

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. 481

Application From Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon
Wireless for a Certificate of Environmental
Compatibility and Public Need for the Construction,
Maintenance and Operation of a Telecommunications
Facility located at 667, 665, 663, and 663R Main Street
in Cromwell, Connecticut

Regular Hearing held at the Cromwell Town
Hall, 41 West Street, Cromwell, Connecticut, Thursday,
April 19, 2018, beginning at 3:00 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 Chairman

5

6 ROBERT HANNON,

7 DEEP Designee

8

9 MICHAEL HARDER

10 DR. MICHAEL W. KLEMENS

11 ROBERT SILVESTRI

12 EDWARD EDELSON

13 DAVID LYNCH

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 MICHAEL PERRONE,

21 Siting Analyst

22

23

24

25

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

2 For the Applicant:

3 ROBINSON & COLE

4 280 Trumbull Street

5 Hartford, Connecticut 06103

6 By: KENNETH C. BALDWIN, ESQ.

7 Kbaldwin@rc.com

8 860.275.8345

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon. I would
2 like to call to order this meeting of the
3 Connecticut Siting Council on Docket 481, today,
4 Thursday, April 19, 2018, approximately 3 p.m.

5 My name is Robin Stein. I'm Chairman of
6 the Connecticut Siting Council. Other members of
7 the Council present are Senator James Murphy, Vice
8 Chairman; Mr. Hannon, designee from the Department
9 of Energy and Environmental Protection;
10 Mr. Edelson; Dr. Klemens; Mr. Silvestri;
11 Mr. Harder; and Mr. Lynch.

12 Members of our staff present are Melanie
13 Bachman, our Executive Director, Staff Attorney;
14 and Michael Perrone, our siting analyst.

15 This hearing is held pursuant to the
16 provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General
17 Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative
18 Procedure Act upon an application from Cellco
19 Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless for a
20 certificate of environmental compatibility and
21 public need for the construction, maintenance and
22 operation of a telecommunication facility located
23 at 667 665, 663 and 663R Main Street in Cromwell,
24 Connecticut. The application was received by the
25 Council on February 23, 2018.

1 As a reminder to all, off-the-record
2 communication with a member of the Council or a
3 member of the Council staff upon the merits of
4 this application is prohibited by law.

5 The party to the proceeding is as
6 follows, the applicant Cellco Partnership, Verizon
7 Wireless, represented by Attorney Baldwin of
8 Robinson & Cole. We'll proceed in accordance with
9 the prepared agenda, copies of which are available
10 next to Mr. Lynch on my left. Also available are
11 copies of the Council's citizen guide to Siting
12 Council procedures.

13 At the end of this evidentiary session
14 we will recess and resume again at 6:30 for the
15 public comment session. The 6:30 p.m. public
16 comment session will be reserved for the public to
17 make brief oral statements into the record.

18 I wish to note that the applicant,
19 including their representatives and witnesses is
20 not allowed to participate in the public comment
21 session. I also wish to note for those who are
22 here and for the benefit of your friends and
23 neighbors who are unable to join us for the public
24 comment session, that you or they may send written
25 statements to the Council within 30 days of the

1 date hereof and such written statements will be
2 given the same weight as if spoken at the hearing.

3 A verbatim transcript will be made in
4 this hearing and deposited with the town clerk's
5 office in Cromwell and Rocky Hill for the
6 convenience of the public.

7 Is there any public official who would
8 like to make a statement at this time.

9
10 (No response.)

11
12 THE CHAIRMAN: I wish to call your
13 attention to the items shown in the hearing
14 program marked as Roman numeral 1D, items one
15 through 6, D9. Does the applicant have any
16 objection to the item the Council has
17 administratively noticed?

18 MR. BALDWIN: No objection,
19 Mr. Chairman.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Accordingly, the Council
21 hereby administratively notices these existing
22 documents, statements and comments.

23 Attorney Baldwin, will you present your
24 witness panel for the purpose of taking the oath?

25 MR. BALDWIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1 Our witness panel consists today, up to my far
2 left -- or right, Anthony Befera, principal
3 engineer, real estate, regulatory with Verizon
4 Wireless; Mark Brauer a radiofrequency engineer
5 responsible for the Cromwell North Two proceeding.

6 To my right, Mr. Robert Burns, a
7 professional engineer and civil engineer for the
8 project with All-Points Technology. Next to
9 Mr. Burns is Matthew Gustafson, professional soil
10 scientist with All-Points Technology.

11 And last but not least, Mike Libertine,
12 the Director of Siting and Permitting for
13 All-Points Technology.

14 And I offer them to be sworn at this
15 time, Mr. Chairman.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Can you please rise for
17 swearing in?

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 ANTHONY BEFERA,
2 MARK BRAUER,
3 ROBERT BURNS,
4 MATTHEW GUSTAFSON,
5 MIKE LIBERTINE,

6 called as witnesses, being first duly sworn by the
7 Executive Director, were examined and testified on
8 their oaths as follows:

9
10 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman, we have a
11 series of exhibits that we'd like to have admitted
12 to the record. I offer them now for
13 identification purposes subject to verification.

14 They are listed in the hearing program
15 under Roman 2, subsection B, Exhibits 1 through 4,
16 and include the application and the bulk file
17 exhibits listed in the program, the affidavit
18 publication, a sign posting affidavit, and the
19 applicant's responses to the Council
20 interrogatories dated April 12, 2018.

21 If I could ask my witnesses, did you
22 prepare or assist in the preparation of those
23 exhibits listed in the hearing program under Roman
24 2B, items 1 through 4?

25 Mr. Befera?

1 THE WITNESS (Befera): Yes.

2 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Brauer?

3 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Yes.

4 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Burns?

5 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes.

6 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson?

7 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes.

8 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Libertine?

9 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes.

10 MR. BALDWIN: Do you have any
11 corrections, amendments or clarifications to any
12 of those exhibits that you would like to offer at
13 this time? Mr. Befera?

14 THE WITNESS (Befera): No.

15 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Brauer?

16 THE WITNESS (Brauer): I do have one
17 minor correction in the application behind tab 6.
18 The coverage plots should read for the blue
19 existing RSRP, neg 85 in building; and the green
20 existing RSRP, neg 95 should be in vehicle, and
21 that is for all four of the plots. That's all.

22 MR. BALDWIN: This is the legend in the
23 lower left-hand corner of those plots.

24 Mr. Burns, any corrections,
25 modifications or amendments to offer?

1 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes. Based on the
2 new power location under tab one, I would like to
3 correct under tower location under coordinates.
4 The new coordinates should be 41 degrees, 37
5 minutes, 56.625 seconds north by 72 degrees, 39
6 minutes, 10.727 seconds west.

7 In addition under Roman numeral two,
8 item E in the second sentence, the distance to the
9 wetlands, the closest wetland area to the facility
10 is located approximately 160 feet with the new
11 location, and the additional wetland area exists
12 approximately 360 feet to the northwest.

13 That's it.

14 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson, any
15 amendments or corrections to make?

16 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes, behind
17 tab eleven in the wetlands inspection report the
18 second page of the wetland section field form, in
19 the second paragraph under general comments the
20 nearest wetland should be identified as 160 feet
21 to the west in the first sentence. And in the
22 second it should be 360 feet north of the proposed
23 facility.

24 Thank you.

25 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Libertine?

1 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I just have --
2 it's not really a modification. It's just a
3 clarification just as a reminder to the Council as
4 we're reviewing any of the visibility report
5 information and photo simulations. That was all
6 prepared from the original site location which has
7 shifted approximately a hundred feet, and I'd be
8 glad to discuss what that change may or may not
9 do.

10 MR. BALDWIN: And with those
11 corrections, modifications and clarification are
12 the exhibits listed in the hearing program under
13 Roman 2B, items one through four true and accurate
14 to the best of your knowledge?

15 Mr. Befera?

16 THE WITNESS (Befera): Yes.

17 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Brauer?

18 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Yes.

19 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Burns?

20 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes.

21 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson?

22 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes.

23 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Libertine?

24 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes.

25 MR. BALDWIN: And do you adopt that

1 information as your testimony in this proceeding?

2 Mr. Befera?

3 THE WITNESS (Befera): Yes.

4 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Brauer?

5 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Yes.

6 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Burns?

7 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes.

8 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson?

9 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes.

10 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Libertine?

11 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I do.

12 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman, I offer them
13 as full exhibits.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. The exhibits are
15 admitted.

16 We'll now begin with cross-examination
17 by Mr. Perrone.

18 MR. PERRONE: Did you fly a balloon
19 today?

20 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, we've had
21 a red weather balloon at -- tethered to a string
22 height of 120 feet. It's approximately between
23 three and four feet in diameter, the balloon
24 itself on top of the string, and that's been up
25 since about 7:25 this morning and will be up until

1 6 p.m.

2 MR. PERRONE: Describe the weather
3 conditions during the balloon flight?

4 THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's been
5 relatively calm all day. So that the balloon has
6 essentially been at its full height, the proposed
7 height of the tower for the vast majority of the
8 day.

