

**CERTIFIED  
COPY**

STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

FEASIBILITY PROCEEDING  
PUBLIC HEARING RE:  
FP-ATT-083-211214 - New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC  
(AT&T) Request to Initiate Feasibility Proceeding for  
shared use of an existing facility located at 499 Mile  
Lane, Middletown, Connecticut.

DATE: FEBRUARY 17, 2022

TIME: 2:00 p.m.

PLACE: HELD VIA ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCING  
PLATFORM

Reporter: Theresa Bergstrand, CSR #406

A P P E A R A N C E S

SITING COUNCIL MEMBERS:

John Morissette, Member and Presiding Officer  
Kenneth Collette, Designee for Katie Dykes, Department  
of Energy and Environmental Protection  
Quat Nguyen, Designee for Marissa Paslick Gillett,  
Public Utilities Regulatory Authority  
Robert Silvestri  
Daniel P. Lynch, Jr.  
Louanne Cooley  
Mark Quinlan

MEMBERS OF STAFF:

Melanie Bachman, Executive Director, Staff Attorney  
Michael Perrone, Siting Analyst  
Lisa Fontaine, Fiscal Administrative Officer

NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS, PCS, (AT&T):

Christopher Fisher, Esq. - Cuddy & Feder, LLP  
Kristen Motel, Esq. - Cuddy & Feder, LLP  
Kelly Bettuchi, AT&T

1 (The hearing commenced at 2:00 p.m.)

2  
3 MR. MORISSETTE: Good afternoon, ladies and  
4 gentlemen. Can everyone hear me okay? Great. Thank  
5 you. Is the Court Reporter with us?

6 COURT REPORTER: Yes, I am.

7 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Just making sure.

8 This is remote public hearing is called to order  
9 this Thursday, February 17th, 2022 two at 2:00 p.m. My  
10 name is John Morissette, Member and Presiding Officer of  
11 the Connecticut Siting Council. Other members of the  
12 counsel are Kenneth Collette, designee for Commissioner  
13 Katie Dykes of the Department of Energy and  
14 Environmental Protection, Quat Nguyen, Designee for  
15 Chairman Marissa Paslick Gillett of the Public Utilities  
16 Regulatory Group, Robert Silvestri, Louanne Cooley,  
17 Daniel P. Lynch, Junior, and Mark Quinlan. Members of  
18 the staff are Melanie Bachman, Executive Director and  
19 Staff Attorney; Michael Perrone, Siting Analyst; Lisa  
20 Fontaine, Physical Administrative Officer.

21 As everyone is aware, it is currently a statewide  
22 effort to prevent the spread of the coronavirus. This  
23 is why the Council is holding this remote public hearing  
24 and we ask for your patience. If you haven't done so  
25 already, I ask that everyone please mute their computer

1 audio and/or telephones, now.

2 This hearing is held pursuant to provisions of  
3 Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the  
4 Uniform Administrative Procedure Act upon a request from  
5 New Cingular Wireless, PCS, LLC, also known as AT&T, to  
6 initiate a feasibility proceeding for shared use of an  
7 existing tower located on at 499 Mile Lane in  
8 Middletown, Connecticut. This request was received by  
9 the Council on December 14th, 2021.

10 I would like to emphasize the purpose of this  
11 meeting, remote public hearing, is to determine if AT&T's  
12 proposed use of the existing tower facility is  
13 technically, legally, environmentally and economically  
14 feasible, and meets public safety concerns. The  
15 counsel's legal notice of the date and time of this  
16 remote public hearing was published in the New Haven  
17 Register on January 15th, 2022. On this Council's  
18 request, the requesting entity erected a sign along Mile  
19 Lane at the entrance of the existing tower site, so as  
20 to inform the public of the name of the requesting  
21 entity, the type of the facility, the remote public  
22 hearing date and contact information for the Council,  
23 including website and phone number.

24 As a reminder to all, off-the-record communication  
25 with a member of the Council or a member of the

1 Council's staff upon the merits of this feasibility  
2 proceeding request is prohibited by law. The requesting  
3 entity to New Cingular Wireless, PSC, LLC, also known as  
4 AT&T. Its representatives are Christopher Fisher,  
5 Esquire, Kristen Motel, Esquire of Cuddy and Feder, LLP.

6 We will proceed in accordance of the prepared  
7 agenda, a copy of which is available on the Council's  
8 web page, along with the record in this matter, the  
9 Public Hearing Notice, Instructions for Public Access to  
10 this Remote Public Hearing, and the Council's Citizens  
11 Guide to Siting Council Procedures. Interested persons  
12 may join any session of this public hearing to listen,  
13 but no public comments will be received during the 2:00  
14 p.m. evidentiary session. At the end of the evidentiary  
15 session, we will recess until 6:30 for a public comment  
16 session. Please be advised, that any person may be  
17 removed from the remote evidentiary session or the  
18 public comment session at the discretion of the Council.

19 At the 6:30 public comment session, is reserved for  
20 the public to make brief statements into the record. I  
21 wish to note that the requesting entity, parties and  
22 interveners, including the representatives, witnesses  
23 and members, are not allowed to participate in the  
24 public comment session. I also wish to note for those  
25 who are listening and for the benefits of your friends

1 and neighbors who are unable to join us for the remote  
2 public comment session, that you or they may send  
3 written statements to the Council within 30 days of the  
4 date hereof, either by mail or by e-mail and such  
5 written statements will be given the same weight as if  
6 spoken during the remote public comment session. A  
7 verbatim transcript of this remote public hearing will  
8 be posted on the Council's web page and deposited in  
9 Middletown City Clerk's Office for the convenience of  
10 the public.

11 The Council will take a 10 to 15 minute break at a  
12 convenient junction, about 3:30 p.m.

13 I wish to call your attention to those items in the  
14 hearing program, marked Roman Numeral 1B, items 1  
15 through 85. That is Roman Numeral 1B, items 1 through  
16 85 that the Council has administratively noticed.

17 Attorney Fisher or Attorney Motel?

18 MR. FISHER: No objection. Thank you.

19 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney Fisher. Good  
20 afternoon, by the way. Accordingly, the Council hereby  
21 administratively notices these items.

22 We will move onto the appearance of the requested  
23 entity, New Cingular Wireless, LLC. Will the requesting  
24 entity present its witnesses for the purposes of taking  
25 the oath. And Attorney Bachman will administrate the

1 oath. Attorney Fisher.

2 MR. FISHER: Yes. Good afternoon, and thank you.  
3 We have one witness listed on our hearing program, Ms.  
4 Kelly Wade Bettuchi of AT&T. We also have on standby,  
5 if needed for clarification, several of our witnesses in  
6 Docket 506. I would as Ms. Bettuchi be sworn.

7 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney Fisher.  
8 Attorney Bachman.

9 MR. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. Ms.  
10 Bettuchi, if you could please just raise your right  
11 hand.

