



Transcript of the Hearing of

Date: January 20, 2015

Volume: I

Case: SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING

Printed On: January 31, 2015

UNITED REPORTERS, INC.

Phone: (866) 534-3383

Fax: (877) 534-3383

Email: info@unitedreporters.com

Internet: www.unitedreporters.com

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Docket No. 453

American Tower Corporation 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
Manchester Tax Assessor Map 133,
Block 3700, Lot 701, 701 Lydall Street,
Manchester, Connecticut

Council Meeting held at the Lincoln
Center Hearing Room, 494 Main Street,
Manchester, Connecticut, Tuesday,
January 20, 2015, beginning at 3:00 p.m.

H e l d B e f o r e:

ROBERT STEIN, Chairman

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING
January 20, 2015

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 2</p> <p>1 A p p e a r a n c e s: 2 C o u n c i l M e m b e r s: 3 S E N A T O R J A M E S J . M U R P H Y , J R . , 4 V i c e C h a i r p e r s o n 5 P H I L I P A S H T O N 6 D R . B A R B A R A C . B E L L 7 C O M M . M I C H A E L C A R O N , P U R A D e s i g n e e 8 R O B E R T H A N N O N , D E E P D e s i g n e e 9 D A N I E L P . L Y N C H , J R . 10 11 C o u n c i l S t a f f: 12 M E L A N I E B A C H M A N , E S Q . , 13 E x e c u t i v e D i r e c t o r a n d 14 S t a f f A t t o r n e y 15 D A V I D M A R T I N 16 S i t i n g A n a l y s t 17 18 F o r N e w C i n g u l a r W i r e l e s s , P C S , L L C , a n d 19 M e s s a g e C e n t e r M a n a g e m e n t , I n c . : 20 C U D D Y & F E D E R , L L P 21 4 4 5 H a m i l t o n A v e n u e , 1 4 t h f l o o r 22 W h i t e P l a i n s , N e w Y o r k 1 0 6 0 1 23 B y : L U C I A C H I O C C H I O , E S Q . 24 25</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 4</p> <p>1 a n d p u b l i c n e e d f o r t h e c o n s t r u c t i o n , 2 m a i n t e n a n c e a n d o p e r a t i o n o f a 3 t e l e c o m m u n i c a t i o n s f a c i l i t y l o c a t e d a t 7 0 1 4 L y d a l l S t r e e t , M a n c h e s t e r , C o n n e c t i c u t . 5 A p p l i c a t i o n w a s r e c e i v e d b y t h e C o u n c i l o n 6 N o v e m b e r 4 , 2 0 1 4 . 7 A s a r e m i n d e r t o a l l , 8 o f f - t h e - r e c o r d c o m m u n i c a t i o n w i t h a m e m b e r o f 9 t h e C o u n c i l o r a m e m b e r o f t h e C o u n c i l ' s 10 s t a f f u p o n t h e m e r i t s o f t h e a p p l i c a t i o n i s 11 p r o h i b i t e d b y l a w . A n d p a r t y t o t h e 12 p r o c e e d i n g i s t h e A p p l i c a n t , A m e r i c a n T o w e r 13 a n d N e w C i n g u l a r W i r e l e s s , a n d t h e i r 14 r e p r e s e n t a t i v e A t t o r n e y C h i o c c h i o f r o m C u d d y 15 & F e d e r . 16 W e w i l l p r o c e e d i n a c c o r d a n c e 17 w i t h t h e p r e p a r e d a g e n d a , c o p i e s o f w h i c h a r e 18 a v a i l a b l e h e r e . A l s o a v a i l a b l e h e r e a r e 19 c o p i e s o f t h e C o u n c i l C i t i z e n G u i d e t o S i t i n g 20 C o u n c i l P r o c e d u r e s . A n d a t t h e e n d o f t h e 21 a f t e r n o o n s e s s i o n , w e w i l l r e c e s s a n d r e s u m e 22 a g a i n a t 7 p . m . 23 T h e 7 p . m . h e a r i n g s e s s i o n 24 w i l l b e r e s e r v e d f o r t h e p u b l i c t o m a k e b r i e f 25 o r a l s t a t e m e n t s i n t o t h e r e c o r d . I w i s h t o</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 3</p> <p>1 T H E C H A I R M A N : G o o d a f t e r n o o n , 2 l a d i e s a n d g e n t l e m e n . I ' d l i k e t o c a l l t o 3 o r d e r t h e m e e t i n g o f t h e C o n n e c t i c u t S i t i n g 4 C o u n c i l , t o d a y , J a n u a r y 2 0 , 2 0 1 5 , 5 a p p r o x i m a t e l y 3 p . m . 6 M y n a m e i s R o b i n S t e i n . I ' m 7 c h a i r m a n o f t h e C o n n e c t i c u t S i t i n g C o u n c i l . 8 O t h e r m e m b e r s o f t h e C o u n c i l p r e s e n t a r e : 9 S e n a t o r J a m e s M u r p h y , o u r v i c e c h a i r m a n ; 10 M r . H a n n o n , d e s i g n e e f r o m t h e D e p a r t m e n t o f 11 E n e r g y a n d E n v i r o n m e n t a l P r o t e c t i o n ; 12 C o m m i s s i o n e r C a r o n , d e s i g n e e f r o m P u b l i c 13 U t i l i t i e s R e g u l a t o r y A u t h o r i t y ; M r . A s h t o n ; 14 D r . B e l l ; a n d M r . L y n c h . 15 M e m b e r s o f t h e s t a f f p r e s e n t 16 a r e : A t t o r n e y B a c h m a n , o u r e x e c u t i v e 17 d i r e c t o r ; a n d D a v i d M a r t i n , o u r s i t i n g 18 a n a l y s t . 19 T h i s h e a r i n g i s h e l d p u r s u a n t 20 t o t h e p r o v i s i o n s o f T i t l e 1 6 o f t h e 21 C o n n e c t i c u t G e n e r a l S t a t u t e s a n d o f t h e 22 U n i f o r m A d m i n i s t r a t i v e P r o c e d u r e A c t u p o n a n 23 a p p l i c a t i o n f r o m A m e r i c a n T o w e r s C o r p o r a t i o n 24 a n d N e w C i n g u l a r W i r e l e s s P C S , L L C , f o r a 25 c e r t i f i c a t e o f e n v i r o n m e n t a l c o m p a t i b i l i t y</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5</p> <p>1 n o t e t h a t p a r t i e s a n d i n t e r v e n o r s , i n c l u d i n g 2 t h e i r r e p r e s e n t a t i v e s a n d w i t n e s s e s , a r e n o t 3 a l l o w e d t o p a r t i c i p a t e i n t h e p u b l i c c o m m e n t 4 s e s s i o n . A n d I a l s o w i s h t o n o t e f o r t h o s e 5 w h o a r e h e r e a n d f o r t h e b e n e f i t o f y o u r 6 f r i e n d s a n d n e i g h b o r s w h o m a y b e u n a b l e t o 7 j o i n u s f o r t h e p u b l i c c o m m e n t s e s s i o n , t h a t 8 y o u o r t h e y m a y s e n d w r i t t e n c o m m e n t s t o t h e 9 C o u n c i l w i t h i n 3 0 d a y s o f t h e d a t e h e r e o f , 10 a n d s u c h w r i t t e n s t a t e m e n t s w i l l b e g i v e n t h e 11 s a m e w e i g h t a s i f s p o k e n a t t h e h e a r i n g . 12 I f n e c e s s a r y , t h e p a r t y a n d 13 i n t e r v e n o r p r e s e n t a t i o n s m a y c o n t i n u e a f t e r 14 p u b l i c c o m m e n t s e s s i o n i f t i m e r e m a i n s . 15 A v e r b a t i m t r a n s c r i p t w i l l b e 16 m a d e o f t h e h e a r i n g a n d d e p o s i t e d w i t h t h e 17 t o w n c l e r k s ' o f f i c e s i n M a n c h e s t e r , B o l t o n 18 a n d V e r n o n f o r t h e c o n v e n i e n c e o f t h e p u b l i c . 19 I s t h e r e a n y p u b l i c o f f i c i a l 20 w h o w i s h e s t o m a k e a s t a t e m e n t a t t h i s t i m e ? 21 (N o r e s p o n s e .) 22 T H E C H A I R M A N : A r e y o u c o m i n g 23 t o m a k e s t a t e m e n t s o r j u s t c o m i n g t o g e t a 24 b e t t e r v i e w ? 25 A V O I C E : A b e t t e r v i e w .</p>

2 (Pages 2 to 5)

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING
January 20, 2015

Page 6

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Sorry.
2 We have a request from State
3 Representative Kelly Luxenberg and State
4 Senator Steve Cassano to be intervenors in
5 the proceedings. Is there a motion to make
6 the --
7 SENATOR MURPHY: I move
8 approval of the motion for intervention by
9 the two legislators.
10 MR. ASHTON: Second.
11 THE CHAIRMAN: I have a motion
12 and a second. All those in favor signify by
13 saying, aye.
14 THE COUNCIL: Aye.
15 THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed?
16 Abstention?
17 The motion carries.
18 I wish to call your attention
19 to the items shown on the hearing program
20 marked as Roman numeral ID items, 1 through
21 60. Does the Applicant or any party
22 intervenor have an objection to the items
23 that the Council has administratively
24 noticed?
25 MS. CHIOCCHIO: No objection.

Page 7

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Accordingly,
2 the Council hereby administratively notices
3 these existing statements, documents and
4 comments.
5 So will the Applicant please
6 present your witness panel for the purpose of
7 taking the oath.
8 MS. CHIOCCHIO: Thank you,
9 Chairman. I'll introduce the witness panel
10 starting with my left.
11 Mr. Matthew Gustafson here,
12 soil scientist, wetlands; Mr. Michael
13 Libertine on visibility. Mr. Scott Chasse is
14 a site civil engineer. To our immediate
15 right is Jennifer Young Gaudet for the site
16 search information; David Jermakian, the
17 environmental review and due diligence;
18 Martin Lavin, RF engineer; and Blake Paynter
19 from American Tower Corporation.
20 THE CHAIRMAN: Would you
21 please rise to take the oath.
22
23
24
25

Page 8

1 MATTHEW GUSTAFSON,
2 MICHAEL LIBERTINE,
3 JENNIFER YOUNG GAUDET,
4 DAVID JERMAKIAN,
5 MARTIN LAVIN,
6 BLAKE PAYNTER,
7 called as witnesses, being first duly
8 sworn by the Executive Director,
9 were examined and testified on their
10 oaths as follows:
11 THE CHAIRMAN: Would you
12 continue by numbering the exhibits of the
13 filing and making a request to
14 administratively notice the documents,
15 verify?
16 MS. CHIOCCHIO: As listed in
17 the hearing program Roman numeral II-A, we're
18 requesting administrative notice of the
19 Connecticut Department of Energy and
20 Environmental Protection letter from Don
21 McKay to David Jermakian, dated
22 November 12th, and also the State Historic
23 Preservation Office Project Review cover
24 form, dated October 6, 2014.
25 And as listed in the hearing

Page 9

1 program, Roman numeral II-B, numbers 1
2 through 7 are the exhibits for the
3 Applicants. And I'll ask my witnesses a
4 series of questions in order to get those
5 admitted into the record.
6 I'll start with Matt, on
7 Matt's end. Did you prepare and assist in
8 the preparation of the exhibits as listed in
9 the program?
10 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes,
11 I did.
12 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike
13 Libertine, yes.
14 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott
15 Chasse, yes.
16 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Jennifer
17 Young Gaudet, yes.
18 THE WITNESS (Jermakian): David
19 Jermakian, yes.
20 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin
21 Lavin, yes.
22 THE WITNESS (Paynter): Blake
23 Paynter, yes.
24 MS. CHIOCCHIO: Do you have
25 any corrections or clarifications to the

