

In The Matter Of:

*Application from American Towers LLC, and New
Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC for a Certificate*

*Public Hearing Docket No. 463
December 15, 2015*

*BCT Reporting LLC
PO Box 1774
Bristol, CT 06010
860.302.1876*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Docket No. 463

Application from American Towers LLC, and New
Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC for a Certificate
of Environmental Compatibility and Public
Need Is for the Construction, Maintenance,
and Operation of a Telecommunications
Facility Located At 351A Boston Post Road,
East Lyme, Connecticut

Public Hearing held at the East Lyme
Town Hall, Upper Meeting Room, 108
Pennsylvania Avenue, Niantic, Connecticut,
Tuesday, December 15, 2015, beginning at 7:00
p.m.

H e l d B e f o r e :

ROBIN STEIN, Chairman

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 JAMES J. MURPHY, JR.,
4 Vice Chairperson

5
6 ROBERT HANNON,
7 DEEP Designee

8
9 LARRY LEVESQUE, ESQ.
10 PURA Designee

11
12 PHILIP T. ASHTON
13 DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.

14
15 C o u n c i l S t a f f :

16 MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.,
17 Executive Director and
18 Staff Attorney

19
20 ROBERT MERCIER
21 Siting Analyst

22

23

24

25

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

2

3 For AMERICAN TOWER CORPORATION & NEW

4 CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC:

5 CUDDY & FEDER, LLP.

6 445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th Floor

7 White Plains, New York 10601

8 By: CHRISTOPHER B. FISHER, ESQ.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Good evening,
2 ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to call to
3 order this public hearing of the Connecticut
4 Siting Council today, Tuesday December 15,
5 2015, approximately -- well, now it is 7 p.m.

6 My name is Robin Stein. I'm
7 Chairman of the Connecticut Siting Council.
8 Other members of the Council at the moment
9 are standing because we're going to have a
10 brief presentation on the side -- but who are
11 present are Senator Murphy, our Vice
12 Chairman; Mr. Hannon, designee from the
13 Department of Energy and Environmental
14 Protection; Mr. Levesque, designee from the
15 Public Utilities Regulatory Authority;
16 Mr. Lynch.

17 Members of the staff, Attorney
18 Melanie Bachman who's our Executive Director,
19 and Mr. Mercier who's our citing analyst from
20 staff.

21 This is a continuation of a
22 public hearing that began at 3 p.m. this
23 afternoon. Copies of the hearing program and
24 the Council's Citizen Guide to Siting Council
25 Procedures are available for members of the

1 public. I think they're over there where
2 that gentleman is. And in addition, I think
3 there's a sign-up sheet over there also.

4 This hearing is held pursuant
5 to the provisions of Title 16 of the
6 Connecticut General Statutes and of the
7 Uniform Administrative Procedure Act, upon an
8 Application from American Towers, LLC, and
9 New Cingular wireless PCS, LLC, for a
10 Certificate of Environmental Compatibility
11 and Public Need for the Construction,
12 Maintenance and Operation of a
13 Telecommunications Facility Located at 351A
14 Boston Post Road, East Lyme, Connecticut.
15 This application was received by the Council
16 on October 6, 2015.

17 This application is also
18 governed by the Telecommunications Act of
19 1996 which is administered by the Federal
20 Communications Commission. This act
21 prohibits the Council from considering the
22 health effects of radiofrequency emissions on
23 human health and wildlife to the extent the
24 emissions from towers are within the federal
25 acceptable safe-limit standards, which

1 standard is also followed by the State
2 Department of Public Health.

3 The federal act also prohibits
4 this Council from discriminating amongst and
5 between providers of functionally equivalent
6 services. This means that if one carrier
7 already provides service for an area, other
8 carriers have the equal right to compete and
9 provide service in the same area.

10 The applicant published notice
11 of the filing of the application to the
12 Council in the New London Day on
13 September 23rd, and September 30th of this
14 year, 2015. The Council's legal notice of
15 the date and time of this hearing was
16 published in the New London Day on
17 November 17, 2015.

18 Upon the Council's request,
19 the applicant erected a sign at the proposed
20 site so as to inform the public of the name
21 of the applicant, type of facility, hearing
22 date and location and contact information for
23 the Council. This afternoon members of the
24 Council staff and public personally conducted
25 a field review of the proposed site in order

1 to observe firsthand the potential effects of
2 the proposals.

3 This hearing session tonight
4 has been reserved first for the public to
5 make short statements into the record. These
6 public statements are not subject to
7 questions from parties or the Council, and
8 members of the public making statements may
9 not ask questions of the parties or Council.
10 These statements will become part of the
11 record for the Council's consideration. As I
12 mentioned, there is a sign-up sheet in the
13 back.

14 As a reminder to all,
15 off-the-record communication with a member of
16 the Council or a member of the Council's
17 staff upon the merits of this application is
18 prohibited by law.

19 I further wish to note that
20 parties and intervenors, including their
21 representatives and witnesses are not allowed
22 to participate in the public comment session.
23 They were represented in the hearing that we
24 had this afternoon and there will be, I
25 believe, a continuation of that hearing on a

1 subsequent date.

2 I also wish to note for those
3 who are here and for the benefit of your
4 friends and neighbors who are unable to join
5 us for the public comment session, that you
6 or they may send written statements to the
7 Council within 30 days of the date hereof and
8 such written statements will be given the
9 same weight as if spoken at a hearing.

10 We ask each person making a
11 public statement in the proceedings to
12 confine his or her statements to the subject
13 matter before the Council and to avoid
14 unreasonable repetition so that we may hear
15 all of your concerns and the concerns of your
16 neighbors. Please be advised that we cannot,
17 members of the Council, answer questions from
18 the public at this forum.

19 A verbatim transcript will be
20 made of this hearing and also of the hearing
21 we held this afternoon, and deposited at the
22 East Lyme Town Clerk's office for the
23 convenience of the public.

24 We generally -- I don't know
25 how many people are planning to speak. If

1 possible, we ask you to confine your comments
2 to roughly three minutes. We do have a
3 mechanism for giving warning, which we don't
4 like to use, but if, you know, if necessary
5 we'll try to urge you to, you know, to be
6 succinct with your remarks. And it goes
7 faster if we don't hear excessive applause
8 and other types of manifestations. That just
9 makes everything go faster.

10 Before starting with hearing
11 from the public, we ask the applicant to make
12 a brief presentation. I believe they are
13 prepared to do that.

14 MR. FISHER: Hi. Good
15 evening. My name is Attorney Chris Fisher.
16 I represent the applicants. We do have a
17 presentation this evening. And for some of
18 you who were here in July when we had a
19 public information session, some of this is
20 the same material in slightly abbreviated
21 fashion.

