

In The Matter Of:

*Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless
Application for a Certificate of Environmental*

*Public Hearing
December 12, 2017*

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

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

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Docket No. 477

Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless
Application for a Certificate of Environmental
Compatibility and Public Need for the
construction, maintenance, and operation of a
telecommunications facility located at 46 Cemetery
Road, Canterbury, Connecticut

Public Hearing held at the Canterbury
Community Center, Main Room, 1 Municipal Drive,
Canterbury, Connecticut, on Tuesday, December 12,
2017, beginning at 3 p.m.

H e l d B e f o r e :

SENATOR JAMES J. MURPHY, JR.,
Vice Chairman

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

2

3 Council Members:

4 ROBERT HANNON

5 Designee for Commissioner Robert Klee

6 Department of Energy and Environmental

7 Protection

8 LARRY P. LEVESQUE, ESQ.,

9 Designee for Chairwoman Katie Dykes

10 Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

11 EDWARD EDELSON

12 MICHAEL HARDER

13 DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.

14 ROBERT SILVESTRI

15

16 Council Staff:

17 MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.

18 Executive Director and

19 Staff Attorney

20

21 ROBERT MERCIER

22 Siting Analyst

23

24

25

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

2

3 For Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon

4 Wireless:

5 ROBINSON & COLE LLP

6 280 Trumbull Street

7 Hartford, Connecticut 06103-3597

8 BY: KENNETH C. BALDWIN, ESQ.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 SENATOR MURPHY: I'd like to call this
2 meeting to order of the Connecticut Siting
3 Council. Ladies and gentlemen, this hearing is
4 called to order this Tuesday, December the 12th,
5 2017, at 3 p.m. My name is James J. Murphy, Jr.
6 I'm the Vice Chairman of the Connecticut Siting
7 Council.

8 Other members of the Council here today
9 are Robert Hannon, designee for Commissioner
10 Robert Klee of the Department of Energy and
11 Environmental Protection; Larry Levesque, designee
12 for Chairman Katie Dykes of the Public Utilities
13 Regulatory Authority; Robert Silvestri; Edward
14 Edelson; Michael Harder; and Daniel P. Lynch, Jr.

15 Members of the staff are Melanie
16 Bachman, our executive director and staff
17 attorney; and Robert Mercier, our siting analyst.

18 This hearing is held pursuant to the
19 provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General
20 Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative
21 Procedures Act upon an application from Cellco
22 Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless for a
23 Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and
24 Public Need for the construction, maintenance, and
25 operation of a telecommunications facility located

1 at 46 Cemetery Road in Canterbury, Connecticut.
2 This application was received by the Council on
3 August 23, 2017.

4 As a reminder to all, off-the-record
5 communication with a member of the Council, or a
6 member of his staff, upon the merits of this
7 application is prohibited by law.

8 The parties and intervenors to this
9 proceeding are as follows: The applicant, Cellco
10 Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless, represented by
11 Kenneth C. Baldwin, Esq., of Robinson & Cole LLP.

12 We will proceed in accordance with the
13 prepared agenda, copies of which are available on
14 the table in the room. Also available are copies
15 of the Council's Citizens Guide to Siting Council
16 Procedures. At the end of the afternoon
17 evidentiary session, we will recess and resume
18 again at 6:30 p.m. for the public comment session.

19 The 6:30 p.m. public comment session
20 will be reserved for the public to make brief oral
21 statements into the record. I wish to note for
22 those who are here, and for the benefit of your
23 friends and neighbors who are unable to join us
24 for the public comment session, that you or they
25 may send written statements to the Council within

1 30 days of the date hereof, and such written
2 statements will be given the same weight as if
3 spoken at the hearing.

4 A verbatim transcript will be made of
5 this hearing, as well as the hearing tonight, and
6 deposited with the Town Clerk's Office here in
7 Canterbury for the convenience of the public.

8 Is there any public official at this
9 time who wishes to make any comment on this
10 proposal?

11 (No response.)

12 SENATOR MURPHY: Not seeing anyone. I
13 wish to call your attention to those items shown
14 on the hearing program marked as Roman Numeral
15 I-D, Items 1 through and including 69.

16 Does the applicant have any objection
17 to any one of these items?

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

20 SENATOR MURPHY: Accordingly, the
21 Council administratively notices these existing
22 documents, statements and comments.

23 Will the applicant please present its
24 panel to be sworn in by our executive director?

25 MR. BALDWIN: Thank you, Senator

1 Murphy. Kenneth Baldwin on behalf of the
2 applicant, Cellco Partnership doing business as
3 Verizon Wireless.

4 Our witness panel, as listed in the
5 hearing program, includes Mr. Anthony Befera, the
6 manager of real estate and project implementation
7 for Verizon Wireless; Kelly Lemay, a radio
8 frequency engineer with Verizon Wireless on the
9 Canterbury South project; Mr. Dave Weinpahl,
10 professional engineer, managing partner, of On-Air
11 Engineering; Mike Libertine, Mike is an LEP and
12 director of siting and permitting for All-Points
13 Technology Corporation; and Dean Gustafson, a
14 senior wetland scientist and professional soil
15 scientist with All-Points Technology.

16 And I'd offer them to be sworn at this
17 time, Mr. Chairman.

18 SENATOR MURPHY: I'd ask that they rise
19 and be sworn by Attorney Bachman.

20 A N T H O N Y B E F E R A ,

21 K E L L Y L E M A Y ,

22 D A V I D W E I N P A H L ,

23 M I C H A E L L I B E R T I N E ,

24 D E A N G U S T A F S O N ,

25 called as witnesses, being first duly sworn

1 by Ms. Bachman, were examined and testified
2 on their oaths as follows:

3 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you.

4 SENATOR MURPHY: I take it there's
5 nothing you're asking to be administratively
6 noticed at this time?

7 MR. BALDWIN: That's correct, Mr.
8 Chairman.

9 SENATOR MURPHY: And do you have some
10 exhibits for us?

11 MR. BALDWIN: We do. They are listed
12 in the hearing program under Roman II, Section
13 II-B, Items 1 through 7, including the
14 application, the associated bulk file exhibits,
15 our affidavit of publication, a determination from
16 the State Historic Preservation Office, our
17 responses to the Council's interrogatories, our
18 sign posting affidavit, a determination letter
19 from the Natural Diversity Data Base, and the
20 applicant's proposed site plan, which we
21 discovered late in the game, Mr. Chairman, were
22 missing a few sheets in the application itself.
23 We did submit additional project plans, including
24 all of the sheets this time, and I brought
25 additional copies in case members of the public

1 tonight would like to see those.

2 We'd offer those exhibits at this time
3 for identification purposes subject to
4 verification.

5 SENATOR MURPHY: Is there any
6 objection?

7 (No response.)

8 SENATOR MURPHY: Hearing none, they are
9 admitted for purposes of -- can the panel verify
10 these documents?

11 MR. BALDWIN: We can, Mr. Chairman.

12 DIRECT EXAMINATION

13 MR. BALDWIN: I'll ask our panel to
14 respond to the following questions: Did you
15 prepare or assist in the preparation of the
16 exhibits listed in the hearing program under
17 Section II-B-1 through 7?

18 Mr. Befera?

19 THE WITNESS (Befera): Yes.

20 MR. BALDWIN: Ms. Lemay?

21 THE WITNESS (Lemay): Yes.

22 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Weinpahl?

23 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): Yes.

24 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Libertine?

25 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes.

1 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson?

2 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes.

3 MR. BALDWIN: And do you have any
4 corrections, modifications or amendments to offer
5 to any of the information in those exhibits?

6 Mr. Befera?

7 THE WITNESS (Befera): No.

8 MR. BALDWIN: Ms. Lemay?

9 THE WITNESS (Lemay): No.

10 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Weinpahl?

11 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): No.

12 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Libertine?

13 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I have one
14 minor correction I'd like to make behind Tab 9 on
15 page 8 with the Visibility Analysis Results. In
16 the second paragraph, the first sentence, it's
17 actually the second line beginning with after the
18 comma, "extending," the distance there should
19 instead of reading plus or minus .57 mile, that
20 should be plus or minus 0.64 mile.

21 And similarly, in the last sentence
22 regarding seasonal views during leaf-off
23 conditions, that should read, "seasonal views
24 during leaf-off conditions could extend to areas
25 within approximately eight tenths of a mile, 0.8,"

1 striking 0.5.

2 With that, that's all I have for
3 corrections.

4 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson?

5 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): I have one
6 correction and one amendment. The correction is
7 under Applicant Exhibit 1 under the Executive
8 Summary, page 20, and it's the third line from the
9 top that reads, "Canterbury South facility would
10 be located in Flood Zone X, an area outside the
11 500 year flood zone." "Flood Zone X" should
12 actually read "Flood Zone C." They both mean the
13 same thing. It's just in earlier mapping, FEMA
14 mapping. So X should be C.

15 The amendment I have we discussed
16 during the site walk. It's under Applicant
17 Exhibit 1, Tab 1, under the project site plans,
18 which is also under Applicant Exhibit 7. It's
19 sheet number C-2, the site plan. I'll give
20 everyone a moment to get to the right page.

21 Generally in the center of that site
22 plan, you see the existing garage, and then just
23 to the northeast is wetland 6, and you see the
24 proposed underground utility line angles to the
25 back corner of the garage. Walking through that

1 existing cleared right-of-way, utility
2 right-of-way, the clearing actually extends
3 through the center of wetland 6. In all
4 likelihood, when they install the underground
5 conduits, they'll continue to utilize that
6 existing clearing. So there will be some
7 temporary impact to wetland 6 as well. Otherwise,
8 it would require removing several mature oak trees
9 to take that angle from the electric manhole to
10 the back corner of the existing garage.

