

1 STATE OF CONNECTICUT
2 CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

3
4 Docket No. 502

5 Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless
6 application for a Certificate of Environmental
7 Compatibility and Public Need for the
8 construction, maintenance, and operation of a
9 telecommunications facility located at 118 Newton
10 Road, Woodbridge, Connecticut.

11
12
13 VIA ZOOM AND TELECONFERENCE

14
15 Public Comment Session held on Tuesday, July 13,
16 2021, beginning at 6:30 p.m. via remote access.

17
18
19 H e l d B e f o r e :

20 JOHN MORISSETTE, Presiding Officer

21
22
23
24
25 Reporter: Lisa L. Warner, CSR #061

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

2 **Council Members:**

3 **ROBERT HANNON**
4 Designee for Commissioner Katie Dykes
5 Department of Energy and Environmental
6 Protection

7 **QUAT NGUYEN**
8 Designee for Chairman Marissa Paslick
9 Gillett
10 Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

11 **ROBERT SILVESTRI**
12 **DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.**
13 **LOUANNE COOLEY**

14 **Council Staff:**

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

18 **ROBERT MERCIER**
19 Siting Analyst

20 **LISA FONTAINE**
21 Fiscal Administrative Officer

22 **For Applicant Cellco Partnership d/b/a**
23 **Verizon Wireless:**

24 **ROBINSON & COLE LLP**
25 280 Trumbull Street
 Hartford, Connecticut 06103-3597
 BY: **KENNETH C. BALDWIN, ESQ.**

26 **For CEPA Intervenor Woodbridge Newton**
27 **Neighborhood Environmental Trust (WNNET):**
28 **LAW OFFICE OF KEITH R. AINSWORTH, ESQ.**
29 51 Elm Street, Suite 201
30 New Haven, Connecticut 06105-2049
31 BY: **KEITH R. AINSWORTH, ESQ.**

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

2
3 **For Party Town of Woodbridge:**

4 **BERCHEM MOSES PC**

5 **1221 Post Road East**

6 **Westport, Connecticut 06880**

7 **BY: NICHOLAS R. BAMONTE, ESQ.**

8 **Also present: Aaron Demarest, Zoom co-host**

9
10
11 ***(AUDIO INTERRUPTION) - denotes breaks in speech**
12 **due to interruptions in audio or echo.**

13 ****All participants were present via remote access.**

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Good evening, ladies
2 and gentlemen. This remote public hearing is
3 called to order this Tuesday, July 13, 2021 at
4 6:30 p.m. My name is John Morissette, member and
5 presiding officer of the Connecticut Siting
6 Council. Other members of the Council are Robert
7 Hannon, designee for Commissioner Katie Dykes of
8 the Department of Energy and Environmental
9 Protection; Quat Nguyen, designee for Chairman
10 Marissa Paslick Gillett of the Public Utilities
11 Regulatory Authority; Robert Silvestri; Louanne
12 Cooley; and 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 As everyone is aware, there is
18 currently a statewide effort to prevent the spread
19 of the Coronavirus. This is why the Council is
20 holding this remote public hearing, and we ask for
21 your patience. If you haven't done so already, I
22 ask that everyone please mute their computer audio
23 and telephones now.

24 This is a continuation of a remote
25 public hearing that began at 2 p.m. this

1 afternoon. A copy of the prepared agenda is
2 available on the Council's Docket No. 502 webpage,
3 along with the record of this matter, the public
4 hearing notice, instructions for public access to
5 this remote public hearing, and the Citizens Guide
6 to Siting Council Procedures.

7 This hearing is held pursuant to the
8 provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General
9 Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative
10 Procedures Act upon an application from Cellco
11 Partnership doing business as Verizon Wireless for
12 a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and
13 Public Need for the construction, maintenance and
14 operation of a telecommunications facility located
15 at 118 Newton Road, Woodbridge Connecticut. This
16 application was received by the Council on May 13,
17 2021.

18 This application is also governed by
19 the Telecommunications Act of 1996 which is
20 administered by the Federal Communications
21 Commission. This Act prohibits the Council from
22 considering the health effects of radio frequency
23 emissions on human health and wildlife to the
24 extent the emissions from towers are within the
25 federal acceptable safe limits standard, which

1 standard is also followed by the state Department
2 of Public Health.

3 The Federal Act also prohibits this
4 Council from discriminating between and amongst
5 providers of functionally equivalent services.
6 This means that if one carrier already provides
7 service for an area, other carriers have the right
8 to compete and provide service in the same area.

9 The Council's legal notice of the date
10 and time of this remote public hearing was
11 published in The New Haven Register on June 10,
12 2021. Upon this Council's request, the applicant
13 installed a sign in the vicinity of the proposed
14 site so as to inform the public of the name of the
15 applicant, the type of facility, the remote public
16 hearing date, and contact information for the
17 Council, which includes the website and phone
18 number.

19 This remote public comment session is
20 reserved for the public to make brief statements
21 into the record. These public statements are not
22 subject to questions from the parties or the
23 Council, and members of the public making
24 statements may not ask questions of the parties or
25 the Council. In fairness to everyone who has

1 signed up to speak, these public statements will
2 be limited to three minutes and will become part
3 of the record for the Council's consideration.
4 Please be advised that written comments may be
5 submitted by any person within 30 days of this
6 public hearing.

7 As a reminder to all, off-the-record
8 communications with a member of the Council or a
9 member of the Council staff upon the merits of
10 this application is prohibited by law.

11 I wish to note that parties and
12 intervenors, including their representatives,
13 witnesses and members, are not allowed to
14 participate in the public comment session. I also
15 wish to note for those who are listening, and for
16 the benefit of your friends and neighbors who are
17 unable to join us for this remote public comment
18 session, that you or they may send written
19 statements to the Council within 30 days of the
20 date hereof by mail or by email, and such written
21 statements will be given the same weight as if
22 spoken at the remote public comment session.
23 Please be advised that any person may be removed
24 from the remote public comment session at the
25 discretion of the Council.

1 We ask each person making a public
2 statement in this proceeding to confine his or her
3 statements to the subject matter before the
4 Council and to avoid unreasonable repetition so
5 that we may hear all of the concerns you and your
6 neighbors may have. Please be advised that the
7 Council cannot answer questions from the public
8 about the proposal.

9 A verbatim transcript of this remote
10 public hearing will be posted on the Council's
11 Docket No. 502 webpage and deposited at the
12 Woodbridge Town Clerk's Office for the convenience
13 of the public.

14 Please be advised that the Council's
15 project evaluation criteria under the statute does
16 not include consideration of property values.

17 Before I call on members of the public
18 to make statements, I request the applicant to
19 make a very brief presentation to the public
20 describing the proposed facility.

21 Attorney Baldwin.

22 MR. BALDWIN: Thank you, Mr.
23 Morissette. Good evening, everyone. My name is
24 Ken Baldwin. I'm a lawyer with Robinson & Cole,
25 and I represent the applicant in this matter,

1 Cellco Partnership doing business as Verizon
2 Wireless.

3 Verizon Wireless commenced the
4 Connecticut Siting Council process back in July of
5 last year, almost a year ago, by the submission of
6 municipal consultation information, a technical
7 report filed with the first selectwoman of the
8 Town of Woodbridge.

9 As many of you know because you were on
10 the meeting, Zoom meeting in October, we held a
11 virtual public information meeting on October 6,
12 and then ultimately filed our application with the
13 Connecticut Siting Council on May 13, 2021.

14 Shown on the screen is plan sheet C-1
15 from our plan set included in the application. It
16 shows the parcel, which is a 6.01 acre parcel,
17 with a mailing address of 118 Newton Road. The
18 proposed tower site shown in the square in the
19 rear portion of the property is where the proposed
20 telecommunications facility would be located. The
21 tower would be located within a 50 foot by 50 foot
22 fenced compound also within a 100 foot by 100 foot
23 leased area. If we could go to the next slide,
24 please.

25 The proposal calls for the installation

1 of a 100 foot monopole telecommunications tower.
2 This is 40 feet lower than originally described
3 and proposed in the applicant's technical report
4 submitted to the town last year. Also, within the
5 50 foot by 50 foot compound Verizon Wireless would
6 install ground mounted equipment cabinets, a
7 generator to provide backup power to its facility,
8 and a 500 gallon propane tank. If we could go to
9 the next slide, please.

10 This sheet A-1 shows a blowup of the
11 tower compound, some grading along the south and
12 east side of the compound as required. It shows
13 the location of the propane tank in the northwest
14 corner of the compound, the tower toward the
15 center of the compound, and Verizon's equipment in
16 the southwest corner of the compound.

17 Access to the telecommunications
18 facility compound would extend from the end of
19 Soundview Drive, the cul-de-sac, into the
20 property, and then southerly toward the proposed
21 tower location. If we can go to the next slide,
22 please.

23 Verizon plans to install its antennas
24 at the top of the 100 foot tower. As shown on
25 this plan elevation, the antennas would extend

1 approximately 4 feet above the top of the tower.
2 The antennas would be mounted on a triangular
3 antenna platform, as shown in the upper right-hand
4 portion of this plan, sheet A-2. The plan would
5 be to install up to 12 antennas on that platform,
6 again, at the 100 foot centerline elevation.

7 Thank you, Mr. Morissette.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
9 Baldwin.

10 Just a note on remote public hearings.
11 Remote public hearings are quite different from
12 in-person hearings. For in-person public hearings
13 members of the public could sign in, step up to
14 the podium and offer their comments. For remote
15 public hearings, the public is required to sign up
16 to speak in advance in order to provide the
17 Council staff with the time necessary to
18 facilitate connection precautions to prevent
19 interruptions, or in common terms, bombing of the
20 proceedings. There are protocols, procedures and
21 consistency measures that are followed as part of
22 the remote public hearing process. Written
23 comments may be submitted within 30 days of the
24 public hearing.

25 We will now call to make public

1 comments from a list of people that have signed up
2 in advance starting with Representative Mary
3 Welander, and second, Senator James Maroney.

4 Representative Welander.

5 REP. WELANDER: Thank you, and good
6 evening. I would like to extend my thanks to the
7 Council for their patience and their attention.
8 They will be hearing all of the concerns tonight
9 from residents. My name is Mary Welander, and I
10 have the honor of serving in the 114 District and
11 serving the Town of Woodbridge in the state
12 legislature.

13 Tonight I am here to reinforce the
14 voices of my constituents in opposition to the
15 location of the proposed cell tower at 118 Newton
16 Road. I appreciate being sent the complete siting
17 packet for reference to the project and would like
18 to start there by referencing page 19 of the
19 introduction under Section 5 of consistency with
20 local land use controls. This section clearly
21 lays out the requirements made by the town for the
22 location of telecommunication facilities in order
23 of preference, and the use of new towers in
24 residential zones comes last.

25 It also clearly states the required

1 number of feet from property lines for a tower at
2 being the height of the tower plus 50 feet. In
3 this case, the required amount of space is a
4 minimum of 150 feet. Two of the property borders
5 do not meet this requirement.

6 Having stopped at almost every home in
7 Woodbridge over the past few years, I was familiar
8 with the area of the proposed tower, but I went
9 back today to look more closely at the general
10 area of the tower and the access road. This is an
11 overwhelmingly residential area. In fact, it is
12 one of the few areas of Woodbridge with small
13 roads that connect to each other rather than a
14 main thoroughfare. In looking at the locations of
15 the existing towers and surrounding sections of
16 town and adjacent municipalities, this appears to
17 be one of the more residential locations outside
18 of a city area for a tower. While I know that the
19 proposed site has the elevation that Cellco claims
20 is necessary to meet the needs of the area, there
21 must be alternate locations that could provide
22 similar service improvements in a less heavily
23 residential area.

24 I would also like to state that in the
25 dozens of emails and phone calls that I received

1 from constituents that not one was in favor of
2 this proposal. Now, I know that the trend tends
3 to be that people are more likely to speak out
4 when they oppose something, but in my years of
5 speaking to, and now representing the residents of
6 Woodbridge, I have found them to be exceedingly
7 balanced in their approach to issues, even
8 controversial ones. I have never had 100 percent
9 of feedback on any issue be aligned in the same
10 way until now.

11 What I also noted was that while high
12 complaints of lack of service was referenced in
13 the packet as a reason for this location, that did
14 not come up one time in any of my communications
15 with residents. Again, my experience with
16 Woodbridge residents is that they will, perhaps
17 begrudgingly, admit that there could be
18 improvements or positive aspects to a situation
19 even when they don't agree with the proposal in
20 its entirety. In this situation, I did not have
21 one person reference the lack of or poor service
22 as a concern or as a potential positive outcome to
23 this action.

