

STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Docket No. 513

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  
Parcel No. 258-10C-001, Mason Hill Road,  
Litchfield, Connecticut

VIA ZOOM AND TELECONFERENCE

Public Hearing held on Thursday, May 4, 2023,  
beginning at 2 p.m. via remote access

H e l d   B e f o r e :

JOHN MORISSETTE, Presiding Officer



Reporter: Lisa L. Warner, CSR #061

1   **A p p e a r a n c e s:**

2  
3   **Council Members:**

4       **BRIAN GOLEMBIEWSKI**

5           Designee for Commissioner Katie Dykes,  
6           Department of Energy and Environmental  
7           Protection

8       **QUAT NGUYEN**

9           Designee for Chairman Marissa Paslick  
10          Gillett, Public Utilities Regulatory  
11          Authority

12       **ROBERT SILVESTRI**

13       **DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.**

14   **Council Staff:**

15       **MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ., Executive Director and**  
16       **Staff Attorney**

17       **ROBERT MERCIER, Siting Analyst**

18       **LISA FONTAINE, Fiscal Administrative Officer**

19   **For the Applicant, Cellco Partnership d/b/a**  
20   **Verizon Wireless:**

21       **ROBINSON & COLE LLP**

22       **280 Trumbull Street**

23       **Hartford, Connecticut 06103-3597**

24       **Phone: 860.275.8200**

25           **BY: KENNETH C. BALDWIN, ESQ.**  
          **kbaldwin@rc.com**

26       **Also present: Aaron Demarest, co-host**

1 MR. MORISSETTE: This remote public  
2 hearing is called to order this Thursday, May 4,  
3 2023, at 2 p.m. My name is John Morissette,  
4 member and presiding officer of the Connecticut  
5 Siting Council.

6 Other members of the Council are Brian  
7 Golembiewski, designee for Commissioner Katie  
8 Dykes of the Department of Energy and  
9 Environmental Protection; Quat Nguyen, designee  
10 for Chairman Marissa Paslick Gillett of the Public  
11 Utilities Regulatory Authority; Robert Silvestri;  
12 Daniel P. Lynch, Jr.

13 Members of the staff are Melanie  
14 Bachman, executive director and staff attorney;  
15 Robert Mercier, siting analyst; and Lisa Fontaine,  
16 fiscal administrative officer.

17 If you haven't done so already, I ask  
18 that everyone please mute their computer audio  
19 and/or telephone now.

20 This hearing is held pursuant to the  
21 provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General  
22 Statutes and the Uniform Administrative Procedure  
23 Act upon an application from Cellco Partnership  
24 d/b/a Verizon Wireless for a Certificate of  
25 Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for

1 the construction, maintenance, and operation of a  
2 telecommunications facility located on Mason Hill  
3 Road, Litchfield, Connecticut. The application  
4 was received by the Council on March 1, 2023.

5 The Council's legal notice of the date  
6 and time of this remote public hearing was  
7 published in the Waterbury Republican-American on  
8 March 18, 2023. Upon this Council's request, the  
9 applicant erected a sign in the vicinity of the  
10 proposed site so as to inform the public of the  
11 name of the applicant, the type of facility, the  
12 remote public hearing date, and contact  
13 information for the Council, including the website  
14 and phone number.

15 As a reminder to all, off-the-record  
16 communication with a member of the Council or a  
17 member of the Council's staff upon the merits of  
18 this application is prohibited by law.

19 The parties and intervenors to the  
20 proceeding are as follows: The Applicant, Cellco  
21 Partnership doing business as Verizon Wireless,  
22 represented by Kenneth C. Baldwin, Esq., of  
23 Robinson & Cole, LLP.

24 We will proceed in accordance with the  
25 prepared agenda, a copy of which is available on

1 the Council's Docket Number 513 webpage, along  
2 with the record of this matter, the public hearing  
3 notice, instructions for public access to this  
4 remote public hearing, and the Council's Citizens  
5 Guide to Siting Council Procedures. Interested  
6 persons may join any session of this public  
7 hearing to listen, but no public comments will be  
8 received during the 2 p.m. evidentiary session.  
9 At the end of the evidentiary session we will  
10 recess until 6:30 p.m. for the public comment  
11 session. Please be advised that any person may be  
12 removed from the remote evidentiary session or the  
13 public comment session at the discretion of the  
14 Council.

15 The 6:30 p.m. public comment session is  
16 reserved for the public to make brief statements  
17 into the record. I wish to note that the  
18 applicant, parties and intervenors, including  
19 their representatives, witnesses and members, are  
20 not allowed to participate in the public comment  
21 session. I also wish to note for those who are  
22 listening and for the benefit of your friends and  
23 neighbors who are unable to join us for the remote  
24 public comment session that you or they may send  
25 written comments to the Council within 30 days of

1 the date hereof, either by email or by mail, and  
2 such written statements will be given the same  
3 weight as if spoken during the remote public  
4 comment session.

5 A verbatim transcript of this remote  
6 public hearing will be posted on the Council's  
7 Docket No. 513 webpage and deposited with the Town  
8 Clerk's Offices in the Litchfield and Thomaston  
9 offices for the convenience of the public.

10 Please be advised that the Council's  
11 project evaluation criteria under the statute does  
12 not include consideration of property ownership or  
13 value.

14 The Council will take a 10 to 15 minute  
15 break at a convenient juncture around 3:30 p.m.

16 We'll now move on to administrative  
17 notice taken by the Council. I wish to call your  
18 attention to those items shown on the hearing  
19 program marked as Roman Numerals I-B, Items 1  
20 through 84, that the Council has administratively  
21 noticed.

22 Does the applicant have an objection to  
23 the items that the Council has administratively  
24 noticed?

25 Good afternoon, Attorney Baldwin. Do

1 you have any objection?

2 MR. BALDWIN: No objection. Thank you.

3 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you.

4 Accordingly, the Council hereby administratively  
5 notices these items.

6 (Administrative Notice Items I-B-1  
7 through I-B-84: Received in evidence.)

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Agenda item of the  
9 appearance of the applicant. Will the applicant  
10 present its witness panel for the purposes of  
11 taking the oath. Attorney Bachman will administer  
12 the oath.

13 MR. BALDWIN: Thank you, Mr.  
14 Morissette, members of the Council, good  
15 afternoon. Kenneth Baldwin at Robinson & Cole on  
16 behalf of the applicant, Cellco Partnership doing  
17 business as Verizon Wireless. We have five  
18 witnesses to present to the Council this  
19 afternoon. Starting on my far left is Brian  
20 Gaudet with All-Points Technologies. Next to  
21 Brian is Tim Parks with Verizon Wireless. To my  
22 immediate right is Dean Gustafson with All-Points  
23 Technologies. To Mr. Gustafson's right is Carlo  
24 Centore with Centek Engineers, the project  
25 engineers. And then at the far end of the table

1 is Shiva Gadasu, who's a radio frequency engineer  
2 with Verizon Wireless responsible for the  
3 Litchfield southeast location. And we offer them  
4 to be sworn at this time.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney  
6 Baldwin.

7 Attorney Bachman.

8 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr.  
9 Morissette.

10 Could the witnesses please raise their  
11 right hand.

12 S H I V A G A D A S U,  
13 T I M O T H Y P A R K S,  
14 C A R L O F. C E N T O R E,  
15 B R I A N G A U D E T,  
16 D E A N G U S T A F S O N,

17 having been first duly sworn by Ms. Bachman,  
18 testified on their oaths as follows:

19 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you.

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Attorney  
21 Baldwin, please begin by verifying all the  
22 exhibits by the appropriate sworn witnesses.

23 MR. BALDWIN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette

24 DIRECT EXAMINATION

25 MR. BALDWIN: There are a total of six



1 exhibits listed in the hearing program under Roman  
2 II, Section B, and again listed as Items 1 through  
3 6. And for the verification process I'll ask our  
4 witnesses to answer the following questions: Did  
5 you prepare or assist in the preparation of the  
6 exhibits listed in the hearing program under Roman  
7 II-B, Items 1 through 6? Mr. Gaudet.

8 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yes.

9 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Parks.

10 THE WITNESS (Parks): Yes.

11 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson?

12 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes.

13 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Centore.

14 THE WITNESS (Centore): Yes.

15 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gadasu.

16 THE WITNESS (Gadasu): Yes.

17 MR. BALDWIN: Do you have any  
18 modifications, amendments or other corrections  
19 offered to any of those exhibits? Mr. Gaudet.

20 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): No.

21 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Parks.

22 THE WITNESS (Parks): No.

23 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson.

24 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): No.

25 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Centore.

1 THE WITNESS (Centore): I do not.

2 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gadasu.

3 THE WITNESS (Gadasu): No.

4 MR. BALDWIN: Is the information  
5 contained in those exhibits true and accurate to  
6 the best of your knowledge? Mr. Gaudet.

7 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yes.

8 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Parks.

9 THE WITNESS (Parks): Yes.

10 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson.

11 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes.

12 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Centore.

13 THE WITNESS (Centore): Yes.

14 MR. BALDWIN: And Mr. Gadasu.

15 THE WITNESS (Gadasu): Yes.

16 MR. BALDWIN: And do you adopt the  
17 information contained in those exhibits as your  
18 testimony in this proceeding? Mr. Gaudet.