11 That's all the corrections I have.

12 MR. BALDWIN: And with those
13 corrections and modifications, is the information
14 contained in those exhibits true and accurate to
15 the best of your knowledge?

16 Mr. Befera?

17 THE WITNESS (Befera): Yes.

18 MR. BALDWIN: Ms. Lemay?

19 THE WITNESS (Lemay): Yes.

20 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Weinpahl?

21 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): Yes.

22 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Libertine?

23 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes.

24 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson?

25 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes.

1 MR. BALDWIN: And do you adopt the
2 information contained in those exhibits as
3 correct, as modified, as your testimony this
4 afternoon?

5 Mr. Befera?

6 THE WITNESS (Befera): Yes.

7 MR. BALDWIN: Ms. Lemay?

8 THE WITNESS (Lemay): Yes.

9 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Weinpahl?

10 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): Yes.

11 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Libertine?

12 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes.

13 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson?

14 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes.

15 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman, I offer
16 them as full exhibits.

17 SENATOR MURPHY: They will be admitted
18 into evidence as full exhibits.

19 (Applicant's Exhibits II-B-1 through
20 II-B-7: Received in evidence - described in
21 index.)

22 SENATOR MURPHY: We'll now begin
23 cross-examination of the panel, beginning with
24 Mr. Mercier, our siting analyst on this docket.

25 Mr. Mercier.

1 MR. MERCIER: Thank you.

2 CROSS-EXAMINATION

3 MR. MERCIER: Just to pick up some of
4 the items on the field review today. Mr.
5 Gustafson, I know you just talked about there's an
6 existing cleared area along wetland 6. And I just
7 want to understand what the utility run will be
8 from the road, Cemetery Road, to the existing
9 garage. Is that going to be telephone service,
10 electric service, or both for your site?

11 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): I'll let
12 Mr. Weinpahl answer that part of the question as
13 far as I'm not sure if it's both electric and
14 telco that's going to run through that.

15 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): Presently
16 there's an existing high voltage underground power
17 line, which is to remain, and the plans from
18 Eversource would pick up that line at the
19 transformer, the existing transformer beyond the
20 garage. So there's no proposed improvements for
21 Eversource on the existing run. There is a
22 proposed telephone conduit adjacent to the
23 existing electrical run, and that's the
24 disturbance through that space.

25 MR. MERCIER: So your new telephone

1 line will go underground?

2 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): We're going to
3 have a trench underground adjacent to the existing
4 primary electrical line.

5 MR. MERCIER: Would that be on the
6 north side of the existing line, or the south
7 side?

8 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): It can go in
9 either direction. That's probably a field
10 determination after that line is located 100
11 percent accurately.

12 MR. MERCIER: Mr. Gustafson, does that
13 relate to what you were talking about, there's an
14 existing cleared area essentially north of the
15 existing underground line that encompasses wetland
16 6?

17 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That's
18 correct.

19 MR. MERCIER: So it's possible that the
20 telephone line will go through wetland 6 too?

21 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That's
22 correct.

23 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Do you know if the
24 cleared area extends out of the wetlands -- excuse
25 me -- the cleared area extends to Cemetery Road

1 but north of the other two wetlands? I can't read
2 what they say. Is that 3 and 4?

3 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): 5 and 6, I
4 believe.

5 MR. MERCIER: Yes, 5 and 6. Is the
6 cleared area a wide swath that also is to the
7 north of those?

8 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yeah, the
9 existing clearing is approximately 40 feet wide,
10 as far as clear from mature trees, and that runs
11 through all three of those wetlands, wetlands
12 starting from Cemetery Road heading into the
13 interior of the site. They're wetlands number 4,
14 5, and then 6 closest to the garage. So those are
15 existing disturbed wetland areas.

16 MR. MERCIER: Okay. So it's possible,
17 if they run the line, they could use areas outside
18 of wetland 4 and 5, but then impact 6, since it's
19 such a wide swath?

20 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): The clearing
21 area encompasses the entire width of both those
22 wetlands. So if we were to maintain within the
23 existing cleared areas, there would still be
24 temporary impacts to wetlands 4 and 5.

25 MR. MERCIER: What type of equipment is

1 going to be used in these areas to install that
2 line, is it a backhoe? I'm not sure what kind of
3 equipment you'd use.

4 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Typically
5 either a backhoe or small excavator. You'd
6 generally be looking at about a 4 foot wide
7 trench.

8 MR. MERCIER: And how deep roughly?

9 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Usually they
10 extend below the frost line, so probably
11 through -- I'd say the bottom of the trench would
12 probably be 4 feet in depth.

13 MR. MERCIER: What kind of impact would
14 it have on these small wetland systems? Would,
15 you know, drainage pathways open up underground,
16 or something of that nature, following the run?

17 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): There is a
18 potential for impacting wetland systems with
19 temporary utility trench impacts as far as
20 altering hydrology. Essentially, the conduit and
21 the backfill material around the conduits provides
22 preferential pathway for underground flow. So as
23 part of the wetland protection and restoration
24 program that's included in the project site plans,
25 one component of that is to install trench plugs.

1 Essentially they're bentonite or clay plugs that
2 are installed around the annulus of the conduit.
3 And that essentially prevents artificial drain of
4 those wetland systems through their preferential
5 flow path. So to deal with those measures, there
6 will not be an adverse effect to the hydrology of
7 any of those wetland systems, and the impacts
8 would just be temporary during construction.

9 MR. MERCIER: What type of restoration
10 of plant matter, or whatever is growing in the
11 wetland, what type of restoration is used in this
12 particular case?

13 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): We've laid
14 out some specific requirements in the wetland
15 protection restoration program that are on the
16 project plans, and that includes pulling off the
17 wetland topsoil with the root balls intact.

18 Essentially, that area is primarily herbaceous
19 material. It's clear of all woody vegetation,
20 either woody shrubs or trees. So it would be a
21 matter of stockpiling the wetland topsoil and
22 subsoil separately during the trenching
23 activities. And then once the conduits and the
24 backfill material are placed, then putting back
25 the wetland subsoil and then the wetland topsoil

1 to restore the area. And then any exposed soils
2 would be seeded with a New England wetland seed
3 mix, which has New England native herbaceous
4 material and grasses, and then mulched for final
5 stabilization.

6 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. There was
7 also a brief discussion as to potentially using
8 the existing driveway to run the telephone line.
9 If you could just repeat what was said out there?
10 I'm not sure if it was something that was viable
11 or not.

12 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): That's wetland
13 system 3, which is just to the south of the
14 driveway where it hits Cemetery Road. That had
15 been investigated originally, and again there
16 would be some wetland impacts to go underground.
17 We could not go aerial with a new pole as there
18 would be an aerial trespass through the adjacent
19 parcel. And I think it was preferred by the owner
20 to also keep the utilities in a common easement.
21 So that potential option was just left off for the
22 time being.

23 MR. MERCIER: For the wetlands 3
24 through 6, is there anything special about these,
25 or are they just small little wet depressions? Is

1 there anything unique or unusual about them?

2 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Wetlands 4, 5
3 and 6 are very similar in nature. They're all
4 headwater hillside seeps. They've obviously been
5 altered by the existing underground utility route.

6 Wetland 3 is associated with an
7 intermittent stream system that drains north
8 underneath Cemetery Road. And I believe there's a
9 pond on the adjacent parcel.

10 Wetland 2 is essentially a hillside
11 seep extension of wetland 3. That wetland drains
12 mainly to the east, and then to the north, and
13 then drains into the intermittent stream that
14 flows through wetland 3.

15 And then finally wetland 1, which is
16 closest to the proposed tower facility, is also a
17 hillside seep system. The wetland is more or less
18 all contained on the adjoining parcels to the
19 east. That wetland is the largest -- it appears
20 to have a larger extent further to the east off
21 the property. We investigated, or we picked up in
22 an aerial photograph there's potentially vernal
23 pool habitat contained within the interior of that
24 wetland system. We did some surveys earlier in
25 the spring to determine if we could conclusively

1 determine if there was actually any breeding. The
2 wetland appears to be too shallow in nature to
3 sustain any type of breeding, so we felt that,
4 based on our observations, it doesn't provide any
5 suitable vernal pool breeding habitat. That
6 wetland does drain more or less to the north,
7 northwest, and then it turns into essentially
8 sheet flow across an upland hillside, and
9 eventually makes its way down to Cranberry Lake,
10 but there is an intermittent stream system
11 associated with that. It's just sheet flow over
12 the upland forested area

13 MR. MERCIER: One of the comments at
14 the field review was around wetland 1, whether you
15 can move the tower compound lease area a little
16 bit further to the east to get away from that
17 wetland. Is that something that's viable or even
18 beneficial given the existing land use?

19 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): I'll let
20 others in the panel discuss the alternatives. But
21 from my perspective from a wetland impact
22 standpoint, we're about 45 feet away from the
23 closest activity to the wetlands, to wetland 1.
24 Considering that's a manipulated field that's been
25 cleared by the property owner, it doesn't contain

1 any mature vegetation. It's essentially
2 maintained as pasture for his animals. So as far
3 as the buffer function or value that that area
4 affords, it's fairly minimal, considering the use
5 of that for an animal paddock area. So from my
6 perspective, I don't feel that the proposed
7 development of that facility will have any adverse
8 effect on wetland 1, but that's contingent upon
9 the proper implementation of erosion sedimentation
10 control measures during construction

11 MR. MERCIER: Staying with that theme
12 there, you talk about the paddock area. Just
13 assuming -- I understand you couldn't actually
14 physically walk over to the potential vernal pool
15 area, is that correct, did you actually go into
16 the neighboring property to look at the vernal
17 pool?