12  
13 (Whereupon Witness Bettuchi was duly sworn in by  
14 Ms. Bachman.)

15  
16 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney Bachman.  
17 Attorney Fisher, please begin by verifying all exhibits  
18 by the appropriate sworn witnesses.

19 MR. FISHER: Certainly, and thank you. We have one  
20 item listed of importance, of administrative notice,  
21 it's all of the evidence and testimony already taken in  
22 Docket 506. I would ask the Council to take notice of  
23 all of these particular documents in this particular  
24 proceeding.

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, attorney Fisher. The

1 exhibits are hereby admitted.

2 MR. FISHER: Thank you. And I would start just,  
3 just in lead up to having the two items listed for  
4 identification verified. This is a rare proceeding. I  
5 think this is the second time the Feasibility Statute  
6 has been invoked in the State of Connecticut to my  
7 knowledge and on behalf of the Applicant, this is a  
8 unique application of it. In many ways we view it as a  
9 nonfeasibility proceeding, that is why Docket 506 is so  
10 important, I think, because it is so interrelated.

11 I would ask Ms. Bettuchi, the listed in hearing  
12 program under Roman Numeral Two, capital B1, refers to a  
13 document dated December 13th, 2001, which is a Notice of  
14 Feasibility proceeding. That document was prepared by  
15 our office on behalf of AT&T. Would you just verify for  
16 the Council that the information in that particular  
17 document was discussed by you and others in AT&T and the  
18 decision to invoke the statute made and that notice  
19 filed on AT&T's behalf?

20 MS. BETTUCHI: Certainly. Thank you. You know, as  
21 was stated earlier, the feasibility proceeding, you  
22 know, is something that is provided by the Legislature  
23 and State law to address tower sharing and, you know,  
24 avoid the unnecessary proliferation of towers. And as  
25 Attorney Fisher noted, you know, we rarely have actually



1 invoked this. In fact, AT&T has never invoked a  
2 proceeding like this before. You know, we certainly  
3 prefer to work on consent with all tower owners, and  
4 routinely negotiate agreements and, you know, seek to  
5 achieve colocation across the state. What we saw here  
6 was something that was very different. Insofar as that  
7 there was an existing tower, but AT&T does not believe  
8 that colocation on that existing tower is feasible, and  
9 we feel that way both for structural reasons, economic  
10 reasons and arguably most important, the City had some  
11 real concerns that they had brought to our attention  
12 about how important that particular tower was to their  
13 overall emergency services in the City of Middletown.

14 MR. FISHER: Yes, sorry, Ms. Bettuchi, so based on  
15 that, you made the decision on AT&T to invoke the  
16 Statute for the reasons listed in the notice we provided  
17 to the Council, is that correct?

18 MS. BETTUCHI: That is correct.

19 MR. FISHER: Okay. Thank you. And so I would ask  
20 that the Council accept the notice as invoking the  
21 feasibility statute for the purposes listed in the  
22 notice and that we are certainly available for  
23 cross-examination.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you Attorney Fisher, you  
25 also have another document, I believe it is the sign

1 posting.

2 MR. FISHER: Oh, yes. Yeah. In anticipation of  
3 this hearing we did have a notice sign posted and  
4 affidavit of the poster presented. Ms. Bettuchi, did  
5 you, under our supervision, have that notice sign  
6 erected at the site?

7 MS. BETTUCHI: We did.

8 MR. FISHER: So I would ask that that document also  
9 be accepted.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you Attorney  
11 Fisher. The exhibits are hereby admitted. We will now  
12 begin with cross-examination of the requested entity by  
13 the Council. We will start with Mr. Perrone, followed  
14 by Mr. Silvestri. Mr. Perrone?

15 MR. PERRONE: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. In Docket  
16 506, the City had expressed concerns about the cut over  
17 process, cutting over to a shared tower. My question  
18 is, based on your discussions with the AT&T team and the  
19 City, would there be any way to maintain a sufficient or  
20 workable continuity of service to satisfy the City's  
21 concerns while constructing a shared tower?

22 MS. BETTUCHI: Well, I certainly think that that's  
23 more at the discretion of the City and what they're,  
24 what the concerns are that they expressed to us. I  
25 would say that we know that there would be some

1 disruption, and our take away from our meetings with  
2 them, was that any disruption, at all, would be very  
3 detrimental to their system and not something they were  
4 willing to proceed with.

5 MR. PERRONE: Turning to page four of the Request  
6 to Initiate Feasibility Proceeding. Under Alternative  
7 Two, AT&T notes that these major economic costs are  
8 beyond AT&T's scope and can't be easily recovered by  
9 customer use or through agreement with the City, even if  
10 100 percent future colocation rents are collected by  
11 AT&T. Could you elaborate on, could you elaborate on  
12 how these costs are beyond AT&T's scope and how they  
13 cannot be easily recovered?

14 MS. BETTUCHI: Well I think the answer to that is  
15 that any build that we do needs to be economical. You  
16 know, we are obviously trying to build a network and  
17 reinforce a network across the entire state. And if any  
18 one particular site becomes so expensive that it  
19 jeopardizes opportunities in other locations, those are  
20 factors that we really do need to take into  
21 consideration.

22 MR. PERRONE: Also in Docket 506, I had asked  
23 Director Bartolotta about potential sway of microwave  
24 dishes on lattice towers versus monopoles. And Director  
25 Bartolotta had indicated that a lattice tower was

1 preferred for Town equipment to minimize the sway. And  
2 Mr. Hamm, the engineer, had concurred that monopoles  
3 tend to sway more. My question is, subsequent to that,  
4 have you had any further discussions with the City or  
5 the AT&T team that would indicate if a shared monopole  
6 is feasible for the City?

7 MS. BETTUCHI: We have not. And that is mainly due  
8 to the fact that the City has made it clear that they do  
9 not wish to cut over their system onto a new tower.

10 MR. PERRONE: And also, Docket 506 responds to  
11 Council interrogatory 16. AT&T and the City has  
12 considered relocating their proposed monopole to a  
13 different location on the City property, although the  
14 City had concerns about future uses. Do you have a  
15 rough estimate of the cost difference to relocate the  
16 monopole to a different location on the City property?

17 MS. BETTUCHI: We have not done a full analysis of  
18 that site because, frankly, we have not gotten a clear  
19 indication from the City that they would actually -- it  
20 is a hypothetical at this point, that they may be  
21 willing to do that. It certainly would be more  
22 expensive for us. We know that the distance would be a  
23 factor, and I would just refer back to some of the  
24 statements that were made by our design team relative to  
25 cost. But then there would also be additional costs

1 related to the process. We have gone through a process  
2 with the City already, where an application has been,  
3 has been reviewed by various departments within the  
4 City, including their Town Council, and so that process  
5 would need to start again. And so that would certainly  
6 also create additional cost.