19 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yes.

20 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Parks.

21 THE WITNESS (Parks): Yes.

22 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson.

23 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes.

24 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Centore.

25 THE WITNESS (Centore): Yes.

1 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gadasu.

2 THE WITNESS (Gadasu): Yes.

3 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Morissette, I offer  
4 them as full exhibits.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney  
6 Baldwin. The exhibits are hereby admitted.

7 (Applicant's Exhibits II-B-1 through  
8 II-B-6: Received in evidence - described in  
9 index.)

10 MR. MORISSETTE: We'll now begin with  
11 cross-examination of the applicant by the Council  
12 starting with Mr. Mercier, followed by Mr.  
13 Silvestri.

14 Mr. Mercier.

15 CROSS-EXAMINATION

16 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. I want to  
17 begin by referring to the submission, dated April  
18 27, that was for the proposed alternate site in  
19 the revised interrogatories. My first question  
20 is, has the original site proposed in the  
21 application, has that been officially withdrawn  
22 and this is just the substitute for it?

23 THE WITNESS (Parks): That is correct.

24 MR. MERCIER: And has the landowner  
25 agreed to the new alternate site and site plan?

1 THE WITNESS (Parks): Yes. I'm sorry,  
2 this is Tim Parks talking. My apologies.

3 MR. MERCIER: Looking at the site plan,  
4 it's attachment 1, there's two site plans. One  
5 shows just a general layout comparing the two  
6 locations, the alternate shown on the right side  
7 of the map. And then if you go to the next  
8 diagram, there's more information on a topographic  
9 map, Mason Hill Road and the driveway, et cetera.  
10 Looking at the second map, it's titled ALT-1.1.

11 Where roughly was the original tower  
12 located? I believe it may have been where, if you  
13 look on the left side, there's like a zigzag line  
14 that represents the erosion control measures, and  
15 at one point it intersects a specific tree. I  
16 believe that's the location. I just want to know  
17 if you could confirm that, please.

18 THE WITNESS (Centore): Carlo Centore  
19 with Centek Engineering. I believe you're  
20 correct. The approximate location, it's to the  
21 west of the eastern edge of the Eversource  
22 right-of-way and approximately between the two  
23 trees that are just below the turnaround that's  
24 shown on the plan.

25 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you. Now,

1 beginning with the access drive, it comes off  
2 Mason Hill Road generally in a southwest  
3 direction, it goes down a little slope there.  
4 What's the grade of that slope, do you have that  
5 information?

6 THE WITNESS (Centore): Yes. You come  
7 in about 10, 15 feet off of Mason Hill Road, and  
8 the grade there is about 20 percent. And then the  
9 average grade extending from that point 40 feet  
10 down to where it starts to flatten out is about a  
11 25 to 30 percent grade there. It's got some  
12 steepness to it coming in, but we've accommodated  
13 that by offering to pave that area to help with  
14 any erosion and access issues that could be  
15 created by that slope.

16 MR. MERCIER: Okay. So just so I  
17 understand, that's the finished grade you're going  
18 to attain is between 20 to 25 percent, depending  
19 on the specific location?

20 THE WITNESS (Centore): That is  
21 correct. The average grade would be about 25 to  
22 30 percent through that area, being the upper 40,  
23 the first 40 feet of the access drive.

24 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Now, would there  
25 be any kind of issue with emergency vehicles or

1 propane fuel trucks from entering or using that  
2 road with a grade such as 25 percent?

3 THE WITNESS (Centore): Having the  
4 ability to turn around at the bottom will allow  
5 the fuel trucks to get in and give them a level  
6 area to come in, and they've got enough area at  
7 the top to access. So we don't foresee any issues  
8 as long as the road is maintained and kept clean  
9 in the winter from snow.

10 MR. MERCIER: So the grade itself is  
11 not problematic for emergency vehicles or the  
12 propane trucks?

13 THE WITNESS (Centore): No.

14 MR. MERCIER: As long as it's salted if  
15 it snows or whatever. Okay. Thank you.

16 THE WITNESS (Centore): Correct.

17 MR. MERCIER: Just looking generally at  
18 the map along Mason Hill Road where the access  
19 drive is, you know, it looks like the terrain kind  
20 of slopes actually south towards the wetland, but  
21 I notice you have the pitch of the road towards  
22 the north side of the driveway rather than the  
23 south. So all the water will be, it looks like  
24 it's going to be collected into the riprap swale  
25 that's going off the level spreader. Would it

1 make sense to put the level spreader and swale on  
2 the other side of the road on the wetland side?  
3 I'm not sure why the swale was chosen on that  
4 side, I guess, if you could elaborate.

5 THE WITNESS (Centore): To the question  
6 I'm trying to think of the appropriate response.  
7 The idea was just to maintain some of the runoff  
8 to the other side of the site and still work its  
9 way down to the wetlands as it comes around the  
10 north side of the site and works its way down.  
11 There's no -- we also didn't want to get into  
12 working in that whole wetland buffer and creating  
13 that swale. Dean --

14 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): I can expand  
15 upon that response. Dean Gustafson. So having  
16 the swale on the northwest side of the access  
17 road, the level spreader is actually more  
18 protective of that nearby wetland resource.  
19 That's mainly because of the somewhat moderate to  
20 steep slopes. So if for some reason that swale or  
21 level spreader isn't properly maintained, that  
22 could ultimately result in some unreleased  
23 discharge and erosion into the wetland. This  
24 layout will help protect in the future that  
25 wetland system, and the water eventually will

1 drain through the subbase for the road and the  
2 compound so there won't be any adverse hydraulic  
3 impact to that nearby wetland system.

4 MR. MERCIER: So as I understand it, so  
5 during heavy rain events water will collect in the  
6 swale and get discharged to the level spreader.  
7 And then what happens, does the level spreader  
8 have a discharge point itself, or could you  
9 describe how deep it is or what type of function  
10 it would have during heavy rain events? Would it  
11 overflow and flood the paved area or gravel area  
12 next to the compound gate? I'm not sure if that  
13 area is paved or not. I know the upper road was.  
14 If you could elaborate on that, please.

15 THE WITNESS (Centore): Carlo Centore,  
16 with Centek Engineering. The lower area of the  
17 drive is gravel. The intent is just to pave the  
18 sloped area coming down into the site. That level  
19 spreader would discharge water to the west and to  
20 the north. It's designed to allow the water to  
21 flow out in those areas. I don't foresee any  
22 issues with any flooding or flooding out of the  
23 access drive or washed out of the access drive as  
24 a result of that.

25 MR. MERCIER: Okay. I guess my final



1 question is, is the road pitched towards the level  
2 spreader -- excuse me, the swale, or is it pitched  
3 to the other side, or is it just neutral? If it  
4 rains, which way is the rain going to run off to,  
5 towards the swale, on the road that is not on  
6 the --

7 THE WITNESS (Centore): Slight pitch to  
8 the north. At a slight pitch to the north towards  
9 the swale.

10 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you. Now,  
11 given the grades there, I know the initial site  
12 plan had the access road extending through the  
13 Eversource right-of-way to the compound area.  
14 Could you still proceed with constructing a road  
15 using the portion of the road on the Eversource  
16 right-of-way to this new compound area, is that  
17 still feasible, or you're no longer considering  
18 the right-of-way area?

19 THE WITNESS (Centore): We can consider  
20 the right-of-way area for crossing over and  
21 accessing the site. It is a possibility.

22 MR. MERCIER: I wasn't sure why you  
23 decided, Cellco decided to do a new access drive  
24 off Mason Hill Road if the other alternative may  
25 still be in play. Anybody have any information on

1 that?

2 THE WITNESS (Centore): The idea was to  
3 pull everything out of the Eversource right-of-way  
4 to avoid another party to be involved with this  
5 site. From a design standpoint or an engineering  
6 standpoint, there's nothing stopping us from  
7 accessing the site through the Eversource  
8 right-of-way. There would be less disruption due  
9 to the shorter amount of road that we'd have to  
10 build here in terms of underground utilities,  
11 gravel access drive and transporting through.  
12 This would have less impact in that respect, but  
13 either option is feasible.

14 MR. MERCIER: Looking at the proposed  
15 compound now, the alternate compound location, a  
16 portion of the turnaround area I understand is  
17 within Eversource's right-of-way, and I think it's  
18 stated that you might need permission to construct  
19 that as proposed here. Has there been any  
20 outreach, or do you foresee any problems where you  
21 would not be able to build that turnaround area to  
22 serve this compound layout?

23 THE WITNESS (Centore): Carlo Centore  
24 again. We do have an alternate plan that we've  
25 considered. We haven't implemented it because

1 this makes more sense, but we can maintain that  
2 turnaround within -- or outside of the  
3 right-of-way by extending the turnaround north  
4 just below the level spreader. We wanted to use  
5 that space for drainage, but we can make some  
6 accommodations to offer a turnaround and get the  
7 drainage to work.

8 MR. MERCIER: Thank you.

9 THE WITNESS (Centore): Yes.

10 MR. MERCIER: Looking at the retaining  
11 walls, just so I understand it, this is not an  
12 excavation into a hill, this is more like you're  
13 going to build some retaining walls and kind of  
14 fill that area in to build up the slope to make it  
15 flat. Is that right?