3 (Pages 6 to 9)

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING
January 20, 2015

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 10</p> <p>1 information contained in the exhibits? 2 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): 3 Matthew Gustafson, no. 4 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike 5 Libertine, no. 6 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Scott 7 Chasse, yes. There's a typo on sheet A1 in 8 the center of the drawing where it calls out 9 the subject site, Parcel ID, owner of record, 10 and the volume and page. The page is 11 inadvertently listed as page 11. It should 12 be page 10. 13 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Jennifer 14 Young Gaudet, no. 15 THE WITNESS (Jermakian): 16 David Jermakian, no. 17 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin 18 Lavin, yes. Behind Tab 1, the RF report, 19 page 1, footnote 1. It should read -- at the 20 end of the footnote, it should be "type of 21 branch diversity receiver." It's a typo. 22 The word "of" is missing between "type" and 23 "branch." 24 THE WITNESS (Paynter): 25 Blake Paynter, no.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 12</p> <p>1 Chasse, yes. 2 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Jennifer 3 Young Gaudet, yes. 4 THE WITNESS (Jermakian): David 5 Jermakian, yes. 6 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin 7 Lavin, yes. 8 THE WITNESS (Paynter): Blake 9 Paynter, yes. 10 MS. CHIOCCHIO: We'd ask that 11 the Council admit the Applicants' exhibits. 12 THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any 13 objection from the Intervenor? 14 (No response.) 15 THE CHAIRMAN: If not, the 16 exhibits are admitted, and we'll now begin 17 with the cross-examination by our Mr. Martin, 18 our siting analyst. 19 (Exhibits II-D-1 through 20 II-D-7: Admitted in evidence - described in 21 index.) 22 CROSS-EXAMINATION 23 MR. MARTIN: Thank you, 24 Mr. Chairman. 25 We don't often see American</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 11</p> <p>1 MS. CHIOCCHIO: Is the 2 information contained in exhibits true and 3 accurate to the best of your knowledge? 4 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): 5 Matthew Gustafson, yes. 6 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike 7 Libertine, yes. 8 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott 9 Chasse, yes. 10 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Jennifer 11 Young Gaudet, yes. 12 THE WITNESS (Jermakian): 13 David Jermakian, yes. 14 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Martin 15 Lavin, yes. 16 THE WITNESS (Paynter): Blake 17 Paynter, yes. 18 MS. CHIOCCHIO: And do you 19 adopt these exhibits as your testimony in 20 this proceeding? 21 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): 22 Matthew Gustafson, yes. 23 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike 24 Libertine, yes. 25 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 13</p> <p>1 Tower before us in these proceedings. Could 2 you explain how American Tower and AT&T came 3 to submit a joint application for this site? 4 THE WITNESS (Paynter): So 5 probably about a year or two ago we started 6 working with AT&T. I wouldn't call it a 7 joint partnership officially, but it's 8 basically driven by AT&T having a need for 9 coverage in the area and then looking to a 10 tower company, like us, who in the long term 11 wants to own and operate it, and they can 12 basically, in essence, collocate on it. So 13 it's kind of a joint partnership in that, in 14 that fashion. 15 Ultimately, we're in the 16 business of owning and operating cell phone 17 towers, so it kind of works out for both of 18 us. 19 MR. MARTIN: Do you foresee 20 developing more towers in this way? Because 21 my impression of American Tower, you kind of 22 buy the existing towers. 23 THE WITNESS (Paynter): We do 24 do a lot of that, too. We take some that 25 AT&T has developed to the end, so you</p>

4 (Pages 10 to 13)

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING
January 20, 2015

Page 14

1 probably see -- you've probably seen a little
2 bit of that. We've definitely done some of
3 those.

4 It's really driven by carrier
5 need and -- and their decision to decide to
6 work with us as their developer and their
7 tower owner at the end of the day.

8 MR. MARTIN: Do you have your
9 own, more or less, site acquisition group
10 that tries to identify gaps in coverage of
11 different -- like different carriers might
12 have?

13 THE WITNESS (Paytner): Do you
14 mean do we proactively look at that?

15 MR. MARTIN: Right.

16 THE WITNESS (Paytner): Yes,
17 we do. We do look at that. We have a group
18 within our company that will try to evaluate
19 that strategically, yes.

20 MR. MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.
21 And how many antennas would
22 AT&T install on this tower?

23 THE WITNESS (Paytner): Is
24 that for me? Sure. They're proposing 12,
25 with their associated equipment along with

Page 16

1 And in AT&T's response to the
2 interrogatory about the license frequencies.
3 You've got a lot of what looked like the call
4 numbers of radio stations. Could you explain
5 what those --

6 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Those
7 are the -- they're four letters and a number.
8 They are the call signs of the licenses that
9 they're assigned. And after each one, there
10 is a designation of exactly which license it
11 is, PCS, cellular.

12 MR. MARTIN: Okay. But how do
13 I know which frequencies they are?

14 THE WITNESS (Lavin): We -- we
15 can provide those if you would like us to.

16 MR. MARTIN: Would you?

17 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Sure.

18 MR. MARTIN: Okay. Great.

19 Thank you.

20 And is this site intended
21 primarily for coverage or for capacity
22 purposes?

23 THE WITNESS (Lavin):

24 Primarily for coverage.

25 MR. MARTIN: Okay. And do you

Page 15

1 it.

2 MR. MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.
3 The frequency that AT&T used
4 to provide GSM service on, what do you use
5 those frequencies for now?

6 THE WITNESS (Paytner): That
7 might be your question.

8 THE WITNESS (Lavin): The
9 GM -- GSM service is still active. I believe
10 it's sunsetting January 2017, if I'm not
11 mistaken. So it is still operational.

12 MR. MARTIN: Would you be
13 providing GSM service from this site?

14 THE WITNESS (Lavin): GSM
15 equipment will not be installed at this site.

16 MR. MARTIN: Okay.

17 And we keep hearing about
18 voice over LTE. How close are we to being
19 able to use LTE technology for voice
20 transmissions.

21 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I
22 believe it is being internally trialed within
23 AT&T. I don't know of a -- of a release date
24 for it yet, though.

25 MR. MARTIN: Okay.

Page 17

1 have any projection or prediction about when
2 the site might reach capacity based on
3 service levels?

4 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I do not
5 know.

6 MR. MARTIN: Okay.

7 And what kinds of indicators
8 does AT&T use to measure areas of deficient
9 service? Like, well, I guess we used to talk
10 about dropped calls, but I guess that's --
11 you use --

12 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Scan
13 measurements, customer complaints. Dropped
14 calls are, you know, people kind of learn
15 where the system doesn't work and tend to
16 hang up before they get there or not initiate
17 in there. So --

18 MR. MARTIN: Did you do drive
19 testing for this site?

20 THE WITNESS (Lavin): We did,
21 yes. We did a scan test of the area to
22 confirm that there was a deficiency in
23 coverage.

24 MR. MARTIN: Okay.

25 And the SHPO document

5 (Pages 14 to 17)

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING
January 20, 2015

Page 18

1 submitted seems to be a cover sheet that
2 really doesn't indicate the site being
3 reviewed. Are there some related documents
4 that would identify this site as the one in
5 Manchester?
6 THE WITNESS (Jermakian): Yes.
7 I believe the entire NEPA assessment report
8 was submitted, and that contains the complete
9 submission to the SHPO.
10 MR. MARTIN: Okay. All right.
11 Thank you.
12 And let's see here. Okay.
13 Can you explain why the existing tower at 93
14 Lake Street would not work for AT&T, more or
15 less to the south, maybe about a mile and a
16 half to this site?
17 THE CHAIRMAN: While you're
18 looking for that, that NEPA report, I don't
19 think the Council has that, so is that
20 something that you could provide?
21 MS. CHIOCCHIO: We can
22 provide -- we didn't provide the entire NEPA
23 report. But we did provide documentation
24 that was submitted, some of it, not all of
25 it, but we can provide the entire report.

Page 19

1 THE WITNESS (Lavin):
2 Ninety-three Lake Street, listed as Alternate
3 3, didn't provide sufficient coverage. It
4 left a gap.
5 MR. MARTIN: Okay. And how
6 about 230 Box Mountain Road?
7 THE WITNESS (Lavin): It's the
8 same. It's -- it's very far away, and it
9 didn't provide --
10 MR. MARTIN: It seems like
11 it's a fairly large tower on an elevation.
12 It wouldn't reach this area?
13 THE WITNESS (Lavin): It was
14 studied at a hundred feet. We could look
15 higher, but the coverage was almost
16 nonexistent in this area. I don't think any
17 practical height on that tower would bring
18 coverage in. It would also be very close to
19 the existing site CT 1069, I believe it is.
20 Just not good engineering practice to -- as
21 far away as it is, to try to get coverage all
22 the way into here.
23 MR. MARTIN: Okay. And would
24 there be alarm systems on the compound or for
25 AT&T's equipment shelter?

Page 20

1 THE WITNESS (Paynter): As far
2 as the compound, it would be just a locked
3 facility.
4 As far as AT&T's equipped
5 shelter, I don't know if I can speak to that,
6 but I'm pretty certain the answer would be,
7 yes.
8 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott
9 Chasse, yes. Typically, the prefabricated
10 equipment shelters are outfitted with alarm
11 systems for entry, hot or cold air, power
12 outage, so forth. So it would be alarmed,
13 yes.
14 MR. MARTIN: All right. Thank
15 you.
16 And could you explain why you
17 couldn't use DAS or some of these other
18 alternate wireless technologies to provide
19 services instead of the proposed tower?
20 THE WITNESS (Lavin): That's
21 more appropriate for an indoor area, stadiums
22 and things of that nature. This area is
23 pretty well spread out, limited facilities.
24 It really would only cover along the roads
25 and not in between. It just wouldn't provide

Page 21

1 the coverage we need.
2 MR. MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.
3 Somewhere on the application
4 it indicates that the top of the tower would
5 be reserved for the Town of Manchester. Have
6 you received any formal expression of
7 interest from the Town about using this
8 tower?
9 THE WITNESS (Paynter): I have
10 not heard of any interest from the Town.
11 MR. MARTIN: And what is the
12 feasibility of other carriers being able to
13 locate on the proposed tower heights below
14 AT&T?
15 THE WITNESS (Paynter): We
16 definitely will design the tower for multiple
17 carriers. At that height, probably at least
18 two more below it.
19 MR. MARTIN: How about above
20 it? Would the tower be designed to be
21 extendable?
22 THE WITNESS (Paynter): Yes.
23 Usually a tower this tall -- it isn't
24 particularly tall as far as towers go, so we
25 would probably use a design for a carrier or

6 (Pages 18 to 21)

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING
January 20, 2015

Page 22

1 two below and have it be a foundation that
2 would support to be extendable in the tower
3 itself.
4 MR. MARTIN: How many feet
5 extendable?
6 THE WITNESS (Paynter): For a
7 tower like this, probably -- probably at
8 least another 10 feet, maybe 20.
9 MR. MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.
10 Would this tower be suitable
11 for a stealth design, such as a monopine?
12 THE WITNESS (Libertine):
13 Well, from my perspective, I think trying to
14 do something in the -- the realm of a
15 monopine probably doesn't fit because of the
16 context. We're at the edge of a field where
17 we have primarily deciduous trees. There are
18 some single lone pines that do exist.
19 It's possible. I'm not sure
20 it would have the effect that might be overly
21 desirable. It's not what I would consider to
22 be a prime location for that type of an
23 installation. One of the drawbacks
24 typically -- although the monopines that are
25 being done today are certainly some very nice

Page 23

1 designs.
2 One of the limitations we
3 would have out here is that we don't have a
4 lot of surrounding trees in the immediate
5 area of the compound. So we're talking
6 about, you know, probably a pole where we
7 would want to start the faux branches
8 somewhere in the neighborhood of 60 to
9 70 feet above the ground, so there would be
10 still be a lot of what I'll call pole.
11 Now, granted, the visibility
12 associated with the facility is not -- not a
13 great footprint, and there are some buffered
14 areas from some of the locations where there
15 are viewpoints, but there are some
16 limitations. So I -- I guess, overall, my
17 feeling would be this would not be a site
18 where I would propose to do a tree. You'd
19 have a much larger profile to be looking at
20 just because of the branching having to be
21 probably anywhere from 25 to 30 feet on
22 either side of that, that top of that door.
23 THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me.
24 Mr. Lynch has a follow-up question.
25 MR. LYNCH: Excuse me.