22 This is just a slide of the
23 project professionals that are representing
24 American Tower, AT&T and T-Mobile, which are
25 involved in this particular project to

1 relocate an existing tower facility. They're
2 the individuals that the Chairman was
3 referencing earlier in the day who gave
4 testimony to the Council on evidentiary
5 facts.

6 This is just a slide of the
7 existing tower site for folks in the
8 community. You all understand it's in the
9 Orchards Development at the top of the hill
10 at the end of Plum Hill Road. You can see
11 some of the ongoing construction and
12 development of future phases of that
13 development. That site has been in operation
14 just under 30 years. It was approved by the
15 Council in the 1980s as one of the early
16 cellular tower facilities and it's a 150-foot
17 monopole.

18 This slide shows you existing
19 coverage in dark green from existing sites.
20 If you look to the right of the map that's
21 I-95. If you look in the areas where it's
22 light green, that's actually Route 1. The
23 areas in dark green are existing AT&T sites.
24 So for example, the one that's just to the
25 center right of the screen is a site in

1 Flanders on the high-tension power lines.

2 The existing cell site is shown central to
3 the map and the light green area is service
4 that is currently provided by AT&T's network
5 that it deems reliable for purposes of voice
6 and data calls in it's existing network.

7 The objective for this
8 particular application is to replace as much
9 of that existing coverage as possible, if not
10 even provide greater coverage. Because of
11 terrain there are some challenges which are
12 really technical in nature. This particular
13 slide is intended to show you some of the
14 sites that AT&T evaluated.

15 The two areas that are
16 outlined in red, one is in close proximity to
17 the existing tower. The other is in an area
18 where Ancient Highway actually extends to the
19 top of that hill and before you get down the
20 other side which is the Gateway Development,
21 so really the two areas where AT&T was
22 focusing. It also looked at a number of
23 sites in and around the area beyond those
24 areas which were technically derived in terms
25 of finding an optimal place to replace the

1 tower site.

2 These are some aerial maps to
3 show you the proposed location. The address
4 is 351A Boston Post Road. It's just across
5 the street from Naomi, and just before you
6 actually get to Plum Hill if you're traveling
7 west.

8 The area on the right shows
9 you the existing tower location. The
10 proposed tower location is on a parcel that's
11 slightly larger than seven acres just down
12 the hill closer to Route 1.

13 This is an elevation of the
14 monopole itself -- I'm sorry, that's --
15 actually, you're right. The gentleman in the
16 back is having a hard time seeing. It's
17 because the lights are on. It's a 194-foot
18 monopole. It would look very similar to the
19 existing tower site. It's designed for use
20 by more than just AT&T and T-Mobile and
21 future carriers. You're seeing there four
22 different antenna platforms, which would be
23 different carriers in the marketplace in
24 addition to AT&T and T-Mobile.

25 This is showing what coverage

1 will actually be replicated from the proposed
2 site. Because we're lower in elevation in
3 this particular location there is some loss
4 in coverage.

5 Primarily from this proposed
6 site, its area is on the other side of hill,
7 so the top of the developments that is the
8 Orchards as you kind of go north on the other
9 side. And that's that light green area shown
10 on the map that you're losing from this
11 location over the existing location.

12 This is a slide to simply
13 demonstrate that the site will fully comply
14 with FCC's public health and safety
15 standards.

16 I'm going to move through
17 these fairly quickly. There are detailed
18 photographs online on the Council's website,
19 both with leaf-on and leaf-off conditions
20 that you can go through. You just have to go
21 to the Council's website. These are intended
22 to show potential visibility and visual
23 changes.

24 Some of the areas we were
25 asked to identify, East Lyme High School,

1 actually the new tower site will not be
2 visible from that location.

3 This is Chesterfield Road.
4 It's actually a little hard to pick up, but
5 it will be visible just above the treeline in
6 the center of that photo. These are some
7 additional shots from that location area.

8 This is Maplewood Drive, and
9 if you look in the center of the photo to the
10 right of that tree, that little notch, you'll
11 see the tower with the two antenna platforms
12 right in the middle.

13 This is MacKinnon Place at
14 Morris Lane, and this is an area where you'll
15 see more of the tower itself and the antennas
16 as well. That distance is a little over a
17 third of a mile.

18 This is Parker Drive, which is
19 over half a mile. And there will be
20 year-round visibility above the treeline
21 here. You'll see the tower in the central
22 part of the photo.

23 This is upper Pattagansett
24 Road. In this particular photo it's hard to
25 make out just because of the visibility, but

1 on the right part is the existing tower. You
2 can see it there. And actually, I don't see
3 in this photo, but actually the tower will be
4 just to the left there. I don't have the
5 simulation, I apologize for that. But if you
6 go online you'll be able to see a number of
7 different locations and photos of the tower
8 site.

9 So thank you, Chairman.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to
11 apologize in advance if I mispronounce your
12 names, and some people have easier
13 handwriting than others to read, but we'll do
14 our best.

15 Evelyn Perry is the first, and
16 the podium is there. Please, it would
17 probably be a good idea if you spell your
18 last name just so we have it, the
19 stenographer has it.

20 EVELYN PERRY: P-e-r-r-y.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: I know I can't
22 see you and you can't see me, but that's
23 fine. The other members are much more
24 photogenic than I am, anyways.

25 EVELYN PERRY: As I've already

1 indicated, my name is Evelyn Perry. I live
2 at 351B Boston Post Road. My property abuts
3 that of Jim and Bonnie DeCosta and
4 additionally I share a driveway with the
5 DeCostas.

6 I just want to say that the
7 photos that were just projected do not even
8 come close to approximating the view that we
9 get of the woodland, and also some of my
10 neighbors in the Plum Hill area. I'll show
11 those to you in just a moment.

12 I am very, very opposed to the
13 placement of this cell tower. I understand
14 the motivation of the DeCostas. They are
15 being offered a goodly sum of money for the
16 placement of this tower. I don't begrudge
17 them the money, however I can't support this
18 cell tower placement because it will come at
19 expense to me.

20 My husband and I purchased
21 this property in 2010 and since then we have
22 invested a lot of time and money to upgrade
23 our home and to clear the property. We
24 purchased the property primarily for the
25 location. It's isolated, it's quiet and at

1 this point it offers a very panoramic view of
2 the surrounding land. With the placement of
3 a 194-foot tower only 354 feet from my house,
4 which by the way is the closest residential
5 site to the tower, I suspect that the views
6 are going to be substantially diminished.