9 We have had intermittent light rain and
10 a fairly low cloud cover and ceiling, but
11 visibility is probably in the neighborhood of
12 about a mile or two. So overall it has not -- it
13 has not been too bad for -- overall for the
14 balloon float, certainly to get an idea for the
15 near views.

16 MR. PERRONE: Was the balloon located at
17 the originally proposed location, or the
18 hundred-foot shift to the east location?

19 THE WITNESS (Libertine): It was in the,
20 what we're calling the modified or the shifted
21 position, a hundred feet to the east of the
22 originally proposed location.

23 MR. PERRONE: And with regard to that
24 hundred-foot shift, is that an actual revision or
25 an alternative, just to be clear?

1 THE WITNESS (Befera): It's a revision.

2 MR. PERRONE: Okay. And in response to
3 Council interrogatory number 15, there was
4 discussion about the neighbors requesting the
5 Gardener's Nursery property to be explored, and
6 Cellco did that. It was mentioned at the
7 November 30, 2015, public information meeting.

8 Did you receive any other comments or
9 recommendations from that public information
10 meeting?

11 THE WITNESS (Befera): No.

12 MR. PERRONE: Next, I'd like to get more
13 into the 100-foot shift and some materials that
14 might possibly change as a result of that.

15 For example, the number of homes within
16 a thousand feet. The originally proposed was 56.
17 Would that number change?

18 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yeah, with the
19 shift the number of homes goes to 58 homes. Some
20 of the ones across the street have moved into that
21 thousand-foot radius. We lost a couple, gained a
22 couple, but overall it's 58 now.

23 MR. PERRONE: And I understand from the
24 response to interrogatory 4 there's 450
25 cubic yards of net cut. Would that amount change?

1 THE WITNESS (Burns): No.

2 MR. PERRONE: What would you do with
3 this net cut material? Would it be hauled off
4 site?

5 THE WITNESS (Burns): More than likely
6 it will be hauled off site. If there are areas
7 within the property that the property owner would
8 like to use it, they certainly can, but for all
9 intents and purposes it will be hauled off site.

10 MR. PERRONE: And also with the
11 hundred-foot shift, page 23 of the application has
12 all the cost numbers. Would any of these cost
13 numbers be impacted by the shift?

14 THE WITNESS (Burns): No.

15 MR. PERRONE: Now I'd like to get into
16 any possible impacts of the RF as a result of the
17 shift. Would your proposed coverage distances or
18 coverage areas change as a result of the shift?

19 THE WITNESS (Brauer): No. The area
20 itself is -- is fairly flat. We don't anticipate
21 any change from a hundred-foot shift.

22 MR. PERRONE: So your propagation maps
23 with the existing proposed would remain
24 essentially the same?

25 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Yes, they would.

1 MR. PERRONE: And would your proposed
2 capacity relief remain about the same?

3 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Yes, it would.

4 MR. PERRONE: I understand in your
5 application under tab 17 there was an FAA
6 analysis, I believe the same elevation but
7 slightly different coordinates.

8 Would the shift impact your FAA
9 analysis?

10 THE WITNESS (Brauer): It should not.

11 MR. PERRONE: I would like to get into
12 the visual impact areas. How would this shift
13 affect the visibility of the tower from 16 Sunset
14 Drive, which is in the southwest?

15 THE WITNESS (Libertine): And just for
16 clarification, that's the property that abuts to
17 the southwest where we were standing essentially
18 at the edge of the driveway, or no?

19 MR. PERRONE: Yes.

20 THE WITNESS (Libertine): We have a
21 photo that is actually taken from the end of the
22 cul-de-sac looking into the driveway. That is
23 photo number 13, I believe. So if I could direct
24 everyone's attention to behind tab 9 to photo
25 number 13.

1 Again, we're looking at the end of the
2 cul-de-sac looking in towards the property. Our
3 subject property would be to the right, and in the
4 right of the photo are the line of arborvitaes and
5 white pines that we were standing alongside as we
6 were viewing that property.

7 Essentially we'd be looking at a slight
8 shift in this particular photo to the right, or
9 eastward. I don't think it would be a
10 substantially different view. As I say, the shift
11 would probably more or less center it over the
12 deciduous tree that is to the right.

13 I would offer, though, as you enter the
14 property the -- the line of sight does become more
15 obstructive -- obstructed, excuse me, because of
16 the presence of the line of the arborvitaes that
17 are essentially in the backdrop behind the cars
18 there.

19 So I think the shift away certainly
20 helps with the -- I guess if you would use the
21 term -- with the tower "looming" over that
22 property. It tends to push it a little bit
23 further away and would help mute those views to
24 some degree. But again, from that particular
25 location we're looking at in the photograph, which

1 is not in the property proper, I don't think it
2 would be substantially different.

3 MR. PERRONE: So in terms of the
4 perceived height it would be about the same, but
5 it's more about shifting it where it looks further
6 away?

7 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Correct.
8 Because we're relatively flat the elevation is
9 essentially the same as the original location from
10 where we flew this. So I don't -- don't believe
11 the elevation would appear any different, but
12 certainly we'd be talking about a shift to the
13 right.

14 MR. PERRONE: Okay. Would your
15 year-round and seasonal visibility areas in
16 acreages remain comparable with the shift?

17 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I think so.
18 It would be -- it would be very minor. In terms
19 of the mapping that we present in the back of the
20 report I don't think it would really change
21 anything substantially. Certainly some of the
22 specific views will change similar to what we just
23 discussed.

24 Going back to that location nextdoor,
25 one of the main benefits I see from the shift to

1 the east is certainly any of the lower portions of
2 the facility, including the fence would certainly
3 be obscured. There may have been some areas on
4 that property where they may have been able to see
5 through the original site. So there's certainly
6 an improvement from that standpoint as well.

7 MR. PERRONE: Was there anything else in
8 the visibility analysis that you believe would
9 change as a result of the shift?

10 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Again, not
11 substantially. I do think, as Mr. Burns
12 indicated, that the shift a little bit further to
13 the road may actually make the views a little bit
14 more prominent, but it's a very short stretch.
15 And when I say short, it's really less than the
16 length of a car where you can actually see that
17 tower from Main Street itself.

18 So those, those residents across the
19 street that now fall within a thousand feet of the
20 tower, I don't think it changes the view
21 substantially for them, but certainly it can be a
22 slight alteration.

23 If we had compared and had two balloons
24 out there you probably would have seen it, but it
25 would be -- to the naked eye it probably would not

1 really account to a whole heck of a lot.

2 MR. PERRONE: Okay. Now I'd like to
3 turn to wildlife. My understanding is the
4 consultations with DEEP and U.S. Fish and Wildlife
5 were before this 100-foot shift.

6 Would the shift have any impact on the
7 conclusions regarding the northern long-eared bat
8 or the eastern box turtle?

9 THE WITNESS (Burns): No, they would
10 not. The site conditions between the two
11 different locations are negligible.

12 MR. PERRONE: And regarding the northern
13 long-eared bat, did you receive a response from
14 U.S. Fish and Wildlife within the 30-day period?

15 THE WITNESS (Burns): No, we did not.

16 THE WITNESS (Libertine): And that's not
17 uncommon.

18 MR. PERRONE: And I understand there's
19 some proposed seasonal restrictions on tree
20 clearing for the northern long-eared bat and
21 migratory birds. Would that not be applicable
22 because no tree clearing is proposed?

23 THE WITNESS (Burns): That is correct.

24 MR. PERRONE: Okay. And I understand
25 the nearest important bird area, Great Meadows in

1 Rocky Hill -- about two and half miles to the
2 north. How would that be impacted by the proposed
3 facility?

4 THE WITNESS (Burns): I do not believe
5 it would be impacted due to the two and half mile
6 separating distance between the facility and that
7 important bird area.

8 MR. PERRONE: Okay. One last item on
9 visibilty. I understand in this proposal there's
10 a four-sided or square platform instead of a
11 triangular platform. Would there be a difference
12 in visual impact with the square platform?

13 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Not
14 substantially. Again, a selective amount of
15 locations where you may get the full face of the
16 square platform may look a little bit different,
17 but in terms of its magnitude on the skyline it
18 should not change significantly at all.

19 MR. PERRONE: Now turning to RF. Does
20 Cellco have any plans to use the fourth side of
21 the platform? I understand you're occupying
22 three?

23 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Not currently,
24 but it certainly is something if we decide to in
25 the future we would.

1 MR. PERRONE: In response to Council
2 interrogatory 19, Cellco discusses the feasibility
3 of small cells as an alternative. Would that
4 answer also apply to a DAS system?

5 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Yes.

6 MR. PERRONE: And on response to Council
7 interrogatory 22 we have the dropped calls. And I
8 understand we have six out of the seven that don't
9 meet the current standard. Would the proposed
10 facility allow any of those to meet the standard?

11 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Yes, it certainly
12 would. You have several sites that are
13 essentially overreaching where they're really
14 useful, and in taking away that coverage area you
15 will certainly improve the dropped calls
16 statistics.

17 MR. PERRONE: Would you know which
18 sectors you would expect the improvement in?

19 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Certainly the
20 Portland Alpha called out in the table in the
21 interrogatories. Cromwell North absolutely
22 would -- would improve. Rocky Hill two would
23 certainly improve.

