

In The Matter Of:
Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless
Application for a Certificate of Environmental

Continued Hearing
August 15, 2017

BCT Reporting LLC
PO Box 1774
Bristol, CT 06010
860.302.1876

1 STATE OF CONNECTICUT
2 CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

3
4
5 Docket No. 471

6 Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless
7 Application for a Certificate of Environmental
8 Compatibility and Public Need for the
9 Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of a
10 Telecommunications Facility Located at 208 Kirk
11 Road, Hamden, Connecticut

12
13
14 Continued Hearing held at the Public
15 Utilities Regulatory Authority, Ten Franklin
16 Square, New Britain, Connecticut, on Tuesday,
17 August 15, 2017, beginning at 1 p.m.

18
19
20
21 H e l d B e f o r e :

22 SENATOR JAMES J. MURPHY, JR., Vice Chairman
23
24
25

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

2

3 Council Members:

4 ROBERT HANNON

5 MICHAEL HARDER

6 DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.

7

8 Council Staff:

9 MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.

10 Executive Director and

11 Staff Attorney

12

13 ROBERT MERCIER

14 Siting Analyst

15

16 For Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon

17 Wireless:

18 ROBINSON & COLE LLP

19 280 Trumbull Street

20 Hartford, Connecticut 06103-3597

21 BY: JOEY LEE MIRANDA, ESQ.

22

23

24

25

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

2

3 For Patricia Sorrentino:

4 MURTHA CULLINA LLP

5 265 Church Street

6 P.O. Box 704

7 New Haven, Connecticut 06503-0704

8 BY: BRIDGET D'ANGELO, ESQ.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 SENATOR MURPHY: Ladies and gentlemen,
2 I'd like to call to order this hearing this
3 Tuesday, August 15, 2017 at 1 p.m. of the
4 Connecticut Siting Council. My name is Jerry
5 Murphy. I'm vice chairman of the Siting Council
6 substituting today for our chairman who could not
7 be with us.

8 On July 20, 2017, the Council, on its
9 own motion, ordered to reopen the evidentiary
10 record. This evidentiary session is a
11 continuation of the public hearing held on May 2,
12 2017, and June 13, 2017. It is held pursuant to
13 the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut
14 General Statutes, and of the Uniform
15 Administrative Procedures Act upon an application
16 from Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless for
17 a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and
18 Public Need for the construction, maintenance and
19 operation of a telecommunications facility located
20 at 208 Kirk Road in Hamden, Connecticut. This
21 application was received by the Council on March
22 3, 2017.

23 A verbatim transcript will be made of
24 this hearing and deposited with the Town Clerk's
25 Office in the Hamden Town Hall for the convenience

1 of the public.

2 We will proceed this afternoon in
3 accordance with the prepared agenda, copies of
4 which are available here in the hearing room over
5 there on the table to my far right, just to this
6 side of the door.

7 We will begin with the appearance of
8 the Applicant, Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon
9 Wireless, to verify the new exhibits marked as
10 Roman numeral II, Item B-12 and 13 on the hearing
11 program.

12 Attorney Miranda, it's good to see you.
13 It's been quite a while since we've had the
14 pleasure of your company. You may proceed. I
15 believe your witnesses have all been sworn.

16 MS. MIRANDA: That's my understanding
17 as well. Thank you.

18 SENATOR MURPHY: Proceed.

19 MS. MIRANDA: Joey Lee Miranda from
20 Robinson & Cole on behalf of Cellco Partnership
21 doing business as Verizon Wireless.

22

23

24

25

1 M I C H A E L L I B E R T I N E,
2 D A V I D W E I N P A H L,
3 A N T H O N Y B E F E R A,
4 J A I M E L A R E D O,

5 called as witnesses, being previously duly
6 sworn, were examined and continued to testify
7 on their oaths as follows:

8 DIRECT EXAMINATION

9 MS. MIRANDA: Gentlemen, did you
10 prepare, or assist in the preparation of the
11 exhibits noted as Roman II, B-12 and 13, on
12 today's hearing program?

13 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mike
14 Libertine. Yes.

15 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): David
16 Weinpahl. Yes.

17 THE WITNESS (Befera): Tony Befera.
18 Yes.

19 THE WITNESS (Laredo): Jaime Laredo.
20 Yes.

21 MS. MIRANDA: Do you have any changes,
22 corrections or modifications at this time?

23 THE WITNESS (Libertine): No.

24 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): No.

