STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

IN RE:
APPLICATION OF NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC (AT&T) FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS TOWER FACILITY AT 8 BARNES ROAD IN THE TOWN OF CANAAN (FALLS VILLAGE)

DOCKET NO. 409

February 11, 2011

AT&T'S RESPONSES TO FALLS VILLAGE INLAND WETLANDS AND CONSERVATION COMMISSIONS' INTERROGATORIES

Q1. Please provide the material used, evidence utilized and the criteria applied to support the assertion at tab 4 page 1 of "no effect on any watercourses or waterbodies."

A1. Please see AT&T's Application, Section VI, Attachment 4, Wetlands Report.

Q2. Please (a) provide an explanation of the basis for the statement made by Dean Gustafson of VHB, tab 4, page 6: (regarding the presence of Hollis and Chatfield outcrop complex) that "Hollis and Chatfield soils consist respectively of somewhat excessively drained shallow (10 to 20 inches to bedrock) glacial till soils derived from gneiss, granite and schist. Therefore, the proposed development will not directly or indirectly affect wetlands or watercourses." (b) and please relate the explanation to the steepness of the slope.

A2. *During a July 1, 2010 wetland determination field investigation, Dean Gustafson, a Professional Soil Scientist with Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. (VHB), identified soils within and proximate to the proposed AT&T development project as Hollis-Chatfield-Rock outcrop complex (soil symbol – 75). The description of Hollis and Chatfield soils provided in VHB's August 25, 2010 Wetland Inspection report (See 10/18/10 Application, Section VI, Attachment 4, page 6) was taken from the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) National Cooperative Soil Survey official descriptions of these soils. The identified soils are not considered wetland soils in accordance with Connecticut's Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Act. The nearest wetland/watercourse resource to the proposed AT&T development project is located across Barnes Road approximately 200 feet north of the proposed AT&T access drive entrance from Barnes Road. The proposed AT&T access drive follows an existing gravel access drive at this location. A residence and maintained lawn and landscaped front and rear yards are located on the north side of Barnes Road separating the road from the nearest wetland area to the north (in the rear yard of the residential property). A comprehensive soil erosion and sediment control plan (E&S Plan) will be developed as part of a Development and Management (D&M) Plan provided the project is approved by the Council. Therefore, with proper erosion control measures installed and maintained during construction of the proposed AT&T Facility*

*and access drive in accordance with the 2002 Connecticut Guidelines for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control (DEP Bulletin 34), no direct or indirect impacts to wetlands or watercourses will occur.*

*According to the NRCS Web Soil Survey (See AT&T's Application, Section VI, Attachment 4, page 8), the majority of the access drive is mapped as soil symbol 75E, with the "E" designating the slope of this soil unit. Steep slopes are typically associated with this soil unit, with slopes classified by "E" consisting of 15 to 45 percent slopes. From a wetland impact evaluation standpoint, steep slopes can represent a concern due to possible erosion and deposition of sediment and contaminated stormwater runoff to downgradient areas, which may include wetland resources. Although there is a significant buffer between the proposed project and the nearest wetland (e.g., ±200 feet to the north separated by Barnes Road and a residential property), a comprehensive E&S Plan and stormwater management plan will be required particularly for the proposed access drive to ensure that no impact to nearby wetland resources occurs. As previously noted, such a plan will be developed after approval during the Connecticut Siting Council's D&M Plan process. It should be noted that no significant erosion or stormwater runoff from the existing gravel access road was observed along the frontage of Barnes Road during the July 1, 2010 wetland inspection that could potentially impact the nearby wetland area.*

Q3. In light of the assertion by Dean Gustafson of VHB, tab 4, page 6 that "The nearest wetland/watercourse is located on an adjoining property across Barnes Road to the north approximately 200 feet from the proposed access drive entrance onto Barnes Road," (a) please address the potential for run-off and the applicant's proposed measures to avoid run-off at the upper reaches of the proposed access road directly above and in close proximity (as shown on the "Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Map" Tab 4, page 8) to the Hollenbeck River running parallel to the access road; (b) Please indicate where this proximity and watershed of the facility to the Hollenbeck River is addressed in the application; (c) Please explain the significance of the proximity of a wetland to the access drive in the assertion by Dean Gustafson of VHB, tab 4, page 6 that "The nearest wetland/watercourse is located on an adjoining property across Barnes Road to the north approximately 200 feet..."in light of, and in contrast to watershed impact on the Hollenbeck river, running parallel and below the tower site and proposed access road.