7 MR. PERRONE: Also, as an update to a Docket 506  
8 question. Has AT&T received a response from Eversource  
9 regarding possible colocation on an existing or approved  
10 electric transmission structure?

11 MS. BETTUCHI: I don't have the answer to that.

12 MR. PERRONE: Okay.

13 MS. BETTUCHI: It may be something that we can ask  
14 Attorney Fisher, one of our standby.

15 MR. PERRONE: Perhaps we can get an answer at the  
16 break.

17 MR. FISHER: Certainly.

18 MR. PERRONE: Sure. I'll continue.

19 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you.

20 MR. PERRONE: Moving onto the AT&T Supplemental  
21 Submission in Docket 506, dated January 26th, 2022.  
22 There is the feasibility table and we have the row of  
23 the four AT&T costs and these costs are exclusive of  
24 AT&T's equipment, could you just give us a quick summary  
25 of what they do include?

1 MS. BETTUCHI: Let's see. I do know that that will  
2 include the typical site work that would be need to be  
3 done. It would include the erection of the monopole  
4 itself. Let's see. I apologize, I don't have that  
5 information in front of me right now. I am trying to  
6 find that. That information is usually provided, as it  
7 was in 506, by our site development team.

8 MR. PERRONE: Right.

9 MS. BETTUCHI: So I apologize that I don't have it,  
10 but I will do my best to pull that up before this ends.

11 MR. PERRONE: Okay.

12 MS. BETTUCHI: Thank you. I am sorry.

13 MR. PERRONE: That's fine. I'll move on. We also  
14 received comments from the Connecticut Airport  
15 Authority, dated January 19, 2022. So from a technical  
16 feasibility perspective, would AT&T ensure that its  
17 deployment of 5G would comply with FCC and FAA guidance  
18 related to air navigation?

19 MS. BETTUCHI: Yes, we would.

20 MR. PERRONE: And that would be true for any tower  
21 scenario?

22 MS. BETTUCHI: Correct.

23 MR. PERRONE: And this also is Docket 506,  
24 page two, Exhibit A of the original application. It  
25 says that AT&T is not proposing a feasibility proceeding

1 given the City's proprietary concerns with modifying and  
2 sharing the existing public safety tower. What are  
3 these proprietary concerns?

4 MS. BETTUCHI: That would be a question for the  
5 City, I am sorry.

6 MR. PERRONE: Okay. And the August 13th, 2021 City  
7 of Middletown Resolution, in Docket 506, refers to an  
8 annual lease total of \$54,000 per year for a new tower  
9 at the existing site. My question is, did AT&T and the  
10 City discuss an annual lease total for AT&T's collocation  
11 on the existing tower?

12 MS. BETTUCHI: We did not, because they were not  
13 interested enough -- we realized very early on that it  
14 was not feasible for us to collocate on that site.

15 MR. PERRONE: Also in Docket 506, Director  
16 Bartolotta had testified that AT&T expressed interest in  
17 collocating at the existing facility back in 2017, prior  
18 to the tower going up in 2018. And my question is, why  
19 did AT&T not follow through with its proposed collocation  
20 at the time the tower went up.

21 MS. BETTUCHI: Well, at the time there was a  
22 definite disconnect in terms of how quickly they needed  
23 to have their site in place. Certainly our process is  
24 very long, as I am sure you can imagine. It takes us a  
25 long time to not only get approvals through the City

1 and, you know, certainly make an application to the  
2 Siting Council, and I think at the end of the day the  
3 City just decided that they needed to move quickly  
4 because their need was greater than waiting for  
5 everything to fall into place.

6 MR. PERRONE: Also Docket 506, AT&T had testified  
7 that their search ring was established in August  
8 2018, was there an earlier search ring that prompted  
9 AT&T's interest in collocating prior to the tower  
10 construction?

11 MS. BETTUCHI: I believe that there was. In fact,  
12 I had been party to one of the conversations with the  
13 City, and we were looking to identify if there were some  
14 opportunities, and then there was a change in just the  
15 general plan and so then, you know, we stepped away for  
16 a while, and then we did have to come back. And that is  
17 when the search ring was officially filed. And that is  
18 where we, you know, that is when we begin our actual  
19 site, you know, site acquisition work.

20 MR. PERRONE: So you didn't have a formal search  
21 ring before the 2018 one?

22 MS. BETTUCHI: Not that I am aware of or can recall  
23 at this time.

24 MR. PERRONE: Okay. Could the City and AT&T  
25 coordinate on a construction schedule in the future for



1 a shared facility at a time when the City changes out  
2 its equipment?

3 MS. BETTUCHI: That would be hard to answer. You  
4 know, I think that would mean that we would not have  
5 anything in this location until the time they got to a  
6 point where they would want to do that, and we feel that  
7 there is a real need there for the community.

8 MR. PERRONE: So you are not aware of any upcoming  
9 maintenance change outs of equipment for the City?

10 MS. BETTUCHI: I am not, no. They have not shared  
11 that information with us.

12 MR. PERRONE: Okay. That is all I have for now.  
13 Thank you.

14 MS. BETTUCHI: Thank you.

15 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Perrone. We will  
16 now continue with cross-examination by Mr. Silvestri,  
17 followed by Mr. Nguyen. Mr. Silvestri.

18 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. And  
19 good afternoon, all. Ms. Bettuchi, much of the  
20 discussion in the December 13th, 2021 Memorandum  
21 regarding the feasibility of site colocations appeared  
22 centered on the following, number one, not being able to  
23 collocate on the municipal lattice tower; number two,  
24 not designating as, what I'll say, desirable for various  
25 reasons, a new multiuse lattice tower at the site; and

1 three, erecting a new shorter tower at the site adjacent  
2 to the existing municipal lattice tower to accomplish  
3 the needed coverage. So far am I correct?

4 MS. BETTUCHI: I believe that is correct.

5 MR. SILVESTRI: Anything that I missed?

6 MS. BETTUCHI: Not that I am aware of, no.

7 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. Are you  
8 satisfied that AT&T investigated all other possibilities  
9 for a tower or a shared tower in the area?

10 MS. BETTUCHI: I am.

11 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. What I am looking at is, and  
12 I think you might have answered this already with Mr.  
13 Perrone, would it be possible to locate a new tower  
14 south of, or perhaps southwest of, the existing  
15 municipal tower to minimize visual impacts?

16 MS. BETTUCHI: So I don't think it would  
17 necessarily minimize visual impacts. And I think we  
18 discussed this during the Docket 506. I think if you,  
19 you arguably run the risk of just introducing a tower  
20 into a new, a new subset of the community. You know, it  
21 will now be visible by, you will have the tower that is  
22 visible by, you know, the existing community, and now we  
23 will have another tower not too far from there that may  
24 impact other communities.

25 That being said, you know, the Council certainly

1 has the authority to make that suggestion and, you know,  
2 we would certainly, you know, work through that. I  
3 think that is part of the reason for the feasibility  
4 proceeding, was to ensure that we had all the facts in  
5 front of the Council, and to ensure that the City had an  
6 opportunity to be a party to the proceedings.