25 THE WITNESS (Befera): No.

1 THE WITNESS (Laredo): No.

2 MS. MIRANDA: Are they true and
3 accurate to the best of your knowledge?

4 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes.

5 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): Yes.

6 THE WITNESS (Befera): Yes.

7 THE WITNESS (Laredo): Yes.

8 MS. MIRANDA: Do you adopt them here
9 today?

10 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, I do.

11 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): Yes.

12 THE WITNESS (Befera): Yes.

13 THE WITNESS (Laredo): Yes, I do.

14 MS. MIRANDA: Thank you. We move to
15 have them entered as full exhibits.

16 SENATOR MURPHY: They'll be so entered.
17 I'm not asking if there's any objections because I
18 see no one here from -- excuse me.

19 MS. D'ANGELO: I have no objection.

20 SENATOR MURPHY: No objection. My
21 apologies. I didn't recognize you back there.

22 (Applicant's Exhibits II-B-12 and
23 II-B-13: Received in evidence - described in
24 index.)

25 MS. MIRANDA: Thank you. The panel is

1 ready for cross-examination.

2 SENATOR MURPHY: We'll begin our
3 cross-examination with staff. Mr. Mercier.

4 MR. MERCIER: Thank you.

5 CROSS-EXAMINATION

6 MR. MERCIER: I just have a few
7 questions regarding the information recently
8 submitted about the cluster mounts and some of the
9 visibility issues pertaining to the tree tower.

10 Now, what's the main difference between
11 the cluster mount and the traditional antenna
12 platform design, is there an issue regarding site
13 performance and the aspect of coverage, or
14 anything of that nature?

15 THE WITNESS (Laredo): The main
16 difference is this time we'll be using a more
17 advanced set of antennas that requires only very
18 few in terms of numbers. That's why the total
19 number of antennas is going to go down to 6, as
20 opposed to 12, and stack them side by side. It
21 has no impact with the performance at all.

22 MR. MERCIER: Now, comparing the
23 cluster mount and the traditional platform, as we
24 typically have seen, is there a cost difference
25 between the equipment, or is that about the same,

1 or is it minuscule?

2 THE WITNESS (Befera): It's a wash.

3 MR. MERCIER: Is this type of cluster
4 mount something Verizon is going to be using going
5 forward in their tower installations, or is this
6 just kind of a one-case deal or special
7 circumstance?

8 THE WITNESS (Laredo): It is the way
9 going forward we'll start to use these cluster
10 mounts.

11 MR. MERCIER: Okay.

12 MR. LYNCH: Excuse me. I just didn't
13 hear the answer. Could you repeat that, please?

14 THE WITNESS (Laredo): Yes. We will
15 start using the cluster mount setup for all our
16 future deployments as much as possible.

17 MR. MERCIER: So even if this tower was
18 approved, even though it was originally proposed
19 as a platform, you probably just will tend to do
20 the cluster mounts?

21 THE WITNESS (Laredo): That is correct.

22 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. How far off
23 the tower are the antenna arms, do they extend
24 like 3, 4 feet, 5 feet, that type of information?
25 What makes them clustered? How close are they to

1 the pole?

2 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): They're
3 definitely closer. I think these were
4 approximately 2, 2 and a half feet off the face of
5 the pole.

6 MR. MERCIER: Are the antennas longer?

7 THE WITNESS (Laredo): They're
8 basically the same length if your question is
9 the --

10 MR. MERCIER: Yes, to the pole.

11 SENATOR MURPHY: So the size of -- if
12 it's a tree, it's decided to be a tree that's
13 disguised, there's no difference then in the size
14 of the base, as you're up there with your antennas
15 that's you're describing. Is that what I'm to
16 understand?

17 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): It wouldn't
18 affect the tree size.

19 SENATOR MURPHY: It wouldn't affect the
20 tree structure.

21 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): Typically the
22 trees all have T-arm mounts, three. And for a
23 traditional installation, that would be a large
24 T-arm with a 5-foot standoff and a 10-foot face.
25 We're basically taking that T-arm and shrinking it

1 down into about a 2-foot face and short standoff.

2 SENATOR MURPHY: So which way you go
3 doesn't matter if it's a tree, you can do it
4 either way?

5 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): It can be done
6 either way.

7 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you very much.
8 Sorry about that.