Page 24

1 Mr. Libertine, would a silo design be more
2 conducive to being out in the field than a
3 monopine?
4 THE WITNESS (Libertine):
5 Strictly speaking from a context standpoint,
6 this is an agricultural field, so that
7 certainly is an option. We probably have
8 some technical -- I don't know about
9 limitations, but certainly, technical issues
10 we'd want to -- to talk to.
11 The other thing I would say
12 about the -- the silo is that we'd still be
13 talking about a fairly substantial structure
14 in terms of width. So, once again, we're
15 going from what I call the standard monopole,
16 which is a fairly slim pole, to something in
17 the neighborhood of probably 20 -- 20 feet
18 diameter so it's a fairly substantial
19 structure that we'd be talking about in terms
20 of its -- strictly from a visibility
21 standpoint.
22 MR. LYNCH: But, as far as
23 perspective, you say it's an open field. A
24 silo would be something that people would be
25 used to seeing in a field rather than any

Page 25

1 type of tower?
2 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I
3 would agree with that, and certainly if we
4 were to compare that with a tree, I think,
5 again, I'd go back to context. I think, in
6 this context, certainly, a silo is something
7 that could be considered.
8 MR. LYNCH: Thank you.
9 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hannon.
10 MR. HANNON: Thank you.
11 I just want to follow up on
12 Mr. Lynch's question. One of the things that
13 we've been discussing in recent meetings is
14 the extendability of some of the towers. And
15 I know that there are some issues associated
16 with the monopines. What about a silo
17 structure?
18 THE WITNESS (Libertine):
19 That's a great question. I'll stop, but I
20 think my colleague here will probably have a
21 lot more to say than I do on that.
22 One -- there are a couple of
23 things that we'd have to consider.
24 First of all, to make it look
25 like a silo, if we're talking about 104-foot

7 (Pages 22 to 25)

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING
January 20, 2015

Page 26

1 pole today, we'd be talking about another 5
2 to 7 feet, maybe even a little more to kind
3 of round that off to make it actually look
4 like a silo.
5 But, to your point, there
6 probably are some, some structural
7 considerations that would have to be taken
8 into account. I think from a purely -- what
9 little I know of construction methods for
10 these type of things, we would probably want
11 to plan ahead and do that initially.
12 In other words, if we were
13 thinking about extending, I'd be a proponent
14 of extending right from the start and say,
15 let's go right to 120, because otherwise --
16 and again I'll let Scott weigh in, I think we
17 probably have some -- I think it can be done,
18 but I think it's there are structural issues.
19 And I'm going to say there's probably some
20 significant cost issues associated with that
21 doing it after the fact.
22 Scott?
23 THE WITNESS (Chasse): You did
24 a nice job.
25 He's correct in that moving

Page 27

1 forward from the get-go, normally, if you're
2 going to have an extension, you put a flange
3 along the top so that you can come back at a
4 future time with a preassembled unit, set it
5 on top of it, flange the flange, bolt it
6 down.
7 Because of the transparency,
8 the RF transparency needed for the materials,
9 they would have to be made out of FRP, fiber
10 reinforced resins. So those connections
11 can't be steel, otherwise it would interfere
12 with the antenna signals going back and
13 forth. So I would also propose that, doing
14 it initially.
15 The higher extension of the
16 gate would be much easier to do because
17 designing something to have to retrofit
18 flange to flange, I'm not sure with the FRP
19 materials how strong that would be capable of
20 having that connection after-the-fact. It
21 would be better to construct it in advance to
22 have it as a -- go in as a whole unit.
23 There probably will be some
24 interior bracing that would be required for
25 it, as well, to structurally support that

Page 28

1 portion. So the lower portion of the silo
2 would be traditional materials, but the upper
3 part where the antennas would be would have
4 to be that stealth material. So to maximize
5 that installation at the get-go would be the
6 most effective way to do it.
7 MR. HANNON: Thank you.
8 MR. MARTIN: Okay.
9 Would the noise levels of AT&T
10 air conditioning and heating equipment meet
11 DEEP noise standards?
12 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes,
13 they would.
14 MR. MARTIN: Okay.
15 Have you done any particular
16 study to --
17 THE WITNESS (Chasse): The
18 distances away -- as the proposed facility is
19 standing with the Crystal Quiet Enclosures
20 that they can put, should be able to get the
21 decibels down; and if not, additional
22 engineering controls, whether it's different
23 sizing of the fan appurtenances for the wall
24 pack air-conditioning units. You can
25 monitor -- or excuse me -- modify the fan

Page 29

1 speeds to lower the noise as well. So there
2 are other engineering controls that can and
3 have been used in order to meet the local
4 noise standards.
5 MR. MARTIN: You said
6 something about "like a Crystal Quiet
7 Enclosure."
8 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yeah.
9 MR. MARTIN: Are these
10 shelters designed to minimize the noise
11 levels?
12 THE WITNESS (Chasse): The
13 Crystal Quiet Enclosure is a generic term,
14 like Kleenex. It would be used -- it's
15 housing that goes around the generator unit,
16 not the shelter. And that is specifically
17 designed to lower the decibels that are
18 emitted from that.
19 MR. MARTIN: And that's kind
20 of part of the standard equipment shelter
21 array or layout?
22 THE WITNESS (Chasse): The
23 standard generator installation usually has
24 an enclosure around it to minimize the noise
25 train.

8 (Pages 26 to 29)

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING
January 20, 2015

Page 30

1 MR. MARTIN: Okay.
2 Now, would the generator be
3 inside? I guess it would be inside the
4 shelter in this particular case.
5 THE WITNESS (Chasse): AT&T's
6 generator is proposed to be outside.
7 MR. MARTIN: Outside?
8 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes.
9 MS. CHIOCCHIO: American
10 Tower.
11 THE WITNESS (Chasse):
12 American Tower's -- excuse me.
13 MS. CHIOCCHIO: -- generator.
14 MR. MARTIN: Is that correct
15 the generator will be outside?
16 THE WITNESS (Chasse): That is
17 correct. We -- we are proposing a shared
18 generator solution that would be outside of
19 AT&T's shelter.
20 MR. MARTIN: Okay. And it
21 would have the noise minimizing equipment
22 around it?
23 THE WITNESS (Paynter): Yeah.
24 I don't know all the specs on our shared
25 gens. I know we're doing them all over the

Page 31

1 country right now, so I think we're keeping
2 them as quiet as we possibly can.
3 And minimize, you know, we --
4 really only run time during emergency, cycle
5 time during a weekday, you know, midday, so
6 it's not while people are trying to sleep,
7 that kind of thing. They're definitely very
8 conscious of it.
9 MR. MARTIN: Thank you. Okay.
10 DEEP had some recommendations
11 regarding the box turtles -- or I forget
12 which exact species of turtles were found in
13 this area -- but they had some
14 recommendations about how to protect these
15 creatures. Would AT&T and American Tower
16 comply with the recommendations of the DEEP?
17 THE WITNESS (Jermakian): Yes,
18 they would.
19 MR. MARTIN: And of the
20 different access routes presented, which is
21 the preferred route among the developers for
22 America Tower?
23 THE WITNESS (Paynter): In my
24 opinion, the route we walked today would be
25 the cleanest, less impactful. I mean, as you

Page 32

1 can see today, you can almost drive to the
2 site as it is. We'd obviously need to firm
3 that up a bit, but I think that would be the
4 obvious choice for us.
5 MR. MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.
6 And the Intervenors have
7 suggested that the Manchester Land Trust
8 property on which the Risley Reservoir is
9 located might be a suitable location for this
10 site. Did you explore this property as a
11 potential location?
12 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): As we
13 looked at -- in the area, initially,
14 Mr. Martin, we certainly were aware of the
15 property surrounding Risley Reservoir. Mr.
16 Lavin can speak more to it, perhaps, but the
17 RF analysis of a property adjacent to the
18 land trust property owned by the Town of
19 Manchester, under the water department, was
20 deemed not to provide sufficient coverage.
21 In general, the area owned by
22 the land trust and surrounding Risley
23 Reservoir is used for recreational purposes
24 and is fairly wet. I'm certainly not going
25 to speak to it in the sense of wetlands, but

Page 33

1 having been there myself, walking my dog in
2 the past, I can assure you it's muddy, wet
3 and used a lot by a lot of people in the
4 area.
5 MR. MARTIN: Have you had any
6 experience trying to locate facilities on
7 land trust properties in other parts of the
8 state?
9 THE CHAIRMAN: Why don't you
10 answer that, and then Mr. Ashton, I think,
11 has a follow-up.
12 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): You're
13 taxing my memory in terms of long-term
14 potential for working with land trust groups.
15 Generally, when a property is designated and
16 owned by a land trust, typically, there are
17 restrictions on use of the property, that it
18 be retained typically in an undeveloped
19 fashion for open space, sometimes for
20 recreational purposes as is the case here.
21 MR. MARTIN: All right. Thank
22 you. Okay.
23 Those are my questions, Mr.
24 Chairman, so I will defer to Mr. Ashton.
25 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

9 (Pages 30 to 33)

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING
January 20, 2015

Page 34

1 Mr. Ashton then.
2 MR. ASHTON: I heard your
3 comments about the land trust, but the
4 question that's important is, did you or did
5 you not ask the land trust?
6 THE WINESS (Gaudet): We did
7 not.
8 MR. ASHTON: You did not.
9 Thank you. That was the question.
10 Do you know if it's RF
11 suitable?
12 THE WINESS (Gaudet): I'll let
13 Mr. Lavin speak to that. It is adjacent to
14 the property that was -- to the location that
15 was --
16 MR. ASHTON: You said that the
17 reservoir property was not. And to my
18 knowledge the DEP is adamant they wouldn't
19 let you use it if it was good. But is this
20 property suitable, the land trust property?
21 THE WITNESS (Lavin): We had
22 previously looked at Alternate 2, which is
23 Town of Manchester Water Department, which is
24 adjacent to that area, and it did not provide
25 sufficient coverage.

Page 35

1 MR. ASHTON: Okay. So there
2 was no point in asking the land trust, I
3 think is what your conclusion is.
4 THE WINESS (Gaudet): That's
5 correct.
6 MR. ASHTON: Thank you.
7 THE WITNESS (Libertine):
8 Mr. Ashton, if it helps, the only other thing
9 I would throw in is we also looked at that
10 more from a desktop standpoint, and there
11 were no maintained roads out on those
12 properties. So we're talking about a
13 substantial amount of earthwork and tree
14 clearing to access points on those
15 properties. There were numerous parcels.
16 MR. ASHTON: It's a case of
17 you're damned if you do, and you're damned if
18 you don't.
19 Thank you.
20 THE CHAIRMAN: Now, we'll go
21 to cross-examination by members of the
22 Council.
23 Senator Murphy?
24 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you
25 Mr. Chairman.

