part
7	really, you know, I'm really sort of	7	of the application. I don't have to include
8	thinking, if you don't, you've got to wait	8	the source. That's a tower that we know
9	until next year to put this up, and these	9	about. It's the Verizon Tower that's on
10	people have been waiting for here for a	10	Route 7, close to Beebe Lane.
11	long time.	11	THE WITNESS (Lavin):
12	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): And	12	Docket 360?
13	with Docket 438, that's what we ended up	13	DR. BELL: And yeah. Yes.
14	doing, is we directed Verizon to do the tree	14	It's close to the intersection of Route 7 and
15	clearing in advance, even though they weren't	15	Route 63. It's a little south of there.
16	ready to start construction. They started	16	So okay. So those are the
17	construction three to six months after that	17	two towers. I'm wondering why they're not on
18	effect, so that way, essentially, the area is	18	this map. And so let's go back to 2435F.
19	prepped and we're fine to construct without	19	This tower actually is if you're looking
20	affecting the bat bat habitat.	20	at the map, it's in between the
21 22	THE WITNESS (Libertine):	21	Connecticut 1134, which is illustrated on the
22	Right. And to your point, it maintained	22 23	map, and the proposed tower we're talking
23	they didn't lose that that construction season.	23	about today. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.
24	SENATOR MURPHY: All right.	24	DR. BELL: So that would be,
23	SENATOR WORTHT. An light.	25	DR. BEEE. So that would be,
	Page 39		
	Fage 59		Page 41
1	I have no other questions,	1	in terms of what you're talking about, in
2	I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman.	2	in terms of what you're talking about, in terms of coverage, wanting to get coverage
2 3	I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.	2 3	in terms of what you're talking about, in terms of coverage, wanting to get coverage into this area, it it would provide, one
2 3 4	I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.	2 3 4	in terms of what you're talking about, in terms of coverage, wanting to get coverage into this area, it it would provide, one would think I understand the terrain is
2 3 4 5	I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Dr. Bell.	2 3 4 5	in terms of what you're talking about, in terms of coverage, wanting to get coverage into this area, it it would provide, one would think I understand the terrain is is the problem here.
2 3 4 5 6	I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Dr. Bell. DR. BELL: Thank you	2 3 4 5 6	in terms of what you're talking about, in terms of coverage, wanting to get coverage into this area, it it would provide, one would think I understand the terrain is is the problem here. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7	I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Dr. Bell. DR. BELL: Thank you Mr. Chair.	2 3 4 5 6 7	in terms of what you're talking about, in terms of coverage, wanting to get coverage into this area, it it would provide, one would think I understand the terrain is is the problem here. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. DR. BELL: One would I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Dr. Bell. DR. BELL: Thank you Mr. Chair. Mr. Lavin, I have a couple of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	in terms of what you're talking about, in terms of coverage, wanting to get coverage into this area, it it would provide, one would think I understand the terrain is is the problem here. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. DR. BELL: One would I'm wondering why is that tower not on the map?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Dr. Bell. DR. BELL: Thank you Mr. Chair. Mr. Lavin, I have a couple of questions about the network in this area.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	in terms of what you're talking about, in terms of coverage, wanting to get coverage into this area, it it would provide, one would think I understand the terrain is is the problem here. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. DR. BELL: One would I'm wondering why is that tower not on the map? And what was it? Was it just an oversight?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Dr. Bell. DR. BELL: Thank you Mr. Chair. Mr. Lavin, I have a couple of questions about the network in this area. And they the questions go to the map and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	in terms of what you're talking about, in terms of coverage, wanting to get coverage into this area, it it would provide, one would think I understand the terrain is is the problem here. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. DR. BELL: One would I'm wondering why is that tower not on the map? And what was it? Was it just an oversight? Are you actually using it in the coverage
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Dr. Bell. DR. BELL: Thank you Mr. Chair. Mr. Lavin, I have a couple of questions about the network in this area. And they the questions go to the map and the table in the application behind Tab 1, on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	in terms of what you're talking about, in terms of coverage, wanting to get coverage into this area, it it would provide, one would think I understand the terrain is is the problem here. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. DR. BELL: One would I'm wondering why is that tower not on the map? And what was it? Was it just an oversight? Are you actually using it in the coverage maps when you show existing coverage or what?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Dr. Bell. DR. BELL: Thank you Mr. Chair. Mr. Lavin, I have a couple of questions about the network in this area. And they the questions go to the map and the table in the application behind Tab 1, on pages 8 and 9. So the map is on page 8 and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	in terms of what you're talking about, in terms of coverage, wanting to get coverage into this area, it it would provide, one would think I understand the terrain is is the problem here. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. DR. BELL: One would I'm wondering why is that tower not on the map? And what was it? Was it just an oversight? Are you actually using it in the coverage maps when you show existing coverage or what? THE WITNESS (Lavin): In the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Dr. Bell. DR. BELL: Thank you Mr. Chair. Mr. Lavin, I have a couple of questions about the network in this area. And they the questions go to the map and the table in the application behind Tab 1, on pages 8 and 9. So the map is on page 8 and the table is on page 9.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	in terms of what you're talking about, in terms of coverage, wanting to get coverage into this area, it it would provide, one would think I understand the terrain is is the problem here. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. DR. BELL: One would I'm wondering why is that tower not on the map? And what was it? Was it just an oversight? Are you actually using it in the coverage maps when you show existing coverage or what? THE WITNESS (Lavin): In the coverage maps in the original submission, it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Dr. Bell. DR. BELL: Thank you Mr. Chair. Mr. Lavin, I have a couple of questions about the network in this area. And they the questions go to the map and the table in the application behind Tab 1, on pages 8 and 9. So the map is on page 8 and the table is on page 9. So the map is supposed to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	in terms of what you're talking about, in terms of coverage, wanting to get coverage into this area, it it would provide, one would think I understand the terrain is is the problem here. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. DR. BELL: One would I'm wondering why is that tower not on the map? And what was it? Was it just an oversight? Are you actually using it in the coverage maps when you show existing coverage or what? THE WITNESS (Lavin): In the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Dr. Bell. DR. BELL: Thank you Mr. Chair. Mr. Lavin, I have a couple of questions about the network in this area. And they the questions go to the map and the table in the application behind Tab 1, on pages 8 and 9. So the map is on page 8 and the table is on page 9. So the map is supposed to be showing potential handoff sites, which you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	in terms of what you're talking about, in terms of coverage, wanting to get coverage into this area, it it would provide, one would think I understand the terrain is is the problem here. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. DR. BELL: One would I'm wondering why is that tower not on the map? And what was it? Was it just an oversight? Are you actually using it in the coverage maps when you show existing coverage or what? THE WITNESS (Lavin): In the coverage maps in the original submission, it is it is used for coverage, yes. I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Dr. Bell. DR. BELL: Thank you Mr. Chair. Mr. Lavin, I have a couple of questions about the network in this area. And they the questions go to the map and the table in the application behind Tab 1, on pages 8 and 9. So the map is on page 8 and the table is on page 9. So the map is supposed to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	in terms of what you're talking about, in terms of coverage, wanting to get coverage into this area, it it would provide, one would think I understand the terrain is is the problem here. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. DR. BELL: One would I'm wondering why is that tower not on the map? And what was it? Was it just an oversight? Are you actually using it in the coverage maps when you show existing coverage or what? THE WITNESS (Lavin): In the coverage maps in the original submission, it is it is used for coverage, yes. I believe it's been deferred it's not on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Dr. Bell. DR. BELL: Thank you Mr. Chair. Mr. Lavin, I have a couple of questions about the network in this area. And they the questions go to the map and the table in the application behind Tab 1, on pages 8 and 9. So the map is on page 8 and the table is on page 9. So the map is supposed to be showing potential handoff sites, which you say in one of your responses to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	in terms of what you're talking about, in terms of coverage, wanting to get coverage into this area, it it would provide, one would think I understand the terrain is is the problem here. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. DR. BELL: One would I'm wondering why is that tower not on the map? And what was it? Was it just an oversight? Are you actually using it in the coverage maps when you show existing coverage or what? THE WITNESS (Lavin): In the coverage maps in the original submission, it is it is used for coverage, yes. I believe it's been deferred it's not on the neighboring map, no. Because it's not an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Dr. Bell. DR. BELL: Thank you Mr. Chair. Mr. Lavin, I have a couple of questions about the network in this area. And they the questions go to the map and the table in the application behind Tab 1, on pages 8 and 9. So the map is on page 8 and the table is on page 9. So the map is supposed to be showing potential handoff sites, which you say in one of your responses to the questions, they are sources of coverage used	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	in terms of what you're talking about, in terms of coverage, wanting to get coverage into this area, it it would provide, one would think I understand the terrain is is the problem here. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. DR. BELL: One would I'm wondering why is that tower not on the map? And what was it? Was it just an oversight? Are you actually using it in the coverage maps when you show existing coverage or what? THE WITNESS (Lavin): In the coverage maps in the original submission, it is it is used for coverage, yes. I believe it's been deferred it's not on the neighboring map, no. Because it's not an existing site, yes. But it was the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Dr. Bell. DR. BELL: Thank you Mr. Chair. Mr. Lavin, I have a couple of questions about the network in this area. And they the questions go to the map and the table in the application behind Tab 1, on pages 8 and 9. So the map is on page 8 and the table is on page 9. So the map is supposed to be showing potential handoff sites, which you say in one of your responses to the questions, they are sources of coverage used for the coverage maps. Right? THE WITNESS (Lavin): Uh-huh. DR. BELL: But there are a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	in terms of what you're talking about, in terms of coverage, wanting to get coverage into this area, it it would provide, one would think I understand the terrain is is the problem here. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. DR. BELL: One would I'm wondering why is that tower not on the map? And what was it? Was it just an oversight? Are you actually using it in the coverage maps when you show existing coverage or what? THE WITNESS (Lavin): In the coverage maps in the original submission, it is it is used for coverage, yes. I believe it's been deferred it's not on the neighboring map, no. Because it's not an existing site, yes. But it was the coverage from it was used I believe, it's been deferred since the original plots were put together.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Dr. Bell. DR. BELL: Thank you Mr. Chair. Mr. Lavin, I have a couple of questions about the network in this area. And they the questions go to the map and the table in the application behind Tab 1, on pages 8 and 9. So the map is on page 8 and the table is on page 9. So the map is supposed to be showing potential handoff sites, which you say in one of your responses to the questions, they are sources of coverage used for the coverage maps. Right? THE WITNESS (Lavin): Uh-huh. DR. BELL: But there are a couple of towers that aren't on the map. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	in terms of what you're talking about, in terms of coverage, wanting to get coverage into this area, it it would provide, one would think I understand the terrain is is the problem here. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. DR. BELL: One would I'm wondering why is that tower not on the map? And what was it? Was it just an oversight? Are you actually using it in the coverage maps when you show existing coverage or what? THE WITNESS (Lavin): In the coverage maps in the original submission, it is it is used for coverage, yes. I believe it's been deferred it's not on the neighboring map, no. Because it's not an existing site, yes. But it was the coverage from it was used I believe, it's been deferred since the original plots were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Dr. Bell. DR. BELL: Thank you Mr. Chair. Mr. Lavin, I have a couple of questions about the network in this area. And they the questions go to the map and the table in the application behind Tab 1, on pages 8 and 9. So the map is on page 8 and the table is on page 9. So the map is supposed to be showing potential handoff sites, which you say in one of your responses to the questions, they are sources of coverage used for the coverage maps. Right? THE WITNESS (Lavin): Uh-huh. DR. BELL: But there are a couple of towers that aren't on the map. And we'll start with Connecticut 2435F, which is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	in terms of what you're talking about, in terms of coverage, wanting to get coverage into this area, it it would provide, one would think I understand the terrain is is the problem here. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. DR. BELL: One would I'm wondering why is that tower not on the map? And what was it? Was it just an oversight? Are you actually using it in the coverage maps when you show existing coverage or what? THE WITNESS (Lavin): In the coverage maps in the original submission, it is it is used for coverage, yes. I believe it's been deferred it's not on the neighboring map, no. Because it's not an existing site, yes. But it was the coverage from it was used I believe, it's been deferred since the original plots were put together. DR. BELL: It is on your coverage map.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Dr. Bell. DR. BELL: Thank you Mr. Chair. Mr. Lavin, I have a couple of questions about the network in this area. And they the questions go to the map and the table in the application behind Tab 1, on pages 8 and 9. So the map is on page 8 and the table is on page 9. So the map is supposed to be showing potential handoff sites, which you say in one of your responses to the questions, they are sources of coverage used for the coverage maps. Right? THE WITNESS (Lavin): Uh-huh. DR. BELL: But there are a couple of towers that aren't on the map. And we'll start with Connecticut 2435F, which is apparently a planned site and which is on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	in terms of what you're talking about, in terms of coverage, wanting to get coverage into this area, it it would provide, one would think I understand the terrain is is the problem here. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. DR. BELL: One would I'm wondering why is that tower not on the map? And what was it? Was it just an oversight? Are you actually using it in the coverage maps when you show existing coverage or what? THE WITNESS (Lavin): In the coverage maps in the original submission, it is it is used for coverage, yes. I believe it's been deferred it's not on the neighboring map, no. Because it's not an existing site, yes. But it was the coverage from it was used I believe, it's been deferred since the original plots were put together. DR. BELL: It is on your coverage map. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Dr. Bell. DR. BELL: Thank you Mr. Chair. Mr. Lavin, I have a couple of questions about the network in this area. And they the questions go to the map and the table in the application behind Tab 1, on pages 8 and 9. So the map is on page 8 and the table is on page 9. So the map is supposed to be showing potential handoff sites, which you say in one of your responses to the questions, they are sources of coverage used for the coverage maps. Right? THE WITNESS (Lavin): Uh-huh. DR. BELL: But there are a couple of towers that aren't on the map. And we'll start with Connecticut 2435F, which is apparently a planned site and which is on the table, but for some reason, you haven't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	in terms of what you're talking about, in terms of coverage, wanting to get coverage into this area, it it would provide, one would think I understand the terrain is is the problem here. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. DR. BELL: One would I'm wondering why is that tower not on the map? And what was it? Was it just an oversight? Are you actually using it in the coverage maps when you show existing coverage or what? THE WITNESS (Lavin): In the coverage maps in the original submission, it is it is used for coverage, yes. I believe it's been deferred it's not on the neighboring map, no. Because it's not an existing site, yes. But it was the coverage from it was used I believe, it's been deferred since the original plots were put together. DR. BELL: It is on your coverage map. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. DR. BELL: But it's it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Dr. Bell. DR. BELL: Thank you Mr. Chair. Mr. Lavin, I have a couple of questions about the network in this area. And they the questions go to the map and the table in the application behind Tab 1, on pages 8 and 9. So the map is on page 8 and the table is on page 9. So the map is supposed to be showing potential handoff sites, which you say in one of your responses to the questions, they are sources of coverage used for the coverage maps. Right? THE WITNESS (Lavin): Uh-huh. DR. BELL: But there are a couple of towers that aren't on the map. And we'll start with Connecticut 2435F, which is apparently a planned site and which is on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	in terms of what you're talking about, in terms of coverage, wanting to get coverage into this area, it it would provide, one would think I understand the terrain is is the problem here. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. DR. BELL: One would I'm wondering why is that tower not on the map? And what was it? Was it just an oversight? Are you actually using it in the coverage maps when you show existing coverage or what? THE WITNESS (Lavin): In the coverage maps in the original submission, it is it is used for coverage, yes. I believe it's been deferred it's not on the neighboring map, no. Because it's not an existing site, yes. But it was the coverage from it was used I believe, it's been deferred since the original plots were put together. DR. BELL: It is on your coverage map. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.

11 (Pages 38 to 41)

UNITED REPORTERS, INC.

	Page 42		Page 44
1	that you actually did use it to to show	1	supposed be showing the towers that you've
2	THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.	2	used
3	DR. BELL: existing and	3	THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.
4	proposed coverage?	4	DR. BELL: to to show
5	THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes,	5	coverage into the area that that is being
6	it's included in the stats. It was deferred	6	covered by the proposed tower.
7	in the meantime, but it's consistent. The	7	THE WITNESS (Lavin): The
8	stats on coverage are consistent all the way	8	the zoom level there is much greater. That
9	through with using the coverage from 2435, at	9	site would be off. It's coverage is
10	the different heights, and for all the	10	included, but it's off the bottom of the
11	different technologies. That coverage is	11	plots with the coverage. The coverage
12	included.	12	DR. BELL: But coverage from
13	DR. BELL: Okay. Does it	13	it is included?
14	so it is providing some coverage or it	14	THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.
15	will	15	DR. BELL: Yes. I mean, I
16	THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.	16	know we don't see the site on the coverage
17	DR. BELL: provide it, but	17	maps. I know that.
18	would it potentially provide	18	THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.
19	THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes.	19	DR. BELL: But but we see
20	DR. BELL: coverage into	20	it on this map, which is supposed to show all
21	this area that we can we can see. Okay.	21	the sites that you've used to construct the
22	Now, let's ask about 2413, the	22	coverage maps.
23	one on Route 7. From your figures, where it	23	THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.
24	appears and in another part of the	24	Uh-huh.
25	application, it's actually less distant	25	DR. BELL: And it's and
	Page 43		Page 45
1		1	
1 2	than than sites you are saying you are	1 2	it's a lot farther away than 2413, and it's
1 2 3		1 2 3	it's a lot farther away than 2413, and it's roughly in the same direction. So what I'm
2	than than sites you are saying you are using to construct your coverage maps, which	2	it's a lot farther away than 2413, and it's
2 3 4 5	than than sites you are saying you are using to construct your coverage maps, which two of them are 1007 and 1180, which are	2 3	it's a lot farther away than 2413, and it's roughly in the same direction. So what I'm asking is, how come, then, 2413 is is
2 3 4 5 6	than than sites you are saying you are using to construct your coverage maps, which two of them are 1007 and 1180, which are roughly in the same direction, that is south.	2 3 4 5 6	it's a lot farther away than 2413, and it's roughly in the same direction. So what I'm asking is, how come, then, 2413 is is THE WITNESS (Lavin): In terms of including it as on the neighbor map, I think that's that is an omission. But the
2 3 4 5 6 7	than than sites you are saying you are using to construct your coverage maps, which two of them are 1007 and 1180, which are roughly in the same direction, that is south. Connecticut 2413, the one I'm citing, is a little bit southeast, but and it's closer to the tower we're looking at today.	2 3 4 5 6 7	it's a lot farther away than 2413, and it's roughly in the same direction. So what I'm asking is, how come, then, 2413 is is THE WITNESS (Lavin): In terms of including it as on the neighbor map, I think that's that is an omission. But the coverage from it does not affect the area
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	than than sites you are saying you are using to construct your coverage maps, which two of them are 1007 and 1180, which are roughly in the same direction, that is south. Connecticut 2413, the one I'm citing, is a little bit southeast, but and it's closer to the tower we're looking at today. So I'm wondering, did you or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	it's a lot farther away than 2413, and it's roughly in the same direction. So what I'm asking is, how come, then, 2413 is is THE WITNESS (Lavin): In terms of including it as on the neighbor map, I think that's that is an omission. But the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	than than sites you are saying you are using to construct your coverage maps, which two of them are 1007 and 1180, which are roughly in the same direction, that is south. Connecticut 2413, the one I'm citing, is a little bit southeast, but and it's closer to the tower we're looking at today. So I'm wondering, did you or did you not use that in constructing your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	it's a lot farther away than 2413, and it's roughly in the same direction. So what I'm asking is, how come, then, 2413 is is THE WITNESS (Lavin): In terms of including it as on the neighbor map, I think that's that is an omission. But the coverage from it does not affect the area where the proposed site is. It doesn't cover that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	than than sites you are saying you are using to construct your coverage maps, which two of them are 1007 and 1180, which are roughly in the same direction, that is south. Connecticut 2413, the one I'm citing, is a little bit southeast, but and it's closer to the tower we're looking at today. So I'm wondering, did you or did you not use that in constructing your coverage maps?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	it's a lot farther away than 2413, and it's roughly in the same direction. So what I'm asking is, how come, then, 2413 is is THE WITNESS (Lavin): In terms of including it as on the neighbor map, I think that's that is an omission. But the coverage from it does not affect the area where the proposed site is. It doesn't cover that. DR. BELL: Okay. But the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	than than sites you are saying you are using to construct your coverage maps, which two of them are 1007 and 1180, which are roughly in the same direction, that is south. Connecticut 2413, the one I'm citing, is a little bit southeast, but and it's closer to the tower we're looking at today. So I'm wondering, did you or did you not use that in constructing your coverage maps? THE WITNESS (Lavin): I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	it's a lot farther away than 2413, and it's roughly in the same direction. So what I'm asking is, how come, then, 2413 is is THE WITNESS (Lavin): In terms of including it as on the neighbor map, I think that's that is an omission. But the coverage from it does not affect the area where the proposed site is. It doesn't cover that. DR. BELL: Okay. But the coverage from 1180 does affect it?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	than than sites you are saying you are using to construct your coverage maps, which two of them are 1007 and 1180, which are roughly in the same direction, that is south. Connecticut 2413, the one I'm citing, is a little bit southeast, but and it's closer to the tower we're looking at today. So I'm wondering, did you or did you not use that in constructing your coverage maps? THE WITNESS (Lavin): I believe that site backs to a mountain that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	it's a lot farther away than 2413, and it's roughly in the same direction. So what I'm asking is, how come, then, 2413 is is THE WITNESS (Lavin): In terms of including it as on the neighbor map, I think that's that is an omission. But the coverage from it does not affect the area where the proposed site is. It doesn't cover that. DR. BELL: Okay. But the coverage from 1180 does affect it? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	than than sites you are saying you are using to construct your coverage maps, which two of them are 1007 and 1180, which are roughly in the same direction, that is south. Connecticut 2413, the one I'm citing, is a little bit southeast, but and it's closer to the tower we're looking at today. So I'm wondering, did you or did you not use that in constructing your coverage maps? THE WITNESS (Lavin): I believe that site backs to a mountain that doesn't have coverage into this area and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	it's a lot farther away than 2413, and it's roughly in the same direction. So what I'm asking is, how come, then, 2413 is is THE WITNESS (Lavin): In terms of including it as on the neighbor map, I think that's that is an omission. But the coverage from it does not affect the area where the proposed site is. It doesn't cover that. DR. BELL: Okay. But the coverage from 1180 does affect it? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It is it is included. I don't know if it ends up
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	than than sites you are saying you are using to construct your coverage maps, which two of them are 1007 and 1180, which are roughly in the same direction, that is south. Connecticut 2413, the one I'm citing, is a little bit southeast, but and it's closer to the tower we're looking at today. So I'm wondering, did you or did you not use that in constructing your coverage maps? THE WITNESS (Lavin): I believe that site backs to a mountain that doesn't have coverage into this area and wouldn't affect the overall new coverage to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	it's a lot farther away than 2413, and it's roughly in the same direction. So what I'm asking is, how come, then, 2413 is is THE WITNESS (Lavin): In terms of including it as on the neighbor map, I think that's that is an omission. But the coverage from it does not affect the area where the proposed site is. It doesn't cover that. DR. BELL: Okay. But the coverage from 1180 does affect it? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It is it is included. I don't know if it ends up making any difference, but it is included in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	than than sites you are saying you are using to construct your coverage maps, which two of them are 1007 and 1180, which are roughly in the same direction, that is south. Connecticut 2413, the one I'm citing, is a little bit southeast, but and it's closer to the tower we're looking at today. So I'm wondering, did you or did you not use that in constructing your coverage maps? THE WITNESS (Lavin): I believe that site backs to a mountain that doesn't have coverage into this area and wouldn't affect the overall new coverage to be provided by the proposed site.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	it's a lot farther away than 2413, and it's roughly in the same direction. So what I'm asking is, how come, then, 2413 is is THE WITNESS (Lavin): In terms of including it as on the neighbor map, I think that's that is an omission. But the coverage from it does not affect the area where the proposed site is. It doesn't cover that. DR. BELL: Okay. But the coverage from 1180 does affect it? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It is it is included. I don't know if it ends up making any difference, but it is included in here. Yes. Uh-huh.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	than than sites you are saying you are using to construct your coverage maps, which two of them are 1007 and 1180, which are roughly in the same direction, that is south. Connecticut 2413, the one I'm citing, is a little bit southeast, but and it's closer to the tower we're looking at today. So I'm wondering, did you or did you not use that in constructing your coverage maps? THE WITNESS (Lavin): I believe that site backs to a mountain that doesn't have coverage into this area and wouldn't affect the overall new coverage to be provided by the proposed site. DR. BELL: So are you saying,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	it's a lot farther away than 2413, and it's roughly in the same direction. So what I'm asking is, how come, then, 2413 is is THE WITNESS (Lavin): In terms of including it as on the neighbor map, I think that's that is an omission. But the coverage from it does not affect the area where the proposed site is. It doesn't cover that. DR. BELL: Okay. But the coverage from 1180 does affect it? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It is it is included. I don't know if it ends up making any difference, but it is included in here. Yes. Uh-huh. DR. BELL: Okay. I'm just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	than than sites you are saying you are using to construct your coverage maps, which two of them are 1007 and 1180, which are roughly in the same direction, that is south. Connecticut 2413, the one I'm citing, is a little bit southeast, but and it's closer to the tower we're looking at today. So I'm wondering, did you or did you not use that in constructing your coverage maps? THE WITNESS (Lavin): I believe that site backs to a mountain that doesn't have coverage into this area and wouldn't affect the overall new coverage to be provided by the proposed site. DR. BELL: So are you saying, actually, that Connecticut 1180, which is on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	it's a lot farther away than 2413, and it's roughly in the same direction. So what I'm asking is, how come, then, 2413 is is THE WITNESS (Lavin): In terms of including it as on the neighbor map, I think that's that is an omission. But the coverage from it does not affect the area where the proposed site is. It doesn't cover that. DR. BELL: Okay. But the coverage from 1180 does affect it? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It is it is included. I don't know if it ends up making any difference, but it is included in here. Yes. Uh-huh. DR. BELL: Okay. I'm just I'm trying to get a sense of what is and what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	than than sites you are saying you are using to construct your coverage maps, which two of them are 1007 and 1180, which are roughly in the same direction, that is south. Connecticut 2413, the one I'm citing, is a little bit southeast, but and it's closer to the tower we're looking at today. So I'm wondering, did you or did you not use that in constructing your coverage maps? THE WITNESS (Lavin): I believe that site backs to a mountain that doesn't have coverage into this area and wouldn't affect the overall new coverage to be provided by the proposed site. DR. BELL: So are you saying, actually, that Connecticut 1180, which is on this map, is is not obstructed to to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	it's a lot farther away than 2413, and it's roughly in the same direction. So what I'm asking is, how come, then, 2413 is is THE WITNESS (Lavin): In terms of including it as on the neighbor map, I think that's that is an omission. But the coverage from it does not affect the area where the proposed site is. It doesn't cover that. DR. BELL: Okay. But the coverage from 1180 does affect it? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It is it is included. I don't know if it ends up making any difference, but it is included in here. Yes. Uh-huh. DR. BELL: Okay. I'm just I'm trying to get a sense of what is and what isn't included in these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	than than sites you are saying you are using to construct your coverage maps, which two of them are 1007 and 1180, which are roughly in the same direction, that is south. Connecticut 2413, the one I'm citing, is a little bit southeast, but and it's closer to the tower we're looking at today. So I'm wondering, did you or did you not use that in constructing your coverage maps? THE WITNESS (Lavin): I believe that site backs to a mountain that doesn't have coverage into this area and wouldn't affect the overall new coverage to be provided by the proposed site. DR. BELL: So are you saying, actually, that Connecticut 1180, which is on this map, is is not obstructed to to this site?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	it's a lot farther away than 2413, and it's roughly in the same direction. So what I'm asking is, how come, then, 2413 is is THE WITNESS (Lavin): In terms of including it as on the neighbor map, I think that's that is an omission. But the coverage from it does not affect the area where the proposed site is. It doesn't cover that. DR. BELL: Okay. But the coverage from 1180 does affect it? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It is it is included. I don't know if it ends up making any difference, but it is included in here. Yes. Uh-huh. DR. BELL: Okay. I'm just I'm trying to get a sense of what is and what isn't included in these THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	than than sites you are saying you are using to construct your coverage maps, which two of them are 1007 and 1180, which are roughly in the same direction, that is south. Connecticut 2413, the one I'm citing, is a little bit southeast, but and it's closer to the tower we're looking at today. So I'm wondering, did you or did you not use that in constructing your coverage maps? THE WITNESS (Lavin): I believe that site backs to a mountain that doesn't have coverage into this area and wouldn't affect the overall new coverage to be provided by the proposed site. DR. BELL: So are you saying, actually, that Connecticut 1180, which is on this map, is is not obstructed to to this site? THE WITNESS (Lavin): 1180	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	it's a lot farther away than 2413, and it's roughly in the same direction. So what I'm asking is, how come, then, 2413 is is THE WITNESS (Lavin): In terms of including it as on the neighbor map, I think that's that is an omission. But the coverage from it does not affect the area where the proposed site is. It doesn't cover that. DR. BELL: Okay. But the coverage from 1180 does affect it? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It is it is included. I don't know if it ends up making any difference, but it is included in here. Yes. Uh-huh. DR. BELL: Okay. I'm just I'm trying to get a sense of what is and what isn't included in these THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. DR. BELL: for the for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	than than sites you are saying you are using to construct your coverage maps, which two of them are 1007 and 1180, which are roughly in the same direction, that is south. Connecticut 2413, the one I'm citing, is a little bit southeast, but and it's closer to the tower we're looking at today. So I'm wondering, did you or did you not use that in constructing your coverage maps? THE WITNESS (Lavin): I believe that site backs to a mountain that doesn't have coverage into this area and wouldn't affect the overall new coverage to be provided by the proposed site. DR. BELL: So are you saying, actually, that Connecticut 1180, which is on this map, is is not obstructed to to this site?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	it's a lot farther away than 2413, and it's roughly in the same direction. So what I'm asking is, how come, then, 2413 is is THE WITNESS (Lavin): In terms of including it as on the neighbor map, I think that's that is an omission. But the coverage from it does not affect the area where the proposed site is. It doesn't cover that. DR. BELL: Okay. But the coverage from 1180 does affect it? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It is it is included. I don't know if it ends up making any difference, but it is included in here. Yes. Uh-huh. DR. BELL: Okay. I'm just I'm trying to get a sense of what is and what isn't included in these THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. DR. BELL: for the for us to see the coverage that's existing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	than than sites you are saying you are using to construct your coverage maps, which two of them are 1007 and 1180, which are roughly in the same direction, that is south. Connecticut 2413, the one I'm citing, is a little bit southeast, but and it's closer to the tower we're looking at today. So I'm wondering, did you or did you not use that in constructing your coverage maps? THE WITNESS (Lavin): I believe that site backs to a mountain that doesn't have coverage into this area and wouldn't affect the overall new coverage to be provided by the proposed site. DR. BELL: So are you saying, actually, that Connecticut 1180, which is on this map, is is not obstructed to to this site? THE WITNESS (Lavin): 1180 down at this at the southern end of the 1180 is at the southern end of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	it's a lot farther away than 2413, and it's roughly in the same direction. So what I'm asking is, how come, then, 2413 is is THE WITNESS (Lavin): In terms of including it as on the neighbor map, I think that's that is an omission. But the coverage from it does not affect the area where the proposed site is. It doesn't cover that. DR. BELL: Okay. But the coverage from 1180 does affect it? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It is it is included. I don't know if it ends up making any difference, but it is included in here. Yes. Uh-huh. DR. BELL: Okay. I'm just I'm trying to get a sense of what is and what isn't included in these THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. DR. BELL: for the for us to see the coverage that's existing. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Uh-huh,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	than than sites you are saying you are using to construct your coverage maps, which two of them are 1007 and 1180, which are roughly in the same direction, that is south. Connecticut 2413, the one I'm citing, is a little bit southeast, but and it's closer to the tower we're looking at today. So I'm wondering, did you or did you not use that in constructing your coverage maps? THE WITNESS (Lavin): I believe that site backs to a mountain that doesn't have coverage into this area and wouldn't affect the overall new coverage to be provided by the proposed site. DR. BELL: So are you saying, actually, that Connecticut 1180, which is on this map, is is not obstructed to to this site? THE WITNESS (Lavin): 1180 down at this at the southern end of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	it's a lot farther away than 2413, and it's roughly in the same direction. So what I'm asking is, how come, then, 2413 is is THE WITNESS (Lavin): In terms of including it as on the neighbor map, I think that's that is an omission. But the coverage from it does not affect the area where the proposed site is. It doesn't cover that. DR. BELL: Okay. But the coverage from 1180 does affect it? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It is it is included. I don't know if it ends up making any difference, but it is included in here. Yes. Uh-huh. DR. BELL: Okay. I'm just I'm trying to get a sense of what is and what isn't included in these THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. DR. BELL: for the for us to see the coverage that's existing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	than than sites you are saying you are using to construct your coverage maps, which two of them are 1007 and 1180, which are roughly in the same direction, that is south. Connecticut 2413, the one I'm citing, is a little bit southeast, but and it's closer to the tower we're looking at today. So I'm wondering, did you or did you not use that in constructing your coverage maps? THE WITNESS (Lavin): I believe that site backs to a mountain that doesn't have coverage into this area and wouldn't affect the overall new coverage to be provided by the proposed site. DR. BELL: So are you saying, actually, that Connecticut 1180, which is on this map, is is not obstructed to to this site? THE WITNESS (Lavin): 1180 down at this at the southern end of the 1180 is at the southern end of the DR. BELL: Of the map. The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	it's a lot farther away than 2413, and it's roughly in the same direction. So what I'm asking is, how come, then, 2413 is is THE WITNESS (Lavin): In terms of including it as on the neighbor map, I think that's that is an omission. But the coverage from it does not affect the area where the proposed site is. It doesn't cover that. DR. BELL: Okay. But the coverage from 1180 does affect it? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It is it is included. I don't know if it ends up making any difference, but it is included in here. Yes. Uh-huh. DR. BELL: Okay. I'm just I'm trying to get a sense of what is and what isn't included in these THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. DR. BELL: for the for us to see the coverage that's existing. THE WITNESS (Lavin): Uh-huh, yes.