9 MR. MERCIER: No. Go ahead.

10 MR. HARDER: Excuse me. I just had a
11 question to follow up on your answer. Could you
12 explain what the standoff and face terms refer to?

13 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): The face is
14 the front mount where the antennas would typically
15 be located on. The front side of the two antennas
16 will be side by side in this instance. And the
17 standoff is the distance from the tower shaft
18 itself, from the pole shaft.

19 MR. HARDER: Okay. Thank you.

20 MR. MERCIER: Now, with the traditional
21 antenna platforms that we've seen up until now,
22 there's usually a, I'll call it, like a walkway or
23 standing platform on the antenna mounting
24 structure, the platform itself. Is there anything
25 like that for worker safety on these?

1 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): There's
2 nothing.

3 MR. MERCIER: So it's like a T-arm and
4 they'll actually rope onto the pole?

5 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): They're going
6 to climb up and tie off and maintain it that way.

7 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Now, I guess for
8 just visibility concerns, what's the difference
9 between the cluster mount and the traditional
10 antenna array?

11 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Really the
12 main difference between the two is it is a little
13 bit of a more compact profile at the top of the
14 tower. Well, two things, I guess. The number of
15 antennas is slightly different, and, of course,
16 because it's closer to the tower, you don't have
17 quite as large a profile at the top. Other than
18 that, there's not a real big difference.

19 I will add, when we were talking about
20 the tree, I guess the one advantage you could
21 argue with the cluster mount is that the top of
22 the tree, those branches that typically would have
23 to extend out 8 or 10 or 12 feet to hide the
24 antennas, can be brought back in. It may be a
25 case where you don't really need to do much of a

1 taper. Normally a lot of these trees you'll see
2 have the extra 5 or 7 feet to the top to kind of
3 give it that conical shape. That's something that
4 could be looked at if we're going to go that
5 route.

6 MR. LYNCH: Mr. Libertine, rather than
7 have a tapered top on the tree, I know there's a
8 couple that we've talked about, the one in Windsor
9 that's like flat on top?

10 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Correct.

11 MR. LYNCH: Is that something that
12 could be used also?

13 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Oh,
14 certainly, yes. Again, it would just be a lower
15 profile at the top because we don't have to extend
16 out to camouflage those large platforms.

17 MR. MERCIER: Now that we're talking
18 about the tree design, I have the photo simulation
19 that was submitted on August 8th. I guess, if we
20 just review one more time for this site to the
21 photo simulation what the expected visibility
22 would be at the end of Country Club Drive for a
23 tree tower during leaf-off and leaf-on conditions.

24 And I guess also for that I would like
25 some information regarding the four residences at

1 the end. One is Ms. Sorrentino to the extreme
2 west. There's another house, number 50, which is
3 on the west side of the cul-de-sac. And then
4 there's two houses on the right side, which is
5 Number 41, and then there's a flag light, Number
6 35. I'm just trying to review the visibility from
7 the end of the cul-de-sac plus those residences.

8 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Sure. The
9 photo simulation that was provided with the
10 cluster mount in a tree configuration, that was
11 taken at the end of Country Club Drive, and that
12 is looking at the alternate site location number 2
13 with the leaves off the trees primarily. So, as
14 you can see from that, there is a fairly
15 straightforward view from the cul-de-sac. I
16 believe all the homes at the cul-de-sac ground
17 elevation would be able to see this certainly with
18 the leaves off the trees. I don't think the
19 Sorrentino's necessarily will have that type of
20 view. They're separated, and they're down lower,
21 so there's a lot more intervening vegetation.
22 Once the leaves are on the trees, I think there
23 will be some spotty views, not so much from the
24 cul-de-sac. My guess is probably more from folks'
25 yards, or even their homes, depending upon the

1 angles you're looking at, again, the three homes
2 more or less at the elevation of the cul-de-sac.

3 Two things that are just my personal
4 opinion. But having been involved with this for a
5 couple of years and looking at all these sites,
6 there was a reason we went down with the original
7 site at the bottom of the property, and that was
8 really to shield any views, or minimize the views
9 from as many people as possible. Bringing it up
10 to this location, it's pretty evident that we've
11 got a higher ground elevation, which kind of gives
12 a lot of direct views at the end of the
13 cul-de-sac.