Page 36

1 Mr. Paynter, in response to
2 Mr. Martin's question about the construction
3 of the base of the tower, you said usually
4 you do construct it to automatically increase
5 if there's a request. Is it your intention
6 to construct it in such a manner that it can
7 be increased?
8 THE WITNESS (Paynter): Yes,
9 for a tower this height. I wouldn't say all
10 towers. If we're going higher, we might --
11 SENATOR MURPHY: I'm asking
12 about this one.
13 THE WITNESS (Paynter): For
14 this particular tower? Yeah, we would
15 want it --
16 SENATOR MURPHY: And you had
17 mentioned 10 or 20 feet. And you're thinking
18 of 20 feet in your --
19 THE WITNESS (Paynter): Twenty
20 feet would probably be the max, yes.
21 SENATOR MURPHY: Okay.
22 With that in mind,
23 Mr. Libertine, tell us about the view if it
24 goes up 20 feet.
25 THE WITNESS (Libertine): This

Page 37

1 being a relatively short tower for the
2 industry, going from 104 to, say, 124, I
3 don't believe it will extend significantly
4 the overall footprint. Obviously, the
5 character of the tower from the near view is
6 what would most be affected because we would
7 be going up another 20 feet.
8 It certainly would extend a
9 little bit in terms of what we're depicting
10 now for the view shed, but again, my general
11 sense is when we're talking about a 20-foot
12 change, typically, it's not a matter of it
13 kind of expanding it horizontally in terms of
14 that, that visibility. It's more of a point
15 of where there are views, those are going to
16 be certainly more substantial just because of
17 that additional height.
18 SENATOR MURPHY: On the RF,
19 the material indicates that you hand off to
20 eight other sites, I believe.
21 THE WITNESS (Lavin):
22 Potentially, I believe, yes.
23 SENATOR MURPHY: Potentially?
24 Or they do?
25 THE WITNESS (Lavin): We'll

10 (Pages 34 to 37)

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING
January 20, 2015

Page 38

1 see if they actually do, but that's our
2 prediction.
3 SENATOR MURPHY: Do they hand
4 off both at 700 and 1900 to all eight of
5 those.
6 THE WITNESS (Lavin):
7 Certainly, at 700. At 1900, they -- it might
8 not make it to all of them.
9 SENATOR MURPHY: Because I was
10 wondering, you know, one of them is, you
11 know, almost three miles a way. All right.
12 The next question that came to
13 mind is you were responding to one of
14 Mr. Martin's questions. And I apologize for
15 asking it this way, but because I didn't pick
16 up on which alternative you were talking
17 about, but you had responded that you had
18 done RF at a hundred feet.
19 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes.
20 For -- that was for Alternate Number 6, I
21 believe.
22 SENATOR MURPHY: Okay. Why
23 was it at a hundred feet?
24 THE WITNESS (Lavin): When I
25 did it, that was the height that was

Page 40

1 In other words, please look at
2 this location and do it at the existing
3 height that's available, as well as a higher
4 height above the top of the existing --
5 currently existing tower.
6 SENATOR MURPHY: So we can
7 anticipate in future dockets that towers that
8 are there where the top is all taken, there
9 may be a look see at going up on these, these
10 towers, because of the change in regulations
11 at the federal level. Is that understood?
12 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): I think
13 that's a fair characterization. I should
14 note that, however, that in my experience --
15 SENATOR MURPHY: Because we'll
16 be asking those questions, I guess, is what
17 we're --
18 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): I do
19 think that in the past additional height has
20 often been considered if the location appears
21 to be a reasonable one and not -- not
22 something that is fairly far afield from the
23 target location that a carrier is seeking.
24 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you.
25 Is there any other carrier who

Page 39

1 presented to me. Its coverage was --
2 normally will run up to higher heights than
3 that, but the coverage, there was so little
4 coverage I did not pursue it any further
5 because the increased height didn't show any
6 promise for bringing in the coverage in.
7 SENATOR MURPHY: Let me ask
8 you a question about down the road. With it
9 going to be much easier for towers to be
10 increased in height come next month, when you
11 do your propagations and investigations of
12 alternative sites and you make your
13 presentations, as you're making here today,
14 is it the plan for RF engineers to look at
15 sites that are there and not, as in the past,
16 look at where they may go on the tower and
17 start to look about increasing the towers in
18 evaluating what is or is not a potential site
19 for coverage?
20 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): I think
21 it's safe to say, Mr. Murphy, that as things
22 change in the next several weeks that we who
23 do site searches will be presenting and --
24 and pushing for RF analysis of existing sites
25 at different heights.

Page 41

1 has expressed an interest in going on this at
2 this location?
3 THE WITNESS (Paynter): We
4 haven't had any interest come to us as of
5 yet. Our original predictions, when we
6 accepted the site from AT&T, that there would
7 be potential, definite potential for future
8 carriers that obviously made it interesting
9 to us.
10 SENATOR MURPHY: I notice from
11 reviewing your application that -- or one the
12 answers -- I think it's to Number 10 of the
13 interrogatories -- that's your backup, you
14 plan to install for shared backup.
15 THE WITNESS (Lavin): That's
16 correct.
17 SENATOR MURPHY: Which leads
18 me to believe that you are suspecting at
19 least that someone else is going to come
20 along and go on this tower.
21 THE WITNESS (Paynter): That
22 that's definitely the case. We also, you
23 know, have some agreements with AT&T where we
24 provide them backup power so that they don't
25 have to worry about managing it, maintaining

11 (Pages 38 to 41)

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING
January 20, 2015

Page 42

1 it. We -- we do that as part of the rest of
2 the entire facility. So, obviously, it is
3 attractive for them, that aspect. But we
4 do -- the intent is to allow other carriers
5 to plug in, so we do hope to see them down
6 the road.
7 SENATOR MURPHY: Okay.
8 And, lastly, you had indicated
9 that the Town had not indicated, at this
10 point, that they wanted to go on the top of
11 the tower.
12 THE WITNESS (Paynter):
13 Nothing that I've seen to date, no.
14 SENATOR MURPHY: But I assume
15 that if they do, so long that it's available,
16 you'll permit them to go on the tower?
17 THE WITNESS (Paynter): Yes.
18 There wouldn't be a problem. We'd be able to
19 work with them, and I'd recommend the very
20 top for them.
21 SENATOR MURPHY: I just wanted
22 to get that for the record.
23 I have nothing else right now,
24 Mr. Chairman.
25 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Page 43

1 Mr. Ashton?
2 MR. ASHTON: Got it. Thank
3 you.
4 You all seem to have gotten
5 the story about the common backup
6 possibilities, so I won't to explore that.
7 Undergrounding is not an issue
8 here, especially since this doesn't cross a
9 street.
10 The only technical small issue
11 is on fencing. The Council is getting
12 increasingly determined -- probably a good
13 word -- to try and make these things, these
14 facilities, cell towers, substations, what
15 have you, a little bit more vandal proof.
16 And would you have any
17 objection to using a smaller mesh on your
18 cyclone fence than two inches? Two inches
19 can be climbed. I've done it, but an inch
20 and a quarter can't be, an inch and a half
21 can't be, unless you have, perhaps, Ms.
22 Gaudet's feet, something like that. But I
23 don't think she's too much into climbing
24 fences. But is that something you'd be
25 willing to consider? By the way, as a

Page 44

1 standard, too, not just here, as a standard.
2 THE WITNESS (Paynter): I
3 definitely probably couldn't speak to it
4 being as a standard for -- for my whole own
5 company to be --
6 MR. ASHTON: I'm sorry.
7 THE WITNESS (Paynter): I said
8 I don't think I can speak to it being a
9 standard. I haven't seen it yet, but it's
10 definitely something we could consider, or
11 other alternatives that would make accessing
12 it --
13 MR. ASHTON: Well, would you
14 object to a requirement to put in smaller
15 than 2-inch fencing?
16 THE WITNESS (Paynter): I
17 would not object, no.
18 MR. ASHTON: Okay.
19 And could we count on that
20 being a part of future applications?
21 THE WITNESS (Paynter): I
22 definitely could not speak to that.
23 MR. ASHTON: You know, I'd
24 hate to see paper wasted or time wasted.
25 Okay.

Page 45

1 My issue goes to the specific
2 location of the site, which is pretty much in
3 the middle of a flat area. We don't have in
4 our possession a good site map with good
5 topography. There are bits and pieces, but I
6 can't quite put it together. What's the
7 possibility of pulling that tower site -- I'm
8 going to make a guess -- about 150 feet,
9 possibly 200 feet south and then up on that
10 slope a bit, which would reduce the height of
11 the structure and make it a little bit
12 further away from the Deer Run/Leo J. houses.
13 I'm not sure. Mr. Chasse, is
14 that yours?
15 THE WITNESS (Chasse): I
16 believe so.
17 MR. ASHTON: Okay.
18 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Just
19 trying to follow along. Where the curvature
20 of the proposed road kind of -- as we were
21 walking and we came around the corner and
22 took the left, we were looking in that
23 particular area. It's about the same ground
24 elevation as what's there.
25 That would be maintaining at

12 (Pages 42 to 45)

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING
January 20, 2015

Page 46

1 the -- at the ground level at the toe of the
2 slope that's there as an alternative
3 location. My concern with going up the
4 embankment would be that the other side of
5 that hill has all been excavated out. So
6 it's like a large crater on the other side
7 from quarrying activities.
8 MR. ASHTON: Okay. That's
9 what worried me.
10 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes.
11 MR. ASHTON: That's why I was
12 missing it. And I did not climb it. I
13 should have.
14 THE WITNESS (Chasse): But to
15 move the facility back down to that area, as
16 far as the ground elevation and not be out in
17 the middle, would bring that a little closer
18 and further away from the access.
19 MR. ASHTON: Is that a
20 reasonable alternative?
21 THE WITNESS (Chasse): It
22 would be one, two -- approximately about
23 300 feet, 350 feet from where it currently
24 is.
25 MR. ASHTON: So that would

Page 48

1 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): If I
2 might just -- just interject. We have not
3 explored with the owner of the property any
4 locations other than that. He did express
5 his concern in the beginning during our first
6 negotiations with him that we not impede his
7 access to haying the field, and such. So --
8 MR. ASHTON: I think that
9 would, actually, benefit the access because
10 it would be out of the middle of the field.
11 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): We can
12 certainly explore that with him.
13 MR. ASHTON: You can put your
14 tower right at the toe of the slope, and if
15 you wanted to, with a little creative
16 imagination, put some of the equipment
17 shelters up on the slope --
18 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): He may
19 be very --
20 MR. ASHTON: And you're out of
21 it even more then from conflicting with the
22 haying operation.
23 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): He may
24 be amenable to it. It's not a discussion we
25 we've had.

Page 47

1 open the distance from Deer Run. Wouldn't
2 it?
3 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes.
4 MR. ASHTON: Considerably.
5 And, Mr. Libertine, would that
6 improve or decrease the visibility?
7 THE WITNESS (Libertine):
8 Well, it certainly would provide additional
9 distance and buffer. So, yes, from that --
10 on that particular location, we have some
11 considerations now to the east because it
12 starts to move it a little bit closer to
13 another residential area.
14 MR. ASHTON: Well, you're not
15 moving it much to the east. You're coming
16 almost due south.
17 THE WITNESS (Libertine):
18 Well, it's the aspect from that particular
19 direction. I'm not saying it's a deal
20 killer. I'm just saying it's one of those
21 balancing acts we have to take into
22 consideration.
23 MR. ASHTON: Okay. No further
24 questions.
25 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Page 49

1 MR. ASHTON: And I'm sure
2 you've got the powers of persuasion. I have
3 a lot of confidence in you, having known you
4 for quite a while.
5 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think
6 it might put the whole compound closer to the
7 wetlands, but that's another something to
8 think about.
9 But, Dr. Klemens.
10 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you,
11 Mr. Chairman.
12 I have a variety of questions.
13 I wanted to follow up on what Senator Murphy
14 was talking about the -- what's coming down
15 the pike, basically. The towers can be
16 extended in that manner much more easily.
17 And you said you were going to
18 have different RF studies. And I'm wondering
19 when you come to future dockets, are you also
20 going to have your visual studies assuming
21 the worst case scenario, from a visual
22 perspective, that is, 20 feet more than is
23 currently being opposed?
24 THE WITNESS (Libertine): If
25 everyone is looking for me to answer that,

13 (Pages 46 to 49)

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING
January 20, 2015

Page 50

1 I'm -- I'm asked to do what is either
2 proposed or what my client instructs me to
3 do. So I have no problem doing it, but I'm
4 not sure that every client is going to be
5 feeling as though that's necessarily help --
6 helpful, quite honestly.
7 DR. KLEMENS: Well, I think
8 the public would find it quite helpful.
9 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I
10 don't disagree with that.
11 DR. KLEMENS: I think that's,
12 you know, would be important because if now
13 we can raise these towers almost without much
14 process, I think it would be helpful to have
15 that. And your client can hear that from at
16 least one Council member. I think it would
17 be very helpful.
18 I have a few other questions
19 while I have Mr. Libertine here. We received
20 an e-mail from a Joseph -- I hope I don't
21 butcher this -- Szumowski who lives at 735
22 Lydall Street and asked why there was no --
23 there were no simulations done from that
24 location. Could you address that,
25 Mr. Libertine.