18 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): No. So our
19 progression of investigation is generally we're
20 provided with some basic property information.
21 Usually we're not utilizing precise survey maps
22 for our investigation. So we have a general sense
23 where the property boundaries are, and we did find
24 some markings to locate that corner. So our
25 wetland investigation was limited to areas right

1 along the property margin so that we could at
2 least demarc the wetland boundary and show a
3 relationship to the site. But as far as
4 investigating further in the interior of that
5 wetland, we avoided any potential trespass.

6 We did, as I told you, as part of our
7 early desktop review before we started our field
8 investigation, we had identified a possible
9 suspect area in the aerial signature interior to
10 that wetland, probably a couple hundred feet off
11 the property boundary onto the adjoining parcel.
12 So we had recommended that we perform a follow-up
13 vernal pool survey to see if wood frogs were
14 utilizing that area. So we did an appropriately
15 timed survey at the end of March, typically when
16 wood frogs are chorusing during the breeding
17 season. We didn't hear any chorusing.

18 And then we also investigated -- we
19 also used binoculars from the property boundary to
20 try to look further in the interior while the
21 leaves were off, and then followed up with an
22 inspection later in the season, early spring
23 season, just to check on the hydrology. And the
24 area appears to just sustain just shallow
25 inundation, generally less than a half foot,

1 during the height of the hyrdoperiod. So based on
2 those observations, we felt the area does not
3 support a significant vernal pool breeding
4 habitat.

5 MR. MERCIER: Just assuming it did,
6 would the compound area, the proposed compound
7 area, as it is today, would that support any type
8 of a suitable habitat for any vernal pool species
9 to use during any type of upland phasing they
10 have?

11 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): So typically
12 for vernal pools you look at, you know, the first
13 100 feet around the vernal pool is critical
14 habitat. That's known as the vernal pool
15 envelope. Obviously, we're beyond that feature,
16 but, in addition, we look at what's known as the
17 critical terrestrial habitat, which extends from
18 100 feet to 750 feet from the vernal pool edge.
19 So potentially we could be within that critical
20 terrestrial habitat.

21 Looking at that from the perspective of
22 assuming that there is potentially some vernal
23 pool breeding habitat, we would look at the
24 habitat quality of that area. And generally the
25 higher quality habitat are forested, or at least

1 some woody cover vegetation, either native shrubs
2 or such. Considering this area lacks that cover,
3 it wouldn't support optimal terrestrial habitat or
4 any possible vernal pool habitat.

5 MR. MERCIER: Thank you.

6 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): You're
7 welcome.

8 MR. MERCIER: Again, I'll just repeat
9 the second half of that. Just out of curiosity,
10 is it possible to move the project further east,
11 or is this where the landowner would like the
12 site?

13 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): This was the
14 original location, I believe, that was leased. We
15 had reshaped the lease area from 100 by 100 to a
16 125 by 80. We've shifted the compound all the way
17 to the far end on the east side. Is it possible
18 he may be amenable to shifting it over 25, 30, 50
19 feet, I'm not -- I can't speak for the owner. But
20 from an engineering perspective, I don't see an
21 issue with it. The grade, it's relatively flat
22 topography out there. It would shorten up the
23 access and utility runs for Verizon coming in. So
24 from an engineering perspective it wouldn't be an
25 issue.

1 MR. MERCIER: Now for your compound I
2 know you just said you have a 50 by 50 compound.
3 Is that correct?

4 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): Yes, 50 by 50.

5 MR. MERCIER: What's the likelihood of
6 the compound expanding, you know, further to the
7 western, or southwest corner?

8 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): I'd say it's
9 pretty unlikely.

10 MR. MERCIER: You could fit how many
11 carriers do you think in a compound that size?

12 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): The 50 by 50
13 presently easily four, including Verizon, its
14 three competitors, who we all know who they are,
15 and even additional space for municipality
16 services, should they desire to put anything on
17 the structure at some point in time.

18 MR. MERCIER: Was there any discussion
19 with any emergency responders, any entities out
20 here that Verizon might have reached out to, to
21 ask if they needed this tower?

22 THE WITNESS (Befera): We didn't reach
23 out to anybody, but no one has approached us yet.

24 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you.

25 Given the site location on, you know,

1 it's kind of on a hill, according to your
2 materials here, is there going to be blasting
3 required? Is there shallow bedrock, anything of
4 that nature, that would cause an issue with
5 putting the foundation in?

6 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): We're not
7 expecting any blasting. Geotechnical engineering
8 would be performed, of course, to determine what
9 the soil conditions are. Even if bedrock is
10 encountered 3, 5 feet below grade, we can use
11 anchors and use different foundation techniques
12 for the pole support.

13 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. Now, where
14 the tower is proposed today, is there a need for
15 any type of tree trimming of any overhanging
16 branches onto the landowner's property from the
17 adjacent property, or is there enough clearance
18 for construction of the tower?

19 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): We have a full
20 open view to the sky, I think, in all directions
21 at the corners of the compound, as stated today,
22 and even beyond that 20, 30 feet in most
23 directions, I believe.

24 MR. MERCIER: I'm just going to turn to
25 Tab 8 for a second. This had to do with, I think,

1 four other sites you may have looked at. On page
2 2 it just lists four properties. And I just
3 wanted to know, besides number 1, which is this
4 property, the other three, 2, 3, 4, was the
5 landowner ever approached, or was this more of a
6 desktop survey, or some other type of survey where
7 you determined that, given the interior location
8 of a potential tower, it just wasn't
9 environmentally -- as environmentally friendly,
10 I'll say?

11 (Off the record discussion.)

12 THE WITNESS (Befera): Sorry for the
13 delay. There was a transition of this search
14 project from a previous consultant to Mr.
15 Schadler, who we just consulted with. But what he
16 knows for certain is that property 2 was
17 contacted, and we do not know about property 4
18 which is landlocked. We probably wouldn't have
19 contacted them. We don't have any firsthand
20 knowledge of contacting them, and no firsthand
21 knowledge of contacting property number 3. But
22 for reasons stated on the previous page, we sought
23 out four choices that we could serve our customers
24 with the least environmental impact with our
25 chosen site of property 1.

1 MR. MERCIER: I'm not sure if you know,
2 but for property 2 was there any kind of an
3 investigation where they wanted a tower on this,
4 were other locations looked at and it wasn't good
5 enough from our perspective, or something else? I
6 just want to know how far along it went with
7 number 2.

8 THE WITNESS (Befera): Well, I think we
9 went as far as actually having a site visit. And
10 when it was discovered that we were going to have
11 to build a bridge over a watercourse of sorts that
12 could support a crane capable of stacking a 160
13 foot tower, that and the additional tree clearing
14 that would be required, we abandoned that site as
15 a possibility.

16 MR. MERCIER: Thank you.

17 SENATOR MURPHY: So, if I may, let me
18 follow up on that. So there was contact made with
19 the proposed -- the owner of 148, and, if things
20 had worked out, it would appear to you that they
21 would have permitted a tower on their property
22 from what you've been told?

23 THE WITNESS (Befera): Yes.

24 SENATOR MURPHY: Because we have a
25 strenuous objection to this tower going in from

1 the owners of that property.

2 THE WITNESS (Befera): Well, that's
3 probably why because we --

4 SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I can think for
5 myself what might be a reason for it, but I'd like
6 to know, and I think we all would like to know.
7 If they're willing to do it --

8 THE WITNESS (Befera): I believe that
9 is the case. They were interested, and it was our
10 choice to look at a property that --

11 SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I can understand
12 environmentally why you made the choice. Okay.
13 But you did not deal with them yourself?

14 THE WITNESS (Befera): No, I did not.

15 SENATOR MURPHY: And the gentleman who
16 you discussed this with off the record did not
17 either, did not deal with them?

18 THE WITNESS (Befera): I believe it was
19 the person prior to him. It was the person that
20 had this prior to him that has left.

21 SENATOR MURPHY: All right.

22 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mr. Chairman,
23 we do have one individual here who I just
24 consulted with who was present at that site visit,
25 and my understanding is that -- I was not present

1 myself. He was from a construction standpoint.
2 And the property owner had directed that
3 particular location across the field at the
4 furthest point away from their residence closest
5 to our site. So what is shown on that map was a
6 preference from the property owner.

7 SENATOR MURPHY: At 148?

8 THE WITNESS (Libertine): At 148.

9 SENATOR MURPHY: So you're telling me
10 that they had expressed some interest in having a
11 tower on their property potentially?

12 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, that's
13 why we went forward with the site design visit.

14 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you.

15 Sorry for the interruption,
16 Mr. Mercier.

17 MR. MERCIER: That's quite okay.

18 Just a quick question. In Tab 17
19 that's the FAA analysis, it had some coordinates
20 on there that listed a site on top of Woodchuck
21 Hill, which is south of this property. So I
22 wasn't sure if that was an additional site that
23 was examined, or was it just because that was the
24 highest point on the side of that hill where your
25 site is. If someone could just elaborate?

1 MR. BALDWIN: Behind tab --

2 MR. MERCIER: 17.

3 MR. BALDWIN: 17 or 18?

4 MR. MERCIER: 17 was the FAA analysis
5 with some coordinates.

6 THE WITNESS (Befera): Yes.

7 MR. MERCIER: In looking at the
8 coordinates, it's for the top of Woodchuck Hill,
9 which your site is on the side of it slightly
10 north, and the elevation is 530, as you can see.

