1	STATE OF CONNECTICUT
2	CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL
3	
4	Docket No. 482
5	Application from Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon
6	Wireless for a Certificate of Environmental
7	Compatibility and Public Need for the Construction,
8	Maintenance and Operation of a Telecommunication
9	Facility Located At 917 Exeter Road In Lebanon,
10	Connecticut
11	
12	Regular Hearing held at the Lebanon Fire
13	Safety Complex, Community Hall, 23 Goshen Hill
14	Road, Lebanon, Connecticut, Tuesday, May 1, 2018,
15	beginning at 3:00 p.m.
16	
17	Held Before:
18	ROBIN STEIN, Chairman
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	Appearances:
2	Council Members:
3	JAMES J. MURPHY, JR.
4	Vice Chairman
5	
6	ROBERT HANNON,
7	DEEP Designee
8	
9	LARRY P. LEVESQUE,
10	PURA Designee
11	
12	MICHAEL HARDER
13	ROBERT SILVESTRI
14	DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.
15	EDWARD EDELSON
16	
17	Council Staff:
18	MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.,
19	Executive Director and Staff Attorney
20	
21	ROBERT MERCIER,
22	Siting Analyst
23	
24	
25	

```
1
    Appearances:(cont'd)
    For the Applicant:
2
        ROBINSON & COLE
3
         280 Trumbull Street
4
         Hartford, Connecticut 06103
5
6
              By: KENNETH C. BALDWIN, ESQ.
7
                   Kbaldwin@rc.com
                   860.275.8345.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

THE CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon. I'd like to call to order this meeting of the Connecticut Siting Council today, Tuesday May, 1, 2028, at approximately 3 p.m.

My name is Robin Stein. I'm Chairman of the Connecticut siting Council. Other members of the Council present are Senator Murphy our Vice Chairman; Mr. Hannon, designee from the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection;
Mr. Levesque, designee from the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority; Mr. Silvestri; Mr. Edelson; Mr. Harder; and Mr. Lynch.

Members of the staff present are Melanie Bachman, our Executive Director and Staff Attorney; and Robert Mercier, our siting analyst.

This hearing is held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act upon an application from Cellco partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless for a certificate of environmental compatibility and public need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunication facility located at 917 Exeter Road in Lebanon, Connecticut.

This application was received by the

Council on March 12, 2018.

As a reminder to all, off-the-record communication with a member of the Council or member of the Council's staff upon the merits of the application is prohibited by law. A party to the proceeding is as follows, Cellco partnership, Verizon Wireless, with Attorney Baldwin of Robinson & Cole.

We will proceed in accordance with the prepared agenda, copies of which are available here. Also available here are copies of the Council's citizen guide to Siting Council procedures.

At this end of this afternoon's evidentiary session we will recess and resume again at 6:30 for the public comment session. The 6:30 public comment session will be reserved for the public to make brief oral statements into the record. I wish to note that the applicant including their representatives and witnesses are not allowed to participate in the public comment session.

I also wish to note for those who are here and for the benefit of your friends and neighbors who are unable to join us for the public

comment session, that you or they may send written statements to the Council within 30 days of the date hereof, and such written statements will be given the same weight as if spoken at the hearing.

A verbatim transcript will be made of this hearing and deposited with the town clerk's office in Lebanon for the convenience of the public.

I would like to start by asking if there are any of the public officials, or the public safety planner wish to make a statement at this time? Feel free, and if you don't mind going -- we don't seem to have a podium, but if you go sit down there.

And just hit the button and hopefully it will turn green.

ROBERT CADY: My name is Robert Cady.

I'm past Fire Chief of the Lebanon Fire

Department, and still active in the fire

department. I'm been the communications officer,

and I take care of all the communications for the

Town of Lebanon DPW, and the fire department.

And I believe this tower would be a great asset for improving our coverage throughout the town as we have several dead areas now. And

I'm hoping that it will improve our communications in those areas.

I have done several coverage maps and it looks like it's going to help us out greatly. I was an engineer for Motorola Communications for 26 years, so I'm pretty in tune to what this tower will give us for coverage.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

PHILIP CHESTER: Hello my name is Philip Chester. I'm the Town Planner in Lebanon. I know you have a lot of materials already. This is a town map. This is the site of the proposed tower, our town high school site.

What you see in green is lands that have been permanently preserved through the State of Connecticut, USDA, and the Town of Lebanon for agriculture only. The white piece that is between all this is a piece which is a pending offer from the State of Connecticut to the property owners who came to the Town for farmland preservation.

So you can see that the site is pretty well surrounded by preserved land. And as you already know, this application went before the planning and zoning commission and got approval.

The board of selectmen held a public hearing as is 1 2 required by state law when they're going to lease land and they voted for this as well -- and the 3 board of education as well voted for this. 4 That's it. 5 6 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. 7 Any other public official at this time? You'll also get a chance this evening if you want 8 at the public hearing. 9 10 11 (No response.) 12 THE CHAIRMAN: I wish to call your 13 attention to the items shown on the hearing 14 program marked as Roman numeral 1D, items 1 15 through 71. 16 17 Does the applicant have any objection to the items the Council has administratively 18 noticed? 19 20 MR. BALDWIN: No objection, Mr. Chairman. 21 22 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. 23 Accordingly, the Council hereby administratively notices these existing comments, 24 statements and comments. Now I'll ask Attorney 25

Baldwin to present your witness panel for the purpose of taking the oath.

MR. BALDWIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My witness panel consists of the following

members. To my far left, your right, is Robert

Burn, professional engineer with All-Points

Technology, the project engineers for this

facility.

To my immediate left is Kelly Lemay, a radiofrequency engineer with Verizon Wireless.

To my right is the newest member of our witness panel, Mr. Andrew Candiello. He's an engineer with the real estate and regulatory division of Verizon Wireless taking over for Tony Befera. We welcome him to our panel. You'll be seeing a lot of him as projects go forward.

He was with us in Cromwell. So he's got a bit of a sense of how things go, so we welcome him to our panel.

To Mr. Candiello's right is Matt
Gustafson, a professional soil scientist with
All-Points technology.

And you know Mike Libertine to the far right -- my far right of the table, the Director of Siting and Permitting for All-Points

1 ANDREW CANDIELLO, 2 KELLY LEMAY, 3 ROBERT BURNS, MICHAEL LIBERTINE, 4 GUSTAFSON, 5 MATTHEW called as witnesses, being first duly sworn 6 7 by the Executive Director, were examined and 8 testified under oath as follows: 9 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman, we have four 10 exhibits to offer in this proceeding. 11 12 listed in the hearing program under Roman two, 13 section B. 14 They include the application with the associated bulk file exhibits, the applicant's 15 16 affidavit of publication dated April 3, 2018; the 17 applicant's responses to the Siting Council's interrogatories dated April 18, 2018; and the 18 applicant's signposting affidavit confirming 19 that a public notice sign was posted at the 20 property in accordance with the Council's 21 22 requirements. 23 I offer those for identification purposes subject to verification by our witness 24 25 panel.