12 (Pages 42 to 45)

	Page 46		Page 48
1	the statement that that you make that has	1	THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.
2	to do with other possible coverage	2	I I had not changed it. I I don't know
3	technologies. On page 11 of the application,	3	why it went from thousands to hundreds.
4	you have boilerplate which has appeared in	4	DR. BELL: Okay.
5	other documents. And you say, in paragraph 2	5	But you you for the
6	on the page, you say: "Closing the coverage	6	purposes of our understanding, I still don't
7	gaps and providing reliable wireless services	7	then, from your point of view, it should
8	in Eastern Salisbury requires a tower site	8	read several thousands of acres rather than
9	that can provide reliable service over a	9	hundreds.
10	footprint that spans blank."	10	THE WITNESS (Lavin): We can
11	Now, on other dockets that	11	see over 3,000 acres of incremental coverage,
12	we've seen, what appears there in that blank	12	so that would be several thousand.
13	is thousands of acres, several thousands of	13	DR. BELL: Okay.
14	acres. And I asked you about that one time.	14	Mr. Libertine, on the
15	THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.	15	monopine, in the simulations that you have in
16	DR. BELL: We had the New	16	the application, the monopine, I think it's
17	Milford docket and we had the Redding Ridge	17	fair to say could I characterize it it
18	docket that where, in that blank, it says	18	looks, sort of, cylindrical as opposed to a
19	several thousands of acres.	19	cone, more like a cone Christmas tree.
20	THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.	20	THE WITNESS (Libertine):
21	DR. BELL: Now, I note you	21	It it does in the photos where we had some
22	have changed to several hundred acres in this	22	visibility. It may be that it is intended to
23	docket, on page 11.	23	be conical, but it's built from the models of
24	THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.	24	trees that have been built before by the
25	DR. BELL: It says: "A	25	manufacturer, so it's fairly representative.
	Page 47		Page 49
1		1	
1 2	footprint that spans several hundred acres."	1 2	Page 49 I think, if you look at Photo 6, where you have a closer view, you
			I think, if you look at
2 3 4	footprint that spans several hundred acres." I'm wondering why such a large	2	I think, if you look at Photo 6, where you have a closer view, you tend to get a little bit more of the what I'll call "taper at the top", and more or
2 3 4 5	footprint that spans several hundred acres." I'm wondering why such a large change in the what is obviously boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It would	2 3 4 5	I think, if you look at Photo 6, where you have a closer view, you tend to get a little bit more of the what I'll call "taper at the top", and more or less the what I'll call the "the more
2 3 4 5 6	footprint that spans several hundred acres." I'm wondering why such a large change in the what is obviously boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It would be between a thousand, I think, and it	2 3 4 5 6	I think, if you look at Photo 6, where you have a closer view, you tend to get a little bit more of the what I'll call "taper at the top", and more or less the what I'll call the "the more traditional conical look."
2 3 4 5 6 7	footprint that spans several hundred acres." I'm wondering why such a large change in the what is obviously boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It would be between a thousand, I think, and it could still be several thousand. I don't	2 3 4 5 6 7	I think, if you look at Photo 6, where you have a closer view, you tend to get a little bit more of the what I'll call "taper at the top", and more or less the what I'll call the "the more traditional conical look." I think, as you start to get
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	footprint that spans several hundred acres." I'm wondering why such a large change in the what is obviously boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It would be between a thousand, I think, and it could still be several thousand. I don't know why the boilerplate was changed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I think, if you look at Photo 6, where you have a closer view, you tend to get a little bit more of the what I'll call "taper at the top", and more or less the what I'll call the "the more traditional conical look." I think, as you start to get away from it at distance, because it's not a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	footprint that spans several hundred acres." I'm wondering why such a large change in the what is obviously boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It would be between a thousand, I think, and it could still be several thousand. I don't know why the boilerplate was changed. There's 640 acres in a square mile, and we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I think, if you look at Photo 6, where you have a closer view, you tend to get a little bit more of the what I'll call "taper at the top", and more or less the what I'll call the "the more traditional conical look." I think, as you start to get away from it at distance, because it's not a Christmas-tree shape necessarily, it tends to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	footprint that spans several hundred acres." I'm wondering why such a large change in the what is obviously boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It would be between a thousand, I think, and it could still be several thousand. I don't know why the boilerplate was changed. There's 640 acres in a square mile, and we have 5.38 square miles of incremental	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I think, if you look at Photo 6, where you have a closer view, you tend to get a little bit more of the what I'll call "taper at the top", and more or less the what I'll call the "the more traditional conical look." I think, as you start to get away from it at distance, because it's not a Christmas-tree shape necessarily, it tends to look a little bit more uniform at distance,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	footprint that spans several hundred acres." I'm wondering why such a large change in the what is obviously boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It would be between a thousand, I think, and it could still be several thousand. I don't know why the boilerplate was changed. There's 640 acres in a square mile, and we have 5.38 square miles of incremental coverage, which would be about 3200 acres.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I think, if you look at Photo 6, where you have a closer view, you tend to get a little bit more of the what I'll call "taper at the top", and more or less the what I'll call the "the more traditional conical look." I think, as you start to get away from it at distance, because it's not a Christmas-tree shape necessarily, it tends to look a little bit more uniform at distance, especially when we're only looking at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	footprint that spans several hundred acres." I'm wondering why such a large change in the what is obviously boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It would be between a thousand, I think, and it could still be several thousand. I don't know why the boilerplate was changed. There's 640 acres in a square mile, and we have 5.38 square miles of incremental coverage, which would be about 3200 acres. So several several hundred	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I think, if you look at Photo 6, where you have a closer view, you tend to get a little bit more of the what I'll call "taper at the top", and more or less the what I'll call the "the more traditional conical look." I think, as you start to get away from it at distance, because it's not a Christmas-tree shape necessarily, it tends to look a little bit more uniform at distance, especially when we're only looking at the upper, you know, 20 or 30 feet of the the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	footprint that spans several hundred acres." I'm wondering why such a large change in the what is obviously boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It would be between a thousand, I think, and it could still be several thousand. I don't know why the boilerplate was changed. There's 640 acres in a square mile, and we have 5.38 square miles of incremental coverage, which would be about 3200 acres. So several several hundred would be an understatement compared to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I think, if you look at Photo 6, where you have a closer view, you tend to get a little bit more of the what I'll call "taper at the top", and more or less the what I'll call the "the more traditional conical look." I think, as you start to get away from it at distance, because it's not a Christmas-tree shape necessarily, it tends to look a little bit more uniform at distance, especially when we're only looking at the upper, you know, 20 or 30 feet of the the facility.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	footprint that spans several hundred acres." I'm wondering why such a large change in the what is obviously boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It would be between a thousand, I think, and it could still be several thousand. I don't know why the boilerplate was changed. There's 640 acres in a square mile, and we have 5.38 square miles of incremental coverage, which would be about 3200 acres. So several several hundred would be an understatement compared to several thousand of the incremental coverage.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I think, if you look at Photo 6, where you have a closer view, you tend to get a little bit more of the what I'll call "taper at the top", and more or less the what I'll call the "the more traditional conical look." I think, as you start to get away from it at distance, because it's not a Christmas-tree shape necessarily, it tends to look a little bit more uniform at distance, especially when we're only looking at the upper, you know, 20 or 30 feet of the the facility. So depending upon the view,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	footprint that spans several hundred acres." I'm wondering why such a large change in the what is obviously boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It would be between a thousand, I think, and it could still be several thousand. I don't know why the boilerplate was changed. There's 640 acres in a square mile, and we have 5.38 square miles of incremental coverage, which would be about 3200 acres. So several several hundred would be an understatement compared to several thousand of the incremental coverage. DR. BELL: So this is this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I think, if you look at Photo 6, where you have a closer view, you tend to get a little bit more of the what I'll call "taper at the top", and more or less the what I'll call the "the more traditional conical look." I think, as you start to get away from it at distance, because it's not a Christmas-tree shape necessarily, it tends to look a little bit more uniform at distance, especially when we're only looking at the upper, you know, 20 or 30 feet of the the facility. So depending upon the view, View 8 shows a good amount of the tree above
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	footprint that spans several hundred acres." I'm wondering why such a large change in the what is obviously boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It would be between a thousand, I think, and it could still be several thousand. I don't know why the boilerplate was changed. There's 640 acres in a square mile, and we have 5.38 square miles of incremental coverage, which would be about 3200 acres. So several several hundred would be an understatement compared to several thousand of the incremental coverage. DR. BELL: So this is this must be something that you put in. Is that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I think, if you look at Photo 6, where you have a closer view, you tend to get a little bit more of the what I'll call "taper at the top", and more or less the what I'll call the "the more traditional conical look." I think, as you start to get away from it at distance, because it's not a Christmas-tree shape necessarily, it tends to look a little bit more uniform at distance, especially when we're only looking at the upper, you know, 20 or 30 feet of the the facility. So depending upon the view, View 8 shows a good amount of the tree above the treeline from the property itself, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	footprint that spans several hundred acres." I'm wondering why such a large change in the what is obviously boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It would be between a thousand, I think, and it could still be several thousand. I don't know why the boilerplate was changed. There's 640 acres in a square mile, and we have 5.38 square miles of incremental coverage, which would be about 3200 acres. So several several hundred would be an understatement compared to several thousand of the incremental coverage. DR. BELL: So this is this must be something that you put in. Is that correct, this this boilerplate?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I think, if you look at Photo 6, where you have a closer view, you tend to get a little bit more of the what I'll call "taper at the top", and more or less the what I'll call the "the more traditional conical look." I think, as you start to get away from it at distance, because it's not a Christmas-tree shape necessarily, it tends to look a little bit more uniform at distance, especially when we're only looking at the upper, you know, 20 or 30 feet of the the facility. So depending upon the view, View 8 shows a good amount of the tree above the treeline from the property itself, and it it does taper. It is conical, but it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	footprint that spans several hundred acres." I'm wondering why such a large change in the what is obviously boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It would be between a thousand, I think, and it could still be several thousand. I don't know why the boilerplate was changed. There's 640 acres in a square mile, and we have 5.38 square miles of incremental coverage, which would be about 3200 acres. So several several hundred would be an understatement compared to several thousand of the incremental coverage. DR. BELL: So this is this must be something that you put in. Is that correct, this this boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): Not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I think, if you look at Photo 6, where you have a closer view, you tend to get a little bit more of the what I'll call "taper at the top", and more or less the what I'll call the "the more traditional conical look." I think, as you start to get away from it at distance, because it's not a Christmas-tree shape necessarily, it tends to look a little bit more uniform at distance, especially when we're only looking at the upper, you know, 20 or 30 feet of the the facility. So depending upon the view, View 8 shows a good amount of the tree above the treeline from the property itself, and it it does taper. It is conical, but it is it's not a traditional, I guess, what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	footprint that spans several hundred acres." I'm wondering why such a large change in the what is obviously boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It would be between a thousand, I think, and it could still be several thousand. I don't know why the boilerplate was changed. There's 640 acres in a square mile, and we have 5.38 square miles of incremental coverage, which would be about 3200 acres. So several several hundred would be an understatement compared to several thousand of the incremental coverage. DR. BELL: So this is this must be something that you put in. Is that correct, this this boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): Not myself personally. I don't put that in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I think, if you look at Photo 6, where you have a closer view, you tend to get a little bit more of the what I'll call "taper at the top", and more or less the what I'll call the "the more traditional conical look." I think, as you start to get away from it at distance, because it's not a Christmas-tree shape necessarily, it tends to look a little bit more uniform at distance, especially when we're only looking at the upper, you know, 20 or 30 feet of the the facility. So depending upon the view, View 8 shows a good amount of the tree above the treeline from the property itself, and it it does taper. It is conical, but it is it's not a traditional, I guess, what everyone considers to be, kind of, that, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	footprint that spans several hundred acres." I'm wondering why such a large change in the what is obviously boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It would be between a thousand, I think, and it could still be several thousand. I don't know why the boilerplate was changed. There's 640 acres in a square mile, and we have 5.38 square miles of incremental coverage, which would be about 3200 acres. So several several hundred would be an understatement compared to several thousand of the incremental coverage. DR. BELL: So this is this must be something that you put in. Is that correct, this this boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): Not myself personally. I don't put that in the application, no.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I think, if you look at Photo 6, where you have a closer view, you tend to get a little bit more of the what I'll call "taper at the top", and more or less the what I'll call the "the more traditional conical look." I think, as you start to get away from it at distance, because it's not a Christmas-tree shape necessarily, it tends to look a little bit more uniform at distance, especially when we're only looking at the upper, you know, 20 or 30 feet of the the facility. So depending upon the view, View 8 shows a good amount of the tree above the treeline from the property itself, and it it does taper. It is conical, but it is it's not a traditional, I guess, what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	footprint that spans several hundred acres." I'm wondering why such a large change in the what is obviously boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It would be between a thousand, I think, and it could still be several thousand. I don't know why the boilerplate was changed. There's 640 acres in a square mile, and we have 5.38 square miles of incremental coverage, which would be about 3200 acres. So several several hundred would be an understatement compared to several thousand of the incremental coverage. DR. BELL: So this is this must be something that you put in. Is that correct, this this boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): Not myself personally. I don't put that in the application, no. DR. BELL: But that's an RF	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I think, if you look at Photo 6, where you have a closer view, you tend to get a little bit more of the what I'll call "taper at the top", and more or less the what I'll call the "the more traditional conical look." I think, as you start to get away from it at distance, because it's not a Christmas-tree shape necessarily, it tends to look a little bit more uniform at distance, especially when we're only looking at the upper, you know, 20 or 30 feet of the the facility. So depending upon the view, View 8 shows a good amount of the tree above the treeline from the property itself, and it it does taper. It is conical, but it is it's not a traditional, I guess, what everyone considers to be, kind of, that, you know, Christmas-tree triangular shape.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	footprint that spans several hundred acres." I'm wondering why such a large change in the what is obviously boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It would be between a thousand, I think, and it could still be several thousand. I don't know why the boilerplate was changed. There's 640 acres in a square mile, and we have 5.38 square miles of incremental coverage, which would be about 3200 acres. So several several hundred would be an understatement compared to several thousand of the incremental coverage. DR. BELL: So this is this must be something that you put in. Is that correct, this this boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): Not myself personally. I don't put that in the application, no. DR. BELL: But that's an RF statement. Correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I think, if you look at Photo 6, where you have a closer view, you tend to get a little bit more of the what I'll call "taper at the top", and more or less the what I'll call the "the more traditional conical look." I think, as you start to get away from it at distance, because it's not a Christmas-tree shape necessarily, it tends to look a little bit more uniform at distance, especially when we're only looking at the upper, you know, 20 or 30 feet of the the facility. So depending upon the view, View 8 shows a good amount of the tree above the treeline from the property itself, and it it does taper. It is conical, but it is it's not a traditional, I guess, what everyone considers to be, kind of, that, you know, Christmas-tree triangular shape. So but these are these are based on trees that have been constructed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	footprint that spans several hundred acres." I'm wondering why such a large change in the what is obviously boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It would be between a thousand, I think, and it could still be several thousand. I don't know why the boilerplate was changed. There's 640 acres in a square mile, and we have 5.38 square miles of incremental coverage, which would be about 3200 acres. So several several hundred would be an understatement compared to several thousand of the incremental coverage. DR. BELL: So this is this must be something that you put in. Is that correct, this this boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): Not myself personally. I don't put that in the application, no. DR. BELL: But that's an RF	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I think, if you look at Photo 6, where you have a closer view, you tend to get a little bit more of the what I'll call "taper at the top", and more or less the what I'll call the "the more traditional conical look." I think, as you start to get away from it at distance, because it's not a Christmas-tree shape necessarily, it tends to look a little bit more uniform at distance, especially when we're only looking at the upper, you know, 20 or 30 feet of the the facility. So depending upon the view, View 8 shows a good amount of the tree above the treeline from the property itself, and it it does taper. It is conical, but it is it's not a traditional, I guess, what everyone considers to be, kind of, that, you know, Christmas-tree triangular shape. So but these are these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	footprint that spans several hundred acres." I'm wondering why such a large change in the what is obviously boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): It would be between a thousand, I think, and it could still be several thousand. I don't know why the boilerplate was changed. There's 640 acres in a square mile, and we have 5.38 square miles of incremental coverage, which would be about 3200 acres. So several several hundred would be an understatement compared to several thousand of the incremental coverage. DR. BELL: So this is this must be something that you put in. Is that correct, this this boilerplate? THE WITNESS (Lavin): Not myself personally. I don't put that in the application, no. DR. BELL: But that's an RF statement. Correct? THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I think, if you look at Photo 6, where you have a closer view, you tend to get a little bit more of the what I'll call "taper at the top", and more or less the what I'll call the "the more traditional conical look." I think, as you start to get away from it at distance, because it's not a Christmas-tree shape necessarily, it tends to look a little bit more uniform at distance, especially when we're only looking at the upper, you know, 20 or 30 feet of the the facility. So depending upon the view, View 8 shows a good amount of the tree above the treeline from the property itself, and it it does taper. It is conical, but it is it's not a traditional, I guess, what everyone considers to be, kind of, that, you know, Christmas-tree triangular shape. So but these are these are based on trees that have been constructed as opposed to something that's in a design