7 I have several photos that I
8 took this morning from various locations on
9 my property. This was at the time that the
10 balloon was being floated. I'm sure that you
11 will not be able to see any of these, but
12 this is from my front yard and here is the
13 balloon. And this was not taken with a
14 telephoto lens. It's just a regular camera
15 lens.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: And if you want
17 you can submit them, those photos to the
18 Council and we'll include them as part of the
19 record.

20 EVELYN PERRY: Well, I have a
21 second set of photos that I would be happy to
22 provide you with. They are labeled as to the
23 location on my property that I actually took
24 these photos.

25 Again, a front yard photo, the

1 balloon is very evident and today's weather
2 conditions were rather poor. I mean, the
3 wind was whipping the balloon around.
4 Whether it actually obtained the proper
5 height or not I certainly could not tell
6 that.

7 More photos clearly showing
8 the balloon. I have photos from our pool
9 area. I have photos from my front porch and
10 photos from the upstairs sunroom at my home.
11 Do you want to pass these and look at them.
12 I'm happy to do so.

13 Additionally, one of my
14 neighbors in Plum Hill also provided me with
15 some photos. Half of the photos were taken
16 by the wireless company on the 7th of
17 December and the other half were taken by the
18 property owner. I just want to point out one
19 in particular to you.

20 This was the photo taken by
21 the wireless company, and you can see the
22 balloon is barely visible in the trees.
23 Okay. This was at 21 Plum Hill Road.

24 This photo was taken by a
25 resident of Plum Hill and you can see that

1 depending on where you are in location to
2 this house, the balloon is rather evident.
3 So contrary to some of the comments that were
4 made during the site visit this afternoon,
5 Plum Hill residents and I will have a very
6 enhanced view of this cell tower. It's not
7 hidden at all.

8 Would you like to see these as
9 well?

10 If I ever choose to sell my
11 house I expect that I will never be able to
12 recoup the investments that I've made in my
13 home and in my property. On the other hand,
14 I have no reasonable expectations that my
15 property taxes are going to go down. Okay.

16 As I already mentioned, I
17 share a driveway with Jim and Bonnie DeCosta.
18 I have a question I know you cannot answer at
19 this point, but it's regarding the tower
20 company's response to the East Lyme Land Use
21 Regulation, Number 31.2.13. It's concerning
22 driveway standards.

23 Specifically it states that
24 the driveway must accommodate 60,000 pound
25 vehicles, the grade is not to exceed 8

1 percent and it must have a minimum vertical
2 clearance of 12 feet. The response from the
3 tower company was, and I quote, a standard
4 gravel compacted driveway is proposed for
5 access to the tower site location.

6 I believe what they are
7 referring to is the private drive that Jim
8 DeCosta has created. It does not address the
9 approximately 280 feet of shared asphalt
10 driveway, nor does it address the 30 to
11 45 percent grade of that portion of the
12 driveway.

13 Additionally, regulation
14 31.2.5 concerns the 1x tower setback height.
15 That is not being met, and I believe that the
16 tower company actually responded that it was
17 not going to meet that regulation. The tower
18 location is only a hundred feet from my
19 property. If it falls and falls in my
20 direction, being that it's 194 feet tall, at
21 least 94 feet of it are going to be on my
22 property.

23 Lastly, I'm aware that the
24 Siting Council will not take health concerns
25 into consideration, but I am an eight-year

1 cancer survivor, so I take the health risks
2 very seriously.

3 I thank you for your time and
4 I respectfully request that you consider
5 alternative sites for this cell tower, ones
6 that will not have such a residential impact
7 as this one.

8 Thank you.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Tom Gardner.

10 TOM GARDNER: Tom Gardner,
11 G-a-r-d-n-e-r. Mr. Chairman, thank you for
12 holding this public hearing tonight. I think
13 it's very valuable for the residents as well
14 as the Council.

15 Let me start off with saying
16 that I've been a resident of East Lyme for
17 about 40 years, most recently 33 years at 24
18 Sunrise Trail which is about 700 feet from my
19 property line to the proposed tower.

20 We bought our property, like
21 many other residents have, because of certain
22 reasons like the treeline and the serenity in
23 the back. There used to be an apple orchard
24 of several hundred acres to our north, the
25 beautiful horse farm to our west that we

1 enjoy watching. We even installed additional
2 windows in our backyard so we could see the
3 deer going through our property and the foxes
4 running through. It was quite enjoyable.

5 Having retired about a year
6 ago I thought I could continue to enjoy those
7 views, those scenic views from where we have
8 our property. Putting a tower in at that
9 location, as we saw from the balloon today
10 and as Evelyn mentioned earlier, there's no
11 way in the world that we're not going to see
12 that tower. It's going to be very visible
13 and very present, especially in the
14 wintertime when we're looking at the
15 snowfall, looking out there and seeing that
16 massive tower. It's not what we bought into.

17 Going back a little bit in
18 history, when the original tower was
19 installed about 30 years ago, there was about
20 several hundred acres of apple orchards up
21 there. As time went on the owner of the
22 apple orchards felt it was time to move on
23 and decided to sell the property to
24 developers to build homes on it, which is
25 fine. I mean, change happens. We have to

1 accept change. We're not opposed to change.

2 They built a beautiful
3 community up there. What's happening out
4 there now is they're taking the cell tower,
5 which the lease is running out, and moving it
6 down from the western portion -- excuse me, I
7 think it's the northeastern portion of that
8 property down into the eastern -- southern
9 edge of the current orchards. So we're
10 moving it from a heavily populated area to
11 another heavily populated area, and I'm not
12 sure that it makes any business sense.

13 As we move forward in time,
14 you know, I think that the rationale has to
15 be, does it make sense for everybody
16 concerned? Does it make sense for AT&T?
17 Does it make sense for the residents of East
18 Lyme, and especially those in close
19 proximity?

20 I think there has to be some
21 consideration given to the concerns that are
22 generally involved in tower site selections
23 and approvals. I think that one of the
24 things I'd like to make the property
25 values -- as Evelyn mentioned, I don't think,

1 you know, that there's any way in the world
2 that, you know, it's going to stay the same.
3 They're going to go down, and we understand
4 that. We understand your mission, or your
5 charge, you can't use that in your decision
6 making process. It is what it is, I guess.

7 Regarding the
8 Telecommunication Act of 1996, I think it was
9 meant at that time to do some value, to
10 expand the telecommunications industry, but I
11 think times have changed. The data for the
12 act, some of the medical data was in 1985.
13 Here we are 30 years later and they're still
14 using that same standard.

15 I doubt very much that Pfizer,
16 one of the largest pharmaceutical companies
17 in the world, a corporate headquarters in New
18 London, would use 30-year-old data to make
19 intelligent management decisions on the
20 medical side of the house.