Page 51

1 THE WITNESS (Libertine):
2 Certainly. We, because of the time of the
3 season that we were asked to produce this
4 study, the leaves were fully on the trees.
5 And as you can see from the map, and I maybe
6 got a flavor from driving around today and
7 kind of getting an idea of what the views are
8 from the south, most of the views, including
9 that location, from the southern -- south of
10 our property and the site, are fully obscured
11 by the leaves when the trees are in full
12 leaf.
13 Certainly, this time of year,
14 you're going to start to see some views
15 through the trees, but we were out there, as
16 I say, when we had a full leaf-on conditions,
17 and it just does not eclipse the trees that
18 time of year. So that was really the reason
19 why we weren't able to get any photographs.
20 DR. KLEMENS: And following
21 Mr. Ashton's suggested relocation, would the
22 views from Lydall Street be more noticeable
23 at that location, or is it pretty much the
24 same?
25 THE WITNESS (Libertine): From

Page 52

1 that specific location, it might be --
2 actually increase the views slightly, but it
3 depends on where -- and from -- from again,
4 from that specific location, the way Lydall
5 Street kind of wraps around the property and
6 just the characteristics of the property with
7 the large knob, there are several locations
8 on that road where you're just not going to
9 see this any time of year.
10 But, again, if we start
11 talking about moving it 300 feet closer to
12 one location to offset it from another, there
13 will be trade-offs. So I think from that
14 particular location, again, I don't believe
15 it's going to be a factor when the leaves are
16 on the trees so much as, again, when leaf --
17 leaf off, when you can see through trees.
18 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you.
19 On your response to Council's
20 interrogatories or prehearing questions, on
21 A17, there was a discussion of the two
22 alternative routes.
23 On Alternative A -- and I
24 quote directly from the document --
25 Alternative A, this access is located within

Page 53

1 dense wooded area and would require the
2 removal of numerous mature trees. Now,
3 looking there today, I think the numerous
4 mature trees are gone.
5 THE WITNESS (Chasse): This is
6 Scott Chasse. I would agree with that
7 assessment. But the response, at that time,
8 was based on our last fieldwork that we had
9 been out there over the beginning part of
10 last year, and that was not the case at that
11 time to the extent that we saw today.
12 DR. KLEMENS: I mean, that
13 also talks about the access road, because
14 part of the argument of having the access
15 road near the wetland is to preserve the
16 dense mature forest. And yet, once you pass
17 that gray truck or whatever was parked there,
18 that seemed to be -- this vehicle that was
19 parked there, that seemed to be the sort of a
20 breakpoint between where the forest hadn't
21 been logged. And all the rest of that slope
22 looked to me very much like it had been
23 pretty heavily logged, and there was pole
24 timber mostly left on it.
25 So I'm a little bit puzzled --

14 (Pages 50 to 53)

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING
January 20, 2015

Page 54

1 I mean, troubled by -- and that's why a site
2 visit is so useful because you hear the
3 characterization of all this dense forest,
4 and you go onto the site and you realize that
5 the dense forest isn't so dense anymore. And
6 I don't know how that would affect your
7 location of that road that is so close to the
8 wetland.

9 What I'm trying to say is I
10 just don't think that that forest that's left
11 there merits that kind of concern anymore.
12 It's pretty well logged over.

13 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes, I
14 would agree.

15 DR. KLEMENS: I just have a
16 few more questions.

17 On page 15 of the
18 introduction -- and I don't know if this is
19 your language or the language from the Town
20 of Manchester's plan of conservation and
21 development, but maybe you can tell me what
22 Gen YR and baby boomers -- I think I know
23 what baby boomers are. But it's sort of odd
24 to see this in an application.

25 MR. ASHTON: Grandchildren.

Page 56

1 point is taken.

2 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you.

3 Okay. I'm going to move
4 quickly to the vernal pool report, and I
5 guess these are from Mr. Gustafson.

6 You documented both spotted
7 salamanders and wood frogs in the vernal
8 pool?

9 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That
10 is incorrect. As in the vernal pool, the
11 only documented species was wood frog.
12 Spotted frog -- spotted salamander were not
13 observed during inspection, but were only
14 mentioned as an expected species that would
15 be utilizing that area.

16 DR. KLEMENS: You didn't find
17 eggs of spotted salamanders.

18 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That
19 is correct.

20 DR. KLEMENS: I'll have to go
21 back and read the report again.

22 Did you dip net for marbled
23 salamander larvae?

24 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): No.

25 DR. KLEMENS: If marbled

Page 55

1 DR. KLEMENS: Grandchildren of
2 baby boomers?

3 MS. CHIOCCHIO: That's pretty
4 much it. That's directly from their plan of
5 conservation and development.

6 DR. KLEMENS: That's from
7 their plan of conservation and development?

8 MS. CHIOCCHIO: Right. And
9 Gen Y refers to the children of, I guess, Gen
10 X. So --

11 DR. KLEMENS: Well, then I
12 can't hold you responsible for what the Town
13 of Manchester said. Okay.

14 On page number 17, under C,
15 you characterize the land as vacant. And I
16 would think that the more appropriate might
17 be it's undeveloped. I think there's
18 certainly a lot of things going on with that
19 land, but it's not developed.

20 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): We don't
21 disagree that -- that there are things being
22 done on the property.

23 DR. KLEMENS: So it's not
24 vacant.

25 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Your

Page 57

1 salamander larvae were present, how would
2 that affect your seasonal construction
3 restrictions? Right now you're restricted
4 from the springtime.

5 THE WITNESS (Gustafson):
6 Correct, correct. The current seasonal
7 restrictions are from March 1st to May 15th,
8 and May 16th to September 15th -- sorry --
9 July.

10 I would anticipate that if
11 marbled salamanders were found, that those
12 seasonal restrictions should be modified.

13 DR. KLEMENS: But there was no
14 work done to look for them?

15 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That
16 is correct.

17 DR. KLEMENS: But that could
18 be done as part of the D and M plan?

19 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yes.

20 That could be addressed in the D and M plan.
21 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes,
22 sorry. That's correct.

23 DR. KLEMENS: Okay.

24 I have no further questions
25 for now, Mr. Chairman.

15 (Pages 54 to 57)

UNITED REPORTERS, INC.

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

bb0d4f6d-e94e-4df7-b79e-9ce3008a4a1

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING
January 20, 2015

Page 58

1 Thank you.
2 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
3 Dr. Bell.
4 DR. BELL: Thank you,
5 Mr. Chair.
6 And just for the record, I'd
7 like to go over a couple of points that we
8 were observing during the site walk. The
9 application is slightly confusing as to the
10 point or points where the access road comes
11 close to the wetland.
12 So, Mr. Gustafson, could you
13 just tell us exactly what are the points at
14 which the access road comes close to the
15 wetland and what those distances are?
16 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): To
17 my understanding there are two point of the
18 development that come closest to the Wetland
19 1 as it was delineated. These are in
20 locations Wetland Flag 11 and Wetland Flag
21 17. And, at both locations, the distances
22 are 17 feet.
23 DR. BELL: Thank you.
24 Mr. Lavin, on the map of the
25 neighboring sites that's in the application

Page 59

1 behind Tab 1, there's one site that's not
2 identified, and it's on South Bolton Road, I
3 think. But it's in Bolton, and it seems to
4 be close to a road labeled "South Road." And
5 I think it's one of the handoff sites.
6 So I just need to know what is
7 the actual identification of that site? It's
8 2.69 miles to the southeast of the proposed
9 site.
10 THE WITNESS (Lavin): I
11 believe it's on the -- it's the last one on
12 the chart on the next page, page 9. It is
13 CT -- I turn 51 on Thursday so -- 5819, 49
14 South Road in Bolton, yes.
15 DR. BELL: Thank you.
16 And on the terrain map that's
17 behind Tab 1 in the application, there are
18 three sites that are called alternate sites.
19 And I really don't understand, what are
20 those? They have red stars and they say,
21 "Alternate AT&T Site." And they have labels
22 S -- beginning with S. So what would S be --
23 mean?
24 THE WITNESS (Lavin): S or SR
25 means search or search ring. That's how AT&T

Page 60

1 identifies sites that are in development
2 internally. They are alternates for this
3 site, A through F corresponding to 1 through
4 6 in the site search summary.
5 DR. BELL: But they're not
6 presented to us as alternates.
7 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): That's
8 correct.
9 DR. BELL: They were search
10 sites, the sites that you looked at and gave
11 us the information on. But I think there are
12 only three of them on this map, but you
13 looked at more sites, didn't you, than three?
14 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): These --
15 these red stars do not -- do not depict the
16 two existing towers at 230 Box Mountain Road,
17 and I believe it's Russell Drive in
18 Manchester. In other words, these are --
19 these are locations that in the search that
20 my company performed on behalf of American
21 Tower, locations that we've presented in
22 addition to existing towers.
23 We did present, as part of our
24 search, the existing tower at 93 Lake Street.
25 We presented -- you'll see it's S2020 --

Page 61

1 DR. BELL: Okay. Is that --
2 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): I
3 believe it says a zero after it, or perhaps
4 it's a D -- and that's 174 Lake Street,
5 Vernon.
6 DR. BELL: Okay.
7 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): And the
8 B designation, S2020 B is the Town of
9 Manchester Water Department property that we
10 discussed earlier.
11 DR. BELL: Okay. I
12 understand.
13 In the application on page 13,
14 the application states under Visual
15 Assessment, the first paragraph, "The visual
16 analysis concludes that only approximately
17 198 acres, or approximately 2.5 percent of
18 the study area will experience seasonal
19 views."
20 What seems to be actually
21 stated in the visual analysis is there are
22 198 additional acres to the 50 that are in
23 the -- that would have year-round views. So
24 I believe that's inconsistent with what the
25 actual visual analysis says. Could I just

16 (Pages 58 to 61)

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING
January 20, 2015

Page 62

1 get somebody to --
2 THE WITNESS (Libertine):
3 You're correct, Dr. Bell. There is
4 inconsistency there. It should be that there
5 are additional acres above and beyond the 50
6 that are year-round. So that would be a
7 total -- if we could do the math, it would be
8 a total of 248.
9 DR. BELL: Yeah. So I did the
10 math, and I get about 3 percent, which is not
11 a large difference, but I just wanted to be
12 clear on it. Okay.
13 Mr. Libertine, while you're on
14 the radar here, the Idrisi tool that you
15 mention in your visual analysis, I-d-r-i-s-i,
16 is that new?
17 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Well,
18 no. That -- actually, that particular
19 program and series of programs that they
20 have, actually, date back almost, I want to
21 say over a decade so it has been around a
22 while.
23 Interestingly enough and as a
24 side note, they've just changed the name.
25 And so they've added a lot functions which we