If our witnesses could answer the 1 2 following questions. Did you prepare or assist in the preparation of the exhibits listed in the 3 hearing program including the application, its 4 associated exhibits, the affidavit of publication, 5 the responses to the Council's interrogatories, 6 7 and the signposting affidavit. 8 Mr. Burns? THE WITNESS (Burns): 9 MR. BALDWIN: Ms. Lemay? 10 11 THE WITNESS (Lemay): 12 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Candiello? 13 THE WITNESS (Candiello): 14 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson? THE WITNESS (Gustafson): 15 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Libertine? 16 17 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. 18 MR. BALDWIN: Do you have any corrections, amendments, modifications or 19 clarifications that you would like to make to any 20 of those exhibits at this time? 21 22 Mr. Burns? 23 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes. Under tab number 1 in the design drawings, drawing R1, in 24 the lower right-hand corner there's a box that 25

reads, site areas and volumes of earthwork. 1 2 you go down under stormwater volume, it says, proposed impervious area. 3 That should read 460 cubic feet. 4 Water quality standard volume one inch 5 should read 40 cubic feet. 6 7 And storage volume 6-inch 40 percent 8 void should read 410 cubic feet. 9 No other changes. MR. BALDWIN: 10 Thank you. 11 Ms. Lemay? 12 THE WITNESS (Lemay): Yes, I have two 13 corrections. The first correction is under Exhibit 3, the responses to interrogatories. 14 15 For question 13, in the response three 16 lines down it should say, data instead of date. 17 The sentence reads dropped calls and ineffective 18 attempts data instead of date, again. And my second correction is in the 19 application under tab six. We had used our old 20 21 standard using OPL, and I would like to make a 22 correction that the coverage maps are in neg 105 23 dB RSRP. 24 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Candiello, any

corrections or modifications?

25

1 THE WITNESS (Candiello): No, I do not. 2 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson. 3 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes, I have one amendment to the application under tab eleven 4 under the wetland inspection. A follow-up vernal 5 pool inspect was conducted on April 30th yesterday 6 to determine presence or absence of obligate 7 8 vernal pool breeding species in the 2018 calendar 9 year. It was determined that spotted 10 salamander was currently utilizing wetland two, 11 the singular vernal pool located in proximity to 12 the project. Only one egg mass was observed 13 within the pool during that inspection. 14 15 Thank you. MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Libertine? 16 17 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I have no corrections at this time. 18 MR. BALDWIN: And with those 19 20 corrections, amendments and modifications is the information contained in those exhibits true and 21 22 accurate to the best of your knowledge? 23 Mr. Burns? THE WITNESS (Burns): 24 25 MR. BALDWIN: Ms. Lemay?

1	THE WITNESS (Lemay): Yes.
2	MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Candiello?
3	THE WITNESS (Candiello): Yes.
4	MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson?
5	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes.
6	MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Libertine?
7	THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes.
8	MR. BALDWIN: And do you adopt the
9	information contained in those exhibits as
10	corrected and amended as your testimony in this
11	proceeding?
12	Mr. Burns?
13	THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes.
14	MR. BALDWIN: Ms. Lemay?
15	THE WITNESS (Lemay): Yes.
16	MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Candiello?
17	THE WITNESS (Candiello): Yes.
18	MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson?
19	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes.
20	MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Libertine?
21	THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes.
22	MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman, I offer them
23	as full exhibits.
24	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Just as an
25	aside, someday somebody will explain why most of

these corrections have to be done at the 11th 1 2 I understand some things -- you don't have to answer that. It would just save us from trying 3 to go back and forth between -- okay. 4 We'll now go to cross-examination 5 starting with Mr. Mercier, our siting analyst. 6 7 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. 8 I just have a couple of follow-ups on 9 the corrections. Mr. Burns, I think you said 460 cubic feet of impervious surface? 10 11 THE WITNESS (Burns): Correct. 12 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Does that just represent the pads, or other things in the 13 compound? Or are there others? 14 15 THE WITNESS (Burns): It represents the concrete pads in the compound, the steel platform 16 17 transformer, and the tower at the base of the tower itself. 18 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. 19 And 20 Mr. Gustafson. Regarding the spotted salamander 21 is that a state listed species? 22 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): No, it is not. 23 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. And I just had a couple other questions regarding the field 24 review today. And when we were out at the site 25

there was the -- as shown on the map, the existing town communication tower. And I believe it was stated that two antennas would be transferred over from the tower. Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Are there other antennas on the tower? And if so, what would happen to those besides the two whips that are going to be transferred? Are there other whip antennas?

THE WITNESS (Burns): There's other whip antennas on the tower. I do not know what the Town has in store for those.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. So it is unknown whether that tower will be dismantled?

THE WITNESS (Burns): The application, once our tower is up and their antennas are switched over, that tower is coming down.

MR. MERCIER: Okay.

THE WITNESS (Candiello): Just to add to that, our lease agreement with the Town requires that we dismantle that tower and return it to the Town for holding, and any equipment that's not transferred would also be returned to the Town as well. So --

1 MR. MERCIER: Okay. I just wanted to 2 confirm that the other antennas will not be relocated on the tower, just the two whips at this 3 point? 4 THE WITNESS (Candiello): Correct. 5 6 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. 7 One other thing that was mentioned at 8 the field review had to do with the 35-kilowatt 9 generator as shown on the plans, but I think I saw a battery also. Is there a battery and a 10 generator at this site? 11 12 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That is correct, and that's our standard design. 13 battery handles the electricity in between the 14 15 disruption from commercial power to emergency power to maintain continuous electricity flow to 16 17 the site. 18 MR. MERCIER: Okay. So the generator is 19 the primary source of power? THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Correct. 20 21 generator charges the batteries and the batteries feed the cell site. 22 23 MR. MERCIER: Okay. So the generator continuously charges the battery? 24 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Correct. 25

MR. MERCIER: I understand you have a shared emergency power system here. Is the Town hooking up at the battery level, or the generator level?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): They'll be hooked up to our -- our PPC. I'll defer to the engineer on that on exactly how they'll be wired in. I can't speak to that specifically, but they will be sharing our generator for emergency power purposes. I -- I don't believe that they would be tying into our batteries as well.

MR. MERCIER: Okay.

THE WITNESS (Burns): My understanding is they're tying directly into the generator.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you. Just a couple other questions I had. You know, I understand on page 16 of the application it stated that you submitted a request to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Have they ever responded, or are they just doing the normal we're not going to respond and follow the typical procedure?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That's correct. The latter is correct, their typical lack of response.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you. Did the State

Historic Preservation Office ever comment on your submittal?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): No, they have not. We have not submitted formally to the SHPO.