11 THE WITNESS (Befera): It's a
12 conservative method of putting in for the
13 analysis, knowing that there was no even private
14 airport within six nautical miles. We knew we
15 could be conservative with using the top of the
16 hill, which is about 35 feet more in ground
17 elevation than the proposed tower location as it
18 is now.

19 MR. MERCIER: Yes. Thank you. I just
20 wasn't sure if that was an additional site.

21 THE WITNESS (Befera): No, they're not.

22 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. Just going
23 back to Tab 8, I noticed on page 2 it talked
24 about -- just above the "Sites Investigated"
25 section, there's a section there that talks about

1 capacity relief at the existing Baltic cell site.
2 I didn't see any other data in here. Maybe you
3 could point to it. If not, if you just know it,
4 is this site currently exhausting, or is this
5 something that's just a benefit when this site was
6 constructed?

7 THE WITNESS (Lemay): Yes. So this
8 site serves two purposes. It's for coverage
9 around the area, and then it also is for capacity
10 relief. The Baltic site, which is located to the
11 southwest of the proposed Canterbury South site,
12 is currently -- the alfa face is currently
13 exhausting, which is the side that is facing
14 Canterbury South. So it would provide relief to
15 that particular sector of that site.

16 MR. MERCIER: Do you know what
17 frequency that was exhausting?

18 THE WITNESS (Lemay): 700 megahertz.

19 MR. MERCIER: Thank you.

20 Would you know how much traffic or
21 capacity would be off loaded from that Baltic
22 sector onto the new site? Some percentage usually
23 it's given as.

24 THE WITNESS (Lemay): I don't have an
25 exact percentage, but I would estimate at least 5

1 percent.

2 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you. On the
3 coverage plots -- I believe that's Tab 6 -- I saw
4 a site. It looks like a proposed site. It's
5 called Canterbury West facility?

6 THE WITNESS (Lemay): Yes.

7 MR. MERCIER: And I wasn't sure how far
8 along that site was, and what type of site it
9 could be, whether it's a tower or some other small
10 cell or something. Do you have any information on
11 that?

12 THE WITNESS (Lemay): The Canterbury
13 West site is a co-lo on an existing tower.

14 MR. MERCIER: And if that was deployed,
15 how would that affect this site? Would that be a
16 lot of overlap, or is it designed not to have much
17 overlap, or if there's overlap with this site is
18 that for capacity issues?

19 THE WITNESS (Lemay): As you can see in
20 the coverage plots, the proposed Canterbury West
21 site covers around that area and to the north.
22 However, there's still coverage gaps to the south
23 where the Canterbury South is proposing to cover
24 where Canterbury West would not reach.

25 MR. MERCIER: Okay. But just for

1 clarification, so Canterbury West is actually
2 modeled on?

3 THE WITNESS (Lemay): It is modeled on
4 the proposed plots because it's not currently
5 existing.

6 MR. MERCIER: Thank you for that
7 clarification. I have no other questions.

8 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you,
9 Mr. Mercier.

10 Mr. Levesque?

11 MR. LEVESQUE: Yes. I wanted to know,
12 the current electric line and transformer that
13 serves the property, are you sure that's adequate
14 to serve your needs?

15 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): Eversource has
16 looked at that line. I believe at this point in
17 time they feel it's sufficient to extend to our
18 facility as a high voltage line, and another
19 transformer will be located outside our compound
20 area. That was their initial determination as far
21 as I know.

22 MR. LEVESQUE: So you say you won't
23 need any upgrade of that line?

24 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): They did not
25 indicate at the time that they needed to.

1 MR. LEVESQUE: So do you have a written
2 approval?

3 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): Nothing in
4 writing from Eversource.

5 MR. LEVESQUE: Then if you have to
6 upgrade it, can you do it avoiding those wetlands?

7 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): I would
8 presume any upgrade required can be conducted
9 within their existing conduit, and it would just
10 be a larger primary cable pulled and no
11 disturbance to that area. That would be my
12 understanding. Eversource has been to the site.
13 They've looked at it. They're aware of Verizon's
14 power requirements. And following their visit,
15 they did not indicate any indication that they
16 were going to be replacing or upgrading that
17 existing conduit.

18 MR. LEVESQUE: And the same with the
19 telecom line, would it be much of a burden to put
20 it next to the driveway instead of along the
21 electric line?

22 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): Again, I
23 believe it was preferred by the landowner to keep
24 the utilities in a common easement and not to add
25 additional easements throughout his parcel. So

1 that was, I think, the reasoning to just follow
2 the existing power line with the new trenching for
3 the telephone. Again, as previously stated, we do
4 have a utility pole on the driveway that could be
5 utilized in some way for telephone service, if
6 needed.

7 MR. LEVESQUE: Okay. Thank you,
8 Mr. Chairman.

9 SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Harder?

10 MR. HARDER: Yes. I have a few
11 follow-ups on that issue of the electrical service
12 and the telco service. I'm a little confused. Is
13 the only new service proposed to be the telco
14 service, there will be no additional electrical
15 lines run?

16 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): There will be
17 an extension of an electrical service from the
18 existing transformer that was on the owner's
19 garage. That will extend along the portion of his
20 driveway and then make the turn down to the
21 proposed compound. So there is an extension of
22 power that's required.

23 MR. HARDER: Right. But nothing
24 new from --

25 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): And that does

1 not go through any wetlands. So I apologize.
2 There's no wetland crossings for that next path.
3 Telephone has got to come right from the street
4 one way or another. There's no getting around
5 that.

6 MR. HARDER: Okay. But no new
7 electrical service from the transformer to the
8 street?

9 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): That's
10 correct.

11 MR. HARDER: The only thing that would
12 be new going through those wetlands would be --

13 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): Would be the
14 telephone service.

15 MR. HARDER: And I think you had said
16 on the site that there was kind of a decision made
17 which wetland do we potentially impact, 4 or 5, I
18 guess, or the one at the end of the driveway. But
19 it seems to me, at least looking at the drawings,
20 if you went to the north side of the driveway, you
21 would probably -- you wouldn't go through the
22 wetland anyway that's adjacent to the driveway.

23 So I guess the property owner's
24 preference aside, it seems to me that running a
25 line along the driveway to the north side of the

1 driveway would allow you to avoid going through a
2 wetland in any case?

3 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): The pole
4 located on the south end, the existing pole is
5 located on the south of the driveway, so there
6 would be a conduit trench from there to cross his
7 driveway, then make the turn, and then follow
8 along the northerly path. I see what you're
9 saying.

10 MR. HARDER: Okay. But you could still
11 avoid actual work in the wetland, I'm assuming, at
12 least from the way the drawing looks anyway, or
13 the pole?

14 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): We don't have
15 a blowup of that area on the plans because it
16 wasn't the decision -- it wasn't the path that was
17 decided upon. However, we would be within the
18 buffer, clearly, but I don't think we would be
19 going through the wetland number 3 either.

20 MR. HARDER: It looks like the pole is
21 very close to the wetland, but it's hard to tell
22 from the drawing.

23 Okay. Another question, I guess, on
24 the wetland nearest the proposed facility. Again,
25 it sounds like it's the property owner's

1 preference to keep it close to the corner, or as
2 close to the corner as possible. But I think you
3 could tell -- we could tell from when we were out
4 on the site, and also looking at the topo lines
5 that are on the drawing, at least site plan C-2,
6 while that part of the property is I wouldn't say
7 perfectly flat, but there's very little slope.
8 The slope that is there goes to the northwest
9 pretty much directly toward the wetland. But if
10 you move the facility 50 feet or so, if you kind
11 of flipped it over and moved it a little to the
12 east, the slope is now to the northeast and not to
13 the northwest, so away from the wetland. Not the
14 most significant impact in either case, I would
15 agree, but it seems to me you could probably do
16 that without any adverse impact to your operation
17 or also preventing what minimal impact there might
18 be.

19 Again, as Mr. Gustafson had said, the
20 assumption is proper erosion control would be
21 implemented and maintained in the future. Since
22 you can't guarantee, it seems to me that moving it
23 would be the appropriate thing to do. And I just
24 want to double check and make sure that there's no
25 other reasons for putting the facility where it is

1 other than the property owner's preference.

2 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): It doesn't
3 appear that the owner would have a problem with a
4 small shift towards the east, if required.

5 MR. HARDER: Okay.

6 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): We're not
7 talking much here, 50 feet, maybe, at the most.

8 MR. HARDER: Yeah, at least, if you
9 look at the site plan, yeah, it looks like maybe
10 50 feet or so.

11 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): The C-3 sheet
12 has one-foot contours on it that would give you
13 the layout, but it's still relatively flat. It
14 will be minimal regrading, if even -- if that's
15 something that's desired.

16 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): The other
17 potential option is that we could pitch the grade
18 when we grade out the compound to drain to the
19 northeast, as opposed to the northwest. It would
20 require a very minor shift in grading. As you
21 know, it's fairly flat out there, but there is a
22 preference to kind of go to the northwest, but we
23 could easily do that with just some minor grading
24 during construction to shift the drainage to the
25 northeast.

1 Would you agree, Mr. Weinpahl?

2 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): Yes.