Page 63

1 are just now starting to implement. So, in
2 future dockets where we're involved, you'll
3 see that that is now going to be called
4 something entirely different. It's still
5 made by Idrisi. They've just, like anything
6 else, they're marketing it a little bit
7 differently.
8 But to answer your question,
9 no, that, that actual tool and technology has
10 been around quite a while.
11 DR. BELL: Okay. Thank you.
12 In the supplemental
13 submission, which is the one on the vernal
14 pool protection plan, silt fencing is
15 mentioned as part of the plan. My question
16 is, would that be staggered silt fencing for
17 the amphibians to get through or not?
18 THE WITNESS (Libertine):
19 At -- at this time, the syncopated silt
20 fencing is not being proposed.
21 DR. BELL: That's what it's
22 called. Okay.
23 THE WITNESS (Gustafson):
24 Also, if I may, I would like to make a
25 correction to my response to Dr. Klemens'

Page 64

1 assertion that the report had indicated
2 observations of spotted salamander egg
3 masses. This is correct.
4 My -- my understanding was
5 incorrect at the -- at my previous response.
6 Spotted salamander egg masses were found,
7 interior portions to Wetland 1 within the
8 vernal pool during the inspection. My
9 apologies for that incorrect statement.
10 DR. BELL: Thank you.
11 Those are my questions. Thank
12 you, Mr. Chair.
13 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
14 Mr. Hannon.
15 MR. HANNON: Thank you,
16 Mr. Chairman. Yes, I do have some questions.
17 Again, there was a question
18 asked out in the field. I just want to make
19 sure that it gets into the record also. The
20 distance from the closest house on Deer Run
21 Trail to the proposed location for the cell
22 tower is what distance again?
23 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott
24 Chasse. Excuse me. It's 452 feet from the
25 proposed tower locate -- excuse me -- from

Page 65

1 the corner of the compound closest to the
2 property at 277 Deer Run Trail.
3 MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you.
4 In going through the report
5 there are some statements that a vernal pool
6 evaluation is going to be done. I'm assuming
7 that that is the supplement that came in. Is
8 that correct? I think it's dated December
9 29th.
10 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That
11 is correct.
12 MR. HANNON: Okay.
13 One of the statements in the
14 report states -- it's on page 3 at the bottom
15 -- the proposed development will not alter
16 existing surface or subsurface flow
17 conditions or directions.
18 Was there any soil testing
19 done? Was there any type of hydrology study
20 done? Because, again, part of the concern
21 that I have in this area is you have a vernal
22 pool wetland area, and between it and the
23 drainage area if you're putting in any type
24 of utility line that could, theoretically,
25 disrupt the current water flow and actually

17 (Pages 62 to 65)

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING
January 20, 2015

Page 66

1 take water away from that wetland area.
2 And I'm just wondering if
3 anything has been done to make a subsurface
4 determination as to what the impact that
5 utility trench would have on the wetlands?
6 THE WITNESS (Gustafson):
7 During the course of the wetland delineation
8 and vernal pool analysis, soil samples were
9 taken in the area. It was determined that
10 the large -- largely -- largest soil
11 component -- components were -- included
12 Raypol, Scarborough, Hartford and Manchester,
13 which are all consistent of outwash
14 geological formations.
15 These are well-sorted sands
16 and gravels where water freely drains;
17 therefore, I do not anticipate that
18 subsurface drainage patterns would be
19 dramatically altered with the proposed
20 development.
21 Similarly, due to the small
22 footprint of the compound, we do not
23 anticipate surface flows to be altered as
24 part of this proposed development.
25 MR. HANNON: So would you say

Page 67

1 then that the majority of the water that
2 seems to be going toward that wetland area is
3 coming from the north, and it's sort of
4 flowing in a southerly fashion?
5 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): My
6 -- my feeling on the area is that the -- the
7 extent of the hydrology of that wetland is
8 not likely supported by just one sector. It
9 likely receives hydrology from all
10 surrounding areas, but, to your point, that
11 there's a large component from the north is
12 probably correct.
13 MR. HANNON: I'm not sure who
14 would want to respond to this, but I didn't
15 see anything on the plans, whatsoever, about
16 any type of, maybe a swale or things of that
17 nature, as it relates to the French mattress
18 that's being proposed.
19 In looking at the topography,
20 it may work in some areas, but I'm not sure,
21 if any, you know, how much thought has gone
22 into actually getting the water to that spot
23 if the purpose of putting in the French
24 mattress is to get the water from one side of
25 the road to the other.

Page 68

1 THE WITNESS (Chasse): The
2 amount of drainage that's in a flow that's
3 coming across the roads for points to the
4 north, which if you're looking a Sheet SP2 --
5 SB1, would be the right-hand side, is really
6 small.
7 There's an existing depression
8 in that area that already has flow coming
9 down through that, albeit not significant.
10 And we didn't want to have the construction
11 or improvement of the road there to be acting
12 as a dam of that existing flow line that's
13 there; therefore, we've proposed a French
14 mattress to maintain the existing flows.
15 MR. HANNON: Okay.
16 One of the other questions I
17 have is some of the numbers that were used in
18 the vernal pool analysis on, I think, it's
19 page 2. No, I take it back. Page 3, second
20 paragraph.
21 One of the things that's being
22 looked at is the quality of the vernal pool
23 area and how much area has been developed
24 around it. And having worked on reviewing
25 subdivision plans and site plans and stuff

Page 69

1 for 30-something years, when numbers, like
2 plus or minus, are used and you're at a
3 pretty close number to what is recommended, I
4 get a little concerned.
5 Because here you're saying
6 that based on the site being 36.7
7 plus-or-minus acres with 15 plus-or-minus
8 acres consisting of existing development,
9 it's like 23.55. You know, if the developed
10 area is actually 15.7, 16, now you're getting
11 over that 25 percent threshold, and that's
12 prior to putting in the road and some of the
13 other work.
14 So I would think that one of
15 the things we would want to try to make sure
16 of is what those numbers actually are.
17 We were talking about this
18 possibly being a Tier 1 level. I don't think
19 you want to have it start dropping in terms
20 of quality. And because of that -- then I'll
21 go back to something that Dr. Klemens raised,
22 and that was looking at the possible
23 Alternative A as the access point. Because
24 there you're saying that the closest house is
25 452 feet away from the corner. So you're

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING
January 20, 2015

Page 70

1 talking about, you know, a 450-foot road
2 versus a 1600-foot road. It doesn't go near
3 the wetlands at all. And I mean, some of the
4 things that can be done is it doesn't
5 necessarily have to be gravel right at the
6 cul de sac, but even going in with concrete
7 structures where you can fill it in with
8 dirt, you know, grow grass on it and still
9 maintain, sort of, the integrity of the area.
10 And that may be something that can be looked
11 at.

12 In the way some of the trees
13 have been taken down, you may not want to do
14 sort of a straight shot in there, but you can
15 probably wind a road a little bit, too, to
16 take advantage of what some of the buffer
17 would be. It's something, I think, you
18 probably should look at.

19 And then one final question I
20 have, and I don't know if this is anything
21 that you have information on. But something
22 that was stated out at the site was that
23 there may be some Manchester Land Trust
24 property out there. Are you familiar with
25 that? And if so, where would it be?

Page 71

1 THE WINESS (Gaudet): There is
2 a parcel owned by the Manchester Land Trust
3 that is behind the houses on Deer Run Trail
4 and comes around and abuts the Reed property
5 at the end of, essentially, at the end of the
6 cul de sac at Deer Run Trail.

7 MR. HANNON: Is that something
8 that would adversely impact access through
9 the cul de sac?

10 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Of the
11 mapping that we had for that area is a
12 compilation map, so the boundaries have not
13 been validated.

14 The town mapping for this area
15 shows the cul de sac ending at,
16 approximately, the Reed property. And some
17 of the survey information we saw had dashed
18 paper lines, paper road going up, abutting to
19 our property, but it has not been validated.

20 If that indeed is not the
21 case, then it would be similar to what the
22 Sheet A1 shows for at the end of Leo Lane
23 where the conservation land actually does go
24 right up around the corner, so that would
25 need further research.

Page 72

1 MR. HANNON: Okay.
2 I have no additional
3 questions.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
5 Commissioner Caron.

6 COMM. CARON: Thank you, Mr.
7 Chairman, but I have no questions.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: My Lynch?

9 MR. LYNCH: Two quick ones,
10 but before I go I want to support the earlier
11 inquires by Senator Murphy and Mr. Ashton as
12 we head into this new world of height
13 evaluation that they get incorporated into
14 future dockets, you know.

15 And my two quick questions
16 are, Mr. Chasse, this 250 feet, is that
17 property line to property line, or is that to
18 the residence itself? 452 feet rather.

19 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Scott
20 Chasse. The 452 feet would be from the
21 northeastern corner of the compound to the
22 closest portion of the structure occupying
23 that parcel, so it is to the residence.

24 MR. LYNCH: Thank you.
25 You're up again. You said

Page 73

1 earlier that the decibel levels from the air
2 conditioning unit and the generating unit
3 would be below standards. Has anyone, after
4 the sites have been completed, gone back and
5 tested that?

6 THE WITNESS (Chasse): We just
7 recently did that for another docket that was
8 approved in Redding, that we went back and
9 did postconstruction noise monitoring so,
10 yes.

11 MR. LYNCH: All right. Thank
12 you.

13 Those are my questions,
14 Mr. Chairman.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
16 Just a couple quick questions.
17 I'm sure it's in here somewhere, but what is
18 the property presently zoned for?

19 THE WITNESS (Chasse): It's
20 zoned as an RR, residential rural property.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Which is
22 minimum parcel sizes?

23 THE WITNESS (Chasse): We'll
24 have to get that to you at the break.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: And, to your

19 (Pages 70 to 73)

UNITED REPORTERS, INC.

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

bb0d4f6d-e94e-4df7-b79e-9ce3008a4a1

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING
January 20, 2015

Page 74

1 knowledge, has there ever been a proposed
2 subdivision on any of this property?
3 MS. CHIOCCHIO: Not to my
4 knowledge.
5 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, given the
6 zoning and given what we saw, the land, it
7 presumably could be subdivided?
8 MS. CHIOCCHIO: I would expect
9 so, yes.
10 THE CHAIRMAN: And,
11 presumably, but again you said that's not
12 clear from the maps you have at the moment,
13 but from what you do show, it looks like both
14 Deer Run Trail and Leo Lane do have proposed
15 paper extensions of the roads into this
16 property which would mean you would have
17 access, for whatever purpose, to extending
18 those roads into your property. Am I --
19 THE WITNESS (Chasse):
20 Theoretically, yes.
21 THE CHAIRMAN: And one of the
22 proposed alternatives that we talked about
23 was -- that was from Deer Run Trail?
24 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes.
25 That would be Option A, as been referred to

Page 76

1 same time move the actual site of the tower
2 south, if you do both of them, you're
3 extending the access drive further -- further
4 to the south.
5 So I guess one of the things
6 that we'll have to grapple with is looking at
7 alternatives which, I guess -- am I correct
8 that they're on the table, or you're not
9 objecting to us looking at the possibility of
10 an access from Deer Run and to, also, the
11 possibility of locating the actual tower -- I
12 don't know what it would be, 200 to 300 feet
13 further south.
14 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): We're
15 always willing to look at additional
16 alternatives raised by the Council.
17 And as I indicated earlier,
18 these are not discussions that we've had with
19 Mr. Reed, the property owner, but we are
20 always willing to -- to entertain additional
21 ideas.
22 THE CHAIRMAN: I think it
23 would be very helpful if you could have that
24 conversation sooner rather than later. I
25 think that would be helpful for the Council.