24 MR. PERRONE: Okay. Would the proposed
25 facility provide any capacity relief to the alpha

1 sector of the Portland facility, or is that too
2 far away?

3 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Yeah, it would to
4 a lesser extent than the other two that we
5 outlined, the Cromwell north and the Rocky Hill
6 two, but Portland is certainly serving in the area
7 and it would benefit from the capacity offload.

8 MR. PERRONE: In the tower elevation
9 drawing sheet A1, at the very top of the tower it
10 has two MDBs -- Mary, Dan, Bill. What does MDBs
11 stand for?

12 THE WITNESS (Burns): It's main
13 distribution box.

14 MR. PERRONE: In response to Council
15 interrogatory number five I understand that Cellco
16 does not anticipate the need for blasting and a
17 final Geotech survey will be performed. Would
18 mechanical chipping be a preferred method to
19 remove rock if you need to?

20 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes, but we don't
21 anticipate -- due to the fact that we're holding
22 the existing grade out there and we're just boxing
23 out for -- for the section, I don't anticipate
24 hitting rock out there. But yes, it would be the
25 preferred method if it did happen.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lynch has a followup.

2 MR. LYNCH: Just a followup on the
3 blasting or the chipping.

4 If either were done would you give
5 advanced notice to all the neighbors?

6 THE WITNESS (Burns): I think we
7 certainly could, yes -- so, yes.

8 MR. LYNCH: A better answer.

9 MR. PERRONE: Turning to pages 19 and 20
10 of the application at the very bottom it mentions
11 a wetlands protection and restoration plan has
12 been developed, and see sheet C5. Is there a
13 wetland protection restoration plan? I didn't see
14 a C5 sheet.

15 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): I believe that
16 that was a holdover from the original tower
17 location which was substantially closer to wetland
18 one. I do not believe that -- that is no longer
19 relevant in the new tower location, the additional
20 separating distance. So we're not currently
21 proposing a wetland protection plan.

22 MR. PERRONE: Are there some features in
23 the turtle protection plan that would be
24 protective of wetlands?

25 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Certainly.

1 The future such as, you know, the spill protection
2 and the educational pieces would certainly overlap
3 the wetland protection, yes.

4 MR. PERRONE: Okay. In the wetland
5 inspection report, tab eleven, the wetland
6 inspection field form -- actually the next page,
7 I'm sorry. Page 2 under vernal pools it checks no
8 for in wetland areas.

9 Is it correct to say that no vernal
10 pools were identified at the project site as well?

11 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That is
12 correct.

13 MR. PERRONE: And moving onto the
14 generator topic. I understand the size increased
15 from 20 kW to 30.

16 Could you explain why it increased?

17 THE WITNESS (Befera): For a couple of
18 reasons. First, it was a -- it's a -- it's a
19 standard that was released by our headquarters
20 going forward, and that was triggered by our
21 desire. When Samsung starts producing the new
22 dual-band radio heads we are going to replace the
23 Nokia Alcatel Lucent single-band radio heads with
24 Samsung dual-band radio heads.

25 And what that means is currently the

1 technology allows for -- you need a radio head for
2 each of your four different frequencies that
3 you're operating ultimately on the tower.

4 And similar with the new antenna
5 structures, you see how they're too close
6 together. Similar to those now, one being able to
7 do 1900 and 2100 megahertz, and the other one
8 being able to do 700 and 850 legacy megahertz.

9 The dual-band Samsung radio heads, which
10 are not yet available for purchase but are
11 supposed to become available later this year, will
12 do the same thing and they'll be able to handle
13 two of those four frequencies each per face.

14 So we should be able to consolidate from
15 12 radio heads to six radio heads, but these new
16 dual-band radio heads, they take more juice.
17 So -- and not only that, but the base band unit or
18 the base station, the BBU, the Samsung product
19 also draws more juice from the Alcatel Lucent BBU.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Murphy?

21 SEN. MURPHY: In follow up to that I
22 have a similar question, but you kind of answered
23 my initial inquiry.

24 But is it 30 you need, or 25 kW?

25 THE WITNESS (Befera): Well --

1 SEN. MURPHY: Because your answer goes
2 on that you're sharing the generator. You would
3 have a 30 kW. So it applied to me that you need
4 the 25, but with your explanation you may need 30,
5 and you're expecting the new party that comes on
6 to be just a 20.

7 Do I have that right?

8 THE WITNESS (Befera): Well, actually if
9 the folks in our -- the smart people in our
10 headquarters, they did the calculations and they
11 said that we need, just for our stuff once we
12 evolve to the Samsung product, we need 30 just for
13 ourselves.

14 SEN. MURPHY: So you need 30. So if
15 somebody else comes on and it's to be shared, the
16 generator has got to be 30 plus whatever they need
17 if they have the same type of heads that you're
18 going to use?

19 THE WITNESS (Befera): Sure.

20 SEN. MURPHY: You're going to have to go
21 up to 60 then.

22 THE WITNESS (Befera): Well, it's
23 something that we do quite often when we do
24 generator sharing. If another carrier comes along
25 and they also want generator backup, then they

1 have the option of trying to get approval to place
2 their own, or they could replace ours with one
3 that's sized accordingly.

4 Whether they say they need 20, they can
5 replace it with a 50. If they say they need 30 kW
6 as well, they can replace with a 60 and we let
7 them take the one that's there for use at another
8 site.

9 SEN. MURPHY: I was wondering whether
10 you -- but you've answered it to start with. 30
11 is what you need. I was wondering whether 25 is
12 what you needed, but you're going with 30 to have
13 a little bit extra. When you throw it in with the
14 second carrier it was 50. It was just curiosity.

15 Okay. I'm satisfied. Thanks.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: I just have a theoretical
17 question. Can you foresee in the future that you
18 could have a combination instead of your system
19 with diesel, in this case, it could be a
20 combination of battery storage and solar?

21 I don't know how much solar you would
22 need to, but I'm just thinking if where -- some of
23 us anyway think that's -- would like to move in
24 that direction at some point, and I know battery
25 storage is becoming much more feasible.

1 THE WITNESS (Befera): I think to -- to
2 get 200 amps of consistent power from solar would
3 require such a significant leased area you can no
4 longer consider it a tower compound. Now it's a
5 solar field with a tower in it.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I didn't know how
7 much.

8 THE WITNESS (Befera): 200 amps.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

10 Mr. Lynch?

11 MR. LYNCH: Just a followup to that.

12 And could you use a fuel-cell as a
13 backup if you had the proper -- you have natural
14 gas or propane?

15 THE WITNESS (Befera): We did look into
16 fuel cells, and hydrogen fuel cells. But the
17 problem with that is that when you've got two days
18 to run these, you have an extended power outage, a
19 week, ten days and you've got 600 sites that you
20 need refilled every other day.

21 And you've got people running all over
22 the place trying to keep these things topped off
23 for you and not from running out. It's not as
24 easy to refill hydrogen as it is to have people
25 refill low-sulfur diesel fuel or propane.

1 MR. LYNCH: If you use natural gas to
2 fire the fuel-cell and you had a line into the
3 site wouldn't that eliminate that problem?

4 THE WITNESS (Befera): Well, if you had
5 a natural gas generator then you wouldn't have to
6 worry about refilling or anything like that, but
7 now you're -- now you're talking about if there's
8 natural gas in the street. For instance, at this
9 location you're talking about a significant
10 increase in cost to run a natural gas line over a
11 thousand feet from over the street.

12 So I mean, we typically do our natural
13 gas generators when we do like a rooftop cell. We
14 want the generator close with the equipment. We
15 do natural gas there, but typically when natural
16 gas is available from the main in the building and
17 the only distance we're running it is vertical.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Klemens?

19 I guess we're off and running.

20 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you.

21 No, that was the question I asked in the
22 field. Is that natural gas, in Sunset Drive in
23 the street there? Because that would be a much
24 shorter run than coming in off of the main road.

25 THE WITNESS (Befera): Well, now you're

1 talking about approaching yet another landowner
2 for an easement to cross their property, where the
3 gas line around that is avoided simply by doing a
4 totally self-contained diesel with a belly tank.

5 DR. KLEMENS: You're not telling me
6 there's any part of Sunset Drive that could access
7 into the site for that? I mean, I don't know if
8 there's even gas in Sunset Drive.

9 Well, it's a very peculiar configuration
10 actually when you look at the tax map. It seems
11 like the residence of Mr. -- I can't pronounce his
12 last name -- is an in-holding in a larger parcel,
13 and I don't even know who that parcel belongs to.
14 It's a very strange -- strange lines on the map
15 and I'm wondering if that parcel actually belongs
16 to the subject, to the owner of the -- it's a
17 strange thing when you look at it.

18 It's like a doughnut. The house sits
19 inside the larger parcel.

20 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yeah, according to
21 the tax maps, the Cromwell tax maps there is a
22 small parcel that the house sits in, but according
23 to the Cromwell tax maps it's owned by the same
24 owner who owns the rest of the doughnut, if you
25 will.

1 DR. KLEMENS: And we don't even know if
2 there's gas in Sunset Drive, anyway?

3 THE WITNESS (Burns): Correct.

4 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Edelson?

