

Response

This question was withdrawn by the Council.

Question No. 3

Did Cellco receive return receipts for all adjacent landowners listed in Application Attachment 4? If not, describe any additional effort to serve notice.

Response

Cellco received return receipts from all but one (1) of the abutting property owners. The original notice to Sharon S. Anderson was returned marked “unclaimed or otherwise undeliverable”. A second notice letter was sent to Ms. Anderson on March 23, 2011 by regular mail.

Question No. 4

Would blasting be required for the construction of the proposed site? Provide estimates of cut and fill.

Response

Cellco does not anticipate the need for blasting to develop the cell site. A more thorough geotechnical survey of the project site would be completed if the relocated Woodstock Facility is approved by the Council. The geotechnical survey would be provided to the Council as a part of Cellco’s Development and Management (“D&M”) Plan. Cellco estimates the need for 510 cubic yards of cut and 93 cubic yards of fill to construct the proposed Woodstock Facility.

Question No. 5

What is Cellco’s minimum signal level threshold for in-building and in-vehicle use?