16 THE WITNESS (Centore): That's correct.

17 MR. MERCIER: You're not excavating  
18 into a hillside, you're more like pushing soil  
19 into a retained area?

20 THE WITNESS (Centore): We're building  
21 it up approximately 3, 3 and a half feet.

22 MR. MERCIER: The previous site plan, I  
23 think, had 200 cubic yards of fill. I don't have  
24 the cut number in front of me. But do you know  
25 what the cuts and fill for this particular site

1 would be?

2 THE WITNESS (Centore): I do. So it's  
3 a 25-cubic yard cut, 218-cubic yard fill. So for  
4 a net fill of 193 or 193.7, we'll call it 194  
5 cubic yards net fill.

6 MR. MERCIER: Okay. To date, has there  
7 been any kind of a subsurface evaluation of  
8 conditions there to determine, you know, number  
9 one, could the swale be built, or, you know, is  
10 there any foundation problems, is there any type  
11 of subsurface study done yet?

12 THE WITNESS (Centore): We have not  
13 done a geotechnical study as of yet.

14 MR. MERCIER: If the site was approved  
15 when would you conduct that study, before the  
16 development and management plan is submitted?

17 THE WITNESS (Centore): It would be  
18 part of the D&M submission.

19 MR. MERCIER: Now, what equipment would  
20 you use at the site to do the study?

21 THE WITNESS (Centore): In terms of  
22 geotechnical equipment?

23 MR. MERCIER: Yes.

24 THE WITNESS (Centore): I would assume  
25 that this site would lend itself to be needing a

1 track mounted boring rig to get in and do the --  
2 to get the appropriate borings.

3 MR. MERCIER: Would this site, besides  
4 some like minor brush or some shrubs or small  
5 trees, would it require the geotech to cut down  
6 some larger trees or do they just maneuver where  
7 they can?

8 THE WITNESS (Centore): Based on what  
9 I'm seeing on the larger trees that would need to  
10 come down as part of the site, I think we can work  
11 -- I am confident that we can work around what's  
12 there except for having to clear out some low  
13 brush or small trees.

14 MR. MERCIER: If ledge is found during  
15 the geotechnical study, how would that be removed,  
16 is it typically chipping or do you anticipate any  
17 kind of blasting?

18 THE WITNESS (Centore): I don't  
19 anticipate any type of blasting. We have to  
20 evaluate it once we get the geotechnical report.  
21 But typically if there is ledge and it's competent  
22 ledge, there's some methods that we can use such  
23 as core drilling it, rock anchors into the ledge,  
24 and having that help us create the foundation for  
25 the tower and not requiring it to be blasted.

1 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you. Now,  
2 initially during the first set of  
3 interrogatories -- I think they were dated April  
4 10th -- there was a remote field review done for  
5 the original site. I don't know if you could do  
6 this now or maybe someone could take a look at it.  
7 If someone could just flip through some of the  
8 pictures and kind of see if any of the photos that  
9 were taken for the initial field review might show  
10 some of the conditions for the proposed alternate  
11 site here.

12 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Brian Gaudet  
13 with All-Points. I'll point you to photos 12A and  
14 12B are probably two of the better vantage points  
15 here. 12A is taken approximately where the new  
16 monopole would be installed and geared towards the  
17 southwest. 12B kind of gives you a good shot of  
18 where the access drive would be coming in off of  
19 Mason Hill.

20 MR. MERCIER: For 12B would you know if  
21 the access road is coming in on the left side of  
22 the picture, the center or the right? Do you have  
23 any sense of where it actually might come -- or is  
24 it just coming across the middle of the photo, or  
25 is it more this is just the general terrain?

1                   THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yes, more the  
2 general terrain here. I would say it looks like  
3 it's probably coming, if you look on the  
4 right-hand side of the photo, there's that larger  
5 tree there and some stone on the right-hand side,  
6 a utility pole in the background there.

7                   MR. MERCIER: Okay.

8                   THE WITNESS (Gaudet): That utility  
9 pole is I believe the one, if you're looking at  
10 the drawing, it's across Mason Hill on the north  
11 side of the road. So that should give you a good  
12 vantage point. It's kind of coming from that  
13 utility pole cutting across the photo down to the  
14 bottom left of the photo.

15                  MR. MERCIER: Okay. Excellent. I see  
16 the pole there. That would make sense. Thank  
17 you.

18                  THE WITNESS (Gaudet): You're welcome.

19                  MR. MERCIER: Also, for the first set  
20 of interrogatories, Interrogatory 7, you know,  
21 there was some discussion as to why the existing  
22 utility poles over Eversource's right-of-way could  
23 not be used. One of them was site access issues  
24 where you needed access all the time in case  
25 there's an issue at the site. Were there other

1 challenges that could occur such as structural  
2 capacity or anything of that nature based on  
3 Verizon's experience with other structure sharing  
4 with transmission lines, were there any other  
5 issues besides the site access?

6 THE WITNESS (Centore): Sure. Carlo  
7 Centore again. We've been involved in the  
8 analysis of many transmission towers. Based on  
9 just general information on what we know about  
10 these towers without having the drawings and  
11 needing to get approximately another 17, 18 feet  
12 above those towers to the RAD center for the  
13 proposed antennas, it's going to be difficult  
14 to -- it would be difficult to make that structure  
15 work without reinforcements or modifications which  
16 Eversource frowns upon and does not actually  
17 permit on any other transmission pole. So I would  
18 say that we have a limitation structurally.

19 We could confirm that through an  
20 analysis being provided, the line loads and tower  
21 drawings, if that's something that requires  
22 further investigation, but based on experience, I  
23 would say that it would be difficult to make that  
24 tower pass.

25 MR. MERCIER: Understood. I wasn't



1 sure, based on Verizon's experience, you know, say  
2 you locate it on a transmission structure, were  
3 there opportunities for collocation by someone  
4 else, or is it usually, you know, one carrier that  
5 could probably use a structure such as the one  
6 along these lines here?

7 THE WITNESS (Centore): It would be a  
8 one carrier type installation that, if it were to  
9 pass, it would be a one carrier type installation,  
10 but I think we'd be hard pressed to make that work  
11 as well.

12 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. Moving to  
13 response 18, it described the limitations  
14 regarding flush-mount antenna installations. In  
15 that response there was the term "beamforming."  
16 So I guess it's a question for Mr. Gadasu, if you  
17 could provide more information as to what is  
18 beamforming and why it is important.

19 THE WITNESS (Gadasu): This is Shiva  
20 Gadasu. So beamforming is, you know, it is on low  
21 band which is 700 and 800 megahertz frequencies we  
22 are using. And, you know, those frequencies are  
23 split between two different antennas per sector.  
24 So in order for beamforming to work, those two  
25 antennas should be placed next to each other. So

1 by doing flush mounting, that's not possible. So  
2 you need, you know, so you can't do a flush mount.

3 MR. MERCIER: Okay. So they have to be  
4 physically next to each other so they could  
5 transmit the signals between each other?

6 THE WITNESS (Gadasu): Right.

7 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Going down my list  
8 here, going down to application attachment 10,  
9 this has to do with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife  
10 determination regarding the northern long-eared  
11 bat that was issued on November 2nd to Verizon for  
12 this particular site. And now I understand that  
13 the Fish and Wildlife Service has uplisted the bat  
14 from threatened to endangered I think at the end  
15 of November of 2022. So how would that uplisting  
16 threatened to endangered affect this site? Do you  
17 have to refile or are you allowed to proceed since  
18 you have the determination already?

19 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean  
20 Gustafson from All-Points. For northern  
21 long-eared bat, yeah, it's been uplisted to  
22 endangered. And the U.S. Fish and Wildlife  
23 Service released a new determination key. It's an  
24 interim key for northern long-eared bat that was  
25 released the end of March. Running this site

1 through that new determination key, we received a  
2 determination of may affect, not likely to  
3 adversely affect. So it is very similar to the  
4 previous determination where the proposed project  
5 will not result in a likely adverse affect to the  
6 northern long-eared bat.

7 MR. MERCIER: Okay. So essentially  
8 there was no change due to the listing?

9 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That's  
10 correct, for this particular project there was  
11 really no change due to the uplisting.

12 And just by way of background, we've  
13 processed probably about 30-plus sites through the  
14 new determination key for various projects,  
15 whether it be telecommunications, solar, et  
16 cetera, and the majority of them there's been no  
17 real change from the old process to this new  
18 determination key for northern long-eared bat.

19 MR. MERCIER: Okay. For attachment 10  
20 there was some recommendations for avoiding tree  
21 clearing from April 1st to October 31st. Is that  
22 something Verizon is willing to adhere to or maybe  
23 some other type of restriction to avoid impacting  
24 bats that may be using this wooded area? Now, I  
25 know there's a recommendation. I didn't see

1 anything if Verizon was willing to adhere to that,  
2 if someone could elaborate.

3 THE WITNESS (Parks): Yes, Verizon  
4 would be willing to do so.

5 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. Now, for that  
6 restriction from April 1st to October 31st, would  
7 that also be protective of forest nesting birds?

8 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean  
9 Gustafson. Yes, that would cover the typical  
10 nesting period for most of the neotropical species  
11 that may be utilizing this forested habitat. The  
12 window is a little bit tighter than that, but it  
13 would be equally protective of those species.

