

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

IN RE: :
 :
APPLICATION OF CELLCO PARTNERSHIP : DOCKET NO. 361
D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS FOR A :
CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL :
COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR :
THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE :
AND OPERATION OF A WIRELESS :
TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY OFF :
NORFOLK ROAD, WINCHESTER, :
CONNECTICUT : AUGUST 7, 2008

**LATE-FILED EXHIBIT OF
CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS**

Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless (“Cellco”) hereby provides the Connecticut Siting Council (“Council”) with the late-filed exhibit requested at the July 7, 2008 hearing in connection with the above-referenced Application.

On April 10, 2008, Cellco filed an application (“Application”) with the Council for a Certificate of Environmental Capability and Public Need (“Certificate”) to construct a 150-foot tower and related wireless telecommunications facility off Norfolk Road (“Property”) in Winchester, Connecticut (“Winchester Facility”). The proposed Winchester Facility would provide for much needed coverage along the heavily-traveled Route 44 and Route 183, as well as local roads in the northerly portion of Winchester.

The Council conducted an evidentiary and public hearing on the Application on July 7, 2008. At the public hearing, two property owners located on Colebrook Road raised concerns regarding the visibility of the proposed tower. In response to those concerns, the Council asked Cellco to consider moving the proposed facility to the west in an effort to reduce the visibility of the Winchester Facility from these residences. Because alternative tower locations further to the

west had not been evaluated, Cellco was unable to provide the Council with a complete analysis of the feasibility of relocating the proposed facility. Accordingly, the Council requested that Cellco provide a late-filed exhibit evaluating potential alternative locations for the Winchester Facility on the Property.

Based on a review of topographic maps, Cellco initially identified three potential alternative locations to the west of the proposed Winchester Facility. *See* Memorandum from Dean Gustafson at Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. (“VHB”) dated August 6, 2008 (“Gustafson Memo”) (attached at Tab 1). After investigating and evaluating these locations in the field, however, one location (identified as Alternative 3 on the map attached to the Gustafson Memo) was determined to be unsuitable due to steep grades and the presence of a seasonal, intermittent watercourse. The Alternative 3 site was rejected for these reasons. *See* Gustafson Memo. The two remaining alternative locations considered – one 300 feet to the west (“Alternative 1”) and one 500 feet to the west (“Alternative 2”) of the proposed Winchester Facility – were found to be suitable from a civil engineering perspective and would not impact wetlands or watercourses on the Property.

Next, the Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 sites were evaluated to determine if they would meet Cellco’s coverage objectives in the Winchester area. Following this evaluation, the Alternative 2 site was eliminated as a potential location because a tower, greater than 200 feet in height, would be required for Cellco to satisfy its coverage objective in the area. Once the Alternative 2 location was eliminated, Cellco’s radio frequency engineers evaluated coverage from the Alternative 1 location at various heights. Cellco determined that it could achieve the best coverage from a facility at the Alternative 1 location at a height of 180 feet. However, even with a facility at 180 feet at the Alternative 1 location, Cellco would still experience gaps in PCS

coverage on both Route 44 and Route 183, totaling approximately one quarter mile. *See* Propagation Maps attached at Tab 2. Cellco then evaluated the possibility of increasing the height of the tower at the Alternative 1 location to 200 feet in an attempt to fill these remaining PCS coverage gaps. Due to the severe topography in the area, even at 200 feet, these gaps in coverage would remain.¹ Cellco would not be able to achieve comparable coverage or fulfill its coverage objectives, therefore, in the Winchester area with a facility at the Alternative 1 location.

Nevertheless, Cellco evaluated the expected visibility of a 180-foot tower at the Alternative 1 location. *See* Memorandum from Michael Koperwhats at VHB dated July 30, 2008 (“Koperwhats Memo”) (attached at Tab 3). This analysis determined that a 180-foot tower at the Alternative 1 location would be visible from 37 acres in the study area – an increase in four (4) acres from the facility location proposed in the Docket No. 361 application. Koperwhats Memo at 2. Moreover, a 180-foot tall tower at the Alternative 1 location would still be visible from those residential properties along Colebrook Road and would, in fact, appear significantly taller above the surrounding tree canopy than the proposed Winchester tower location from these same residences. *Id.* Thus, relocating the Winchester Facility to the Alternative 1 location would not address the concerns raised by the two property owners on Colebrook Road and would actually increase the overall visibility of the Winchester Facility.

¹ Cellco determined that it would need a tower height of 225 feet at the Alternative 1 location to fill the remaining PCS coverage gaps along Routes 44 and 183.