6 MR. EDELSON: One other question on the
7 generator. I notice you say it's -- basically you
8 have 96 hours. Is it 96 hours?

9 THE WITNESS (Befera): Forty-three.

10 MR. EDELSON: Forty-three hours. I'm
11 sorry. Other applicants have gone with 80 hours.
12 I'm wondering what determined a lower number? Is
13 that something that is standard out of the
14 corporation? Or was it based on the size of the
15 tank?

16 THE WITNESS (Befera): It's more or less
17 based on the size of the tank that you choose to
18 store. For a generator this size we're looking at
19 a 132-gallon tank. With the sixties we would have
20 a 250-gallon tank.

21 We always -- you don't want to store
22 more fuel than is necessary. And with the 30 kW
23 we thought the 132-gallon tank was ideal, because
24 even with the larger generators and the larger
25 tanks, our target was to try to get two days

1 before refilling was necessary during an extended
2 power outage, so that fit the equation.

3 MR. EDELSON: But you see my concern is
4 that we have certain applicants who are using one
5 number. Is this a standard we should see for
6 Cellco?

7 THE WITNESS (Befera): It is a standard
8 for us. We cannot speak to the desires of our
9 competitors.

10 MR. EDELSON: Right, but we should see
11 consistency on this?

12 THE WITNESS (Befera): I believe we
13 will, yes.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lynch?

15 MR. LYNCH: I've got one more. I've got
16 to still beat this horse.

17 For refueling, if there is an imminent
18 weather alert, whether it's a hurricane, tornado,
19 blizzard, you know, and it's two or three days
20 out, do you go to these facilities and top these
21 tanks off so you can run for the proper amount of
22 time?

23 THE WITNESS (Befera): We do, actually,
24 typically to 80 percent. We make sure that all of
25 our tanks are at least 80 percent in preparation

1 of a significant storm that could cause an
2 extended power outage.

3 MR. LYNCH: Thank you.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Silvestri?

5 MR. SILVESTRI: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman,
6 but I have to this one time.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Everybody has used up
8 their quote of questions -- but go ahead.

9 MR. SILVESTRI: On that topic, March had
10 a number of nor'easters as you're aware.

11 How did you prepare for resiliency and
12 potential power outages?

13 THE WITNESS (Befera): We -- we fared
14 really well during those storms. We did have some
15 outages, but it wasn't very -- they weren't
16 expensive.

17 They were -- at one point we had a
18 couple hundred generators -- sites on generator
19 throughout all of New England, but most of them
20 were less than 24 hours. The power was restored
21 fairly quickly. I don't know if anyone lost power
22 at their home. I did, and it was restored within,
23 like, six hours. So nothing was extended.

24 MR. SILVESTRI: But this would be an
25 instance as you mentioned earlier where you had

1 prepared to go out and top off the tanks before
2 anything happened in these cases?

3 THE WITNESS (Befera): That's something
4 that we do, and we have resources to do that with
5 several days notice. We usually know almost a
6 week in advance if something significant is headed
7 our way, and we do have the resources with that
8 leadtime to get the tanks at 80 percent minimum in
9 preparation of that.

10 And we have rollup -- a cavalry of folks
11 with hundred-gallon tanks on pickup trucks just
12 waiting for our call. They're basically reserved
13 for us all along rollup generators where we don't
14 have permanent generators. We've got a cavalry of
15 rollup generators either owned or reserved for us
16 for rent in preparation for any type of storm so
17 we can maintain the quality of our network in
18 these outages.

19 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you.

20 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

21 MR. PERRONE: Looking at the sheet R1, I
22 understand that the utility trench is on the south
23 side close to the existing trees.

24 Would excavation for the utility trench
25 adversely impact the roots of the existing trees?

1 THE WITNESS (Burns): I think that they
2 could, and we could put protection measures with
3 the contractor in place. I could also shift it to
4 the other side of the road if that -- if that was
5 a concern or if, you know, if it became an issue.

6 MR. PERRONE: Do you know the total
7 construction disturbance area?

8 THE WITNESS (Burns): It is -- yeah,
9 25,000 square feet. Sorry.

10 MR. PERRONE: So would it be correct to
11 say that this would not require a DEEP general
12 permit? You would be under one acre?

13 THE WITNESS (Burns): Correct.

14 MR. PERRONE: Turning to response to
15 Council interrogatory 39, I understand Cellco has
16 not yet submitted the project information to the
17 State Historic Preservation Office. Do you plan
18 to file with SHPO?

19 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. It's
20 Verizon's protocol is to wait until they're fairly
21 far along on the siting process to ensure things
22 haven't shifted, like this as it often does.

23 So once they have the confidence level,
24 then they will go through the full NEPA process
25 which will include a formal submission to

1 the SHPO.

2 MR. PERRONE: Do you know roughly when?

3 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Well, my guess
4 is after this hearing we'll probably regroup, and
5 I'd say in the next three to four weeks that
6 process will likely begin.

7 MR. PERRONE: And lastly, the cost
8 topic. How is the cost of tower construction and
9 ground leasing recovered? For example, would it
10 be allocated among national customers, regional
11 customers, Connecticut customers?

12 THE WITNESS (Befera): Well, our pricing
13 is done -- our pricing is done on a national
14 basis. Building, maintaining and continually
15 improving our network is the cost of doing
16 business.

17 Nationwide our unlimited data plan in
18 California is priced the same as it is in Florida,
19 as it is in Connecticut.

20 MR. PERRONE: So it's fair to say that
21 the costs of this project would be covered on a
22 national level?

23 THE WITNESS (Befera): Yes.

24 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. That's all I
25 have.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. Now
2 we'll continue with cross-examination by
3 councilmembers. We'll start with Senator Murphy.

4 SEN. MURPHY: I just have one item.

5 Mr. Libertine, a question. If the tower
6 is increased in height and now we have a change in
7 the location from when you did the evaluation, is
8 there any substantial change adversely affecting
9 any given area because of the movement of the
10 tower you've discussed for this?

11 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Well, if we're
12 talking about as proposed, at the 120-foot height
13 today moving a hundred feet?

14 SEN. MURPHY: Right.

15 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Overall, no.
16 I would say that if you were to look through each
17 individual photograph that's represented in the
18 visual report you might say, well, this could
19 shift from a seasonal to a full year-round and
20 vice versa, but essentially in terms of the
21 overall footprint I don't think it's going to have
22 a substantial change.

23 DR. KLEMENS: So no one would get a
24 drastic blast because it was up there instead of
25 over there?

1 THE WITNESS (Libertine): That's
2 correct. I think if we started moving another
3 hundred feet -- I know there was some
4 suggestion of, you know, could it be for, you
5 know -- at one point people were asking, could
6 maybe we move further?

7 I think there's going to be a tipping
8 point where now it would become much more visible
9 to Main Street, but I think where we are talking
10 about now, within -- within a few hundred feet of
11 where we were originally proposed, and as long as
12 we stayed in the concrete manufacturer's yard, it
13 shouldn't have really a substantial change.

14 SEN. MURPHY: I think I have nothing
15 else at this time, Mr. Chairman.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

17 Dr. Klemens?

18 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19 Just a couple of cleanup things. Going
20 back to your simulation number 13. I think if you
21 look on the right-hand side of the photograph, is
22 that -- that's an outbuilding. Correct? From
23 another property on Sunset drive, that's not a
24 house there?

25 THE WITNESS (Libertine): That's

1 correct. It's a shed.

2 DR. KLEMENS: It's a shed. And
3 understanding basically what you said, looking at
4 the tower on simulation 13, that tower now is
5 almost going to be in line with the center of the
6 trunk of that deciduous tree?

7 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Generally,
8 yes.

9 DR. KLEMENS: So the tower is going to
10 be a little bit more hidden, the bottom of the
11 tower, than it is now?

12 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I would agree
13 with that, particularly once the leaves come out.

14 DR. KLEMENS: Correct. Thank you.

15 Now I looked at this, and from when I'm
16 looking at the coverage maps -- and I generally
17 don't talk about these things. I leave it up to
18 my colleagues, but I see a very minimal benefit at
19 the 700 megahertz, and certainly a coverage
20 improvement at the 2100 megahertz especially
21 anything near the dividend pond open space. But
22 this really is a capacity rather than a coverage
23 application. Is that correct?

24 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes, it is.
25 It is mostly at capacity.

1 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you. Okay. Let's
2 get back to the wetlands report. Tab number
3 eleven, please? I was intrigued first that you
4 went off the property. Correct? And you have
5 flags on some of those wetlands. Correct?

6 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): The wetland to
7 the north or to the --

8 DR. KLEMENS: Both of them you flagged?

9 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): To the north
10 and -- yes, correct.

11 DR. KLEMENS: Is that owned by -- this
12 property or?

13 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): No.

14 DR. KLEMENS: Okay. Because it's
15 unusual. I raised the question, the Canterbury
16 matter and I raised a question about what was in a
17 vernal pool there. And their response was that,
18 well, it's off the site. We can't go there.