7 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you for your response.  
8 When you mentioned the word fact or facts, it kind of  
9 brings me up to my second question for you. Did you, or  
10 can you, refocus site exploration towards the center of  
11 the search ring? And I'd like to call your attention to  
12 our Administrative Notice List, item number 37 in  
13 particular, that talks about the replacement of wood  
14 structures with weathered steel structures on that  
15 transmission corridor. Did you have a chance to look at  
16 that?

17 MS. BETTUCHI: So I would just go back to, I think  
18 we established in the Docket 506 that we have explored  
19 from a technical and environmental impact standpoint  
20 everything that we think is possible in this area within  
21 that ring. And keeping in mind, you know, what  
22 available space the City is willing to potentially  
23 offer. So, I feel confident that we have explored our  
24 options at this point.

25 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. I bring that one up in

1 particular, because I believe in the proceedings for  
2 Docket 506 everything was referenced as wood structures  
3 for that transmission line, and they are no longer wood,  
4 they are weathered steel. And the concern that I  
5 believe I heard back with the proceedings for 506, is  
6 that it wouldn't work putting a communication tower, if  
7 you will, on top of a wood structure, but seeing that  
8 they are weathered steel, I am wondering if that is  
9 another area that needs to be explored.

10 MR. FISHER: Maybe if I could just jump in without  
11 testifying. I think those questions actually go beyond  
12 the scope of the feasibility proceeding. Those are  
13 really related to, would there be some alternative to  
14 Docket 506. Certainly there was a lot of testimony in  
15 Docket 506, and we could certainly address it here  
16 through testimony of other witnesses who are on standby  
17 as to whether wood or steel makes a difference. My  
18 recollection of the testimony was, it was more a  
19 function of height and location, than it was style or  
20 structure.

21 MR. SILVESTRI: We may agree to disagree, but I  
22 thank you for your comments, Attorney Fisher.

23 Let me pose my last question to you, then, Ms.  
24 Bettuchi. Back in Docket 506, information was provided  
25 by a party or intervener concerning coverage by another

1 carrier. And it seemed to indicate that there was  
2 sufficient coverage present for that carrier. So my  
3 question is, did you investigate, at all, how other  
4 carriers are succeeding in providing coverage, if you  
5 will, in the area, or not succeeding. And if they are  
6 succeeding, is there a way that AT&T could mimic that  
7 coverage?

8 MS. BETTUCHI: So that really has to do with  
9 network design and the various existing towers that are  
10 already out there and how they all work together. I  
11 can't speak to how, I believe it was T-Mobile that they  
12 had referenced, how their network works. We wouldn't be  
13 privy to that information. We really, when we look at  
14 site design, it is based on our existing network and  
15 where we feel we have areas where we need to make  
16 improvements for coverage.

17 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you for your response.  
18 Mr. Morissette, I am all set. Ms. Bettuchi, thank you,  
19 and Attorney Fisher, thank you.

20 MS. BETTUCHI: Thank you.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: And thank you, Mr. Silvestri. We  
22 will now move on with cross-examination by Mr. Nguyen,  
23 followed by Ms. Cooley. Mr. Nguyen.

24 MR. NGUYEN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. Good  
25 afternoon, Ms. Bettuchi. Are you a lawyer?

1 MS. BETTUCHI: I am not.

2 MR. NGUYEN: That is good. Because let's put the  
3 legal and interpretation of the law aside. I just want  
4 to ask you about the technical feasibility. So having a  
5 shared tower in this particular site, and I understand  
6 that the City raised a concern about safety, is that the  
7 reason why AT&T thinks that is not technical, or is it  
8 the technical feasibility is not possible because of  
9 the, because of the Town's concern about --

10 MS. BETTUCHI: No, I think, so we employ a number  
11 of experts in that field to do analysis, and I believe  
12 it was their testimony in Docket 506 that indicated that  
13 it was their conclusion that that was not, it was not  
14 feasible for us to, to collocate on the existing tower.  
15 It would require that tower to be reinforced. And  
16 actually to be rebuilt in order to accommodate our  
17 equipment in addition to their equipment. But I am also  
18 not an engineer.

19 MR. NGUYEN: No, thank you for that clarification.  
20 What I am, what I am trying to get at is, is I am not  
21 referencing the existing structure that AT&T can  
22 collocate. I am talking about modification of, whatever  
23 that, that modification would be, to the extent that  
24 having a one tower in this particular site, that can  
25 accommodate AT&T and other carriers, including the Town,

1 would that be technically not feasible, or infeasible?

2 MS. BETTUCHI: No, I think technically if you were  
3 to remove their existing tower and erect a new  
4 tower, you could reasonably have something built that  
5 could accommodate multiple carriers, whether they be the  
6 Town or someone else. We just know that the Town has no  
7 interest in moving their equipment to a new tower.

8 MR. NGUYEN: I understand that. Okay.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Anything else, Mr. Nguyen?

10 MR. NGUYEN: Yes, that is all I have, Mr.  
11 Morissette. Thank you.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen. We will  
13 now continue with cross-examination by Ms. Cooley,  
14 followed by Mr. Quinlan. Ms. Cooley.

15 MS. COOLEY: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. Good  
16 afternoon. I have only really one question, and it  
17 might be more for my own curiosity about how this works.  
18 But I am looking at page four of the December 13th,  
19 memo, under alternative two, about the fourth line down  
20 it, it mentions, to overcome the City's public safety  
21 network concerns, it would require a new massive lattice  
22 tower with all new City equipment installed. And the  
23 question that I have is, I understand the City's  
24 concerns, and I understand the, as Mr. Nguyen brought  
25 up, the technical feasibility is there if you were to

1 build a new tower and put that new equipment on. But  
2 the question I have is kind of about cost, if you were  
3 to do that, switch over to the new tower without  
4 interruption for the City, the old equipment that the  
5 City had used, does that have any value? Could that be  
6 reused, resold? Is there any recovery of cost in  
7 something like that?

8 MS. BETTUCHI: Unfortunately, I think that would be  
9 a question for the City. I am not familiar enough with  
10 that type of equipment that they use to be able to  
11 answer that for you. I am sorry.

12 MS. COOLEY: I think that is really all I have.  
13 Thank you.

14 MS. BETTUCHI: Thank you.

15 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Ms. Cooley. We will  
16 now continue with Mr. Quinlan, followed by Mr. Collette.  
17 Mr. Quinlan.

18 MR. QUINLAN: Well just a follow-up on that  
19 question. Would, is there any market for your type of  
20 equipment if it was used, you couldn't use it at a site?

21 MS. BETTUCHI: I can't really answer that. I tell  
22 you, we typically make those changes to the, to our  
23 equipment when we where looking to upgrade just because  
24 the technology has advanced. So I don't suppose that  
25 there is much of a market for that. It is just, you are



1 looking to deploy whatever the latest technology is to  
2 ensure the best quality of service for your customers.