13 (Pages 46 to 49)

11	Page 50		Page 52
1		1	
1 2	the drawing that I would cite as being the	1 2	3D models of if you remember some of the I don't know. Well, it's been a while
3	other kind, the more conical kind, is on SP2 behind Tab 4, which I think that's fair to	3	since there's been a monopine, I guess. But
4	say that's more of what I would call the	4	in in some of the I'm trying to think
5	conical Christmas-tree shape. Would that be	5	which site it was. I know the Council had
6	correct, Mr. Chasse?	6	asked for the actual manufacturer's drawing.
7	THE WITNESS (Chasse): That is	7	It actually breaks out each piece, almost
8	correct. That is drawn with more of a cone	8	like a Tinkertoy, so you can see each of
9	shape, as you've indicated.	9	those pieces come together. That's what we
10	Typically, at the top of a	10	based it on, those type of shop drawings. So
11	monopine, the receptors, which are the	11	that it's it's much more realistic to what
12	cavities that the branches actually stick	12	can be built in the field.
13	into, they they range from six to	13	DR. BELL: I think, wouldn't
14	eight feet. And then, as you further go down	14	you wouldn't you agree that the towers
15	the tower, you're going to start getting into	15	that we've actually that several of the
16	some tens and twelves. You really don't go	16	towers that we've seen, like the Winchester
17	too, too much. So if you get two 12s on both	17	Tower, and so forth, are more like your
18	sides, you've a 24-inch span that's going	18	illustrations
19	across. So, structurally, you've got	19	THE WITNESS (Libertine): And
20	limitations as to you can't start at the	20	again
21	top with the 24-foot span and come down. So	21	DR. BELL: more cylindrical
22	the relativeness of going from 6 to 12 when	22	than like this picture in SP2?
23	you're this high above the tree line may look	23	THE WITNESS (Libertine):
24	as though it's cylindrical but, in actuality,	24	Absolutely. And, again, it goes back to what
25	it is going 6s, feathering to 8s, to going to	25	Mr. Chasse was saying. That in the in the
	Page 51		Page 53
			5
1	10s, to going to 12s. It's just that the	1	
1 2	10s, to going to 12s. It's just that the differential between the 6 and the 12 over	1 2	actual field or in the conditions, you have those limitations from a structural
2	10s, to going to 12s. It's just that the differential between the 6 and the 12 over the 60 feet that's shown above the treeline		actual field or in the conditions, you have
	differential between the 6 and the 12 over	2	actual field or in the conditions, you have those limitations from a structural
2 3 4 5	differential between the 6 and the 12 over the 60 feet that's shown above the treeline	2 3	actual field or in the conditions, you have those limitations from a structural standpoint, and that that's how they
2 3 4 5 6	differential between the 6 and the 12 over the 60 feet that's shown above the treeline isn't as obvious as it is to hear the number. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And the other thing that probably is this	2 3 4 5 6	actual field or in the conditions, you have those limitations from a structural standpoint, and that that's how they they more or less end up just because they they do the job of actually doing the concealment. And, to a great degree, you
2 3 4 5 6 7	differential between the 6 and the 12 over the 60 feet that's shown above the treeline isn't as obvious as it is to hear the number. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And the other thing that probably is this always seems to create some confusion, at	2 3 4 5 6 7	actual field or in the conditions, you have those limitations from a structural standpoint, and that that's how they they more or less end up just because they they do the job of actually doing the concealment. And, to a great degree, you know, ever since we started doing this, I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	differential between the 6 and the 12 over the 60 feet that's shown above the treeline isn't as obvious as it is to hear the number. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And the other thing that probably is this always seems to create some confusion, at least for me, is that the site plans that are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	actual field or in the conditions, you have those limitations from a structural standpoint, and that that's how they they more or less end up just because they they do the job of actually doing the concealment. And, to a great degree, you know, ever since we started doing this, I take a great interest in looking at natural
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	differential between the 6 and the 12 over the 60 feet that's shown above the treeline isn't as obvious as it is to hear the number. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And the other thing that probably is this always seems to create some confusion, at least for me, is that the site plans that are developed, at this point, from a siting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	actual field or in the conditions, you have those limitations from a structural standpoint, and that that's how they they more or less end up just because they they do the job of actually doing the concealment. And, to a great degree, you know, ever since we started doing this, I take a great interest in looking at natural pines in environments because you get some
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	differential between the 6 and the 12 over the 60 feet that's shown above the treeline isn't as obvious as it is to hear the number. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And the other thing that probably is this always seems to create some confusion, at least for me, is that the site plans that are developed, at this point, from a siting standpoint, where we're depicting the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	actual field or in the conditions, you have those limitations from a structural standpoint, and that that's how they they more or less end up just because they they do the job of actually doing the concealment. And, to a great degree, you know, ever since we started doing this, I take a great interest in looking at natural pines in environments because you get some you get some fir trees that are, you know,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	differential between the 6 and the 12 over the 60 feet that's shown above the treeline isn't as obvious as it is to hear the number. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And the other thing that probably is this always seems to create some confusion, at least for me, is that the site plans that are developed, at this point, from a siting standpoint, where we're depicting the monopine is really just that. And that it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	actual field or in the conditions, you have those limitations from a structural standpoint, and that that's how they they more or less end up just because they they do the job of actually doing the concealment. And, to a great degree, you know, ever since we started doing this, I take a great interest in looking at natural pines in environments because you get some you get some fir trees that are, you know, your classic beautiful Christmas trees where
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	differential between the 6 and the 12 over the 60 feet that's shown above the treeline isn't as obvious as it is to hear the number. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And the other thing that probably is this always seems to create some confusion, at least for me, is that the site plans that are developed, at this point, from a siting standpoint, where we're depicting the monopine is really just that. And that it's a it's a I won't say it's a cartoon,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	actual field or in the conditions, you have those limitations from a structural standpoint, and that that's how they they more or less end up just because they they do the job of actually doing the concealment. And, to a great degree, you know, ever since we started doing this, I take a great interest in looking at natural pines in environments because you get some you get some fir trees that are, you know, your classic beautiful Christmas trees where they're out in an open area. But when you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	differential between the 6 and the 12 over the 60 feet that's shown above the treeline isn't as obvious as it is to hear the number. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And the other thing that probably is this always seems to create some confusion, at least for me, is that the site plans that are developed, at this point, from a siting standpoint, where we're depicting the monopine is really just that. And that it's a it's a I won't say it's a cartoon, but it's more of a schematic as opposed to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	actual field or in the conditions, you have those limitations from a structural standpoint, and that that's how they they more or less end up just because they they do the job of actually doing the concealment. And, to a great degree, you know, ever since we started doing this, I take a great interest in looking at natural pines in environments because you get some you get some fir trees that are, you know, your classic beautiful Christmas trees where they're out in an open area. But when you get into an area like we're talking, where
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	differential between the 6 and the 12 over the 60 feet that's shown above the treeline isn't as obvious as it is to hear the number. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And the other thing that probably is this always seems to create some confusion, at least for me, is that the site plans that are developed, at this point, from a siting standpoint, where we're depicting the monopine is really just that. And that it's a it's a I won't say it's a cartoon, but it's more of a schematic as opposed to really trying to represent the look of of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	actual field or in the conditions, you have those limitations from a structural standpoint, and that that's how they they more or less end up just because they they do the job of actually doing the concealment. And, to a great degree, you know, ever since we started doing this, I take a great interest in looking at natural pines in environments because you get some you get some fir trees that are, you know, your classic beautiful Christmas trees where they're out in an open area. But when you get into an area like we're talking, where you have woods, they do tend to grow in a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	differential between the 6 and the 12 over the 60 feet that's shown above the treeline isn't as obvious as it is to hear the number. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And the other thing that probably is this always seems to create some confusion, at least for me, is that the site plans that are developed, at this point, from a siting standpoint, where we're depicting the monopine is really just that. And that it's a it's a I won't say it's a cartoon, but it's more of a schematic as opposed to really trying to represent the look of of the tree itself. So that that may be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	actual field or in the conditions, you have those limitations from a structural standpoint, and that that's how they they more or less end up just because they they do the job of actually doing the concealment. And, to a great degree, you know, ever since we started doing this, I take a great interest in looking at natural pines in environments because you get some you get some fir trees that are, you know, your classic beautiful Christmas trees where they're out in an open area. But when you get into an area like we're talking, where you have woods, they do tend to grow in a much more conical shape.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	differential between the 6 and the 12 over the 60 feet that's shown above the treeline isn't as obvious as it is to hear the number. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And the other thing that probably is this always seems to create some confusion, at least for me, is that the site plans that are developed, at this point, from a siting standpoint, where we're depicting the monopine is really just that. And that it's a it's a I won't say it's a cartoon, but it's more of a schematic as opposed to really trying to represent the look of of the tree itself. So that that may be another reason why it looks a little bit	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	actual field or in the conditions, you have those limitations from a structural standpoint, and that that's how they they more or less end up just because they they do the job of actually doing the concealment. And, to a great degree, you know, ever since we started doing this, I take a great interest in looking at natural pines in environments because you get some you get some fir trees that are, you know, your classic beautiful Christmas trees where they're out in an open area. But when you get into an area like we're talking, where you have woods, they do tend to grow in a much more conical shape. So they they actually do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	differential between the 6 and the 12 over the 60 feet that's shown above the treeline isn't as obvious as it is to hear the number. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And the other thing that probably is this always seems to create some confusion, at least for me, is that the site plans that are developed, at this point, from a siting standpoint, where we're depicting the monopine is really just that. And that it's a it's a I won't say it's a cartoon, but it's more of a schematic as opposed to really trying to represent the look of of the tree itself. So that that may be another reason why it looks a little bit inconsistent between those two, the photos	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	actual field or in the conditions, you have those limitations from a structural standpoint, and that that's how they they more or less end up just because they they do the job of actually doing the concealment. And, to a great degree, you know, ever since we started doing this, I take a great interest in looking at natural pines in environments because you get some you get some fir trees that are, you know, your classic beautiful Christmas trees where they're out in an open area. But when you get into an area like we're talking, where you have woods, they do tend to grow in a much more conical shape. So they they actually do look more like a what I'll call a natural
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	differential between the 6 and the 12 over the 60 feet that's shown above the treeline isn't as obvious as it is to hear the number. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And the other thing that probably is this always seems to create some confusion, at least for me, is that the site plans that are developed, at this point, from a siting standpoint, where we're depicting the monopine is really just that. And that it's a it's a I won't say it's a cartoon, but it's more of a schematic as opposed to really trying to represent the look of of the tree itself. So that that may be another reason why it looks a little bit inconsistent between those two, the photos and the site plan itself.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	actual field or in the conditions, you have those limitations from a structural standpoint, and that that's how they they more or less end up just because they they do the job of actually doing the concealment. And, to a great degree, you know, ever since we started doing this, I take a great interest in looking at natural pines in environments because you get some you get some fir trees that are, you know, your classic beautiful Christmas trees where they're out in an open area. But when you get into an area like we're talking, where you have woods, they do tend to grow in a much more conical shape. So they they actually do look more like a what I'll call a natural pine in its setting, but I think we all, kind
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	differential between the 6 and the 12 over the 60 feet that's shown above the treeline isn't as obvious as it is to hear the number. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And the other thing that probably is this always seems to create some confusion, at least for me, is that the site plans that are developed, at this point, from a siting standpoint, where we're depicting the monopine is really just that. And that it's a it's a I won't say it's a cartoon, but it's more of a schematic as opposed to really trying to represent the look of of the tree itself. So that that may be another reason why it looks a little bit inconsistent between those two, the photos and the site plan itself. DR. BELL: Well, I guess my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	actual field or in the conditions, you have those limitations from a structural standpoint, and that that's how they they more or less end up just because they they do the job of actually doing the concealment. And, to a great degree, you know, ever since we started doing this, I take a great interest in looking at natural pines in environments because you get some you get some fir trees that are, you know, your classic beautiful Christmas trees where they're out in an open area. But when you get into an area like we're talking, where you have woods, they do tend to grow in a much more conical shape. So they they actually do look more like a what I'll call a natural pine in its setting, but I think we all, kind of, in our mind, think, oh, you know you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	differential between the 6 and the 12 over the 60 feet that's shown above the treeline isn't as obvious as it is to hear the number. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And the other thing that probably is this always seems to create some confusion, at least for me, is that the site plans that are developed, at this point, from a siting standpoint, where we're depicting the monopine is really just that. And that it's a it's a I won't say it's a cartoon, but it's more of a schematic as opposed to really trying to represent the look of of the tree itself. So that that may be another reason why it looks a little bit inconsistent between those two, the photos and the site plan itself. DR. BELL: Well, I guess my comment as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	actual field or in the conditions, you have those limitations from a structural standpoint, and that that's how they they more or less end up just because they they do the job of actually doing the concealment. And, to a great degree, you know, ever since we started doing this, I take a great interest in looking at natural pines in environments because you get some you get some fir trees that are, you know, your classic beautiful Christmas trees where they're out in an open area. But when you get into an area like we're talking, where you have woods, they do tend to grow in a much more conical shape. So they they actually do look more like a what I'll call a natural pine in its setting, but I think we all, kind of, in our mind, think, oh, you know you know, beautiful, symmetrical trees. And that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	differential between the 6 and the 12 over the 60 feet that's shown above the treeline isn't as obvious as it is to hear the number. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And the other thing that probably is this always seems to create some confusion, at least for me, is that the site plans that are developed, at this point, from a siting standpoint, where we're depicting the monopine is really just that. And that it's a it's a I won't say it's a cartoon, but it's more of a schematic as opposed to really trying to represent the look of of the tree itself. So that that may be another reason why it looks a little bit inconsistent between those two, the photos and the site plan itself. DR. BELL: Well, I guess my comment as THE WITNESS (Libertine):	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	actual field or in the conditions, you have those limitations from a structural standpoint, and that that's how they they more or less end up just because they they do the job of actually doing the concealment. And, to a great degree, you know, ever since we started doing this, I take a great interest in looking at natural pines in environments because you get some you get some fir trees that are, you know, your classic beautiful Christmas trees where they're out in an open area. But when you get into an area like we're talking, where you have woods, they do tend to grow in a much more conical shape. So they they actually do look more like a what I'll call a natural pine in its setting, but I think we all, kind of, in our mind, think, oh, you know you know, beautiful, symmetrical trees. And that it's it's almost impossible.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	differential between the 6 and the 12 over the 60 feet that's shown above the treeline isn't as obvious as it is to hear the number. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And the other thing that probably is this always seems to create some confusion, at least for me, is that the site plans that are developed, at this point, from a siting standpoint, where we're depicting the monopine is really just that. And that it's a it's a I won't say it's a cartoon, but it's more of a schematic as opposed to really trying to represent the look of of the tree itself. So that that may be another reason why it looks a little bit inconsistent between those two, the photos and the site plan itself. DR. BELL: Well, I guess my comment as THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah. That was a good point. Thank you,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	actual field or in the conditions, you have those limitations from a structural standpoint, and that that's how they they more or less end up just because they they do the job of actually doing the concealment. And, to a great degree, you know, ever since we started doing this, I take a great interest in looking at natural pines in environments because you get some you get some fir trees that are, you know, your classic beautiful Christmas trees where they're out in an open area. But when you get into an area like we're talking, where you have woods, they do tend to grow in a much more conical shape. So they they actually do look more like a what I'll call a natural pine in its setting, but I think we all, kind of, in our mind, think, oh, you know you know, beautiful, symmetrical trees. And that it's it's almost impossible. And a matter of fact, we've
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	differential between the 6 and the 12 over the 60 feet that's shown above the treeline isn't as obvious as it is to hear the number. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And the other thing that probably is this always seems to create some confusion, at least for me, is that the site plans that are developed, at this point, from a siting standpoint, where we're depicting the monopine is really just that. And that it's a it's a I won't say it's a cartoon, but it's more of a schematic as opposed to really trying to represent the look of of the tree itself. So that that may be another reason why it looks a little bit inconsistent between those two, the photos and the site plan itself. DR. BELL: Well, I guess my comment as THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah. That was a good point. Thank you, Mr. Gustafson.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	actual field or in the conditions, you have those limitations from a structural standpoint, and that that's how they they more or less end up just because they they do the job of actually doing the concealment. And, to a great degree, you know, ever since we started doing this, I take a great interest in looking at natural pines in environments because you get some you get some fir trees that are, you know, your classic beautiful Christmas trees where they're out in an open area. But when you get into an area like we're talking, where you have woods, they do tend to grow in a much more conical shape. So they they actually do look more like a what I'll call a natural pine in its setting, but I think we all, kind of, in our mind, think, oh, you know you know, beautiful, symmetrical trees. And that it's it's almost impossible. And a matter of fact, we've had a lot of tree applications in other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	differential between the 6 and the 12 over the 60 feet that's shown above the treeline isn't as obvious as it is to hear the number. THE WITNESS (Libertine): And the other thing that probably is this always seems to create some confusion, at least for me, is that the site plans that are developed, at this point, from a siting standpoint, where we're depicting the monopine is really just that. And that it's a it's a I won't say it's a cartoon, but it's more of a schematic as opposed to really trying to represent the look of of the tree itself. So that that may be another reason why it looks a little bit inconsistent between those two, the photos and the site plan itself. DR. BELL: Well, I guess my comment as THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah. That was a good point. Thank you,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	actual field or in the conditions, you have those limitations from a structural standpoint, and that that's how they they more or less end up just because they they do the job of actually doing the concealment. And, to a great degree, you know, ever since we started doing this, I take a great interest in looking at natural pines in environments because you get some you get some fir trees that are, you know, your classic beautiful Christmas trees where they're out in an open area. But when you get into an area like we're talking, where you have woods, they do tend to grow in a much more conical shape. So they they actually do look more like a what I'll call a natural pine in its setting, but I think we all, kind of, in our mind, think, oh, you know you know, beautiful, symmetrical trees. And that it's it's almost impossible. And a matter of fact, we've

14 (Pages 50 to 53)

UNITED REPORTERS, INC.