14 MR. MERCIER: For the compound area is  
15 there any lighting proposed on the cabinets or the  
16 base of the tower or the gate, no night lighting  
17 that's on constantly?

18 THE WITNESS (Centore): Carlo Centore,  
19 Centek. No, no continuously running lights at the  
20 equipment. There is a small light mounted to the  
21 overhead ice canopy that's on a motion sensor.

22 MR. MERCIER: Is that also operable by  
23 a switch or is it just motion only or a timer?

24 THE WITNESS (Centore): Typically we do  
25 motion only. I'm sorry, I stand corrected. There

1 is also a switch, and that switch is on a timer so  
2 that the light doesn't stay on continuously.

3 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. For this  
4 particular site has any other carrier expressed  
5 any interest to Cellco to collocate on the tower?

6 THE WITNESS (Parks): This is Tim Parks  
7 from Cellco. Not at this time.

8 MR. MERCIER: Okay. How about any  
9 emergency entity or maybe the municipality?

10 THE WITNESS (Parks): Again, Tim Parks.  
11 No one has reached out to us.

12 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you. Going  
13 back to the submission of the alternate site, it's  
14 a Late-File, not really a Late-File, but the April  
15 27th, in there was a revised viewshed map. And  
16 also in that document there was a response 33, it  
17 was a revised response to Interrogatory 33. It  
18 dealt with visibility to area homes. In that  
19 response it stated that within a half mile I think  
20 there was 31 residences would have seasonal views  
21 and 10 would have year-round and seasonal views.

22 Looking at the map, the half mile  
23 buffer area there at the top-right corner, is  
24 there a particular neighborhood that has the  
25 concentration of views or is it just kind of

1 scattered around?

2 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): This is Brian  
3 Gaudet with All-Points. It's scattered. There's  
4 residential -- looking again at the half-mile  
5 radius, there's residential properties throughout  
6 that seasonal area there. I would say that the  
7 densest neighborhood would be to the east in the  
8 Atwood Heights area and Atwood Road area. That's  
9 sort of immediately to the east going down towards  
10 the southeast there. But again, there are  
11 residential properties along Mason Hill Road that  
12 will experience a combination of either seasonal  
13 or seasonal and year-round views.

14 MR. MERCIER: Okay. For that Atwood  
15 Heights area I was trying to blow up that area to  
16 scan it a little closer. Are there little spot  
17 year-round views in there or is that just all  
18 seasonal?

19 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): There's a  
20 handful of, I would call it, intermittent  
21 year-round views. It is tough to see it, they're  
22 very fine. The tree cover here is pretty thick  
23 going down towards that neighborhood, so you do  
24 benefit from the forested area kind of blocking  
25 out a lot of those full year-round views. But

1 it's expected that it would probably pop into view  
2 again at a static location potentially on some of  
3 those properties.

4 MR. MERCIER: Okay. In the initial  
5 visibility analysis I believe it stated that for  
6 year-round views it would generally be the upper  
7 10 to 30 feet. That was for the original site.  
8 Would that still be the same for this particular  
9 relocated site?

10 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yeah, there's  
11 not much change in the visibility from the  
12 original location to this location. It's such a  
13 minor shift. The ground elevation is the same.  
14 The only area where it might open up some  
15 additional views if we went with the alternate  
16 access drive would be sort of immediately  
17 north-northwest right along Mason Hill Road where  
18 you wouldn't benefit from that tree cover right up  
19 against the road itself. But primarily any  
20 year-round views you're not going to see more than  
21 30 feet above the tree line from most locations.

22 MR. MERCIER: Okay. So you just stated  
23 that there would be some cutting to open up the  
24 access road along the hill there. So for  
25 year-round views going down that driveway is there

1 a house across the street at all or is it just  
2 people driving by would, you know, see down the  
3 driveway for a moment?

4 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Residents across  
5 the street, which if you look now, again, at the  
6 half-mile radius, I'll point you just to the north  
7 of where the yellow square, yellow exed-out square  
8 which is representing the site location, that  
9 yellow patch that you see there is right on that  
10 property. You've got some year-round views there.  
11 It wouldn't open up substantially more year-round  
12 views. I mean, the access drive is not that wide,  
13 you're not removing that many trees. So it would  
14 be minimal, again, impacting a property that's  
15 already going to have some year-round and some  
16 seasonal views on it.

17 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Now, referring to  
18 the initial visibility analysis in the application  
19 that was attachment, I think, 9, there's a whole  
20 series of photographs in there. How would  
21 relocation of the tower affect, you know, the  
22 balloon location in the photographs, is it  
23 minimal?

24 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): It's minimal  
25 depending on your vantage point. Let me pull up,



1 let me kind of flip through some of these photos  
2 here so we can talk through it. Photo 4.

3 MR. MERCIER: Okay. We'll just start  
4 there, photo 4, yeah.

5 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Photo 4, it's  
6 essentially going to shift to the left, to the  
7 other side of that transmission pole.

8 MR. MERCIER: Okay.

9 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): And it's pretty  
10 minimal. Depending on the angle, it's not going  
11 to be a big pure 50-foot shift from a specific  
12 vantage point just based on it being angled here.  
13 So it would be, you know, probably just to the  
14 left of the bonnets on that transmission line  
15 there.

16 MR. MERCIER: Going to Photo 5, looking  
17 at that curve area, is the access road entrance  
18 along this area would you know?

19 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Give me one  
20 second. So the access drive here would actually  
21 be cut into the, I think it would be off the right  
22 of this photo, the Photo 5.

23 MR. MERCIER: Off to the right?

24 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yes. So this  
25 shift would be where the balloon is. Probably, if

1 you look towards the top of the photo, just trying  
2 to describe it here, you've got sort of a little  
3 cutout in two of the taller trees there, you'd  
4 probably shift more to the right-hand side of that  
5 location.

6 MR. MERCIER: Okay. I'll just scan  
7 over to Figure 7. This is the Atwood Heights.  
8 For this particular picture there probably  
9 wouldn't be much change, you know, it's still kind  
10 of behind some trees?

11 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yeah, I think  
12 the general characteristic in this area is not  
13 going to change, again, looking at a static  
14 location. In this one particular spot it might  
15 shift behind that house from this one vantage  
16 point on the street, but generally it will be the  
17 same height, same seasonal impact through the  
18 trees back through that neighborhood.

19 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Also way down on  
20 Photo 27 it's actually a picture taken, I think,  
21 from a dam at Northfield Brook Lake.

22 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yes.

23 MR. MERCIER: Do you know if that's  
24 some type of -- is that a recreational area or is  
25 that just strictly flood control and people could

1 walk along the road, I guess.

2 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): It is, it's the  
3 dam at the Northfield Reservoir. I don't know  
4 offhand if it's got any recreational value to it.  
5 I would have to look into that.

6 MR. MERCIER: The original  
7 Interrogatory Response 31 had to do with the  
8 historic resources report that would be filed with  
9 the State Historic Preservation Office if the  
10 tower is approved. I'm not really sure why you  
11 don't file during the application process and why  
12 do you wait until, if this tower was approved.

13 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Mercier, I'm sorry,  
14 you broke up there a little bit. Could you repeat  
15 that question for us? I'm sorry.

16 MR. MERCIER: Sure. This has to do  
17 with the State Historic Preservation Office. And  
18 I believe Interrogatory Response 31 stated that  
19 the historic resource report would be filed with  
20 them if the tower is approved by the Council. Any  
21 particular reason why you wait until the tower is  
22 approved rather than filing during the application  
23 review with the Council?

24 THE WITNESS (Parks): Tim Parks from  
25 Cellco. That's just part of our process. There's

1 no real reason why we do that. It's when we  
2 choose to.

3 MR. MERCIER: Okay. For the propane  
4 generator at the site how often is that tested, is  
5 it once a week, twice a week, once a month?

6 THE WITNESS (Parks): It's usually  
7 twice a month usually in the midday hours of a  
8 weekday.

9 MR. MERCIER: Thank you.

10 THE WITNESS (Parks): Uh-huh.

11 MR. MERCIER: I don't have any other  
12 questions at this time. Thank you.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.  
14 Mercier. Can everyone hear me okay? I seem to be  
15 having lots of problems over here with my  
16 internet.

17 MR. BALDWIN: We can hear you, Mr.  
18 Morissette.

19 MR. MORISSETTE: Great. Thank you. Am  
20 I the only one having problems here or are others  
21 also having problems?

22 MR. SILVESTRI: So far so good on my  
23 end, Mr. Morissette.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. It keeps  
25 bouncing me out. So if it happens again, I'm

1 going to leave the meeting and try to come in,  
2 re-log in again. So if I disappear, it's for that  
3 reason. Okay. Thank you.

4 With that, we will continue with  
5 cross-examination by Mr. Silvestri and then we  
6 will continue after Mr. Silvestri with Mr. Nguyen.

7 Mr. Silvestri.

8 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr.  
9 Morissette. And good afternoon, everyone.

10 I will say, I'll start this out with  
11 your conversation with Mr. Mercier left me  
12 somewhat confused, and I'll tell you why: When I  
13 look at the April 27th submittal, the bottom of  
14 page 1 going onto page 2, it mentions that the  
15 proposed location was going to be within the  
16 eastern-most part of the Eversource easement at  
17 the time that you filed and that Cellco was under  
18 the impression Eversource might agree to allow for  
19 that but things had changed. On April 11, Cellco  
20 learned that its proposed use of the easement  
21 would not be permitted, yet with alternate drawing  
22 1.1 we're still back on the easement part.