Just as a matter of getting it on the record, we spoke in the last docket in Cromwell to this. Verizon has a protocol in place where they do not initiate the National Environmental Policy Act consultations or compliance program until they're at a point where they're confident that the tower has a relatively good chance of moving forward, but particularly they're more concerned to make sure that things don't change during the siting or zoning process.

So it's -- we're probably talking, providing things move forward positively here, they probably will not initiate that for another 30 to 60 days. It's just their policy.

So what we have been doing is reviewing existing historic data that both the SHPO maintains so that we can get an understanding of whether or not we may have potential conflicts in -- in the event that we would have that potential.

We don't have that here. There are no

resources within more than a half-mile in terms of national register sites, or even state listed sites. We would then probably do an informal consultation. So we can at least respond to you folks with an idea of whether or not we're going to have to do some type of mitigation.

MR. MERCIER: Now that you've mentioned the National Environmental Policy Act procedure, is this site within the Last Green Valley Heritage Corridor?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): It is. The

Last Green Valley is actually the current name of
what was formerly known as Quinnebog and Shetucket
Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor and that
was established in the mid-nineties, but recently
renamed in 2014. And it involves about -- I want
to say 26. I have it in my notes here -- 26

Connecticut municipalities.

Lebanon is about in the southern end of that. It goes all the way into the Massachusetts border, and beyond there are actually 25, or 23 municipalities in Massachusetts that are also part of that.

MR. MERCIER: Now being Lebanon, the sites within the heritage corridor, is there any

other type of analysis you have to do specific to the corridor manager or the National Park Service?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): No, it's not.

It's -- the National Park Service is actually a consulting party, but they don't manage this particular program. And the program itself doesn't inhibit any private property rights.

But to your point we don't have necessarily to go through any additional federal or even state regulatory reviews, but the idea of the national heritage corridor is to combine or to balance out the heritage conservation recreational opportunities and economic development.

and as Mr. Chester had indicated earlier, one of the heritage conservation programs in place here is the farmland preservation which we're surrounded by. I do as a matter of course take a look at what the recreational opportunities are in the area and can certainly speak to those and what impact, or in this case, no impact to those.

We have a few state parks. We have the airline trail as well that runs through Lebanon. So there are several open space and state forest areas that are used by the public, but we don't

have any visibility from any of those areas.

MR. MERCIER: Besides recreational, do
they identify certain historic sites or other
types of cultural features? And if so, would this
tower be visible for those and somehow impact the
values of those resources?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's a yes and a no answer in this case. Yes, they do. It's a consortium. It's basically volunteers who will work within the communities to try to establish those areas or points of interest.

Certainly, although it's not listed, per se, I would think that the town green which is just to our north of where we are now is certainly a well-known resource. There we did take a very hard look at that when we did our balloon float back over a year ago.

There are some areas on the west side of the green, that looking between a few homes you would have a very fleeting glimpse just above the trees. And I think that's represented in the visibilty report.

I can tell you those exact numbers, but for the most part the visibility does not really extend into the center of town, but those views

are actually represented by views one through three on the pullout map, behind tab nine in the application.

I will say that that area of visibility, the footprint we've shown up there is quite generous, or I guess I would use the word "conservative" in the sense that we basically all -- we just included everything along the green as a potential, depending on where you're standing. But having -- I actually walked the area when we had the balloon in the air and we had a perfect day for it.

I think it's probably over predicting what is there, and certainly you can see the characteristics of the views in photos one through three.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you. You know looking at some of your photos I know you flew two balloons, one to represent the whip antennas and obviously it's not discernible at some distances.

In general, for these two whips is there a certain distance away from the tower where, you know, it becomes almost invisible, like a half mile or anything of that nature, a quarter mile?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah,

generally a quarter-mile is about the rule of thumb. There may be a few spots where it extends a little bit more, but typically a quarter mile or less is where you -- and you'd have to have a pretty good set of eyes at a quarter mile.

I know for myself I need binoculars when I'm looking for whips at the distance. But yeah, I'd say as a general rule of thumb I would use a quarter mile.

MR. MERCIER: The tower is just galvanized steel. Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes.

MR. MERCIER: It's not painted or anything? Okay. I just had one other question that had to do with the coverage maps.

In tab 6, the 700 megahertz. I was looking at this as an extremely large area that the site covers. And I'm just curious. I see down below south of Route 2 there's some sporadic, non-connected coverage to the main cell coverage, I'll call it.

Is that new coverage down south of Route 2 by the Colchester east site? Would that connect back to this site, this proposed cell site? Or is that just kind of once they optimize it, it's not

1 going to come into play as actual real service 2 from this site? THE WITNESS (Lemay): It probably 3 wouldn't come into play. Your cellphone would 4 most likely connect to the towers surrounding that 5 more than it would connect to this proposed site. 6 7 So --MR. MERCIER: No, I know. 8 I think in 9 the interrogatories, or maybe it was in the application you gave a square mile accounting of 10 what the site would cover. I was just wondering 11 12 if that includes all this purple shaded area, bright purple? 13 14 THE WITNESS (Lemay): Yes. 15 MR. MERCIER: Okay. So in reality the cell site would probably cover a little bit less? 16 17 THE WITNESS (Lemay): Correct. 18 MR. MERCIER: Okay. I have no other 19 questions. Thank you. 20 THE CHAIRMAN: I'll now go to questions from the members of the Council. 21 22 Senator Murphy? 23 SEN. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 24 Just a few things. Mr. Libertine, if the Town goes up 25

20 feet, any appreciable difference in the view?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Well, at

another 20 feet we'd start to open up some further

distant views. There's some fairly consistent

rolling hills as we get out from the immediate

area of the site.

So I'd say, yeah. If another 20 feet came into play we would start to break the treeline from some of the areas.

And again, I'd point you to the map behind tab nine at the end of the visibility report. Essentially if we were to look to the south southwest where the viewpoint number 22 is shown, I think a 20-foot increase would probably open it up along that entire road.

Similarly, I think a 20-foot increase would push things to the northeast towards the green where you would start to see it well above the tree line. We're probably talking 15 or 20 feet above the treeline, as opposed to at the treeline. So yeah, when we start talking about 20 feet that typically starts to open views up.

SEN. MURPHY: For viewshed purposes, this is probably the height it should be at?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): I'd say, yeah.