	Page 54		Page 56
1	branching so it looks like it's been	1	case, there aren't any, but we would be
2	windblown and weathered over time.	2	showing National Register properties and
3	So it's I go back to that,	3	districts or landmarks or any any other
4	you know, classic, you know, beauty is in the	4	nationally significant and listed sites.
4 5	eye of the beholder. But in terms of trying	5	The SHPO has asked us to
6	to portray it for you folk, we want to be	6	actually break these out for their review.
7	able to show you something we can actually	7	They like to know what's on what's been
8	build versus something that may be pleasing	8	documented on a resource inventory at the
9	to the eye in a photograph, but really, in	9	state level, so that when they go and do
10	the real world, we can't go out there and	10	their review, it helps them understand, well,
11	actually replicate it.	11	is this really significant from their
12	DR. BELL: Okay. Thank you.	12	perspective, does it have the eligibility
13	I just have one other, sort of, a	13	criteria that would raise it to a certain
14	housekeeping question.	14	level for them to either, perhaps, come back
15	Behind Tab 10, which has to do	15	and say, you know, we need to be thinking
16	with the historic or cultural resources, we	16	about mitigation or this could be an adverse
17	see this circle which has to do with the area	17	effect, that type of thing?
18	of impact. But we have two terms on the	18	So that's it's basically
19	legend that I just wanted to know what they	19	the same exact graphic just showing two
20	mean.	20	different elements. We try sometimes
21	THE WITNESS (Libertine): Sure.	21	we'll do it on one map. In this area, we
22	DR. BELL: Connecticut Trust	22	probably should have done it on one map. But
23	Barns HRI 2012 Salisbury HRI 2003. My	23	sometimes it gets very busy because you'll
24	question is what does the HRI mean?	24	you'll see some locations where you have
25	THE WITNESS (Libertine):	25	individual resource inventory sites up at the
_			
	Page 55		
	rage 55		Page 57
1		1	
1 2	Sure. Let me let me explain. These	1 2	Page 57 state level that go up and down an entire road, and that creates a potential local
			state level that go up and down an entire
2	Sure. Let me let me explain. These there are actually two different graphics for	2	state level that go up and down an entire road, and that creates a potential local historic district. So the graphic can just get very busy, so that's the reason why we
2 3 4 5	Sure. Let me let me explain. These there are actually two different graphics for historic resources. To answer your question,	2 3	state level that go up and down an entire road, and that creates a potential local historic district. So the graphic can just
2 3 4 5 6	Sure. Let me let me explain. These there are actually two different graphics for historic resources. To answer your question, the HRI is actually Historic Resource	2 3 4	state level that go up and down an entire road, and that creates a potential local historic district. So the graphic can just get very busy, so that's the reason why we break it out on to two. But you probably heard more than you wanted to hear.
2 3 4 5 6 7	Sure. Let me let me explain. These there are actually two different graphics for historic resources. To answer your question, the HRI is actually Historic Resource Inventory. The State of Connecticut, over the years, has inventoried, through consultants, either individual sites or	2 3 4 5 6 7	state level that go up and down an entire road, and that creates a potential local historic district. So the graphic can just get very busy, so that's the reason why we break it out on to two. But you probably heard more than you wanted to hear. But the HRI is really a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Sure. Let me let me explain. These there are actually two different graphics for historic resources. To answer your question, the HRI is actually Historic Resource Inventory. The State of Connecticut, over the years, has inventoried, through consultants, either individual sites or potential districts that are eligible for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	state level that go up and down an entire road, and that creates a potential local historic district. So the graphic can just get very busy, so that's the reason why we break it out on to two. But you probably heard more than you wanted to hear. But the HRI is really a state-level inventory, that that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Sure. Let me let me explain. These there are actually two different graphics for historic resources. To answer your question, the HRI is actually Historic Resource Inventory. The State of Connecticut, over the years, has inventoried, through consultants, either individual sites or potential districts that are eligible for listing on the National Register.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	state level that go up and down an entire road, and that creates a potential local historic district. So the graphic can just get very busy, so that's the reason why we break it out on to two. But you probably heard more than you wanted to hear. But the HRI is really a state-level inventory, that that's really just shows that there is a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Sure. Let me let me explain. These there are actually two different graphics for historic resources. To answer your question, the HRI is actually Historic Resource Inventory. The State of Connecticut, over the years, has inventoried, through consultants, either individual sites or potential districts that are eligible for listing on the National Register. And, again, local, when you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	state level that go up and down an entire road, and that creates a potential local historic district. So the graphic can just get very busy, so that's the reason why we break it out on to two. But you probably heard more than you wanted to hear. But the HRI is really a state-level inventory, that that's really just shows that there is a potential eligibility listing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Sure. Let me let me explain. These there are actually two different graphics for historic resources. To answer your question, the HRI is actually Historic Resource Inventory. The State of Connecticut, over the years, has inventoried, through consultants, either individual sites or potential districts that are eligible for listing on the National Register. And, again, local, when you hear about a local historic district, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	state level that go up and down an entire road, and that creates a potential local historic district. So the graphic can just get very busy, so that's the reason why we break it out on to two. But you probably heard more than you wanted to hear. But the HRI is really a state-level inventory, that that's really just shows that there is a potential eligibility listing. DR. BELL: Was was that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Sure. Let me let me explain. These there are actually two different graphics for historic resources. To answer your question, the HRI is actually Historic Resource Inventory. The State of Connecticut, over the years, has inventoried, through consultants, either individual sites or potential districts that are eligible for listing on the National Register. And, again, local, when you hear about a local historic district, that doesn't necessarily mean that's it's on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	state level that go up and down an entire road, and that creates a potential local historic district. So the graphic can just get very busy, so that's the reason why we break it out on to two. But you probably heard more than you wanted to hear. But the HRI is really a state-level inventory, that that's really just shows that there is a potential eligibility listing. DR. BELL: Was was that what gave somebody, either you or SHPO, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Sure. Let me let me explain. These there are actually two different graphics for historic resources. To answer your question, the HRI is actually Historic Resource Inventory. The State of Connecticut, over the years, has inventoried, through consultants, either individual sites or potential districts that are eligible for listing on the National Register. And, again, local, when you hear about a local historic district, that doesn't necessarily mean that's it's on the National Register. It can be, but it's a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	state level that go up and down an entire road, and that creates a potential local historic district. So the graphic can just get very busy, so that's the reason why we break it out on to two. But you probably heard more than you wanted to hear. But the HRI is really a state-level inventory, that that's really just shows that there is a potential eligibility listing. DR. BELL: Was was that what gave somebody, either you or SHPO, the clue to do the digging that resulted in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Sure. Let me let me explain. These there are actually two different graphics for historic resources. To answer your question, the HRI is actually Historic Resource Inventory. The State of Connecticut, over the years, has inventoried, through consultants, either individual sites or potential districts that are eligible for listing on the National Register. And, again, local, when you hear about a local historic district, that doesn't necessarily mean that's it's on the National Register. It can be, but it's a separate listing. And it doesn't hold the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	state level that go up and down an entire road, and that creates a potential local historic district. So the graphic can just get very busy, so that's the reason why we break it out on to two. But you probably heard more than you wanted to hear. But the HRI is really a state-level inventory, that that's really just shows that there is a potential eligibility listing. DR. BELL: Was was that what gave somebody, either you or SHPO, the clue to do the digging that resulted in revising the site?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Sure. Let me let me explain. These there are actually two different graphics for historic resources. To answer your question, the HRI is actually Historic Resource Inventory. The State of Connecticut, over the years, has inventoried, through consultants, either individual sites or potential districts that are eligible for listing on the National Register. And, again, local, when you hear about a local historic district, that doesn't necessarily mean that's it's on the National Register. It can be, but it's a separate listing. And it doesn't hold the same regulatory significance that a National	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	state level that go up and down an entire road, and that creates a potential local historic district. So the graphic can just get very busy, so that's the reason why we break it out on to two. But you probably heard more than you wanted to hear. But the HRI is really a state-level inventory, that that's really just shows that there is a potential eligibility listing. DR. BELL: Was was that what gave somebody, either you or SHPO, the clue to do the digging that resulted in revising the site? THE WITNESS (Libertine): No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Sure. Let me let me explain. These there are actually two different graphics for historic resources. To answer your question, the HRI is actually Historic Resource Inventory. The State of Connecticut, over the years, has inventoried, through consultants, either individual sites or potential districts that are eligible for listing on the National Register. And, again, local, when you hear about a local historic district, that doesn't necessarily mean that's it's on the National Register. It can be, but it's a separate listing. And it doesn't hold the same regulatory significance that a National Register site does, but it obviously shows	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	state level that go up and down an entire road, and that creates a potential local historic district. So the graphic can just get very busy, so that's the reason why we break it out on to two. But you probably heard more than you wanted to hear. But the HRI is really a state-level inventory, that that's really just shows that there is a potential eligibility listing. DR. BELL: Was was that what gave somebody, either you or SHPO, the clue to do the digging that resulted in revising the site? THE WITNESS (Libertine): No. Actually, the the process of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Sure. Let me let me explain. These there are actually two different graphics for historic resources. To answer your question, the HRI is actually Historic Resource Inventory. The State of Connecticut, over the years, has inventoried, through consultants, either individual sites or potential districts that are eligible for listing on the National Register. And, again, local, when you hear about a local historic district, that doesn't necessarily mean that's it's on the National Register. It can be, but it's a separate listing. And it doesn't hold the same regulatory significance that a National Register site does, but it obviously shows that it's eligible.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	state level that go up and down an entire road, and that creates a potential local historic district. So the graphic can just get very busy, so that's the reason why we break it out on to two. But you probably heard more than you wanted to hear. But the HRI is really a state-level inventory, that that's really just shows that there is a potential eligibility listing. DR. BELL: Was was that what gave somebody, either you or SHPO, the clue to do the digging that resulted in revising the site? THE WITNESS (Libertine): No. Actually, the the process of the archaeological cultural resource inventory
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Sure. Let me let me explain. These there are actually two different graphics for historic resources. To answer your question, the HRI is actually Historic Resource Inventory. The State of Connecticut, over the years, has inventoried, through consultants, either individual sites or potential districts that are eligible for listing on the National Register. And, again, local, when you hear about a local historic district, that doesn't necessarily mean that's it's on the National Register. It can be, but it's a separate listing. And it doesn't hold the same regulatory significance that a National Register site does, but it obviously shows that it's eligible. So on that first graphic, you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	state level that go up and down an entire road, and that creates a potential local historic district. So the graphic can just get very busy, so that's the reason why we break it out on to two. But you probably heard more than you wanted to hear. But the HRI is really a state-level inventory, that that's really just shows that there is a potential eligibility listing. DR. BELL: Was was that what gave somebody, either you or SHPO, the clue to do the digging that resulted in revising the site? THE WITNESS (Libertine): No. Actually, the the process of the archaeological cultural resource inventory has evolved, and it's something, actually, we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Sure. Let me let me explain. These there are actually two different graphics for historic resources. To answer your question, the HRI is actually Historic Resource Inventory. The State of Connecticut, over the years, has inventoried, through consultants, either individual sites or potential districts that are eligible for listing on the National Register. And, again, local, when you hear about a local historic district, that doesn't necessarily mean that's it's on the National Register. It can be, but it's a separate listing. And it doesn't hold the same regulatory significance that a National Register site does, but it obviously shows that it's eligible. So on that first graphic, you are looking at what we we break it out,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	state level that go up and down an entire road, and that creates a potential local historic district. So the graphic can just get very busy, so that's the reason why we break it out on to two. But you probably heard more than you wanted to hear. But the HRI is really a state-level inventory, that that's really just shows that there is a potential eligibility listing. DR. BELL: Was was that what gave somebody, either you or SHPO, the clue to do the digging that resulted in revising the site? THE WITNESS (Libertine): No. Actually, the the process of the archaeological cultural resource inventory has evolved, and it's something, actually, we do that a lot of other consultants don't.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Sure. Let me let me explain. These there are actually two different graphics for historic resources. To answer your question, the HRI is actually Historic Resource Inventory. The State of Connecticut, over the years, has inventoried, through consultants, either individual sites or potential districts that are eligible for listing on the National Register. And, again, local, when you hear about a local historic district, that doesn't necessarily mean that's it's on the National Register. It can be, but it's a separate listing. And it doesn't hold the same regulatory significance that a National Register site does, but it obviously shows that it's eligible. So on that first graphic, you are looking at what we we break it out, and we do this for the NEPA compliance	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	state level that go up and down an entire road, and that creates a potential local historic district. So the graphic can just get very busy, so that's the reason why we break it out on to two. But you probably heard more than you wanted to hear. But the HRI is really a state-level inventory, that that's really just shows that there is a potential eligibility listing. DR. BELL: Was was that what gave somebody, either you or SHPO, the clue to do the digging that resulted in revising the site? THE WITNESS (Libertine): No. Actually, the the process of the archaeological cultural resource inventory has evolved, and it's something, actually, we do that a lot of other consultants don't. What happens is, a lot of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Sure. Let me let me explain. These there are actually two different graphics for historic resources. To answer your question, the HRI is actually Historic Resource Inventory. The State of Connecticut, over the years, has inventoried, through consultants, either individual sites or potential districts that are eligible for listing on the National Register. And, again, local, when you hear about a local historic district, that doesn't necessarily mean that's it's on the National Register. It can be, but it's a separate listing. And it doesn't hold the same regulatory significance that a National Register site does, but it obviously shows that it's eligible. So on that first graphic, you are looking at what we we break it out, and we do this for the NEPA compliance process, and it helps the SHPO because they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	state level that go up and down an entire road, and that creates a potential local historic district. So the graphic can just get very busy, so that's the reason why we break it out on to two. But you probably heard more than you wanted to hear. But the HRI is really a state-level inventory, that that's really just shows that there is a potential eligibility listing. DR. BELL: Was was that what gave somebody, either you or SHPO, the clue to do the digging that resulted in revising the site? THE WITNESS (Libertine): No. Actually, the the process of the archaeological cultural resource inventory has evolved, and it's something, actually, we do that a lot of other consultants don't. What happens is, a lot of times, because of the process of the NEPA
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Sure. Let me let me explain. These there are actually two different graphics for historic resources. To answer your question, the HRI is actually Historic Resource Inventory. The State of Connecticut, over the years, has inventoried, through consultants, either individual sites or potential districts that are eligible for listing on the National Register. And, again, local, when you hear about a local historic district, that doesn't necessarily mean that's it's on the National Register. It can be, but it's a separate listing. And it doesn't hold the same regulatory significance that a National Register site does, but it obviously shows that it's eligible. So on that first graphic, you are looking at what we we break it out, and we do this for the NEPA compliance process, and it helps the SHPO because they like to see both what's on the National	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	state level that go up and down an entire road, and that creates a potential local historic district. So the graphic can just get very busy, so that's the reason why we break it out on to two. But you probably heard more than you wanted to hear. But the HRI is really a state-level inventory, that that's really just shows that there is a potential eligibility listing. DR. BELL: Was was that what gave somebody, either you or SHPO, the clue to do the digging that resulted in revising the site? THE WITNESS (Libertine): No. Actually, the the process of the archaeological cultural resource inventory has evolved, and it's something, actually, we do that a lot of other consultants don't. What happens is, a lot of times, because of the process of the NEPA evaluation that all the carriers have to go
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Sure. Let me let me explain. These there are actually two different graphics for historic resources. To answer your question, the HRI is actually Historic Resource Inventory. The State of Connecticut, over the years, has inventoried, through consultants, either individual sites or potential districts that are eligible for listing on the National Register. And, again, local, when you hear about a local historic district, that doesn't necessarily mean that's it's on the National Register. It can be, but it's a separate listing. And it doesn't hold the same regulatory significance that a National Register site does, but it obviously shows that it's eligible. So on that first graphic, you are looking at what we we break it out, and we do this for the NEPA compliance process, and it helps the SHPO because they like to see both what's on the National Register. If you turn to that second page	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	state level that go up and down an entire road, and that creates a potential local historic district. So the graphic can just get very busy, so that's the reason why we break it out on to two. But you probably heard more than you wanted to hear. But the HRI is really a state-level inventory, that that's really just shows that there is a potential eligibility listing. DR. BELL: Was was that what gave somebody, either you or SHPO, the clue to do the digging that resulted in revising the site? THE WITNESS (Libertine): No. Actually, the the process of the archaeological cultural resource inventory has evolved, and it's something, actually, we do that a lot of other consultants don't. What happens is, a lot of times, because of the process of the NEPA evaluation that all the carriers have to go through, they have to consult with the SHPO
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Sure. Let me let me explain. These there are actually two different graphics for historic resources. To answer your question, the HRI is actually Historic Resource Inventory. The State of Connecticut, over the years, has inventoried, through consultants, either individual sites or potential districts that are eligible for listing on the National Register. And, again, local, when you hear about a local historic district, that doesn't necessarily mean that's it's on the National Register. It can be, but it's a separate listing. And it doesn't hold the same regulatory significance that a National Register site does, but it obviously shows that it's eligible. So on that first graphic, you are looking at what we we break it out, and we do this for the NEPA compliance process, and it helps the SHPO because they like to see both what's on the National	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	state level that go up and down an entire road, and that creates a potential local historic district. So the graphic can just get very busy, so that's the reason why we break it out on to two. But you probably heard more than you wanted to hear. But the HRI is really a state-level inventory, that that's really just shows that there is a potential eligibility listing. DR. BELL: Was was that what gave somebody, either you or SHPO, the clue to do the digging that resulted in revising the site? THE WITNESS (Libertine): No. Actually, the the process of the archaeological cultural resource inventory has evolved, and it's something, actually, we do that a lot of other consultants don't. What happens is, a lot of times, because of the process of the NEPA evaluation that all the carriers have to go

15 (Pages 54 to 57)

UNITED REPORTERS, INC.

	Page 58		Page 60
1	and often the SHPO is interested in cultural	1	information to the tribe and to SHPO, in the
2	resources, the belowground resources, as well	2	cases where they're interested, so that we
3	as, you know the SHPO usually well,	3	can kind of move forward.
4	mostly with the historic, but there's also a	4	In this case, we obviously
5	cultural aspect. Long story short is, to do	5	found something that made it imperative that
6	what we had to do on this site is a fairly	6	we take a closer look. And then, when we
7	exhaustive process when you go through what	7	did, we actually found an isolated site. And
8	we call the Phase 1A and Phase 1B process.	8	that precipitated the move. So
9	The Phase 1A is really the	9	DR. BELL: Okay. Thank you.
10	historical resource. You you take a look.	10	THE WITNESS (Libertine):
11	You build the history of the site. You try	11	You're welcome.
12	to understand has it been manipulated by man,	12	DR. BELL: Thank you,
13	are there soils that are still intact that	13	Mr. Chair.
14	have the potential to have some kind of	14	THE CHAIRPERSON: So what is
15	culturally significant artifacts.	15	it that you found?
16	In this case, the Phase 1A did	16	THE WITNESS (Libertine):
17	come back saying, you know, it's close to	17	Well, we found a very small area of they
18	some streams. It's on a hillside. And, you	18	were shards that really were interpreted to
19	know, if you look around, it's pretty	19	be potentially tools and other well, other
20	undisturbed soil. This could be one of those	20	tools that may have been used by either
21 22	spots where there's there's, you know,	21	Native Americans or even prehistoric. They
22	probably intact or potential for intact	22 23	were found in, more or less, the upper level strata of the soils. Once that was
23 24	artifacts. So that's what clued us in to go to that next level.	23	discovered, the archaeologist decided two
24	But I wanted to step back.	24	things: One, I'm not going to dig any deeper
23	But I wanted to step back.	2.5	things. One, I'm not going to tig any tecper
	Page 59		Page 61
1	-	1	
1	The the tribes in Connecticut, the	1	because there could be even something more
2	The the tribes in Connecticut, the Mashantucket Pequots and the Mohegans,	2	because there could be even something more significant below that. And you don't want
	The the tribes in Connecticut, the Mashantucket Pequots and the Mohegans, automatically, if there's ground disturbance,		because there could be even something more significant below that. And you don't want to start digging that up, at that point. So
2 3	The the tribes in Connecticut, the Mashantucket Pequots and the Mohegans, automatically, if there's ground disturbance, they ask for some form of archaeological	2 3	because there could be even something more significant below that. And you don't want
2 3 4	The the tribes in Connecticut, the Mashantucket Pequots and the Mohegans, automatically, if there's ground disturbance, they ask for some form of archaeological work. Now, in the old days, when this first	2 3 4	because there could be even something more significant below that. And you don't want to start digging that up, at that point. So what we did is we had them go around
2 3 4 5	The the tribes in Connecticut, the Mashantucket Pequots and the Mohegans, automatically, if there's ground disturbance, they ask for some form of archaeological	2 3 4 5	because there could be even something more significant below that. And you don't want to start digging that up, at that point. So what we did is we had them go around concentric circles around there, total area,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	The the tribes in Connecticut, the Mashantucket Pequots and the Mohegans, automatically, if there's ground disturbance, they ask for some form of archaeological work. Now, in the old days, when this first started, they just said, go do a full Phase 1. Well, it's a very expensive	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	because there could be even something more significant below that. And you don't want to start digging that up, at that point. So what we did is we had them go around concentric circles around there, total area, and to define that area, much like you would contaminated soil, or anything else where you wanted to find what's clean and what's dirty,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The the tribes in Connecticut, the Mashantucket Pequots and the Mohegans, automatically, if there's ground disturbance, they ask for some form of archaeological work. Now, in the old days, when this first started, they just said, go do a full Phase 1. Well, it's a very expensive process. And so we came up with the idea of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	because there could be even something more significant below that. And you don't want to start digging that up, at that point. So what we did is we had them go around concentric circles around there, total area, and to define that area, much like you would contaminated soil, or anything else where you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	The the tribes in Connecticut, the Mashantucket Pequots and the Mohegans, automatically, if there's ground disturbance, they ask for some form of archaeological work. Now, in the old days, when this first started, they just said, go do a full Phase 1. Well, it's a very expensive process. And so we came up with the idea of reaching out to the tribes and asking could	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	because there could be even something more significant below that. And you don't want to start digging that up, at that point. So what we did is we had them go around concentric circles around there, total area, and to define that area, much like you would contaminated soil, or anything else where you wanted to find what's clean and what's dirty, or in this case, what's intact and what's not.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	The the tribes in Connecticut, the Mashantucket Pequots and the Mohegans, automatically, if there's ground disturbance, they ask for some form of archaeological work. Now, in the old days, when this first started, they just said, go do a full Phase 1. Well, it's a very expensive process. And so we came up with the idea of reaching out to the tribes and asking could we do a Phase 1A initially, and if the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	because there could be even something more significant below that. And you don't want to start digging that up, at that point. So what we did is we had them go around concentric circles around there, total area, and to define that area, much like you would contaminated soil, or anything else where you wanted to find what's clean and what's dirty, or in this case, what's intact and what's not. Once we established that area,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	The the tribes in Connecticut, the Mashantucket Pequots and the Mohegans, automatically, if there's ground disturbance, they ask for some form of archaeological work. Now, in the old days, when this first started, they just said, go do a full Phase 1. Well, it's a very expensive process. And so we came up with the idea of reaching out to the tribes and asking could we do a Phase 1A initially, and if the conclusion is that this really doesn't merit	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	because there could be even something more significant below that. And you don't want to start digging that up, at that point. So what we did is we had them go around concentric circles around there, total area, and to define that area, much like you would contaminated soil, or anything else where you wanted to find what's clean and what's dirty, or in this case, what's intact and what's not. Once we established that area, we worked with Mr. Vergati and said, look,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	The the tribes in Connecticut, the Mashantucket Pequots and the Mohegans, automatically, if there's ground disturbance, they ask for some form of archaeological work. Now, in the old days, when this first started, they just said, go do a full Phase 1. Well, it's a very expensive process. And so we came up with the idea of reaching out to the tribes and asking could we do a Phase 1A initially, and if the conclusion is that this really doesn't merit going the next step, will that be sufficient.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	because there could be even something more significant below that. And you don't want to start digging that up, at that point. So what we did is we had them go around concentric circles around there, total area, and to define that area, much like you would contaminated soil, or anything else where you wanted to find what's clean and what's dirty, or in this case, what's intact and what's not. Once we established that area, we worked with Mr. Vergati and said, look, you know, this is right in the corner of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The the tribes in Connecticut, the Mashantucket Pequots and the Mohegans, automatically, if there's ground disturbance, they ask for some form of archaeological work. Now, in the old days, when this first started, they just said, go do a full Phase 1. Well, it's a very expensive process. And so we came up with the idea of reaching out to the tribes and asking could we do a Phase 1A initially, and if the conclusion is that this really doesn't merit going the next step, will that be sufficient. And they said, yeah, let's try it. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	because there could be even something more significant below that. And you don't want to start digging that up, at that point. So what we did is we had them go around concentric circles around there, total area, and to define that area, much like you would contaminated soil, or anything else where you wanted to find what's clean and what's dirty, or in this case, what's intact and what's not. Once we established that area, we worked with Mr. Vergati and said, look, you know, this is right in the corner of the compound. There's no way we would not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	The the tribes in Connecticut, the Mashantucket Pequots and the Mohegans, automatically, if there's ground disturbance, they ask for some form of archaeological work. Now, in the old days, when this first started, they just said, go do a full Phase 1. Well, it's a very expensive process. And so we came up with the idea of reaching out to the tribes and asking could we do a Phase 1A initially, and if the conclusion is that this really doesn't merit going the next step, will that be sufficient. And they said, yeah, let's try it. And that's that's evolved.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	because there could be even something more significant below that. And you don't want to start digging that up, at that point. So what we did is we had them go around concentric circles around there, total area, and to define that area, much like you would contaminated soil, or anything else where you wanted to find what's clean and what's dirty, or in this case, what's intact and what's not. Once we established that area, we worked with Mr. Vergati and said, look, you know, this is right in the corner of the compound. There's no way we would not disturb this. And if we are going to disturb
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	The the tribes in Connecticut, the Mashantucket Pequots and the Mohegans, automatically, if there's ground disturbance, they ask for some form of archaeological work. Now, in the old days, when this first started, they just said, go do a full Phase 1. Well, it's a very expensive process. And so we came up with the idea of reaching out to the tribes and asking could we do a Phase 1A initially, and if the conclusion is that this really doesn't merit going the next step, will that be sufficient. And they said, yeah, let's try it. And that's that's evolved. So to answer your question,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	because there could be even something more significant below that. And you don't want to start digging that up, at that point. So what we did is we had them go around concentric circles around there, total area, and to define that area, much like you would contaminated soil, or anything else where you wanted to find what's clean and what's dirty, or in this case, what's intact and what's not. Once we established that area, we worked with Mr. Vergati and said, look, you know, this is right in the corner of the compound. There's no way we would not disturb this. And if we are going to disturb it, that creates a whole nother Phase 2
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	The the tribes in Connecticut, the Mashantucket Pequots and the Mohegans, automatically, if there's ground disturbance, they ask for some form of archaeological work. Now, in the old days, when this first started, they just said, go do a full Phase 1. Well, it's a very expensive process. And so we came up with the idea of reaching out to the tribes and asking could we do a Phase 1A initially, and if the conclusion is that this really doesn't merit going the next step, will that be sufficient. And they said, yeah, let's try it. And that's that's evolved. So to answer your question, the Phase 1A is done any time we have to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	because there could be even something more significant below that. And you don't want to start digging that up, at that point. So what we did is we had them go around concentric circles around there, total area, and to define that area, much like you would contaminated soil, or anything else where you wanted to find what's clean and what's dirty, or in this case, what's intact and what's not. Once we established that area, we worked with Mr. Vergati and said, look, you know, this is right in the corner of the compound. There's no way we would not disturb this. And if we are going to disturb it, that creates a whole nother Phase 2 issue, very expensive, very time-consuming.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The the tribes in Connecticut, the Mashantucket Pequots and the Mohegans, automatically, if there's ground disturbance, they ask for some form of archaeological work. Now, in the old days, when this first started, they just said, go do a full Phase 1. Well, it's a very expensive process. And so we came up with the idea of reaching out to the tribes and asking could we do a Phase 1A initially, and if the conclusion is that this really doesn't merit going the next step, will that be sufficient. And they said, yeah, let's try it. And that's that's evolved. So to answer your question, the Phase 1A is done any time we have to initiate a NEPA. We just recommend that to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	because there could be even something more significant below that. And you don't want to start digging that up, at that point. So what we did is we had them go around concentric circles around there, total area, and to define that area, much like you would contaminated soil, or anything else where you wanted to find what's clean and what's dirty, or in this case, what's intact and what's not. Once we established that area, we worked with Mr. Vergati and said, look, you know, this is right in the corner of the compound. There's no way we would not disturb this. And if we are going to disturb it, that creates a whole nother Phase 2 issue, very expensive, very time-consuming. And we said, well, wait a minute, if we could
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	The the tribes in Connecticut, the Mashantucket Pequots and the Mohegans, automatically, if there's ground disturbance, they ask for some form of archaeological work. Now, in the old days, when this first started, they just said, go do a full Phase 1. Well, it's a very expensive process. And so we came up with the idea of reaching out to the tribes and asking could we do a Phase 1A initially, and if the conclusion is that this really doesn't merit going the next step, will that be sufficient. And they said, yeah, let's try it. And that's that's evolved. So to answer your question, the Phase 1A is done any time we have to initiate a NEPA. We just recommend that to our clients and they found that it it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	because there could be even something more significant below that. And you don't want to start digging that up, at that point. So what we did is we had them go around concentric circles around there, total area, and to define that area, much like you would contaminated soil, or anything else where you wanted to find what's clean and what's dirty, or in this case, what's intact and what's not. Once we established that area, we worked with Mr. Vergati and said, look, you know, this is right in the corner of the compound. There's no way we would not disturb this. And if we are going to disturb it, that creates a whole nother Phase 2 issue, very expensive, very time-consuming. And we said, well, wait a minute, if we could keep it intact, let's do that and protect it,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The the tribes in Connecticut, the Mashantucket Pequots and the Mohegans, automatically, if there's ground disturbance, they ask for some form of archaeological work. Now, in the old days, when this first started, they just said, go do a full Phase 1. Well, it's a very expensive process. And so we came up with the idea of reaching out to the tribes and asking could we do a Phase 1A initially, and if the conclusion is that this really doesn't merit going the next step, will that be sufficient. And they said, yeah, let's try it. And that's that's evolved. So to answer your question, the Phase 1A is done any time we have to initiate a NEPA. We just recommend that to our clients and they found that it it really does help the process, because we can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	because there could be even something more significant below that. And you don't want to start digging that up, at that point. So what we did is we had them go around concentric circles around there, total area, and to define that area, much like you would contaminated soil, or anything else where you wanted to find what's clean and what's dirty, or in this case, what's intact and what's not. Once we established that area, we worked with Mr. Vergati and said, look, you know, this is right in the corner of the compound. There's no way we would not disturb this. And if we are going to disturb it, that creates a whole nother Phase 2 issue, very expensive, very time-consuming. And we said, well, wait a minute, if we could keep it intact, let's do that and protect it, and that precipitated the move.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	The the tribes in Connecticut, the Mashantucket Pequots and the Mohegans, automatically, if there's ground disturbance, they ask for some form of archaeological work. Now, in the old days, when this first started, they just said, go do a full Phase 1. Well, it's a very expensive process. And so we came up with the idea of reaching out to the tribes and asking could we do a Phase 1A initially, and if the conclusion is that this really doesn't merit going the next step, will that be sufficient. And they said, yeah, let's try it. And that's that's evolved. So to answer your question, the Phase 1A is done any time we have to initiate a NEPA. We just recommend that to our clients and they found that it it really does help the process, because we can move it much further along much quicker and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	because there could be even something more significant below that. And you don't want to start digging that up, at that point. So what we did is we had them go around concentric circles around there, total area, and to define that area, much like you would contaminated soil, or anything else where you wanted to find what's clean and what's dirty, or in this case, what's intact and what's not. Once we established that area, we worked with Mr. Vergati and said, look, you know, this is right in the corner of the compound. There's no way we would not disturb this. And if we are going to disturb it, that creates a whole nother Phase 2 issue, very expensive, very time-consuming. And we said, well, wait a minute, if we could keep it intact, let's do that and protect it, and that precipitated the move. So, essentially, there were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	The the tribes in Connecticut, the Mashantucket Pequots and the Mohegans, automatically, if there's ground disturbance, they ask for some form of archaeological work. Now, in the old days, when this first started, they just said, go do a full Phase 1. Well, it's a very expensive process. And so we came up with the idea of reaching out to the tribes and asking could we do a Phase 1A initially, and if the conclusion is that this really doesn't merit going the next step, will that be sufficient. And they said, yeah, let's try it. And that's that's evolved. So to answer your question, the Phase 1A is done any time we have to initiate a NEPA. We just recommend that to our clients and they found that it it really does help the process, because we can move it much further along much quicker and not have to expend those monies if it's not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	because there could be even something more significant below that. And you don't want to start digging that up, at that point. So what we did is we had them go around concentric circles around there, total area, and to define that area, much like you would contaminated soil, or anything else where you wanted to find what's clean and what's dirty, or in this case, what's intact and what's not. Once we established that area, we worked with Mr. Vergati and said, look, you know, this is right in the corner of the compound. There's no way we would not disturb this. And if we are going to disturb it, that creates a whole nother Phase 2 issue, very expensive, very time-consuming. And we said, well, wait a minute, if we could keep it intact, let's do that and protect it, and that precipitated the move.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	The the tribes in Connecticut, the Mashantucket Pequots and the Mohegans, automatically, if there's ground disturbance, they ask for some form of archaeological work. Now, in the old days, when this first started, they just said, go do a full Phase 1. Well, it's a very expensive process. And so we came up with the idea of reaching out to the tribes and asking could we do a Phase 1A initially, and if the conclusion is that this really doesn't merit going the next step, will that be sufficient. And they said, yeah, let's try it. And that's that's evolved. So to answer your question, the Phase 1A is done any time we have to initiate a NEPA. We just recommend that to our clients and they found that it it really does help the process, because we can move it much further along much quicker and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	because there could be even something more significant below that. And you don't want to start digging that up, at that point. So what we did is we had them go around concentric circles around there, total area, and to define that area, much like you would contaminated soil, or anything else where you wanted to find what's clean and what's dirty, or in this case, what's intact and what's dirty, or in this case, what's intact and what's not. Once we established that area, we worked with Mr. Vergati and said, look, you know, this is right in the corner of the compound. There's no way we would not disturb this. And if we are going to disturb it, that creates a whole nother Phase 2 issue, very expensive, very time-consuming. And we said, well, wait a minute, if we could keep it intact, let's do that and protect it, and that precipitated the move. So, essentially, there were several shards found in about a, maybe,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	The the tribes in Connecticut, the Mashantucket Pequots and the Mohegans, automatically, if there's ground disturbance, they ask for some form of archaeological work. Now, in the old days, when this first started, they just said, go do a full Phase 1. Well, it's a very expensive process. And so we came up with the idea of reaching out to the tribes and asking could we do a Phase 1A initially, and if the conclusion is that this really doesn't merit going the next step, will that be sufficient. And they said, yeah, let's try it. And that's that's evolved. So to answer your question, the Phase 1A is done any time we have to initiate a NEPA. We just recommend that to our clients and they found that it it really does help the process, because we can move it much further along much quicker and not have to expend those monies if it's not necessary. And we found about 90 to 95	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	because there could be even something more significant below that. And you don't want to start digging that up, at that point. So what we did is we had them go around concentric circles around there, total area, and to define that area, much like you would contaminated soil, or anything else where you wanted to find what's clean and what's dirty, or in this case, what's intact and what's dirty, or in this case, what's intact and what's not. Once we established that area, we worked with Mr. Vergati and said, look, you know, this is right in the corner of the compound. There's no way we would not disturb this. And if we are going to disturb it, that creates a whole nother Phase 2 issue, very expensive, very time-consuming. And we said, well, wait a minute, if we could keep it intact, let's do that and protect it, and that precipitated the move. So, essentially, there were several shards found in about a, maybe, 15-foot, 12-foot radius that were, again,

16 (Pages 58 to 61)

UNITED REPORTERS, INC.