24 I respectfully urge members of the
25 Siting Council to listen to the people and

1 families who will be living under this tower and
2 hear the overwhelming opposition to this location
3 and reject this proposal. Thank you so much for
4 your time and consideration.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you,
6 Representative Welander.

7 We'll now hear from Senator James
8 Maroney. Senator.

9 SENATOR MARONEY: Good evening. And I
10 would also like to thank the Siting Council for
11 your service but also for the opportunity to speak
12 before you tonight. I join my colleagues,
13 Representative Welander and Senator Cabrera, in
14 opposing the location of this cell tower at 118
15 Newton Road. We've already sent you a letter, and
16 my colleague, Representative Welander, has just
17 completed her testimony. In addition, I
18 understand that more than 40 other residents have
19 signed up to testify tonight. So in the interest
20 of time, instead of reiterating those points, let
21 me say that, like Representative Welander, I've
22 heard from dozens of constituents who are all
23 unanimously opposed to the location of this cell
24 tower. They believe that it doesn't belong in a
25 residential area. And I must say I agree with

1 them.

2 Like Representative Welander, I went to
3 the location this afternoon. I actually do not
4 represent all of Woodbridge, like Representative
5 Welander, and this is not technically in the part
6 of Woodbridge that I represent, so I took the
7 opportunity to walk around the area to familiarize
8 myself with the location. And as she mentioned,
9 it is very close to other residential homes, and
10 there are only residential homes in the near
11 vicinity of this location.

12 So I would urge you to ask the Cellco
13 Partnership to work with the Town of Woodbridge to
14 find a more suitable location within the town. I
15 thank you for your time and your consideration.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Senator
17 Maroney.

18 We will now continue with Donna
19 Soufrine followed by Michael Soufrine. Donna
20 Soufrine, please.

21 (No response.)

22 MR. MORISSETTE: Donna Soufrine?
23 Michael Soufrine?

24 (No response.)

25 MR. MORISSETTE: We will come back to

1 the Soufrines. Next we have Rebecca Dalrymple.

2 REBECCA DALRYMPLE: Hi. Rebecca
3 Dalrymple.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Rebecca.

5 REBECCA DALRYMPLE: That's okay. Thank
6 you for having me tonight. I am a resident in
7 Woodbridge, and I actually moved to Woodbridge
8 with my husband and my two children in September
9 of 2014. And we chose to live in Woodbridge
10 because of the access to great schools as well as,
11 as well as -- I apologize -- as well as raising
12 our children in a more rural setting.

13 And I'm speaking out tonight in
14 opposition of the cell phone tower being in a
15 residential neighborhood. We have proposed many
16 alternate sites to Verizon. And I know during the
17 hearing this afternoon they spoke out and shared
18 that they have not actually gone to all of these
19 sites that we've proposed, and many of these
20 alternate sites have included town owned
21 properties as well as other commercial properties
22 throughout Woodbridge. And it's our belief that
23 if the cell tower were on town owned property or a
24 commercial site that it would have much less
25 impact on our neighborhood.

1 And the concerns that I have about it
2 impacting our neighborhood are all tied to a
3 potential loss in property value, as well as harm
4 to the environment and the neighborhood, you know,
5 the trails and the wildlife that lives in our
6 neighborhood. And frankly, where my home is
7 located, I am at the corner of Forest Glen and
8 Soundview Drive. And as Cellco shared tonight,
9 the plan is to use Soundview Drive as an access
10 road to provide, you know, maintenance for this
11 tower. So what was once a quiet cul-de-sac that
12 my children could ride their bikes on will now be
13 a routine maintenance service driveway for Cellco,
14 and I don't believe that this is right.

15 So I strongly encourage Cellco and the
16 Siting Council, to press them to sit down with our
17 town, who is very open and willing, to propose
18 some alternate sites that wouldn't be in the
19 middle of a residential neighborhood. Thank you.

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. We'll now
21 call upon Karen Kassap followed by Hau Wu. Karen
22 Kassap, please.

23 KAREN KASSAP: Hello. Thank you for
24 the opportunity to express my ideas. I'm Karen
25 Kassap, and I live at 14 Orchard Road, just around

1 the corner from the proposed cell tower.

2 My husband and I moved to Woodbridge in
3 2003. We were drawn to the area because of the
4 beautiful rural landscape, the excellent schools,
5 nature trails, and a quiet life among good
6 neighbors. When we moved here we knew that we
7 would have to accept certain limitations of rural
8 life in exchange for living in this town.

9 Woodbridge residents rely on well water. We have
10 no gas or sewer lines and no sidewalks. It has
11 always been obvious to us that there could be
12 better cell phone reception, but we accepted it as
13 a trade-off for rural living.

14 That being said, we were shocked and
15 dismayed to learn that anyone thought it was
16 acceptable to put a cell phone tower on private
17 property in close proximity to two other homes and
18 several other near neighbors. It is a sad
19 reflection on the relationship we have with our
20 neighbors at 118 Newton Road that they contracted
21 with Verizon to allow a cell phone tower to be
22 built on their property without thought of or
23 consulting with their nearest neighbors. And I am
24 sorry for that. However, while they have the
25 right to use their property in this way, we have

1 the right to voice our objections.

2 This transaction affects the entire
3 community and it is unwanted. The tower will be
4 an eyesore in the middle of closely situated
5 homes. It will negatively affect the nature of
6 our town and the nature of those living next to
7 the tower. I would not have chosen to purchase a
8 house if it had a cell tower next to it, if for no
9 other reason that it is unsightly.

10 I know that the Woodbridge selectmen
11 have proposed 14 alternative sites to Verizon,
12 including town owned property with attractive
13 lease terms. It is my belief that Verizon has not
14 seriously considered these other options. And it
15 is hard to believe that of all the other choices
16 none could provide adequate substitute. Does the
17 criteria for determining what is the best location
18 include considering the effects of the community?
19 If not, then it should.

20 On the Siting Council website it
21 clearly states that the Council is responsible for
22 balancing the needs for adequate and reliable
23 public utility services at the lowest reasonable
24 cost to consumers with the need to protect the
25 environment and ecology of the state and to

1 minimize damage to scenic, historic and
2 recreational values. Allowing the construction of
3 a cell tower at 118 Newton Road would damage the
4 scenic, historic and recreational values of our
5 town and be contrary to your own stated goals. A
6 cell tower could be an asset in Woodbridge, but
7 not if it is placed in the middle of a densely
8 populated community. Thoughtful and respectful
9 location of the tower should be a priority. I
10 implore you to deny the application and recommend
11 that Verizon reconsider one of the 14
12 alternatives.

13 I fully realize that this is not the
14 first time that a community has spoken out in
15 protest of a cell tower on a neighbor's property,
16 and that there is a disappointing history of the
17 Siting Council giving their approval nonetheless.
18 If you find that you do not have legal reason or
19 authority to prohibit construction, then I ask
20 that you consider providing moral consideration to
21 the abutting property owners. I believe -- (TIME
22 ELAPSED)

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, but your
24 time has expired. Thank you for your statements.

25 We will now continue with Hau Wu.

1 HAU WU: Hi, my name is Hau Wu. And we
2 just moved to this house three weeks ago. So we
3 fell in love with this house at first sight
4 earlier this year. The property is beautiful.
5 It's carpeted with lush greens with a good variety
6 of wild animals. And we did not know about this
7 tower when we signed a purchase agreement almost
8 the same day, because we really loved this
9 property, and that the proposed tower was this
10 close to us after we sold our house in New York
11 and had made arrangement for a long distance
12 mover. So it was too late for us to make any
13 changes in our plan.

14 So Woodbridge has a really quiet, rural
15 feeling, and it's close to my work in New Haven
16 and has great school system for my daughter. But
17 if we had known that early enough, I'm not sure if
18 we will be still sitting in this house at this
19 moment. And what I am certain though is, when the
20 time comes, the next potential buyer comes to
21 visit this property, they will be able to see the
22 tower right away inside the house looking into the
23 backyard because the proposed tower is just next
24 to us. We live on 31 Penny Lane. So the proposed
25 tower is just a fence away from us, it will be an

1 eyesore, and they will see it. I believe, unlike
2 us, there will be a really thorough thinking and
3 research if they are going to buy it or not, or we
4 take a deep financial or really hard financial
5 hit. So I'm really concerned about the declining
6 value of my property which we really love.

7 So we purchased this home anticipating
8 a really quiet and peaceful surrounding, and this
9 tower, right, like one fence away from us in the
10 back yard, will have -- will be like a significant
11 scenic impact with really bad economic
12 consequence. So I really hope Verizon can
13 consider any other options that's not in a
14 neighborhood. And thank you all for your
15 attention.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you for your
17 comments this evening.

18 We'll now call on Gene Shannon. Gene
19 Shannon? Gene Shannon?

20 (No response.)

21 MR. MORISSETTE: We will now continue
22 with Christine Edwards followed by Barbara
23 Metzger. Christine Edwards, please.

24 CHRISTINE EDWARDS: Hello?

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes. Thank you. Go

1 ahead.

2 CHRISTINE EDWARDS: Hi, my name is
3 Christine -- hello. Thank you for allowing me to
4 speak tonight. I'm Christine Edwards. My husband
5 and I were sent here by the U.S. Navy as active
6 duty service members about three years ago. Along
7 with many other military families, we knew
8 Woodbridge had good schools, but we chose this
9 particular area of Woodbridge because of the
10 general feel it had, the proximity to nature and
11 hiking trails that surround this neighborhood.

12 The trade-offs to this decision, of
13 course, as there always are some, came in the form
14 of power outages due to downed trees, this is
15 Woodbridge, and of course higher taxes, but
16 definitely not something that we would have
17 considered like living in close proximity to a
18 cell tower. We live in a very special place, and
19 the value of our homes in Woodbridge reflect this.
20 A change, like a cell tower being erected right in
21 this residential area, will no doubt affect the
22 value of homes in this vicinity, but even more
23 dangerously, I think set a precedent for this
24 happening in other parts of our beautiful town.

25 I feel there are far too many residents

1 in this town that are still unaware that this is
2 happening. I essentially feel like this comes
3 down to a lesson that we all try to teach our kids
4 in that doing the right thing often means not
5 doing the easy thing. I strongly feel that
6 Verizon has found an easy solution to this problem
7 in a resident who is willing to devalue our
8 neighborhood for personal gain, and I feel like
9 this monetary gain could and should be spent or
10 should benefit our town and all of the citizens
11 that will benefit from greater network coverage
12 and also the revenue that this tower generates.
13 And I feel that the residents of this town need
14 much more information than a sign erected at 118
15 Newton Road to know that this is happening and
16 that other 14 exactly options have not been
17 thoroughly investigated.

18 So my husband will retire after 32
19 years of military service in this coming year, and
20 we have decided that we will stay in this
21 wonderful Town of Woodbridge. Our decision to
22 stay might include good schools and a beautiful
23 neighborhood, but in the end it is based on
24 meeting wonderful neighbors like those that are on
25 this call voicing their concerns tonight that have

1 come together to fight, not in animosity in any
2 way, but with great care for our neighbors and for
3 this beautiful place that we call home. I urge
4 Cellco Partnership to take the time to do what is
5 right in finding another solution to this issue.
6 Thank you very much.

7 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you for your
8 statements this evening.

9 We'll now call on Barbara Metzger.

10 BARBARA METZGER: Hi.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Hello.

12 BARBARA METZGER: Hi. Thank you for
13 the opportunity to speak tonight. I also feel
14 very similar to the people who have already
15 spoken, especially the objections spoken by Mary
16 Welander. She actually said many of the things I
17 wanted to say tonight.

18 But I just wanted to share with you,
19 I've been living in Woodbridge for over 25 years
20 now. I moved to Woodbridge after a lifetime of
21 living in cookie-cutter homes with sidewalks and
22 postage stamp backyards. And when we moved from
23 California to Woodbridge, I found my dream
24 community, neighborhood, friends, everything that
25 I was hoping it would be became fulfilled. We

1 fell in love with our house. We sit in the
2 backyard and look out at the woods and feel like
3 we have our own private park. And the
4 neighborhood that we live in, Forest Glen area is
5 where I specifically live, people are constantly
6 out and about. It's a very active neighborhood.
7 There are always people bicycling, walking dogs,
8 running, you meet your friends and neighbors on
9 the street constantly. And we walk the Soundview
10 area as well our dog regularly.