21 One of the other things I
22 think is important to recognize is that in
23 1941 to 1945 our tobacco manufacturers gave
24 cigarettes to our armed servicemembers going
25 overseas. I think today we can understand

1 the strategy behind that, to be addictive.
2 Twenty years later the United States came out
3 and said that smoking is hazardous to your
4 health.

5 I'd like to submit that today
6 not knowing the dangers of cell towers, but
7 in 20 years from today -- we need to protect
8 our children and the people growing up in the
9 neighborhoods, and those people in close
10 proximity, I think, based upon reading in the
11 studies from Israel and Germany, are at risk.

12 Are we willing to take that
13 chance and put a tower in a densely populated
14 area? I come from a technology company. I
15 retired from a multinational worldwide of
16 156,000 employees, and one of the things we
17 were most concerned about were our customers,
18 that we not hurt our customers. And then we
19 looked at our brand and our image to ensure
20 that we were protecting them.

21 In this case here I just don't
22 see how they're doing anybody any good by
23 considering this location. What I would like
24 to suggest, there were alternate locations,
25 one specifically is Stones Ranch. The

1 elevation above sea level is 300 feet. In
2 this documentation that AT&T offered, the
3 State pays to build a 199-foot tower on that
4 particular site to get access.

5 And I'm talking there's two
6 sites now on Stones Ranch. There's a lower
7 one by the airstrip and then there's one deep
8 in the woods, and there's no houses within a
9 mile of that particular location. There's
10 two or three others which I think are
11 relevant as well as one of the 30 acres on
12 top of Marion Lane, which has not been
13 considered.

14 So I think there are
15 alternatives and I say, I do embrace
16 technology. We have to today. But I think
17 the deployment methodology here is flawed and
18 it needs to have a new fresh look of what we
19 can do to change it.

20 So I would, in closing, say
21 two things. One is that we need to protect
22 our children. And the recent issue at the
23 Ancient Highway, we protected the ceremonial
24 grounds that was 2 to 3 hundred years old.
25 But we should protect our children, today's

1 children and tomorrow's children in today's
2 location and not worry about something that
3 happened 2 to 3 hundred years ago to protect
4 them.

5 I have one document, which
6 I'll submit, is the site with the longitude
7 and latitude of the Stones Ranch location for
8 the commission to consider.

9 And thank you very much for
10 your time.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

12 Heather, is it Tooker?

13 HEATHER TOOKER: That's
14 T-o-o-k-e-r. I don't have a rehearsed
15 speech. I'm just a concerned citizen. We
16 own two properties. We live at 342 Boston
17 Post Road and we also own the property across
18 the street, 345 Boston Post Road. So we have
19 two properties that would be affected by this
20 tower.

21 I have some pictures from the
22 balloon test today that shows the view from
23 my front door, two of them. And I also have
24 a view from down the street just a bit where
25 it would be right across the street.

1 I'm concerned about the views,
2 concerned about property values, all things
3 that have already been said here tonight.
4 And we have two young daughters, ten and six,
5 critically concerned about them, too.

6 I am a technology user. My
7 daughters are technology users, so we
8 understand the need for something like this
9 especially in our community, however to have
10 it that close. One of my houses is within
11 500 feet and the other is within 750 feet of
12 this tower. It's just too close.

13 I understand there's
14 alternative sites -- I'm sorry. I'm so
15 nervous -- that should be considered and I
16 would appreciate that, if you would do that.

17 I thank you very much for your
18 time.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

20 This one I don't think I'll
21 even get close. Vaishali, is that the first
22 name? And I apologize for not even
23 attempting our last name, but please spell
24 it. Well, enlighten me and also spell it,
25 please.

1 VAISHALI SAHASRABUDHE: All
2 right. Are you ready? It's really long.
3 It's Sahasrabudhe, S, as in Sam, A-H-A-S-R-A,
4 B as in boy, U, D as in David, H-E. Got it?

5 So good evening, everyone.

6 I'm Vaishali Sahasrabudhe and I live at 19
7 Plum Hill Road, and that's within the Orchard
8 subdivision. And I'm here to also oppose the
9 proposal to build a cell tower at the
10 proposed location, mainly for three reasons.
11 I think you've heard most of them, so I'll
12 reiterate.

13 The first one being the
14 Orchard subdivision is a beautiful place.
15 You know, all of us who bought houses love
16 the view. The serenity, it's -- and with
17 this cell tower at 351 Boston Post Road, you
18 know, several of the houses have a clear view
19 of this tower.

20 Secondly, we don't know what
21 this is going to do to our property values.
22 I suspect that the property values would go
23 down were we to try to sell the property.

24 And then lastly, the issue
25 about what affects this might have on health.

1 And even though I think this is something
2 that is not considered, I would also submit
3 that, you know, the information related to
4 this is inconclusive and there isn't
5 sufficient long-term data available to
6 actually make that call on whether there's an
7 impact or not.

8 So based on all these three
9 reasons and in addition to that, the
10 alternative sites that have been mentioned I
11 would strongly urge the Council to take these
12 into consideration.

13 Thank you.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

15 Daniel Czikowsky.

16 DANIEL CZIKOWSKY: Hello.

17 Yeah, that it Czikowsky, C as in cat, Z as in
18 zebra, I-K-O-W-S-K-Y. I am a resident of 11
19 Heritage Road, in striking distance of the
20 tower. And we just moved to this, this area
21 about a year and a half ago.

22 My wife and I were taking a
23 cruise with the convertible looking for the
24 right place to start our family. And we said
25 one day once we had the opportunity to move

1 to East Lyme, that it was going to happen.
2 And lo and behold, while driving we turned
3 down Heritage Road and went through that
4 neighborhood.

5 And that neighborhood had such
6 a feel, a good energy about the people.
7 There were picnics going on. It was a
8 lakeside community. The houses weren't on
9 top of each other. Everybody waved and we
10 said, this is it. This is it. Even the hair
11 on my arms now stands up when I think about
12 that day we hit that road.

13 Lo and behold, a year later
14 goes by and we were able to purchase a house
15 and get skin in the game in that
16 neighborhood, and it kind of looks like this
17 picture right here. So we could all agree
18 that it would look ridiculous to paint a big
19 huge cell tower in the middle of this, or
20 looking at that.

21 We were able to have our son.
22 He's seven months old -- and my brother is a
23 scientist in Brazil. He forwarded me the
24 data he researched in Brazil on the effects.
25 And you know, I would like for people to take

1 into account the data that has been
2 researched and considered, especially in
3 Brazil and Australia. Because they, there
4 are people that are spearheading this kind of
5 research and this data and the effects on the
6 communities that it does have and the death
7 rates as a direct result.

