



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Ten Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051

Phone: (860) 827-2935 Fax: (860) 827-2950

E-Mail: siting.council@ct.gov

www.ct.gov/csc

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

May 12, 2014

Daniel M. Laub, Esq.
Christopher B. Fisher, Esq.
Cuddy & Feder LLP
445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th Floor
White Plains, NY 10601

RE: **DOCKET NO. 445** - Homeland Towers, LLC and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a telecommunications facility located at Ridgefield Town Assessor Map Parcel #D08-124, southwest of the intersection of Old Stagecoach Road and Aspen Ledges Road, Ridgefield, Connecticut.

Dear Attorneys Fisher and Laub:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions from Dr. Michael W. Klemens no later than May 27, 2014. To help expedite the Council's review, please file individual responses as soon as they are available.

Please forward an original and 15 copies to this office, as well as send a copy via electronic mail. In accordance with the State Solid Waste Management Plan and in accordance with Section 16-50j-12 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies the Council is requesting that all filings be submitted on recyclable paper, primarily regular weight white office paper. Please avoid using heavy stock paper, colored paper, and metal or plastic binders and separators. Fewer copies of bulk material may be provided as appropriate.

Copies of your responses shall be provided to all parties and intervenors listed on the service list, which can be found on the Council's pending proceedings website.

Yours very truly,

Melanie Bachman
Acting Executive Director

MB/cdm

c: Parties and Intervenors
Ray Vergati
Michele Briggs

Docket 445:
Homeland Towers, LLC and New Cingular Wireless (AT&T)
Ridgefield, Connecticut
Applicant Interrogatories, Set Two

20. On page 5 of the SAI Radio Frequency Report behind Tab 1 of the application, North Salem Road and Route 116 are listed separately with different traffic counts. However, are not North Salem Road and Route 116 synonymous? Please clarify at which locations these traffic counts were taken.
21. For the Visibility Analysis, why were no simulations done in the immediate neighborhood of the tower; for example from the access road, which is Town open space, or from Old Stagecoach Road or Aspen Ledges Road near where they meet?
22. Why were no simulations with “leaf-off” conditions provided with the Visibility Analysis as recommended in the Council on Environmental Quality’s comments dated April 17, 2014?
23. On the Visibility Analysis-Topo Base map, why is Route 116 marked as Route 33?
24. Please quantify the number of residences impacted, at least seasonally, around Mamasasco Lake. How can that impact be lessened? How does that number of impacted residences compare with other recent applications before the Siting Council?
25. Were any State funds, directly or indirectly used for the purchase of the conservation lands over which an easement will be granted to the proposed tower site?
26. Regarding bog turtles, please comment on whether an incidental take permit from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, under the Endangered Species Act, is required or not, bearing in mind that take is both the loss of individual turtles and/or loss of their habitat.
27. For the record, please identify the compiler of the Federal Recovery Plan for the Bog Turtle.
28. The Recovery Plan lists three zones of management concern for the Bog Turtle. Please identify the management zone in which the proposed tower site lies.
29. Reviewing the criteria for minimizing impact to bog turtles and their habitat within the appropriate management zone, please describe in detail how the proposed activities comply or do not comply with each criteria or recommendation of the appropriate zone within the Recovery Plan.
30. Is the Applicant familiar with the content of the Ridgefield Natural Resources Inventory (NRI)? For the record, please attribute authorship of that NRI.
31. Please examine the account on Page 43 of the NRI and opine on what is, in your best professional judgment, the likelihood that bog turtles are still extant in the Titicus River/Mopus Brook wetlands.

32. On page 7 of 7 in the wetlands functions and values report received on April 1, 2014, it is stated that a principal function of the wetland is that it contains State or Federally listed threatened and endangered species. Is that comment concerning the on-site sloping, forested seepage wetland observed on the Council's Site walk? If so, what species are we discussing? Is the function and values report for the on-site wetland, or the entire wetland/watershed system that extends westward for several miles into North Salem, NY?
33. Could the proposed site be characterized as mature moist second growth forest?
34. Is the duff layer thick?
35. On page 2 of his testimony, Dr. Danzer refers to the site having a southwestern exposure. Please reconcile the exposure of the site with the preferred habitat for slimy salamanders described earlier (Page 6 of 7).
36. Are there any known locations for slimy salamanders in Connecticut located on southwest facing slopes?