23 So could you explain to me why one  
24 didn't work but the other might work?

25 THE WITNESS (Centore): Carlo Centore

1 with Centek Engineering. We took the tower out of  
2 the easement, and that was the intent was to  
3 remove the tower and its base equipment outside of  
4 that Eversource easement. The only portion that  
5 is extending onto that area is the turnaround at  
6 the bottom of the access drive.

7 MR. SILVESTRI: And is that at this  
8 point permitted by Eversource or is that something  
9 you need to work out?

10 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Silvestri, if I could  
11 speak to that from a legal perspective. That's  
12 something we have to work out. There is a  
13 process, as you may be aware, with Eversource to  
14 use portions of their existing easement areas.  
15 And that, if we were going to propose to use any  
16 portion of the easement area, we would have to go  
17 through that process. What we discovered a short  
18 time ago was that the use of any structures or the  
19 installation of any structures within that  
20 easement was a nonstarter, but the installation of  
21 a gravel area we think may be something we could  
22 work through that process.

23 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Attorney  
24 Baldwin. And if I understood and heard correctly  
25 before, if that area on the easement right now for

1 the turnaround does not come to fruition, then  
2 you'd be looking at putting a turnaround to the  
3 west of the proposed spreader, is that correct,  
4 did I hear correctly on that one?

5 THE WITNESS (Centore): That is  
6 correct.

7 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. Now,  
8 in your discussion with Mr. Mercier I also heard a  
9 comment that something would have a lesser impact.  
10 And I don't know if that was directed towards the  
11 access from Mason Hill Road or if that was  
12 contemplating access through a right-of-way on  
13 Eversource. Could you possibly clarify what that  
14 meant that whatever you mentioned to Mr. Mercier  
15 would have less of an impact?

16 THE WITNESS (Centore): Carlo Centore.  
17 The less impact would be the amount of  
18 construction and underground utilities and  
19 bringing, getting access to the site across the  
20 right-of-way. Lesser impact would be the shorter  
21 access drive coming off of Mason Hill Road, as is  
22 currently shown.

23 MR. SILVESTRI: So the proposal for the  
24 alternate with Mason Hill Road would have less of  
25 an impact than if you came in from the ROW; do I

1 have that correct?

2 THE WITNESS (Centore): Correct.

3 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. Okay. I  
4 think that will put to rest a couple other  
5 questions that I had there. But stay on Alternate  
6 1.1 for a minute or so, that drawing. I noticed  
7 the proposal for the proposed wetland buffer  
8 enhancement area, and you do have a number of  
9 species and potential quantities that would be  
10 planted along the side of the proposed compound.  
11 A question I have for you: Once these species are  
12 planted, what type of maintenance might be  
13 associated with them, what might you have to do  
14 from month to month or from year to year?

15 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean  
16 Gustafson from All-Points. So the native species  
17 that are proposed in the planting plan essentially  
18 require zero maintenance once they get  
19 established. And it's something that we would  
20 probably want to monitor for the first growing  
21 season or two to make sure that the plants that  
22 got planted are remaining healthy. But once that  
23 period is gone, they require no maintenance at  
24 all.

25 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. And I



1 noticed all but one are along the bush species,  
2 but you do have a dogwood that's there. Anything  
3 special that you have to do with the gray dogwood?

4 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): No, the gray  
5 dogwood is a shrub species as well. The mature  
6 height is around 15 to 20 feet max.

7 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. And  
8 just for my clarification, I think we put to bed  
9 that on page 7 of the original application it's  
10 not natural gas and that it's propane, correct?

11 THE WITNESS (Parks): Tim Parks from  
12 Cellco. That is correct.

13 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. Then, if I  
14 understand correctly, the tower height would be  
15 110 feet which at the alternate location is  
16 approximately 141 feet from the transmission line  
17 and 37 feet from the easement. And again, this is  
18 for the tower. What are the thoughts on  
19 installing a hinge point for the tower?

20 THE WITNESS (Centore): Carlo Centore.  
21 The hinge point is a good solution to avoiding the  
22 potential for anything going into the high tension  
23 lines and keeping it outside of the easement.

24 MR. SILVESTRI: So you would design  
25 with a hinge point or a yield point, if you will?

1 THE WITNESS (Centore): Correct.

2 MR. SILVESTRI: Any idea where that  
3 point might be on that tower?

4 THE WITNESS (Centore): Yes. I know I  
5 have it in here. Bear with me. So to clarify,  
6 the proposed tower is 105 feet tall. The yield  
7 point to the Eversource right-of-way is  
8 approximately 30 to 35 feet away. So we would put  
9 the yield point 30 feet below the top of the tower  
10 so that it hinges and falls onto it, it would  
11 hinge onto itself within that 30-foot distance.

12 MR. SILVESTRI: So 30 feet below, if I  
13 did the math right, about 75 feet?

14 THE WITNESS (Centore): I apologize, it  
15 is a 110-foot tower. It's 105-foot centerline. I  
16 got the two mixed up. I apologize. So 110-foot  
17 tower. The yield point would be approximately 70  
18 feet above grade.

19 MR. SILVESTRI: 70 feet, okay. Thank  
20 you. Okay. Then with the proposed retaining wall  
21 that would be installed, would the new ground  
22 elevation for the compound actually be at the top  
23 of the wall, or would the wall extend up a little  
24 bit higher than the elevation for the compound?

25 THE WITNESS (Centore): Typically we

1 like the wall to extend up a little bit, and we  
2 put our fence behind that. But it's a 6-inch  
3 difference, let's say, 6 to 8 inches difference.

4 MR. SILVESTRI: So the ground elevation  
5 for the compound would be about 6 inches below the  
6 top of the wall?

7 THE WITNESS (Centore): Correct.

8 MR. SILVESTRI: Got you. Thank you. I  
9 want to talk about noise for a second or two.  
10 Under Tab 1 on page 7 of the environmental  
11 assessment it states that no noise would be  
12 emitted with the exception for the backup  
13 generator. And there was a response, I believe,  
14 under Interrogatory 28 that noise levels emitted  
15 from the proposed equipment cabinet are  
16 negligible.

17 The question I have is, are there fans  
18 that are going to be within that cabinet, and  
19 would the fans have any impact on noise  
20 generation? And fans being for cooling purposes.

21 THE WITNESS (Centore): Yes, I would  
22 say, not having the dB ratings for the fans on the  
23 equipment, I can say that those sound levels would  
24 be less, significantly less than those of the  
25 generator running. So I would say there would be,

1 the impact would be negligible.

2 MR. SILVESTRI: And if I understand the  
3 systems correctly, fans would run more, say,  
4 during the summer daytime than opposed at night or  
5 any other time of the year?

6 THE WITNESS (Centore): That is  
7 correct.

8 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. All right. If I  
9 go back to pages 9 to 10 of the original  
10 submittal, a question I have, how do the mobile  
11 telephone switching offices that are in Windsor  
12 and Wallingford, how do they actually interact  
13 with Cellco's cell sites?

14 THE WITNESS (Gadasu): This is Shiva  
15 Gadasu. I'm sorry, could you repeat that again?

16 MR. SILVESTRI: Looking at the Windsor  
17 and Wallingford offices that you have, how do  
18 those interconnect or interact with any of the  
19 Cellco cell sites?

20 THE WITNESS (Gadasu): So those are the  
21 switch locations, so that is like, it acts as a  
22 backhaul.

23 MR. SILVESTRI: But do they interact  
24 from an airwave standpoint, from a fiberoptic  
25 standpoint, how do they talk to each other?

1 THE WITNESS (Gadasu): I believe it's  
2 fiberoptics.

3 MR. SILVESTRI: Fiber, okay. And  
4 should a problem occur, say, at one of those  
5 either at Windsor or at Wallingford, is there a  
6 backup that's provided, does one switching center  
7 take over for the other, how does that work  
8 between the two in Windsor and Wallingford?

9 THE WITNESS (Gadasu): I'm sorry, I do  
10 not have an answer to that question.

11 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Maybe during the  
12 break you could look at that, just a curiosity  
13 question I have. I mean, I'd appreciate it if you  
14 could find something on that.

15 MR. BALDWIN: We can take that as a  
16 homework assignment, Mr. Silvestri.

17 MR. SILVESTRI: I appreciate that.  
18 Thank you, Attorney Baldwin.

19 What I'd like to do now is turn to Tab  
20 6, which are the drawings, if you will, existing  
21 and proposed coverage that you have. And one of  
22 the things I'm curious about -- this is existing  
23 and proposed coverage for the 700 megahertz.  
24 There's not a number on the page, but I hope you  
25 could find that based on the title. The question

1 I have is why is there a gap in coverage south of  
2 the proposed location? And this would be near the  
3 wording for the Northfield Reservoir and State  
4 Highway 254.

5 THE WITNESS (Gadasu): This is Shiva  
6 Gadasu again. I believe the terrain is dropping  
7 quite dramatically in that area, hence the RF is  
8 not able to, should, you know, pass it.

9 MR. SILVESTRI: So if I understand, it  
10 could be a terrain issue at a much lower elevation  
11 that the signals would not be able to reach, they  
12 pass over the top, so to speak?