A3. *The Hollenbeck River is located approximately 1,000' to the west from the proposed tower location. Drainage and erosion control will be addressed through a comprehensive E&S Plan and Stormwater Management Plan that will be included in a Development and Management ("D&M" plan) after any approval of the facility which may be issued by the Siting Council.*

*As discussed above, the proposed access drive and Facility will not significantly alter existing drainage patterns including those located within the watershed of the Hollenbeck River. A comprehensive E&S Plan and Stormwater Management Plan will be incorporated into the construction and operation and maintenance of the proposed Facility and access drive to ensure that no adverse impacts to the watershed of the Hollenbeck River will occur. Considering the significant buffer to the nearest wetland area (e.g., ±200 feet to the north separated by Barnes*

*Road and a residential property) and significant buffer to the Hollenbeck River (±700 feet to the west separated by State Route 63) it is not anticipated that these wetland and watercourse resources will be impacted by the proposed project provided that a comprehensive E&S Plan and stormwater management plan are implemented.*

Q4. Page 6 of the application narrative states: "Utilities to serve the proposed facility would extend underground from pole number 2942 on Barnes Road and generally follow the existing access drive to be improved up to the tower compound location." Please provide specifications for the placement, accommodation and routing of said utilities and all hydrologic analyses of the effects from ground disturbance for their installation.

A4. Detailed plans will be included in a Development and Management ("D&M" plan) after any approval of the facility which may be issued by the Siting Council. Access road drainage calculations are provided in Attachment 5 of AT&T's Application.

Q5. Please explain (a) how the "existing access drive" (Application page 13) is existing in light of map CO2A. And (b) please describe the construction steps required for installing the access road, including removal of material (amount of material); as well as the amount of fill to be brought in; and the removal of natural features; excavation required; and all mechanical equipment required and how this equipment will be accommodated.

A5. The location of the proposed access drive will comply with the limits of the easement area providing access to the site. Please see Response No. 2 of AT&T Responses to Siting Council Interrogatories dated January 26, 2011 for cut and fill amounts.

As noted in the Emergency Access Statement provided in Attachment 5 of AT&T's Application, the proposed access road is designed to safely accommodate construction vehicles and equipment as well as emergency vehicles. AT&T proposes to improve an existing access drive for an unmanned public utility facility that, unlike a residence or commercial structure, does not require frequent access. As demonstrated in the materials attached in Exhibit A, large vehicles and emergency vehicles can be safely accommodated on roads with grades in excess of 20%.

Q6. Please state if the property deed says that this logging trail is a public highway. If so, please describe the steps that will be taken to comply with the Town's zoning regulations relating to "public highways."

A6. As noted in AT&T's Application, the existing access drive is provided via a perpetual easement right of way *for all purposes for which a public highway* may be used for the benefit of the subject site. As detailed in AT&T's Application, the proposed access drive will be used to access an unmanned facility for monthly maintenance. Pursuant to Section 16-50x of the Connecticut General Statutes, no local land use, zoning, wetlands or other permits are required for a cellular tower facility including a driveway serving it. Rather, the State Siting Council exclusively regulates such facilities through a Certificate application process.

Q7. Will any blasting be necessary fro (a) site development? (b) access road development? (c) drainage development? If so, please provide details of where blasting will take place and any analysis of potential harm to surrounding areas and steps to be taken to mitigate such harm.