14 I personally walked the site and
15 advocated for alternate site 1, mostly to offset
16 the view that we're looking at here by bringing it
17 down. And I think the balloon float photos from
18 the alternate analysis kind of do this justice.
19 It's very difficult to really see this tower when
20 it's set down below in both times of the year just
21 because of the lower profile on the horizon, and
22 the fact that there's so much intervening
23 vegetation. I also think by moving it to the
24 alternate location 1, we were able to gain enough
25 distance from the Sorrentino's to more or less

1 make that minimally visible. Again, I think
2 certain times of the year with the leaves off the
3 trees, if you know what you're looking for,
4 whether it's a tower or a tree, there is going to
5 be an opportunity to see a portion of the
6 facility. Again, my personal feeling here is I'm
7 not sure a tree really is -- I wouldn't be a
8 strong advocate for a tree in this particular
9 situation. I don't think it necessarily lends
10 itself. That's just my own personal opinion.

11 And, again, I guess I would say at
12 alternate location 2, you could argue a tree is a
13 little less obtrusive. But if we were thinking
14 about alternate location 1, I don't think it would
15 be necessary at all just because there's such
16 minimal visibility.

17 I hope that answered the question.

18 MR. MERCIER: Let me just review that.
19 So pertaining to the tree at alternate 2 we just
20 talked about, you don't believe the Sorrentino
21 property would have much of a view of the
22 structure --

23 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Correct.

24 MR. MERCIER: -- compared to the other
25 three residences out there, the cul-de-sac?

1 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah, I think
2 number 2, yeah, that's a statement that I saw in
3 the field, or I was able to verify in the field.
4 I think it starts to open up more views for more
5 people.

6 MR. MERCIER: And this photo simulation
7 might be representative of what might be viewed
8 from the residences, the other residents, number
9 50, 41, 35, as well as the end of the cul-de-sac?

10 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, I'd say
11 that's representative.

12 MR. MERCIER: Okay.

13 THE WITNESS (Libertine): We didn't
14 have the opportunity to get in their backyards.
15 But, again, standing on our property, on the
16 subject property looking back, there are some gaps
17 in some of the vegetation that are similar to what
18 we're seeing here. So I think it's a fair
19 representation.

20 MR. MERCIER: Now, in regards to
21 alternate site 1, which you just spoke about, did
22 you state that that's probably the most isolated
23 from the end of the cul-de-sac in the aspect of
24 visibility?

25 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, I do.

1 And I think it also balances that, you know,
2 obviously the concerns that the Sorrentinos
3 brought up are legitimate. But moving it back to
4 that alternate location, again, viewing it from
5 that spot looking back at the Sorrentino's, I was
6 very confident that it really did the job of
7 allowing for more intervening vegetation to really
8 obstruct the views. It was very difficult to see
9 her home from that location, so that gave me a
10 good comfort level. And then when we flew the
11 balloon and compared it to site 2, again, from my
12 perspective aesthetically, I've been advocating
13 alternate site 1. I recognize there's other
14 challenges with that site location, but strictly
15 from an aesthetic standpoint, I think it's
16 significantly an improvement over alternate site
17 2.

18 MR. MERCIER: Was the photograph that
19 was submitted, the photo simulation we're talking
20 about, was that based on the balloon fly that was
21 done in May? I think you did it in May.

22 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, right
23 before the leaves broke, yes. It actually was
24 Cinco de Mayo.

25 MR. MERCIER: And you flew a green

1 balloon at site 2?

2 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I would have
3 to double check that. I believe that's true.
4 Yes, it was a green balloon, and then a red
5 balloon was flown at site 1.

6 MR. MERCIER: Okay. I do recall in the
7 transcript that Ms. Sorrentino said she saw the
8 green balloon, so I just wanted to confirm that.

9 THE WITNESS (Libertine): That's my
10 recollection as well, yes.

11 MR. MERCIER: Okay. And one other
12 thing you talked about, you don't believe that
13 site 1, which is 150-foot tower as proposed in the
14 documents here, that that's a good site for a tree
15 tower given the height, I presume?

16 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Oh,
17 absolutely. I don't believe a tree tower is
18 really going to be effective in any way. Again,
19 those are really site specific, and in this case I
20 just don't see the need for it. It's almost an
21 invisible location back there from surrounding
22 locations.

23 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. I have no
24 other questions.

25 SENATOR MURPHY: Dan.

1 MR. LYNCH: Mr. Libertine, I'm not
2 hearing too well. Did I hear you correctly that
3 alternate site 1 could work very well with just a
4 standard monopole?