11 So putting the cell tower there,
12 proposed putting it there, was a real shock to us,
13 having lived here for so long. And we have also
14 put up with the power outages and things that come
15 with living in a heavily wooded area, but we chose
16 it specifically because of that, because it was
17 semirural and very different than how we grew up.
18 And our kids have thrived here, they've gone on to
19 college and beyond, and we're still here. And we
20 have no intention of leaving. But having this
21 eyesore put into our area when there are
22 alternatives that would be equally available and
23 accessible to provide adequate coverage, it just
24 seems so antidemocratic because you're not
25 listening to the voice of the people here, that

1 the whole community is basically against it,
2 except for the one family that's going to benefit
3 from it financially.

4 And it just seems unjust in some some
5 way that they had five options listed, Cellco had
6 five options listed in their proposal, and they go
7 to the very last option without going through the
8 first four options to make sure that they were not
9 viable. It's contrary to logical thinking. This
10 area has always been beautiful and pristine, and
11 they're going to destroy it with this tower that
12 will not only be an eyesore, but it will affect
13 financially. I would never buy a house near a
14 cell tower. It will affect the people who live
15 there and have no power over it.

16 And it will also, even though there is
17 supposed studies that say it's within acceptable
18 limits of health -- (TIME ELAPSED)

19 MR. MORISSETTE: Sorry, but your time
20 has expired. Thank you.

21 We'll now call on Yan Gurewich. Yan
22 Gurewich.

23 YAN GUREWICH: Yes. Good evening. I'm
24 sorry, I'm having camera problems so I'll just
25 speak. So good evening. Thanks for allowing me

1 an opportunity to present today or to call today.

2 My name is Yan Gurewich. I originally
3 became a resident of Woodbridge around 30 years
4 ago when my father purchased a property here. I
5 attended Amity High School, lived in the town
6 through my teens and early adulthood. After
7 getting married and living in New Naven, Hamden
8 and Orange, we decided to return to Woodbridge in
9 2010. We purchased a house at 54 Forest Glen
10 Drive where I currently reside with my wife, two
11 sons, and of course our dog, "Butkus."

12 So why did we choose to return to
13 Woodbridge? One of the reasons why I have always
14 been drawn to the town is its unparalleled and
15 undisturbed natural scenery which makes life here
16 tranquil and unique. There are certainly other
17 benefits like a great school system and proximity
18 to New Haven. However, I place natural
19 surroundings as the most important factor for our
20 family.

21 So let's discuss the proposal of
22 building a cell tower at 118 Newton Road. Clearly
23 the structure will change the character of our
24 nature-centric values. Instead of seeing
25 beautiful trees, I will be forced to stare at a

1 100 plus foot cell tower. The quiet early
2 evenings we enjoy spending on the deck will be
3 ruined by the presence of an industrialized
4 structure that will always detract from the
5 natural scenery that we became accustomed to.

6 Property values will undoubtedly
7 suffer. There is legitimate research online,
8 sources available upon request, which points to
9 decreases of up to 20 percent in property values
10 located near a tower. Decreases primarily
11 associated with perceived, if not factual, health
12 impact as well as general decrease in desirability
13 and degraded curb appeal. All the data points
14 aside, any reasonable person can intuitively agree
15 the desirability suffers when the cell tower is in
16 close proximity, and desirability impacts value.
17 The only variable is magnitude.

18 I understand the importance of a
19 reliable cell signal and believe it's in the best
20 interest of the town for a variety of reasons.
21 However, the proposed location is unacceptable.
22 Based on feedback from a variety of sources, the
23 town has offered alternative locations in a
24 commercial zoned area, and for unknown reason to
25 me, that has not been considered. It's

1 unconscionable that we as residents are being
2 completely removed in the decision-making process
3 and are left with impactful consequences.

4 I implore Verizon and other parties
5 involved to seriously reconsider 118 Newton Road
6 as a proposed location for the tower. Please
7 consider other locations where the lives of the
8 residents will not be impacted and the demeanor of
9 our town is not changed. Thank you for your time.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
11 Gurewich.

12 We'll now call on Laurie Feldman
13 followed by Elliot Agin. Laurie Feldman, please.

14 LAURIE FELDMAN: My name is Laurie
15 Feldman, and I have lived in Woodbridge for over
16 25 years. And much like other Woodbridge
17 residents, we were drawn to raise our family here
18 due to the beauty of the natural surroundings and
19 of course the excellent schools. For me there are
20 a few things as restorative as natural beauty.
21 And sitting in my kitchen observing the deer in
22 the yard, the hummingbirds, wild turkeys, and even
23 a bear, brings me a feeling of peace. This access
24 to our beautiful surroundings in Woodbridge was
25 never so vital as it was this past year and a half

1 during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic. When
2 we could go no where, we discovered amazing hikes
3 in the woods of Woodbridge. When we could be with
4 no one else, we could wave hi to our friends and
5 neighbors as everyone seemed to take to the roads
6 for daily walks.

7 I speak to you this evening to say that
8 I am not against cell phone towers in Woodbridge.
9 I'm against seeing a cell phone tower in a
10 residential area where it will adversely affect
11 the ambiance of that residential neighborhood. If
12 we must have a cell phone tower in Woodbridge,
13 please make sure it is in a commercial or
14 industrial area or town owned property. Thank
15 you.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. We'll now
17 call on Elliot Agin.

18 ELLIOT AGIN: My name is Elliot Agin.
19 Carol and I moved to Woodbridge 30 years ago. We
20 have enjoyed living in this small town with great
21 neighbors and schools and its proximity to one of
22 the country's most sophisticated metro areas. We
23 are proud of and have participated in our civic
24 culture all these years. There is great -- (AUDIO
25 INTERRUPTION)

1 MR. MORISSETTE: I'm sorry, Mr. Agin,
2 you've put yourself on mute. For some reason
3 you're on mute.

4 ELLIOT AGIN: Can you hear me?

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, I can hear you
6 now. You dropped off. You may want to go back
7 and repeat yourself a little bit.

8 ELLIOT AGIN: We are proud of and have
9 participated in our civic culture all of these
10 years. There is great mutual respect for all
11 sides of every issue and a long tradition of town
12 meetings and frequent votes for which we have made
13 ourselves heard. I am grateful for this
14 opportunity to comment on the current plan to
15 place a cell tower on Newton Road. I'm appalled
16 that the Siting Council would entertain placement
17 of an eyesore of this magnitude in a private
18 residential neighborhood without considering the
19 substantial damage to surrounding properties. The
20 tower will benefit only a single isolated resident
21 upon whose land it will be placed, but will damage
22 the visual environment and the property values of
23 many, and this, without our consent, by a process
24 over which we have no control and by people who
25 are not our elected representatives. Furthermore,

1 the insult is compounded by the fact of a viable
2 alternative site in the town center where the
3 tower is welcome.

4 In conclusion, I respectfully urge the
5 siting committee to decline the current proposal.
6 Thank you.

7 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. We'll now
8 continue with Bruce Fraser followed by Penelope
9 Sampoli. Bruce Fraser, please.

10 BRUCE FRASER: My name is Bruce Fraser.
11 I've lived in Woodbridge for almost 16 years. My
12 wife and I chose Woodbridge primarily for the
13 schools for our children, but shortly after
14 moving, we fell in love with the beautiful, quiet
15 treed town. I'll make my remarks short. I'm
16 probably going to repeat what other people have
17 said.

18 I have two objections to the proposed
19 cell tower being built in our neighborhood or any
20 other residential neighborhood. First is the
21 aesthetics of placing a huge, unattractive piece
22 of commercial equipment in a quiet and beautiful
23 residential neighborhood. The homeowners here
24 strive to keep the neighborhood aesthetically
25 pleasing and do a great job of doing that.

1 Placing a cell tower in a residential neighborhood
2 is an abomination to the atmosphere of a
3 residential area.

4 My second objection is the economics of
5 this proposal. You will hear from a real estate
6 professional about the adverse financial effects
7 of placing a cell tower in a residential
8 neighborhood on the values of the homes nearby and
9 eventually on the town itself. It is also
10 patently unfair to allow one homeowner to reap an
11 ongoing financial benefit from a commercial
12 enterprise at the expense of the other homeowners
13 and the town. It would make much more sense to
14 place a cell tower on town property where the
15 economic benefit would accrue to all the town
16 citizens. Thank you.

17 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. I now call
18 upon Penelope Sampoli followed by Norman Bender.
19 Penelope Sampoli, please.

20 PENELOPE SAMPOLI: Yes. Good evening.
21 Can you hear me?

22 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, I can. Good
23 evening.

24 PENELOPE SAMPOLI: My name is Penny
25 Sampoli, and I live at 108 Newton Road in

1 Woodbridge. And as the owner of a property
2 adjacent to 118 Newton Road, I strongly oppose the
3 construction of a commercial cell tower on my
4 neighbor's property.

5 My husband, three young children and I
6 moved to Woodbridge in 1995. With a growing
7 family, we needed a larger house and were also
8 looking for a school system that could meet the
9 special needs of our oldest child born with
10 developmental disabilities. Growing up in
11 Woodbridge proved to be a wonderful experience for
12 all three of my children. All three received an
13 excellent public school education, just as we had
14 hoped, but more than that, my children were lucky
15 enough to live amidst beautiful natural
16 surroundings with abundant wildlife, a fascinating
17 variety of plant life. It was a truly magical
18 experience for them as children.

19 Sadly, my husband passed away in 2001
20 after a long struggle with lymphoma. After my
21 husband's death, I made a concerted effort to
22 remain in our home in Woodbridge. I fully
23 expected that my home would retain its value over
24 the long term. I'm counting on my home's residual
25 value to provide support in my old age and to

1 provide a modest sum and trust for my oldest child
2 who still lives with me as my dependent and whom
3 you may hear in the background. I'm sorry about
4 that.

5 I am devastated when I think about the
6 negative impact that the commercial installation
7 of a cell tower next door to me would likely have
8 on the resale value of my home. The proposed cell
9 tower would be clearly visible above the treeline
10 from nearly every vantage point in my yard. It
11 would be a blight and an eyesore. I fear that it
12 would degrade the environment and lower the resale
13 values of the surrounding homes as well.

14 At the same time, I can discern no real
15 benefit to be gained from such close proximity to
16 a new cell tower. As a long time Verizon
17 customer, I cannot recall a single dropped call in
18 over a decade. While I share the goal of an
19 expanded and equitably distributed
20 telecommunications services, I believe that an
21 approach which prioritizes the demands of the
22 telecommunications industry over our local
23 community's desire to protect its scenic beauty,
24 environment and local property values is not in
25 the broader public interest. It is especially

1 troubling that one homeowner can make a decision
2 that impacts the whole neighborhood so
3 significantly. To state the obvious,
4 telecommunication services are a public good and
5 should be regulated accordingly.

6 I understand that the Siting Council
7 must strike a difficult balance in its work, but I
8 firmly believe that you should deny Verizon's
9 application, as currently proposed, and direct the
10 company to work closely with Woodbridge town
11 officials to find a more suitable site that does
12 not negatively affect -- (TIME ELAPSED)

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you for your
14 comments. We'll now call on Norman Bender,
15 please. Norman Bender.

16 (No response.)

17 MR. MORISSETTE: We will come back to
18 Mr. Bender. We'll move on to Phil Lebov, Phil
19 Lebov. Mr. Lebov?

20 NORMAN BENDER: Can you hear me?

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, Mr. Bender.
22 Thank you.

23 NORMAN BENDER: Sorry, we hit mute.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: That's all right.
25 Please continue.

1 NORMAN BENDER: Thank you for the
2 privilege of being heard. Cell towers have a
3 place, everyone knows that, but just where is the
4 question. It could be in a very isolated area.
5 It could use a tower that's already on town
6 property. But to unduly change the landscape and
7 to benefit one household at the expense of so
8 many, many others is wrong on so many, many
9 levels.

10 We need to realize that for many people
11 a home is their greatest equity stake in life, and
12 to downgrade the value of that is something the
13 town should not allow, and I would think in good
14 conscious Verizon should not want. It's not just
15 a Newton Road, Woodbridge problem, and it's not
16 just a problem for other parts of Woodbridge or
17 Bethany or Orange or Hamden or North Haven or East
18 Haven or Westville in New Haven. If they get away
19 with this here, make no mistake, they'll be coming
20 for you. They'll do the same thing in other
21 neighborhoods. You get one guy who is, gal, who's
22 just interested in number one, and it will affect
23 the value of everyone around.