8 And it's hard to look at your
9 children and just keep wondering and worrying
10 on a daily basis. And we can talk about the
11 money and the property values and all that
12 stuff going down. It's almost a given. You
13 know, it's a given. It's guaranteed. The
14 only thing that isn't guaranteed yet is the
15 effects of this on the health of our
16 families.

17 And we're in this for the long
18 haul. We're in this for the long run. The
19 bank gave us 30 years to pay the note back so
20 we planned on being there for the long run.
21 And then, you know, a year later goes by, we
22 invest a lot of blood, sweat and tears in
23 renovations into a property that, you know,
24 and this becomes apparent.

25 So you know, we just, as a

1 community, as a neighborhood, as a bunch of
2 families, as a bunch of parents of kids that
3 you just want a good place. You know the
4 kids can't be here to speak for themselves
5 and we just -- we really beg of you to
6 reconsider the aforementioned locations to
7 give us another option and keep our way of
8 life.

9 Because I can guarantee you if
10 we were to turn down to Heritage Road and we
11 would have seen this huge monstrosity, we
12 wouldn't have gotten the feeling. The hair
13 on your arms wouldn't have stood up and you
14 would have definitely looked for another
15 place to bring a family up.

16 So thank you.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Frank, is it
18 Termini?

19 FRANK TERMINI: It's Frank
20 Termini, T-e-r-m-i-n-i. I'm representing
21 myself and I'm representing my wife. And I
22 thank you for the opportunity to speak to you
23 directly. I live on Plum Hill Road and my
24 property abuts the Perrys. So I don't have
25 to go much further to tell you the proximity

1 that I am to that tower.

2 I'm in technology. I've been
3 a general manager and a director of
4 information technology, so I know the ins and
5 outs of technology. I know how to read
6 documents.

7 I have concerns over my
8 property value. Personally, I don't think
9 any cell phone tower belongs this close to
10 anybody's home, let alone a residential
11 neighborhood. But I understand it's got to
12 go someplace and this is a process that we're
13 going through.

14 My home is a very large part
15 of my finances and I fully expect that if
16 this tower goes in, that at some point in
17 time I will pay for that in terms of my
18 personal investments being hurt.

19 I've heard estimates. I've
20 read estimates. I've listened to people talk
21 of estimates of being impacted between 5 and
22 20 percent in terms of their property values.
23 Those 20 percent numbers that I read always
24 came with an asterisk saying, this is for
25 those people who are closer to the tower than

1 the people who are further away. Well, I'm
2 one of those people who are closer to that
3 tower, and I expect it to be the higher
4 value. And I'm very emotional about it.

5 I moved to that community
6 because I searched for a place that I could
7 love as I got older towards my retirement,
8 and now that's being somewhat taken away from
9 me. I have seasonal views of that, but the
10 fact is when I sit on my back deck and look
11 at -- and put my feet up, I'm going to be
12 looking at that tower.

13 The one thing that I can't get
14 over is, yes, I'm a member of the Orchards
15 community and, yes, there was a tower there.
16 When I bought that home I had a choice. I
17 could have walked away. I knew with the
18 paperwork that I signed that there was a
19 tower there.

20 I could have walked away. I
21 decided that the community, the views,
22 everything about it screamed at me and I
23 purchased it. Now I'm having a tower put
24 closer to me and I don't have a choice. It's
25 unacceptable to me -- but I have no choice

1 and that is something I'm having a very
2 difficult time with.

3 Other sites, it has come up a
4 couple of times here. Other sites, are there
5 other sites? I've read documents. I've read
6 Docket 463 which talks about the other sites.
7 I've heard about the Stones Ranch and what I
8 read was it was ruled out. I know of people
9 who the tower company went to the door and
10 said, can we consider your property for the
11 site? They said, no. They moved on.

12 With an existing site there is
13 no construction cost. There's no roads to
14 build. There's no power lines to power this
15 unit. The site exists. I do not know if
16 this Council accepted the no from the Stones
17 Ranch on face value. I would like to know
18 who said no. On what grounds?

19 Is it a part of the public
20 record? Can we talk to those people?
21 They're public servants. They work for us.
22 They work for us. They're not a private
23 company. Can I just talk to them and find
24 out why they said no? Is that an option? I
25 don't know. I just see, no, rejected. No

1 reason why that I'm aware of. There may be a
2 reason that may be part of the public record.
3 I could not find it.

4 I've heard of the Marion Drive
5 site. Again, I don't see any reasons that
6 make it any different for me. I don't have a
7 technical reason for it. No one has said,
8 this is why. Is it too close to a previous
9 site? I would like to be part of a solution
10 to this problem. I would rather not work
11 against anybody here.

12 If there was something I could
13 do I would do it. So I became part of the
14 group in Plum Hill to work against this site,
15 but to work for a solution. In that vein, we
16 have a letter here, I have a letter here. I
17 believe the Council has it. This is from the
18 agent of the association of the Orchards.

19 And basically it's a letter
20 extending the lease for one more year to help
21 vet all the other sites that we think are
22 worth looking at. It's our way of being part
23 of the solution here and giving everybody
24 time to get those answers from those other
25 sites, those other towers, the other

1 properties that are out there.

2 I just -- in my heart I don't
3 think if I didn't come up here and say, I
4 want to be part of the solution, I don't
5 think I would have given myself and everybody
6 in here an honest chance at getting this
7 thing looked at in another light.

8 So I have this letter. I
9 don't know if it's -- it says it was
10 addressed to you, but I don't know if you
11 have received it. But this is a copy and I
12 don't mind leaving it.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: If you could
14 provide us with that copy that would be
15 appreciated.

16 FRANK TERMINI: The last thing
17 I'd like to say is -- and I'm not
18 representing anybody else's view here except
19 my own. I think the way we got here is
20 despicable.

21 One of the things that I was
22 told is when you look at another site, if
23 you're going to be part of the solution do
24 not pick a site that affects other people's
25 residences, and yet that's exactly what

1 happened with the Ancient Highway. There was
2 a reason that that site was withdrawn. I
3 know it's -- the Council didn't do it. The
4 application was withdrawn. My understanding
5 is that it was withdrawn.

6 Now I'm getting emotional. I
7 apologize.

8 The application was withdrawn
9 because of litigation. The litigation was --
10 the owner of the property talked to me as
11 part of a group over the phone and said the
12 litigation was never resolved.

13 That open litigation appears
14 to me that the cell phone tower company --
15 and I'm putting words in somebody's mouth
16 here -- but they chose to go after a softer
17 target, which is where I live. Because I am
18 not the Mohegan Sun and I don't have the
19 attorneys the Mohegan Sun has and I don't
20 have diplomatic immunity, or whatever you
21 want to call it. We never got an answer for
22 why the people turned -- the tower company
23 turned their sights on our location.