13 THE WITNESS (Gadasu): From the tower  
14 location to the reservoir, which is to the south,  
15 I believe, you know, the terrain is dropping, you  
16 know, as you go south, hence, you know, it can't,  
17 you know, the signal can't pass through the  
18 terrain.

19 MR. SILVESTRI: Now, would that also be  
20 true, looking at the same coverage map, right  
21 where it has Litchfield SE Connecticut, right  
22 above that, just above the letters L-I-T in  
23 Litchfield there is also a gap. Is that also an  
24 elevation issue?

25 THE WITNESS (Gadasu): That is true.

1 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. Then  
2 another curiosity question. You show the 700  
3 megahertz, the 850, the 1,900, the 2,100 and the  
4 5G. Why does the coverage go down as you go  
5 higher in megahertz?

6 THE WITNESS (Gadasu): So this is Shiva  
7 Gadasu again. So as we go up frequencies, the  
8 signal, you know, cannot travel further. But the  
9 shorter the frequency, the longer it travels.

10 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. So that's a  
11 physics type of limitation. All right. Now, the  
12 big curiosity question I have is 5G is being  
13 touted as the save all, if you will, yet 5G,  
14 according to these maps, has such limited  
15 coverage. How does 5G benefit the receiver, the  
16 people that use 5G if it can't really penetrate  
17 that far away?

18 THE WITNESS (Gadasu): Yeah, I mean, 5G  
19 we need, you know, more towers, you know, to  
20 provide continuous coverage, you know, with  
21 respect to, you know, like as we do for 700  
22 hundred megahertz. So, you know, we propose  
23 mostly, you know, so we try to propose 5G more in  
24 dense urban areas, but, you know, it will also  
25 help, you know, once it gets into a rural area, it

1 will help users who can connect to it.

2 MR. SILVESTRI: So if I heard and  
3 understood correctly, the denser, say, urban areas  
4 would benefit more from a 5G; would that be  
5 correct?

6 THE WITNESS (Gadasu): Right, because  
7 there would be a more number of users consolidated  
8 close to the site as opposed to rural areas.

9 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you for that  
10 information. Then on Tab 8 of the site search  
11 summary it notes that RF engineers determined that  
12 certain parcels could not satisfy Cellco's service  
13 objections -- objectives, excuse me. And the  
14 question I have is, is that true for all  
15 frequencies or you're really looking more at the  
16 700 megahertz?

17 THE WITNESS (Gadasu): So in this  
18 perspective, I mean, this is a coverage fill-in,  
19 so we just look at -- in this case we just look  
20 at, you know, 700 coverage.

21 MR. SILVESTRI: Being the one that will  
22 cover the most area?

23 THE WITNESS (Gadasu): Right.

24 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. All  
25 right. I have a couple more. If you could turn



1 to the April 10th submittal for the interrogatory  
2 responses. And I'm looking at Question Number 9  
3 which is on page 7. This talks about the climbing  
4 pegs on the lower portion of the tower that would  
5 be removed to deter climbing of the tower. The  
6 question I have for you on those, do they need to  
7 be reinstalled at some point in the future for  
8 maintenance purposes?

9 THE WITNESS (Centore): Again, Carlo  
10 Centore. Typically when they maintain the towers,  
11 the crews going out on site would bring pegs that  
12 they can install to be able to access. They would  
13 install those with a ladder and then remove them  
14 when they leave the site.

15 MR. SILVESTRI: So they would not leave  
16 them on site, they would bring them with them,  
17 correct?

18 THE WITNESS (Centore): Correct.

19 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. And just  
20 checking through my notes.

21 Mr. Morissette, that's all I have at  
22 this time. Thank you. And thank you for your  
23 responses also.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.  
25 Silvestri. We'll now continue with

1 cross-examination of the applicant by Mr. Nguyen,  
2 followed by Mr. Golembiewski.

3 Mr. Nguyen.

4 MR. NGUYEN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.

5 Good afternoon. Let me start with a  
6 few follow-ups from Mr. Mercier and Mr.  
7 Silvestri's questions. First of all, the  
8 alternate site location, where is that exactly  
9 before the Council?

10 THE WITNESS (Centore): I'm sorry, I  
11 didn't --

12 MR. BALDWIN: The alternate site, where  
13 is that in relation to it.

14 THE WITNESS (Centore): It's due east  
15 of the existing site or the originally proposed  
16 site.

17 MR. NGUYEN: So the southeast portion  
18 of the property, is that right?

19 THE WITNESS (Centore): Correct.

20 MR. NGUYEN: And east of the existing  
21 Eversource transmission line?

22 THE WITNESS (Centore): Correct.

23 MR. NGUYEN: Now, you responded earlier  
24 from Mr. Silvestri that the alternate site  
25 addressed some of the concerns from Eversource,

1 but there's some missing information that you are  
2 waiting for Eversource, a green light, if you  
3 will. Could you clarify what that is?

4 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Nguyen, if I could  
5 respond as I responded as to the legal status of  
6 the easement. Eversource requires anyone using a  
7 portion of their right-of-way to enter into  
8 essentially a license agreement for that use. And  
9 that, again, is a process that we would have to  
10 undertake if any portion of our improvements were  
11 going to utilize that portion of the existing  
12 legal easement that Eversource has on the  
13 property.

14 MR. NGUYEN: Okay. So it is about  
15 easement. Now, assuming that you don't get that  
16 from Eversource, then what would be plan B?

17 THE WITNESS (Centore): So plan B, the  
18 only portion of the alternate site that would  
19 impact the Eversource easement is the turnaround  
20 at the very end of the access drive. And we would  
21 need to reconfigure that portion of the turnaround  
22 back off of the Eversource easement.

23 MR. NGUYEN: And as of today, have  
24 there been any update regarding the agreement with  
25 Eversource?

1 MR. BALDWIN: There is nothing new  
2 beyond what has been reported in the record, Mr.  
3 Nguyen.

4 MR. NGUYEN: With respect to the backup  
5 power, the response to Interrogatory Number 24  
6 indicated that the battery backup would provide  
7 uninterrupted power and prevent a reboot  
8 condition. Could you explain what that is?  
9 Response to number 24.

10 (Inaudible.)

11 MR. NGUYEN: I beg your pardon?

12 THE WITNESS (Parks): Tim Parks from  
13 Cellco. When power is lost at a site, the backup  
14 battery will be first to kick on to keep the site  
15 powered as the generator is powering up which  
16 typically takes 10 to 15 minutes. Once the  
17 generator is up to speed, then the generator will  
18 take over.

19 MR. NGUYEN: Okay. Regarding Wetland  
20 Number 1 and considering the alternate location,  
21 the Council on Environmental Quality questioning  
22 whether or not the proposed site can move to  
23 further north and northwest within the proposed  
24 lease area. I'm not sure if this alternate site  
25 has addressed that, but have you took a look into

1 that?

2 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean  
3 Gustafson from All-Points. I can talk about the  
4 potential for wetland impact and then maybe others  
5 from the team can address moving the alternate  
6 location. But from a wetland impact perspective  
7 we're providing -- the alternate facility is  
8 providing a nondisturbed buffer of 50 feet that's  
9 existing forested habitat. And we are providing  
10 additional best practices during construction,  
11 including installation of appropriate erosion  
12 control measures as well as a wetland protection  
13 plan.

14 And then in addition to that, we are  
15 providing a buffer enhancement planting plan that  
16 will improve the understory habitat, buffering the  
17 alternate facility from Wetland 1, to include a  
18 variety of native wetland buffer shrubs that will  
19 enhance various functions and values of the buffer  
20 zone, particularly wildlife habitat, as well as  
21 water quality renovation. So we feel that this  
22 plan adequately protects, you know, the function  
23 and value of Wetland 1, and the project would not  
24 result in an adverse effect to that wetland  
25 system.

1 MR. NGUYEN: Okay. My apologies, let  
2 me go back to the backup power. Would there be a  
3 shared use of a backup generator should there be  
4 future carriers?

5 THE WITNESS (Parks): Tim Parks from  
6 Cellco. Typically Verizon likes to install their  
7 generator for our own use, so we would prefer not  
8 to share the generator.

9 MR. NGUYEN: And you indicated earlier  
10 that there was no inquiry from any other carriers  
11 or even the towns.

12 THE WITNESS (Parks): Correct. To this  
13 point, there has been no interest shown from any  
14 other carrier or, I'm sorry, emergency services.

15 MR. NGUYEN: Okay. Mr. Morissette,  
16 that's all I have.

17 Thank you, gentlemen.

18 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen.

19 We will now continue with  
20 cross-examination of the applicant by Mr.  
21 Golembiewski.

22 Mr. Golembiewski.

23 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Thank you, Mr.  
24 Morissette. I have maybe eight questions. So  
25 hopefully it will be quick.

1 First question I guess it would be for  
2 the RF engineer, Shiva Gadasu. I noticed in the  
3 site search summary there was a town, I guess,  
4 police department communications tower sort of in  
5 the southeast part of the search area. I was just  
6 wondering, I know it said that it was not a viable  
7 alternative, but I was wondering if that included  
8 considering increasing the height of that existing  
9 tower or putting a larger tower in that location.