A7. Please see response no. 7 of AT&T's Responses to Siting Council Interrogatories, dated January 26, 2011.

Q8. Please identify all existing seeps, springs, fissures and caves at or near the proposed construction sites, including the access road and the drainage system, that will be affected by the described construction and clearing.

A8. None of the listed features were identified during the survey of the subject site.

Q9. Please describe all measures proposed to prevent damage or closure of all exiting seeps, springs, fissures and caves that would be affected by any blasting on the site.

A9. Please see Response No.8 above.

Q10. Please describe (a) the precise location and construction details of the two proposed dams and the assurance that they will contain the anticipated maximum flow, and (b) the process by which accumulated soil/sedimentation will be removed.

A10. Detailed plans will be included in a Development and Management ("D&M" plan) after any approval of the facility which may be issued by the Siting Council. Please see Attachment 5 of AT&T's Application for access road drainage calculations and confirmation that the design of all drainage improvements was done in accordance with the ConnDOT Drainage Manual and meets the requirements specified therein.

Q11. To the extent the once-a-month site visits occur during winter and snowy weather, what road treatment will be used on the access road?

A11. It is anticipated that no road treatments will be used. AT&T's proposed facility is unmanned. The access road will be cleared on an "as-needed" basis for maintenance.

Q12. What snow and ice removal equipment would be used on the access road?

A12. Please see Response No. 11 above.

Q13. Please provide the name, contact information and qualifications of the person certifying the statement at page 14 of the Application that "Design of all proposed drainage improvements, including the access drive drainage, complies with the Conn DOT Drainage Manual and meets all requirements specified therein."

A13. Please see AT&T's Witness List and Resumes of Witnesses.

Q14. Please provide the name, contact information and qualifications of the person certifying the statement at page 14 of the Application that "The proposed Facility will have no impact on water flow, water quality, or air quality."

A14. Please see AT&T's Witness List and Resumes of Witnesses.

Q15. Please provide the name, contact information and qualifications of the person who prepared the "wetlands delineation report" and the person certifying the statement at page 14 of the Application that "A wetlands delineation report indicates that there are no wetlands on the site." Please provide the report.

A15. Please see AT&T's Witness List and Resumes of Witnesses. Please see Attachment 4 of AT&T's Application.

Q16. In light of the narrative state at page 8, "With respect to wireless communications services, the Telecommunications Act of 1996 expressly preserved State and/or local land use authority over wireless facilities, placed several requirements and legal limitations on the exercise of such authority and preempted State or local regulatory oversight in the area of emissions as more fully set forth in 47 USC 332(c)(7)." Please describe the steps the applicant will take to comply with Conn. Gen. Stat. §22a-32. (Formerly Sec. 22-71) "Regulated activity permit. Application. Hearing. Waiver of Hearing." which provides in pertinent part, "No regulated activity shall be conducted upon any wetland without a permit."

A16. Pursuant to Section 16-50x of the Connecticut General Statutes, no local land use, zoning, wetlands or other permits are required for a cellular tower facility. The State Siting Council exclusively regulates such facilities through a Certificate application process.

Q17. Did the Applicant or any consultant on its behalf meet or communicate with any representative of the following agencies and entities concerning the issue of "critical habit":

(a) United States Fish and Wildlife Service

(b) Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection

(c) The Nature Conservancy

(d) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

If yes, please provide all inquires, responses and materials obtained from each agency, especially as to each agency's definition of "critical habitat," as referred to on NEPA Screen Map, Tab 7, page 5.

A17. Please see AT&T's Application, Section VI and Attachments 7, 8 & 9 for all correspondence and consultation conducted in accordance the FCC's regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Q18. Please explain the relevance of the US DOI 1/4/10 letter from Thomas R. Chapman to this application in light of Mr. Chapman's statement that:

> Based on past experiences, we anticipate the there will be few, if any, projects that are likely to impact piping plovers, roseate terns, bog turtles, Jesup's milk-vetch or other such species that are found on coastal beaches, riverine habitats or in wetlands because communication towers typically are not located in these habitats.