24 We are definitely, I'm told, underdogs
25 in this fight. So I'd like to close by quoting

1 the quintessential political underdog from many
2 years ago, a man named Harry Truman, who when he
3 went into the various neighborhoods who were going
4 to be devastated by his opponent winning, and I'd
5 like to say this from Woodbridge, from Newton Road
6 in Woodbridge, to every other part of Woodbridge,
7 to all the other towns, listen carefully, call
8 your representatives, because if we lose, you
9 lose. Thank you.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Bender.
11 I'll recall Phil Lebov.

12 PHIL LEBOV: Hi there. Can you hear
13 me?

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, I can. Thank
15 you.

16 PHIL LEBOV: Okay. Hi, I'm Phil Lebov.
17 I've lived in Woodbridge now for over 35 years
18 with my wife. We've all mused about stories about
19 people who have decided to buy a house next to an
20 airport and then complained about the noise of air
21 traffic. The cell tower situation is exactly the
22 opposite of that. There's a great number of
23 reasons to move to Woodbridge, but none of them
24 are to be close to a giant unsightly steel
25 structure like a cell tower.

1 I was born in New Haven, and I've lived
2 in various towns in Connecticut, and each move
3 that I made was in pursuit of a more comfortable
4 lifestyle as my income improved. While in New
5 Haven, I envied those who were lucky enough to
6 live in the little pastoral bucolic community up
7 the hill in Woodbridge. This is a town that was
8 built from a tried and true New England formula
9 whereby the center of the town is occupied by a
10 meeting house, a church, a school and a green.
11 Residences and farms grew from the center of the
12 town outward allowing for a centralized
13 compartmentalization for benefit of all.

14 As time went on, fire departments and
15 police stations and public work departments were
16 also placed in the town center. Residential areas
17 were kept free of these sorts of structures so
18 people could maintain their properties for
19 residential use, and maintain they did. Drive
20 down any road in Woodbridge and what you'll find
21 is a beautifully kept house set on a manicured
22 lawn with meticulous landscaping. No houses are
23 badly in need of paint. There are no junk
24 vehicles or construction equipment decaying on
25 front lawns. This is what draws people to want to

1 live in Woodbridge.

2 Sure, the taxes are not low, we don't
3 have a central water or sewer system, and we have
4 to pay for trash removal. What we do have is a
5 great school system, a welcoming community, and to
6 my point, an immense sense of pride of ownership.
7 No one who has spent time toiling in their gardens
8 or mowing their lawns wants to look up and see a
9 cell phone tower rising on the horizon on their
10 neighbor's property when we could be served just
11 as well by placing it in the center of town where
12 such structures have historically been intended to
13 be placed.

14 Are cell towers intrinsically
15 unsightly? Well, yeah. The City of Los Angeles
16 requires that wireless telecommunications have the
17 least possible impact on the environment. It
18 mandates that towers be designed with stealth
19 techniques which may include camouflaging them to
20 look like trees. For these reasons, I would like
21 to stand with my Woodbridge neighbors and friends
22 in opposition of the proposed construction of the
23 cell tower. Thank you.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. We'll now
25 call upon Mitchell Smooke. Mitchell Smooke.

1 MITCHELL SMOOKE: Thank you.

2 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you.

3 MITCHELL SMOOKE: My name is Mitchell
4 Smooke. My wife and I live at 23 Penny Lane in
5 Woodbridge. We moved to Connecticut from
6 California in 1984. I'm currently a professor at
7 Yale University in the department of mechanical
8 engineering. I've served as the chair of the
9 department for 13 years, and more recently I was
10 the dean of the School of Engineering and Applied
11 Science.

12 I fully support the comments of my
13 neighbors that have been made regarding the impact
14 of the proposed cell tower on property values in
15 the vicinity of the tower. In addition, I agree
16 with the comments made regarding the corresponding
17 collateral damage that would occur to the town's
18 property tax revenue and its mill rate.

19 I'm particularly disturbed by the lack
20 of details in Docket 502 site selection summary.
21 Specifically of the 25 potential sites,
22 approximately 12 were rejected due to distance.
23 They apparently did not satisfy Cellco's
24 Woodbridge N2 service objectives which I found
25 were not clearly stated. Seven of the sites were

1 rejected due to elevation issues, and several
2 others failed for a variety of reasons, including
3 conservation and wetland restrictions.

4 As I am sure you are aware, there is a
5 tower in the center of Woodbridge that is 130 feet
6 in height. While it is not a cell phone tower, it
7 is used for communication by the police and the
8 fire departments throughout the town. After
9 speaking to the Woodbridge Police, they tell me
10 that communication throughout Woodbridge is not
11 restricted due to this tower's location. On top
12 of it, the top of the tower is approximately 460
13 feet above sea level.

14 In addition, on July 8th I spoke with a
15 representative of the company in Branford that
16 built the Woodbridge tower. The representative
17 did not believe that the height of the current
18 tower could be increased so as to support cell
19 phone transmitting equipment due to the weight
20 issues of the transmitters and antennae, but he
21 felt that a new tower built in the vicinity of the
22 current one, for example, behind the fire
23 department, could easily be made to accommodate
24 increased service in the Route 114, Route 63, 67
25 and Newton Road areas. In addition, if the town

1 were willing to work with Verizon on leasing and
2 tax issues, it could be economically beneficial to
3 all parties involved.

4 Another issue I find disturbing is the
5 fact that when one looks at the actual cell phone
6 site coverage maps, there are very few holes in
7 Woodbridge cell phone service. It seems hard to
8 justify a stand-alone tower in a residential
9 neighborhood unless there are other factors at
10 play unknown to us that will impact our future
11 coverage. I ask the question, is Verizon planning
12 on doing something that will cause our future cell
13 phone coverage to deteriorate? If so, why hasn't
14 this been vetted in an open forum. A tower placed
15 within the center of the town could enhance cell
16 phone coverage on the routes in question where
17 there are small holes in service. (TIME ELAPSED)

18 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. That
19 concludes your time for comments. Thank you for
20 your time.

21 Next is Ann Werner. Ann Werner. Ann
22 Werner.

23 (No response.)

24 MR. MORISSETTE: I'll call upon Alan
25 Ruskis. Alan Ruskis.

1 ALAN RUSKIS: Hi. Thank you. My name
2 is Alan Ruskis, and I'm a resident of Orange,
3 Connecticut speaking today as a close friend of
4 many Woodbridge residents and a citizen deeply
5 concerned with the current conflict of large
6 businesses and the individual. I do thank the
7 committee for the opportunity to talk on behalf of
8 these homeowners against the intrusion of this
9 Verizon tower in their community. I believe the
10 federal, state and local governments have a duty
11 to protect us as individuals against abusive
12 practices of large businesses.

13 Zoning law is created to ensure the
14 safe and amicable environmental of residential
15 areas where residents of this particular community
16 have long lived there, maintained those
17 guidelines, and created a sought-after
18 environment. I know we wouldn't let an individual
19 break off a corner of their property and open a
20 small store, a hot dog stand or any such business.
21 Why would we let a large corporation do exactly
22 the same?

23 I also understand that communication
24 infrastructure is very important today and know
25 some sacrifices must be made at times to maintain

1 that. In this particular case, however, there are
2 clearly a number of alternatives for placement of
3 this tower that do not violate the residential
4 nature of any community at all. I heard many of
5 these presented this afternoon. Some have been
6 explored, others have hardly been considered at
7 all. I do not understand why we would not pursue
8 those solutions here in more detail. I came away
9 from this afternoon's hearing with many, many
10 unanswered questions.

11 I thank you again for this opportunity.
12 And I sincerely hope that the committee will see
13 the value of siding with these residents in
14 protecting their community over the interests of a
15 large corporation trying to disrupt it and deny
16 this particular site. Thank you again.

17 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Ruskis.

18 We'll now call upon Susan Cassidy
19 followed by Saraab Myott. Susan Cassidy, please.

20 SUSAN CASSIDY: Hi, I'm Susan Cassidy.
21 I've lived in Woodbridge for 16 years. I'm on
22 Baldwin Road though, and I won't be able to see
23 the tower from my property, but my concern is for
24 my neighbors' financial well-being.

25 I've been a realtor for nearly 20

1 years. I have managed real estate offices in
2 Oxford, Milford and Greenwich, and I was a
3 regional vice president for my brokerage
4 responsible for 19 offices between here and the
5 New York line. And while no one in real estate
6 can ever say I've seen it all, I can come closer
7 than most.

8 It has always been true that property
9 values are impacted by your neighbor. Try selling
10 your home if your neighbor has a half a dozen
11 rusted vehicles in the front yard, or see what
12 happens to your value if your beautiful view is
13 now obstructed by your neighbor's new addition.
14 It's fact. One neighbor's treatment of their
15 property impacts the property owners around them,
16 and there doesn't have to be a known health issue
17 or economic impact study for that to be true.

18 And in this instance how are we
19 defining "neighbor"? Is it immediately next door,
20 down the street, within sight of the tower? We
21 all know that there are some absolute truths in
22 real estate, location, location, location, and
23 price fixes anything. Location is the first rule
24 of real estate. You can increase the size of a
25 house or improve the condition, but you cannot

1 pick it up and move it. And there's only one
2 thing that fixes a location problem, and that
3 brings us to price fixes anything. At the right
4 price there is a buyer for any house. But is the
5 house sitting next to the highway? Price it
6 accordingly. Is there a, the driveway goes up the
7 side of a mountain? Price it accordingly. And if
8 there is a cell tower that looms over the
9 backyard, price it accordingly.

10 And a third rule of real estate is that
11 buyers do not like uncertainty. Why risk buying
12 the house with a cell tower nearby when there's
13 probably another one across town or in a
14 neighboring town that doesn't have one. In my
15 professional opinion, this proposed location for
16 the cell tower is going to negatively impact our
17 entire town. This location borders some of our
18 highest priced neighborhoods. And due to the
19 proximity to the high school and the center of
20 town, if these property values are impacted, it
21 brings down the average sale price for everybody
22 in Woodbridge. And when the values go down, the
23 mill rates go up.

24 I'm urging the Siting Council to please
25 recommend to Verizon to work with the town and

1 listen to the options they have for nonresidential
2 locations. I am not saying not in Woodbridge.
3 I'm simply saying that there must be a location in
4 Woodbridge that will bring the benefits of 5G
5 without creating a detriment to the community.
6 And frankly, in my opinion, added cost to Verizon
7 versus lost equity for our property owners should
8 be an obvious choice. Thank you.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. I'll now
10 call upon Saraab Myott. Saraab Myott.

11 SARAAB MYOTT: Thank you and good
12 evening. My name is Saraab Myott, and I currently
13 reside at 38 Penny Lane in Woodbridge. I am a
14 long-time Woodbridge resident since 1979, that's
15 42 years.

16 What I love and value, value being the
17 key word, most about Woodbridge is what you've
18 heard from my neighbors this evening. I love
19 nature. I love wildlife. I love the fact that I
20 have the sanctity of my yard, my home, and my
21 neighbors to walk my dogs. And I'm so proud of
22 the fact that I've been able to raise my children,
23 ages 10, 12 and 15, here where I grew up. And all
24 those values, all those things that we've talked
25 about this evening that you've heard from my

1 neighbors that I have valued they value, and I am
2 so proud to be able to extend that to them.

3 And exactly what Ms. Cassidy was just
4 talking about, I am so concerned about preserving
5 the value of my home, and just because my
6 neighbors have done such a good job of
7 articulating it, and thinking what Mr. Bender just
8 said, that our home is our greatest equity stake.

9 I just want to make it personal for
10 everyone. In 2018 I faced an unexpected divorce.
11 I had to negotiate priorities and protect the
12 well-being of myself and secure the financial
13 future of my children, and the decision I made was
14 just as Mr. Bender articulated, in my home. And
15 what we're talking about here I oppose so strongly
16 because there is no data in the world, Ms. Cassidy
17 has said it way better than me, that shows
18 anything other than a decrease (AUDIO
19 INTERRUPTION) cell tower is erected.

20 And I ask the Council members to think
21 about the impact to our community and to people
22 like me. And perhaps you know someone like me
23 who's been in this situation. It's not easy. And
24 I have fought very hard to keep my home and to
25 protect my family, and I'm asking you to do the

1 same on my behalf and the behalf of my neighbors.
2 So please make a decision that's right for our
3 town and give us an alternative location or give
4 us the opportunity to sit at the table with you
5 and come up with an alternative location to
6 protect my neighbors and my family. Thank you.

7 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. We will
8 now call on Brian Daley. Mr. Daley.