10 THE WITNESS (Gadasu): So this is Shiva  
11 Gadasu. So going further southeast than the  
12 existing, you know, plots we have submitted, you  
13 know, the coverage will overlap with our existing  
14 sites which we don't want to in this case.

15 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. So you're  
16 saying there would have been too much, even if you  
17 raise the tower, there would have been too much  
18 overlapping and not enough to fill the intended  
19 gap in coverage?

20 THE WITNESS (Gadasu): Correct.

21 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: All right. I think  
22 I had one more question. Let's see. No, I think  
23 that's the only one for you.

24 So visibility, if that was Mr. Gaudet,  
25 I had a question in regards to visibility. To the

1 northwest there are a series of state properties,  
2 including Mattatuck State Forest, Humaston Brook  
3 State Park and Northfield Pond. How would you  
4 characterize the views from those state properties  
5 of the proposed tower?

6 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Very minimal.  
7 This is Brian Gaudet with All-Points. So yes, to  
8 the northwest there you can see, if we're looking  
9 at the viewshed map, you've got Northfield Pond  
10 called out, and that's the only predicted area of  
11 any visibility. We are predicting year-round  
12 visibility from the pond itself, so on that  
13 western shoreline, if you will, you would likely  
14 have some year-round views. Throughout the rest  
15 of the forest, again, with the thick tree cover,  
16 relatively low height of this facility, there  
17 would be no views anticipated from the rest of the  
18 state forest area.

19 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. Thank you.  
20 And then also I guess, you know, the visibility  
21 from the nearby neighborhoods, including Atwood  
22 Heights and Mason Hill Road, with the alternative  
23 I believe you said to Mr. Silvestri that -- or no,  
24 Mr. Mercier, that there really would be no  
25 substantial change to the views from these nearby



1 neighborhoods.

2 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yeah, it's a  
3 very minor change. Let me just look at my notes  
4 here. The total visibility of the proposed  
5 location, it does increase slightly from the  
6 original as far as seasonal views go, and that's  
7 primarily just moving it up to the north so you  
8 get some additional visibility to the north. And  
9 again, it extends a little bit further down Mason  
10 Hill, but the characteristics of those views,  
11 certainly throughout the residential neighborhoods  
12 to the east, residential properties to the west as  
13 well, north and west, will remain essentially the  
14 same as what was predicted with the original  
15 location.

16 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: And I guess I was  
17 wondering if the site was selected also because  
18 there was these transmission lines there and  
19 monopoles already there that sort of, you know, I  
20 guess, maybe, and I don't want to say camouflaged,  
21 but because there was infrastructure there or not,  
22 was that part of maybe this site being a preferred  
23 site?

24 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): I didn't  
25 participate in the site search itself, but I can

1 speak certainly to the visibility and then I can  
2 pass it off to another team member. But, I mean,  
3 you've got pretty substantially tall transmission  
4 lines running through that right-of-way north and  
5 south throughout the study area. And they're  
6 visible from the majority of the areas where we  
7 could see the balloon during the field test. So  
8 there is a bit of context putting a monopole in  
9 that location with, you know, considering that  
10 you've got these structures that are within about  
11 15 feet of the height above ground level as to  
12 what the proposed tower is.

13 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. Thank you.  
14 This question would be for Mr. Centore. I know as  
15 I looked through the application that Litchfield  
16 zoning regs require that a tower be set back a  
17 distance equal to one-half the times the height of  
18 the tower from a lot line or road. And I know  
19 Mason Hill Road is, you know, right northerly  
20 along this. I don't believe there's a way to meet  
21 that requirement. But I guess does the hinge  
22 point assure that the tower would not in a  
23 catastrophic failure fall onto the road?

24 THE WITNESS (Centore): It would, yes.

25 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: So would that sort

1 of meet the spirit, I guess, of that zoning  
2 requirement?

3 THE WITNESS (Centore): It would. And  
4 it has in the past when we've had that limitation  
5 set.

6 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. Great. My  
7 last few questions, I guess, would be for Mr.  
8 Gustafson. And I had a question in regards to the  
9 Wetlands Protection Program that's in the impact  
10 analysis. Is that, I guess, would there be an  
11 objection to that being a condition of the Siting  
12 Council approval? I know you guys mentioned it  
13 and I know it's in the plan. I guess I'm sort of  
14 a DEEP enforcement guy, so I always try to make  
15 sure that whatever, you know, approval there is,  
16 is that we can enforce. If you say you're going  
17 to do that, you know, is that, I guess, are you  
18 voluntarily doing it, or would you object to that  
19 being specifically identified in any type of  
20 license?

21 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean  
22 Gustafson for All-Points. We have no objection,  
23 speaking on behalf of the applicant, of providing  
24 that as an enforceable item. And our intent would  
25 be to incorporate those notes into the D&M plan so

1 they would be part and parcel of the D&M plan and  
2 eventually the construction drawings so the  
3 contractor is fully aware of those obligations.

4 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: I like that, Mr.  
5 Gustafson. Thank you. So I had one more question  
6 -- I have two more, maybe for you, or one maybe  
7 for Mr. Centore. I know we were talking about the  
8 buffer wetland enhancement plantings. Isn't it  
9 standard that after a year that you would check  
10 survivorship and then replace those plants that  
11 did not survive the initial year?

12 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes, that  
13 would be standard. And again, for the D&M plan  
14 we'd provide full sequencing and construction  
15 notes for the wetland buffer planting plan as well  
16 as post-construction monitoring requirements. So  
17 we would have at a minimum at least an inspection  
18 a year after planting to ensure survivorship.

19 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: And then I'm  
20 assuming that the plants would be installed by  
21 hand and not with equipment in that area.

22 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That would be  
23 our intent is that there isn't a lot of plantings  
24 and it is a sensitive area. So we would just be  
25 looking for hand labor to install those plants.

1 And we can include that as part of the  
2 construction sequence notes to limit and restrict  
3 it to that.

4 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. That would be  
5 appreciated. I think finally, I don't know if  
6 this is you, Dean, or Mr. Centore, but I did see  
7 that there's a proposed level spreader at the  
8 terminus of the riprap swale on the north side.  
9 An actual specification for that would be included  
10 in the D&M plan, yes?

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

13 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: With appropriate  
14 design for size and energy dissipation?

15 THE WITNESS (Centore): Correct.

16 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. That would be  
17 all my questions, Mr. Morissette. Thank you.

18 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.  
19 Golembiewski.

20 With that, we're going to take a break  
21 and we'll reconvene at 3:35. And we have one  
22 outstanding question from Mr. Silvestri that we  
23 can address when we return, and then we'll  
24 continue with cross-examination from myself.  
25 Thank you, everyone. We'll see you at 3:35.

1 Thank you.

2  
3 (Whereupon, a recess was taken from  
4 3:22 p.m. until 3:35 p.m.)  
5

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. We're back.  
7 Thank you, everyone. Is the court reporter with  
8 us?

9 THE COURT REPORTER: I sure am. Thank  
10 you.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you.

12 Okay. Do we have a response to Mr.  
13 Silvestri's open question?

14 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Morissette, we  
15 actually have, we double backed on our notes, and  
16 we wanted to respond to two homework assignments,  
17 if we could. The first was with respect to Mr.  
18 Mercier's question about the Northfield Reservoir  
19 and the visibility from there, whether there were  
20 any recreational uses in that area. And Mr.  
21 Gaudet can address that now.

22 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney  
23 Baldwin.

24 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Brian Gaudet  
25 with All-Points. So the Northfield Reservoir does

1 have some recreational uses, sounds like some  
2 hiking trails, walking trails, picnic tables. I  
3 believe it's stocked with some fish as well by the  
4 state. Regardless of the recreational value of  
5 that location, the only views that are  
6 anticipated, and I'll point to photo 27 from  
7 attachment 9 in the application, would be from the  
8 dam itself. There's significant drop-off in  
9 elevation down below the dam sort of at the lake  
10 level where the intervening vegetation would block  
11 out any potential views of the facility from that  
12 location.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Gaudet.  
14 Mr. Mercier, any follow-up?

15 MR. MERCIER: No, thank you. That was  
16 good.

17 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.

18 MR. BALDWIN: And then, Mr. Morissette,  
19 we had a question about the switching station in  
20 Windsor, and Mr. Gadasu can address that now.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney  
22 Baldwin. Please continue.

23 THE WITNESS (Gadasu): This is Shiva  
24 Gadasu. So the switch itself has, you know, a  
25 redundancy, but if it has to fail, the backup in

1 this case, this site goes to Windsor switch, and  
2 the Westborough switch location acts as a backup.

3 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Mr.  
4 Silvestri, any follow-up?

5 MR. SILVESTRI: No. Appreciate the  
6 homework assignment. Thank you.

7 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you,  
8 Mr. Silvestri, and thank you, Mr. Gadasu.

9 Mr. Gadasu, while I've got you, I will  
10 commence with my questions. I would would like to  
11 go to, kind of follow on Mr. Silvestri's questions  
12 relating to the proposed and existing coverage map  
13 and section, I think it's 6, of the application.  
14 And similar to Mr. Silvestri's question, there is  
15 an area to the southwest and it's Humaston Park,  
16 and it seems to be in a valley, Thomaston Game  
17 Club, that whole area. Could you explain why the  
18 coverage doesn't extend to that area?