3 MR. HARDER: Right. I was thinking the
4 same thing. It would accomplish pretty much the
5 same thing.

6 The only other question I had was
7 concerning the site search, and I just wanted to
8 make sure I understood. The application
9 identifies the four sites in Tab 8. And I wasn't
10 sure from what you were saying before, were these
11 sites identified? There's a person, I guess,
12 that's not here that's not part of the process
13 now. Was that person part of your -- under your
14 control and part of your process and just happened
15 to leave the company or leave the process, or was
16 it a totally separate company that was involved
17 that identified these sites and you were just kind
18 of picking up from there?

19 THE WITNESS (Befera): No. It was an
20 individual that worked for Verizon.

21 MR. HARDER: Okay. I guess just one
22 quick question. Back to the discussion about the
23 electrical service, there was a statement
24 somewhere in the application that said -- I
25 thought it said Eversource required or would

1 require that new utilities be installed adjacent
2 to the existing utilities that run through the
3 wetlands, and that was one of the reasons I was a
4 little confused about this from the discussion
5 earlier. It made me think that there was new
6 electrical service going through that trench, but
7 it doesn't sound like that's the case now.

8 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): That may be a
9 misstatement in the application. It's just a
10 telephone line that's proposed parallel to that
11 existing electrical line.

12 MR. HARDER: Okay. Thank you.

13 That's all I have, Mr. Chairman. Thank
14 you.

15 SENATOR MURPHY: Mr. Edelson?

16 MR. EDELSON: Yes.

17 So I apologize. This is my first
18 hearing, so I might ask some questions that really
19 are not all that appropriate or quite simple.

20 When I look at the coverage map and
21 thinking about the public need, it seems like this
22 tower does a good job of filling in a gap for
23 Verizon. But I'm surprised when you say that none
24 of the other competitors are interested. Do they
25 currently have a similar gap, or are they meeting

1 that gap area in a different way, and in which
2 case is that an option for you? And I'm not sure
3 who to address that to.

4 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Edelson, I'm not sure
5 that our witnesses can speak to the coverage needs
6 of other wireless carriers. I think what Mr.
7 Befera was referring to in his response related
8 specifically to the typical offer that is made at
9 the time of the technical reports to the
10 municipality that would allow them to use the
11 tower, if they see fit, and no other municipal or
12 emergency service entity expressed any interest.

13 I think the Siting Council, as a matter
14 of fact, asks other wireless carriers if they have
15 any interest, and I think the record includes a
16 letter from T-Mobile saying that they may be
17 interested but not at this time. I'm not sure we
18 have a witness that can speak to what their
19 specific needs are.

20 MR. EDELSON: Let me pose it slightly
21 different. Did you make inquiries of other
22 carriers if they could help you with their
23 existing infrastructure to meet the needs that
24 you're trying to address here? Have you inquired
25 of other carriers if they have capacity that you

1 could --

2 THE WITNESS (Befera): There are no
3 existing structures in this area owned by any of
4 our competitors or ourselves that can satisfy
5 these objectives.

6 MR. EDELSON: Your objectives?

7 THE WITNESS (Befera): Yeah, that was
8 investigated. The seven existing structures that
9 abut this target area, the seven existing towers
10 actually that abut --

11 MR. EDELSON: That are shown on the
12 map.

13 THE WITNESS (Befera): -- that are
14 shown on this map, those are the closest towers on
15 every one of them. And you can clearly see from
16 the existing coverage maps that it's not getting
17 in this area.

18 MR. EDELSON: So nobody is getting into
19 that area, those are the only existing towers
20 would be not an unrealistic conclusion on my part.
21 I'm not asking you to make the conclusion.

22 THE WITNESS (Befera): That's very
23 likely the case, Mr. Edelson, very likely the
24 case.

25 MR. EDELSON: And just to clarify,

1 because I think some of us were kind of surprised
2 how close you were to the property line, but this
3 is in compliance with all the setback requirements
4 for the Town of Canterbury, that you verified all
5 the setbacks that are for their zoning ordinances
6 that they have in place?

7 MR. BALDWIN: Bear with me just one
8 second. We do include in our application a
9 narrative discussion of the local requirements,
10 but I'll just point out that the Siting Council
11 authority and jurisdiction preempts local zoning
12 requirements. So, in essence, we're not obligated
13 to comply with those local setback requirements,
14 but, if I remember correctly, the town required
15 the height of the tower, so we would not comply
16 with that local requirement but for the Siting
17 Council's preemptive authority.

18 MR. EDELSON: So that would put it at
19 160 feet or so from each of those boundaries at
20 that corner that we were looking at?

21 THE WITNESS (Befera): That's under the
22 town's zoning bylaw.

23 MR. EDELSON: Okay. No other
24 questions.

25 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you.

1 Mr. Hannon?

2 MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3 Rather than looking behind Tab 1, which
4 does not have maps C-4, 5 and 6, and not looking
5 behind Tab 4, which has those maps, but you can't
6 read and go blind, I would refer to the December
7 1st submittal that came in where the maps are
8 larger and you can read them.

9 On C-3, one of the questions I had -- I
10 asked this out in the field -- just in general
11 terms, any time dealing with erosion and
12 sedimentation control and you're dealing with
13 wetland areas or intermittent streams, things of
14 that nature, I would much prefer to see something
15 like silt socks or coir logs, things of that
16 nature, because, again, that's a much better
17 mechanism for controlling any type of erosion. I
18 realize this is a relatively flat location, but
19 that's something I would strongly recommend,
20 should this project go forward.

21 On C-5, under the erosion and
22 sedimentation controls, I got the notes there
23 dealing with the coir logs or the silt socks. I
24 think it's on number 1d. It talks about the silt
25 fence. But I'm not sure that's the best in this

1 area.

2 Under the seeding specifications,
3 because you are close to a wetland area, I'm not
4 sure about applying fertilizer. That maybe
5 something that can be eliminated and still have
6 the area stabilized.

7 Based on a comment that was made
8 earlier, and I have some questions, which I didn't
9 before on the utilities because there seems to be
10 a little bit of conflict on what's on C-5 and C-6.
11 C-5 talks about the buried cable trench cross
12 section, which it's a minimum of 36 inches that's
13 covered, but it talks about electrical, telephone
14 and/or cable television service, but yet on C-6 it
15 talks about typical electrical trench detail.
16 That's a minimum of 36 inches.

17 So there's some inconsistencies with
18 the details that are being used. So I'm just
19 trying to get a better understanding as to what
20 you most likely anticipate the depth of the trench
21 is to be. And I would think that you're probably
22 talking about trying to get below the frost line,
23 which I want to say is maybe 42 inches in this
24 area. So comment on that, please.

25 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): Yes. I

1 apologize for the duplicate of detailing. The C-6
2 details for the grounding and the electric and
3 telephone conduits are the ones that we utilized.

4 MR. HANNON: Okay. So then the one on
5 C-5 is not, that's just a general --

6 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): It was a
7 general one that was left in the set that probably
8 could have been just removed or moved over to the
9 civil engineering sheets one way or the other.
10 But there is duplication, and we can make sure one
11 is eliminated.

12 MR. HANNON: Okay. And then my last
13 questions deal with Tab 11. For wetland number 1,
14 page 2 of 2, the end of the third paragraph under
15 "General Comments" it says, "This statement is
16 based on APT's review of the project site plans
17 completed, last revision date 8/1/17." I agree
18 with that. All the plans were identified as
19 8/1/17. However, in dealing with wetland 4, 5 and
20 6, you refer to a revision date of 8/2/17. I'm
21 assuming that's an error because there are no
22 plans dated 8/2/17. That's sort of the middle of
23 the last paragraph on that page in the General
24 Comments.

25 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. Thank

1 you, Mr. Hannon. Those dates should be 8/1/17.

2 MR. HANNON: Okay. So I just want to
3 make sure I'm not missing a set of plans.

4 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): No, you are
5 not.

6 MR. HANNON: Thank you. That's all I
7 have.

8 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you.

9 Mr. Silvestri?

10 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you,
11 Mr. Chairman.

12 I want to dovetail on a couple issues
13 that were already discussed just to make sure that
14 I have them straight in my head. The telephone
15 line, or telecom line, is going to come in from
16 Cemetery Road, and it's going to be close to the
17 transformer. And then from the transformer to the
18 compound you're going to have both power and that
19 telecom line. Is that correct?

20 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): That is
21 correct.

22 MR. SILVESTRI: Earlier on, if I heard
23 right, there was discussion about needing a 4 foot
24 wide trench that would be done with a backhoe.
25 Would you actually need that for the telecom line?

1 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): Most likely
2 not, probably get a narrower trench for that.
3 We're going to be putting two telephone conduits
4 in, one active and one a spare. I don't know
5 that -- 2 feet is probably very workable in that.

6 MR. SILVESTRI: The reason I bring that
7 up. I've done a lot of work around my house, and
8 it's very easy for me to rent a trenching machine.
9 Essentially, you have a chainsaw type blade that
10 goes down long enough and digs through the ground
11 and piles up the sand or the dirt on one side.
12 You have depth that you could get there. I'm not
13 sure if you have the width there. But it's not a
14 big wide trench at all, and it's pretty narrow.
15 And you basically backfill.

16 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): It will be 4
17 feet by the time it's completely dug and prepared
18 and the conduit is put in. So it will be wider
19 than a foot, certainly, but 4 feet might be a
20 little bit more that's needed.

21 MR. SILVESTRI: That's what I wanted to
22 clear up. Going forward from the transformer,
23 you're probably going to have to be wider, but at
24 least coming in from Cemetery Road.

25 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): And there's

1 also typically minimal dimensions from high
2 voltage power to adjacent utilities of a foot,
3 such that the plans have indicated. So that will
4 certainly be wider, yes.