19 But this time you went off site?

20 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): This was a
21 unique circumstance. We had evaluated this
22 property to the north, known as the Gardener
23 property, as an alternate tower location. So that
24 these flags are an indication of an investigation
25 performed for that property.

1 So we were given express authorization
2 to do a wetland delineation on this property,
3 which is why you see these updated maps.

4 DR. KLEMENS: Okay. So that leads me to
5 my next question. As I understand it you did the
6 data in your field investigation in September of
7 2015 on the property?

8 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): I believe that
9 is correct, yes.

10 DR. KLEMENS: So I guess my question is
11 particularly as in regards to wetland number two,
12 you say it's not a vernal pool.

13 How have you concluded that?

14 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): The indication
15 in the field form is for -- specifically for
16 wetland one -- or for wetland two, sorry.
17 Wetland -- the wetland one identified -- we did
18 not determine if that was or was not a vernal pool
19 based on the time of year restrictions.

20 I will say, however based on the
21 characteristics of that wetland that it would not
22 be, you know, a classic vernal pool habitat due to
23 the outfall and inlet of, you know, moving water.

24 DR. KLEMENS: Which wetland are we
25 talking about?

1 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Wetland one.

2 DR. KLEMENS: I'm talking about wetland
3 two.

4 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Wetland two is
5 consistent of a dug pond, which certainly could
6 provide some vernal pool habitat.

7 Again, that at the time of the
8 inspection, that was off the property and it was
9 just field located, and it was not delineated on
10 subsequent visits. During the investigation for
11 the Gardener property to the north, those
12 properties were investigated -- or those areas
13 were investigated.

14 DR. KLEMENS: So wouldn't it be more
15 accurate instead of, "no," to say, "potential."
16 Seeing you weren't there at the correct season to
17 determine whether or not they were vernal pools?

18 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): I think that
19 could be a correct statement to make that there
20 would -- could be potential habitat there.

21 DR. KLEMENS: Okay. Thank you.

22 And following that line of reasoning if
23 wetland two was a vernal pool, the move that you
24 have created with the tower, the relocation of the
25 tower, the revision has actually moved it out of

1 the vernal pool envelope. Is that correct?

2 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That is
3 correct, yes.

4 DR. KLEMENS: If it was a vernal pool?

5 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That is
6 correct, yes. Previously it was within 85 feet,
7 which would put it within the hundred-foot vernal
8 pool. Now it is 160 which would be outside that
9 hundred feet.

10 DR. KLEMENS: So if wetland two was a
11 vernal pool, this redesign is actually beneficial
12 to the pool?

13 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Correct. It
14 should also be noted that due to the location it
15 would be in existing disturbed areas anyways, and
16 that, you know, which would be unsuitable habitat.

17 And based on the BDPs, we would not have
18 any increase in that disturbed area. So we would
19 not be impacting any, you know, potential habitat
20 within the CTH.

21 DR. KLEMENS: Let's go to the box turtle
22 plan very quickly -- which is in here. I want to
23 make one correction which you'll probably find
24 humorous.

25 We've invented a new Italian dish, terra

1 penne. It's tear-ah-pini [phonetic]. It was
2 unpaginated.

3 When the DEEP asked for qualified, it
4 seems a lot of work is being expended on looking
5 for box turtles from a place that at least -- do
6 you think that's good box turtle habitat there?

7 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): No. No, I do
8 not. I assume you're talking about the compound
9 and access route?

10 DR. KLEMENS: Well, the compound. Yeah.

11 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes, I do not
12 believe those two are, you know, good habitat for
13 box turtles.

14 DR. KLEMENS: So the DEEP has asked for
15 a herpetologist to do all of this work. Who is
16 that going to be?

17 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That is going
18 to be at the discretion of Verizon, but typically
19 All-Points Technology, a representative of
20 All-Points Technology, either Dean Gustafson or
21 myself performs that work.

22 DR. KLEMENS: Have you ever found a box
23 turtle in any of these projects where you have to
24 do these box turtle sweeps?

25 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): No, I have

1 not.

2 DR. KLEMENS: Well, it's a rather
3 expensive activity for questionable value.
4 Correct?

5 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): I would agree
6 with that statement.

7 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you. It's just a
8 statement. It's not -- you're following what you
9 have to do. I question the utility of some of it.
10 That's all.

11 I have no further questions,
12 Mr. Chairman.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

14 Mr. Silvestri?

15 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

16 I want to start with a couple blanks I
17 need to fill in on some other topics that were
18 discussed.

19 Going back to the generator, the fuel
20 tank is self contained on that. Is that right?

21 THE WITNESS (Befera): Yes.

22 MR. SILVESTRI: And all one piece, if
23 you will?

24 THE WITNESS (Befera): Yes, the
25 generator set more or less sits on top of it. It

1 is double walled with an alarm between the
2 interior wall and the exterior wall.

3 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you.

4 And Mr. Libertine, if I can go back to
5 the visuals with you for a few moments? If you
6 looked at number five -- is the new location,
7 would it have that tower shifted to the right as I
8 look at that picture?

9 THE WITNESS (Libertine): From that
10 perspective, yes, slightly.

11 MR. SILVESTRI: Would that be true also
12 with number seven, also shifting to the right?

13 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes,
14 similarly. That orientation is somewhat to the
15 northeast. So yeah, it would shift to the right,
16 not dramatically, but certainly would shift.

17 MR. SILVESTRI: Just three more quick
18 ones on the visual. Number eleven, would it then
19 shift to the right and be behind the trees?

20 THE WITNESS (Libertine): From that
21 location, most likely. But certainly the -- it
22 would start to encroach into the tree, yes.

23 MR. SILVESTRI: And then 24 was the last
24 question I had on visual, if that was also moving
25 to the right?

1 THE WITNESS (Libertine): That may
2 actually -- bear with me one second so I can get
3 the right page number.

4 MR. SILVESTRI: Uh-huh.

5 THE WITNESS (Libertine): That might not
6 shift dramatically in either direction just
7 because that is essentially looking -- and we're
8 calling it southwest. It's really west southwest.
9 And where we're shifting that slightly to the east
10 it might almost -- almost be a negligible
11 differential just in that particular location.

12 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. Then another
13 blank I wanted to make sure I had covered. Tree
14 removal, any tree removal on both the compound and
15 the access road?

16 THE WITNESS (Burns): No, sir.

17 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you.

18 My next question was actually prompted
19 by one of the offices I used to have many years
20 ago down in the New Haven Harbor area on
21 Waterfront Street. And in your response to
22 Council interrogatory number 35 concerning the
23 stealth tower design options, was any
24 consideration given to constructing a Fox concrete
25 silo somewhere on the property to blend into the

1 business that's going on there?

2 THE WITNESS (Libertine): It was not
3 considered, and I'll just speak for my own
4 personal, or professional opinion is that if we
5 start talking about those types of stealth
6 applications then we're talking about a much
7 larger object on the horizon.

8 And because of the feedback that we got
9 from the neighbors, our intention was in any way
10 possible to try to minimize the profile. And I
11 think doing some type of a silo certainly would
12 start to create a very large diameter structure
13 because we would obviously want to have enough
14 room to contain those antennas within it.

15 And so we're probably talking about
16 something in the 15-foot diameter range, maybe
17 even more, 20, maybe to be able to accommodate
18 that and allow room for the antennas to go in and
19 for people to work on them.

20 So from my perspective when I looked at
21 this question and remembered all we had been
22 through on this site, my feeling was that, you
23 know, we're in a fairly industrial location at
24 that property itself. It's a relatively short
25 tower. So from my perspective one thing I might

1 consider is to bring the antennas in tighter at
2 the top, but I'm not sure that works necessarily
3 for RF. So there's always that balancing act.

4 Beyond that, any of the other, what I
5 would call the traditional options that we
6 typically would like to look at, I think again
7 would just create such a larger profile on the
8 horizon. The challenge at the site is it's very
9 flat, as anyone knows that has driven the area.
10 There is good tree cover in the area, but it's not
11 exceptionally tall tree cover there and it's
12 mostly deciduous.

13 So we tend to be above the treeline by
14 30 to 50 feet, depending upon the location. So
15 it's really difficult at that point to be thinking
16 about doing a full tree, doing even a -- well,
17 we're really moving away in the industry from
18 flagpoles and internal antenna arrays just because
19 of the limitations inherent with those.

20 So we are limited in terms of what we
21 might be able to do here, but to answer your --
22 your first question is, no, I don't believe it was
23 ever -- it certainly wasn't considered beyond
24 anyone at this table, I don't believe, because --

25 THE WITNESS (Befera): No, for reasons

1 that you stated, that it would significantly
2 increase just the mass of what we would have to
3 put there as opposed to a relatively steep pole.
4 So it wasn't considered.

5 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. You
6 know, I looked at the existing cylindrical items
7 that were their silos. It kind of put it back
8 into my memory when I saw it and wanted to pose
9 that question to you.

10 THE WITNESS (Libertine): No, from --
11 from a contextual standpoint certainly there's
12 some merit and perhaps we didn't have neighbors as
13 close. That might be something. There's also a
14 cost factor there that I know that's probably not
15 as relevant, but that certainly comes into play as
16 well.

17 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you.