	Page 62		Page 64
- 1		1	
1 2	fragments. And they determined, in their	1 2	no reason why. I mean, I think the the
3	studies that it was not necessarily a permanent residency there. That it was most	3	point we're trying to make is the the need for the tower outweighs any environmental
4	likely some type of an encampment or a	4	impact, and that we've demonstrated, through
5	temporary area to be working, hunting,	5	our application materials, that any impacts
6	fishing, that type of thing.	6	are not significant or adverse.
7	So that's been recorded. We	7	MR. HANNON: I I just
8	have the coordinates. We're going to protect	8	thought you would have included that. I
9	it. That will also be submitted to the state	9	mean, because if you're talking about it
10	archaeologist for recordkeeping. They keep a	10	won't have any substantial adverse effect on
11	database. Actually, our subcontractors keep	11	the aesthetics or scenic quality, that the
12	the database for them. But that way, it will	12	environment would have been included in that.
13	be a registered and recorded site.	13	MS. CHIOCCHIO: And it should
14	We don't like to mark those in	14	have been. You're right.
15	the field because we don't want people going	15	MR. HANNON: If I understand
16	out there that are treasure seekers and going	16	it correctly, as far as the national
17	out there and digging them up, but it will be	17	diversity database information goes, that you
18	curated from that process.	18	are agreeing to the time limit in terms of
19	THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank	19	when you can actually go out there and clear
20	you.	20	trees. Correct?
21	I have a whole host of other	21	THE WITNESS (Gustafson):
22	questions, but that would be getting us off	22	That that's correct.
23	on what I think is an interesting but	23	MR. HANNON: Okay.
24	unrelated tangent, so I will refrain.	24	I can skip that one. Skip
25	Mr. Hannon.	25	that. Dr. Bell got that one.
	Page 63		Page 65
1	Page 63	1	Page 65
1	MR. HANNON: Thank you,	1	To, I guess, it's Tab 4, Map
2	MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.	2	To, I guess, it's Tab 4, Map SP1, I've got some questions there. It was
2 3	MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, I I do have some	2 3	To, I guess, it's Tab 4, Map SP1, I've got some questions there. It was hard to find it. I think I found a clear
2 3 4	MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, I I do have some questions. On the application, on page 2 in	2 3 4	To, I guess, it's Tab 4, Map SP1, I've got some questions there. It was hard to find it. I think I found a clear delineation on another map. But just to the
2 3 4 5	MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, I I do have some questions. On the application, on page 2 in the introduction, I'm just kind of curious	2 3 4 5	To, I guess, it's Tab 4, Map SP1, I've got some questions there. It was hard to find it. I think I found a clear delineation on another map. But just to the north of, sort of, that construction apron
2 3 4	MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, I I do have some questions. On the application, on page 2 in the introduction, I'm just kind of curious about the language.	2 3 4	To, I guess, it's Tab 4, Map SP1, I've got some questions there. It was hard to find it. I think I found a clear delineation on another map. But just to the north of, sort of, that construction apron that's going in, there's a 12-inch pipe.
2 3 4 5 6	MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, I I do have some questions. On the application, on page 2 in the introduction, I'm just kind of curious	2 3 4 5 6	To, I guess, it's Tab 4, Map SP1, I've got some questions there. It was hard to find it. I think I found a clear delineation on another map. But just to the north of, sort of, that construction apron
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, I I do have some questions. On the application, on page 2 in the introduction, I'm just kind of curious about the language. The middle of the page, the	2 3 4 5 6 7	To, I guess, it's Tab 4, Map SP1, I've got some questions there. It was hard to find it. I think I found a clear delineation on another map. But just to the north of, sort of, that construction apron that's going in, there's a 12-inch pipe. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, I I do have some questions. On the application, on page 2 in the introduction, I'm just kind of curious about the language. The middle of the page, the paragraph just before Section C, the applicants, I mean, there's a comment in there that you're saying that the public need	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	To, I guess, it's Tab 4, Map SP1, I've got some questions there. It was hard to find it. I think I found a clear delineation on another map. But just to the north of, sort of, that construction apron that's going in, there's a 12-inch pipe. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Correct. MR. HANNON: I'm kind of curious as to what that kind of connects to, because just a little bit north of that,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, I I do have some questions. On the application, on page 2 in the introduction, I'm just kind of curious about the language. The middle of the page, the paragraph just before Section C, the applicants, I mean, there's a comment in there that you're saying that the public need for the tower here far outweighs any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	To, I guess, it's Tab 4, Map SP1, I've got some questions there. It was hard to find it. I think I found a clear delineation on another map. But just to the north of, sort of, that construction apron that's going in, there's a 12-inch pipe. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Correct. MR. HANNON: I'm kind of curious as to what that kind of connects to, because just a little bit north of that, you've got a 32-inch metal pipe. So what is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, I I do have some questions. On the application, on page 2 in the introduction, I'm just kind of curious about the language. The middle of the page, the paragraph just before Section C, the applicants, I mean, there's a comment in there that you're saying that the public need for the tower here far outweighs any potential adverse environmental effect. But	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	To, I guess, it's Tab 4, Map SP1, I've got some questions there. It was hard to find it. I think I found a clear delineation on another map. But just to the north of, sort of, that construction apron that's going in, there's a 12-inch pipe. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Correct. MR. HANNON: I'm kind of curious as to what that kind of connects to, because just a little bit north of that, you've got a 32-inch metal pipe. So what is this 12-inch pipe doing there, and where
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, I I do have some questions. On the application, on page 2 in the introduction, I'm just kind of curious about the language. The middle of the page, the paragraph just before Section C, the applicants, I mean, there's a comment in there that you're saying that the public need for the tower here far outweighs any potential adverse environmental effect. But yet, when you go on a little bit further,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	To, I guess, it's Tab 4, Map SP1, I've got some questions there. It was hard to find it. I think I found a clear delineation on another map. But just to the north of, sort of, that construction apron that's going in, there's a 12-inch pipe. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Correct. MR. HANNON: I'm kind of curious as to what that kind of connects to, because just a little bit north of that, you've got a 32-inch metal pipe. So what is this 12-inch pipe doing there, and where you've got the apron, is that going to have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, I I do have some questions. On the application, on page 2 in the introduction, I'm just kind of curious about the language. The middle of the page, the paragraph just before Section C, the applicants, I mean, there's a comment in there that you're saying that the public need for the tower here far outweighs any potential adverse environmental effect. But yet, when you go on a little bit further, you're saying you will not have a substantial	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	To, I guess, it's Tab 4, Map SP1, I've got some questions there. It was hard to find it. I think I found a clear delineation on another map. But just to the north of, sort of, that construction apron that's going in, there's a 12-inch pipe. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Correct. MR. HANNON: I'm kind of curious as to what that kind of connects to, because just a little bit north of that, you've got a 32-inch metal pipe. So what is this 12-inch pipe doing there, and where you've got the apron, is that going to have any adverse impact on that pipe?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, I I do have some questions. On the application, on page 2 in the introduction, I'm just kind of curious about the language. The middle of the page, the paragraph just before Section C, the applicants, I mean, there's a comment in there that you're saying that the public need for the tower here far outweighs any potential adverse environmental effect. But yet, when you go on a little bit further, you're saying you will not have a substantial adverse effect on aesthetics or scenic	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	To, I guess, it's Tab 4, Map SP1, I've got some questions there. It was hard to find it. I think I found a clear delineation on another map. But just to the north of, sort of, that construction apron that's going in, there's a 12-inch pipe. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Correct. MR. HANNON: I'm kind of curious as to what that kind of connects to, because just a little bit north of that, you've got a 32-inch metal pipe. So what is this 12-inch pipe doing there, and where you've got the apron, is that going to have any adverse impact on that pipe? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, I I do have some questions. On the application, on page 2 in the introduction, I'm just kind of curious about the language. The middle of the page, the paragraph just before Section C, the applicants, I mean, there's a comment in there that you're saying that the public need for the tower here far outweighs any potential adverse environmental effect. But yet, when you go on a little bit further, you're saying you will not have a substantial adverse effect on aesthetics or scenic quality, but you don't say anything about the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	To, I guess, it's Tab 4, Map SP1, I've got some questions there. It was hard to find it. I think I found a clear delineation on another map. But just to the north of, sort of, that construction apron that's going in, there's a 12-inch pipe. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Correct. MR. HANNON: I'm kind of curious as to what that kind of connects to, because just a little bit north of that, you've got a 32-inch metal pipe. So what is this 12-inch pipe doing there, and where you've got the apron, is that going to have any adverse impact on that pipe? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Very good. If we're looking at the same sheet,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, I I do have some questions. On the application, on page 2 in the introduction, I'm just kind of curious about the language. The middle of the page, the paragraph just before Section C, the applicants, I mean, there's a comment in there that you're saying that the public need for the tower here far outweighs any potential adverse environmental effect. But yet, when you go on a little bit further, you're saying you will not have a substantial adverse effect on aesthetics or scenic quality, but you don't say anything about the environment. Is there a reason why?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	To, I guess, it's Tab 4, Map SP1, I've got some questions there. It was hard to find it. I think I found a clear delineation on another map. But just to the north of, sort of, that construction apron that's going in, there's a 12-inch pipe. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Correct. MR. HANNON: I'm kind of curious as to what that kind of connects to, because just a little bit north of that, you've got a 32-inch metal pipe. So what is this 12-inch pipe doing there, and where you've got the apron, is that going to have any adverse impact on that pipe? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Very good. If we're looking at the same sheet, SP1, on the North side of the road where the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, I I do have some questions. On the application, on page 2 in the introduction, I'm just kind of curious about the language. The middle of the page, the paragraph just before Section C, the applicants, I mean, there's a comment in there that you're saying that the public need for the tower here far outweighs any potential adverse environmental effect. But yet, when you go on a little bit further, you're saying you will not have a substantial adverse effect on aesthetics or scenic quality, but you don't say anything about the environment. Is there a reason why? I mean, I would think that if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	To, I guess, it's Tab 4, Map SP1, I've got some questions there. It was hard to find it. I think I found a clear delineation on another map. But just to the north of, sort of, that construction apron that's going in, there's a 12-inch pipe. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Correct. MR. HANNON: I'm kind of curious as to what that kind of connects to, because just a little bit north of that, you've got a 32-inch metal pipe. So what is this 12-inch pipe doing there, and where you've got the apron, is that going to have any adverse impact on that pipe? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Very good. If we're looking at the same sheet, SP1, on the North side of the road where the apron is coming in, you follow the silt fence
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, I I do have some questions. On the application, on page 2 in the introduction, I'm just kind of curious about the language. The middle of the page, the paragraph just before Section C, the applicants, I mean, there's a comment in there that you're saying that the public need for the tower here far outweighs any potential adverse environmental effect. But yet, when you go on a little bit further, you're saying you will not have a substantial adverse effect on aesthetics or scenic quality, but you don't say anything about the environment. Is there a reason why? I mean, I would think that if you're raising the potential of an issue with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	To, I guess, it's Tab 4, Map SP1, I've got some questions there. It was hard to find it. I think I found a clear delineation on another map. But just to the north of, sort of, that construction apron that's going in, there's a 12-inch pipe. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Correct. MR. HANNON: I'm kind of curious as to what that kind of connects to, because just a little bit north of that, you've got a 32-inch metal pipe. So what is this 12-inch pipe doing there, and where you've got the apron, is that going to have any adverse impact on that pipe? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Very good. If we're looking at the same sheet, SP1, on the North side of the road where the apron is coming in, you follow the silt fence that's there all the way up and you'll see
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, I I do have some questions. On the application, on page 2 in the introduction, I'm just kind of curious about the language. The middle of the page, the paragraph just before Section C, the applicants, I mean, there's a comment in there that you're saying that the public need for the tower here far outweighs any potential adverse environmental effect. But yet, when you go on a little bit further, you're saying you will not have a substantial adverse effect on aesthetics or scenic quality, but you don't say anything about the environment. Is there a reason why? I mean, I would think that if you're raising the potential of an issue with the environment, that you would want to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	To, I guess, it's Tab 4, Map SP1, I've got some questions there. It was hard to find it. I think I found a clear delineation on another map. But just to the north of, sort of, that construction apron that's going in, there's a 12-inch pipe. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Correct. MR. HANNON: I'm kind of curious as to what that kind of connects to, because just a little bit north of that, you've got a 32-inch metal pipe. So what is this 12-inch pipe doing there, and where you've got the apron, is that going to have any adverse impact on that pipe? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Very good. If we're looking at the same sheet, SP1, on the North side of the road where the apron is coming in, you follow the silt fence that's there all the way up and you'll see just a little V on a contour line that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, I I do have some questions. On the application, on page 2 in the introduction, I'm just kind of curious about the language. The middle of the page, the paragraph just before Section C, the applicants, I mean, there's a comment in there that you're saying that the public need for the tower here far outweighs any potential adverse environmental effect. But yet, when you go on a little bit further, you're saying you will not have a substantial adverse effect on aesthetics or scenic quality, but you don't say anything about the environment. Is there a reason why? I mean, I would think that if you're raising the potential of an issue with the environment, that you would want to clarify that, that, you know, based on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	To, I guess, it's Tab 4, Map SP1, I've got some questions there. It was hard to find it. I think I found a clear delineation on another map. But just to the north of, sort of, that construction apron that's going in, there's a 12-inch pipe. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Correct. MR. HANNON: I'm kind of curious as to what that kind of connects to, because just a little bit north of that, you've got a 32-inch metal pipe. So what is this 12-inch pipe doing there, and where you've got the apron, is that going to have any adverse impact on that pipe? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Very good. If we're looking at the same sheet, SP1, on the North side of the road where the apron is coming in, you follow the silt fence that's there all the way up and you'll see just a little V on a contour line that's sitting there, just a little note. That's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, I I do have some questions. On the application, on page 2 in the introduction, I'm just kind of curious about the language. The middle of the page, the paragraph just before Section C, the applicants, I mean, there's a comment in there that you're saying that the public need for the tower here far outweighs any potential adverse environmental effect. But yet, when you go on a little bit further, you're saying you will not have a substantial adverse effect on aesthetics or scenic quality, but you don't say anything about the environment. Is there a reason why? I mean, I would think that if you're raising the potential of an issue with the environment, that you would want to clarify that, that, you know, based on the evaluation you do not anticipate it?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	To, I guess, it's Tab 4, Map SP1, I've got some questions there. It was hard to find it. I think I found a clear delineation on another map. But just to the north of, sort of, that construction apron that's going in, there's a 12-inch pipe. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Correct. MR. HANNON: I'm kind of curious as to what that kind of connects to, because just a little bit north of that, you've got a 32-inch metal pipe. So what is this 12-inch pipe doing there, and where you've got the apron, is that going to have any adverse impact on that pipe? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Very good. If we're looking at the same sheet, SP1, on the North side of the road where the apron is coming in, you follow the silt fence that's there all the way up and you'll see just a little V on a contour line that's sitting there, just a little note. That's the 684 contour line. That's basically the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, I I do have some questions. On the application, on page 2 in the introduction, I'm just kind of curious about the language. The middle of the page, the paragraph just before Section C, the applicants, I mean, there's a comment in there that you're saying that the public need for the tower here far outweighs any potential adverse environmental effect. But yet, when you go on a little bit further, you're saying you will not have a substantial adverse effect on aesthetics or scenic quality, but you don't say anything about the environment. Is there a reason why? I mean, I would think that if you're raising the potential of an issue with the environment, that you would want to clarify that, that, you know, based on the evaluation you do not anticipate it? MS. CHIOCCHIO: Perhaps I'll	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	To, I guess, it's Tab 4, Map SP1, I've got some questions there. It was hard to find it. I think I found a clear delineation on another map. But just to the north of, sort of, that construction apron that's going in, there's a 12-inch pipe. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Correct. MR. HANNON: I'm kind of curious as to what that kind of connects to, because just a little bit north of that, you've got a 32-inch metal pipe. So what is this 12-inch pipe doing there, and where you've got the apron, is that going to have any adverse impact on that pipe? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Very good. If we're looking at the same sheet, SP1, on the North side of the road where the apron is coming in, you follow the silt fence that's there all the way up and you'll see just a little V on a contour line that's sitting there, just a little note. That's the 684 contour line. That's basically the high point of the swale. Everything that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, I I do have some questions. On the application, on page 2 in the introduction, I'm just kind of curious about the language. The middle of the page, the paragraph just before Section C, the applicants, I mean, there's a comment in there that you're saying that the public need for the tower here far outweighs any potential adverse environmental effect. But yet, when you go on a little bit further, you're saying you will not have a substantial adverse effect on aesthetics or scenic quality, but you don't say anything about the environment. Is there a reason why? I mean, I would think that if you're raising the potential of an issue with the environment, that you would want to clarify that, that, you know, based on the evaluation you do not anticipate it?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	To, I guess, it's Tab 4, Map SP1, I've got some questions there. It was hard to find it. I think I found a clear delineation on another map. But just to the north of, sort of, that construction apron that's going in, there's a 12-inch pipe. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Correct. MR. HANNON: I'm kind of curious as to what that kind of connects to, because just a little bit north of that, you've got a 32-inch metal pipe. So what is this 12-inch pipe doing there, and where you've got the apron, is that going to have any adverse impact on that pipe? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Very good. If we're looking at the same sheet, SP1, on the North side of the road where the apron is coming in, you follow the silt fence that's there all the way up and you'll see just a little V on a contour line that's sitting there, just a little note. That's the 684 contour line. That's basically the

17 (Pages 62 to 65)