1 150 is a pretty good sized tower. And again, 2 we've got pretty good topography here. So there's areas where it's nearly or just about invisible, 3 but some of those higher points where you have 4 that vista you see across the -- the valleys and 5 are able to see it eclipse the tree. 6 7 I would agree. I'd say at 150 is a 8 pretty good -- pretty good height. 9 SEN. MURPHY: Curiosity. This is 10 probably for you, Mr. Baldwin. 11 The arrangement for the Town to go on 12 moving its whips over and sharing generators and what have you, is that done by a separate 13 agreement other than this lease that's before us? 14 15 How do you work that? THE WITNESS (Candiello): It was 16 17 negotiated as part of the -- of the lease for the 18 site as a paragraph in the lease that addresses 19 that. 20 SEN. MURPHY: Okay. Well, I guess I 21 didn't find it, because I looked for it -- but I 22 think I'll look again. 23 And I probably answered my own question

when I came up here today, but the facility at 16

Waterman Road, which I did a field review with

24

25

1 Mr. Mercier a long time ago, how far is that from 2 this tower as the bird, the crow flies, if you 3 know? MR. BALDWIN: I'm sorry. 4 Senator Murphy, which tower site was that? 5 SEN. MURPHY: It's not one of your 6 towers listed, but it's referred to in 7 interrogatory 16. It's a facility that's on, 8 9 like, nursery producing products that sends them out by truck. 10 THE WITNESS (Lemay): Yes. 11 I'm sorry. What was your question for that site? 12 SEN. MURPHY: How far is it from the 13 site of this tower as the crow flies? 14 Because 15 actually I thought it was closer, because I paid attention when I came up here today -- and I think 16 I'm wrong. It's hard to tell. 17 18 MR. BALDWIN: Can we take that as a 19 homework assignment. We'll have that scaled out, 20 Senator Murphy. 21 Thank you. 22 SEN. MURPHY: Sure. And I assume from 23 reading, the applicant and so forth, that your answer is going to come back that it really 24 25 doesn't do the job for you.

1 And so I assume the answer, that that 2 facility was not investigated at all as a possibility for the location of this tower, 3 whoever did the --4 5 THE WITNESS (Lemay): No. I would say no, because that site was looked at as a capacity 6 7 to site for that farm due to an exhausting sector 8 on Franklin North which faces that way. 9 So the primary purpose of designing that site was just to cover that farm. Again, a 10 capacity site, instead of where this one has more 11 12 of a dual purpose. It's a coverage and it's a capacity site. 13 SEN. MURPHY: I think, Mr. Chairman, 14 15 that does it for me -- at least right now. Thank 16 you. 17 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Edelson? 18 MR. EDELSON: 19 So just to get on the 20 record with regard to the location of the gravel 21 drive that you're going to put in, you're trying 22 to maneuver between two wetlands.

And when I look at the bottom of page 21 the numbers there kind of implied that it wasn't down the middle. It says 109 feet from one,

23

24

25

26 feet from the -- 109 feet from wetland one, although a portion is 26 feet away, and then 107 feet.

So the 26 feet made it sound like it was closer to wetland one than wetland two, but if you could put on the record what was the thinking about the location of the access drive?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): The purpose of pushing it closer to wetland one and pushing it farther away from wetland two is wetland two hosts in its interior a vernal pool resource.

And to get it outside of the 100-foot vernal pool envelope -- which is pretty much, you know, the non-disturb zone buffer for vernal pools as set up by Calhoun and Klemens -- in his BDP recommendations it needed to be within 26 feet of wetland one. So we are just outside that hundred-foot, which pushes us, obviously like you said, within 26 feet of wetland two.

MR. EDELSON: Was it also done to minimize the number of trees that would need to be taken down? Or it was really more the vernal pool and trying to keep that distance?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It was solely for keeping it outside the hundred-foot vernal

pool envelope buffer.

MR. EDELSON: Okay. In terms of the generator -- and we kind of had this discussion whenever it was when we were up in Cromwell a couple weeks go. If I've got my number correct -- I've just misplaced it -- with the thousand-gallon propane tank I think it indicated to be 132 hours of continuous operation of the backup generator.

At Cromwell I believe the number was sized for 76 hours. So I'm trying to understand -- or actually I think it was in the sixties.

But regardless I'd ask the question of, does Verizon have a standard? And I think the answer was no. So now I'm sort of trying to figure out why at one location do you have a certain number, and here we're almost twice as much -- which sounds good to me, but I'm trying to understand why it seems almost arbitrary?

THE WITNESS (Candiello): At the

Cromwell location that was a diesel -- diesel fuel

generator with a belly tank. Those are a much

lower profile. Here, this is a propane fuel

generator with a -- with a large thousand-gallon

tank attached to it.

So it's a sizable tank and different -the difference in fuel is a significant difference
in the amount of fuel that's stored there for the
generator.

MR. EDELSON: Again, it occurs to me that you'd be targeting a criteria. We want backup capability for so much time, not oh well, we bought this unit and the unit is going to dictate how much time we're going to have.

If I'm buying something I look for it to sort of fit certain criteria, but you're making it sound like it's, if we buy diesel this is the way the diesel comes. I mean, you can always put in another tank. I mean, tankage is available.

So again, I'll just make my same plea, because I don't think you're going to change it and we don't have a requirement, but 132 hours sounds a lot better to me for having what are becoming critical infrastructure for the Town.

They're going to have their, I guess, emergency system is going to be dependent on this tower once they take the other one down. That should be, to me, setting the criteria not just the fact that one, you know, what the tank size is should come from that.

1 And with that, Mr. Chairman, those are 2 my only questions. 3 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Hannon, you're on the other side 4 5 today. 6 MR. HANNON: It surprised me, too. But thank you. 7 8 I was going to start with Mr. Burns, but 9 I want to go back. A question dealing with wetland two. If I'm not mistaken, I think the 10 closest distance to wetland 2 is 70 feet to the 11 point of the driveway. Correct? 12 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Sixty-eight, I 13 believe, but yes to your point. 14 15 MR. HANNON: I just wanted to make sure that that's also part of the record. Now I'll go 16 17 back to Mr. Burns. Map R1, this is the map R1, 18 but also if you can get your figure on page 5 behind tab one. Just the questions are related. 19 20 Okay. So on map R1 the site area in 21 volumes of earthwork. There's a statement that 22 says approximately 60 cubic yards of fill will be 23 required for the site. The next sentence is,

compound and roadway will require approximately

200 cubic yards of clean, broken fill. How do you

24

25

get 60 cubic yards and 200 cubic yards?

THE WITNESS (Burns): The -- the site will be an excess fill site. I don't know if you noticed when we went out there it kind of drops down so that area would have to be filled, but the top four inches, six inches in the compound, four on the driveway will be the gravel. So the fill is actually the layer under the gravel to get us up to grade.

MR. HANNON: Okay. And then it talks about excavating approximately 590 cubic yards of material for the trench. I don't see any details in here about what the trench design would be.

I'm assuming that there's some crushed stone around the pipe itself and then you backfill.

So my question is, what do you do with the 500 cubic yards of material you're taking out? Where do you store it while you're trying to get the conduits in, the crushed stone in?