3 MR. QUINLAN: Right. So there might not be a  
4 market if it is older technology, but if it is the same  
5 vintage technology, it might still have some value?

6 MS. BETTUCHI: Perhaps. I would say things change  
7 very rapidly in this environment, so I am really just  
8 not in a position to answer that question. I am sorry.

9 MR. QUINLAN: Thanks a lot, though. That is all my  
10 questions. Thank you.

11 MS. BETTUCHI: Thank you.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Quinlan. We will  
13 now move on to Mr. Collette, followed by Mr. Lynch. Mr.  
14 Collette.

15 MR. COLLETTE: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. I have  
16 no questions for this witness.

17 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you Mr. Collette. Now move  
18 onto Mr. Lynch, followed by myself. Mr. Lynch.

19 Mr. Lynch, I see that you are connected and your  
20 microphone is off, but I don't hear you.

21 MR. COLLETTE: Can you hear me, Mr. Chairman?

22 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, I can. Thank you, Mr. Lynch.

23 MR. LYNCH: Technical difficulties on this end, let  
24 me tell you. And I apologize for, kind of, in and out.  
25 And the few questions I have had, they have already been

1 answered while I was trying to get in. I apologize,  
2 just let me know, and we will skip to something else.  
3 Seems like, as you would say, this is deja vu all over  
4 again.

5 As far as I want to start off with -- hold on, I  
6 got to move my notes here -- alternative number one.  
7 Now I understand why it is not feasible, but my question  
8 is, if you used all the engineering applications you  
9 mentioned in your letter, as well as add a guide to the  
10 tower, would that be feasible?

11 MS. BETTUCHI: According to our experts, no, that  
12 would not be sufficient.

13 MR. LYNCH: All right. Most of my questions,  
14 actually it was only two, have to deal with alternative  
15 number two, which is the lattice top, a different  
16 lattice design tower. Now, if we go all over New  
17 England, you see lattice towers all over the place. The  
18 Town says they are, it is able to anchor their equipment  
19 better. And as far as I am seeing here, the only reason  
20 AT&T is backing away from the lattice tower is cost, am  
21 I correct in that assumption.

22 MS. BETTUCHI: I don't believe so, sir. I am, and  
23 I am sorry, this would be a new lattice tower, so taking  
24 --

25 MR. LYNCH: Yes.

1 MS. BETTUCHI: Right. Okay. No. No. There were  
2 other reasons, and I would to refer back to the  
3 information provided by our experts during the docket.

4 MR. LYNCH: Well if you wouldn't mind, you know,  
5 trying to summarize that for me so we don't get any late  
6 files, but as I read your explanation in alternative two  
7 for the lattice tower, it sounds like it is all about  
8 money. So if you can give me some other reasons, other  
9 than the Jerry McGuire, I'll listen. And the reason I  
10 am stuck on the lattice tower is, like I say, they are  
11 all over New England, but the State Police, when they  
12 did their communications 20 years or so ago, that, they  
13 used a lot of lattice towers, and they were able to  
14 accommodate their equipment and I think the Federal  
15 Government's equipment on it also. So I was just, I am  
16 kind of confused as to why it's being limited here, as  
17 far as, you know, using a lattice tower. I am just  
18 throwing that out there.

19 MS. BETTUCHI: Understood. I do know that there  
20 would have been added construction costs for a new  
21 compound. It would require a new driveway and utility  
22 extensions. If it was on a different location on the  
23 property, which it would also have a larger, it would  
24 essentially take up more space than the monopole would.  
25 And I know that the steel that is associated with that

1 is a significant cost. And so those were some of the  
2 reasons, I think, that were cited in the docket by our  
3 experts.

4 MR. LYNCH: Now, also in your narrative here, I  
5 know, AT&T would not be able to recoup any of these  
6 additional costs through marketing or, or new tenants.

7 MS. BETTUCHI: Not to the degree of cost that would  
8 be associated with a new lattice tower.

9 MR. LYNCH: Okay.

10 MS. BETTUCHI: That would be, I think, I think our  
11 estimates were close to a million dollars for that new  
12 construction. But it, it also still did not address the  
13 issue that was brought forth by the City, which was that  
14 they did not want to move their equipment.

15 MR. LYNCH: If I remember, Mr. Bartolotta talking  
16 about their equipment, especially the disk on the  
17 tower, your microwaves have to be point to point, and it  
18 would seem to me that any lattice tower design would be  
19 easier to adjust to point to point communication.

20 MS. BETTUCHI: And I think that's why they chose to  
21 build the lattice tower for their purposes.

22 MR. LYNCH: You mean the existing lattice tower?

23 MS. BETTUCHI: The existing lattice tower, right.  
24 But again, the City has made it very clear to us that  
25 they do not want to move their equipment that is

1 existing on their current tower.

2 MR. LYNCH: All right. Thank you, Mr. Morissette.  
3 Those are all my questions.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Lynch. I would  
5 like to go over a few items that I have on my list.  
6 Now, before going back to the table that was supplied as  
7 part of the supplemental submission dated January 26th,  
8 2022. There are four alternatives listed in that table.  
9 I believe there are five. And I would like to go  
10 through each one of them so that we are clear what the  
11 options are for this proceeding.

12 The first one being the reinforced, which we have  
13 talked about as alternative one. And the second being,  
14 constructing a new lattice tower at 180 feet, which we  
15 just discussed. That is column two. We have column  
16 three, which is to construct a new monopole at 180 feet.  
17 And that monopole could be adjacent to the existing  
18 lattice structure that there is today, or it could be in  
19 another location depending on the site. And then you  
20 have construct a new large replacement lattice tower.  
21 You have a fifth possible outcome of a new 150-foot  
22 monopole, and we did discuss that during our hearing. I  
23 believe it was the second hearing, as to the viability  
24 of installing a 100-foot monopole. And technically,  
25 both the 180-foot and the 150-foot are technically

1 viable based on the testimony that I heard that day.  
2 However it has got, they both have cost implications.  
3 And so, first of all, would you agree that are five  
4 scenarios in which the Council should be reviewing and  
5 looking at in this proceeding?

6 MS. BETTUCHI: I think that's fair to say. I would  
7 say yes, based on your explanation.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Very good. So part of,  
9 part of the evaluation, in my mind, is, you know, we  
10 have to look at the economic cost of each. And there  
11 has been costs that have been testified to, but I want  
12 to make sure that we have all the costs associated with  
13 all, each of those scenarios. And we have a couple of  
14 homework assignments, and what I would like to do is  
15 after I ask my questions, is we will take a, probably a  
16 15-minute break to allow you to do some homework to  
17 address some of the questions that are on the table now.  
18 But also that I will present here. So, the first cost  
19 that you have is the erection of the structure, the  
20 monopole or the lattice, and those costs are actually  
21 established on your table. So for example, under the  
22 modified existing tower, that would be the \$150,000 just  
23 for the tower. Then you add the cost of the equipment,  
24 AT&T's equipment only. So for this analysis that you  
25 provided in your supplemental filing, the equipment is

1 not provided. So you are basically saying that in  
2 scenarios the equipment cost is the same, true?