5 MR. SILVESTRI: Earlier, Mr. Weinpahl,
6 you mentioned there's the potential to move 50
7 feet with the concerns we came up with the wetland
8 and the vernal pool, if I understood that
9 correctly. The question I had is what direction?

10 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): 50 feet on the
11 compound?

12 MR. SILVESTRI: I don't know if it was
13 compound or center line on the pole.

14 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): I think staff
15 had inquired about the option of shifting the
16 compound to the east, and if that might be
17 engineering wise any issues. That's not the case
18 as long as the landlord is willing to allow us to
19 shift the compound and the lease area, we can play
20 with 25 feet, 30 feet, 50 feet. I think once you
21 get up to 100, 200 feet, it's now getting much
22 further east than perhaps he would like. But if
23 50 feet is the right number, then 50 feet is the
24 right number.

25 MR. SILVESTRI: When you say shift the

1 compound, does the center line for the cell tower
2 also shift?

3 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): We would
4 consider that to shift everything together.

5 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay.

6 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): The lease
7 would shift, the leased area would shift 50 feet,
8 the compound, and the tower would shift 50 feet
9 due east.

10 MR. SILVESTRI: I just wanted to make
11 sure the compound wasn't shifting and the tower
12 was going to stay on the proposed site.
13 Everything would move?

14 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): Everything
15 would move.

16 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Provided RF
17 agrees. And I don't see why there would be a
18 problem with that. One of the reasons
19 Mr. Gustafson had suggested that we may want as an
20 alternative to regrade that corner to basically
21 have anything flow to the north is because tech --
22 or I guess just the challenge of going back and
23 renegotiating the lease, if we had to move outside
24 the current -- if we could stay within the lease
25 area and shift it 50 feet, that would be great. I

1 don't know if we have 50 feet to the east under
2 the current lease.

3 So we would like to at least have that
4 option of one or the other to explore both options
5 because it may just be mechanically a tough thing
6 to do to go back and get the lease all redone. I
7 don't want to speak for anyone here at the table,
8 but I know in the past we've run into those type
9 of issues where it just becomes a challenge to do
10 that. So I think that's why we would like to at
11 least keep both on the table and maybe present
12 that in the D&M plan, provided this moves forward
13 and gets approved, and that way try to resolve it
14 at that point.

15 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you,
16 Mr. Libertine.

17 THE WITNESS (Libertine): You're
18 welcome.

19 MR. SILVESTRI: If I could turn your
20 attention to both page 7 and 21 of the
21 application. 21 comments that the proposed
22 generator would be propane fueled, and then you go
23 back to 7 and it's diesel fueled. Which is it?

24 THE WITNESS (Befera): That's a typo on
25 page 21. It's proposed as a diesel fuel.

1 MR. SILVESTRI: Is propane or natural
2 gas feasible for your diesel generator?

3 THE WITNESS (Befera): Propane is
4 feasible. Natural gas I don't think would be
5 available.

6 MR. SILVESTRI: So propane is a
7 possibility?

8 THE WITNESS (Befera): Propane is
9 certainly a possibility.

10 MR. SILVESTRI: If you stay with
11 diesel, what's envisioned from a spill protection
12 from leaks of the equipment and from filling?

13 THE WITNESS (Befera): The unit itself,
14 it actually has a spec sheet in section 7. And
15 the unit itself has a 12 gallon system spill
16 containment and a 2 and a half gallon fuel fill
17 spill containment. And we haven't had any issues
18 with either of those containment features
19 resulting in a spill. We're very diligent when it
20 comes to environmental aspects of our locations
21 and our sites, and environmental impact is taken
22 very seriously in my organization.

23 MR. SILVESTRI: The reason I bring that
24 up from a diesel standpoint, we discussed the
25 potential pitch, if you will, on wetland number 1.

1 If you look in the opposite direction, it's all
2 downhill from there going to the lake, hence my
3 concerns with diesel and necessary containment
4 that you would need.

5 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): To elaborate
6 on Tony's remarks, there are two tanks, and the
7 second tank is 110 percent of the first tank of
8 the diesel containment. The second any type of
9 liquid leaves that first tank and arrives at the
10 second tank, it's alarmed and Verizon is notified
11 instantly of a leak, and there's several other
12 alarms that are built into the diesel system.
13 Unless there's a restriction for some reason, it
14 is preferred. It doesn't -- it takes up less
15 compound space to not put an LP tank, the propane,
16 which requires 10 foot clearances, and now we have
17 a 50 by 50 compound, and one quarter of it ends up
18 getting used up just to put a fuel tank. So
19 that's the reasoning why the diesel is preferred
20 as an initial proposal to clarify that.

21 MR. SILVESTRI: You mentioned you would
22 hear an alarm. In either case, for propane or for
23 diesel, if you had to exercise that engine once
24 every two weeks, as proposed, for 30 minutes,
25 would that be done remotely as well, or would you

1 actually have somebody on site that would fire up
2 the generator?

3 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): I believe
4 that's all remotely set up on a timer, and it will
5 go off every like say two weeks. I'm not sure
6 what Verizon's maintenance is on it currently, it
7 does change, but two weeks sounds about right.
8 And it would be 30 minutes. And I don't think it
9 would even shift the load. It would just exercise
10 the generator. It's all on a timer.

11 THE WITNESS (Befera): It is done
12 remotely most of the time. The only time that it
13 wouldn't be -- that someone would be present, if
14 they were there for another reason at that time
15 when the generator was set to exercise. Other
16 than that, there's typically no one there.

17 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you.

18 Two other ones for you. If I could
19 turn your attention to the visibility analysis
20 section which is Section 9. All together, if I
21 counted correctly, there were ten visualizations
22 presented on Cemetery Road running from southeast
23 to south to southwest. And I just want to put
24 some of these maybe in a better perspective.
25 Could you provide an approximate address for three

1 of these? 17, 20 and 23 would be the ones I'm
2 interested in.

3 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I can
4 certainly do that. I'd like to cross reference
5 that. Can I come back after dinner as a homework
6 assignment and do that for you rather than take
7 the time now because I'll have to go back to
8 abutters and double check.

9 MR. SILVESTRI: Yeah. When I look at
10 it -- and I think it would be okay -- I'm just
11 trying to figure out, okay, where on Cemetery Road
12 are we looking at these.

13 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Actually, if
14 I might, once you get done with any other
15 questions you have, what I'll try to do is do that
16 while you folks continue to ask questions and see
17 what we can get accomplished now. But certainly.

18 SENATOR MURPHY: If you can do it
19 before we break, fine; if you can't, we'll take it
20 when we come back.

21 MR. SILVESTRI: The last question I had
22 was on the site selection. I'm curious. When you
23 had your site search and in your conversations
24 with the municipality, did the town offer any
25 potential site for a proposed tower?

1 THE WITNESS (Befera): No.

2 MR. SILVESTRI: That's all I have,
3 Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

4 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you.

5 Mr. Lynch?

6 MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

7 I just want to follow up.

8 Mr. Silvestri had the point on the propane tanks
9 that I was interested in. And I was confused too
10 when I saw propane and diesel, and I'm glad you
11 clarified that.

12 But now, as far as the diesel generator
13 is concerned, it's run remotely, you know, started
14 once a week, once every two weeks, whatever. But
15 if there is notice like we had over the weekend of
16 a storm coming, is there any provision that
17 someone would go out and top off this tank so
18 there's enough fuel inside?

19 THE WITNESS (Befera): That is
20 something that is routinely done whenever there is
21 an impending weather condition. All of our tanks
22 are to be checked and topped off to a minimum of
23 80 percent. So there is attention brought to it.
24 And they are double walled fire marshal approved
25 tanks with detections within that second tank for

1 a leak and low fuel. Those are silent alarms on
2 the site, but the operations control center see
3 them as red lights.

4 MR. LYNCH: Thank you. And that leads
5 me back to the storms again. This summer and fall
6 we've had some serious -- we discussed this
7 before -- some serious storms. And if this area
8 was ever to get -- and we will get one one of
9 these days, a category 3 or 4 hurricane -- would
10 the diesel generator and the tower itself be able
11 to withstand these type of winds? And by the
12 tower, I mean, that they'll probably stay there,
13 but the apparatus that are on the tower.

14 THE WITNESS (Befera): With the
15 hurricanes that we've seen in recent years, even,
16 whether they be Irene, Sandy, we have not lost
17 apparatus off of the towers, and we have not had
18 any tower failures, either partial or total.

19 MR. LYNCH: What about the generating
20 unit?

21 THE WITNESS (Befera): The generating
22 unit, as proposed, says on the spec that it can
23 withstand up to 150 mile an hour winds without
24 falling over.

25 MR. LYNCH: Thank you.

1 THE WITNESS (Befera): And it's on the
2 ground.

3 MR. LYNCH: Also, Mr. Befera, you said
4 earlier that you have not talked to the local
5 emergency services. But that's not where I'm
6 going. Driving out here, having my passport
7 stamped a couple times, there's nothing out here.
8 Would you also inquire, or they inquire, ask you,
9 federal and state emergency or local emergency
10 services, police services, would they be able to
11 go on the tower?

12 THE WITNESS (Befera): Absolutely. It
13 is a policy of ours with any tower that we own
14 that we have control of to offer a spot on the
15 tower for emergency services. Now, the contact
16 was made. Through the process of the municipal
17 consultation, the town was offered but has not yet
18 come back to us about any need.