24 We are a very small community.
25 We were given very little notice. I got a

1 letter in the mail from the Town and I thank
2 the Town for that, but only a handful of us
3 got that letter -- mailed to me. Now if my
4 sin here is I don't subscribe to the Day,
5 well then, you know, that is really a
6 terrible thing to be accused of.

7 And it's nothing against the
8 Day. It's just that you mentioned several
9 dates and there was never -- for a property
10 owner so close not to be notified, to me is
11 wrong. How we got here is wrong.

12 I stated I wanted to be part
13 of the solution and I'm going to walk away
14 now, but there is one thing. I heard
15 somebody mentioned a safe-limit standard and
16 I don't know if I'm quoting -- I think that's
17 what you called it. It was part of an act
18 that you were working under, and I just don't
19 know the age of that act. And I would like
20 to have that in the public record at some
21 point. Because we're working in 2015 and I
22 would think that the acts that we're working
23 under are current as well.

24 That's all I've got to say.

25 Thank you.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else
2 who signed up?

3 I will just repeat what I
4 said. It's the Telecommunications Act of
5 1996. It's a federal law that's passed by
6 Congress. It can be changed and updated, but
7 Congress has to do it.

8 There have been court cases
9 where states or other localities have tried
10 to use -- you might want to call them updated
11 or different standards, and in each case
12 they've lost and the courts have just -- I'm
13 just telling you there is a means, but it's a
14 federal statute.

15 There was a woman -- this is
16 going to get a little chaotic, but I would
17 hope that people had signed up, but we will
18 allow additional people. So apparently there
19 was a woman who raised her hand first. So if
20 you want to speak?

21 KATE FIEDLER: My name is Kate
22 Fiedler. I live on Heritage Road and I found
23 out about this, the tower on December 1st.
24 There was a flyer that was put in my mailbox
25 and when I heard that there was absolutely no

1 way that health or wealth could be
2 considered, and these are probably the two
3 things that people are most interested in, is
4 their health and their wealth.

5 I thought I'd like to get
6 involved in a group that's going to find out
7 more about this, and I now know more about
8 cell towers than I ever wanted to learn based
9 on congressional testimony that's been going
10 on in a fight about cell towers with a woman
11 who's very active, who's been involved in
12 this for about 26 years.

13 But I wanted to speak today
14 respectfully to the Siting Council, but also
15 to the public to just give an overview of the
16 1996 health congressional act and some of the
17 health dangers, so forgive me. I'm going to
18 be reading it.

19 The safety of cell phone
20 towers is the subject of extensive scientific
21 debate. There's a growing body of scientific
22 evidence that the electromagnetic radiation
23 they emit even at low levels is dangerous to
24 human health. The industry has set what they
25 say are safe levels of radiation exposure,

1 but there's a growing number of doctors,
2 physicists and health officials who strongly
3 disagree.

4 The current Federal
5 Communications Commission, the FCC safe
6 standards that are based on 1985 research,
7 failed to consider more recent research that
8 found brain cancer, memory impairment, DNA
9 breakdown, neurological problems with
10 radiofrequencies at much lower levels.

11 The earlier studies considered
12 only the thermal or heating effects of
13 radiation. In other words, the level at
14 which radiation would heat tissue or cook a
15 person in the same manner as a microwave oven
16 works. The FCC levels assure we'll not be
17 cooked. Isn't that nice? But failed to
18 address long-term chronic exposures.

19 Citing just one international
20 cell conference in our world -- so different
21 from the United States -- this occurred in
22 Salzburg in the year 2000. They set safety
23 limits for the public at thousands of times
24 lower than United States' standards. The
25 resolution set international levels 10,000

1 times a stricter than those of the current
2 U.S. standard. This limit takes into account
3 the growing evidence for non-thermal, in
4 other words, non-cooking radiofrequency
5 bio-effects.

6 Cell phone towers expose the
7 public to involuntary chronic, cumulative
8 radiofrequency radiation. Low levels of RFs
9 have been shown to be associated with changes
10 in cell proliferation and DNA damage. Some
11 scientific studies show adverse health
12 effects at levels hundreds, indeed thousands
13 of times lower than the United States'
14 standards. These harmful low levels of
15 radiation can reach as far as a mile away
16 from cell tower location.

17 Reported health problems
18 include headaches, sleep disorders, memory
19 impairment, nosebleeds, increase in seizures,
20 blood brain barrier leakage problems,
21 increased heart rates, lower sperm counts,
22 impaired nervous systems.

23 Those at risk, who are most at
24 risk are children whose cranial bones are
25 very thin. So therefore I wonder why the

1 increase in autism, attention deficit, things
2 of this nature? Women are at particular
3 risk. Some of the European studies have
4 shown that for women with breast cancer risk,
5 ours increases tenfold.

6 According to the former Deputy
7 Director of the U.S. Department of Health,
8 Elizabeth Jacobson stated the safety of RF
9 has not been established, nor has the
10 necessary research been conducted to test it.

11 According to Dr. Robert Becker
12 author of the Body Electric; and Cross
13 Currents, the Perils of Electropollution, at
14 present are the greatest polluting element in
15 the earth's environment and this
16 proliferation of electromagnetic fields
17 radiation once considered safe is well
18 correlated with increases in birth defects,
19 depression, Alzheimer's disease, learning
20 disabilities chronic fatigue syndrome and
21 cancer.

22 The incidence of brain cancer
23 is up 25 percent since the seventies. Brain
24 tumors are the second leading cause of cancer
25 death for children and young adults. Yet,

1 the United States had a de facto policy of
2 post-sales surveillance with respect to RF
3 radiation. Only after years of exposure will
4 there be studies to characterize the health
5 consequences. Some show up immediately, and
6 can often take three to ten years for the
7 longer-term effects of radio frequency
8 illness such as cancer to appear.

9 Finally, many researchers and
10 public health officials and citizens believe
11 consumers should not be forced to act as
12 guinea pigs in an experiment that results in
13 an extensive health crisis. Quite
14 justifiably, the public, and I believe this
15 neighborhood, this community remains
16 skeptical of attempts by governments and
17 industry officials to reassure them that all
18 is well, particularly given the unethical way
19 in which they often operate symbiotically to
20 promote their own interests.

21 Thank you.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. And
23 make sure you spell your last name, say it
24 and spell it, please?