3 MS. BETTUCHI: With respect to antennas.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes. Your, AT&T's equipment.

5 MS. BETTUCHI: Correct.

6 MR. MORISSETTE: As far as AT&T's equipment to  
7 install on the particular tower.

8 All right. Then we have the decommissioning cost  
9 of the original Middletown tower, which I understand is  
10 about 200K, and that would be for each of the scenarios,  
11 would you agree with that?

12 MS. BETTUCHI: Correct. If we need to take the  
13 tower down, that should be the cost estimate.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. And if, if the tower is  
15 going to be relocated in a different location, so as the  
16 lattice structure, the new large lattice structure,  
17 would be in an entirely different location, there is  
18 site restoration cost that is required of the old  
19 compound, along with the equipment. And that was  
20 testified to be about 50 to 100k, do you agree with  
21 that, would that be consistent with all the scenarios?

22 MS. BETTUCHI: I believe that that would be  
23 appropriate, yes.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. And here comes the tricky  
25 questions that I am not really clear on. So if you were

1 to build a new tower adjacent to the Middletown tower,  
2 Middletown could utilize their existing compound and  
3 shed. If you were to move it, as in a large replacement  
4 lattice tower, you would have to build a new compound  
5 and shed, correct?

6 MS. BETTUCHI: Correct.

7 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. And what would be the cost  
8 of that component? Do you know that?

9 MS. BETTUCHI: I don't know it off the top of my  
10 head, but I can certainly get that during the break. I  
11 can get an estimate of what that compound cost would be.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. And then, I am a little  
13 sketchy on this, as well, so in either scenario, whether  
14 you are close to the existing tower, or at a distance  
15 from the existing tower, Middletown's equipment would  
16 have to be duplicated. So you would have to keep the  
17 existing equipment on the tower operating, and on the  
18 new tower, either at a distance or adjacent, you would  
19 have to install new Middletown equipment, is that  
20 correct?

21 MS. BETTUCHI: That is. And that is why those,  
22 those options were not preferable to the City and why  
23 our lead proposal was a separate, adjacent monopole to  
24 serve the public and allow the, and keeping the City's  
25 equipment in tact on their, their existing tower.



1 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Understood. Understood.  
2 So do we know what the cost of the parallel equipment  
3 would be to add on that, or is that part of any other,  
4 any of the other estimates?

5 MS. BETTUCHI: I don't believe that is part of any  
6 of the other estimates. And I believe we were looking  
7 to try to get an estimate from the City as to what that  
8 might cost, but I don't know that we did. But I would  
9 have to go back and take a look at our information.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. I don't think we have it  
11 either. That would be a useful bit of information and  
12 then -- excuse me, go ahead.

13 MS. BETTUCHI: I was going to say, that would be  
14 specific, that would be the City's, would be the one  
15 that would provide that information based on what their  
16 existing equipment is, which we don't have that detailed  
17 information ourselves. So I don't think AT&T could  
18 provide a cost estimate of what that would look like for  
19 their equipment.

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Oh, I am sure AT&T could come up  
21 with a cost of three whip antennas and two microwaves,  
22 but, we can get a ball -- I would hope you could get a  
23 ballpark figure of that. Is it 50k, is it 100k or is it  
24 10k.

25 MS. BETTUCHI: I'll certainly do my best, Mr.

1 Morisette.

2 MR. MORISSETTE: Great. Thank you. Okay. And  
3 then, then, I am assuming there is going to be costs for  
4 cut over. So you are going to have staff on the ground,  
5 assuming, you know, recognizing that Middletown doesn't  
6 want to do this, but if it was going to occur, there  
7 would be a cost associated with cutting over, and I  
8 wouldn't think that would be that much, but it would  
9 certainly cost some labor to do that cut over.

10 MS. BETTUCHI: Yes.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: And that is not in any of your  
12 estimates, as well?

13 MS. BETTUCHI: I don't believe it is.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. All right. And then is the  
15 additional cost to go, if the, the lattice structure,  
16 for example, is at a distance from the original  
17 Middletown site, those additional costs for roads for  
18 electric service and, you know, other things, and we  
19 don't have those costs either.

20 MS. BETTUCHI: Yeah, I don't think we have a full  
21 breakdown of each of those. But I can certainly do my  
22 best during the break to try to give you a little bit  
23 more of a breakdown.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. That would be helpful,  
25 because then we can have all the costs associated with

1 each of the scenarios, all five scenarios, to see what  
2 exactly we are talking about here. Because we have  
3 talked about cost, but it is not all, not all in these  
4 numbers. And we are only looking at, really, I think,  
5 just the structure itself. And if it is only just the  
6 structure, we need to be clear on that.

7 Okay. Ms. Bettuchi, you did just testify, and I  
8 want to make sure I understood this correctly. That,  
9 for example, the lattice structure at a million dollars,  
10 that is not recoverable through your rates structure?

11 MS. BETTUCHI: It would just not be economically  
12 feasible for us. We would not spend a million dollars  
13 on a single site.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So you would abandon the  
15 site, you would not spend a million dollars? And in you  
16 did build, if you did spend the million dollars, it is  
17 recoverable?

18 MS. BETTUCHI: I don't think that it is -- I don't  
19 know how I could answer that. So what we are looking to  
20 do in this area -- in order to recover that, you would  
21 arguably need to add quite a few more customers. I just  
22 I don't know if I could answer that question.

23 MR. FISHER: Mr. Morissette, if I might be  
24 permitted, because it is actually a legal construct,  
25 going down your hypothetical, if the Council was to

1 order something like that within its jurisdiction under  
2 the feasibility statute, the feasibility statute has a  
3 provision that deals with State Superior Court  
4 arbitration of compensation related to -- and that would  
5 really be a very wide open question about how would you  
6 structure a relationship with the City to achieve a  
7 response on that question you are asking. So I don't  
8 want to go further than that, but I did want to cite the  
9 statute.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes. Thank you. I do recognize  
11 that, but that is more of a cost sharing mechanism  
12 between AT&T and the City. So whatever cost that AT&T  
13 bears, it would somehow be recoverable, whether it be a  
14 million dollars or \$350,000, I would assume, but I don't  
15 know that.

16 MR. FISHER: The legal answer is, it would be  
17 subject to whatever was negotiated by AT&T post Siting  
18 Council decision with the City and/or the subject of the  
19 dispute if AT&T wanted to do that kind of project. And  
20 the dispute would relate to compensation and the  
21 structure. So I hesitate to go any further, but that  
22 really is a whole different line of inquiry on the cost  
23 recovery aspects of the statute, which the Council  
24 doesn't have jurisdiction over.