9 BRIAN DALEY: My name is Brian Daley.
10 My wife and I and our son, Liam, moved to 14
11 Soundview Drive in Woodbridge three years ago.
12 Our property abuts the proposed cell tower. We
13 are speaking out in opposition to this tower being
14 placed in a residential neighborhood.

15 Before purchasing our home on
16 Soundview, we were a running joke at our real
17 estate agent's office. The office was convinced
18 my wife and I would never agree on a house. For
19 us, we weren't looking for a house, we were
20 looking for a home. We looked at houses every
21 weekend for over two years before placing the
22 offer on our home. It wasn't easy purchasing a
23 home in this area with all the competition on the
24 market and facing a multiple offer situation.

25 In the end we resorted to writing a

1 personal letter to the previous owner on why we
2 wanted the house. In the letter we described the
3 life we saw in Woodbridge at Soundview Drive. It
4 included our son being in the community that
5 valued education and childhood development. The
6 letter included us sitting at the front porch
7 watching our son play in the yard, watching him
8 ride his bike in the beautiful cul-de-sac, his
9 friends meeting up for pickup sports at the end of
10 our road in a neighborhood we felt safe and
11 comfortable in. At no point was cell service a
12 concern of ours in searching for our home. We
13 weren't aware at the time of purchasing our home
14 that the property next door had been considered
15 for a Verizon cell tower site. No where did it
16 need to be disclosed to us. If we had known, I
17 can guarantee we would not have purchased this
18 property.

19 The placement of the tower, as other
20 people have mentioned, will have a drastic
21 negative impact on the surrounding property values
22 and our quality of life. This is not a cell tower
23 that is isolated from the rest of the
24 neighborhood. This is a cell tower feet away from
25 where my son plays basketball. It will affect my

1 son's quality of life.

2 When we mentioned the situation to
3 family friends, the other mother's response was,
4 Don't worry, Liam can come to play, come for play
5 dates at our house. At first I didn't realize the
6 underlying message of that statement, but when I
7 did, I realized she was saying Liam could go to
8 her house because she would not feel comfortable
9 having her son at our house next to a cell tower.

10 I am concerned for my son's safety. I
11 will feel uncomfortable having my son play outside
12 while construction or maintenance is going on with
13 the tower. The neighborhood is filled with
14 children, and to have a tower that will have a
15 paved entrance with direct access from our
16 cul-de-sac is absurd to think that kids of all
17 ages will not be curious about it and drawn to the
18 property. I'm concerned what will happen if my
19 son gets hurt on the cell tower property, and I am
20 concerned of the property owner's reactions when
21 the kids of the neighborhood enter the cell tower
22 area.

23 I feel the placement of this tower is
24 inconsistent with the values of our community.
25 Woodbridge is a shining gem of New Haven County

1 because of the attention it pays to preserving its
2 community, environment, and investing in our
3 children's future. People move to rural
4 communities as ours based on these reasons.
5 People -- (TIME ELAPSED)

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you for your
7 comments, Mr. Daley.

8 We'll now move on to Steven Kleinstein.
9 Mr. Kleinstein.

10 STEVEN KLEINSTEIN: Hi. I would like
11 to start out by saying that it disturbed me
12 greatly to see that several CSC members are not on
13 video for this meeting. I have no idea if they're
14 paying attention or not, or if they are even
15 present now to hear my strong objection and the
16 objections of so many of my neighbors. I find it
17 disrespectful.

18 My name is Steve Kleinstein. I live
19 just down the block from the proposed cell tower
20 site. I moved to Woodbridge with my family in
21 2006. We looked for homes in many different
22 neighborhoods. We chose Woodbridge for several
23 reasons. Great schools and an easy commute to New
24 Haven were two of the things that attracted us
25 here, but mainly we fell in love with the idyllic

1 look and feel of the town. My wife and I take
2 walks around the neighborhood almost daily, and it
3 just gives me a good feeling being around all the
4 trees in a natural setting.

5 Now I'm concerned that the proposed
6 cell tower is going to ruin this beautiful area
7 that we chose. The proposed site is less than one
8 mile from my home. It is directly on my commute
9 home from work. I drove this route on March 10,
10 2021, the day that a crane was at the site to
11 perform a CW transmit test showing exactly how the
12 cell tower would disrupt my news and the views of
13 my neighbors. It was terrible. The location of
14 the tower was impossible to miss from the street.
15 If it gets built, it will cause me emotional
16 stress every time I walk or drive by. Cell phone
17 towers simply do not belong smack in the middle of
18 a residential neighborhood as is proposed in this
19 case.

20 The day the crane was there I also
21 walked down to my neighbors' houses on Soundview
22 Drive. I could not believe how close the cell
23 tower was to these properties. It will be an
24 eyesore and completely destroy this area. There
25 is simply no reason to put a tower like this in

1 the middle of a neighborhood in full view of many
2 houses and in partial view of many more.

3 Connecticut should not be allowing this, and you
4 should not be allowing this.

5 I am also concerned about fairness. It
6 is simply not fair for one family to benefit
7 financially from a cell tower that will surely
8 cause the rest of the residents of Woodbridge to
9 lose money and peace of mind. The tower should be
10 built on town owned property so that all of the
11 residents can benefit equally. Cell tower revenue
12 would benefit the entire town by helping to pay
13 for things like better schools, and this would
14 provide benefits for all. I don't think that
15 Verizon has engaged sufficiently with the town to
16 explore alternative sites, ones that are not in
17 the middle of a residential neighborhood.

18 All together, the idea of this tower is
19 very upsetting to me. While I love this
20 neighborhood dearly, I would not have purchased
21 this house if the cell tower was present and will
22 certainly have to consider leaving if the tower
23 does get built.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
25 Kleinstein.

1 We'll now move on to Nanci Skylar,
2 please. Nanci Skylar.

3 NANCI SKYLAR: Can you hear me?

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, we can hear you.
5 Thank you.

6 NANCI SKYLAR: Hi. My name is Nanci
7 Skylar. Thank you for allowing me to speak today.
8 I live at 41 Penny Lane. I've lived in Woodbridge
9 since 1994 which is 27 years ago. We first came
10 to this area in the eighties for my husband's
11 residency at Yale New Haven Hospital. And after
12 some time away in Boston for training, we decided
13 to return to the greater New Haven area. And we
14 moved to Woodbridge shortly thereafter as we felt
15 it would be a wonderful place to put down our
16 roots and raise our family in this safe and
17 beautiful rural community with wonderful neighbors
18 who take great pride in the community.

19 In terms of the proposed cell tower to
20 be built in this heavily residential area, there
21 are some deeply disturbing cites and study and
22 data that translates into serious health risks for
23 people living in this area, many of whom house
24 young children, in addition to destroying the
25 ambience of the area. In 2018 the National

1 Research Council simply said we do not have enough
2 information about potential health risks of
3 long-term exposure to radio frequency energy from
4 cell towers and other components of our
5 communication systems. A German study reinforced
6 this. An Australian study found that children
7 living near broadcast towers, which emit similar
8 radiation to cell towers, develop Leukemia at
9 three times the rate of children living seven
10 miles away.

11 Scientists have cited other health
12 problems from cell phone tower radiation in
13 residential areas such as headaches, memory loss
14 and cardiovascular stress. I think that, judging
15 from what everybody is saying today and
16 conversations we've had in our community, most of
17 us in this heavily residential area would be
18 willing to sacrifice 100 percent perfect cell
19 phone service rather than a tower located in a way
20 and in an area that could impact the health of our
21 residents and the beauty of our community, not to
22 mention the property value.

23 So in summary, I strongly reject and I
24 strongly oppose the cell tower proposition from
25 the 118 Newton Road location and hope that other

1 locations around Woodbridge, which would be more
2 appropriate, will be strongly considered instead.

3 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you for your
4 comments. Next is Mary Lou Narowski. Mary Lou
5 Narowski. Mary Lou Narowski?

6 (No response.)

7 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Moving on to
8 Joann Karales. Joann Karales.

9 JOANN KARALES: Hi.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Good evening.

11 JOANN KARALES: Hi, my name is Joann
12 Karales, and my husband, Bill and I, live at 40
13 Orchard Road. Recently in 2017, we moved from
14 Long Island to be closer to my daughter and her
15 family who live in Bethany. We spent over a year
16 looking for a home, researching towns. We decided
17 on Woodbridge because of its peaceful quiet
18 neighborhood. My favorite thing is taking long
19 walks with my grandchildren and enjoying nature.
20 If the cell tower had been in existence at 118
21 Newton, we would have never purchased this home.
22 I am greatly concerned it will destroy the
23 aesthetic characteristics and beauty of this
24 neighborhood.

25 The location of our home was also a

1 very important decision as we relocated our
2 company. Close to New Haven and Milford, it made
3 a perfect choice. Living in Woodbridge allowed us
4 to have the best of both worlds in keeping with
5 the rural lifestyle we wanted. I would like to
6 make it very clear, we are not against cell
7 towers. They have relevance and are essential but
8 belong in commercial or industrial areas.

9 In January of 2020 we purchased an
10 office building and warehouse. Within close
11 distance to both of those buildings is a cell
12 tower clearly visible from our office windows. It
13 did not have any impact on our decision for this
14 need to purchase. But this is where we live --
15 work, I'm sorry, this is where we work, not where
16 we live.

17 Cell phone companies cannot lose site
18 of the perspective of a cell tower. They should
19 not be able to deface a neighborhood by monetarily
20 benefiting a single homeowner to gain access to a
21 residential area. I would like to point out that
22 the owners of 118 Newton clearly will not be
23 disturbed in any way. The people living on
24 Soundview will have the hardest impact, their
25 lives disrupted, their street used for

1 construction and then long-term maintenance
2 access.

3 Advanced technology was created to
4 enhance people's lives, not destroy them. I ask
5 the Siting Council to hear the voices of concern
6 for this community and work with us to move the
7 cell tower to a more appropriate location. Thank
8 you.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Next on
10 the list is Hongbing Huang.

11 HONGBING HUANG: Thank you for the
12 opportunity to speak. My name is Hongbing Huang.
13 My family and I moved to our new home on 51 Penny
14 Lane just a few weeks ago. So the house is one of
15 the properties that abuts the proposed cell tower
16 site.

17 Learning that a 100 foot cell tower is
18 proposed to be built so close to my house gives me
19 a taste of buyer's remorse. We chose this town
20 and neighborhood because it offers a rural feel,
21 small town charm, and good schools. We considered
22 a similar house in a neighboring town before we
23 signed the contract for the house. I have to say,
24 one of the determining factors for us to choose 31
25 Penny Lane is because it has a serene backyard and

1 a beautiful treehouse, and my daughter loves the
2 treehouse. It is at the northeast corner of the
3 backyard. If the cell tower is built as proposed,
4 it would feel like the treehouse stands next to a
5 100 foot monopole and fenced station, and this
6 certainly is not what we envisioned when bought
7 the house. I'm concerned that a cell tower in
8 this proposed site will adversely affect the
9 character of the neighborhood, ruining the rural
10 feel of the community.

11 In addition to it being a visual
12 blight, the proposed cell tower is also a
13 potential fire and a fall hazard. It's not
14 unheard of that cell towers catch fires and high
15 winds topple poles. Cell towers in residential
16 areas will create anxiety, stress and worry, and
17 would result in deterioration of quality of life
18 for our neighborhood.

19 As a newcomer to the community, my own
20 reaction to the news about the cell tower proposal
21 makes me believe that a cell tower in this
22 residential area would lead to a depreciation of
23 real estate value in this neighborhood. I'm not
24 against cell towers in Woodbridge, but I don't
25 think that installing cell towers in residential

1 areas is a good idea. I encourage Verizon to find
2 another available and less intrusive location.
3 Thank you for your attention.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you for your
5 comments this evening. We'll now call upon Maria
6 Kayne.

7 MARIA KAYNE: Hello. Good evening, my
8 name is Maria Kayne.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Good evening.

10 MARIA KAYNE: I've been a resident of
11 Woodbridge since 1979, and I live on 1891
12 Litchfield Turnpike. I learned from a neighbor of
13 mine that about 20 years ago there were goats
14 grazing at 118 Newton Road. Therefore, not long
15 ago this land was still a working farm. It's one
16 of Woodbridge's prime agricultural lands. From
17 2004 to 2009, the Connecticut Working Lands
18 Alliance and other concerned organizations worked
19 with the Connecticut legislature to put forth a
20 policy to conserve and preserve what was left of
21 agricultural lands in the state. We were losing
22 agricultural lands development in disturbing
23 amounts daily and rapidly.