25 KATE FIEDLER: F like Freddy,

1 I-E-D-L-E-R.

2 LEWIS MOSTOWY: Good evening.
3 My name is Lou Mostowy. I'm here also with
4 my wife Cynthia. We live at 335 Boston Post
5 Road which is just to the northeast,
6 four acres, four and a half acres to the
7 northeast of the parcel.

8 I've lived off and on in this
9 town all my life. I grew up here on Mostowy
10 Road at the north end of town. My father was
11 born in the town somewhere in a farmhouse 86
12 years ago. So we've been around a while.

13 I've been living in the house
14 we live in now since 2006. Got married to
15 Cynthia in 2007, and some of you have been
16 around long enough -- this is
17 Dr. Morrison's -- used to be a vet's office
18 in the seventies. My wife bought the
19 property from him when unfortunately his wife
20 died of cancer, or something, and his plans
21 completely changed.

22 4.65 acres and I remember
23 looking at it and going, there's an awful lot
24 of land back there. And we have the ability
25 to split the land and sell it, first cut. We

1 were going to do it in 2008. We actually
2 started with a local surveyor to draw up the
3 plans, and we stopped. We put it all on hold
4 simply because the market in 2008 crashed.

5 So we've had it on hold for a
6 while. We have considered putting the land
7 back on the market, splitting off a flag lot.
8 We do have a logger coming to take all the
9 high-value lumber off the property.

10 And this cellphone tower, I
11 walked up into the woods. It's approximately
12 137 feet from the property line. Let's call
13 it 140, make the math easy. So if the tower
14 falls -- which I'm a professional engineer.
15 I know it's improbable that that's going to
16 happen, but 55 feet of that would be on my
17 property. And where that comes into play is
18 if you want to build a house up there I'm
19 sure the Town of East Lyme might have a
20 problem with it now.

21 So this, this is truly going
22 to cost me money in terms of I cannot sell
23 that property. It's three acres, almost, of
24 land in the town of East Lyme, a mile and a
25 half from the four corners. That is

1 essentially going to be useless for me to be
2 able to sell. That land has been back
3 there -- you say, well, you say you should
4 have moved on it sooner. Well, the
5 probability of somebody plunking a cell phone
6 tower right next door is pretty low.

7 Now I did send a letter to
8 Attorney Fisher and I did ask why I wasn't
9 considered for the cell phone tower. And the
10 main reason was they asked all my neighbors.
11 And I'm like, is there something wrong if I
12 want to sell this property? Did you find out
13 something about it that I don't know about?
14 Watershed, frogs, whatever, that I was just
15 kind of curious. Because if you might know
16 something that I don't know, if I try to sell
17 this property -- because we didn't finish the
18 survey.

19 I agree with Evelyn and Tom.
20 It was a little surreal walking up there
21 today and looking at the balloon, which from
22 my property line, I had to crook back to see
23 it but it just looks so unnatural to imagine
24 this steel monopole in the middle of just
25 serenity up there.

1 So from the bottom line, I've
2 got to put three kids through college. We
3 really wanted to use some of the funds from
4 selling that property. We had also
5 considered building a house up there
6 ourselves and selling the land, the property
7 we live on now. And we're the only ones that
8 have the ability to split property and sell
9 off anywhere around here, anywhere around the
10 proposed site.

11 So I ask that the Council
12 reconsider, especially like Tom said, the
13 Stones Ranch sites. And I know there are
14 other sites around here sitting in the middle
15 of nowhere on farmland that would just seem
16 much more appropriate and have a lot less
17 impact on residents.

18 Thank you.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Is that Duke
20 University?

21 MICHAEL RITZ: Yes.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. All
23 right. I don't have a problem with Duke. If
24 it was another university I might have a
25 problem, but go ahead.

1 MICHAEL RITZ: Well, she did
2 her undergraduate at UConn, so she's at Duke
3 Graduate School. Name is Ritz, R-i-t-z, like
4 the hotels, but I didn't get any of that
5 money. My name is Michael Ritz. I've been
6 in East Lyme for over 20 years. And I've
7 lived in the Orchards for about two years.

8 This cell tower would actually
9 get farther away from my house. So I'm not
10 here because I have to look at the cell
11 tower. I look at it now. I discussed with
12 Mr. Carrier the fact that we get 30,000 bucks
13 a year from the cell tower people to have it
14 on our property and it goes against our
15 association dues. And he said that the cell
16 tower had to go.

17 And I said, why? You know, we
18 can make it look like a lighthouse. Right?
19 But why does the cell tower have to go?

20 And Mr. Carrier said, nobody
21 will want to buy a house next to a cell
22 tower. Now Mr. Carrier also, I believe, with
23 the letter you just have, has said that he's
24 willing to extend the lease. He's not going
25 to build houses there next year. So he is

1 willing to give us another, at least another
2 year to come up with a really good solution
3 to this.

4 I have AT&T. I love AT&T and
5 I'm a big, you know, cell phone user, but I
6 really believe that East Lyme is a very, very
7 special place. We're getting ready to do
8 some really big things in this town with the
9 Cosco and some other things. Let's not screw
10 this up.

11 That area in Plum Hill road
12 and Boston Post Road is charming, absolutely
13 charming. There must be another place where
14 this cell tower can serve this community and
15 not have the impact that it does.

16 Thank you.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir.

18 Red shirt first, and that's
19 the first one I saw.

20 CHAD FIEDLER: My name is Jack
21 Fiedler, foxtrot, India, echo, delta, Lima,
22 echo, Roger. I live at 18 Heritage Road. I
23 had not intended to speak tonight. My wife
24 spoke about health. I speak in opposition to
25 the tower.

1 Three minutes, no questions,
2 no applause, no health considerations. Were
3 I able to ask a question I would ask the
4 Council members whether any of them were ever
5 faced with having a cell tower within a half
6 a mile of their own personal home.

7 I realize that this tower has
8 to go up someplace. I wrote down some
9 considerations that I would hope could be
10 applied to this decision. If we do in fact
11 have a valid letter that extends the time in
12 which a decision was to be made in favor of a
13 particular site, I would hope that gives the
14 Council sufficient leeway, in fact, to do
15 that, to leave this door open to consider
16 other possibilities.

17 I realize full well that
18 putting a tower adjacent to any neighborhood
19 is going to draw the ire of the people that
20 live in that neighborhood. It seems to me
21 the simplest solution to that is find a site
22 that's publicly owned and doesn't have any
23 neighbors. That's not rocket science. I
24 believe the Stones Ranch property meets that
25 criterion.

1 The Stones Ranch -- I wrote
2 down a series of little points here. With
3 regard to the height of the tower, a 194-foot
4 pole in the middle of a residential area is
5 bound to have an economic affect. It may
6 well also have a health affect that is yet as
7 unrecognized by the United States, and
8 therefore unrecognized by you folks as a
9 parameter in your decision making.