18 I wanted to go back to page 8 of the
19 application. It states that you're going to
20 initially deploy 700 and 2100 megahertz services,
21 and that you were to add the 850 and the 1900 when
22 capacity is needed.

23 The question I want to pose to you is,
24 will construction include the 850 and the 1900
25 components, or would those be added at some time

1 in the future?

2 THE WITNESS (Brauer): The antenna
3 portion and the cabling will be ready. The radio
4 heads will be added later as needed.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lynch?

6 MR. LYNCH: Thank you. Just a followup?

7 MR. SILVESTRI: Yeah.

8 MR. LYNCH: You said that the other
9 sections wouldn't be used until they're needed.

10 Any idea with the growth of the network
11 when that would be?

12 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Tomorrow -- no,
13 the way things are going with 4G data usage we
14 have seen incredible growth year over year.

15 I believe I have testified at some of
16 the other hearings that our data growth was about
17 30 percent. It's ramped up to about 50 percent
18 year over year. So I would see those other two
19 carriers being used within a couple of years.

20 MR. LYNCH: And if I heard you right to
21 Mr. Silvestri, you're putting in the structure,
22 but you're not putting in the antennas?

23 THE WITNESS (Brauer): No. The antennas
24 are ready. The cabling is ready. The only thing
25 that wouldn't be installed right off the bat would

1 be the actual radio heads themselves.

2 MR. LYNCH: Okay. Thank you.

3 MR. SILVESTRI: Turning now to page 22
4 of the application. There's wording that
5 specifies a propane fuel generator, and I assume
6 that's a typo?

7 THE WITNESS (Befera): Yes. Yes, that's
8 a typo overlooked from a previous application that
9 this was formed from.

10 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. You had
11 mentioned earlier about the public information
12 meeting on November 30th of 2015. Approximately
13 how many people attended the meeting?

14 THE WITNESS (Befera): About 10 or 12
15 individuals.

16 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you.

17 If I can have you reference Council
18 interrogatory number 22, and this is concerning
19 the ineffective attempts and dropped calls. I
20 have two questions for you on this one.

21 The first one is, how does the system
22 differentiate between what I'll call an attempted
23 call that doesn't connect, versus a call that no
24 one answers?

25 THE WITNESS (Brauer): You mean, a call

1 that would go through and somebody on the other
2 end simply doesn't --

3 MR. SILVESTRI: Yeah, you're going to
4 call me and I don't pick up the phone, versus some
5 technical problem that happened that you're
6 calling an ineffective attempt?

7 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Oh. Well, simply
8 that if the call does go through and the other end
9 acknowledges the connection, that a regular --
10 that's a normal functioning call. So that's
11 not -- that's not a drop. That's not an
12 ineffective attempt. That's just normal.

13 If anywhere along the line the call,
14 let's say for you don't have enough resources,
15 that's flagged as an ineffective attempt due to
16 resources. If you're in the area where it's poor
17 RF and you simply can't make the connection, some
18 of those don't get picked up because you don't
19 have the phone, your user equipment having the
20 ability to report back to -- I can't get on
21 because there is no -- there is no RF there.

22 If you half-make a call and it gets
23 through the process and you drop off the system
24 because of poor RF, it's already logged that the
25 user equipment was attempting to make that and it

1 was unsuccessful.

2 MR. SILVESTRI: But the last part would
3 be your dropped call. Correct?

4 THE WITNESS (Brauer): If -- if you
5 haven't established a connection yet, if you're
6 only in initial communication it's not an
7 established call that drops. It's an ineffective
8 attempt because it hasn't started yet.

9 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay, but I don't have
10 voicemail -- hypothetically. The phone is
11 ringing. I don't pick it up. I'm still not sure
12 how you differentiate that between my trying a
13 call and then the line goes dead?

14 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Well, usually if
15 you don't pick up, if there's no voicemail I would
16 assume that it would keep ringing until you hit
17 end.

18 MR. SILVESTRI: Well, would that be an
19 ineffective attempt?

20 THE WITNESS (Brauer): No, that would
21 be -- that would be a normal termination, a normal
22 call termination.

23 MR. SILVESTRI: Let me ask a similar
24 question then on the dropped call part of it. How
25 does your system differentiate between a call that

1 was lost, or what you call a dropped call, versus
2 I'm tired of talking to you, now I'm hanging up?

3 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Whenever you hit
4 end, or on some of the older phones you would
5 close the clamshell. The phone reports back that
6 that's a normal termination of the call.

7 MR. SILVESTRI: So it's that button,
8 it's the end button --

9 THE WITNESS (Brauer): It's the end
10 button.

11 MR. SILVESTRI: -- that differentiates?

12 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Yeah.

13 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you.

14 MR. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman?

15 Just getting clarification of what --
16 Mr. Silvestri and I had some similar question.

17 Did I hear you correctly saying that you
18 differentiate between failure to generate a call
19 and a dropped call?

20 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Yes.

21 MR. LYNCH: And which is the bigger
22 problem -- for your system, that is?

23 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Dropped calls
24 are, generally. We take both of them very
25 seriously. Our customers don't want to have

1 either one, but in the industry a drop is
2 considered more -- I would say given more weight,
3 if you will.

4 MR. LYNCH: I would have thought the
5 opposite, but that's just me.

6 Thank you very much.

7 MR. SILVESTRI: Two more questions for
8 you. The NDDB map that's within attachment five
9 of the response to the Council interrogatories,
10 that's the original proposed location. Not the
11 revised one. Correct?

12 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes, that is
13 correct.

14 MR. SILVESTRI: The last question I have
15 for you, Mr. Brauer, goes back to one of the
16 questions that came up about capacity and
17 coverage. The driver, if I heard correctly on
18 this project you mentioned, is capacity. Is that
19 correct?

20 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Yes.

21 MR. SILVESTRI: And coverage is second?

22 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Yes.

23 MR. SILVESTRI: Capacity being relief
24 for your other cell sites?

25 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Yes.

1 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Looking then at
2 the secondary method for coverage, the middle
3 school and TPC would be high on the list of trying
4 to get coverage from this tower?

5 THE WITNESS (Brauer): The middle school
6 area, the Route 99, sort of, the Players Club
7 area, yes. Those are the main drivers.

8 MR. SILVESTRI: Was there any thought
9 then on locating this tower at TPC?

10 THE WITNESS (Brauer): I certainly
11 wouldn't have minded that, but I'm not sure if --
12 I'm not sure if we ever got into any kind of
13 negotiations with them.

14 THE WITNESS (Befera): TPC has been kind
15 enough to let us put a permanent -- I'm sorry, a
16 temporary cell up here on wheels. We call it a
17 CROW, cell repeater on wheels. They have allowed
18 us to do that for the PGA tournament each summer
19 and we did talk to them about some small cells to
20 try and be right on top of the action there, and
21 we didn't get anywhere with them.

22 We did pursue, but they really weren't
23 interested. They said for the PGA tournament
24 we'll let you bring something in here to let you
25 amplify your single, because we understand that's

1 important for a lot people and we know that it's
2 deficient throughout the course, but they had no
3 interest in a permanent installation whether it be
4 a macro cell, a tower or a small cell.

5 MR. LYNCH: You're doing it again, Bob.
6 That was one of the questions I had on there, too,
7 TPC -- because I know you're bringing the portable
8 during the tournament.

9 Will this new facility prevent you -- or
10 you wouldn't need to bring in a portable?

11 THE WITNESS (Brauer): That's correct.
12 This would alleviate much of that need.

13 MR. LYNCH: Thank you.

14 MR. SILVESTRI: I'm all set, Mr.
15 Chairman. Thank you.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hannon?

17 MR. HANNON: I was going to pass, but
18 everybody else is pitching in. I figure I might
19 as well, too. I have hopefully three quick
20 questions.

21 When we were at the site and when we
22 were out towards the area where the proposed
23 driveway is, it looked as though a portion of this
24 roadway that you are proposing has already been
25 cut out. Is that correct?

1 THE WITNESS (Burns): I believe the
2 property owner has done some work out there. I
3 don't know why it wasn't -- I don't think it was
4 based on this, but I don't have any more
5 information than that.

6 MR. HANNON: Because then my followup to
7 that is, how does that impact your 450 cubic yards
8 of material?

9 THE WITNESS (Burns): That's a good
10 question. I think that, just looking at it, it
11 looks like it was scraped away, maybe a foot, a
12 foot and a half.

13 Typically we're going to be boxing out
14 about ten inches. So maybe some of that 450 cubic
15 yards of excavation that we have to haul away,
16 we've got to push into this area, that one area.
17 So it actually could help us so that we don't have
18 to truck away as much as we thought.

19 MR. HANNON: That's fine. And my last
20 question is, why not propane backup?

21 THE WITNESS (Befera): It really doesn't
22 matter to us whether we do propane or diesel as
23 long as it's self-contained. The propane has its
24 advantages and the diesel also has its advantages.

25 The propane, although not as easy to get

1 filled when you have multiple propane tanks across
2 the geography during an extended outage, it does
3 have a thousand-gallon tank and can run our
4 generator for five days, versus the two days on
5 the diesel.