	Page 66		Page 68
1	MR. HANNON: Okay.	1	the proposed access route.
2	THE WITNESS (Chasse): When	2	MR. HANNON: I don't have
3	you then move back towards the apron and away	3	anything else.
4	from the apron, between where the 32-inch	4	THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
5	pipe is and the 12-inch, there's another high	5	Commissioner Caron.
6	point in there. That's another 684.	6	COMM. CARON: No, thank you,
7	MR. HANNON: Okay.	7	Mr. Chairman.
8	THE WITNESS (Chasse): So we	8	THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Lynch.
9	have this little area that's being picked up,	9	MR. LYNCH: Most of my
10	and that 12-inch PVC pipe, if you refer to	10	questions have been answered, but I still
11	the detail I referred to earlier with the	11	have one or two.
12	correction, on Detail 1 SP3, we actually show	12	Going back, Mr. Chasse, on the
13	the 12-inch pipe there. Our flared out	13	utility trench that we were just talking to
14	entranceway is going to encroach upon it, so	14	Mr. Hannon about, that's electrical and
15	we've gone and put the belts and suspenders	15	phone?
16	on it and we're protecting that area, even	16	THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes,
17	though it's kind of outside of our area for	17	fiber and for telco and power.
18	that.	18	MR. LYNCH: Now, this is
19	MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you.	19	just is the phone now Frontier or is it
20	And one of the comments or one	20	still AT&T?
21	of the questions I had on the site walk was	20	THE WITNESS (Chasse): I
22	the possibility of moving the utility trench	22	believe it's Frontier. Yeah, as of August.
23	to the opposite side of the drive. And I	23	MR. LYNCH: Okay. And
24	think you had said that that may be a good	24	Mr. Libertine, I agree with the earlier
25	possibility.	25	questioning by Senator Murphy. If we're
23	possionity.	23	questioning by Senator Mulphy. If were
	Page 67		
	Page 07		Page 69
1		1	
1 2	And, again, part of that was	1 2	going up in height and from what I
2	And, again, part of that was because of the wetlands. But also on that		going up in height and from what I understand, if T-Mobile ever gets back in,
2 3	And, again, part of that was because of the wetlands. But also on that northern edge of the driveway, there appears	2	going up in height and from what I understand, if T-Mobile ever gets back in, and coming out of Kansas, I guess, Sprint is
2 3 4	And, again, part of that was because of the wetlands. But also on that northern edge of the driveway, there appears to be a pretty solid, sort of, rock wall, I	2 3	going up in height and from what I understand, if T-Mobile ever gets back in, and coming out of Kansas, I guess, Sprint is going to get start getting aggressive, but
2 3 4 5	And, again, part of that was because of the wetlands. But also on that northern edge of the driveway, there appears to be a pretty solid, sort of, rock wall, I guess. So, from that perspective, I'm also	2 3 4	going up in height and from what I understand, if T-Mobile ever gets back in, and coming out of Kansas, I guess, Sprint is going to get start getting aggressive, but they haven't done anything in a while.
2 3 4 5 6	And, again, part of that was because of the wetlands. But also on that northern edge of the driveway, there appears to be a pretty solid, sort of, rock wall, I guess. So, from that perspective, I'm also concerned about where you're showing using	2 3 4 5	going up in height and from what I understand, if T-Mobile ever gets back in, and coming out of Kansas, I guess, Sprint is going to get start getting aggressive, but they haven't done anything in a while. They'll probably want to go up in height.
2 3 4 5 6 7	And, again, part of that was because of the wetlands. But also on that northern edge of the driveway, there appears to be a pretty solid, sort of, rock wall, I guess. So, from that perspective, I'm also concerned about where you're showing using silt fence over there, because I'm not sure	2 3 4 5 6	going up in height and from what I understand, if T-Mobile ever gets back in, and coming out of Kansas, I guess, Sprint is going to get start getting aggressive, but they haven't done anything in a while. They'll probably want to go up in height. Now, does that, as Mr. Murphy was leading to,
2 3 4 5 6	And, again, part of that was because of the wetlands. But also on that northern edge of the driveway, there appears to be a pretty solid, sort of, rock wall, I guess. So, from that perspective, I'm also concerned about where you're showing using	2 3 4 5 6 7	going up in height and from what I understand, if T-Mobile ever gets back in, and coming out of Kansas, I guess, Sprint is going to get start getting aggressive, but they haven't done anything in a while. They'll probably want to go up in height.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And, again, part of that was because of the wetlands. But also on that northern edge of the driveway, there appears to be a pretty solid, sort of, rock wall, I guess. So, from that perspective, I'm also concerned about where you're showing using silt fence over there, because I'm not sure that you could put silt fence in on that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	going up in height and from what I understand, if T-Mobile ever gets back in, and coming out of Kansas, I guess, Sprint is going to get start getting aggressive, but they haven't done anything in a while. They'll probably want to go up in height. Now, does that, as Mr. Murphy was leading to, it creates a big problem for a monopine
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	And, again, part of that was because of the wetlands. But also on that northern edge of the driveway, there appears to be a pretty solid, sort of, rock wall, I guess. So, from that perspective, I'm also concerned about where you're showing using silt fence over there, because I'm not sure that you could put silt fence in on that side, given where that rock wall is. So I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	going up in height and from what I understand, if T-Mobile ever gets back in, and coming out of Kansas, I guess, Sprint is going to get start getting aggressive, but they haven't done anything in a while. They'll probably want to go up in height. Now, does that, as Mr. Murphy was leading to, it creates a big problem for a monopine versus and I think you were suggesting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	And, again, part of that was because of the wetlands. But also on that northern edge of the driveway, there appears to be a pretty solid, sort of, rock wall, I guess. So, from that perspective, I'm also concerned about where you're showing using silt fence over there, because I'm not sure that you could put silt fence in on that side, given where that rock wall is. So I think you may need to reconsider what you're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	going up in height and from what I understand, if T-Mobile ever gets back in, and coming out of Kansas, I guess, Sprint is going to get start getting aggressive, but they haven't done anything in a while. They'll probably want to go up in height. Now, does that, as Mr. Murphy was leading to, it creates a big problem for a monopine versus and I think you were suggesting that a monopole may be a better solution.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	And, again, part of that was because of the wetlands. But also on that northern edge of the driveway, there appears to be a pretty solid, sort of, rock wall, I guess. So, from that perspective, I'm also concerned about where you're showing using silt fence over there, because I'm not sure that you could put silt fence in on that side, given where that rock wall is. So I think you may need to reconsider what you're using for erosion control measures, at least	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	going up in height and from what I understand, if T-Mobile ever gets back in, and coming out of Kansas, I guess, Sprint is going to get start getting aggressive, but they haven't done anything in a while. They'll probably want to go up in height. Now, does that, as Mr. Murphy was leading to, it creates a big problem for a monopine versus and I think you were suggesting that a monopole may be a better solution. THE WITNESS (Libertine): If
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	And, again, part of that was because of the wetlands. But also on that northern edge of the driveway, there appears to be a pretty solid, sort of, rock wall, I guess. So, from that perspective, I'm also concerned about where you're showing using silt fence over there, because I'm not sure that you could put silt fence in on that side, given where that rock wall is. So I think you may need to reconsider what you're using for erosion control measures, at least on that side.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	going up in height and from what I understand, if T-Mobile ever gets back in, and coming out of Kansas, I guess, Sprint is going to get start getting aggressive, but they haven't done anything in a while. They'll probably want to go up in height. Now, does that, as Mr. Murphy was leading to, it creates a big problem for a monopine versus and I think you were suggesting that a monopole may be a better solution. THE WITNESS (Libertine): If we're talking about going up in height, then
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And, again, part of that was because of the wetlands. But also on that northern edge of the driveway, there appears to be a pretty solid, sort of, rock wall, I guess. So, from that perspective, I'm also concerned about where you're showing using silt fence over there, because I'm not sure that you could put silt fence in on that side, given where that rock wall is. So I think you may need to reconsider what you're using for erosion control measures, at least on that side. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Uh-huh.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	going up in height and from what I understand, if T-Mobile ever gets back in, and coming out of Kansas, I guess, Sprint is going to get start getting aggressive, but they haven't done anything in a while. They'll probably want to go up in height. Now, does that, as Mr. Murphy was leading to, it creates a big problem for a monopine versus and I think you were suggesting that a monopole may be a better solution. THE WITNESS (Libertine): If we're talking about going up in height, then my personal belief would be that it a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And, again, part of that was because of the wetlands. But also on that northern edge of the driveway, there appears to be a pretty solid, sort of, rock wall, I guess. So, from that perspective, I'm also concerned about where you're showing using silt fence over there, because I'm not sure that you could put silt fence in on that side, given where that rock wall is. So I think you may need to reconsider what you're using for erosion control measures, at least on that side. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Uh-huh. MR. HANNON: So it may be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	going up in height and from what I understand, if T-Mobile ever gets back in, and coming out of Kansas, I guess, Sprint is going to get start getting aggressive, but they haven't done anything in a while. They'll probably want to go up in height. Now, does that, as Mr. Murphy was leading to, it creates a big problem for a monopine versus and I think you were suggesting that a monopole may be a better solution. THE WITNESS (Libertine): If we're talking about going up in height, then my personal belief would be that it a monopine excuse me a monopole would be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	And, again, part of that was because of the wetlands. But also on that northern edge of the driveway, there appears to be a pretty solid, sort of, rock wall, I guess. So, from that perspective, I'm also concerned about where you're showing using silt fence over there, because I'm not sure that you could put silt fence in on that side, given where that rock wall is. So I think you may need to reconsider what you're using for erosion control measures, at least on that side. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Uh-huh. MR. HANNON: So it may be whether it's a silt sock or hay wall, whatever terminology you want to use for it, but that may be more appropriate for that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	going up in height and from what I understand, if T-Mobile ever gets back in, and coming out of Kansas, I guess, Sprint is going to get start getting aggressive, but they haven't done anything in a while. They'll probably want to go up in height. Now, does that, as Mr. Murphy was leading to, it creates a big problem for a monopine versus and I think you were suggesting that a monopole may be a better solution. THE WITNESS (Libertine): If we're talking about going up in height, then my personal belief would be that it a monopine excuse me a monopole would be a better solution here, if we start to get into those heights. MR. LYNCH: Yeah. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And, again, part of that was because of the wetlands. But also on that northern edge of the driveway, there appears to be a pretty solid, sort of, rock wall, I guess. So, from that perspective, I'm also concerned about where you're showing using silt fence over there, because I'm not sure that you could put silt fence in on that side, given where that rock wall is. So I think you may need to reconsider what you're using for erosion control measures, at least on that side. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Uh-huh. MR. HANNON: So it may be whether it's a silt sock or hay wall, whatever terminology you want to use for it,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	going up in height and from what I understand, if T-Mobile ever gets back in, and coming out of Kansas, I guess, Sprint is going to get start getting aggressive, but they haven't done anything in a while. They'll probably want to go up in height. Now, does that, as Mr. Murphy was leading to, it creates a big problem for a monopine versus and I think you were suggesting that a monopole may be a better solution. THE WITNESS (Libertine): If we're talking about going up in height, then my personal belief would be that it a monopine excuse me a monopole would be a better solution here, if we start to get into those heights. MR. LYNCH: Yeah. Thank you. In deference to my good friend and colleague,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	And, again, part of that was because of the wetlands. But also on that northern edge of the driveway, there appears to be a pretty solid, sort of, rock wall, I guess. So, from that perspective, I'm also concerned about where you're showing using silt fence over there, because I'm not sure that you could put silt fence in on that side, given where that rock wall is. So I think you may need to reconsider what you're using for erosion control measures, at least on that side. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Uh-huh. MR. HANNON: So it may be whether it's a silt sock or hay wall, whatever terminology you want to use for it, but that may be more appropriate for that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	going up in height and from what I understand, if T-Mobile ever gets back in, and coming out of Kansas, I guess, Sprint is going to get start getting aggressive, but they haven't done anything in a while. They'll probably want to go up in height. Now, does that, as Mr. Murphy was leading to, it creates a big problem for a monopine versus and I think you were suggesting that a monopole may be a better solution. THE WITNESS (Libertine): If we're talking about going up in height, then my personal belief would be that it a monopine excuse me a monopole would be a better solution here, if we start to get into those heights. MR. LYNCH: Yeah. Thank you. In deference to my good friend and colleague, Dr. "Monopine" Bell down here, I agree.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	And, again, part of that was because of the wetlands. But also on that northern edge of the driveway, there appears to be a pretty solid, sort of, rock wall, I guess. So, from that perspective, I'm also concerned about where you're showing using silt fence over there, because I'm not sure that you could put silt fence in on that side, given where that rock wall is. So I think you may need to reconsider what you're using for erosion control measures, at least on that side. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Uh-huh. MR. HANNON: So it may be whether it's a silt sock or hay wall, whatever terminology you want to use for it, but that may be more appropriate for that site because you're not trenching down into rock. So it may work out a little bit better for the site.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	going up in height and from what I understand, if T-Mobile ever gets back in, and coming out of Kansas, I guess, Sprint is going to get start getting aggressive, but they haven't done anything in a while. They'll probably want to go up in height. Now, does that, as Mr. Murphy was leading to, it creates a big problem for a monopine versus and I think you were suggesting that a monopole may be a better solution. THE WITNESS (Libertine): If we're talking about going up in height, then my personal belief would be that it a monopine excuse me a monopole would be a better solution here, if we start to get into those heights. MR. LYNCH: Yeah. Thank you. In deference to my good friend and colleague, Dr. "Monopine" Bell down here, I agree. And if Verizon should go on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And, again, part of that was because of the wetlands. But also on that northern edge of the driveway, there appears to be a pretty solid, sort of, rock wall, I guess. So, from that perspective, I'm also concerned about where you're showing using silt fence over there, because I'm not sure that you could put silt fence in on that side, given where that rock wall is. So I think you may need to reconsider what you're using for erosion control measures, at least on that side. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Uh-huh. MR. HANNON: So it may be whether it's a silt sock or hay wall, whatever terminology you want to use for it, but that may be more appropriate for that site because you're not trenching down into rock. So it may work out a little bit better for the site. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	going up in height and from what I understand, if T-Mobile ever gets back in, and coming out of Kansas, I guess, Sprint is going to get start getting aggressive, but they haven't done anything in a while. They'll probably want to go up in height. Now, does that, as Mr. Murphy was leading to, it creates a big problem for a monopine versus and I think you were suggesting that a monopole may be a better solution. THE WITNESS (Libertine): If we're talking about going up in height, then my personal belief would be that it a monopine excuse me a monopole would be a better solution here, if we start to get into those heights. MR. LYNCH: Yeah. Thank you. In deference to my good friend and colleague, Dr. "Monopine" Bell down here, I agree. And if Verizon should go on the tower, they can go lower. Would they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And, again, part of that was because of the wetlands. But also on that northern edge of the driveway, there appears to be a pretty solid, sort of, rock wall, I guess. So, from that perspective, I'm also concerned about where you're showing using silt fence over there, because I'm not sure that you could put silt fence in on that side, given where that rock wall is. So I think you may need to reconsider what you're using for erosion control measures, at least on that side. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Uh-huh. MR. HANNON: So it may be whether it's a silt sock or hay wall, whatever terminology you want to use for it, but that may be more appropriate for that site because you're not trenching down into rock. So it may work out a little bit better for the site. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson. I agree that, you know, use of a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	going up in height and from what I understand, if T-Mobile ever gets back in, and coming out of Kansas, I guess, Sprint is going to get start getting aggressive, but they haven't done anything in a while. They'll probably want to go up in height. Now, does that, as Mr. Murphy was leading to, it creates a big problem for a monopine versus and I think you were suggesting that a monopole may be a better solution. THE WITNESS (Libertine): If we're talking about going up in height, then my personal belief would be that it a monopine excuse me a monopole would be a better solution here, if we start to get into those heights. MR. LYNCH: Yeah. Thank you. In deference to my good friend and colleague, Dr. "Monopine" Bell down here, I agree. And if Verizon should go on the tower, they can go lower. Would they also be using would you make them use the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And, again, part of that was because of the wetlands. But also on that northern edge of the driveway, there appears to be a pretty solid, sort of, rock wall, I guess. So, from that perspective, I'm also concerned about where you're showing using silt fence over there, because I'm not sure that you could put silt fence in on that side, given where that rock wall is. So I think you may need to reconsider what you're using for erosion control measures, at least on that side. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Uh-huh. MR. HANNON: So it may be whether it's a silt sock or hay wall, whatever terminology you want to use for it, but that may be more appropriate for that site because you're not trenching down into rock. So it may work out a little bit better for the site. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson. I agree that, you know, use of a straw wall or a filter, a compost filter sock	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	going up in height and from what I understand, if T-Mobile ever gets back in, and coming out of Kansas, I guess, Sprint is going to get start getting aggressive, but they haven't done anything in a while. They'll probably want to go up in height. Now, does that, as Mr. Murphy was leading to, it creates a big problem for a monopine versus and I think you were suggesting that a monopole may be a better solution. THE WITNESS (Libertine): If we're talking about going up in height, then my personal belief would be that it a monopine excuse me a monopole would be a better solution here, if we start to get into those heights. MR. LYNCH: Yeah. Thank you. In deference to my good friend and colleague, Dr. "Monopine" Bell down here, I agree. And if Verizon should go on the tower, they can go lower. Would they also be using would you make them use the T-mounts or could they go to a full platform
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	And, again, part of that was because of the wetlands. But also on that northern edge of the driveway, there appears to be a pretty solid, sort of, rock wall, I guess. So, from that perspective, I'm also concerned about where you're showing using silt fence over there, because I'm not sure that you could put silt fence in on that side, given where that rock wall is. So I think you may need to reconsider what you're using for erosion control measures, at least on that side. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Uh-huh. MR. HANNON: So it may be whether it's a silt sock or hay wall, whatever terminology you want to use for it, but that may be more appropriate for that site because you're not trenching down into rock. So it may work out a little bit better for the site. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson. I agree that, you know, use of a straw wall or a filter, a compost filter sock barrier, would be better suited for that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	going up in height and from what I understand, if T-Mobile ever gets back in, and coming out of Kansas, I guess, Sprint is going to get start getting aggressive, but they haven't done anything in a while. They'll probably want to go up in height. Now, does that, as Mr. Murphy was leading to, it creates a big problem for a monopine versus and I think you were suggesting that a monopole may be a better solution. THE WITNESS (Libertine): If we're talking about going up in height, then my personal belief would be that it a monopine excuse me a monopole would be a better solution here, if we start to get into those heights. MR. LYNCH: Yeah. Thank you. In deference to my good friend and colleague, Dr. "Monopine" Bell down here, I agree. And if Verizon should go on the tower, they can go lower. Would they also be using would you make them use the T-mounts or could they go to a full platform array?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And, again, part of that was because of the wetlands. But also on that northern edge of the driveway, there appears to be a pretty solid, sort of, rock wall, I guess. So, from that perspective, I'm also concerned about where you're showing using silt fence over there, because I'm not sure that you could put silt fence in on that side, given where that rock wall is. So I think you may need to reconsider what you're using for erosion control measures, at least on that side. THE WITNESS (Chasse): Uh-huh. MR. HANNON: So it may be whether it's a silt sock or hay wall, whatever terminology you want to use for it, but that may be more appropriate for that site because you're not trenching down into rock. So it may work out a little bit better for the site. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson. I agree that, you know, use of a straw wall or a filter, a compost filter sock	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	going up in height and from what I understand, if T-Mobile ever gets back in, and coming out of Kansas, I guess, Sprint is going to get start getting aggressive, but they haven't done anything in a while. They'll probably want to go up in height. Now, does that, as Mr. Murphy was leading to, it creates a big problem for a monopine versus and I think you were suggesting that a monopole may be a better solution. THE WITNESS (Libertine): If we're talking about going up in height, then my personal belief would be that it a monopine excuse me a monopole would be a better solution here, if we start to get into those heights. MR. LYNCH: Yeah. Thank you. In deference to my good friend and colleague, Dr. "Monopine" Bell down here, I agree. And if Verizon should go on the tower, they can go lower. Would they also be using would you make them use the T-mounts or could they go to a full platform

18 (Pages 66 to 69)

UNITED REPORTERS, INC.

	Page 70		Page 72
1		1	
1	move further down the tower, the branching	1	So they had indicated they
2	receptors are spaced a little differently so	2	would look to mirror the same type of design.
3	you could use more traditional types of	3	If this did, in turn, turn out to be a
4	mounts down there. With the technology	4	monopine, they could, in fact, install that.
5	changes and going to RH RRH-driven system,	5	MR. LYNCH: Now, would they be
6	a lot of the appurtenances are making their	6	prohibited from putting in any type of
7	way up to the tower. So just like a unipole,	7	microwave line of sight equipment?
8	or a flagpole without the flag, is somewhat	8	THE WITNESS (Vergati): They,
9 10	prohibitive now because they can't use the	9 10	from a no, they would not.
	equipment, using a monopine also has its		MR. LYNCH: And lastly,
11 12	difficulties because of those receptors in	11	Mr. Lavin again. And your C Square
12	the way.	12	testimony, which I think is behind one
	MR. LYNCH: You led right into	13	page 3, you list for well, it just happens
14	my next question, which I was going to have	14	just to be 700 frequency, but you list
15 16	for Mr. Lavin here. Can there be, with the	15	here I don't know if this is population
	monopine I know in previous testimony from	16	and then roadway coverage. Is that what
17 18	your colleague, Mr. Wells, about flagpoles,	17 18	you're focusing on now? I'm assuming
18	he said, flags can be an interferer with the		population means residences and businesses
20	can with a monopine, can some of these	19	and stuff. Is that the main focus of your
	branches or receptors also interfere?	20	THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's
21 22	THE WITNESS (Lavin):	21 22	it's both. Population is just population.
22	They're they're made to be RF transparent	22	Just census data, not business data.
23	and they they really wouldn't.	23	MR. LYNCH: Okay. But it would assume it's it would probably be
24 25	THE WITNESS (Chasse): It's	24 25	
20	more of a physical this is Scott Chasse.	25	more residential then, if you say it's not
	Page 71		Page 73
1		1	
1	More of a physical interference than an RF	1	business. But isn't that the area you're
2	More of a physical interference than an RF interference.	2	business. But isn't that the area you're looking to bring your data into, you know,
2 3	More of a physical interference than an RF interference. MR. LYNCH: Okay. And my last	2 3	business. But isn't that the area you're looking to bring your data into, you know, your data services rather than covering gaps
2 3 4	More of a physical interference than an RF interference. MR. LYNCH: Okay. And my last question has to deal with, if the Town comes	2 3 4	business. But isn't that the area you're looking to bring your data into, you know, your data services rather than covering gaps in roadways?
2 3 4 5	More of a physical interference than an RF interference. MR. LYNCH: Okay. And my last question has to deal with, if the Town comes onto the tower, and we we are in a	2 3 4 5	business. But isn't that the area you're looking to bring your data into, you know, your data services rather than covering gaps in roadways? THE WITNESS (Lavin): More
2 3 4 5 6	More of a physical interference than an RF interference. MR. LYNCH: Okay. And my last question has to deal with, if the Town comes onto the tower, and we we are in a monopine design, would the I'm assuming	2 3 4 5 6	business. But isn't that the area you're looking to bring your data into, you know, your data services rather than covering gaps in roadways? THE WITNESS (Lavin): More population, yes. And in this case, I guess,
2 3 4 5 6 7	More of a physical interference than an RF interference. MR. LYNCH: Okay. And my last question has to deal with, if the Town comes onto the tower, and we we are in a monopine design, would the I'm assuming they probably have 14 or 18-foot foot	2 3 4 5 6 7	business. But isn't that the area you're looking to bring your data into, you know, your data services rather than covering gaps in roadways? THE WITNESS (Lavin): More population, yes. And in this case, I guess, we may be it's based on census data and we
2 3 4 5 6	More of a physical interference than an RF interference. MR. LYNCH: Okay. And my last question has to deal with, if the Town comes onto the tower, and we we are in a monopine design, would the I'm assuming they probably have 14 or 18-foot foot whips coming out the would they be coming	2 3 4 5 6	business. But isn't that the area you're looking to bring your data into, you know, your data services rather than covering gaps in roadways? THE WITNESS (Lavin): More population, yes. And in this case, I guess, we may be it's based on census data and we may we may not have captured seasonal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	More of a physical interference than an RF interference. MR. LYNCH: Okay. And my last question has to deal with, if the Town comes onto the tower, and we we are in a monopine design, would the I'm assuming they probably have 14 or 18-foot foot whips coming out the would they be coming out of the top, Mr. Vergati?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	business. But isn't that the area you're looking to bring your data into, you know, your data services rather than covering gaps in roadways? THE WITNESS (Lavin): More population, yes. And in this case, I guess, we may be it's based on census data and we may we may not have captured seasonal residents at the Twin Lakes area because they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	More of a physical interference than an RF interference. MR. LYNCH: Okay. And my last question has to deal with, if the Town comes onto the tower, and we we are in a monopine design, would the I'm assuming they probably have 14 or 18-foot foot whips coming out the would they be coming out of the top, Mr. Vergati? THE WITNESS (Vergati): In my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	business. But isn't that the area you're looking to bring your data into, you know, your data services rather than covering gaps in roadways? THE WITNESS (Lavin): More population, yes. And in this case, I guess, we may be it's based on census data and we may we may not have captured seasonal residents at the Twin Lakes area because they would not have been counted there.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	More of a physical interference than an RF interference. MR. LYNCH: Okay. And my last question has to deal with, if the Town comes onto the tower, and we we are in a monopine design, would the I'm assuming they probably have 14 or 18-foot foot whips coming out the would they be coming out of the top, Mr. Vergati? THE WITNESS (Vergati): In my preliminary conversations with Litchfield	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	business. But isn't that the area you're looking to bring your data into, you know, your data services rather than covering gaps in roadways? THE WITNESS (Lavin): More population, yes. And in this case, I guess, we may be it's based on census data and we may we may not have captured seasonal residents at the Twin Lakes area because they would not have been counted there. MR. LYNCH: That's another
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	More of a physical interference than an RF interference. MR. LYNCH: Okay. And my last question has to deal with, if the Town comes onto the tower, and we we are in a monopine design, would the I'm assuming they probably have 14 or 18-foot foot whips coming out the would they be coming out of the top, Mr. Vergati? THE WITNESS (Vergati): In my preliminary conversations with Litchfield County dispatch, Mr. Soule had indicated that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	business. But isn't that the area you're looking to bring your data into, you know, your data services rather than covering gaps in roadways? THE WITNESS (Lavin): More population, yes. And in this case, I guess, we may be it's based on census data and we may we may not have captured seasonal residents at the Twin Lakes area because they would not have been counted there. MR. LYNCH: That's another point I didn't think of. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	More of a physical interference than an RF interference. MR. LYNCH: Okay. And my last question has to deal with, if the Town comes onto the tower, and we we are in a monopine design, would the I'm assuming they probably have 14 or 18-foot foot whips coming out the would they be coming out of the top, Mr. Vergati? THE WITNESS (Vergati): In my preliminary conversations with Litchfield	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	business. But isn't that the area you're looking to bring your data into, you know, your data services rather than covering gaps in roadways? THE WITNESS (Lavin): More population, yes. And in this case, I guess, we may be it's based on census data and we may we may not have captured seasonal residents at the Twin Lakes area because they would not have been counted there. MR. LYNCH: That's another
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	More of a physical interference than an RF interference. MR. LYNCH: Okay. And my last question has to deal with, if the Town comes onto the tower, and we we are in a monopine design, would the I'm assuming they probably have 14 or 18-foot foot whips coming out the would they be coming out of the top, Mr. Vergati? THE WITNESS (Vergati): In my preliminary conversations with Litchfield County dispatch, Mr. Soule had indicated that they would look to mirror the same kind of application that was done at a recent site in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	business. But isn't that the area you're looking to bring your data into, you know, your data services rather than covering gaps in roadways? THE WITNESS (Lavin): More population, yes. And in this case, I guess, we may be it's based on census data and we may we may not have captured seasonal residents at the Twin Lakes area because they would not have been counted there. MR. LYNCH: That's another point I didn't think of. Thank you. Those are my questions, Mr. Chairman.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	More of a physical interference than an RF interference. MR. LYNCH: Okay. And my last question has to deal with, if the Town comes onto the tower, and we we are in a monopine design, would the I'm assuming they probably have 14 or 18-foot foot whips coming out the would they be coming out of the top, Mr. Vergati? THE WITNESS (Vergati): In my preliminary conversations with Litchfield County dispatch, Mr. Soule had indicated that they would look to mirror the same kind of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	business. But isn't that the area you're looking to bring your data into, you know, your data services rather than covering gaps in roadways? THE WITNESS (Lavin): More population, yes. And in this case, I guess, we may be it's based on census data and we may we may not have captured seasonal residents at the Twin Lakes area because they would not have been counted there. MR. LYNCH: That's another point I didn't think of. Thank you. Those are my questions,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	More of a physical interference than an RF interference. MR. LYNCH: Okay. And my last question has to deal with, if the Town comes onto the tower, and we we are in a monopine design, would the I'm assuming they probably have 14 or 18-foot foot whips coming out the would they be coming out of the top, Mr. Vergati? THE WITNESS (Vergati): In my preliminary conversations with Litchfield County dispatch, Mr. Soule had indicated that they would look to mirror the same kind of application that was done at a recent site in Washington Depot, where LCD placed, I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	business. But isn't that the area you're looking to bring your data into, you know, your data services rather than covering gaps in roadways? THE WITNESS (Lavin): More population, yes. And in this case, I guess, we may be it's based on census data and we may we may not have captured seasonal residents at the Twin Lakes area because they would not have been counted there. MR. LYNCH: That's another point I didn't think of. Thank you. Those are my questions, Mr. Chairman. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	More of a physical interference than an RF interference. MR. LYNCH: Okay. And my last question has to deal with, if the Town comes onto the tower, and we we are in a monopine design, would the I'm assuming they probably have 14 or 18-foot foot whips coming out the would they be coming out of the top, Mr. Vergati? THE WITNESS (Vergati): In my preliminary conversations with Litchfield County dispatch, Mr. Soule had indicated that they would look to mirror the same kind of application that was done at a recent site in Washington Depot, where LCD placed, I believe, it was two whip antennas coming off the very top of the tower and then one at a lower elevation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	business. But isn't that the area you're looking to bring your data into, you know, your data services rather than covering gaps in roadways? THE WITNESS (Lavin): More population, yes. And in this case, I guess, we may be it's based on census data and we may we may not have captured seasonal residents at the Twin Lakes area because they would not have been counted there. MR. LYNCH: That's another point I didn't think of. Thank you. Those are my questions, Mr. Chairman. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Mr. Perrone.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	More of a physical interference than an RF interference. MR. LYNCH: Okay. And my last question has to deal with, if the Town comes onto the tower, and we we are in a monopine design, would the I'm assuming they probably have 14 or 18-foot foot whips coming out the would they be coming out of the top, Mr. Vergati? THE WITNESS (Vergati): In my preliminary conversations with Litchfield County dispatch, Mr. Soule had indicated that they would look to mirror the same kind of application that was done at a recent site in Washington Depot, where LCD placed, I believe, it was two whip antennas coming off the very top of the tower and then one at a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	business. But isn't that the area you're looking to bring your data into, you know, your data services rather than covering gaps in roadways? THE WITNESS (Lavin): More population, yes. And in this case, I guess, we may be it's based on census data and we may we may not have captured seasonal residents at the Twin Lakes area because they would not have been counted there. MR. LYNCH: That's another point I didn't think of. Thank you. Those are my questions, Mr. Chairman. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Mr. PERRONE: I just had one final question. Mr. Chasse, the existing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	More of a physical interference than an RF interference. MR. LYNCH: Okay. And my last question has to deal with, if the Town comes onto the tower, and we we are in a monopine design, would the I'm assuming they probably have 14 or 18-foot foot whips coming out the would they be coming out of the top, Mr. Vergati? THE WITNESS (Vergati): In my preliminary conversations with Litchfield County dispatch, Mr. Soule had indicated that they would look to mirror the same kind of application that was done at a recent site in Washington Depot, where LCD placed, I believe, it was two whip antennas coming off the very top of the tower and then one at a lower elevation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	business. But isn't that the area you're looking to bring your data into, you know, your data services rather than covering gaps in roadways? THE WITNESS (Lavin): More population, yes. And in this case, I guess, we may be it's based on census data and we may we may not have captured seasonal residents at the Twin Lakes area because they would not have been counted there. MR. LYNCH: That's another point I didn't think of. Thank you. Those are my questions, Mr. Chairman. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Mr. PERRONE: I just had one final question. Mr. Chasse, the existing boathouse access, not the logging access,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	More of a physical interference than an RF interference. MR. LYNCH: Okay. And my last question has to deal with, if the Town comes onto the tower, and we we are in a monopine design, would the I'm assuming they probably have 14 or 18-foot foot whips coming out the would they be coming out of the top, Mr. Vergati? THE WITNESS (Vergati): In my preliminary conversations with Litchfield County dispatch, Mr. Soule had indicated that they would look to mirror the same kind of application that was done at a recent site in Washington Depot, where LCD placed, I believe, it was two whip antennas coming off the very top of the tower and then one at a lower elevation. I believe that particular pole was 135 with two 7-foot THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	business. But isn't that the area you're looking to bring your data into, you know, your data services rather than covering gaps in roadways? THE WITNESS (Lavin): More population, yes. And in this case, I guess, we may be it's based on census data and we may we may not have captured seasonal residents at the Twin Lakes area because they would not have been counted there. MR. LYNCH: That's another point I didn't think of. Thank you. Those are my questions, Mr. Chairman. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Mr. PERRONE: I just had one final question. Mr. Chasse, the existing boathouse access, not the logging access, would that be upgraded with gravel, like,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	More of a physical interference than an RF interference. MR. LYNCH: Okay. And my last question has to deal with, if the Town comes onto the tower, and we we are in a monopine design, would the I'm assuming they probably have 14 or 18-foot foot whips coming out the would they be coming out of the top, Mr. Vergati? THE WITNESS (Vergati): In my preliminary conversations with Litchfield County dispatch, Mr. Soule had indicated that they would look to mirror the same kind of application that was done at a recent site in Washington Depot, where LCD placed, I believe, it was two whip antennas coming off the very top of the tower and then one at a lower elevation. I believe that particular pole was 135 with two 7-foot	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	business. But isn't that the area you're looking to bring your data into, you know, your data services rather than covering gaps in roadways? THE WITNESS (Lavin): More population, yes. And in this case, I guess, we may be it's based on census data and we may we may not have captured seasonal residents at the Twin Lakes area because they would not have been counted there. MR. LYNCH: That's another point I didn't think of. Thank you. Those are my questions, Mr. Chairman. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Mr. Perrone. MR. PERRONE: I just had one final question. Mr. Chasse, the existing boathouse access, not the logging access, would that be upgraded with gravel, like, from the end of the pavement to where the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	More of a physical interference than an RF interference. MR. LYNCH: Okay. And my last question has to deal with, if the Town comes onto the tower, and we we are in a monopine design, would the I'm assuming they probably have 14 or 18-foot foot whips coming out the would they be coming out of the top, Mr. Vergati? THE WITNESS (Vergati): In my preliminary conversations with Litchfield County dispatch, Mr. Soule had indicated that they would look to mirror the same kind of application that was done at a recent site in Washington Depot, where LCD placed, I believe, it was two whip antennas coming off the very top of the tower and then one at a lower elevation. I believe that particular pole was 135 with two 7-foot THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): two 7-foot antennas coming off the top. And then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	business. But isn't that the area you're looking to bring your data into, you know, your data services rather than covering gaps in roadways? THE WITNESS (Lavin): More population, yes. And in this case, I guess, we may be it's based on census data and we may we may not have captured seasonal residents at the Twin Lakes area because they would not have been counted there. MR. LYNCH: That's another point I didn't think of. Thank you. Those are my questions, Mr. Chairman. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Mr. Perrone. MR. PERRONE: I just had one final question. Mr. Chasse, the existing boathouse access, not the logging access, would that be upgraded with gravel, like, from the end of the pavement to where the access to the tower would begin?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	More of a physical interference than an RF interference. MR. LYNCH: Okay. And my last question has to deal with, if the Town comes onto the tower, and we we are in a monopine design, would the I'm assuming they probably have 14 or 18-foot foot whips coming out the would they be coming out of the top, Mr. Vergati? THE WITNESS (Vergati): In my preliminary conversations with Litchfield County dispatch, Mr. Soule had indicated that they would look to mirror the same kind of application that was done at a recent site in Washington Depot, where LCD placed, I believe, it was two whip antennas coming off the very top of the tower and then one at a lower elevation. I believe that particular pole was 135 with two 7-foot THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): two 7-foot antennas coming off the top. And then they had a third Yagi, I believe, maybe at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	business. But isn't that the area you're looking to bring your data into, you know, your data services rather than covering gaps in roadways? THE WITNESS (Lavin): More population, yes. And in this case, I guess, we may be it's based on census data and we may we may not have captured seasonal residents at the Twin Lakes area because they would not have been counted there. MR. LYNCH: That's another point I didn't think of. Thank you. Those are my questions, Mr. Chairman. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Mr. Perrone. MR. PERRONE: I just had one final question. Mr. Chasse, the existing boathouse access, not the logging access, would that be upgraded with gravel, like, from the end of the pavement to where the access to the tower would begin? THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	More of a physical interference than an RF interference. MR. LYNCH: Okay. And my last question has to deal with, if the Town comes onto the tower, and we we are in a monopine design, would the I'm assuming they probably have 14 or 18-foot foot whips coming out the would they be coming out of the top, Mr. Vergati? THE WITNESS (Vergati): In my preliminary conversations with Litchfield County dispatch, Mr. Soule had indicated that they would look to mirror the same kind of application that was done at a recent site in Washington Depot, where LCD placed, I believe, it was two whip antennas coming off the very top of the tower and then one at a lower elevation. I believe that particular pole was 135 with two 7-foot THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes. THE WITNESS (Vergati): two 7-foot antennas coming off the top. And then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	business. But isn't that the area you're looking to bring your data into, you know, your data services rather than covering gaps in roadways? THE WITNESS (Lavin): More population, yes. And in this case, I guess, we may be it's based on census data and we may we may not have captured seasonal residents at the Twin Lakes area because they would not have been counted there. MR. LYNCH: That's another point I didn't think of. Thank you. Those are my questions, Mr. Chairman. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Mr. Perrone. MR. PERRONE: I just had one final question. Mr. Chasse, the existing boathouse access, not the logging access, would that be upgraded with gravel, like, from the end of the pavement to where the access to the tower would begin?