19 Now, in terms of ensuring that, should
20 we be fortunate enough to have this structure
21 approved at this location, ensuring that over time
22 when these emergency services have the budget to
23 purchase the equipment and have the desire to go
24 there, should we be fortunate enough to have this
25 tower approved, we would just ask that it be a

1 stipulation in the approval that emergency
2 services can go on the tower for a dollar a year
3 contract.

4 SENATOR MURPHY: If there's space.

5 THE WITNESS (Befera): Well, they would
6 be at the top. They'd be up above everybody else.

7 MR. LYNCH: Well, that's my next
8 question. Wouldn't you have to also get -- you
9 know, set up their equipment and your equipment so
10 there's no interference? They have to have, what
11 is it, a 10 foot gap that you need, you know,
12 above or below the tower so you won't have any
13 interference?

14 THE WITNESS (Befera): Well, 10 foot of
15 separation is recommended, but there would need to
16 be some type of frequency coordination involved
17 that would take place once all the information was
18 in and a design would come out of that.

19 MR. LYNCH: Okay.

20 THE WITNESS (Befera): But in most
21 cases that we've seen, the emergency services use
22 whip antennas, and they coexist up above everybody
23 else. And that also aids -- it gives them the
24 best coverage, but also aids in leaving the bulk
25 of the tower free for collocation of similar

1 services with panel types of antennas because, you
2 know, those 20 foot whips takes up a lot of
3 vertical space down low.

4 MR. LYNCH: That I know. But referring
5 back to the state, more the federal government
6 than the state, they use microwaves. Would they
7 cause any interference?

8 THE WITNESS (Befera): No, not at all.
9 A microwave is like shooting a pencil through the
10 air 100 feet over your head. It doesn't spray out
11 like that or anything.

12 MR. LYNCH: Okay. Going back to the
13 application itself, on page number 9 right at the
14 top -- I think this may be Ms. Lemay -- you talked
15 about the system being designed for "orderly
16 expansion" for a wireless system. Now, is that
17 expansion, you know, strictly -- is that comment
18 strictly on interchanging the antennas over the
19 years, or is it the expansion of the tower itself?

20 THE WITNESS (Lemay): That would be for
21 changing the equipment over the years and future
22 advancements such as, you know, another carrier,
23 if there was a need in that area to add another
24 carrier, or future 5G plans that we do not have
25 currently for Connecticut.

1 MR. LYNCH: Now, within the application
2 or the interrogatories you talk about coverage,
3 in-vehicle and in-building. Now, my question
4 relates to is there more in-building coverage or
5 residential coverage now than there is in-vehicle
6 coverage?

7 THE WITNESS (Lemay): In the Town of
8 Canterbury?

9 MR. LYNCH: Pardon?

10 THE WITNESS (Lemay): In the Town of
11 Canterbury?

12 MR. LYNCH: Well, yes. Well, the Town
13 of Canterbury --

14 THE WITNESS (Lemay): Yes. I would say
15 there's more in-vehicle coverage than in-building
16 because when you go in buildings there's about a
17 10 dB loss.

18 MR. LYNCH: Now, for that coverage,
19 whether it's in-building or in-vehicle, does that
20 only apply to cell service, or does that apply to,
21 you know, tablets and laptops and so on?

22 THE WITNESS (Lemay): If you're on
23 Verizon's network, that would also apply to
24 tablets.

25 MR. LYNCH: So you're actually

1 delivering more data than you are phone calls?

2 THE WITNESS (Lemay): Potentially.

3 MR. LYNCH: You also reference, I
4 think, in the interrogatories why you won't use a
5 DAS system and why it would be, you know, not
6 adequate to use up here. But even if someone did
7 apply a DAS system, doesn't that also need a
8 central base station to work off of, so they would
9 need a tower somewhere if someone decided to
10 develop a DAS system?

11 THE WITNESS (Befera): It wouldn't have
12 to be a tower. A DAS system is typically designed
13 as attachments to utility poles. And they call
14 the antennas nodes. And it will be a multitude of
15 nodes designed throughout an area. And these
16 applications typically, like we have one in
17 downtown Boston, they are for very congested
18 areas, not a place with fewer people like
19 Canterbury where you're trying to cover as much as
20 you can because your capacity issues are secondary
21 to your coverage issues. But the central base, or
22 the telecom hotel that you refer to, could be a
23 building that we drop in someone's parking lot as
24 long as it's a good location for fiber and to
25 where you're going to expand this DAS system from.

1 It doesn't necessarily require a tower.

2 MR. LYNCH: Okay. I'm going to have to
3 use that hotel line.

4 Also, you referenced flush mounted, you
5 know, and why flush mounts won't work. My
6 question concerning flush mounts is, do you get
7 the same service, quality service, from flush
8 mounts for cellular and data service that you
9 would get from just an array of antennas?

10 THE WITNESS (Lemay): No, the quality
11 of the service would not be the same as our
12 proposed design because the flush mount utilizes
13 one antenna to the pole, and our proposal talks
14 about having two antennas spaced at an optimal
15 distance apart from each other so that when you
16 move the antennas to the specific azimuth that we
17 design, they interact optimally. So the boresight
18 of the antenna, on each antenna, moves together,
19 or it's oriented together. Instead of one antenna
20 that reduces the amount of force that we can use
21 in the antenna, with two we have four channels
22 which increases the amount of possible channels
23 that users can use. So quality wise, no, we would
24 need the two antennas in the configuration that
25 we've proposed.

1 MR. LYNCH: Now, my last question, and
2 I don't really think it applies, but I'm going to
3 ask it anyhow. We are close to the Rhode Island
4 border. Is that in any way -- do you have to
5 alter your coverage going from one state to
6 another?

7 THE WITNESS (Lemay): We're not close
8 enough to the border to need to alter our
9 coverage.

10 MR. LYNCH: So your coverage is never
11 going to extend into Rhode Island?

12 THE WITNESS (Lemay): For this site,
13 no.

14 MR. LYNCH: Thank you. That's all,
15 Mr. Chairman.

16 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Lynch.

17 Mr. Silvestri, I believe you had
18 another question?

19 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you,
20 Mr. Chairman.

21 My last one actually is now, as opposed
22 to before. Page 20 of the application notes that
23 "At the request of the town, Cellco hosted a
24 public information meeting at Canterbury Town Hall
25 on April 6, 2017." My question was, how many

1 people actually attended?

2 THE WITNESS (Libertine): It was a fair
3 amount. I would say maybe a dozen and a half.

4 MR. SILVESTRI: And that was here?

5 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, it was.
6 We actually offered to do a public balloon float
7 after that so that folks can see the balloon for
8 themselves after we had actually done it once for
9 our photos, which we presented. So we were able
10 to do that the following week in coordination with
11 the first selectman.

12 MR. SILVESTRI: How many people showed
13 up for the balloon float?

14 THE WITNESS (Libertine): There were
15 several people driving around. You know, it was
16 for the whole day, so it was for people going to
17 work, coming back from work, that type of thing.

18 I do have answers for the homework, so
19 I don't have to come back and say my dog ate my
20 homework today. So I'd like to get that on the
21 record, if that's good with you folks, before we
22 break. And I'm going to ask that it might be
23 helpful to cross reference behind Tab 1, sheet
24 C-1, which is the abutters' map.

25 So starting with view or photo number

1 17, which is to the northwest of the site
2 location, that would actually be on the western
3 end of the property that is identified as 148
4 Cemetery Road. So on the C-1 sheet that would be
5 09-6, which is at the top of the sheet, or
6 actually furthest to the left. And it's actually
7 part of where you'll see the north arrow. That's
8 a fairly large property with quite a bit of
9 frontage along the road. So 17 is actually west
10 of the intersection of Bingham Road 2, which kind
11 of comes right down almost on the driveway to that
12 property.

13 Moving eastward, number 20 is actually
14 also right in front of 148 Cemetery Road, same
15 property. So it gives you an idea of the extent
16 of the frontage along that road that looks over
17 that entire property. And that shot was just east
18 of the intersection of Cemetery Road and Bingham
19 Road 2, which extends to the north where you'll
20 see photo locations 14 and 15 on the viewshed map.

21 And then photo number 23 will be more
22 to the southeast. That is across the street. It
23 was actually taken in the Cemetery property, Dean
24 Cemetery, but it's across the street from house
25 number 75 Cemetery Road, if that's helpful. And

1 again on the C-1 abutters' map, that would be
2 number I believe 9.3, which is the Canterbury
3 Cemetery Association, that property. So it's
4 abutted immediately to the east by 9-16, which is
5 owned by the Westminster Congregational Church,
6 and it is just south of 09-2B, which is 144
7 Cemetery Road.

8 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you.

9 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Thank you.

10 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you,
11 Mr. Chairman.

12 SENATOR MURPHY: Okay. I had a couple
13 that were left on my hit parade, and Mr. Silvestri
14 took care of a portion.

15 At the public meeting were there any
16 suggestions or comments made that were
17 incorporated in your application?

18 THE WITNESS (Libertine): There really
19 were no requests or suggestions for any type of
20 modifications.

21 SENATOR MURPHY: And lastly, in
22 constructing the tower and the foundation that
23 will be used for this tower, will it be
24 constructed in such a manner that without any
25 change to the foundation the height of the tower

1 can increase?

2 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): The foundation
3 can be designed such that the tower could be
4 expanded. That would be --

5 SENATOR MURPHY: I know that. The
6 question was, are you doing it that way or aren't
7 you?

8 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): Presently, I
9 don't believe the plans indicate that we are doing
10 that.