5 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I believe
6 that, yes.

7 MR. LYNCH: And one other follow-up for
8 Mr. Mercier. You said in the future that Verizon
9 may use the cluster mounts more often. Now, if
10 that's the case, is there any possibility that
11 you'd go back to existing towers and antennas and
12 swap them out for the cluster mounts?

13 THE WITNESS (Laredo): We are doing
14 that right now.

15 MR. LYNCH: Okay. Thank you. No more
16 questions.

17 SENATOR MURPHY: Bob?

18 MR. MERCIER: No more questions from
19 me. Thank you.

20 SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Hannon?

21 MR. HANNON: Thank you. I do have a
22 couple. One of the comments that was provided on
23 behalf of Ms. Sorrentino was talking about the
24 stained wood fence for the compound. Based on
25 what I've seen on the photos, and granted, it's a

1 photo simulation for more what's up in the air,
2 what are the odds that site 1 or site 2, the
3 alternates, would you have a chance of even seeing
4 the compound itself?

5 THE WITNESS (Libertine): In site
6 alternate location 1 at the lower elevation you
7 would not see it from any of these locations that
8 we're discussing at the cul-de-sac, or even the
9 Sorrentino's.

10 I think site 2, I think certainly the
11 three homes that are surrounding the end of that
12 cul-de-sac would have an opportunity, when the
13 leaves are off the trees, to look directly into
14 the site. So there's a good chance they'll see
15 portions of that compound.

16 MR. HANNON: And in terms of a wooden
17 fence versus a chain-link fence, with camouflaged
18 material that you can put through the links, do
19 they both do about the same job? Maintenance wise
20 I would think that the chain-link fence is
21 probably easier to maintain.

22 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes.
23 Strictly from a visual standpoint at the distances
24 we're talking, I think it's going to be just as
25 effective either way. I'm not sure the aesthetics

1 of a wooden fence would really be something that a
2 lot of people would notice from those particular
3 vantage points. And again, it's really to
4 obstruct in some way, or at least minimize the
5 direct views into the equipment, and a privacy
6 slatting of some sort would certainly be more than
7 effective to do that.

8 MR. HANNON: And just to clarify one
9 thing for me. I think in terms of the gate that
10 was being proposed, it was more like the metal cow
11 gate, but I thought I read something in the
12 transcript where somebody may have been talking
13 about the possibility of a wooden gate. So what's
14 your take on that?

15 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): That I think
16 came up last hearing, and I think we're open to
17 any type of gate at that location, a swing gate, a
18 wood gate. Well, wood wasn't preferred because of
19 the maintenance, but a vinyl perhaps to match the
20 compound fence at alternate 2. Black chain-link
21 might hide itself very nicely in the woods, 10, 15
22 feet in you may not even know it's there. So I
23 think the cow gate was removed, and I think the
24 applicant is open to any other suggestions or
25 preferences.

1 THE WITNESS (Libertine): We did answer
2 in one round of interrogatories that we'd
3 certainly be open to doing a wood gate located, I
4 think it was like a 12-foot setback off of the
5 cul-de-sac. And certainly from an aesthetic
6 standpoint, that would look very nice.

7 MR. HANNON: Has anybody done their
8 homework to determine whether or not you have to
9 pave the first 10 or 12 feet of the driveway?
10 Because that was a question that was raised
11 earlier. Because in an area like this, I don't
12 know what the town's driveway ordinance is. So if
13 you don't have to pave it, and you use some type
14 of pavers, or you can backfill, plant grass, and
15 still get the stability that you need and not have
16 that 12-foot or 16-foot wide asphalt driveway, to
17 me that would look more natural in this area. I'm
18 just curious if anybody has gone back and done any
19 homework on that.

20 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): I don't
21 believe that had been confirmed yet as to whether
22 we needed to put an asphalt driveway or apron
23 versus something more natural. Certainly if we
24 can go with a natural product, that would be
25 preferable.

1 MR. HANNON: Okay. I do not have any
2 other questions at this time.

3 SENATOR MURPHY: Mike.

4 MR. HARDER: One question, which may
5 actually be outside the scope of today's hearing,
6 but I wasn't able to attend at least one of the
7 hearings. And my question is, my concern is, I
8 guess, from looking back over the application, I
9 thought the alternative discussion, alternative
10 site discussion, was kind of weak. My question
11 is, was an evaluation done, or any attempt made to
12 look at the open parcels immediately to the north
13 of this property? Because none of them are
14 mentioned. There's several, five or six sites, in
15 the general area, but nothing related to those
16 parcels.