19 THE WITNESS (Gadasu): Yes. So this is  
20 Shiva Gadasu again. So as it is in a valley, the  
21 RF signals cannot pass through the terrain.

22 MR. MORISSETTE: Can you please confirm  
23 that it is in a valley? I was just assuming that  
24 it was because it didn't have any coverage.

25 THE WITNESS (Gadasu): I believe you



1 are referring to the east of Northfield Road,  
2 State Highway 254?

3 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, to the west, to  
4 the southwest. It's that whole white area.

5 THE WITNESS (Gadasu): Okay. I see  
6 that now. Yeah, that is true. Anything which is  
7 not colored it is not covered due to terrain.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So it's a  
9 valley and therefore it's not getting that far to  
10 the west. Okay. Thank you for that response.

11 I would like to move on to wetlands,  
12 Mr. Gustafson. My understanding now that the  
13 access road is being relocated in the alternative  
14 arrangement that Wetland 2 is basically out of the  
15 picture now and there's no concern at all. Could  
16 you confirm that for me?

17 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean  
18 Gustafson from All-Points. That's correct. With  
19 the elimination of the access through the  
20 Eversource right-of-way, which the entrance of  
21 that existing gravel access for the maintenance,  
22 the Eversource maintenance off of Mason Hill Road,  
23 Wetland 2 is proximate to that location, we are  
24 well removed from that location now.

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Great. Thank you.

1 Moving on to Wetland 1, in the filing of April  
2 27th on page 4 it says minor grading, tree  
3 clearing and installation of soil erosion control  
4 measures will result in temporary work occurring  
5 within 25 feet of Wetland 1. Could someone  
6 describe in a little bit more detail as to what  
7 type of work that will be?

8 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean  
9 Gustafson, All-Points. That work would consist of  
10 providing some vegetation clearing around the  
11 proposed compound, particularly the eastern and  
12 southern portion of the compound that face Wetland  
13 1, and then providing an area -- and it's  
14 generally about within 10 feet of the proposed  
15 retaining wall will be the installation of erosion  
16 sedimentation control measures. What we would  
17 likely recommend in this instance is using compost  
18 filter sock. That will help minimize some of the  
19 ground disturbance and provide better protection  
20 than just installation of a silt fence by itself.  
21 So that would be kind of the characteristic of  
22 that type of activity within that area.

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. If I look  
24 at the drawing, ALT-1.1, if I understood you  
25 correctly, basically the extent of the work

1 activity would be along where the proposed wetland  
2 buffer enhancement area is, that line. Is that  
3 approximately what you're referring to as 10 feet?

4 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): So on that  
5 figure, the ALT-1.1 drawing, essentially the limit  
6 of disturbance associated with construction of the  
7 facility is earmarked by a jagged zigzag line that  
8 kind of passes through the buffer enhancement  
9 zone.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Great. So to  
11 the extent you're going to be performing tree  
12 clearing though, it doesn't appear that there's a  
13 whole lot of trees to clear. Am I misreading that  
14 or --

15 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): No.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: -- is there mostly  
17 brush?

18 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Sorry to  
19 interrupt. Again, Dean Gustafson. The tree  
20 clearing is clearly noted on ALT-1.1, and that's  
21 consistent with our inspection of this property  
22 during our original wetland investigation is that  
23 the mature trees, and these represent trees 6 inch  
24 DBH or greater, that there is a fairly minor  
25 amount of actual tree removal for this project.

1 And as you'll note within kind of the wetland  
2 buffer enhancement zone where that LOD line is,  
3 the zigzag line, there are a couple of trees on  
4 the eastern and southeastern side of the proposed  
5 retaining wall. Those should be able to, we  
6 should be able to protect those and retain those  
7 post-development. So yeah, there isn't a lot of  
8 tree clearing for this particular facility.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Great.  
10 Thank you. Just one other clarification. You  
11 mentioned that it was on that same drawing there's  
12 a 25-foot buffer from Wetland 1, but you mentioned  
13 a 50-foot wetland buffer to the tree wetlands. So  
14 it's not shown here on this map or this drawing,  
15 but it would be almost in the center of Wetland 1  
16 if I go in another 25 feet, am I looking at that  
17 properly?

18 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): I'm not 100  
19 percent clear on your question. For the original  
20 facility we did provide a 50-foot nondisturbed  
21 buffer essentially for that. And there's really,  
22 that reference is just for kind of perspective on  
23 the application. There isn't any regulatory  
24 significance behind that. The town does regulate  
25 a 100-foot upland review area, so we do have that

1 on the mapping. The 50-foot that we referenced in  
2 the original application was just kind of a  
3 reference point to show that for the original  
4 location that we were able to maintain essentially  
5 a 50-foot non-disturb zone for that project. And  
6 this one is being reduced to 25 feet.

7 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. I must have  
8 misunderstood because I thought earlier you said  
9 that there would be a 50-foot buffer to the  
10 wetland tree area, but that's not the case, I  
11 misunderstood?

12 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That's not  
13 the case.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So it's 25  
15 feet, period?

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

18 MR. MORISSETTE: All right. Very good.  
19 Thank you. I'm glad I clarified that.

20 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): You're  
21 welcome.

22 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. My question on  
23 the yield point has been asked and answered.

24 Mr. Gaudet, in the visual analysis,  
25 again, I had extreme difficulty finding those

1 little red arrows. It was like where's Waldo.  
2 Could you kindly in the future make them, you  
3 know, big and bold so I don't have to hunt and  
4 peck all over the -- I did finally find them after  
5 three tries.

6 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Some of these  
7 are tucked pretty good behind the trees, so we'll  
8 take a closer look at that next time.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. I  
10 appreciate that. That pretty much concludes the  
11 questions that I had for this afternoon. So with  
12 that, we are done for the hearing for this  
13 afternoon, and the Council will recess until 6:30  
14 p.m. Well, actually, before we do this, let's  
15 just go back and see if anybody else has any  
16 follow-up questions before we recess for the  
17 afternoon.

18 Mr. Mercier, do you have any follow-up  
19 questions?

20 MR. MERCIER: I have no additional  
21 questions. Thank you.

22 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.  
23 Mercier.

24 Mr. Silvestri, do you have any  
25 follow-up questions?

1 MR. SILVESTRI: I'm all set, Mr.  
2 Morissette. And I appreciate the panel clearing  
3 up my confusion. Thank you.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr.  
5 Nguyen, any follow-up questions?

6 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: You're muted, I  
7 think.

8 MR. NGUYEN: Thank you. I was talking  
9 to myself. Thank you. About the technology, is  
10 Cellco proposing 5G for this particular site?

11 THE WITNESS (Gadasu): This is Shiva  
12 Gadasu. Yes, we are.

13 MR. NGUYEN: Okay. Thank you. That's  
14 all I have. Thank you.

15 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen.  
16 Mr. Golembiewski, any follow-up  
17 questions?

18 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: No follow-up. Thank  
19 you, Mr. Morissette.

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. And I have  
21 no follow-up questions.

22 So with that, the Council will recess  
23 until 6:30 p.m., at which time we will commence  
24 with the public comment session of this remote  
25 public hearing. So thank you, everyone. We'll


1 see you at 6:30.

2 (Whereupon, the witnesses were excused,  
3 and the above proceedings were adjourned at 3:47  
4 p.m.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25



CERTIFICATE FOR REMOTE HEARING

I hereby certify that the foregoing 72 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original stenotype notes taken of the PUBLIC HEARING before the CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL IN RE: DOCKET NO. 513, 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 PARCEL NO. 258-10C-001, MASON HILL ROAD, LITCHFIELD, CONNECTICUT, which was held before JOHN MORISSETTE, PRESIDING OFFICER, on May 4, 2023.

  
-----  
Lisa L. Warner, CSR 061  
Court Reporter

I N D E X

**\*\*Administrative Notice Items I-B-1 through I-B-84: Received in evidence - PAGE 7**

**WITNESSES: (Sworn on page 8)**

SHIVA GADASU  
TIMOTHY PARKS  
CARLO F. CENTORE  
BRIAN GAUDET  
DEAN GUSTAFSON

**EXAMINERS:**

	PAGE
Mr. Baldwin (Direct)	8
Mr. Mercier (Start of cross)	11
Mr. Silvestri	37
Mr. Nguyen	50, 71
Mr. Golembiewski	54
Mr. Morissette	64

**APPLICANT'S EXHIBITS  
(Received in evidence)**

EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
II-B-1	Application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need, filed by Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless, received March 1, 2023, and attachments and bulk file exhibits including: Bulk file exhibits: a. Technical Report to the Town of Litchfield b. Town of Litchfield Zoning Regulations c. Town of Litchfield Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations d. Town of Litchfield Plan of Conservation and Development	11
II-B-2	Applicant's Affidavit of Publication, dated March 2, 2023	11
II-B-3	Applicant's signed protective order related to unredacted lease agreement, dated March 30, 2023	11

1     I n d e x:    (Cont'd)

2

3     EXHIBIT       DESCRIPTION

PAGE

4     II-B-4       Applicant's responses to  
5                Council Interrogatories, Set One,  
              dated April 10, 2023

11

6     II-B-5       Applicant's Sign Posting  
7                Affidavit, dated April 25, 2023

11

8     II-B-6       Applicant's Proposed alternate  
9                tower location, modified interrogatory  
              responses and attachments, dated  
              April 27, 2023

11