11 SENATOR MURPHY: Okay.

12 THE WITNESS (Libertine): My
13 understanding is typically, Mr. Chair, that the
14 tower foundations are designed by the
15 manufacturers, and they typically include a
16 provision for an extension up to about 20 feet
17 between -- and I don't know, I'm not a structural
18 engineer, but I've always assumed that that would
19 account for two additional arrays, if necessary.
20 And I don't mean to overstep Mr. Weinpahl. That's
21 been our experience that that's usually how those
22 foundation designs come back.

23 THE WITNESS (Befera): Because we know
24 it is the pleasure of the Council to have the
25 towers extendable up to 20 feet above the original

1 proposal --

2 SENATOR MURPHY: Not necessarily.

3 THE WITNESS (Befera): -- we buy in a
4 situation like this where we're proposing a 160
5 foot tower, what we have designed is an 180 foot
6 tower.

7 SENATOR MURPHY: So the answer to my
8 question is yes?

9 THE WITNESS (Befera): Is yes, the
10 foundation is designed for a 180 foot tower. We
11 only put 160 of it up.

12 SENATOR MURPHY: But we understand what
13 the reservations are on increasing it and so
14 forth. That's why I'm asking the question.

15 Okay. That's the end of my hit parade.

16 Does any other member -- Mr. Mercier?

17 MR. MERCIER: Yes. Thank you. Just a
18 couple of follow-ups. There were other things on
19 my list I waited until now to ask.

20 There's a house located east of the
21 site, the tower site. It's number 40 shown on
22 C-2. It's the Riley residence. It's kind of just
23 north of the existing driveway to the garage.

24 Mr. Libertine, do you anticipate
25 visibility from that residence? Do you see it on

1 the map on C-2? It's basically the landlocked
2 parcel shown on C-2.

3 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, I just
4 wanted a reference point. Yes, I do see it.

5 MR. MERCIER: I think that's number 40.
6 I just want to get a sense if you believe they
7 could see the tower above the tree line or through
8 the tree line because it's relatively close.

9 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I believe
10 those folks actually came to the public info
11 meeting, and we discussed that. Yes, my sense is
12 having been out there during a leaf-off situation
13 and kind of walking along their property line, I'm
14 confident they're not going to see a view of the
15 tower unobstructed above the trees. What's going
16 to happen this time of year is if you're looking
17 through the trees in the right position on that
18 property, you'll probably see a portion of the
19 tower through the trees. It's fairly well wooded
20 in that lot.

21 MR. MERCIER: Would the galvanized
22 finish have any kind of reflective qualities so it
23 would enhance their view, or do you believe --

24 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Typically
25 not. My experience with the galvanized poles is

1 that in short order they tend to dull, and so they
2 don't have a reflective quality that you would
3 get. Actually what we found in some situations
4 recently on some of the painted towers, they tend
5 to have a bit of a gloss finish, and on a bright
6 day those actually get accentuated in terms of
7 color. But that can work on a good blue day, if
8 we have a blue tower. I'm thinking of the site in
9 Ridgefield that was done a few years back where
10 it's a two-tone. And the blue looks great on a
11 day when it's a bright blue sky. On days like
12 today, it probably doesn't matter all that much,
13 but there are some conditions where you'll
14 actually -- it will actually accentuate the color
15 a little bit.

16 But in terms of the gray monopole, I
17 think here the weathered steel probably works
18 quite well because, again, with the exception of a
19 few views along Cemetery Road where it's clear the
20 tower is well above the trees and there's not much
21 we can do to really minimize that, the majority of
22 other views are either through the trees or,
23 again, not visible at all in the immediate area.
24 So I think in this case doing any type of
25 camouflaging I don't think is really going to be a

1 big benefit.

2 MR. MERCIER: There was a question at
3 the field review today regarding Cranberry Lake
4 which is just north downhill from the tower site
5 and not on the property, the north side, that is.
6 Is that a public recreation area? Does anybody
7 know if that lake is open to the public, or is
8 that privately owned?

9 THE WITNESS (Libertine): To the best
10 of my knowledge, that is all private access.
11 There's no public access.

12 MR. MERCIER: Do you believe the tower
13 will be visible from the north side of that lake
14 from open areas, people viewing across the lake
15 looking at the tower?

16 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes.

17 MR. MERCIER: Would they see it
18 unobstructed?

19 THE WITNESS (Libertine): There will be
20 views of the tower, and that's pretty well
21 documented. Again, it's upgrade from there, but I
22 think if you look at some of the photos actually
23 that Mr. Silvestri had pointed out right along
24 Cemetery Road, it kind of looks out over the lake
25 there. So yeah, I would say on the northern side

1 of the lake, certainly. It will be a lower
2 profile. You won't see as much of the tower as
3 you see from the road, but certainly it would
4 still be above the trees.

5 MR. MERCIER: And there was some brief
6 discussion of potentially moving the tower further
7 to the east along that existing gravel drive we
8 walked today. Is there less vegetation,
9 intervening vegetation on -- if the tower was
10 moved further east, is there less vegetation that
11 would block views when viewed from the lake?

12 THE WITNESS (Libertine): If we're
13 talking a move of 50 feet or less, I don't think
14 it would make a substantial difference one way or
15 the other.

16 MR. MERCIER: Okay.

17 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I think if we
18 started moving certainly down the driveway
19 eastward so we were aligned with the garage and
20 that far of a shift -- and maybe I'll -- let me
21 take that back. If we didn't move quite to the
22 edge of the garage where the garage would actually
23 shield views, that would be a little bit more wide
24 open just because you don't have the vegetation.
25 It's pretty much a wide open field all the way

1 down. About 50 feet or less, I wouldn't say
2 that's going to be a problem.

3 MR. MERCIER: There was one other
4 comment. Post construction would this site cause
5 any runoff or any type of accelerated runoff
6 downhill towards the lake? Is there any runoff
7 concern?

8 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): There will be
9 no net increase in runoff. We have a trench
10 design with our road for the 650 feet to grab all
11 potential water from the gravel access. It's
12 oversized, to say the least, with regard to
13 that. So the rest of the conditions are not to be
14 impacted.

15 MR. MERCIER: Great.

16 The last line had to do with some
17 recent sites I was involved with where they
18 weren't using platform mounts anymore, Verizon
19 was, that is. So is this site going to be using a
20 platform or a cluster mount, as was in some
21 previous dockets we had, cluster mount meaning
22 it's standoff arms rather than a full platform?

23 THE WITNESS (Weinpahl): The plans
24 right now still have a triangular platform design.
25 It will have a rail kit. This is to also help

1 anchor the top end of the antennas and radio heads
2 that are proposed. We have 9 radio heads, 9
3 antennas proposed. We've been involved in some
4 older projects of the old low profile platforms
5 which is just a flat place to stand with no
6 railings, and they're starting to get overstressed
7 from many years ago. So this design is still a
8 triangular platform, 12 feet in size, and for the
9 amount of equipment going up there, it seemed to
10 be the most applicable design to use from an
11 engineering side, and I know preferred also by the
12 RF engineer.

13 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. I have no
14 other questions.

15 SENATOR MURPHY: Any other questions by
16 members of the Council?

17 (No response.)

18 SENATOR MURPHY: If not, then we'll
19 recess until 6:30 p.m., at which time we'll
20 continue with the public comment session. Enjoy
21 your meal.

22 (Whereupon, the witnesses were excused,
23 and the above proceedings were adjourned at 4:36
24 p.m.)

25

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

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing 78 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original stenotype notes taken of the Council Hearing in Re: DOCKET NO. 477, CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATION OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY LOCATED AT 46 CEMETERY ROAD, CANTERBURY, CONNECTICUT, which was held before SENATOR JAMES J. MURPHY, JR., Vice Chairman, at the Canterbury Community Center, Main Room, 1 Municipal Drive, Canterbury, Connecticut, on December 12, 2017.

 _____

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

1 I N D E X

2 WITNESSES ANTHONY BEFERA PAGE 7

3 KELLY LEMAY

4 DAVID WEINPAHL

5 MICHAEL LIBERTINE

6 DEAN GUSTAFSON

7 EXAMINERS:

8 Mr. Baldwin (Direct) 9

9 Mr. Mercier (Cross starts) 14, 73

10 Senator Murphy 29, 70

11 Mr. Levesque 35

12 Mr. Harder 37

13 Mr. Edelson 43

14 Mr. Hannon 47

15 Mr. Silvestri 50, 68

16 Mr. Lynch 59

17 APPLICANT'S EXHIBITS

18 (Received in evidence)

19 EXHIBIT DESCRIPTION PAGE

20 II-B-1 Application for a Certificate 13

21 of Environmental Compatibility and
22 Public Need filed by Cellco Partnership

23 d/b/a Verizon Wireless, received

24 August 23, 2017, and attachments and

25 bulk file exhibits including:

1 I n d e x (Cont'd):

2

3

a. Technical report, dated 2/22/17

4

b. Town of Canterbury zoning regulations

5

c. Town of Canterbury inland wetlands

6

and watercourses

7

d. Town of Canterbury plan of conservation

8

and development

9

II-B-2 Applicant's affidavit of 13

10

publication, dated September 13, 2017

11

II-B-3 SHPO determination letter, dated 13

12

October 5, 2017

13

II-B-4 Applicant's responses to Council 13

14

interrogatories, dated November 17, 2017

15

II-B-5 Applicant's sign posting affidavit, 13

16

dated November 27, 2017

17

II-B-6 NDDDB determination letter, received 13

18

November 30, 2017

19

II-B-7 Applicant's project site plans, 13

20

dated December 1, 2017

21

22

23

24

25