24 On the local side, the Town of
25 Woodbridge also recognized the issue, and to this

1 day includes farm preservation as an important
2 policy in its town plan of conservation and
3 development. It has become an essential value of
4 the culture of the town. Any development, even
5 the erection of a cell tower, destroys the land by
6 changing numerous soil elements that ensure the
7 stability of life on earth. Woodbridge has enough
8 necessary development and also enough cell towers
9 that we do not need one in a residential area.

10 It's been proven time and time again
11 that conservation and preservation of farmland is
12 essential in alleviating climate change.
13 Woodbridge has -- okay. So we do not need another
14 cell tower, especially not in this neighborhood.
15 The erection of a cell tower leaves metal and
16 chemical residues and cement that are bad for the
17 soil. When you disturb greenery, you disturb
18 essential exchanges of gas in the soil that
19 affects, you know, the making of, like turning
20 carbon dioxide into nutrients to support plant
21 life and tree life, and it also impacts the
22 sending back of gases that, you know, affect the
23 global, the warming of the globe.

24 What else did I want to say? In
25 addition, when you make a cell tower, you compact

1 the land with constant passage of heavy equipment
2 and constructing permanent passage to the tower.
3 Compaction has a huge negative impact on the soil.
4 It kills many organisms that develop in the soil
5 and disrupts important cycles that sustain life on
6 the land.

7 Also, as we are in a watershed, which
8 includes that neighborhood -- (TIME ELAPSED)

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, but that
10 concludes your time for comments. Thank you for
11 your comments.

12 We'll now call upon Ellen Scalettar.
13 Ellen Scalettar? Ellen Scalettar.

14 (No response.)

15 MR. MORISSETTE: I'll now call upon
16 Linda Calarco. Linda Calarco. Linda Calarco.

17 (No response.)

18 MR. MORISSETTE: We'll now call on Greg
19 Karwaski.

20 A VOICE: She's here.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you.

22 LINDA CALARCO: Yes. Thank you. I'm
23 sorry for the delay.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: That's okay.

25 LINDA CALARCO: My name is Linda

1 Calarco. Thank you to the Siting Council for
2 hearing my comments and those of my neighbors this
3 evening.

4 I have lived at 27 Forest Glen Drive
5 for 40 years. My husband and I raised our two
6 sons in our house, which we have renovated,
7 improved and increased its value multiple times.
8 Families have lived in this safe and beautiful
9 neighborhood over the years with confidence that
10 it will maintain its character and value. Only
11 now with the possibility of the erection of an
12 industrial structure in the middle of homes,
13 backyards, jungle gyms and barbecues is that
14 assumption, that confidence in neighborhood
15 character and worth dashed and destroyed.

16 I understand that Woodbridge could use
17 improved cell phone service. I understand that
18 Verizon wants to provide that for its customers,
19 as it should. However, I'm not sure Verizon
20 understands the full scope of its responsibility,
21 that it has a responsibility to serve its
22 customers not only by providing cell phone
23 capability but they also have the responsibility
24 to do so with the least possible negative impact
25 to the people they serve.

1 Erecting this tower in a residential
2 zone is inappropriate, unsightly, disturbing to a
3 way of life, disturbing to wildlife, and
4 detrimental to property value. A cell tower does
5 not belong in this residential neighborhood, nor
6 in a neighborhood of those who sit on the Siting
7 Council, nor in the neighborhood of employees of
8 Verizon. It does not belong in any residential
9 neighborhood, any residential zone, and Verizon
10 knows that too.

11 And Verizon also knows that there are
12 other options available to them which can, with
13 their technical expertise, yield comparable
14 coverage and service. They need to recognize that
15 it is their responsibility to sit down with town
16 officials to work out a solution that serves the
17 needs of its customers without this negative
18 impact which has been outlined by our neighbors
19 this evening and which is fully known by Verizon.
20 Erecting another tower between two already
21 existing towers is a simplistic solution. Surely
22 Verizon can work out a more suitable, a more
23 technically sophisticated solution, that will meet
24 everyone's needs without the harmful effects this
25 plan presents. All they need is the will.

1 I ask the Siting Council, whose mandate
2 is to ensure the proper use of the state's land,
3 to ensure that Verizon be a responsible corporate
4 citizen by declining their application and by
5 asking them to collaborate with the town and come
6 up with a solution that provides the customers
7 with better service without the negative impact on
8 their -- (TIME ELAPSED)

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. That
10 concludes your three minutes. Thank you for your
11 comments this evening.

12 We now call upon Greg Karwaski. Greg
13 Karwaski.

14 GREG KARWASKI: Yes. Good evening.
15 Thank you for allowing me to speak today. So we
16 live on Soundview Drive. We are about maybe 200
17 or 300 feet away from the proposed cell tower
18 location. We are asking you to consider, to ask
19 Verizon to consider a different location for the
20 cell tower. The cell tower is not needed here.
21 We are directly impacted by this proposal as many,
22 many other dozens of citizens that you heard from
23 this evening.

24 We have moved into this house six years
25 ago. We came here to raise our family to take

1 advantage of the beautiful landscape, the school
2 system. This proposal would turn our life upside
3 down, and especially that there is really no --
4 there are alternatives available which we believe
5 were not considered thoroughly. They were not
6 given a fair shake. And the town is willing to
7 work with Verizon. And we're asking you to, to
8 Verizon to work with the town to find a better
9 location that will not impact negatively our
10 neighborhood. Thank you.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Kiyoko
12 Karwaski, would you like to say something too?

13 KIYOKO KARWASKI: Thank you for the
14 time tonight. Please allow me to introduce myself
15 first. My name is Kiyoko Karwaski. I'm Greg's
16 wife. We live at 10 Soundview Drive. We moved to
17 this house in January 2015. We have lived here
18 about five, six years. We bought this house, as
19 he mentioned, because of everyone says this is the
20 really good place for us to live for the family
21 life. And we were so thankful to have this house.
22 It's so beautiful. It's very hard for us to have
23 this house because we just got married. We just
24 bought a house right after we married. And we
25 don't have kids, but we just wanted to start --

1 it's the best place for us to stay for long term.

2 But last summer we found out that
3 Verizon is trying to erect a tower at the end of
4 our cul-de-sac. We were shocked, of course, that
5 the cell tower is to be located, it's in our
6 backyard. Since the terrifying data we found out,
7 we have constant fear of losing our house. Our
8 property lies around 250 feet from 118 Newton
9 Road, and even worse, Verizon tried to use our
10 cul-de-sac to be an access road to the tower.
11 This instantly changes the character of our
12 residential house, and we carefully choose to buy
13 our house to stay away from any industrial
14 facility, any busy areas, and never wanted to be
15 next to a major road, just live quietly like this.

16 Since we found out this proposal,
17 Verizon has no consideration of our voices. This
18 is the only time for us to be able to speak up.
19 So I'm not really -- and then we live so close to
20 the tower, but our house is second from the cell
21 tower, so Verizon does not need to consider our --
22 (TIME ELAPSED)

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. That
24 concludes your three minutes. Thank you very much
25 for your comments.

1 Next is Dr. Michael Berman.

2 MICHAEL BERMAN: Good evening. My name
3 is Michael Berman. And Nancy and I have lived in
4 Woodbridge on Prospect Court since August of 1977.
5 That's 44 years. At the same time we moved to
6 Woodbridge, I opened up my medical practice in
7 Branford, but I chose -- we chose to move to
8 Woodbridge for its excellent schools, its rural
9 feel, yet its proximity to the educational,
10 cultural and health care resources of New Haven.

11 We feel a true pride and privilege to
12 live in this beautiful town and have always been
13 grateful to our many dedicated town members and
14 leaders who have consistently and faithfully
15 committed their collective time and efforts to
16 preserve the natural beauty, wildlife, undeveloped
17 land, historic sites, and pastoral persona that
18 makes each and every neighborhood of Woodbridge a
19 most, if not the most, desirable place to live and
20 raise a family in New Haven County.

21 Woodbridge was first named Amity. The
22 word Amity has been used in the English language
23 to describe friendship or friendliness well over
24 500 years. I respectfully ask that we treat one
25 another in friendship, honoring the historically

1 named birth right of our town, and summon the
2 Verizon team to transcend the external commercial
3 and economic pressures to place a cell tower in
4 the center of a residential neighborhood and
5 select another more appropriate site. In a town
6 once called Amity, we cherish the harmony it
7 shares with its existing terrain and its history,
8 legacy and its soul.

9 We must preserve the serenity, natural
10 beauty, safety and value of every residential
11 neighborhood in our town. I hope the passions and
12 concerns expressed here tonight can help us move
13 forward working together with Verizon to find a
14 location that is acceptable to all parties and all
15 citizens in Woodbridge. Thank you.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Dr. Berman.

17 We'll now continue with Jonathan
18 Greengarden followed by Roger Hess. Mr.
19 Greengarden.

20 JONATHAN GREENGARDEN: Good evening.
21 My name is Jonathan Greengarden. And while I
22 currently live and work in Washington, D.C., I
23 still consider my home to be in Woodbridge because
24 it's where I grew up, where my family still lives,
25 and where I visit as often as I can. I'm

1 especially concerned about this tower proposal
2 because it would be on property directly abutting
3 and impinging upon my family's residential
4 property and unquestionably impacting my family on
5 a daily basis.

6 Although it's referenced as being at
7 118 Newton Road, it will be accessed from and in
8 clear view of Soundview Drive where my family has
9 lived for 26 years. Our house is at the end of a
10 cul-de-sac with only five homes on the street in a
11 picturesque neighborhood with many young families.
12 It's quiet, safe, there's no traffic, and it's a
13 cul-de-sac where I learned to ride my bike, play
14 kickball with my neighbors, and where so many
15 young families of all ages still come today.

16 My family takes much pride in our home
17 and continuously works hard to maintain its
18 character and appeal and will forever be ruined by
19 the presence of this tower. The thought of it
20 being clearly visible to us is absolutely
21 revolting. It's hard to fathom trying to enjoy
22 time outside in the front or backyard or being
23 inside and looking out the windows only to see a
24 cell tower hovering above us.

25 The area where the tower would go has

1 been gradually cleared of so many trees and is now
2 a very open sparse field. It would be unavoidable
3 not to see it. Ironically, my family will be
4 affected much more than the homeowners who have
5 the lease agreement with Verizon because their
6 homes are conveniently much further away from the
7 proposed location of the tower. The idea that
8 such a project could possibly be proposed at this
9 location is both unimaginable and unconscionable.

10 Aesthetically the tower will be
11 incredibly offensive and noxious. It's
12 irrefutable that the general public's perception
13 is that being in close proximity to a cell tower
14 is undesirable and impacts the use, enjoyment,
15 value and marketability of one's property. I'm
16 certain that if you were to tour this proposed
17 site, and I hope you will, you'd agree that this
18 area is not appropriate. It absolutely does not
19 fit with the landscape and character of the
20 neighborhood.

21 I would like to finish by noting that
22 when a homeowner purchases their home, they're
23 guaranteed certain rights of protection, one of
24 which is the right of enjoyment. I can tell you
25 unequivocally this right would be clearly taken

1 away from my family. It's obvious there's an
2 upsurge of cell tower development, and I want to
3 clearly state I'm not opposed to this. Anyone
4 living in this era knows this is the wave of the
5 future; however, I am vehemently opposed to having
6 cell towers in heavily residential neighborhoods
7 such as this one. There are much more practicable
8 viable sites and options that have been offered to
9 Verizon to accommodate the purported need for
10 improved cell service in Woodbridge, and I urge
11 you to seriously and resolutely have them consider
12 these. I strongly beseech you to deny this
13 application at this location. Thank you.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
15 Greengarden. Before we move on to Mr. Roger Hess
16 and Kevin Tatro, we're going to take an 11 minute
17 break, and we will return back here at 8:15 for
18 the remainder of the public comments. So that
19 will be an 11 minute break till 8:15. Thank you,
20 everyone.

21 (Whereupon, a recess was taken from
22 8:04 p.m. until 8:10 p.m.)
23
24
25

1 MR. MORISSETTE: We're back on the
2 record. I'll call on Roger Hess, please.

3 ROGER HESS: Good evening, Mr.
4 Morissette, members of the Siting Council. Thank
5 you for your time and attention.

6 My name is Roger Hess. My family moved
7 to our home in Woodbridge 24 years ago. We came
8 specifically for the (AUDIO INTERRUPTION). We
9 have always loved the neighborhood specifically
10 because of the unspoiled natural beauty, combined
11 with tastefully landscaped homes and without large
12 commercial structures. And we know from meeting
13 newcomers that this is the main draw for others
14 who look to move into this neighborhood.