19 (Pages 70 to 73)

UNITED REPORTERS, INC.

	Daga 74		Dago 76
	Page 74		Page 76
1	scarified and improved as a gravel surface	1	maybe this is really where you should do some
2	running up through there. And then, at the	2	more work before it gets to us, is to really
3	very last 90 feet, we radii off of that and	3	check to see what other providers and also
4	continue the new road up to the up to the	4	what their needs might be. Because we
5	facility, but it starts at the existing road.	5	wouldn't this discussion about whether it
6	MR. PERRONE: Okay. In other	6	should be 157 feet or 170 feet or 200 feet,
7	words	7	or whether they could go at the lower levels
8	THE WITNESS (Libertine): 1900	8	and still provide some basic coverage, I
9	feet or	9	mean, I don't I mean, somebody said it's
10	THE WITNESS (Chasse): Oh, no.	10	up to us. I don't know how we can answer
11	MR. PERRONE: That's what I'm	11	that question. That's really So I
12	wondering. Yeah, in other words the	12	it's it's a real it's a frustration,
13	THE WITNESS (Chasse): I'm	13	certainly to this member of the Council. So
14	sorry.	14	that's the statement part of it, which is
15	MR. PERRONE: There was	15	hopefully not a complete exercise in
16	yes, from the maintenance area where the	16	futility. But based on past responses, it
17	THE WITNESS (Chasse): I	17	hasn't been very haven't gotten too far,
18	misunderstood your question. Yes, from the	18	but it really is is a frustration.
19	maintenance area to the proposed improved	19	So my question on the to
20	road at the logging road, the only	20	Mr. Lavin, if if you are not in your seat,
21	disturbance there will be for trenching for	21	for example, say it was another another
22	telco. No road improvements are proposed.	22	provider was proposing this and was sent
23	MR. PERRONE: Okay. thank you.	23	whatever the form letter to in this case,
24 25	That's all I have.	24 25	you know, got to you and you didn't have any
25	THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. I	25	plans, but you knew that this was an area,
	~ 75		
	Page 75		Page 77
1	Page 75	1	Page 77
1	have I'll try to make this into a	1	because I assume the carriers know where they
2	have I'll try to make this into a question, at some point. But again, to	2	because I assume the carriers know where they have coverage and where there's really a
2 3	have I'll try to make this into a question, at some point. But again, to follow up Senator Murphy and also Mr. Lynch,	2 3	because I assume the carriers know where they have coverage and where there's really a problem, is it either too costly, too
2 3 4	have I'll try to make this into a question, at some point. But again, to follow up Senator Murphy and also Mr. Lynch, and part of it's really just out of	2 3 4	because I assume the carriers know where they have coverage and where there's really a problem, is it either too costly, too time-consuming, or just something because of
2 3 4 5	have I'll try to make this into a question, at some point. But again, to follow up Senator Murphy and also Mr. Lynch, and part of it's really just out of frustration, my understanding is, when an	2 3 4 5	because I assume the carriers know where they have coverage and where there's really a problem, is it either too costly, too time-consuming, or just something because of proprietary your nature? And I'm
2 3 4 5 6	have I'll try to make this into a question, at some point. But again, to follow up Senator Murphy and also Mr. Lynch, and part of it's really just out of frustration, my understanding is, when an application for a cell tower comes in, we do	2 3 4 5 6	because I assume the carriers know where they have coverage and where there's really a problem, is it either too costly, too time-consuming, or just something because of proprietary your nature? And I'm obviously not asking for the model to say,
2 3 4 5 6 7	have I'll try to make this into a question, at some point. But again, to follow up Senator Murphy and also Mr. Lynch, and part of it's really just out of frustration, my understanding is, when an application for a cell tower comes in, we do request that we see if any of the other	2 3 4 5 6 7	because I assume the carriers know where they have coverage and where there's really a problem, is it either too costly, too time-consuming, or just something because of proprietary your nature? And I'm obviously not asking for the model to say, yes, in the future, we might also be
2 3 4 5 6	have I'll try to make this into a question, at some point. But again, to follow up Senator Murphy and also Mr. Lynch, and part of it's really just out of frustration, my understanding is, when an application for a cell tower comes in, we do request that we see if any of the other carriers are interested. Correct?	2 3 4 5 6	because I assume the carriers know where they have coverage and where there's really a problem, is it either too costly, too time-consuming, or just something because of proprietary your nature? And I'm obviously not asking for the model to say, yes, in the future, we might also be interested, but we're really going to need X
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	have I'll try to make this into a question, at some point. But again, to follow up Senator Murphy and also Mr. Lynch, and part of it's really just out of frustration, my understanding is, when an application for a cell tower comes in, we do request that we see if any of the other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	because I assume the carriers know where they have coverage and where there's really a problem, is it either too costly, too time-consuming, or just something because of proprietary your nature? And I'm obviously not asking for the model to say, yes, in the future, we might also be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	have I'll try to make this into a question, at some point. But again, to follow up Senator Murphy and also Mr. Lynch, and part of it's really just out of frustration, my understanding is, when an application for a cell tower comes in, we do request that we see if any of the other carriers are interested. Correct? And we get usually either no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	because I assume the carriers know where they have coverage and where there's really a problem, is it either too costly, too time-consuming, or just something because of proprietary your nature? And I'm obviously not asking for the model to say, yes, in the future, we might also be interested, but we're really going to need X X feet to make it worthwhile, or give
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	have I'll try to make this into a question, at some point. But again, to follow up Senator Murphy and also Mr. Lynch, and part of it's really just out of frustration, my understanding is, when an application for a cell tower comes in, we do request that we see if any of the other carriers are interested. Correct? And we get usually either no response I'm just checking to make sure I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	because I assume the carriers know where they have coverage and where there's really a problem, is it either too costly, too time-consuming, or just something because of proprietary your nature? And I'm obviously not asking for the model to say, yes, in the future, we might also be interested, but we're really going to need X X feet to make it worthwhile, or give something so that the Council has has you know, it's a hypothetical question, obviously, at this point has a better
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	have I'll try to make this into a question, at some point. But again, to follow up Senator Murphy and also Mr. Lynch, and part of it's really just out of frustration, my understanding is, when an application for a cell tower comes in, we do request that we see if any of the other carriers are interested. Correct? And we get usually either no response I'm just checking to make sure I have the question or statement to we're not interested at this time, to actually, in a few cases, we would be interested in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	because I assume the carriers know where they have coverage and where there's really a problem, is it either too costly, too time-consuming, or just something because of proprietary your nature? And I'm obviously not asking for the model to say, yes, in the future, we might also be interested, but we're really going to need X X feet to make it worthwhile, or give something so that the Council has has you know, it's a hypothetical question, obviously, at this point has a better sense of whether what what the plan
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	have I'll try to make this into a question, at some point. But again, to follow up Senator Murphy and also Mr. Lynch, and part of it's really just out of frustration, my understanding is, when an application for a cell tower comes in, we do request that we see if any of the other carriers are interested. Correct? And we get usually either no response I'm just checking to make sure I have the question or statement to we're not interested at this time, to actually, in a few cases, we would be interested in the future. We may be interested in the future.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	because I assume the carriers know where they have coverage and where there's really a problem, is it either too costly, too time-consuming, or just something because of proprietary your nature? And I'm obviously not asking for the model to say, yes, in the future, we might also be interested, but we're really going to need X X feet to make it worthwhile, or give something so that the Council has has you know, it's a hypothetical question, obviously, at this point has a better sense of whether what what the plan And this is also for the public, which in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	have I'll try to make this into a question, at some point. But again, to follow up Senator Murphy and also Mr. Lynch, and part of it's really just out of frustration, my understanding is, when an application for a cell tower comes in, we do request that we see if any of the other carriers are interested. Correct? And we get usually either no response I'm just checking to make sure I have the question or statement to we're not interested at this time, to actually, in a few cases, we would be interested in the future. We may be interested in the future. It would really help if,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	because I assume the carriers know where they have coverage and where there's really a problem, is it either too costly, too time-consuming, or just something because of proprietary your nature? And I'm obviously not asking for the model to say, yes, in the future, we might also be interested, but we're really going to need X X feet to make it worthwhile, or give something so that the Council has has you know, it's a hypothetical question, obviously, at this point has a better sense of whether what what the plan And this is also for the public, which in many case is very concerned about the height
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	have I'll try to make this into a question, at some point. But again, to follow up Senator Murphy and also Mr. Lynch, and part of it's really just out of frustration, my understanding is, when an application for a cell tower comes in, we do request that we see if any of the other carriers are interested. Correct? And we get usually either no response I'm just checking to make sure I have the question or statement to we're not interested at this time, to actually, in a few cases, we would be interested in the future. We may be interested in the future. It would really help if, particularly in the area where it's known	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	because I assume the carriers know where they have coverage and where there's really a problem, is it either too costly, too time-consuming, or just something because of proprietary your nature? And I'm obviously not asking for the model to say, yes, in the future, we might also be interested, but we're really going to need X X feet to make it worthwhile, or give something so that the Council has has you know, it's a hypothetical question, obviously, at this point has a better sense of whether what what the plan And this is also for the public, which in many case is very concerned about the height because of visibility. And if it's another
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	have I'll try to make this into a question, at some point. But again, to follow up Senator Murphy and also Mr. Lynch, and part of it's really just out of frustration, my understanding is, when an application for a cell tower comes in, we do request that we see if any of the other carriers are interested. Correct? And we get usually either no response I'm just checking to make sure I have the question or statement to we're not interested at this time, to actually, in a few cases, we would be interested in the future. We may be interested in the future. It would really help if, particularly in the area where it's known and I can't believe that the carriers don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	because I assume the carriers know where they have coverage and where there's really a problem, is it either too costly, too time-consuming, or just something because of proprietary your nature? And I'm obviously not asking for the model to say, yes, in the future, we might also be interested, but we're really going to need X X feet to make it worthwhile, or give something so that the Council has has you know, it's a hypothetical question, obviously, at this point has a better sense of whether what what the plan And this is also for the public, which in many case is very concerned about the height because of visibility. And if it's another 10 or 20 feet, they're going to be really,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	have I'll try to make this into a question, at some point. But again, to follow up Senator Murphy and also Mr. Lynch, and part of it's really just out of frustration, my understanding is, when an application for a cell tower comes in, we do request that we see if any of the other carriers are interested. Correct? And we get usually either no response I'm just checking to make sure I have the question or statement to we're not interested at this time, to actually, in a few cases, we would be interested in the future. We may be interested in the future. It would really help if, particularly in the area where it's known and I can't believe that the carriers don't know that they really have a coverage	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	because I assume the carriers know where they have coverage and where there's really a problem, is it either too costly, too time-consuming, or just something because of proprietary your nature? And I'm obviously not asking for the model to say, yes, in the future, we might also be interested, but we're really going to need X X feet to make it worthwhile, or give something so that the Council has has you know, it's a hypothetical question, obviously, at this point has a better sense of whether what what the plan And this is also for the public, which in many case is very concerned about the height because of visibility. And if it's another 10 or 20 feet, they're going to be really, you know, even that much more concerned.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	have I'll try to make this into a question, at some point. But again, to follow up Senator Murphy and also Mr. Lynch, and part of it's really just out of frustration, my understanding is, when an application for a cell tower comes in, we do request that we see if any of the other carriers are interested. Correct? And we get usually either no response I'm just checking to make sure I have the question or statement to we're not interested at this time, to actually, in a few cases, we would be interested in the future. We may be interested in the future. It would really help if, particularly in the area where it's known and I can't believe that the carriers don't know that they really have a coverage issue that we could get a little bit more	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	because I assume the carriers know where they have coverage and where there's really a problem, is it either too costly, too time-consuming, or just something because of proprietary your nature? And I'm obviously not asking for the model to say, yes, in the future, we might also be interested, but we're really going to need X X feet to make it worthwhile, or give something so that the Council has has you know, it's a hypothetical question, obviously, at this point has a better sense of whether what what the plan And this is also for the public, which in many case is very concerned about the height because of visibility. And if it's another 10 or 20 feet, they're going to be really, you know, even that much more concerned. So I'm just looking to see if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	have I'll try to make this into a question, at some point. But again, to follow up Senator Murphy and also Mr. Lynch, and part of it's really just out of frustration, my understanding is, when an application for a cell tower comes in, we do request that we see if any of the other carriers are interested. Correct? And we get usually either no response I'm just checking to make sure I have the question or statement to we're not interested at this time, to actually, in a few cases, we would be interested in the future. We may be interested in the future. It would really help if, particularly in the area where it's known and I can't believe that the carriers don't know that they really have a coverage issue that we could get a little bit more helpful response. Obviously, unless I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	because I assume the carriers know where they have coverage and where there's really a problem, is it either too costly, too time-consuming, or just something because of proprietary your nature? And I'm obviously not asking for the model to say, yes, in the future, we might also be interested, but we're really going to need X X feet to make it worthwhile, or give something so that the Council has has you know, it's a hypothetical question, obviously, at this point has a better sense of whether what what the plan And this is also for the public, which in many case is very concerned about the height because of visibility. And if it's another 10 or 20 feet, they're going to be really, you know, even that much more concerned. So I'm just looking to see if there's if there's any way we could get a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	have I'll try to make this into a question, at some point. But again, to follow up Senator Murphy and also Mr. Lynch, and part of it's really just out of frustration, my understanding is, when an application for a cell tower comes in, we do request that we see if any of the other carriers are interested. Correct? And we get usually either no response I'm just checking to make sure I have the question or statement to we're not interested at this time, to actually, in a few cases, we would be interested in the future. We may be interested in the future. It would really help if, particularly in the area where it's known and I can't believe that the carriers don't know that they really have a coverage issue that we could get a little bit more helpful response. Obviously, unless I'm wrong, and the people sitting in the audience	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	because I assume the carriers know where they have coverage and where there's really a problem, is it either too costly, too time-consuming, or just something because of proprietary your nature? And I'm obviously not asking for the model to say, yes, in the future, we might also be interested, but we're really going to need X X feet to make it worthwhile, or give something so that the Council has has you know, it's a hypothetical question, obviously, at this point has a better sense of whether what what the plan And this is also for the public, which in many case is very concerned about the height because of visibility. And if it's another 10 or 20 feet, they're going to be really, you know, even that much more concerned. So I'm just looking to see if there's if there's any way we could get a little bit more intelligent responses from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	have I'll try to make this into a question, at some point. But again, to follow up Senator Murphy and also Mr. Lynch, and part of it's really just out of frustration, my understanding is, when an application for a cell tower comes in, we do request that we see if any of the other carriers are interested. Correct? And we get usually either no response I'm just checking to make sure I have the question or statement to we're not interested at this time, to actually, in a few cases, we would be interested in the future. We may be interested in the future. It would really help if, particularly in the area where it's known and I can't believe that the carriers don't know that they really have a coverage issue that we could get a little bit more helpful response. Obviously, unless I'm wrong, and the people sitting in the audience represent Verizon and Sprint and T-Mobile and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	because I assume the carriers know where they have coverage and where there's really a problem, is it either too costly, too time-consuming, or just something because of proprietary your nature? And I'm obviously not asking for the model to say, yes, in the future, we might also be interested, but we're really going to need X X feet to make it worthwhile, or give something so that the Council has has you know, it's a hypothetical question, obviously, at this point has a better sense of whether what what the plan And this is also for the public, which in many case is very concerned about the height because of visibility. And if it's another 10 or 20 feet, they're going to be really, you know, even that much more concerned. So I'm just looking to see if there's if there's any way we could get a little bit more intelligent responses from not only the applicant, but for those who
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	have I'll try to make this into a question, at some point. But again, to follow up Senator Murphy and also Mr. Lynch, and part of it's really just out of frustration, my understanding is, when an application for a cell tower comes in, we do request that we see if any of the other carriers are interested. Correct? And we get usually either no response I'm just checking to make sure I have the question or statement to we're not interested at this time, to actually, in a few cases, we would be interested in the future. We may be interested in the future. It would really help if, particularly in the area where it's known and I can't believe that the carriers don't know that they really have a coverage issue that we could get a little bit more helpful response. Obviously, unless I'm wrong, and the people sitting in the audience represent Verizon and Sprint and T-Mobile and whoever else so I suspect they're not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	because I assume the carriers know where they have coverage and where there's really a problem, is it either too costly, too time-consuming, or just something because of proprietary your nature? And I'm obviously not asking for the model to say, yes, in the future, we might also be interested, but we're really going to need X X feet to make it worthwhile, or give something so that the Council has has you know, it's a hypothetical question, obviously, at this point has a better sense of whether what what the plan And this is also for the public, which in many case is very concerned about the height because of visibility. And if it's another 10 or 20 feet, they're going to be really, you know, even that much more concerned. So I'm just looking to see if there's if there's any way we could get a little bit more intelligent responses from not only the applicant, but for those who were not who may have been queried, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	have I'll try to make this into a question, at some point. But again, to follow up Senator Murphy and also Mr. Lynch, and part of it's really just out of frustration, my understanding is, when an application for a cell tower comes in, we do request that we see if any of the other carriers are interested. Correct? And we get usually either no response I'm just checking to make sure I have the question or statement to we're not interested at this time, to actually, in a few cases, we would be interested in the future. We may be interested in the future. It would really help if, particularly in the area where it's known and I can't believe that the carriers don't know that they really have a coverage issue that we could get a little bit more helpful response. Obviously, unless I'm wrong, and the people sitting in the audience represent Verizon and Sprint and T-Mobile and whoever else so I suspect they're not here. But AT&T is, so I'll suggest and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	because I assume the carriers know where they have coverage and where there's really a problem, is it either too costly, too time-consuming, or just something because of proprietary your nature? And I'm obviously not asking for the model to say, yes, in the future, we might also be interested, but we're really going to need X X feet to make it worthwhile, or give something so that the Council has has you know, it's a hypothetical question, obviously, at this point has a better sense of whether what what the plan And this is also for the public, which in many case is very concerned about the height because of visibility. And if it's another 10 or 20 feet, they're going to be really, you know, even that much more concerned. So I'm just looking to see if there's if there's any way we could get a little bit more intelligent responses from not only the applicant, but for those who were not who may have been queried, but respond in either no response or a very vague
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	have I'll try to make this into a question, at some point. But again, to follow up Senator Murphy and also Mr. Lynch, and part of it's really just out of frustration, my understanding is, when an application for a cell tower comes in, we do request that we see if any of the other carriers are interested. Correct? And we get usually either no response I'm just checking to make sure I have the question or statement to we're not interested at this time, to actually, in a few cases, we would be interested in the future. We may be interested in the future. It would really help if, particularly in the area where it's known and I can't believe that the carriers don't know that they really have a coverage issue that we could get a little bit more helpful response. Obviously, unless I'm wrong, and the people sitting in the audience represent Verizon and Sprint and T-Mobile and whoever else so I suspect they're not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	because I assume the carriers know where they have coverage and where there's really a problem, is it either too costly, too time-consuming, or just something because of proprietary your nature? And I'm obviously not asking for the model to say, yes, in the future, we might also be interested, but we're really going to need X X feet to make it worthwhile, or give something so that the Council has has you know, it's a hypothetical question, obviously, at this point has a better sense of whether what what the plan And this is also for the public, which in many case is very concerned about the height because of visibility. And if it's another 10 or 20 feet, they're going to be really, you know, even that much more concerned. So I'm just looking to see if there's if there's any way we could get a little bit more intelligent responses from not only the applicant, but for those who were not who may have been queried, but