Because there's nothing on the plans that show where you might be doing any soil stockpiling.

THE WITNESS (Burns): Typically when we put together the D and M set we'd show a stockpile area. They'll putting that trenching in,

1 excavating and backfilling the same day. So that 2 nothing -- there's no open trench at the end of the day, but there will be times where we need to 3 stockpile and we will have a stockpile area 4 specified that's surrounded by a silt fence, all 5 of that. 6 7 MR. HANNON: And then going behind tab 8 one, page 5, under Roman numeral three, facilities, section F. The third sentence down, 9 the site improvements would require approximately 10 600 cubic yards of fill imported to this site, and 11 12 60 cubic yards. Is that just a typo? 13 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes. MR. HANNON: So it is just the 60 cubic 14 15 yards? 16 THE WITNESS (Burns): Correct. What's 17 on the drawings is correct. 18 MR. HANNON: Okay. On map SP-1. didn't see any notes at all in terms of the 19 surfaces of the compound area. Will it be gravel? 20 21 Is it going to be natural soil? THE WITNESS (Burns): It will be gravel. 22 23 MR. HANNON: About how deep? 24 THE WITNESS (Burns): In the compound we 25 go six inches deep with gravel.

MR. HANNON: Okay. And then looking here, based on conditions at the site today and where you're proposing to put in the trench what are the chances that the utility trench might be intercepting groundwater and diverting it away from wetland one?

THE WITNESS (Burns): I would say that there's a pretty good chance we're going to hit groundwater out there, but diverting it away from wetland one? I don't know the answer to that.

Where the utility trench is shown now is a bit schematic in nature, and going forward we could flop it to the other side of the road to get further away.

MR. HANNON: I think more of what my issue would be that when you're doing the D and M plan, assuming this goes forward, that's something I think that needs to be addressed.

THE WITNESS (Burns): Understood.

MR. HANNON: And then also based on site conditions today I'm wondering if you have to do any additional work for the road construction based on the soils that are out there, because I'm not sure that six inches of gravel is going to get you where you need to go with the weight of some

of this equipment coming out of the site.

THE WITNESS (Burns): We typically specify for the driveway a four-inch gravel surface, six inches of a base material and then ten inches of a subbase. More than likely what we try and do is -- is specify what's in place if it meets the spec, but if it doesn't then they are going to have to bring the material.

MR. HANNON: Okay. On map C1, sort of a general comment. This is my own personal issue on this. So it's not the siting Council's issue. But when you have construction areas going on near wetlands -- and I'm not sure how fine the material is here.

I'm not sure they're just going in with silt fence works. I think you'll probably need to be looking at something like silk socks or something along those lines to make sure you're not getting any erosion materials outside the boundaries of the structure. That's a D and M issue.

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): If I may respond to that? We do have a wetland and vernal protection plan in place with a monitor that will be on-site that can make calls in the field to

that point with finer materials or focused flows, or making its way to a silt fence. It appears that it's at a risk of impacting the wetland -- recommending and requiring additional reinforcement to those parameter controls.

MR. HANNON: Thank you. I'm not sure if this is a question that you can answer, but I'll ask it anyway. Behind tab ten on the November 8, 2017, letter that the department sent to Dean Gustafson.

Down towards the last bullet on that first page I think there's a period that's missing behind the i-n, because I think what they're saying is the exclusionary fencing must be at least 20 inches tall. And I'm assuming that's also part of the reason why the silt fence is being incorporated into the overall design.

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): I believe you're correct.

MR. HANNON: Staying behind tab ten.

And again, this may be a D and M issue, but the petroleum storage and spill prevention item in here talks about -- well, I-1 talks about fueling vehicles or machinery shall occur at a minimum 100 feet from wetlands or watercourses and take place

1 on an impervious path. 2 So I'm assuming that if you go with what's existing that's going to be some of the 3 existing asphalt that is somewhere on site, but 4 that's something that will probably need to be 5 delineated in the D and M plan. 6 7 I actually saw out of the site where 8 some of these things were on one of the photos, so I don't have to ask that question. 9 I believe that does it. 10 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Hannon. 11 12 Mr. Levesque? MR. LEVESQUE: Mr. Burns, the tower or 13 the foundation you built to accommodate it, can it 14 15 reach the height of the tower? THE WITNESS (Burns): Typically, yes. 16 17 It's a Verizon requirement, but yes, it's usually 18 designed for the extra 20 feet. MR. LEVESQUE: Does the lease with the 19 20 Town restrict the height of the tower, the 150? THE WITNESS (Candiello): 21 There is a 22 depiction of the tower at it's current height in 23 the lease. So a modification to that would -would require an amendment. 24

MR. LEVESQUE: A picture, but not a

25

1 written statement, is that what you're saying? 2 THE WITNESS (Candiello): Yeah, there's no restriction, but it would be a modification to 3 the lease exhibit that we would need to have them 4 5 agree to. 6 MR. LEVESQUE: And you would have to 7 make an application? 8 THE WITNESS (Candiello): Correct. 9 MR. LEVESQUE: How about Mr. Burns, do you know if you have to do any blasting for the 10 11 compound? 12 THE WITNESS (Burns): No geotech investigation has been done yet, but my gut says 13 by walking up there we're not going to hit a lot 14 of rock. So I don't think so. Every precaution 15 is taken. If we do hit rock we'll see if we can 16 17 excavate it without blasting. MR. LEVESQUE: For this site, or any 18 region, would you try to schedule it outside of 19 school session, the noise? 20 21 THE WITNESS (Burns): Oh, yes. 22 MR. LEVESQUE: Not with the drilling. 23 But does that make a lot of noise, by the blasting 24 rigs? THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes, if -- if we 25

1 have to blast, yes, but I don't see that as 2 happening. Thank you very much. 3 MR. LEVESQUE: THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Silvestri. 4 5 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 6 I want to go back to the emergency 7 generator for a moment. And the emergency 8 generator and propane tank are sized to provide both backup power to the Town's equipment and 9 Cellco's. We stated that before. 10 Could there be an instance where power 11 12 to the Town's equipment would be lost, but not Cellco's, such that the generator would feed the 13 Town's equipment or vice versa? 14 THE WITNESS (Candiello): I think if it 15 were to run out of fuel and not be refilled in 16 17 time, yes. 18 MR. SILVESTRI: Actually, my question was the Town has equipment. You folks have 19 20 equipment. If either one went out the generator 21 would go on. Is that correct? Or both of them 22 have to go out? 23 THE WITNESS (Candiello): If the commercial power fails to the property the 24 generator has an automatic transfer switch to turn 25

1 on. 2 MR. SILVESTRI: And if commercial power fails both would go out. Both the town and 3 Cellco's equipment? 4 THE WITNESS (Candiello): Would be 5 6 powered, correct. 7 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. 8 natural gas available to power the generator 9 instead of propane? THE WITNESS (Candiello): I do not know 10 that, sir. 11 12 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Not to the best of my knowledge. There's no natural gas in 13 14 town. 15 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. So that's going to lead to my next question for you. 16 17 Located to the south on York Road is the 18 Millstream Hunting Preserve. It's approximately 300 acres of land. And from what I've read, it's 19 20 apparently used by people that have gun permits 21 and people that don't have gun permits. 22 While I don't know the specifics on how 23 that land is situated, did you examine its proximity in relation to your propane tank? 24 THE WITNESS (Candiello): I don't 25

believe so, sir.