Page 75

1 previously.
2 THE CHAIRMAN: And just to get
3 a sense if it were to be -- well, in whatever
4 case, after construction, how frequent is --
5 well, it wouldn't be construction -- travel
6 to maintain or monitor, how weekly, monthly,
7 what kind of traffic does one normally
8 expect?
9 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Once
10 the site is done, operations folks for the
11 carriers will visit the site intermittently,
12 say, once a month, thereabouts.
13 THE CHAIRMAN: And I don't
14 remember -- also, would you want to assume
15 that you would -- not a formal gate, but
16 there would be some something that would
17 prohibit traffic that wasn't involved in the
18 actual site or property from going from
19 whichever direction; is that --
20 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes.
21 Some kind of control device at the entrance
22 could be deployed.
23 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. And if
24 we were to consider an alternative ingress
25 and egress from Deer Run Trail and at the

Page 77

1 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): We
2 certainly intend to.
3 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Excuse
4 me, Chairman Stein. To answer your question
5 about the minimum lot area in an RR zone in
6 the town of Manchester, it's 30,000 square
7 feet. And this is a 64-acre parcel so we
8 exceed that extensively.
9 THE CHAIRMAN: Right. But
10 given -- which we didn't -- or at least I
11 didn't see the actual. There's been some
12 quarry activity on a portion of it, which
13 while is technically feasible that it could
14 be filled in -- oh, the question is, is the
15 quarry actually in use?
16 THE WITNESS (Chasse): There's
17 equipment there with trucks and conveyor
18 belts, so I presume so. I have not
19 physically -- personally, seen it in
20 operation, but it appears as though it is
21 active.
22 THE CHAIRMAN: I see. But
23 presumably, even if that part was off the
24 table, the part we saw could be subdivided,
25 obviously, subject to keeping the proper

20 (Pages 74 to 77)

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING
January 20, 2015

Page 78

1 buffers from the wetlands?
2 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes.
3 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hannon?
4 MR. HANNON: Thank you,
5 Mr. Chairman.
6 Just a follow-up on Alternate
7 A access. If that ended up being the way
8 that this project finished up, and seeing as
9 how the mature forest is pretty much gone at
10 this point in time, would there be any
11 opposition to putting in some type of
12 buffering on the road to kind of soften that
13 area a little bit?
14 THE WINESS (Gaudet): You're
15 referring to vegetative screening?
16 MR. HANNON: Yes.
17 THE WINESS (Gaudet): There
18 would be no objection.
19 MR. HANNON: Thank you.
20 I have no further questions.
21 THE CHAIRMAN: I'll apologize
22 for constantly -- I'm not trying to avoid
23 somebody out there other than the sun.
24 That concludes the
25 cross-examination by the Council. However,

Page 80

1 resident and anybody in Connecticut, I think
2 we know we need these things, but we need to
3 have the best location that meets the needs
4 of the system, as well as the community that
5 they're located in.
6 We had, collectively, met on
7 this as a delegation, three members of the
8 floor in the House and myself have suggested
9 that we look at the Risley Reservoir land
10 across the street.
11 It has been mentioned, and as
12 well as the Town of Manchester land, however,
13 they are separate pieces of land. The Town
14 of Manchester land, I would agree with your
15 observations. Around that area, it is
16 swampy. It's probably not the best location.
17 But, to the right of that, as you look
18 straight across the street to the right,
19 there's 175 acres of land owned by the
20 Manchester Land Trust, President Malcolm
21 Barlow. In fact, talked with Malcolm at 2:30
22 today. He has had no discussions regarding
23 this project or any tele project, though they
24 have a substantial amount of land there as
25 well as other locations throughout the town.

Page 79

1 we have the Intervenor, which are now
2 formally intervenors. So I'll ask at this if
3 State Representative Luxenberg -- or I don't
4 know if also Senator Cassano is here, and
5 whether they would like to utilize their
6 opportunity to cross-examine the Applicant.
7 And we have to figure out a
8 place -- if you could go to the podium, if
9 that's all right.
10 SENATOR CASSANO: Thank you,
11 Mr. Chairman. We decided to let the old guy
12 go first. First of all, I want to thank you.
13 I am Steve Cassano, state
14 senator from the 4th Senate District,
15 Manchester, Glastonbury, Bolton, Andover. I
16 want to thank you for being here, and I want
17 to say I understand the difficulty that you
18 go through.
19 We want electricity, but we
20 don't want power lines. We want natural gas,
21 but we don't want gas lines. And, of course,
22 we want telephone service, but we don't want
23 towers. And so you have to juggle these
24 things, and we understand that.
25 As a town of Manchester

Page 81

1 We call it a mountain. Some
2 places it would be a hill, but Connecticut
3 it's a mountain. Box Mountain is to the left
4 of it. You have a tower there. You have a
5 tower further down on Lake Street. The land
6 that the Land Trust owns is directly across
7 the street, directly across the pond.
8 And so we would urge, before a
9 final decision is made, that you would look
10 at that particular parcel. The height is
11 there. There are no houses with 175 acres.
12 I can assure you. I know there's land access
13 for trucks to get in there, and so on. I
14 think a lot of things could be worked out
15 with far less harm to the neighborhood.
16 And so I would, again, ask you
17 to look at that possibility. You may have --
18 if you have, I know it's not in conjunction
19 with the Land Trust, but I would hope that
20 there will be a meeting to work with them and
21 see if, in fact, there is a location.
22 And I would turn it over to
23 Kelly Luxenberg, the representative who lives
24 in that region and brought us together. And
25 I want to thank her for her efforts. Thank

21 (Pages 78 to 81)

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING
January 20, 2015

Page 82

1 you.
2 REP. LUXENBERG: Thank you,
3 Senator Cassano, and thank you for letting us
4 be a part of this process today.
5 I have only been a
6 representative -- now I think I'm going on my
7 tenth today. So this was a great opportunity
8 into the foray of public service. So if I
9 ask questions that you can't answer because
10 of industry standards, please feel free to
11 let me know.
12 So one of my first questions
13 would be in reviewing the application and
14 then the subsequent Council's question, I
15 wanted to know why 277 Deer Run Trail didn't
16 originally receive a letter about the
17 proposed tower.
18 And I'm sorry. I don't know
19 who I should be directing questions to.
20 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): The
21 property at 277 Deer Run Trail does not abut
22 the Reed property directly, and under the
23 requirements for notice, it was not required
24 to receive notice.
25 REP. LUXENBERG: Okay. Thank

Page 83

1 you.
2 But it is the property that
3 you cite as the closest to the tower; is that
4 correct?
5 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes, it
6 is the closest.
7 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): It's the
8 closest house to the property.
9 REP. LUXENBERG: Okay. So the
10 closest home to the property. But other
11 homes were notified who were further away
12 from the proposed site.
13 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Because
14 their property lines abut the property
15 boundary of Mr. Reed's property.
16 REP. LUXENBERG: Right. I
17 mean, from my perspective -- and again, if I
18 can't make comments. Can I make comments?
19 Is that all right and observations, or no?
20 I'm just looking for a point of
21 clarification. Thank you.
22 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, at this
23 point we would prefer questions and answers
24 rather than -- right. That's what would --
25 REP. LUXENBERG: Thank you,

Page 84

1 Mr. Chairman. I appreciate that.
2 So moving onto my next
3 question, when you talk fire alarm -- or I'm
4 sorry -- security alarms, would they be
5 audible to the neighborhood if they are set
6 off?
7 THE WITNESS (Chasse): No,
8 they're silent.
9 REP. LUXENBERG: They're
10 silent? Okay.
11 And also as you talk about the
12 extension of the tower, at what point would
13 it require the lights that were discussed in
14 the application that it currently doesn't
15 have because it's under the height
16 requirement?
17 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): We
18 don't anticipate that the tower would ever be
19 extended to that height, which is 200 feet.
20 REP. LUXENBERG: Two hundred
21 feet. Okay. Thank you.
22 And can you share why this,
23 this particular site on the parcel of land
24 was chosen as opposed to other areas on
25 Mr. Reed's property?

Page 85

1 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): As we
2 walked the property when we first visited it,
3 we were attempting to find a location where
4 screening, natural screening would provide
5 some buffer between existing residences and
6 the tower location. As we've noted earlier
7 through questions and answers, the property
8 is -- has been cleared in areas that were not
9 at that time cleared.
10 We also were in discussion
11 with Mr. Reed as to his existing uses, and he
12 asked us to be sensitive to not going right
13 out in the middle of the field. He wanted to
14 be able to maintain his haying operation as
15 best as possible.
16 We took note of the fact that
17 there was an existing access drive that would
18 require no clearing and minimal grading
19 and -- and strengthening in order to be
20 suitable for a permanent access. So there
21 were a number of factors that we looked at as
22 we first investigated the property.
23 REP. LUXENBERG: And how long
24 have these conversations been occurring with
25 Mr. Reed?

22 (Pages 82 to 85)

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING
January 20, 2015

Page 86

1 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): They
2 occurred over a period of months, and a lease
3 has been in place for, I'm going to estimate,
4 approximately a year.
5 REP. LUXENBERG: Approximately
6 a year? So at the time --
7 THE WITNESS (Chasse): I'm
8 sorry. Not to interrupt. That's a lease
9 option, a legal arrangement with Mr. Reed,
10 and no subsequent discussions have been had.
11 REP. LUXENBERG: Okay. But
12 prior to that lease option, there were
13 previous discussions. Ultimately, what I'm
14 trying to get at is an understanding of when
15 that clearing of that area began, because I
16 know you do cite throughout your application
17 that no trees would need to be removed for
18 the process. So I'm just trying to have an
19 understanding of the timeline.
20 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): I don't
21 know when the clearing that we observed today
22 at the -- at the end of the property closest
23 to Deer Run Trail took place. That is not
24 something that we've had any discussions with
25 Mr. Reed about.

Page 87

1 REP. LUXENBERG: But is there
2 a specific time that you can share with us as
3 to when you actually started the
4 conversations with him or approached Mr. Reed
5 about this opportunity?
6 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): I
7 believe it was in August of 2013.
8 REP. LUXENBERG: Okay. Thank
9 you.
10 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Excuse
11 me. This is Scott Chasse. Just a point of
12 clarification. The application indicates
13 that no tree removal is proposed based on the
14 proposed development that's here, not what
15 the owner has personally done outside of this
16 application.
17 REP. LUXENBERG: Okay. Thank
18 you.
19 Now I have a question on the
20 deficiency in coverage, not necessarily in
21 towers in the area as we have noted that
22 there's are several others in the area.
23 And this is just probably my
24 ignorance, but how can another carriers
25 maintain coverage in that area on these

Page 88

1 existing towers, but AT&T says that they're
2 not suitable for coverage.
3 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Excuse
4 me. I believe AT&T is on most of those
5 towers. They are noted on the plots. I
6 can't speak to anyone else's coverage, but I
7 know that there are no existing structures
8 that will allow us to fill in this deficiency
9 in coverage.
10 REP. LUXENBERG: Well,
11 specifically, I guess then my question goes
12 to 93 Lake, which I know that a member of the
13 Council asked about, that AT&T is not a
14 tenant on that tower which is .9 miles from
15 the proposed location.
16 THE WITNESS (Lavin): Yes. It
17 was -- it was studied, and it was not found
18 to give sufficient coverage to cure the
19 deficiency.
20 REP. LUXENBERG: And just for
21 my purposes, can you define what -- how you
22 determine what sufficient coverage is and,
23 like, how you determine that process?
24 THE WITNESS (Chasse): The
25 threshold for coverage is on the plots. It's

Page 89

1 for 700 megahertz, it's 83 or 93 decibels
2 above a milliwatt. For PCS, it's 86, or
3 90 -- minus 96 decibels above a milliwatt.
4 It's a field strength.
5 REP. LUXENBERG: Okay. Well,
6 that really -- unfortunately, that doesn't
7 mean much to me, but we will go with that. I
8 mean, from I guess that 93 Lake Street area
9 is able to cover T-Mobile and Clearwire, so I
10 would just be curious, maybe in more layman's
11 terms, at a later time, to understand why
12 that doesn't work for AT&T.
13 Yes, I'm sorry.
14 MR. ASHTON: Representative
15 Luxenberg, I get the feeling that the answer
16 given went right over your head. Forgive me.
17 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes,
18 that would be right. Thank you.
19 MR. ASHTON: This is engineer
20 talk, and you have to avoid that as much as
21 possible.
22 REP. LUXENBERG: I'm a
23 nonprofit manager. So --
24 MR. ASHTON: I'm not trying to
25 denigrate you at all, but there are technical