20 (Pages 74 to 77)

	Page 78		Page 80
1	THE WITNESS (Lavin): Well, I	1	ultimately.
2	think anyone's RF engineering department	2	MS. CHIOCCHIO: Right. And I
3	could tell you, at any point in time, whether	3	think, you know, like Martin said, it goes to
4	they thought they would need it in the	4	RF first because they know where the needs
5	future. But we're, of course, not the only	5	are and so forth, but that's not the only
6	group of the carriers and consultants that	6	consideration. And I think Mr. Vergati can
7	have to weigh in on it. And it's also, I	7	talk a little bit about, you know, the siting
8	think, mostly a matter of commitment, to some	8	process.
9	extent, how much I, as the RF engineer, I can	9	SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I think
10	say, oh, yeah, I I think having a tower	10	Verizon, in this one, responded that they
11	there at 180 feet would be great, but I don't	11	could use going on this pole but it's not in
12	know if the rest of Operator X would be	12	the budget.
13	willing leary of committing to doing that	13	MS. CHIOCCHIO: Correct.
14	or thinking it was going to be something	14	Correct. And a lot of times that's the case.
15	they'd be held to.	15	SENATOR MURPHY: Right.
16	SENATOR MURPHY: Can I ask a	16	Right. Which which
17	question?	17	MS. CHIOCCHIO: Yeah.
18	THE CHAIRPERSON: Sure. And	18	SENATOR MURPHY: that's
19	Senator Murphy.	19	what led me to start asking the question.
20	SENATOR MURPHY: A kind of	20	MS. CHIOCCHIO: Right. And
21	follow-up to that and I'll ask this	21	the other, you know, in certain areas,
22	question of the other carrier, if the other	22	including this area, it's going to take more
23	main carrier comes in. When let's assume	23	than one facility to provide coverage. So
24	this was Verizon that came with this	24	not knowing you know, having three or four
25	application. And the form letter goes out	25	search rings in an area, not really knowing,
	approximation and the form former goes our		······································
	Dama 70		
	Page 79		Page 81
1		1	
1 2	and your Cuddy & Feder gets the letter, is AT&T interested in this site. What does	1 2	Page 81 you know, the the process or the timing of how you're going to find a site that works
1 2 3	and your Cuddy & Feder gets the letter, is AT&T interested in this site. What does		you know, the the process or the timing of how you're going to find a site that works
2	and your Cuddy & Feder gets the letter, is	2	you know, the the process or the timing of
2 3	and your Cuddy & Feder gets the letter, is AT&T interested in this site. What does Cuddy & Feder have AT&T do in order to	2 3	you know, the the process or the timing of how you're going to find a site that works and working through all of that, there are a
2 3 4	and your Cuddy & Feder gets the letter, is AT&T interested in this site. What does Cuddy & Feder have AT&T do in order to respond to us with whatever your response is? How much goes into it? I mean, I think	2 3 4	you know, the the process or the timing of how you're going to find a site that works and working through all of that, there are a lot of unknowns.
2 3 4 5	and your Cuddy & Feder gets the letter, is AT&T interested in this site. What does Cuddy & Feder have AT&T do in order to respond to us with whatever your response is?	2 3 4 5	you know, the the process or the timing of how you're going to find a site that works and working through all of that, there are a lot of unknowns. So I would imagine it would be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and your Cuddy & Feder gets the letter, is AT&T interested in this site. What does Cuddy & Feder have AT&T do in order to respond to us with whatever your response is? How much goes into it? I mean, I think that's kind of what we're really looking to	2 3 4 5 6	you know, the the process or the timing of how you're going to find a site that works and working through all of that, there are a lot of unknowns. So I would imagine it would be difficult for Verizon, not knowing their network in this area, to say, yeah, I could definitely use X feet, that's my minimum. So
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and your Cuddy & Feder gets the letter, is AT&T interested in this site. What does Cuddy & Feder have AT&T do in order to respond to us with whatever your response is? How much goes into it? I mean, I think that's kind of what we're really looking to find out and, kind of, maybe, going to ask you we want you to do a heck of a lot more. But let's start with, what do you do?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you know, the the process or the timing of how you're going to find a site that works and working through all of that, there are a lot of unknowns. So I would imagine it would be difficult for Verizon, not knowing their network in this area, to say, yeah, I could definitely use X feet, that's my minimum. So that's another consideration.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and your Cuddy & Feder gets the letter, is AT&T interested in this site. What does Cuddy & Feder have AT&T do in order to respond to us with whatever your response is? How much goes into it? I mean, I think that's kind of what we're really looking to find out and, kind of, maybe, going to ask you we want you to do a heck of a lot more. But let's start with, what do you do? MS. CHIOCCHIO: Actually, I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	you know, the the process or the timing of how you're going to find a site that works and working through all of that, there are a lot of unknowns. So I would imagine it would be difficult for Verizon, not knowing their network in this area, to say, yeah, I could definitely use X feet, that's my minimum. So that's another consideration. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. If
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	and your Cuddy & Feder gets the letter, is AT&T interested in this site. What does Cuddy & Feder have AT&T do in order to respond to us with whatever your response is? How much goes into it? I mean, I think that's kind of what we're really looking to find out and, kind of, maybe, going to ask you we want you to do a heck of a lot more. But let's start with, what do you do? MS. CHIOCCHIO: Actually, I don't think Cuddy & Feder actually gets those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	you know, the the process or the timing of how you're going to find a site that works and working through all of that, there are a lot of unknowns. So I would imagine it would be difficult for Verizon, not knowing their network in this area, to say, yeah, I could definitely use X feet, that's my minimum. So that's another consideration. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. If there are no further questions from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and your Cuddy & Feder gets the letter, is AT&T interested in this site. What does Cuddy & Feder have AT&T do in order to respond to us with whatever your response is? How much goes into it? I mean, I think that's kind of what we're really looking to find out and, kind of, maybe, going to ask you we want you to do a heck of a lot more. But let's start with, what do you do? MS. CHIOCCHIO: Actually, I don't think Cuddy & Feder actually gets those letters. I think they go directly to AT&T.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	you know, the the process or the timing of how you're going to find a site that works and working through all of that, there are a lot of unknowns. So I would imagine it would be difficult for Verizon, not knowing their network in this area, to say, yeah, I could definitely use X feet, that's my minimum. So that's another consideration. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. If there are no further questions from the Council oh.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and your Cuddy & Feder gets the letter, is AT&T interested in this site. What does Cuddy & Feder have AT&T do in order to respond to us with whatever your response is? How much goes into it? I mean, I think that's kind of what we're really looking to find out and, kind of, maybe, going to ask you we want you to do a heck of a lot more. But let's start with, what do you do? MS. CHIOCCHIO: Actually, I don't think Cuddy & Feder actually gets those letters. I think they go directly to AT&T. SENATOR MURPHY: Oh, okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you know, the the process or the timing of how you're going to find a site that works and working through all of that, there are a lot of unknowns. So I would imagine it would be difficult for Verizon, not knowing their network in this area, to say, yeah, I could definitely use X feet, that's my minimum. So that's another consideration. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. If there are no further questions from the Council oh. THE WITNESS (Vergati): I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and your Cuddy & Feder gets the letter, is AT&T interested in this site. What does Cuddy & Feder have AT&T do in order to respond to us with whatever your response is? How much goes into it? I mean, I think that's kind of what we're really looking to find out and, kind of, maybe, going to ask you we want you to do a heck of a lot more. But let's start with, what do you do? MS. CHIOCCHIO: Actually, I don't think Cuddy & Feder actually gets those letters. I think they go directly to AT&T. SENATOR MURPHY: Oh, okay. MS. CHIOCCHIO: But, you know,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	you know, the the process or the timing of how you're going to find a site that works and working through all of that, there are a lot of unknowns. So I would imagine it would be difficult for Verizon, not knowing their network in this area, to say, yeah, I could definitely use X feet, that's my minimum. So that's another consideration. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. If there are no further questions from the Council oh. THE WITNESS (Vergati): I would just add to that. Obviously, as a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and your Cuddy & Feder gets the letter, is AT&T interested in this site. What does Cuddy & Feder have AT&T do in order to respond to us with whatever your response is? How much goes into it? I mean, I think that's kind of what we're really looking to find out and, kind of, maybe, going to ask you we want you to do a heck of a lot more. But let's start with, what do you do? MS. CHIOCCHIO: Actually, I don't think Cuddy & Feder actually gets those letters. I think they go directly to AT&T. SENATOR MURPHY: Oh, okay. MS. CHIOCCHIO: But, you know, if we did	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	you know, the the process or the timing of how you're going to find a site that works and working through all of that, there are a lot of unknowns. So I would imagine it would be difficult for Verizon, not knowing their network in this area, to say, yeah, I could definitely use X feet, that's my minimum. So that's another consideration. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. If there are no further questions from the Council oh. THE WITNESS (Vergati): I would just add to that. Obviously, as a tower developer, it's it's our hopes to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and your Cuddy & Feder gets the letter, is AT&T interested in this site. What does Cuddy & Feder have AT&T do in order to respond to us with whatever your response is? How much goes into it? I mean, I think that's kind of what we're really looking to find out and, kind of, maybe, going to ask you we want you to do a heck of a lot more. But let's start with, what do you do? MS. CHIOCCHIO: Actually, I don't think Cuddy & Feder actually gets those letters. I think they go directly to AT&T. SENATOR MURPHY: Oh, okay. MS. CHIOCCHIO: But, you know, if we did SENATOR MURPHY: But I was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	you know, the the process or the timing of how you're going to find a site that works and working through all of that, there are a lot of unknowns. So I would imagine it would be difficult for Verizon, not knowing their network in this area, to say, yeah, I could definitely use X feet, that's my minimum. So that's another consideration. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. If there are no further questions from the Council oh. THE WITNESS (Vergati): I would just add to that. Obviously, as a tower developer, it's it's our hopes to take an application forward where have four
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and your Cuddy & Feder gets the letter, is AT&T interested in this site. What does Cuddy & Feder have AT&T do in order to respond to us with whatever your response is? How much goes into it? I mean, I think that's kind of what we're really looking to find out and, kind of, maybe, going to ask you we want you to do a heck of a lot more. But let's start with, what do you do? MS. CHIOCCHIO: Actually, I don't think Cuddy & Feder actually gets those letters. I think they go directly to AT&T. SENATOR MURPHY: Oh, okay. MS. CHIOCCHIO: But, you know, if we did SENATOR MURPHY: But I was curious, AT&T	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	you know, the the process or the timing of how you're going to find a site that works and working through all of that, there are a lot of unknowns. So I would imagine it would be difficult for Verizon, not knowing their network in this area, to say, yeah, I could definitely use X feet, that's my minimum. So that's another consideration. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. If there are no further questions from the Council oh. THE WITNESS (Vergati): I would just add to that. Obviously, as a tower developer, it's it's our hopes to take an application forward where have four co-applicants, obviously. What we can do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and your Cuddy & Feder gets the letter, is AT&T interested in this site. What does Cuddy & Feder have AT&T do in order to respond to us with whatever your response is? How much goes into it? I mean, I think that's kind of what we're really looking to find out and, kind of, maybe, going to ask you we want you to do a heck of a lot more. But let's start with, what do you do? MS. CHIOCCHIO: Actually, I don't think Cuddy & Feder actually gets those letters. I think they go directly to AT&T. SENATOR MURPHY: Oh, okay. MS. CHIOCCHIO: But, you know, if we did SENATOR MURPHY: But I was curious, AT&T MS. CHIOCCHIO: Right. But if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you know, the the process or the timing of how you're going to find a site that works and working through all of that, there are a lot of unknowns. So I would imagine it would be difficult for Verizon, not knowing their network in this area, to say, yeah, I could definitely use X feet, that's my minimum. So that's another consideration. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. If there are no further questions from the Council oh. THE WITNESS (Vergati): I would just add to that. Obviously, as a tower developer, it's it's our hopes to take an application forward where have four co-applicants, obviously. What we can do and we do meet regularly with the carriers
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	and your Cuddy & Feder gets the letter, is AT&T interested in this site. What does Cuddy & Feder have AT&T do in order to respond to us with whatever your response is? How much goes into it? I mean, I think that's kind of what we're really looking to find out and, kind of, maybe, going to ask you we want you to do a heck of a lot more. But let's start with, what do you do? MS. CHIOCCHIO: Actually, I don't think Cuddy & Feder actually gets those letters. I think they go directly to AT&T. SENATOR MURPHY: Oh, okay. MS. CHIOCCHIO: But, you know, if we did SENATOR MURPHY: But I was curious, AT&T MS. CHIOCCHIO: Right. But if we did we'd forward it along to AT&T, ask	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	you know, the the process or the timing of how you're going to find a site that works and working through all of that, there are a lot of unknowns. So I would imagine it would be difficult for Verizon, not knowing their network in this area, to say, yeah, I could definitely use X feet, that's my minimum. So that's another consideration. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. If there are no further questions from the Council oh. THE WITNESS (Vergati): I would just add to that. Obviously, as a tower developer, it's it's our hopes to take an application forward where have four co-applicants, obviously. What we can do and we do meet regularly with the carriers and discuss, some of them are very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and your Cuddy & Feder gets the letter, is AT&T interested in this site. What does Cuddy & Feder have AT&T do in order to respond to us with whatever your response is? How much goes into it? I mean, I think that's kind of what we're really looking to find out and, kind of, maybe, going to ask you we want you to do a heck of a lot more. But let's start with, what do you do? MS. CHIOCCHIO: Actually, I don't think Cuddy & Feder actually gets those letters. I think they go directly to AT&T. SENATOR MURPHY: Oh, okay. MS. CHIOCCHIO: But, you know, if we did SENATOR MURPHY: But I was curious, AT&T MS. CHIOCCHIO: Right. But if we did we'd forward it along to AT&T, ask their own consultants to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	you know, the the process or the timing of how you're going to find a site that works and working through all of that, there are a lot of unknowns. So I would imagine it would be difficult for Verizon, not knowing their network in this area, to say, yeah, I could definitely use X feet, that's my minimum. So that's another consideration. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. If there are no further questions from the Council oh. THE WITNESS (Vergati): I would just add to that. Obviously, as a tower developer, it's it's our hopes to take an application forward where have four co-applicants, obviously. What we can do and we do meet regularly with the carriers and discuss, some of them are very tightlipped. Obviously, it's proprietary and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and your Cuddy & Feder gets the letter, is AT&T interested in this site. What does Cuddy & Feder have AT&T do in order to respond to us with whatever your response is? How much goes into it? I mean, I think that's kind of what we're really looking to find out and, kind of, maybe, going to ask you we want you to do a heck of a lot more. But let's start with, what do you do? MS. CHIOCCHIO: Actually, I don't think Cuddy & Feder actually gets those letters. I think they go directly to AT&T. SENATOR MURPHY: Oh, okay. MS. CHIOCCHIO: But, you know, if we did SENATOR MURPHY: But I was curious, AT&T MS. CHIOCCHIO: Right. But if we did we'd forward it along to AT&T, ask their own consultants to SENATOR MURPHY: I think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	you know, the the process or the timing of how you're going to find a site that works and working through all of that, there are a lot of unknowns. So I would imagine it would be difficult for Verizon, not knowing their network in this area, to say, yeah, I could definitely use X feet, that's my minimum. So that's another consideration. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. If there are no further questions from the Council oh. THE WITNESS (Vergati): I would just add to that. Obviously, as a tower developer, it's it's our hopes to take an application forward where have four co-applicants, obviously. What we can do and we do meet regularly with the carriers and discuss, some of them are very tightlipped. Obviously, it's proprietary and very competitive at times, but they do know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and your Cuddy & Feder gets the letter, is AT&T interested in this site. What does Cuddy & Feder have AT&T do in order to respond to us with whatever your response is? How much goes into it? I mean, I think that's kind of what we're really looking to find out and, kind of, maybe, going to ask you we want you to do a heck of a lot more. But let's start with, what do you do? MS. CHIOCCHIO: Actually, I don't think Cuddy & Feder actually gets those letters. I think they go directly to AT&T. SENATOR MURPHY: Oh, okay. MS. CHIOCCHIO: But, you know, if we did SENATOR MURPHY: But I was curious, AT&T MS. CHIOCCHIO: Right. But if we did we'd forward it along to AT&T, ask their own consultants to SENATOR MURPHY: I think normally the response, the ones that I've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	you know, the the process or the timing of how you're going to find a site that works and working through all of that, there are a lot of unknowns. So I would imagine it would be difficult for Verizon, not knowing their network in this area, to say, yeah, I could definitely use X feet, that's my minimum. So that's another consideration. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. If there are no further questions from the Council oh. THE WITNESS (Vergati): I would just add to that. Obviously, as a tower developer, it's it's our hopes to take an application forward where have four co-applicants, obviously. What we can do and we do meet regularly with the carriers and discuss, some of them are very tightlipped. Obviously, it's proprietary and very competitive at times, but they do know our our site list that we market to them.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and your Cuddy & Feder gets the letter, is AT&T interested in this site. What does Cuddy & Feder have AT&T do in order to respond to us with whatever your response is? How much goes into it? I mean, I think that's kind of what we're really looking to find out and, kind of, maybe, going to ask you we want you to do a heck of a lot more. But let's start with, what do you do? MS. CHIOCCHIO: Actually, I don't think Cuddy & Feder actually gets those letters. I think they go directly to AT&T. SENATOR MURPHY: Oh, okay. MS. CHIOCCHIO: But, you know, if we did SENATOR MURPHY: But I was curious, AT&T MS. CHIOCCHIO: Right. But if we did we'd forward it along to AT&T, ask their own consultants to SENATOR MURPHY: I think normally the response, the ones that I've read come from counsel.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you know, the the process or the timing of how you're going to find a site that works and working through all of that, there are a lot of unknowns. So I would imagine it would be difficult for Verizon, not knowing their network in this area, to say, yeah, I could definitely use X feet, that's my minimum. So that's another consideration. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. If there are no further questions from the Council oh. THE WITNESS (Vergati): I would just add to that. Obviously, as a tower developer, it's it's our hopes to take an application forward where have four co-applicants, obviously. What we can do and we do meet regularly with the carriers and discuss, some of them are very tightlipped. Obviously, it's proprietary and very competitive at times, but they do know our our site list that we market to them. They do know what we what we have for RAD
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and your Cuddy & Feder gets the letter, is AT&T interested in this site. What does Cuddy & Feder have AT&T do in order to respond to us with whatever your response is? How much goes into it? I mean, I think that's kind of what we're really looking to find out and, kind of, maybe, going to ask you we want you to do a heck of a lot more. But let's start with, what do you do? MS. CHIOCCHIO: Actually, I don't think Cuddy & Feder actually gets those letters. I think they go directly to AT&T. SENATOR MURPHY: Oh, okay. MS. CHIOCCHIO: But, you know, if we did SENATOR MURPHY: But I was curious, AT&T MS. CHIOCCHIO: Right. But if we did we'd forward it along to AT&T, ask their own consultants to SENATOR MURPHY: I think normally the response, the ones that I've read come from counsel. MS. CHIOCCHIO: Right. Right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	you know, the the process or the timing of how you're going to find a site that works and working through all of that, there are a lot of unknowns. So I would imagine it would be difficult for Verizon, not knowing their network in this area, to say, yeah, I could definitely use X feet, that's my minimum. So that's another consideration. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. If there are no further questions from the Council oh. THE WITNESS (Vergati): I would just add to that. Obviously, as a tower developer, it's it's our hopes to take an application forward where have four co-applicants, obviously. What we can do and we do meet regularly with the carriers and discuss, some of them are very tightlipped. Obviously, it's proprietary and very competitive at times, but they do know our our site list that we market to them. They do know what we what we have for RAD centers available and and lat/longs and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and your Cuddy & Feder gets the letter, is AT&T interested in this site. What does Cuddy & Feder have AT&T do in order to respond to us with whatever your response is? How much goes into it? I mean, I think that's kind of what we're really looking to find out and, kind of, maybe, going to ask you we want you to do a heck of a lot more. But let's start with, what do you do? MS. CHIOCCHIO: Actually, I don't think Cuddy & Feder actually gets those letters. I think they go directly to AT&T. SENATOR MURPHY: Oh, okay. MS. CHIOCCHIO: But, you know, if we did SENATOR MURPHY: But I was curious, AT&T MS. CHIOCCHIO: Right. But if we did we'd forward it along to AT&T, ask their own consultants to SENATOR MURPHY: I think normally the response, the ones that I've read come from counsel.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you know, the the process or the timing of how you're going to find a site that works and working through all of that, there are a lot of unknowns. So I would imagine it would be difficult for Verizon, not knowing their network in this area, to say, yeah, I could definitely use X feet, that's my minimum. So that's another consideration. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. If there are no further questions from the Council oh. THE WITNESS (Vergati): I would just add to that. Obviously, as a tower developer, it's it's our hopes to take an application forward where have four co-applicants, obviously. What we can do and we do meet regularly with the carriers and discuss, some of them are very tightlipped. Obviously, it's proprietary and very competitive at times, but they do know our our site list that we market to them. They do know what we what we have for RAD

21 (Pages 78 to 81)

	Page 82	Page 84
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	 What we can possibly do on our end is that when we do send these certified letters out to the carriers in the market, that if they do respond with interest to us or to the Council, to please take the extra effort to look at a RAD center, run a propagation map, so we do have a general idea what their need may be now or in the future and and it can be discussed more at an intelligent level, I guess, at this point. SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: They seem to get increasingly tightlipped when we ask about generators. I hope that's not the sole reason that they often don't respond to these letters. So the questions from the counsel and staff we've completed. MS. CHIOCCHIO: Chairman, we do have a response to Mr. Perrone's question regarding coverage from the Appalachian Trail. So, Martin, do you want to? THE WITNESS (Lavin): Using the telco map which has the at the end of Section 8, almost at the end, the viewshed 	 CERTIFICATE I CERTIFICATE I hereby certify that the foregoing 83 2 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original 3 verbatim notes taken of the Council Meeting in Re: DOCKET NO 452, HOMELAND TOWERS, LLC 4 AND NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF 5 ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND 6 OPERATION OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY LOCATED AT SALISBURY TAX ASSESSOR MAP 16, LOT 5, 250 CANAAN ROAD, SALISBURY, CONNECTICUT, CONNECTICUT, which was held before ROBERT 8 STEIN, Chairperson, at the Salisbury Town Hall, Upstairs Meeting Room, 27 Main Street, Salisbury, Connecticut, Thursday, December 4, 2014 10 11 12 13 14 15 Robert G Dixon, CVR-M 857 Court Reporter 16 UNITED REPORTERS, INC 90 Brainard Road, Suite 103 17 Hartford, Connecticut 06114
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	Page 83 map topo base. The blue line with the numbers 11, 12 and 13 on it at the bottom of the map is apparently the Appalachian Trail. And based on that, I don't think the I think the proposed site does not improve coverage that I as far as I can tell, on that stretch of the Appalachian Trail. MR. PERRONE: Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: I guess the selectman has left. I don't know if there's anybody else here from the town, since they are a party to it. I don't see anybody. So so we'll hold open the this portion of the hearing, the evidentiary, for this evening to see if Mr. Dresser, if he comes back, to see if he has any questions. But until then, the Council will now recess until :00 p m. when we'll begin the public comment exsion. (Whereupon, the witnesses were excused, and the above proceedings were adjourned at 4:20 p m.)	Page 851INDEX2WITNESSES MARTIN LAVIN3MICHAEL LIBERTINE4DEAN GUSTAFSON5RAYMOND VERGATI6SCOTT CHASSE7EXAMINATION8Mr. Perrone9Page 1491010EXHIBITS11(Received in evidence.)12EXHIBIT13II-B-114submitted on October 6, 2014151616II-B-217submitted on October 6, 2014181919I-B-319II-B-320Legal Notice dated Oct. 27, 201421II-B-422II-B-423Submission dated Nov. 19, 20142425

22 (Pages 82 to 85)

UNITED REPORTERS, INC.

Page 86	
1 IN D E X (Cont'd.) 2 EXHIBIT DESCRIPTION 3 II-B-5 HT and AT&T Responses to Siting 13 4 Council Interrogatories dated 5 November 19, 2014 6 7 7 II-B-6 8 November 18, 2014 9 10 10 II-B-7 11 Council Interrogatories, Set II, 12 dated November 25, 2014 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	

23 (Page 86)