A18. *The referenced policy statement from the US Fish and Wildlife Service regarding consultation requirements with respect to federally-listed species is relevant to the proposed AT&T project in that the development activities will not occur in coastal beaches, riverine habitats or wetlands. Therefore, additional consultation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service with respect to the noted species is not required, provided the proposed Facility will not impact the habitats of these species. Please see the Oct 4, 2010 memo from VHB in Attachment 7 of AT&T's Application which indicated that no federally listed endangered or threatened species are identified in the Town of Canaan.*

Q19. The USFWS has a self-help determination web page for "Project Review for Projects with Federal Involvement" at http://www.fws.gov/newengland/EndangeredSpec-Consulation_Project_Review.htm a copy of which is attached hereto, and is referenced in both standard "To Whom it May Concern" letters attached to the Application at tab 7, pages 8, 9 and 10. There are six steps (A-F) required under "Step 1," and four steps (A-D) under "Step 2," and "Step 3" requires resolution between a required "habitat survey" and "a description of the proposed project." All evidence of actions taken beyond Step 1 A appears to be missing from the Application. Please provide a description of the steps taken in fulfillment of the attached USFWS guidelines, including, but not limited to, the comparison of "habitat present within the proposed project action area with habitat that is suitable for the species." (USFWS Endangered Species Consultation Guide)

A19. *Step 1 A of the US Fish & Wildlife Service New England Field Office Endangered Species Consultation (http://www.fws.gov/newengland/EndangeredSpec-consultation_Project_Review.htm) states "Choose your state list below and review for Towns in which federally-listed species occur:" As noted in the materials provided by VHB's USFWS Compliance Determination, dated October 4, 2010 (See AT&T's Application, Section VI, Attachment 7, page 6), no federally listed species are identified in the town of Canaan.*

*Step 1 B states "You should contact your state Natural Heritage Program or Endangered Species Program (see list below) for additional information on federally and state-listed species:" The Connecticut Endangered Species Program (CTDEP Natural Diversity Data Base [NDDB] Program) was contacted and it was determined that "...there are no known extant populations of Federal or State Endangered, Threatened or Special Concern Speices that occur at the site in question." (See AT&T's Application, Section VI, Attachment 8).*

*Steps 1 C and D do not apply to this project. Step 1 E states "If a proposed project occurs in a Town with no known listed, proposed or candidate species present, no further coordination with the Service is needed. You may download a 'no species present' letter (158*

*KB) stating 'no species are known to occur in the project area'." Therefore, the conclusion provided in VHB's USFWS Compliance Determination, "No federally-listed endangered or threatened species are known to occur in Falls Village, Connecticut (refer to the enclosed listing;) and as such the proposed development will not result in an adverse affect to any federally-listed endangered or threatened species." was properly determined in accordance with the USF&WS policy. (See AT&T's Application, Section VI, Attachment 7, page 6)*

Q20. The species referred to are state species provided at a link under Step 1. B at the above mentioned web page (attached for reference). Please indicate where in the Application these State species are mentioned and addressed.

A20. *The NDDB Program was contacted to determine the impact of proposed development project on state listed species and it was determined that "...there are no known extant populations of Federal or State Endangered, Threatened or Special Concern Species that occur at the site in question." A comprehensive package of information was submitted to CTDEP to assist in their review, including a preliminary habitat assessment, photographs, site location map, site plans, etc. in order to ensure that a proper assessment of the proposed project was provided by the NDDB Program. (See AT&T's Application, Section VI, Attachment 8)*

Q21. Please describe the steps taken by the applicant to ascertain the presence of State and Federal Endangered Species within the effective proposed coverage area, beyond the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's standardized do-it yourself "guidelines to assist the public in determining whether a Section 7 consultation is needed an dhow to avoid or minimize effects for specific projects" (http://www.fws.gov/newengland/EndangeredSpec-Consultation.htm (last visited 1/28/11) attached).