6 Our -- our default system for generators
7 is typically diesel because there we have more of
8 a crew on retainer for refills in short notice.
9 It's more self-contained. It takes up less space.
10 It doesn't require the ten-foot spark zone that
11 prohibits additional carriers to locate their
12 equipment into the compound.

13 So it makes for the need for a larger
14 compound, but in a place like, you know, in a
15 location like this the -- the business was such
16 and the environmental history was such that diesel
17 was -- was allowed by our environmental reviewers.

18 MR. HANNON: And then just to follow up
19 on that, when you go in and actually complete a
20 final grade for the enclosed area? Is there --
21 well, I know there's a way.

22 But is it feasible to possibly pitch
23 that just slightly towards the concrete
24 manufacturing operation and away from the
25 wetlands, wetland number two in particular?

1 THE WITNESS (Burns): The idea behind
2 this was to not change the existing drainage
3 patterns. Right now, that existing drainage
4 pattern, although it's flat as a pancake if you
5 look at some of the overall topo -- which I did on
6 the GIS map in Cromwell. You can actually pull up
7 the topography feed -- it kind of flows to the
8 northwest.

9 Those wetlands are to the east. So the
10 idea -- I'm sorry, the West. The idea would be to
11 maintain that existing drainage pattern and it
12 would flow away from the wetland.

13 MR. HANNON: I'm done.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

15 Mr. Edelson?

16 MR. EDELSON: I just wanted to confirm
17 going back to the public information meeting,
18 there were attempts to contact the Mayor and the
19 Town Manager. As of January they haven't
20 responded.

21 Has there been any update on that in the
22 last four months?

23 THE WITNESS (Befera): No.

24 MR. EDELSON: And Mr. Libertine, when
25 you mentioned there was feedback from some of the

1 property owners, was that at the public
2 information meeting, or that was a subsequent
3 information interaction?

4 THE WITNESS (Libertine): No, that was
5 from the public information meeting. We were
6 here for well over an hour and a half just
7 discussing the proposal. So there were some
8 thoughts primarily asking about the property to
9 the north, the Gardener property which we later
10 then did some investigations on.

11 MR. EDELSON: I just wanted to know if
12 there had been subsequent discussions?

13 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Not that I'm
14 aware of.

15 MR. EDELSON: So we discussed a lot
16 about how this is about capacity. And when we
17 look at the, you know, the maps, we see excellent
18 coverage, but we know this is a very congested
19 part of the state.

20 And so if it occurs to me that, well,
21 why at only a 120-foot tower? Why not a taller
22 tower that would give you more ability to
23 alleviate coverage issues -- not coverage issues,
24 capacity issues in a further area? Why keep it to
25 120 and not go for a further higher tower?

1 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Well, when we --
2 when we took a look at the locations that were
3 available to us we started modeling various
4 heights. And once you reach a minimum height and
5 still have approximately half of the offload
6 from -- that you want from the surrounding sites,
7 that's where it would stop.

8 If it was a taller tower, yes, you
9 certainly could take away more from the
10 surrounding sites, but then you might end up with
11 a problem on the new tower you just built taking
12 too much traffic. So we try to lower, we try to
13 keep it as low as possible and keep the offload as
14 even as possible.

15 MR. EDELSON: So I'm not sure I really
16 follow all of that in terms of the modeling, but
17 it sort of implies to me that you end up with more
18 towers as a result. Would that be a conclusion of
19 that because you're, rather than having a few,
20 fewer taller towers you're going to have more?

21 THE WITNESS (Brauer): I would say it's
22 the opposite. If you have taller towers now
23 you're seeking to offload that, that new set of
24 taller towers. So you're potentially looking at
25 more locations to offload what you just built.

1 If you try to make it as balanced and as
2 even as possible you are -- you're making
3 everything stable, or as stable as the user will
4 let you make it. And I feel you would minimize
5 the need for new towers, new locations.

6 MR. EDELSON: Well, I'm not going to
7 belabor it, and obviously there's a deficiency in
8 my understanding of this. But I'm concerned
9 because of your comment about how what was written
10 here said, we'll add, you know, the other
11 frequencies later. And I think you're making an
12 astute observation that later is now, that things
13 are moving so quickly.

14 And I know personally, you know, I'm
15 amazed how much data I'm using. And two years ago
16 I would have said I would never be using that much
17 data on my smartphone. It just never occurred to
18 me that it would be that much and I'm just one
19 person. So I've got to believe you multiply that
20 by a couple million people, things are growing
21 very fast.

22 THE WITNESS (Brauer): It is certainly
23 keeping us on our toes.

24 THE WITNESS (Befera): A significant
25 driver to that is the reintroduction of the

1 all-you-can-eat plans, the unlimited data plans.
2 And that is to compete with our competitors who
3 are on TV cutting our phone bills in half with
4 chainsaws.

5 MR. EDELSON: No, I used to actually
6 look at my data and worry about it. And now it's
7 like, who cares? You know, why not another video?
8 Even if I don't want to watch it I'm still
9 bringing it down. So it is a problem because it
10 just creates more and more demand on that.

11 But the other aspect we should talk
12 about a little bit is, you know, these things,
13 these devices have gone from nice to have ten
14 years ago to almost essential, especially from an
15 emergency point of view.

16 And that's what leads me to my -- and I
17 don't think I'm going to be able to change
18 anything here, because we don't have a standard
19 that says you've got to meet this, but I think
20 we've got to go back and look at that 43 hours.

21 The cell phones are becoming really
22 critical during a time of emergency, and when I
23 say emergency, like a natural disaster when
24 electricity outage is there. And I'm feeling like
25 48 hours, two days in a community like this, or in

1 my community doesn't sound like a lot when we've
2 seen outages of four or five days.

3 Now I realize, you know, you have the
4 capacity to refuel the tank. It's not like you
5 can't refuel, but we end up in these situations
6 where roads are blocked and the ability to move
7 trucks around with diesel fuel, or propane for
8 that matter, anything but a natural gas pipeline
9 does prevent that.

10 So I would encourage you to take that
11 message back to say, what should the standard be?
12 Because as I've said, we've seen other competitors
13 come in with 80 hours. That just seems a little
14 more moving in the right direction to me.

15 My last thing, I just want to, you know,
16 truth in advertising. So on page 20 it did refer
17 to this wetlands plan as attachment one and it
18 wasn't there, but that was part of the original
19 application. So this application did not include
20 sheet C5 and that was for the original site.

21 So that was, to be clear, something that
22 wasn't included in the application. Because I
23 realize you're saying now, well, for the revision
24 I don't need C5, but the document we received was
25 for the original site, the original siting.

1 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): I'd like to
2 provide clarification on that. I believe that was
3 a holdover similar to the propane generator that
4 was discussed. That was a holdover in the
5 template document. A wetland protection plan was
6 never proposed for either location.

7 MR. EDELSON: So that was an error in
8 the --

9 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That is
10 correct, sir.

11 MR. EDELSON: Okay. That clarifies
12 that.

13 THE WITNESS (Libertine): The thought
14 being that, just for further clarification, that
15 the proper erosion and soil sedimentation controls
16 as part of construction would be more than
17 adequate, even in the original location, and now
18 that we've moved it further away -- so we
19 apologize. That is another, I think, typo that
20 was just carried over.

21 MR. EDELSON: As you said, the site is
22 as flat as a pancake. And so I think that wetland
23 was, even though it was within the hundred feet,
24 it wasn't going to be impacted by what you're
25 doing there, at least from my point of view?

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

3 MR. EDELSON: Thank you.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Harder?

5 MR. HARDER: Yes. Thank you
6 Mr. Chairman. I just have one question that
7 concerns public input.

8 Mr. Libertine, you said there were a
9 number of comments at the public meeting. Could
10 you indicate whether any of those, or if you got
11 any responses to the notices to the abutters? Or
12 for any other communications, if you had any
13 objections or anything like negative comments
14 regarding the proposal?

15 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Well, I would
16 certainly characterize the meeting as very cordial
17 and productive. I would say that the majority of
18 folks there had concerns primarily with esthetics.
19 Most of the folks there identified themselves from
20 the neighborhoods to the south.

21 And so that's why the idea was brought
22 up by several folks about looking at sites just to
23 the north because they felt it was further
24 removed, that gentleman, the Gardener property
25 which we've referred to had a substantial amount

1 of land to get kind of creative on. So that was
2 more or less the general consensus and the crowd
3 was, could you at least take a look at that so we
4 might have even further distance between the
5 factory and their homes?

6 I think everyone recognized the need for
7 the tower, but again as is not uncommon in those
8 situations in public input meetings, folks usually
9 have a concern about what they're going to see
10 from their properties.

11 MR. HARDER: Okay. Thank you.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lynch?

13 MR. LYNCH: Most of the specific
14 questions I had regarding the site have already
15 been asked by the Council, but I have a couple
16 general questions with regards to your network
17 itself.

18 Going back to interrogatory number 19
19 that Mr. Perrone asked you about the small cells,
20 he asked you about DAS. But in your system you've
21 done a number of smaller cells on buildings and so
22 on throughout the state.