MR. SILVESTRI: Again, I'm not sure where everything is set up, but it might be something to look at to see if that tank really needs to be protected?

THE WITNESS (Candiello): Something we can definitely look into.

MR. SILVESTRI: If I could have you look back at Council interrogatory number eight. The response stated that two alternative tower locations were investigated on the subject property and subsequently rejected. The site schematic in attachment one to the interrogatory response depicts the locations.

If you look at that schematic, right in the middle is the words "alternate one driveway," and we were kind of standing on the hill very close to that.

Could that area be used to the south of those words for the location of the cell tower?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): While that location is currently open it is actively used by the high school's agricultural program, and siting a facility there would impede their use of those areas.

1 THE WITNESS (Libertine): But accessing 2 through that field -- are you -- just for clarification, are you asking if the ultimate 3 location --4 The ultimate location of 5 MR. SILVESTRI: the cell tower. We were standing on the hill, and 6 7 looking straight ahead was where the access road 8 was laid out. But if you look to the left of 9 where we were standing you have an open area. That's -- I'm questioning if it could be an 10 alternate? 11 12 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That little tiered pad they had up there? 13 14 MR. SILVESTRI: Exactly, yeah. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yeah. 15 Again, that's an area they use actively. So it would 16 17 impede there, their use of those areas. 18 MR. SILVESTRI: All right. Stay with that drawing, if you will. And it also goes back 19 to the application in section eight on page 2. 20 Is there room to install this tower 21 22 between the existing lattice tower for the Town 23 and the garage building near where we were gathered today? 24 25 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): To answer your question, yes, there is room. That location
was -- all locations along the total of that slope
were evaluated during the original process and
were subsequently eliminated.

Part of the process on moving to the location we are currently proposing was the benefit of pushing it away from both the school facility and the recreational facilities, and added -- are minimizing the visual impacts associated with those two pieces of infrastructure.

MR. SILVESTRI: A visual impact for the compound? For the tower?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): For the tower and compound.

MR. SILVESTRI: I might come back to that in a moment. Let me hold my other thought on that.

Moving on in my list, it's my understanding that Lyman Memorial High School has a very large agricultural program. Was any consideration given to designing a silo instead of a traditional cell tower to kind of blend in with the agricultural purpose of the school?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yeah, it -- it

wasn't considered seriously here only because of the height that we needed. Height is really the factor.

I'd say from my perspective keeping things in relative context, if we had a tower at the 80 to 90-foot level that probably would have been something we would have had to take a hard look at knowing that the Council may have asked that question and would want to know why we wouldn't do it.

Here when we're talking about 150 feet, that's for this area. I think if we were in the Midwest that might work, but here 150 feet, that would be one heck of a -- and it would be tall and it would be wide. It would be about 20 feet in diameter or so to accommodate these arrays.

So I think that might start to work against what we might ultimately be trying to do to make it blend in. It might just do the opposite at that type of height. So height was really the restrictive factor here first. We also have the issue of the town antennas.

They certainly -- the whips could certainly be on top of a silo, but again at that scale I think that we just really didn't want to

go down that road just because of the height.

MR. SILVESTRI: Just to satisfy my thought process on the visual aspect of it, any consideration for a watchtower or a fire tower?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Again, no.

I've been a big proponent of looking into those in the right context. Typically if we were on a remote hill and we were, again just eclipsing the trees or maybe even a little bit, 20 feet above the treeline, I think it would work really well and contextually it would be great.

Here, again at 150 feet it just seemed to be a little bit just out of scale for that type of an option. When we get to that height, anything above, you know, 130 feet typically -- unless you have an opportunity to do a tree, which again we really don't here just because of the mix of the existing forest around it at the height above the treeline.

My personal opinion is a slim pole is the way to go because it's going to be about the least obtrusive when you get to those type of heights. But certainly in the right setting I would love to see some type of a fire tower. It was certainly part of the heritage of Connecticut.

MR. SILVESTRI: The last question I have is on the visual aspect of it. And you mentioned a slim pole. Any consideration to a -- I don't know what you call it -- a unipole or a flagpole without a flag?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): I'm going to let -- I think that's probably an RF issue more than anything else.

But from my aesthetic standpoint I -- I like the idea of the unipoles. If you can do internal arrays they certainly maintain -- or limit the -- the actual overall top of the tower's impact.

But what we -- what I have found, and I'll let Kelly speak to this because she's certainly more -- it's her bailiwick, but my experience has been when we start looking at unipoles, we typically have to go up to accommodate multiple carriers. So that's always that balancing act as well.

THE WITNESS (Lemay): For this design I would not want to do a flushmount antenna just like normal designs, because it really needs further advancements and further designs.

We really need the platform because it

really allows us to achieve the specific azimuths that we want and we want to make modifications that way. So for the particular design I would not want to flushmount the antennas. It would be very difficult. It would make it harder to achieve.

We like to have the antennas at a certain spacing, and with that we wouldn't be able to achieve that spacing which would have issues with our LIMO. So I would like to keep it like this. It would not be ideal to have flushmount antennas.

MR. SILVESTRI: Would a flushmount also impede other potential carriers from coming onto that pole?

THE WITNESS (Lemay): Yes.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, both.

Looking at the access road, and again viewing it from where we stood at the top of the hill, we're looking down towards the proposed access road. And the road kind of bends to the right first before it then circles around and goes back to where the proposed compound would be.

Would moving that slightly more to the

left give you more of a buffer than the 26 feet from wetland one?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It would. One of the considerations when we proposed the routing of this access road was to keep it out of the agricultural classrooms usages of that area.

So by putting it on the very outside of their cleared areas, you know, within that 26 feet of wetland one we minimized the impacts to the areas they use. So that was the thought process behind that tight to wetland one on the edges.

MR. SILVESTRI: Staying again with the access road, it will go downhill to some degree.

I guess, even with -- Mr. Burns, what you mentioned, whatever type of fill that you're going to put it there.

What's the prediction for stormwater runoff? We mentioned groundwater before, but for stormwater runoff and how that might affect either of the two wetlands?