10 As to the height of the tower
11 itself, 195 feet -- 194 feet, forgive me, is
12 two thirds the length of a football field
13 which is a long haul even for Tom Brady.
14 It's a big pole. I'm not an expert on
15 Connecticut flora and fauna, but I don't
16 think I have any 150-foot trees around me,
17 and I have a lot of big old oaks. So this
18 thing is going to loom over all of us that
19 are near to it.

20 I would hope that ultimately
21 you're able to find a site that first of all
22 does not affect any personal property, any
23 private property, either socially or
24 economically. And although you may not be
25 able to consider it directly, I'm sure it

1 would weigh on your thinking indirectly in
2 terms of the health of those people,
3 particularly women and children that have to
4 live under or adjacent to it.

5 I would hope you could find a
6 piece of land that's owned by the State or
7 the Town that they would be willing to have
8 AT&T consider, or in the case of Stones
9 Ranch, reconsider.

10 I would hope that you would
11 find something that would have a high enough
12 elevation so that it would pass RF test
13 muster. I would hope it would be, as I said,
14 a sufficient distance from a populated area
15 that it would pose no obvious threat like the
16 tower falling into your swimming pool, or a
17 less obvious threat, the health of our
18 children.

19 It seems to me the Stones
20 Ranch site meets all of these criteria if you
21 would accept them as valid criteria. As I
22 understand it, the Stones Ranch site was
23 rejected because the state police objected to
24 it. There was no mention in a document that
25 I saw of any RF objection to it, certainly

1 not on the basis of elevation that's over
2 300 feet, and that's one of the highest
3 points in the whole list of places that were
4 initially targeted.

5 That particular site has
6 several other advantages. It has a
7 significant economic advantage. There's
8 already a tower there. There's already
9 access there. There's already power there.
10 The capital cost of improving the site and
11 making it ready for an AT&T tower should be
12 significantly less and I would think would
13 obviously offset the already sunk costs in
14 whatever they've got in flying balloons over
15 our property.

16 In closing, I would simply ask
17 that that time be recognized as available
18 time, that you as an appointed group could
19 make use of in considering what you've heard
20 here, that you would make use of it, and that
21 you pay particular attention to the several
22 sites that aren't on public -- that aren't on
23 private land and wouldn't suffer from all the
24 agonies that the current site selection puts
25 us through.

1 Thank you.

2 JOHN DRABIK: John Drabik, D
3 as in dog, R as in rabbit, A as in animal, B
4 as in boy, I as in an incompetent, K as in
5 corn.

6 I own the Ancient Highway site
7 that AT&T kind of bagged it on because of
8 some vague references to a stone landscape by
9 the Mohegan Indian tribe. I say vague
10 because they've been asked through the court
11 system and asked directly to identify what,
12 and where they found it.

13 They have yet to do that.
14 They refuse to do that. Now they might have
15 sovereignty, maybe, but they're affecting
16 private property rights. The judge is going
17 to be deciding on this hopefully within the
18 next two or three weeks. So before you folks
19 go and dedicate anything to Plum Hill, or
20 anywhere else, I think if they can buy some
21 time with the tower up on a hill you should
22 do so.

23 If you can put a temporary
24 tower up, I'll volunteer my piece. I've got
25 three or four pieces in town. I've got a

1 hundred acres in town on a golf course.
2 You're welcome to use any of that to buy
3 these folks some time for a fair and
4 equitable interview, so to speak, of a good
5 property.

6 Now my 14-acre piece that was
7 turned down by AT&T because of this alleged
8 stone landscape has been developed all around
9 it as fully as it can be and only on one
10 side, the northern, northwestern side. The
11 rest of it is open space. Not much more can
12 happen here. It's 14 acres as opposed to the
13 7 acres. The tower is going to fall, nobody
14 is going to hear it, like a tree in the
15 woods.

16 There's also a 20-acre piece I
17 own, 250 yards to the south that's also at
18 the same elevation, maybe a little higher.
19 How come you're not considering that?
20 There's nothing around it. The Town's open
21 space piece of 30 acres abuts that. So now
22 you've got 50 acres to play with. Come on.

23 AT&T, grow a set of balls.
24 Ask the Indians what they're hiding, because
25 they're hiding. My bet is they have nothing,

1 just using sovereign immunity to give
2 somebody -- do somebody a favor who didn't
3 want it in their backyard.

4 In the meantime, they're
5 allowing these folks up in Plum Hill to get
6 screwed while they're laughing. That's not
7 fair. That's not what this is all about.
8 You guys have the tough job of putting a
9 tower where nobody wants it.

10 Well, I've asked for a tower
11 on my golf course a few hundred feet away
12 from my house. I've got a contract on it.
13 I've got one up on the Ancient Highway that's
14 probably not going to happen. And then I
15 also have the 20 acres a little bit to the
16 east. Tell AT&T to stretch another cable out
17 there, put it on my 20-acre piece.

18 There's alternatives if they
19 want to look for it. Will they have to
20 compromise? Yeah, but they're not going to
21 affect all these people.

22 I think I've said enough for
23 tonight. Have a good night. Thank you.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We're
25 going to close the public comment session.

1 I'd like to announce that the evidentiary
2 portion of the hearing which started this
3 afternoon will be continued on Tuesday
4 January 26, 2016, 11 a.m. in New Britain. A
5 number of these issues that were raised this
6 evening will be considered at that time.

7 I'd also like to note that
8 anyone who has not become a party or
9 intervener, but who desires to make his or
10 her views known to the Council, you may file
11 written statements with the Council until the
12 record closes.

13 Copies of the transcript of
14 this hearing will be filed at the East Lyme
15 Town Clerk's office, and all the files are
16 available on the Siting Council website so
17 you can look through them at your leisure.

18 And I hereby declare this
19 portion of the hearing adjourned. And thank
20 you, all for your participation.


21 (Whereupon, the above
22 proceedings were concluded at 8:12 p.m.)

23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing 60 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original verbatim notes taken of the Siting Council Public Hearing in Re: Docket No. 463, APPLICATION FROM AMERICAN TOWERS LLC, AND NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED IS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATION OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY LOCATED AT 351A BOSTON POST ROAD, EAST LYME, CONNECTICUT, which was held before ROBIN STEIN, Chairman, at East Lyme Town Hall, Upper Meeting Room, 108 Pennsylvania Avenue, Niantic, Connecticut, on December 15, 2015.



Robert G. Dixon, CVR-M 857
Notary Public
BCT Reporting, LLC
PO Box 1774
Bristol, Connecticut 06011

My Commission Expires: 6/30/2020