25 MR. BACHMAN: Attorney Fisher, apologies, it

1 appears that Mr. Morissette has dropped from the  
2 meeting. So if we could just give him a few moments to  
3 get back in the meeting. He may not have caught what  
4 you just said.

5 MR. FISHER: I just hope it is something I didn't  
6 say.

7 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Sorry about that. I guess  
8 Zoom didn't like my line of questioning either.

9 Okay. Okay. With that, I think we will take a  
10 15-minute break. We will come back at, I think -- Ms.  
11 Bettuchi is 15 minutes enough time to follow-up on the  
12 questions that we have open.

13 MS. BETTUCHI: I am sure I can do that, sir.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. We will come back at 3:5.  
15 So the information, the open questions that I see  
16 are, any follow-up with Eversource relating to the  
17 weathered steel structures in the right-of-way. Whether  
18 any feedback was received or explored.

19 MS. BETTUCHI: I ask actually got an answer to that  
20 one already, if you would like it. And the answer is  
21 no, we have not gotten any response.

22 MR. MORISSETTE: No response. Okay. And a  
23 follow-up on the cost table, asked by Mr. Perrone, the  
24 components. And keep in mind the components that I  
25 inquired about, as well. And then the, Mr. Lynch wanted

1 to know, relating to alternate number two, whether there  
2 are other reasons, other than cost, to not do the new  
3 replacement lattice tower noted in the December 13th  
4 memorandum. Okay?

5 MS. BETTUCHI: Okay.

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Okay. Thank you,  
7 everyone. We will recess until 3:15, and then we will  
8 come back to hear the responses. Thank you.

9 MS. BETTUCHI: Thank you.

10  
11 (Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

12  
13 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. We are going to go back on  
14 the record. Okay. Ms. Bettuchi, how did you make out?

15 MS. BETTUCHI: Well I think I did well. But if you  
16 wanted to pose the questions to me individually again so  
17 that we know, I know that I am capturing everything that  
18 you asked for, I will do my best to give you a full and  
19 complete answer.

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Well let's start with  
21 the, I believe is the easier one, having to do with  
22 alternative number two, posed by Mr. Lynch, relating to  
23 the cost versus other reasons why not to develop that  
24 alternative proposal.

25 MS. BETTUCHI: So, I would start by saying that we

1 don't have an issue with constructing a lattice tower.  
2 That is not a concern for us. So we would, if that was  
3 required, we would be able to do that. There is,  
4 however, a significant cost associated with that, and  
5 that has to do with the cost of steel, the  
6 additional work associated with that construction of the  
7 steel tower. And then, of course, it would also include  
8 the decommissioning of the existing tower.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you. Mr. Lynch,  
10 would you like to follow-up on your question?

11 MR. LYNCH: Just a slight follow-up. What would be  
12 the advantage or disadvantages of a lattice tower over a  
13 monopole design.

14 MS. BETTUCHI: I don't think there really is, is  
15 any.

16 MR. LYNCH: So in essence either one will, either a  
17 lattice tower or the monopole design will actually fit  
18 AT&T's needs?

19 MS. BETTUCHI: Correct. We have placed antennas on  
20 both forums, both designs.

21 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. And thank you, Mr.  
22 Morissette.

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Lynch. And thank  
24 you, Ms. Bettuchi.

25 The second question that is open has to do with the

1 cost table components relating to Mr. Perrone's  
2 questioning and enhanced by additional components that I  
3 added to it. Why don't you start off, if you could, and  
4 Mr. Perrone if you would like to jump in as to what your  
5 needs are for components, that would be helpful.

6 MR. PERRONE: Sure.

7 MS. BETTUCHI: So, one of the first questions I  
8 think that was asked, was what is the approximate cost  
9 for a new compound in a new location. And we actually  
10 did discuss that during one of our prior hearings on  
11 Docket 506, and I think it was Ms. Cooley that might  
12 have posed the question. And we estimated that it would  
13 be approximately \$200,000 to construct a secondary  
14 compound to support the needs of a tower in a different  
15 location.

16 There was also the question of the replacement of  
17 the City's equipment. And the City testified that --  
18 now keep in mind what they have spent up to this point  
19 is kind of imbedded in their, you know, massive build  
20 that they had done several years ago, but I think upon,  
21 you know, further questioning, it was suggested that it  
22 could be approximately \$150,000. I think I believe that  
23 was the testimony from the City.

24 There was also a question of what the cost would be  
25 to drop an existing tower. And so that estimate is



1 approximately \$200,000. And then a follow-up to that  
2 was any remediation costs associated with the  
3 property, and that actually, the restoration expense,  
4 excuse me, that is not really accounted for, because we  
5 think it would be pretty minimal. It is still a public  
6 safety site. And so it's not as though, you know -- we  
7 would essentially take it down, but it is not as though  
8 we would be replanting trees or things like that. So  
9 it, you know so negligible that it is not really a  
10 factor. I am hoping that might be everything, but if  
11 not please feel free to follow-up and I'll do my best.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Ms. Bettuchi. Go ahead  
13 Mr. Perrone.

14 MR. PERRONE: Do you have an estimate on cut over  
15 costs?

16 MS. BETTUCHI: So it would certainly have, you  
17 know, at bare minimum the cost is \$150,000 for that new  
18 equipment, but then there would be additional, the  
19 really tough thing to nail down is the labor costs,  
20 because those are very, those are variable. And so we  
21 really weren't able to pull together an estimate for  
22 that. But those would be the two main components.

23 MR. PERRONE: And the AT&T equipment cost would  
24 that be something like \$110k to \$120k for all these  
25 scenarios?

1 MS. BETTUCHI: Yes. So our equipment is the same  
2 across the board. So regardless of which scenario you  
3 plug that into, and that is why we didn't actually  
4 factor that into the, the chart, simply because it  
5 remains the same for us regardless of which option we  
6 discuss.

7 MR. PERRONE: But \$110k to \$120k sounds about right  
8 on that?

9 MS. BETTUCHI: Probably, yes.

10 MR. PERRONE: Okay. Oh, and one last thing. I  
11 asked you about cut over costs, were those standalone or  
12 are they buried into the decommissioning costs of the  
13 existing tower.

14 MS. BETTUCHI: So those would be standalone. The  
15 one thing I would note is, that we really, there is some  
16 additional costs that would be associated with something  
17 like that, just based on, at least, our thought is that  
18 the City would not be willing to do that in any way,  
19 shape or form. So, if that was what was required, we  
20 would, there is probably a good chance that we would  
21 wind up, I don't know if I would say litigating, but I  
22 do think it would become a lot more costly. I just  
23 don't think that that is going to be a feasible option.  
24 And I think at the end of the day, you know, our goal is  
25 always to try to strike a balance and find something

1 that works best for everybody involved. So.