THE WITNESS (Burns): The design of the access drive will maintain the existing drainage patterns as much as possible. There will be some areas that, with the fill, may cut off. It's a fairly flat area so we knew we were going to be

1 slowed down and may -- not trapped, but give you a 2 path of the water along the toe of slope. In addition, the road itself is gravel 3 which tends to be permeable. So any stormwater 4 from that would -- would trickle into the ground 5 that way. So I don't -- it's not that big of an 6 area as well that I think it would affect. 7 8 MR. SILVESTRI: When you mentioned 9 trenches before when you were discussing with Mr. Hannon it was only trenches to put in the road 10 then. You're not looking at any type of 11 12 perforated pipe or anything like that underneath 13 the road. 14 Is that correct? 15 THE WITNESS (Burns): That's correct. 16 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Last question I 17 have for you. How many trees are anticipated to 18 be removed? THE WITNESS (Burns): 19 Twelve. 20 MR. SILVESTRI: And that's for both the 21 access road and the compound? 22 THE WITNESS (Burns): Correct. 23 MR. SILVESTRI: That's all I have for now, Mr. Chairman. 24 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Harder? 25

1 MR. HARDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2 First, I had a point of clarification just from the correction Mr. Burns gave us on the 3 4 stormwater volume. You mentioned the value for the proposed impervious area should be 400 and 5 some cubic feet. 6 7 Should that be square feet, or are we 8 talking about something other than an area? did I misunderstand? 9 THE WITNESS (Burns): It's square feet. 10 11 MR. HARDER: Okay. So the correct 12 number is what you meant, 400 and some square 13 feet. 14 THE WITNESS (Burns): Square feet, 15 correct. 16 MR. HARDER: Okay. Thank you. 17 The only, I guess, significant issue I have concerns one of the issues raised by 18 Mr. Silvestri and that is the alternatives that 19 were evaluated. I guess a couple preliminary 20 questions first. How tall is the existing tower 21 22 that the Town uses out there? 23 THE WITNESS (Candiello): Approximately 24 80 feet. 25 MR. HARDER: Eighty?

THE WITNESS (Candiello): Yes.

MR. HARDER: Okay. Thank you. And I guess referring again to question number eight in the response to interrogatories, you mentioned for alternative one, the first two reasons that that site was rejected was proximity to the recreational fields and the lack of screening to the high school.

Why are those real issues? Why are those problems in terms of, you know the use of the athletic fields and I guess the educational experience for the students and anyone in school?

THE WITNESS (Candiello): Yeah, in putting the tower where it is currently proposed removes it from the other areas of the property that are already being used to avoid any interference for future expansions.

Near that where some of the vehicles were parked there, there was an orchard that was developed, and there's some other areas there that, you know, they want to maintain for any future, you know, projects or -- or plans they might have?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): And if I may?

You know, to your question from a visual

standpoint, that was at a request from personnel from the Town and the school. So that's -- that's really where the driving force came from.

MR. HARDER: Right. Understood. I guess I'm skeptical that those are significant enough reasons to avoid those areas and put the facility where it's proposed, especially running the access road right down -- I mean, technically it's not wetland, but as we saw today it meets probably most people's definition of a wetland.

It's mucky and it's wet. And it would be, I mean, you're talking about filling it with an access road. The proximity to the vernal pool and to the other closer wetland is a concern.

You know, concerns about proximity to the athletic fields to me don't seem to be that legitimate a reason, I guess, considering that there's a wind power generator out front smack in, you know, in the middle of the athletic fields out in front of the school.

You've got an existing tower there that, you know, that sticks up above the treeline to some extent. Granted, it's not as high as the proposed tower. And especially if you're going to be replacing the existing tower, I guess, I'm very

skeptical that locating it out in the middle of the woods where you've got to take some trees down and put the access road through where it's proposed -- even if the tower was not put where the existing tower is located this is a huge piece of property.

There's other -- other pieces to me where, again assuming that the effects of athletic activities and school activities, you know, just wouldn't be that great. Visually, sure it's an issue.

You know, I think about urban situations where, you know, towers and other facilities are put much closer to schools and other, you know, residential facilities, residents, you know, houses and whatever. The expectation is that those people put up with those locations and life goes on.

And I don't know. I just don't see it as, you know, as an appropriate -- the proposed location as an appropriate place, but anyway that's my opinion at this point.

So that's really the only question I have, the only issue I had, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm getting to enjoy going after my colleague, Mr.

Silvestri, who asked most of my questions -- but I

do have a couple that relate basically to the

propane fuel tank.

I'm looking at diagram A1 and I have a couple questions.

Now it's been told to me, and I'll will put this out here, that weather can impact the regulators on propane fuel tanks. Does Verizon, or when their maintenance people go out there, do they check on this?

Cold weather can freeze them and, I guess, hot weather can expand the regulator.

THE WITNESS (Candiello): So we do an annual maintenance, full maintenance on all of our generators at all of our cell sites. And in addition to that it's a weekly cycling that we -- we do.

And if the generator failed to cycle on a particular week, if there was an issue with the regulator like you're suggesting, we would be notified through an alarm that there was -- the generator failed to cycle that week and there was a problem that we would have to go look at it.

MR. LYNCH: So whosever inspecting them 1 2 finds a fault, would they be able to correct it right there and then? Or would they have to call 3 somebody? 4 THE WITNESS (Candiello): I think it 5 depends on what the fault is. I think in most --6 7 in most situations, you know, a plumbing company 8 or a generator company would be able to repair it. 9 MR. LYNCH: And also regarding the tank, I know the manufacturers of the tank -- and in 10 11 some towns -- I didn't see it in the town 12 regulations for Lebanon -- have a setback for any 13 facility for a propane tank. Is that being 14 applied here? THE WITNESS (Candiello): 15 It is a ten-foot spark radius -- is what we utilize. 16 17 MR. LYNCH: Is that the safe zone, ten feet for a thousand gallon tank? 18 THE WITNESS (Candiello): Yes. 19 MR. LYNCH: And also -- and at our last 20 21 hearing -- I think it was brought up before --Mr. Befera mentioned that fuel cells could not be 22 23 used with propane -- although natural gas -- at a Since then I objected and they are used as

backup facilities on cell sites.

24

25

I was just wondering if a fuel cell could be implemented here rather than, you know, with a generator rather than a propane tank?

THE WITNESS (Candiello): I would have to investigate that, Mr. Lynch. I don't -- it's not something that we propose as part of our standards.

MR. LYNCH: I've asked this question.

Mr. Baldwin can tell you. I have asked this

question all the time, but I do know that some -
it may not be Verizon's -- that some telco

facilities do use fuel cells as a backup. Some

even use it as, you know, a baseload.

THE WITNESS (Candiello): I can't speak to what our competitors utilize at their cell sites.

MR. LYNCH: Ms. Lemay, I don't have any questions for you.

But this is an aside from this actual hearing -- but in the proposed merger for T-Mobile and Sprint they talked about one of the reasons for it is for the upcoming, you know, federal, you know, spectrum auction.