15 I'm very concerned about this highly
16 intrusive cell phone tower because it absolutely
17 spoils the entire area. It does not belong
18 directly in any of our neighbor's backyards. And
19 I'm concerned because we know there are other
20 sites that are better for us, the people who
21 bought property and live here, and that can
22 provide improved cellular coverage.

23 I'm concerned because I know Verizon's
24 needs are to find the easiest and cheapest site
25 possible. I'm concerned because I know they will

1 do everything they possibly can to convince you
2 that this is not only the best site for them but
3 also the only reasonable alternative. So I'm
4 worried because you may consider their proposal
5 only on the facts and figures they present on
6 paper.

7 And I am distraught over the
8 possibility that you will approve their proposal
9 without personally visiting our neighborhood to
10 understand the immense negative impact your
11 decision would have on us, the citizens who live
12 here, and that you won't have a chance to see some
13 of the other, more appropriate sites that Verizon
14 would rather not use because they will undoubtedly
15 cost them a little more money. I cannot reconcile
16 that a public commission might make a decision
17 favoring a gigantic business's cost needs over a
18 town's residents quality of life and property
19 values.

20 I remain hopeful that you will consider
21 visiting the area personally and that you will not
22 approve this proposal and that you will side with
23 the Connecticut residents whom you serve over the
24 business behemoth. Thank you for your time and
25 consideration.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Hess.
2 I must apologize to everyone. I jumped the gun.
3 I said 8:15, and I started early. I hope
4 everybody was able to jump on and hear Mr. Hess's
5 comments. Again, I apologize for the early start.

6 But we will continue with Kevin Tatro.
7 Kevin Tatro, please.

8 KEVIN TATRO: Yes. Thank you. My name
9 is Kevin Tatro. I live at 30 Orchard Road in
10 Woodbridge. Pretty much every day we walk our dog
11 down Soundview Drive. I'm talking to you from
12 outside my backyard so you can see what it looks
13 like in our neighborhood. We spend hundreds of
14 hours out here, and we spend thousands of hours of
15 manicuring our property and planting the flowers
16 that exist here. That's why we moved to
17 Woodbridge. We moved to an area that was zoned
18 residential. Now there's going to be a business
19 use returning a piece of this property in our
20 neighborhood into a commercially zoned space. I'm
21 not sure why last year the Town of Woodbridge
22 decided to change our zoning laws, but it allowed
23 for the Siting Council to determine what happens
24 in our town.

25 I was walking down Soundview Drive with

1 my wife and our dog when one of the neighbors
2 there told us about what was going on. They
3 hadn't been notified by the town. Nobody had been
4 notified about what was going on despite the fact
5 that the town had known about it for months.

6 I've been involved in development of
7 real estate around the country for years and seen
8 the kind of things that are going on. It really
9 disturbs me that I listen to all our residents
10 here saying we don't want it in this spot. There
11 are better spots. There are spots that benefit
12 the Town of Woodbridge. There are spots that I'm
13 sure, if the Town of Woodbridge had a conversation
14 with Verizon, it would be less expensive for them
15 to operate it there than this spot, but what's
16 been chosen is to benefit one individual who's
17 making an abundance of money.

18 In many cases these properties become
19 worth over a million dollars in the lease payments
20 that come through to them. While it's well-known
21 and the most studies that are out there show that
22 you have major declines in property values around
23 cell tower properties, and yet the decision has
24 been made by our town basically not to do battle
25 with Verizon on this for making a deal that is

1 better than what's going on out there. We have to
2 seriously wonder what's going on that one
3 individual gets an unjust enrichment while all of
4 the neighbors are clearly going to be very
5 negatively impacted.

6 And studies show 20 percent decline in
7 property values near cell towers. Everybody knows
8 that. 78 percent of the population has said that
9 they would not buy a property near a cell tower,
10 and yet this is what's going on. I'm really
11 curious where people are looking at this unjust
12 enrichment of one individual and a taking and a
13 diminished value from others without any
14 representation. And at this point, I'm wondering
15 who's going to sue who. The Woodbridge town
16 people are very wealthy people on a whole. You've
17 got dozens of lawyers located in direct vicinity
18 of this place. I can't wait till the lawsuits
19 start. Who are they going to be suing, the
20 current property owner? The Siting Council?
21 Verizon? The town? I'm not sure where this is
22 going to go. But all the people living here in
23 half-million-dollar houses that are going to lose
24 \$100,000 in value, on average, are probably not
25 going to sit back and just watch this. From my

1 standpoint, I look at this and say the Siting
2 Council was set up to protect the -- (TIME
3 ELAPSED)

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Thank you
5 for your comments.

6 We'll now continue with George Lister.
7 George Lister.

8 GEORGE LISTER: Good evening, my name
9 is George Lister. My home is 5 Forest Glen Drive.
10 This is about two-tenths of a mile from the
11 proposed site for the cell tower.

12 I moved here seven years ago when I was
13 recruited to a senior faculty position. My late
14 wife and I were attracted to Woodbridge because of
15 its proximity and ease of access to New Haven and
16 New York where my grown sons live. We were
17 particularly smitten, however, by the rustic feel
18 and lush landscape and the care our neighbors
19 apparently invested in this neighborhood.

20 As a resident of this neighborhood, I
21 absolutely realize that reliable cell phone
22 service brings important benefits, including
23 safety. Accordingly, my concern is less about my
24 own home. Rather, my concern is for those
25 families adjacent or closest to the tower who I

1 believe bear a hugely disproportionate burden.
2 There is little doubt that having a tower in one's
3 backyard reduces the value of the house, impairs
4 the ambience and is a deterrent for its sale. I
5 dare say that no one listening to these comments
6 would willingly move to a home next to a cell
7 tower. Furthermore, I anticipate it to be even
8 more disconcerting to have a cell tower erected
9 next door without your consent after you purchased
10 your home.

11 As part of any community, even if there
12 are not specified guidelines, we all have a
13 responsibility to keep our property tidy, safe and
14 commensurate with the decorum of the neighborhood.
15 It is those homes closest to an eyesore who have
16 the largest consequence. Hence, part of the
17 civility in living in a neighborhood is to
18 understand what others bear and to find ways to
19 help reduce that inconvenience.

20 Because of these thoughts, I believe
21 there's a compelling reason to seek an alternative
22 site for the tower not in another neighborhood
23 filled with homes but in an area that is distant
24 from homes. This decision here will certainly
25 have ripples and implications for other Woodbridge

1 neighborhoods facing similar types of decisions.
2 Thank you very much for your time.

3 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Thank you
4 for your comments. We will now call upon Sara
5 Sampoli. Sara Sampoli.

6 SARA SAMPOLI: Thank you. My name is
7 Sara Sampoli, and I grew up living at 108 Newton
8 Road, a property adjacent to the location of the
9 proposed tower beginning when I was 3 years old.
10 I'm 29 now, so I've called a few dorm rooms and
11 apartments home since then, but my mom continues
12 to live at 108 Newton Road. And I, first as a
13 student at Yale College and more recently at Yale
14 Law School, have continued to spend much of my
15 time there as well.

16 I strongly oppose the construction of
17 the commercial cell tower because I'm concerned
18 about the negative effect on the surrounding
19 properties, including my mom's, as well the
20 destruction of the neighborhood's unique natural
21 environment. I'll try not to repeat the points
22 raised by others who have spoken tonight, but
23 instead offer a few words about my experience as a
24 child growing up in an environment best described
25 as idyllic.

1 To me, opening our back door felt like
2 walking straight into the depths of an ancient
3 forest. Lush green grass grazed my ankles and
4 moss sat at the base of every tree. Wild apples
5 fell from one of the shorter ones, and ferns
6 dotted the back property line. Squirrels and
7 rabbits hopped across the yard in a steady stream,
8 and sometimes as many as ten deer at a time
9 decamped to our property for an afternoon.

10 I remember one spring a mother deer
11 left her two young fawns under a particularly
12 shady tree for two full days before coming back to
13 collect them, and I waited diligently at our
14 kitchen window for her return. Another year, I
15 sat mesmerized on our porch at sunset as I watched
16 a fox play in our grass. A group of three wild
17 turkeys came so frequently that we gave them
18 nicknames. Particularly at night the yard felt
19 positively wild. Frogs croaked from the nearby
20 swamp, and owls hooted, the sky pitch black save
21 for the bright light of hundreds of stars. Hawks
22 swooped overhead. And once a small groundhog
23 scared my younger brother so badly, he bolted
24 inside shouting "It hissed at me."

25 As children, my younger brother and I

1 spent countless hours playing in our backyard. We
2 swung on our swingset and watched the leaves
3 overhead, constructed a hammock between two
4 perfectly spaced trees, and searched for new and
5 exciting animals. In our backyard each day was a
6 new wilderness adventure.

7 All of this is to say that I share the
8 same worry as so many other speakers tonight that
9 the proposed 100 foot cell tower at 118 Newton
10 Road will do permanent and lasting damage to the
11 truly unique natural environment that I benefited
12 from so much as a child. My childhood certainly
13 wasn't perfect, and it wasn't always easy after my
14 father died when I was 9. Still, I remember those
15 years as truly joyful ones in large part because
16 of the stunning natural surroundings and abundant
17 wildlife I was able to enjoy every day. I hope
18 that future generations of neighborhood children
19 continue to have this same opportunity without a
20 looming cell tower next door. Thank you.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. We'll now
22 call upon Nicole Donzello.

23 NICOLE DONZELLO: Good evening. How
24 are you?

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Good evening.

1 NICOLE DONZELLO: Thank you for the
2 opportunity to speak. I speak in support of my
3 fellow residents. I do not reside in the area
4 where I will be adjacent to the cell tower;
5 however, I support my fellow residents as they
6 would support me if I were in their shoes.

7 In determining whether a tower should
8 be erected at the Newton Road location, I
9 respectfully request that this Council balance any
10 compelling public interest in erecting this tower
11 at this particular location with any detrimental
12 effects on adjacent residents' property values
13 when assessing the evidence that's been presented.
14 And I do consider comments from my fellow
15 residents evidence.

16 The Cellco argument is that there's a
17 compelling public interest to have uninterrupted
18 service in Woodbridge. I personally do not have
19 any issues at my residence in town. I'm
20 approximately one mile away. And I do have
21 Verizon as my carrier. However, I do acknowledge
22 that there are some areas that can be described as
23 spotty. Now, I use spotty, and I don't like to
24 use the word gap because gap would mean that there
25 is a significant issue within the town. And as

1 indicated by a fellow resident earlier, there is a
2 map in evidence currently that indicates that this
3 is very minimal.

4 That being said, I would ask the
5 question, and I ask this theoretically, not to
6 actually ask for a response, has the cell company
7 proven that a tower in this exact location is the
8 only solution to this problem? And if they have,
9 does this need outweigh the detrimental effect
10 this placement will have on adjacent residents'
11 property values? Now, the Cellco claims that it
12 has investigated other potential sites in the area
13 and that Soundview, and I use Soundview because
14 that is where the entrance is, is the only site
15 that can provide the necessary service. Although
16 I just heard, which is very concerning to me, from
17 a fellow resident that Cellco conceded today that
18 they did not in fact investigate all
19 possibilities, and I really find that troubling.

20 Verizon should not only investigate the
21 possibilities they have neglected to, but also
22 investigate the possibility of connecting their
23 services to other wireless structures already in
24 existence, not only within Woodbridge but the
25 surrounding towns such as Ansonia, Bethany,

1 Seymour, as shown on the maps that I was able to
2 view on your website. The detrimental effect a
3 tower will have on property values for those
4 residential properties around this location
5 substantially outweighs the need to have a tower
6 at this exact location to improve service.

7 As I indicated earlier, I was not able
8 to view the hearing earlier today, but I'm sure
9 you have heard or will hear from appraisers who
10 can provide concrete evidence to support this
11 argument. The presence of a tower will one
12 hundred percent cause substantial damage to the
13 character of the neighborhood aesthetically.

14 (TIME ELAPSED)

15 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. That
16 concludes your comment, allocation of time.

17 We will now call upon Margaret Maley.
18 Margaret Maley.

19 MARGARET MALEY: Yes. Can you hear me?

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, we can. Thank
21 you.

22 MARGARET MALEY: My name is Margaret
23 Maley. My husband, Andrew and I, have lived at 11
24 Soundview for 21 years. When we moved here our
25 children were very young. Now they're in their

1 twenties. We live one house away from the
2 proposed site. We moved here for many of the same
3 reasons all of our neighbors have said, so I won't
4 go into that.