17 THE WITNESS (Befera): We did look at
18 the parcels to the north, and they are so heavily
19 wooded that a much greater amount of disturbance
20 to vegetation would be required for a much longer
21 road and clearing. We had a conversation with the
22 gentleman who owns a parcel to the north, and he
23 was not interested. Fitzgerald, I think, is the
24 name that rings a bell.

25 So we decided to go with this property

1 because the disturbance to the natural vegetation
2 would be minimized, as opposed to a quite
3 extensive clearing to get to parcels further back.

4 MR. HARDER: Okay.

5 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I'd also add
6 that this is a site that has been in the past
7 pursued by AT&T, and then ultimately dropped
8 because it wasn't in their build plan, so that had
9 also gone through a site search of a similar
10 nature. And I think when Verizon decided to take
11 a look, they went and more or less reevaluated and
12 tried to speak to the folks. So this site has
13 kind of been in the search ring, and the most
14 viable site for going back now five or six years.
15 So there is a history to that as well.

16 MR. HARDER: Thank you.

17 SENATOR MURPHY: Anyone else have any?

18 MR. HANNON: I just want to go back to
19 a note that is on Cellco's responses. You talk
20 about you don't know if the cluster mounted
21 antenna configuration would work for other
22 wireless carriers. Can you please go into a
23 little more detail on that?

24 THE WITNESS (Laredo): Presently that's
25 a directive handed over to us as a region.

1 MR. HANNON: When you say "to us," do
2 you mean Verizon or all of the carriers?

3 THE WITNESS (Laredo): To us, Verizon
4 design team, RF design team. And we are not aware
5 of the current designs that other carriers are
6 implementing in the field. So far, as far as my
7 opinion goes, it's the first time I've seen a
8 carrier use a cluster mount for these specific
9 applications, especially here in Connecticut. So
10 I'm not aware of any other carrier doing the same
11 strategy at this point.

12 THE WITNESS (Befera): And I think that
13 is in that answer kind of as a disclaimer like
14 where we can't really make any representation as
15 to what another carrier's preference or what
16 another carrier is willing or not willing to do.
17 So I think that it was more of a general
18 disclaimer saying we can't speak for the other
19 carriers' desires, designs, and what they want to
20 do.

21 MR. HANNON: So then if a monopine is
22 the route that the Council goes down, and I'm
23 assuming you would have to design that monopine to
24 also be able to take into consideration other
25 carriers that may not have access to this more

1 compact system, that you'd still have to build it
2 out like normal, correct, or would you reduce the
3 size under the assumption that maybe everybody
4 could come in with a compact system, but then
5 would you have to go back and do some amendments
6 to the monopine?

7 THE WITNESS (Befera): Well, typically
8 they tend to taper like a Christmas tree design,
9 so that could possibly be accommodated without
10 making any modifications. But if modifications
11 are required to hide a future tenant's antennas
12 because they're using a more traditional antenna
13 array, they can buy the branches and replace
14 shorter branches with larger branches to
15 accommodate it. And in nature, you know, trees
16 don't grow like Fuller brushes. They don't -- you
17 know, there's some irregularity to them. So --

18 MR. HANNON: It's something that could
19 be accommodated?

20 THE WITNESS (Befera): Absolutely,
21 yeah. Branches can be swapped out for other size
22 branches.

23 MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you. That
24 was it.

25 SENATOR MURPHY: Bob.

1 MR. MERCIER: You just brought up an
2 interesting point. For existing tree towers of a
3 recent build, is there maintenance issues with the
4 branches? Do they wear out after ten years or
5 something, winter snow? Are you aware of any
6 ongoing maintenance issues with tree towers in New
7 England?

8 THE WITNESS (Befera): None that we've
9 encountered yet. And tree towers, I think, have
10 been around for at least 10 or 12 years. So we
11 haven't experienced any issues with them. We
12 actually have a number of them in Vermont where
13 that's all we did in Vermont for a number of
14 years, and no issues to speak of.

15 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you.