And my question is, when is it and what frequencies are being auctioned off? You know,

1 just in general. If you do know, that's fine. Ιf 2 you don't, that's fine too. I'm not sure any of our 3 MR. BALDWIN: witnesses can answer that question, Mr. Lynch. 4 I'm not sure our witnesses can answer that 5 6 question at this point. 7 MR. LYNCH: You know, I figured I would 8 just throw it out. If someone could, they could. 9 Those are my questions, Mr. Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. 10 Just a couple. One is on the zoning. It's the first 11 12 time I've seen residential agriculture. Do you 13 know what the density or lot size is? I know the gentleman in the back of the 14 15 room -- a two-acre zone? And any other providers expressed any interest in colocating? 16 17 THE WITNESS (Candiello): No. No, sir. 18 THE CHAIRMAN: If they were to, how many? What would be the number that could 19 theoretically colocate? 20 21 THE WITNESS (Candiello): The tower is 22 planning to accommodate four carriers. So three 23 additional to Verizon. 24 Okay. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. If the tower were to be moved as 25

suggested by, I guess, maybe a couple of the members of the Council, would that require renegotiating the lease with the Town and school?

THE WITNESS (Candiello): Yes, it would.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

I want to support your use of the shared generator. We've been struggling to get some interest in doing that. So we welcome your and the Town's willingness to do that. We think that makes a lot of sense.

Just, I guess, we want to get into the record Mr. Libertine's favorite question is -- you want to describe the balloon flight and the diameter of the string you used, and the amount of pounds per, whatever it is, cubic inch of inflatable helium, and whether or not that will have an adverse impact on -- go ahead?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): We have had an approximately four-foot diameter red weather balloon floating since about quarter to eight this morning. It will be up until 6 p.m. tonight.

And actually, it was very calm this morning. The windiest that we'd seen it was towards the second half of the field review.

But as of leaving the site we have not

lost a balloon and we've had beautiful blue skies with great visibility today. So overall it's been a very good day for being able to view that.

So if you've had a chance to drive some of the road that surrounds the property -- I had a chance before I came up to the site and it was very much similar to what's presented in our report.

The one thing I will say is because it was bouncing around a little bit, some of the further distant views that are just the treeline I was not able to see today, but it is documented in the report where some of those views are.

I'm sorry. It was also tethered

150 feet. So the bottom of the balloon

represented the top of the main tower. And of

course, we did not fly a second balloon today to

demonstrate the top of the antennas, but that is

represented in the report.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Mr. Baldwin?

MR. BALDWIN: We were able to come up with that distance for Senator Murphy and thought if we had a moment before the break we could do that.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: You want to let us know? 2 MR. BALDWIN: Ms. Lemay, can you respond 3 to that question? THE WITNESS (Lemay): Sure. 4 The proposed small-cell facility at Lebanon Prides 5 Corner is approximately 1.5 miles from the 6 proposed Lebanon center site. 7 8 SEN. MURPHY: And they were approached, 9 or were they not interested in a tower of this type, if anyone on the panel knows? 10 11 THE WITNESS (Lemay): Again, this site 12 was very specific for the 350-acre farm parcel and, this was too far to the south for this 13 particular search area. 14 15 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lynch? 16 MR. LYNCH: Just one simple comment, 17 Mr. Chairman. I would like to support 18 Mr. Silvestri's idea or comment on protecting that propane tank. A long-gun projectile could do some 19 20 serious damage to the tank. THE CHAIRMAN: It makes a lot of sense. 21 I think I also saw -- not too far, a pistol, an 22 23 NRA pistol range or something. I guess, pistols don't have quite the distance, but yes. 24 I support 25 that.

Yes?

MR. MERCIER: Thank you. I just had a quick follow-up that had to do with the DEEP letter in tab ten. In just reading through it at the end, it basically said, you know, they identified eastern box turtle, but then at the end they did mention two other species, wood and spotted turtles.

Are those also located at the site? Or is that just maybe an error on their part? That was the Dawn McKay Letter of November 8th.

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): She specifies in her letter that any confirmed sitings of those turtles that you mentioned, wood or box spotted turtles should be recorded.

Without being able to speak for this location in the state -- there's not generally a lot of records that the NEB had. So my assumption is that that is a catchall for a species that could be in this area of the state and is not documented. So to my feeling, that's probably a catchall statement.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you.

And one other question I had, had to do with the plan platforms proposed. I saw that it

was a square platform and I really haven't seen one of those since Docket 405. And volume is down, so I was wondering why are you using that here at this location?

THE WITNESS (Burns): The square platform is to accommodate the azimuths. They are -- a triangle platform wouldn't work because the azimuths are too close together from an angle standpoint and they'd be shooting into each other. So we had a square platform in Cromwell as well, I believe. But --

MR. MERCIER: Is this a new thing going forward? Or are those two, Cromwell and this one, unique cases?

THE WITNESS (Burns): It's site dependent depending on what, what areas they need to cover. They are not typical, but they're not atypical.

MR. MERCIER: Is there a certain direction you're trying to prevent the coverage from going to, I guess? Is that what's it's for?

THE WITNESS (Lemay): It's dependent on where I would like to face the majority of the coverage. So basically I orient them where I want the coverage to go, but that's why. And to his

point, we can't utilize a triangular platform for those specific azimuths. MR. MERCIER: All right. So it's like more control at this site. THE WITNESS (Lemay): Just depending on where the woods are, where the town center is and those kind of factors that go into determining the azimuth. MR. MERCIER: All right. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: The Council will now recess until 6:30, at which time we will commence the public comment portion of this hearing. (Whereupon, the above proceedings were concluded at 4:12 p.m.)

1 CERTIFICATE 2 I hereby certify that the foregoing 66 3 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original verbatim notes taken 4 of the Regular Hearing in Re: DOCKET NO. 482, APPLICATION FROM CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL 5 COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE 6 CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF A TELECOMMUNICATION FACILITY LOCATED AT 917 EXETER ROAD IN LEBANON, CONNECTICUT, which was held 7 before ROBIN STEIN, Chairman, at the Lebanon Fire 8 Safety Complex, Community Hall, 23 Goshen Hill Road, Lebanon, Connecticut, May 1, 2018. 9 10 11 12 13 14 Robert G. Dixon, CVR-M 857 Notary Public 15 A Plus Reporting Service 55 Whiting Street, Suite 1A 16 Plainville, CT 06062 My Commission Expires: 6/30/2020 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	INDEX		
2	WITNESSES		
3	Robert Burns	Page	11
4	Kelly Lemay		
5	Andrew Candiello		
6	Matthew Gustafson		
7	Michael Libertine		
8			
9			
10	EXAMINERS:		
11	Mr. Baldwin	Page	11
12	Mr. Mercier	Page	16
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			