23 (Pages 86 to 89)

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING
January 20, 2015

Page 90

1 specifications measuring the signal strength
2 at various frequencies.
3 The signal strength is
4 measured in decibels, dB, which Mr. Lavin
5 referred to. And, in general, the further
6 you are away from a site, the more the signal
7 weakens, and hence you get a negative DB
8 that's too high.
9 It also -- the signal from any
10 given source is affected by topographic
11 features. For example, if my finger
12 represents a tower and there's a mountain
13 here, a receiver over here is not going to
14 receive the signal from that source. So this
15 is the kind of thing that, in technical
16 jargon, Mr. Lavin was trying to say.
17 REP. LUXENBERG: Thank you,
18 Mr. Ashton.
19 MR. ASHTON: It's fairly
20 straightforward after we cut through the
21 nonsense.
22 REP. LUXENBERG: Well, thank
23 you. The finger visual was very helpful.
24 So, I mean, I guess again, I
25 would just be thinking of how others are

Page 91

1 maintaining the coverage.
2 And this question I have has
3 been answered a few times, but I just want to
4 clarify for purposes, since they are, I
5 guess, to my first question the adjacent
6 landowner, no conversations other than the
7 letter that went to the Manchester Land
8 Conservation Trust have been had with the
9 land conservation trust which does own around
10 the area on Deer Run Trail and also owns the
11 property at Riskey Reservoir among others,
12 and Manchester?
13 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): That is
14 correct. No conversations have been had.
15 REP. LUXENBERG: Okay.
16 Now, this would be kind of a
17 follow-up question for -- we seemed to have
18 talked a lot about Option A for an access
19 road, which I believe would include creating
20 pavement through the land conservation trust,
21 is that correct, or a roadway through the
22 land conservation trust?
23 THE WITNESS (Chasse):
24 Additional survey research would be needed
25 for that. If it's town land, then it would

Page 92

1 not be going through the conservation trust.
2 It would be part of the subdivision rights of
3 the Deer Run Trail road that's already there.
4 Basically, a paper road would have been
5 extended on the original subdivision that
6 goes right up to the property line. That's
7 what needs verification.
8 REP. LUXENBERG: Yes. I would
9 definitely like to see verification of that
10 because I would be under the impression that
11 because it is the adjacent property, that you
12 would have to go through that, which then
13 might speak to the earlier -- from earlier in
14 the hearing when we were talking about why
15 Riskey was not a plausible location because
16 of its passive use.
17 I apologize for all of my
18 questions. I just want to make sure that I
19 have -- that I have asked them all.
20 Oh, can you share how many
21 homes are within 1500 feet of the tower
22 location?
23 THE WITNESS (Chasse): We do a
24 thousand foot, and it's 45.
25 REP. LUXENBERG: Forty-five.

Page 93

1 And those are on Deer Run Trail, Leo J, and
2 it should be reflected in the notes that it
3 is not Leo Lane, it's Leo J Lane.
4 THE WITNESS (Chasse): Yes,
5 Leo J Lane, yes.
6 In the application materials,
7 there's actually a form that's included in
8 there that gives you a list of all 45 sites.
9 REP. LUXENBERG: Oh, yes.
10 Okay. Thank you.
11 And then, in terms of, I know
12 we've looked at acreage for the number of
13 homes -- or the area that would see it. Can
14 you identify how many homes that would be of
15 that 348 acres?
16 THE WITNESS (Libertine): We
17 could get that for you. I don't have that at
18 my fingertips.
19 REP. LUXENBERG: Okay. Thank
20 you.
21 And while you were looking
22 through the process, were any other areas
23 that were not residential looked at as
24 potential alternative sites?
25 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): In

24 (Pages 90 to 93)

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING
January 20, 2015

Page 94

1 general, the area of the -- the search, the
2 search ring and the surrounding areas are
3 generally residential.
4 As indicated in our site
5 search summary, the proposed location, the
6 water department location are both locations
7 that do not have residences built on them.
8 I'm not sure whether that's responsive to
9 your question.
10 REP. LUXENBERG: Okay. I just
11 didn't know if there was any industrial area
12 that could have potentially fallen in.
13 There's one that's not that far from the
14 proposed location, if that fell within the
15 search rings. So --
16 THE WINESS (Gaudet): It did
17 not. There were no industrial or commercial
18 areas found in or immediately in the area of
19 the search area.
20 REP. LUXENBERG: Okay. And
21 then, also, I just have a question about the
22 liability. If something ever happened on the
23 area who is liable? Is it ATC?
24 THE WITNESS (Paytner): I
25 don't know if I can speak entirely to the

Page 95

1 legality of our liability, but I -- I do know
2 we have to insure our site, so I'd imagine we
3 are liable depending on the incident.
4 REP. LUXENBERG: Okay. And,
5 ultimately, my question would get the
6 liability that would be to the Lydall Woods
7 Association, that the homes that are on Deer
8 Run Trail, Leo J and Bridle Path pay into in
9 their insurance for that crossover.
10 If you do -- if you do look at
11 going with Option A for the access road, I
12 would want to ensure that the condo
13 association was not liable for any -- any
14 extra costs from this project, other than the
15 ones that, certainly, the homeowners will be,
16 assuming if this moves forward. Okay. Thank
17 you.
18 Oh, I'm sorry. Senator
19 Cassano has a question.
20 SENATOR CASSANO: I just want
21 to close with a comment again thanking you,
22 but I want to relate an experience that I
23 would hope that would influence what you're
24 going to do.
25 I remember, like yesterday, I

Page 96

1 believe it was November 11th in 1977. It was
2 my second day in office, and we had a meeting
3 with the governor of Connecticut. And we
4 were told that day that JCPenney's was coming
5 to Manchester. The roof of that building, as
6 you know it, is probably 40 acres. This was
7 the largest economic development piece that
8 Manchester had ever seen.
9 In that meeting, the director
10 of transportation said, Well, we can't do
11 this because I-91, 291 is coming right
12 through that same area.
13 Governor Grasso looked at him
14 and said, That's easy, move the highway.
15 If we can move a highway, we
16 can move a tower to a better location, a
17 higher location, that will meet the same
18 needs and hope we have the same kind of
19 feeling, the same kind of direction that
20 Governor Grasso gave us at that time.
21 Thank you.
22 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
23 Your questions were most
24 helpful.
25 So the Applicant -- so we will

Page 97

1 be continuing the evidentiary hearing to a
2 subsequent date, so I think you have several
3 assignments between now and then as it
4 relates to looking at land trust property.
5 And, also, hopefully, you can clear up the
6 issue as to whether you have paper street
7 access from these other developments.
8 Oh, sorry. Dr. Klemens.
9 DR. KLEMENS: A point of
10 clarification, two things. I heard this is a
11 condominium association, or an association.
12 Are these public streets or private streets
13 that these streets -- or are they dedicated
14 to the Town of Manchester, particularly Deer
15 Run Trail and --
16 THE CHAIRMAN: I think that's
17 something they can provide at the next
18 meeting.
19 DR. KLEMENS: And another
20 thing, are you going to talk to Mr. Reed
21 about moving -- I'd also like, when you talk
22 to him please ask him whether he would agree,
23 if we were going to put the tower there, for
24 a no clearing restriction on the area
25 anymore, the woodland, because the woodland

25 (Pages 94 to 97)

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET 453 - COUNCIL MEETING
January 20, 2015

Page 98

1 is being used as a buffer. And it's
2 disappearing.
3 THE CHAIRMAN: The answer is,
4 we can ask him, but we cannot require that.
5 DR. KLEMENS: We can ask, but
6 we --
7 THE CHAIRMAN: Unless it's
8 regulated, like wetlands, we don't have that
9 jurisdiction.
10 DR. KLEMENS: But could you
11 ask him to do it voluntarily?
12 MR. MURPHY: Never hurts to
13 ask.
14 THE CHAIRMAN: Never hurts to
15 ask. This is a learning -- continuous
16 learning experience for all parties,
17 including members of the Council, including
18 yours truly.
19 So we're now going to recess
20 until 7 p.m. when we'll commence the public
21 comment session of the hearing. Thank you.
22 (Whereupon, the witnesses were
23 excused, and the above proceedings were
24 adjourned at 4:38 p.m.)
25

Page 99

1 CERTIFICATE
2 I hereby certify that the foregoing 98
3 pages are a complete and accurate
4 computer-aided transcription of my original
5 verbatim notes taken of the Siting Council
6 Meeting in Re: DOCKET NO. 453, AMERICAN
7 TOWER CORPORATION AND NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS
8 PCS, LLC APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF
9 ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED
10 FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND
11 OPERATION OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY
12 LOCATED AT MANCHESTER TAX ASSESSOR MAP 133,
13 BLOCK 3700, LOT 701, 701 LYDALL STREET,
14 MANCHESTER, CONNECTICUT, which was held
15 before ROBERT STEIN, Chairman, at the Lincoln
16 Center Hearing Room, 494 Main Street,
17 Manchester, Connecticut, on January 20, 2015.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Robert G. Dixon, CVR-M 857
Court Reporter
UNITED REPORTERS, INC.
90 Brainard Road, Suite 103
Hartford, Connecticut 06114

Page 100

1 I N D E X
2 WITNESSES MATTHEW GUSTAFSON
3 MICHAEL LIBERTINE
4 JENNIFER YOUNG GAUDET
5 DAVID JERMAKIAN
6 MARTIN LAVIN
7 BLAKE PAYNTER Page 8
8 EXAMINERS:
9 Mr. Martin Page 12
10
11 EXHIBITS
12 (Admitted in evidence.)
13 EXHIBIT DESCRIPTION PAGE
14 II-B-1 Application for a Certificate 12
15 of Environmental Compatibility
16 and Public Need filed by American
17 Tower Corporation and New Cingular
18 Wireless PCS, LLC, received
19 November 4, 2014
20 a.) Plan of Conservation and
21 Development, Town of Manchester
22 Adopted December 17, 2012,
23 Effective January 14, 2013
24 b.) Zoning Regulations, Town of
25 Manchester, Adopted May 2, 1938,
Amended August 19, 2014
c.) Zoning Map, Town of Manchester
d.) Inland Wetlands and Watercourses
Regulations, Town of Manchester,
Adopted November 14, 1975, Amended
December 16, 2013, Effective
January 3, 2014
e.) Technical Report

Page 101

1 I N D E X (Cont'd.)
2 EXHIBIT DESCRIPTION PAGE
3 II-B-2 Publisher's Affidavit of 12
4 Publication of the Legal Notice
5 dated November 10, 2014
6 II-B-3 Certification of Service on 12
7 DEEP and State Representative
8 Geoff Luxenberg dated Nov. 6, 2014
9 II-B-4 Applicant's Responses to 12
10 CSC Interrogatories, dated
11 December 18, 2014
12 II-B-5 Applicant's Supplemental 12
13 Submission, dated
14 December 29, 2014
15 II-B-6 Resumes 12
16 a.) Blake E. Paynter
17 b.) Jennifer Young Gaudet
18 c.) Scott M. Chasse, P.E.
19 d.) Matthew Gustafson
20 e.) Michael Libertine, LEP
21 f.) David A. Jermakian, CHMM
22 g.) Martin J. Lavin
23 II-B-7 Affidavit of Sign Posting, 12
24 dated January 3, 2015
25

26 (Pages 98 to 101)