

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

IN RE: :
 :
 APPLICATION OF CELLCO PARTNERSHIP : DOCKET NO. 382
 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 :
 LANE STREET, SHELTON, CONNECTICUT : SEPTEMBER 15, 2009

RESPONSES OF CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS
TO CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL PRE-HEARING INTERROGATORIES

On August 31, 2009, the Connecticut Siting Council (“Council”) issued Pre-Hearing Interrogatories to the Applicant, Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless (“Cellco”), relating to the above-captioned docket. Below are Cellco’s responses.

Question No. 1

Did Cellco receive return receipts for all adjacent landowners listed in Application Attachment 5? If not, list the abutters that did not receive notice and describe any additional effort to serve notice.

Response

Cellco send out a total of 494 certified letters to abutters of the Harry B. Brownson Country Club property. Many of the abutters listed in the application are Aspetuck Village Condominium unit owners. Aspetuck Village is located to the north and east of the southerly portion of the Country Club parcel. (See Site Plan/Abutters Map, Sheet C-1, behind Tab 1 of the Application).

Sixty-five of the certified letters were returned mark either “Unclaimed” “Rejected” or “Return to Sender – Unable to Forward”. “Green Cards” for one of the abutters’ letters was not returned at all (owners listed as Michael and Connie Howley). The letters marked “unclaimed” and “rejected” were sent out to the listed abutters, a second time, by regular mail. For those letters marked “Return to Sender – Unable to Forward” Cellco reviewed Shelton Tax Assessor’s records to confirm that the ownership information included in the application was correct. In one case, for abutter Mary-Joan Donahue at 30 Philip Drive, the listed owner was the same but the owner’s mailing address had changed. In that instance, the notice letter was resent to Ms. Donahue at her new address. In all other cases, the ownership information in the Tax Assessor’s records matched that contained in the Cellco application. The remaining notice letters were resent to these owners at the same address by regular mail.

Question No. 2

What tower height was considered at the rejected Brownson Country Club clubhouse location?

Response

As described in the application, the location considered near the clubhouse was rejected due to its proximity to residential areas and the lack of natural screening on the northerly portion of the Country Club’s property. (See Aerial Photograph p. iii of the Application). That said, Cellco would need a tower height of 170 feet near the clubhouse to satisfy its coverage objectives in the Huntington area.

Question No. 3

What tower height was considered at the rejected Brownson Country Club site near the 11th green? Describe the “significant impacts to wetlands” in this location.

Response

The ground elevation behind the 11th green is about the same as the proposed tower location to the south. A tower height of 120 feet would be needed at this location to satisfy Cellco’s coverage objectives.

Dean Gustafson with VHB, Inc. completed a site investigation and found that wetland areas surround the 11th green to the north, east and west. The proposed Cellco telecommunications facility is located south of the 11th green. Two forested wetland corridors flow from the north towards the 11th Green along the north and east sides of the green. The wetland systems consist primarily of mature forested wetland habitats associated with seasonal intermittent watercourses. The two wetland corridors combine along the west side of the green and flow to the southwest between the 11th and 16th Fairways and into an irrigation pond. Therefore, due to the location of these adjoining wetland resources and their extent, development of a wireless telecommunications facility in this area would result in a significant impact to wetlands.

Question No. 4

What were the steeple heights considered at the St. Paul’s Church and Huntington Congregational Church? Was a replacement steeple considered at either location? If not, why not?