5 We oppose the cell tower because we're
6 concerned about a decline in our property value
7 mainly. While we aren't planning to move soon,
8 we're at the age where we're thinking about
9 downsizing, and we don't want our future plans
10 impacted by lower property values. It isn't right
11 that we work for this home and put money into it
12 only to have its value decline. It isn't right
13 that our future plans would be affected.

14 I don't know if the Siting Council has
15 made a site visit, and the photos I see in the
16 application don't seem to show it, but our short
17 street takes a sharp blind turn halfway down. The
18 end of the cul-de-sac is clearly visible as soon
19 as you make the turn. The proposed cell tower
20 will be neatly framed in this opening. When you
21 buy or sell a house you think about curb appeal.
22 For us, the first impression buyers would have is
23 a cell tower looming at the end of the cul-de-sac.

24 Our neighborhood seems to be undergoing
25 a cyclical change; older owners are moving away

1 and young families are moving in. Pre-pandemic
2 I've never seen so many kids at our bus stop.
3 During a lockdown and pandemic folks are out
4 walking, exercising, walking their dogs, riding
5 bikes. We've never seen so many people come down
6 our street. It was great. And folks continue to
7 do so.

8 I have to say when I was a kid growing
9 up in Concord, Mass. riding my bike around, and
10 later in high school driving around, this proposed
11 cell tower would have been a magnet. It's easily
12 visible, it had a fence to climb, all kinds of
13 stuff to check out. Challenge accepted for
14 teenage me.

15 We've heard that Verizon has rejected
16 the numerous alternative sites proposed by the
17 Town of Woodbridge. My question is, if the
18 proposed site was not available, Verizon would
19 undoubtedly figure out an alternative. Clearly,
20 this site is the easy one for Verizon. Street
21 access through our quiet cul-de-sac, hardly any
22 site prep needed. Just because it's easy doesn't
23 mean it's the right place. Cell towers don't
24 belong in residential neighborhoods. Thank you.

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Next on

1 the list is Joseph Crisco. Mr. Crisco. Joseph
2 Crisco.

3 (No response.)

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Next on the list is
5 Kristy Laydon. Kristy Laydon.

6 KRISTY LAYDON: Hi. My name is Kristy
7 Laydon, and I reside at 16 Forest Glen Drive. I
8 have lived in this house with my family since
9 2012. This is the same property that my husband
10 was born and raised on. I oppose the cell phone
11 tower because my family purposely chose to live in
12 a rural wooded area, and now this has the power to
13 drastically change the landscape of the entire
14 community without any consideration of the
15 surrounding homes.

16 My property is completely encompassed
17 by aging 60 to 75 foot white pine trees that need
18 to be replaced and will cause extreme exposure to
19 the site. I believe the evaluation of the homes
20 immediately adjacent to the tower, including mine,
21 will be impacted during a time that our community
22 is suffering economically.

23 If you can see my background, this is
24 my property. This is the corner that would be
25 affected, and that's my view that I'd lose. Thank

1 you for your time.

2 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you for your
3 comments this evening.

4 Next is Rick Sadler. Mr. Sadler. Rick
5 Sadler?

6 (No response.)

7 JOSEPH CRISCO: Joe Crisco is here.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Hi, Mr. Crisco. Go
9 right ahead. Thank you.

10 JOSEPH CRISCO: Thank you for your
11 service. As a member of the board of selectmen
12 and former state senator 24 years, my wife and I,
13 Pat, are opposed to the location of the tower.
14 There are other sites available that could be
15 utilized. In all the years we've been customers
16 of Verizon we've never had a service problem.
17 Thank you again for your service.

18 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Crisco.
19 We'll call upon Rick Sadler again.
20 Rick Sadler.

21 (No response.)

22 MR. MORISSETTE: We'll move on to the
23 next person on the list, Hui-Jia Dong. Hui-Jia
24 Dong?

25 HUI-JIA DONG: Can you hear me now?

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes. Thank you.

2 HUI-JIA DONG: Good evening, respectful
3 members of Siting Council. My name is Hui-Jia
4 Dong. I'm a resident of Woodbridge. I'm here
5 today to express my deep concerns about the impact
6 of placing a 100 foot tall cellular phone tower,
7 base tower, in a residential area. Actually, it
8 is planned at the backyard of 118 Newton Road.

9 We moved from out of state to
10 Connecticut about a year ago. While we're looking
11 for a new home, we instantly fell in love with
12 this community. This is a neighborhood where kids
13 play block soccer or block hockey, family bike,
14 walk, and the whole summer parties without
15 concerns. And this is a town of many trees,
16 natural fields, wild animals and community
17 gardens. I believe that a tower would negatively
18 affect our community and leave a different
19 neighborhood for the children growing up in the
20 future.

21 While we understand that most cell
22 phone towers are needed to support our technology
23 life increasingly, I believe this particular tower
24 does not belong in a residential area. I strongly
25 hope that Verizon Wireless will seriously consider

1 alternative locations that Woodbridge township
2 provided and to come up with a more suitable
3 location in favor of town residents house,
4 welfare, and the enjoyment of the nature and
5 beauty around us. This is a really beautiful
6 town.

7 Respectful siting members, I appreciate
8 the opportunity to voice my opinion on this issue.
9 We are the residents who will be directly affected
10 by a cell phone tower in our neighborhood and must
11 continue to be included in conversations about
12 sighting of the cell phone tower placement, as
13 this could happen in anyone's neighborhood and in
14 anyone's backyard. This is the time to consider
15 incorporating policy that mandate minimum distance
16 from residential structures, of noise, and the
17 radiation from a tower, and assessment of the
18 environmental health prior to recommending this
19 kind of infrastructure. And thank you so much for
20 your attention and your time.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. I will now
22 call upon Mica Cardoza. Mica Cardoza.

23 (No response.)

24 MR. MORISSETTE: I will now call Diane
25 Pryor. Diane Pryor.

1 DIANE PRYOR: Hi. Can you hear me?

2 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, I can hear you.

3 Thank you.

4 DIANE PRYOR: Okay. My name is Diane
5 Pryor, and I reside at 115 Newton Road with my
6 husband and two children. Our property is
7 directly across the street from 118 Newton Road,
8 the proposed cell tower site.

9 When we looked at property in
10 Woodbridge, there were two factors for us. We
11 wanted the house to be on a peaceful piece of
12 property, which would offer us privacy, and be far
13 enough away from high tension wires or cell tower
14 lines since we did not want to risk the health and
15 well-being of us or our children. We were lucky
16 to find both. We are a very peaceful quiet
17 neighborhood. We've lived here for almost 18
18 years now. We've had an amazing life on this
19 property and in this home.

20 I find it heartbreaking and disturbing
21 that a cell tower would be proposed in this
22 peaceful residential neighborhood. I often see
23 young children right next door to 118 Newton Road
24 playing outside, and I cannot imagine being greedy
25 enough to worry more about a monthly check going

1 into my pocket than the health and well-being of
2 these children. You are hearing a common thread
3 here.

4 I am not opposed to a cell tower in
5 Woodbridge, and I don't think many of my neighbors
6 are either. I understand the importance of cell
7 service. I am simply asking you to seek out other
8 lots that are not in a residential neighborhood.
9 There are a number of them in town, so please do
10 your due diligence and investigate other
11 nonresidential properties to see if you can find a
12 more suitable spot for this cell tower, property
13 that is not in close proximity to families, young
14 families, older families, new and old, pouring
15 their hearts into their homes that they love. My
16 late father always said "If it ain't broke, don't
17 fix it." It's not necessary, and it's definitely
18 not wanted here. Thank you for your time.

19 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. That
20 concludes the list of participants this evening.
21 But there were several that were not available
22 first time through, so I will go back and see if
23 they've joined us. We will start with Donna
24 Soufrine. Donna Soufrine, are you able to join us
25 this evening?

1 (No response.)

2 MR. MORISSETTE: Is Michael Soufrine
3 with us, either Donna or Michael Soufrine?

4 (No response.)

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Is there a Gene
6 Shannon? Gene Shannon.

7 (No response.)

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Ann Werner. Ann
9 Werner? Ann Werner.

10 (No response.)

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Mary Lou Narowski.
12 Mary Lou Narowski.

13 (No response.)

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Ellen Scalettar.
15 Ellen Scalettar. Ellen Scalettar.

16 (No response.)

17 MR. MORISSETTE: Rick Sadler. Rick
18 Sadler?

19 (No response.)

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Mica Cardoza.

21 MR. GREENGARDEN: He's on -- (AUDIO
22 INTERRUPTION)

23 MR. MORISSETTE: I'm sorry, who is
24 that?

25 MR. GREENGARDEN: Mica is trying to --

1 (AUDIO INTERRUPTION)

2 MICA CARDOZA: Hi. This is Mica
3 Cardoza.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: There you go. We can
5 hear you. Please continue.

6 MICA CARDOZA: Sorry for that issue. I
7 did want to voice my strong opposition. And my
8 points are very consistent with those points
9 already provided by the many neighbors, residents
10 and friends who have spoken.

11 There are a few points that I would
12 like to just reiterate or reemphasize. I very
13 much agree that there's a disturbing lack of
14 information supporting the level of need for the
15 cell tower exclusively at the location that's been
16 proposed. Also, there seems to have been nothing
17 more than a cursory consideration of any of the
18 alternatives that have been provided by the town
19 and by others.

20 As a former selectman, I know for
21 certain that the town leaders have already and are
22 very much willing to work with Verizon and Cellco
23 to come up with alternates to this location. I
24 believe one of the biggest points that I'm hoping
25 that the Council is considering is that the issue

1 is with more with this specific location for all
2 the reasons that you've heard, and it's very, very
3 legitimate. And we're hoping that you will more
4 or less hold the company accountable to truly
5 demonstrate that there is no viable or feasible
6 alternative in terms of bringing the level of
7 service to the degree that it would provide the
8 improvements that they're looking for.

9 I can tell you, as one of the other
10 callers had indicated, that the service can be
11 spotty. However, it's not a significant problem.
12 And even something where it's not ideally where
13 Verizon and Cellco are looking to put it, I
14 believe will improve service enough so that it
15 would absolutely address any concerns that folks
16 have.

17 I'm hoping that the Council will indeed
18 weigh the detrimental impact the tower will have
19 on the neighborhood and the town as a whole
20 against the information that's being provided and
21 be certain that there is no alternative because
22 everyone is willing to work this through. And
23 we're hoping that the company will also, Cellco
24 and Verizon will also look to do that with us. So
25 thank you for your time.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. That
2 concludes our public comment session for this
3 evening. I want to thank everyone for coming out
4 and voicing your opinions and your comments this
5 evening. Thank you once again.

6 The Council announces that it will
7 continue with the evidentiary session of this
8 public hearing on Tuesday, August 31, 2021, at 2
9 p.m. via Zoom remote conferencing. A copy of the
10 agenda for the continued remote evidentiary
11 hearing session will be available on the Council's
12 Docket No. 502 webpage, along with the record of
13 this matter, the public hearing notice,
14 instructions for public access to the remote
15 evidentiary hearing session, and the Council's
16 Citizens Guide to Siting Council Procedures.

17 Please note that anyone who has not
18 become a party or intervenor but who desires to
19 make his or her views known to the Council may
20 file written statements with the Council until the
21 public comment record closes.

22 Copies of the transcript of this
23 hearing will be filed at the Woodbridge Town
24 Clerk's Office.

25 I hereby declare this hearing

1 adjourned, and thank you everyone for your
2 participation. Have a good evening.

3 (Whereupon, the above proceedings
4 adjourned at 8:43 p.m.)

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

1 CERTIFICATE FOR REMOTE HEARING

2
3 I hereby certify that the foregoing 102 pages
4 are a complete and accurate computer-aided
5 transcription of my original stenotype notes taken
6 of the REMOTE PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION IN RE:
7 DOCKET NO. 502, CELLCO PARTNERSHIP d/b/a VERIZON
8 WIRELESS APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF
9 ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR
10 THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATION OF A
11 TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY LOCATED AT 118 NEWTON
12 ROAD, WOODBRIDGE, CONNECTICUT, which was held
13 before JOHN MORISSETTE, PRESIDING OFFICER, on July
14 13, 2021.

15
16
17 

18 -----
19 Lisa L. Warner, CSR 061
20 Court Reporter
21 BCT REPORTING, LLC
22 55 WHITING STREET, SUITE 1A
23 PLAINVILLE, CONNECTICUT 06062
24
25