23 Would doing something like that in this
24 area also eliminate the possibility of building
25 this tower?

1 THE WITNESS (Brauer): In this
2 particular area I would say no, because we do have
3 larger areas of unimproved space such as where
4 Watrous Park is where there is no utility pole
5 infrastructure for us to colocate on.

6 And certainly over towards the golf
7 course where most everything is underground, there
8 are some utility poles over that way, but we
9 couldn't -- we can't fill in the same area.

10 MR. LYNCH: I was really talking about
11 small cells on the buildings, not necessarily on
12 poles, but that's irrelevant.

13 As far as your search ring, I'm always
14 going from the past that you try to stay within a
15 two-mile radius, you know, for your coverage and,
16 I guess, capacity, but Portland was over
17 three miles away and across the river.

18 Can you really actually reach Portland
19 from this new location?

20 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Yeah, our
21 Portland cell site is -- it's on a very prominent
22 hilltop and it does reach across the river because
23 the -- the terrain drops down where the river is,
24 and then comes back up. You have a line of sight
25 right to the -- right to the location.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: That makes sense. Thank
2 you.

3 And lastly, we've talked about emergency
4 power for electric, but if you lose your trunk or
5 basement phone service what happens to the cell
6 site?

7 THE WITNESS (Brauer): If you look the
8 backhaul to the cell site, even if it has power it
9 has no service.

10 MR. LYNCH: All right. Thank you.

11 That's all, Mr. Chairman.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I assume the
13 answer to my question is somewhere in here, but
14 did you get any response from other carriers as
15 far as interest?

16 THE WITNESS (Befera): No.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. And how many
18 carriers theoretically could go on this pole?
19 Because I can't -- well, answer the question
20 because I --

21 THE WITNESS (Befera): It would be -- it
22 would be a function of, I think our intention here
23 is to design a 140-foot pole and not purchase the
24 last 20 feet. So it would be 120 feet, but
25 extendable to 140 for carriers that want greater

1 than 120 feet in height. That could accommodate
2 two additional.

3 And there would be -- if someone would
4 be able to make 110 feet work, that would be a
5 fourth carrier. We can design it to hold someone
6 at 100 feet as well. We can design it to hold
7 someone also at 90 feet.

8 It all depends on when we design the
9 tower with the tower manufacturer what we give
10 them for loading. If we say we want one of our
11 array at 6 different levels of this 140-foot
12 proposed structure, they will design it with the
13 antennas we tell them we want it loaded for, and
14 that includes of course the foundation and the
15 steel.

16 So I mean, we could design it for
17 anything that we want. It's just that, you know,
18 it's more or less for companies out there doing
19 what we do in this area. So that's why I think we
20 keep falling back to the four.

21 It used to be six. Now it's four and we
22 keep falling back to the four, but -- but the
23 intention here was because some carriers might
24 need more height than we do in this area. Maybe
25 their network isn't as mature with the surrounding

1 sites as ours is. So the 20-foot extendable
2 option was -- was really what we thought we would
3 lean to.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: So the question is, is
5 the extra 20 feet -- from a visibility, is that
6 pretty significant?

7 THE WITNESS (Libertine): If we were to
8 go up another 20 feet, I think it would be -- yes,
9 we'd start to see expansion of footprint, and
10 certainly some of the near views would be
11 substantially more impactful, yes.

12 Anytime we go up and we go up over
13 15 feet or so, that's pretty normal especially in
14 a terrain like this where it's relatively level.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: So actually if I'm
16 correct, under whatever the federal statutes, you
17 can go up another 10 percent, which is 12 feet.
18 Right. So I don't know where the 140 came in?

19 THE WITNESS (Befera): It's just when
20 you -- I mean, of course --

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Are you rounding up?

22 THE WITNESS (Befera): No. They
23 typically, I mean, you can have them build
24 whatever additional height that you -- that you
25 want as they have the original tower design, but

1 but I think any extension would still have to come
2 back in front of the Council for reapproval.

3 MR. BALDWIN: It certainly would,
4 Mr. Chairman. I think we're talking about
5 similar --

6 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Three
7 different things.

8 MR. BALDWIN: Similar but different
9 things. Whether a tower extension would satisfy
10 the requirements as an eligible facilities request
11 under the 2012 Tax Relief Act is one question, and
12 that would limit that height extension based on
13 those standards and not give the Siting Council
14 the ability to deny that application.

15 However if AT&T theoretically comes in
16 and says I, like this tower site, but I need
17 160 feet, they can come back to the Siting Council
18 and ask for that extension even beyond those EFR
19 standards. And then the siting Council would
20 evaluate it as it would any tower extension. And
21 I think in that instance, since it wouldn't
22 satisfy the criteria you certainly could deny that
23 application if you didn't like the additional
24 visual impact.

25 So I think there's one aspect legally,

1 that that would perhaps tie the Council's hands on
2 a lower extension, one, an extension that
3 satisfied the EFR criteria. If something goes
4 beyond those criteria and is no longer an eligible
5 facilities request, then the Council reviews their
6 proposal as it would any tower extension in
7 accordance with the state standards.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: That was what I was
9 trying to elicit, the difference that under the --
10 well, you said it. I'm not even going to attempt
11 to restate what you said because I think you did a
12 good job.

13 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mr. Chairman,
14 just to hopefully close the record on, I think,
15 your original question. My understanding is the
16 tower will be designed for the foundation support
17 four total carriers at this time, and that would
18 accommodate a 12 or a 20-foot extension if
19 necessary, but it would allow for four carriers.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. And you would have
21 enough room on the ground to have, worst-case from
22 our view, four separate generators with four
23 separate tanks?

24 THE WITNESS (Burns): The site is
25 designed now for four carriers including Verizon.

1 So, yes.

2 SEN. MURPHY: Attorney Baldwin, I
3 thought under that federal regulation that came
4 down some years that it was 4 percent or 10 feet,
5 whichever was the greater. Is the cap as to
6 whether they take a look at whether they qualify
7 or not?

8 THE CHAIRMAN: You want to clarify?

9 MR. BALDWIN: I think, subject to check,
10 I think it's the greater of 10 percent or 20 feet,
11 I believe, that would satisfy the federal -- the
12 criteria under the eligible facilities request.

13 SEN. MURPHY: Ten percent or 20 feet.

14 MR. BALDWIN: Or 20 feet, the greater
15 of.

16 SEN. MURPHY: The greater of? So it's
17 not 10 percent or 10 feet, because it's 20 feet.
18 Right?

19 MR. BALDWIN: I believe that's the case.

20 SEN. MURPHY: And there is the talk of
21 20 feet going up here on this one, which is the
22 greater of the two.

23 MR. BALDWIN: I think Mr. Befera's
24 comments are more historic than anything else.
25 That has been Verizon's standard for as long as

1 I've been doing this, and frankly something that
2 the Council has asked for before just to allow for
3 that additional height if other carriers needed
4 additional height.

5 THE WITNESS (Libertine): And in this
6 industry ten-foot increments are pretty standard
7 for separation across up here.

8 SEN. MURPHY: And this goes back some
9 time, and we really haven't had one. But it
10 appeared to me that if you fall within the
11 purview, our saying no is almost a no-no under the
12 criteria.

13 MR. BALDWIN: Again, if you satisfy the
14 eligible facilities request requirements the
15 statutes say very clearly it must be approved.

16 SEN. MURPHY: Right.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Perrone? Sorry.

18 MR. PERRONE: Just one last question.

19 Mr. Befera, I understand you updated us
20 that no other carriers have expressed an interest
21 in colocating the facility. As of the date of
22 filing of the application the Town had not
23 expressed an interest.

24 Just as a further update, did you hear
25 anything else from the Town as far as interest in

1 colocating?

2 THE WITNESS (Befera): No, not since the
3 filing of the application we have not.

4 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. That's all I
5 had.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. Lynch?

7 MR. LYNCH: To go back to the increasing
8 of the tower's height, wouldn't you need a
9 ten-foot separation anyhow with the tower, with an
10 additional carrier going up or down?

11 THE WITNESS (Brauer): Typically what we
12 have done is that ten-foot separation. Yes,
13 that's becoming kind of our standard.

14 MR. LYNCH: Thank you.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. The Council is
16 going to recess until 6:30, at which time we will
17 resume with the public portion of the hearing.

18
19 (Whereupon, the above proceedings were
20 concluded at 4:32 p.m.)

21

22

23

24

25

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

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing 80 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original verbatim notes taken of the Regular Hearing in Re: DOCKET NO. 481, APPLICATION FROM CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY LOCATED AT 667, 665, 663, AND 663R MAIN STREET IN CROMWELL, CONNECTICUT, which was held before ROBIN STEIN, Chairman, at the Cromwell Town Hall, 41 West Street, Cromwell, Connecticut, April 19, 2018.



Robert G. Dixon, CVR-M 857
Notary Public
A Plus Reporting Service
55 Whiting Street, Suite 1A
Plainville, CT 06062
My Commission Expires: 6/30/2020

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

Anthony Befera Page 8
Mark Brauer
Robert Burns
Matthew Gustafson
Mike Libertine

EXAMINERS:

Mr. Baldwin Page 8
Mr. Perrone Page 12