2 MR. PERRONE: That is all I have on the cost, Mr.  
3 Morissette.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Perrone. Okay. I  
5 am going to go back through the list of questioners and  
6 see if there is any follow-up based on the information  
7 that we have heard so far. Mr. Perrone, anything beyond  
8 the costs?

9 MR. PERRONE: No, thank you. I am all set.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr. Silvestri, any  
11 follow-up questions?

12 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. I am  
13 still confused on the cost for the first column that we  
14 have. AT&T's proposed modified the existing tower site  
15 with the second tower. Again to try to get it straight  
16 in my head, the number that is here, exclusive of AT&T  
17 equipment cost, is \$150,000. When I went back to  
18 response number three for the interrogatories in Docket  
19 506, I come up with the total estimated cost at  
20 \$260,000. Ms. Bettuchi, could you just run through the  
21 costs again on that one, so I have it straight in my  
22 head?

23 MS. BETTUCHI: Sure. So at a high level, the  
24 \$150,000 that you see in that first column basically  
25 represents the cost of the monopole itself, the labor to

1 install it and some of the minor compound work that we  
2 would need to do. But it, because there is already an  
3 existing compound there and we are just simply, you  
4 know, erecting a monopole next to it, that is very  
5 minimal. And then, you know, I think the, the number  
6 that you are getting to as a final number is including  
7 our equipment cost, which we had just discussed with Mr.  
8 Perrone.

9 MR. SILVESTRI: Reiterate one more time what the  
10 \$150,000 represents.

11 MS. BETTUCHI: The pole itself, the monopole.

12 MR. SILVESTRI: Yes.

13 MS. BETTUCHI: The labor to install it. And then  
14 some small compound expenses, you know, just to make  
15 some modifications to the compound to allow us to  
16 connect into it.

17 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Because again, I am looking  
18 at that response on interrogatory three. It has tower  
19 and foundation at \$54,000, site development at \$50,000,  
20 then it goes into utility installation at \$36,000,  
21 antenna and equipment at \$120,000. That is why, I can't  
22 do the math on that one, that is why I am asking you the  
23 question.

24 MS. BETTUCHI: So I think the 54, the 50, the 36  
25 kind of gets you in the range of the \$150,000, and then,

1 you know, they are estimates. And then the antenna is  
2 actually the cost, that is the our equipment that we  
3 don't include in the, in the chart that we provided,  
4 simply because that equipment is consistent in any  
5 scenario. So that cost remains the same.

6 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay.

7 MS. BETTUCHI: December that help?

8 MR. SILVESTRI: Yes, thank you for that  
9 clarification.

10 MS. BETTUCHI: Certainly.

11 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. I am  
12 all set.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Silvestri. Mr.  
14 Nguyen, any follow-up questions.

15 MR. NGUYEN: No follow-up. Thank you.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Great. Thank you. Ms. Cooley,  
17 any follow-up?

18 MS. COOLEY: No, thank you. I have no follow-up  
19 questions.

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr. Quinlan, any  
21 follow-up questions?

22 MR. QUINLAN: I did have a question. Earlier I  
23 thought you said that the restoration was between  
24 \$50,000 and \$100,000, and now you are saying it is not  
25 much. And I am just wondering, is that mixed in with

1 some of the decommissioning costs, or how is that taken  
2 into consideration?

3 MS. BETTUCHI: Yes, and I think it, \$50,000 when  
4 you are looking at a project of this magnitude, you  
5 know, certainly if we were going to construct a new,  
6 large replacement lattice tower and we are talking a  
7 million dollars, you know, that site work is minimal.

8 MR. QUINLAN: Okay. Thank you.

9 MS. BETTUCHI: You are welcome.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Quinlan. Mr.  
11 Collette, any follow-up?

12 MR. COLLETTE: No follow-up questions. Thank you.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr. Lynch, any  
14 follow-up questions?

15 MR. LYNCH: Just a curiosity question, Mr.  
16 Morissette. I see Mr. Levin is with us. Could we get  
17 his opinion on putting the antennas and apparatus on a  
18 cell, a monopole and a lattice tower, as far as  
19 obtaining coverage and angling antennas, if he is still  
20 with us.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Unfortunately Mr. Levin is not  
22 sworn in. We could get him sworn in, if necessary.

23 MR. PERRONE: There is no need. It was just a  
24 curiosity question.

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Very good. Thank you, Mr.

1 Lynch. Is there anything else? Anything else, Mr.  
2 Lynch?

3 Okay. I have one follow-up question. Could AT&T  
4 meet its coverage objectives by then installation of a  
5 temporary facility as part of any future coordinated  
6 tower reconstruction efforts to support the City and  
7 AT&Ts's equipment?

8 MS. BETTUCHI: I would say no. Not our long-term  
9 needs for the area.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: But the question is more along the  
11 lines of, if a temporary facility was to be installed  
12 while the reconstruction of the new tower was put in  
13 place.

14 MS. BETTUCHI: Are you talking about something like  
15 a cell tower on wheels, or something to that effect?

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Something to that effect, yes.

17 MS. BETTUCHI: You could probably have it, you  
18 know, plus some of the, you know, provide some of the  
19 coverage objectives in a short term. I think the  
20 question would really become, you know, for us, whether  
21 or not the City would be willing to move their  
22 equipment, which from our perspective that is just, that  
23 is not, that is a nonstarter for them.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you for your  
25 response.

1           Okay. I believe that concludes our questioning for  
2 this afternoon. The Council will recess until 6:30  
3 p.m., at which time we will commence with the public  
4 comment session of this remote public hearing.

5           Well thank you, everyone, we will see you at 6:30.  
6 Thank you.

7  
8                       (Whereupon a recess was taken at 3:30 p.m.)  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25



1  
2 STATE OF CONNECTICUT

3 I, THERESA BERGSTRAND, a Licensed Professional  
4 Reporter/Commissioner within and for the State of  
5 Connecticut, do hereby certify that I took the above  
6 hearing of the Connecticut Siting Council on FEBRUARY  
7 17, 2022, Held via Zoom Videoconferencing Platform, in  
8 RE: FP-ATT-083-211214 - New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC  
9 (AT&T) Request to Initiate Feasibility Proceeding for  
10 shared use of an existing facility located at 499 Mile  
11 Lane, Middletown, Connecticut.

12 I further certify that the within testimony was  
13 taken by me stenographically and reduced to typewritten  
14 form under my direction by means of computer assisted  
15 transcription; and I further certify that said  
16 deposition is a true record of the testimony given by  
17 said witness.

18 I further certify that I am neither counsel for,  
19 related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the  
20 action in which this deposition was taken; and further,  
21 that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or  
22 counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially  
23 or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

24 WITNESS my hand and seal the 23rd day of  
25 February, 2022.

Theresa Bergstrand

Theresa Bergstrand, CSR.  
My commission expires 3/31/2026