16 And, Mr. Libertine, we might have
17 talked about this previously. I just want to
18 refresh my memory. We just talked about alternate
19 site 1 and alternate site 2, you know, aspects of
20 a tree design, whether it's appropriate or not.
21 Now, how about a brown painted tower, would that
22 be of any benefit at either site rather than a
23 galvanized normal structure?

24 THE WITNESS (Libertine): The reason
25 I'm hesitating is only because, when I think of

1 brown, I've seen a lot of the brown poles, and in
2 some cases they tend to stick out as much, if not
3 more, than the steel because the steel does
4 weather. Certainly in Southern New England a lot
5 of the trees have more of a mottled, a lot of
6 times more gray effect. So the brown works in
7 some cases. Here I suppose an argument could be
8 made that because it's buried in the woods that
9 painting it brown would certainly reduce some
10 initial glare, although that's really not the
11 right word, attraction because of the metal
12 component to it. I don't think -- it certainly
13 wouldn't make it stand out anymore in this
14 particular setting.

15 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. No other
16 questions.

17 SENATOR MURPHY: Anyone else? Dan?

18 MR. LYNCH: Just to follow up to Mr.
19 Hannon's question about other carriers. Could you
20 as owner or project manager of this tower require
21 other carriers to use the same antenna design?

22 THE WITNESS (Befera): I suppose we
23 could. However, I think it would be a much
24 stronger case if you did.

25 MR. LYNCH: I got myself in trouble

1 you're saying?

2 THE WITNESS (Befera): Well, if you
3 require it, they'll make it work.

4 MR. LYNCH: I'll stop while I can get
5 out of this thing. Thank you very much.

6 SENATOR MURPHY: Are you all set?

7 MR. HANNON: Yes.

8 SENATOR MURPHY: All set?

9 MR. HARDER: Yes.

10 SENATOR MURPHY: You'll all set, Bob?

11 MR. MERCIER: Yes. Thank you.

12 SENATOR MURPHY: Attorney D'Angelo, do
13 you want to cross-examine?

14 MS. D'ANGELO: No, your Honor.

15 SENATOR MURPHY: No questions?

16 MS. D'ANGELO: No questions.

17 SENATOR MURPHY: Okay.

18 Do you have anything else?

19 (No response.)

20 SENATOR MURPHY: Before closing this
21 hearing, the Connecticut Siting Council announces
22 that briefs and proposed findings of fact may be
23 filed with the Council by any party or intervenor
24 no later than September 14, 2017. The submission
25 of briefs or proposed findings of fact are not

1 required by this Council, rather we leave it to
2 the choice of the parties and intervenors.

3 Anyone who has not become a party or
4 intervenor, but who desires to make his or her
5 wishes known to the Council, may file written
6 statements with the Council within 30 days of the
7 date hereof.

8 The Council will issue draft findings
9 of fact, and thereafter parties and intervenors
10 may identify errors or inconsistencies between the
11 Council's draft findings of fact and the record.
12 However, no new information, no new evidence, no
13 argument, and no reply briefs without our
14 permission, will be considered by the Council.

15 Copies of this transcript will be filed
16 at the Hamden Town Clerk's Office.

17 I hereby declare this hearing
18 adjourned. Everybody have a safe trip to wherever
19 you're going.

20 MS. MIRANDA: Thank you.

21 (Whereupon, the witnesses were excused
22 and the above proceedings concluded at 1:32 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 31 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original stenotype notes taken of the Continued Public Hearing in Re: DOCKET NO. 471, CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY LOCATED AT 208 KIRK ROAD, HAMDEN, CONNECTICUT, which was held before JAMES J. MURPHY, JR., VICE CHAIRMAN, at the Public Utility Regulatory Authority, Ten Franklin Square, New Britain, Connecticut, on August 15, 2017.

 _____

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

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

I N D E X

WITNESSES MICHAEL LIBERTINE PAGE 6

DAVID WEINPAHL

ANTHONY BEFERA

JAIME LAREDO

EXAMINERS:

Ms. Miranda

Mr. Mercier

Senator Murphy

Mr. Harder

Mr. Lynch

Mr. Hannon

APPLICANT'S EXHIBITS

(Received in evidence)

EXHIBIT DESCRIPTION PAGE

II-B-12 Applicant's responses to 7

Council interrogatories, Set Three,
dated August 3, 2017

II-B-13 Applicant's photo simulation of 7

a tree tower at alternate site
No. 2 (as requested in Council
Interrogatory 40), dated
August 8, 2017