A21. *Please see Response No.s 19 and 20 above.*

Please provide specific definition (including square footage and coordinates) of the following terms appearing in the application and support documents:

Q22. At tab 4, page 2, II, Scenic, Natural, Historic & Historic & Recreational Values: "Site" per: "After review of a preliminary habitat evaluation, the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection determined that there are no known extant populations of Federal or State endangered, threatened or special concern species occurring at the site."

A22. Please see Attachment 8 of AT&T's Application for information provided to the DEP from VHB regarding the delineation of the site area.

Q23. At tab 7, page 10, "the project area(s)" per: "Based on the information currently available, no federally-listed or proposed, threatened or endangered species or critical habitat under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) are known to occur in the project area(s)."

A23. *Please see Response No. 18 and 19 above.*

Q24. Narrative, page 9: "surrounding areas": per "Currently, gaps in reliable coverage exist in the eastern portion of Falls Village along Routes 7, 126 and 63 and surrounding areas. Please provide geographical details including precise location and extent or size of what is meant by the phrase "surrounding areas."

A24. Please see the Existing Site Coverage propagation plot in Attachment 1 of AT&T's Application and Response No. 14 of AT&T's Responses to Siting Council's interrogatories, dated January 26, 2011.

Q25. Please describe and provide a map showing the outer limits of the projected maximum reliable coverage of operating frequency 880 MHz from the proposed site.

A25. Please see the Existing & Proposed Site Coverage propagation map (with scale) in Attachment 1 of AT&T's Application for proposed coverage at 850 MHz, AT&T's licensed frequency.

Q26. Please describe and provide a map showing the outer limits of the projected maximum reliable coverage of operating frequency 1900 MHz from the proposed site.

A.26. Please see the propagation map (with scale) included in Exhibit B for proposed coverage at 1900 MHz.

Q27. Tab 4, page 5: C Squared Systems Power Density Calculations. Please provide Cingular Wireless's plans for after-built monitoring for compliance with these projected power densities throughout the life of the facility.

A27. Through the Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("TCA"), Congress expressly preempted State and local governments from regulating wireless facilities on the basis of radio frequency emissions. 47 U.S.C. §332(c)(7)(b)(iv). See Cellular Phone Taskforce v. FCC, 205 F.3d 82 (2d Cir. 2000). As such, post install monitoring is not required and cannot be legally required.

Q28. Definition of Terms: Please provide specific definition of the following term appearing in the application and support documents; At tab 4, page 2, II, Scenic, Natural, Historic & Recreational Values: "Effect: per "The Connecticut State Historic Preservation officer ("SHPO") has determined that the proposed project will have no effect on historic, architectural or archeological resources."

A28. The Merriam-Webster on-line dictionary defines "effect" as follows: power to bring about a result; influence. Please see Attachment 9 of AT&T's Application for the SHPO's no effect determination for AT&T's proposed facility.

Q29. Please describe (a) any site visit made by the SHPO or officer thereof; (b) provide the SHPO detailed explanation of the term "no effect."

A29. The SHPO did require or request any site visits. See Attachment 9 of AT&T's Application for correspondence with the SHPO.

Q30. Please describe all steps in the process by which a rubber stamp from the State historic Preservation Office was caused to be placed upon the letter of opinion dated 8/7/10 of the applicant's consultant "VHB" appearing at tab 6, page 2.

A30. *A copy of the entire September 9, 2010 submission to the SHPO is included in Exhibit E.*

Q31. Please provide the materials used, evidence utilized and the criteria applied to support the assertion at tab 4 page 2 that "The proposed facility will not be visible from the South Canaan Meeting House."

A31. *Vanasse Hangen Brustlin (VHB), Inc. conducted an evaluation of the potential viewshed associated with the proposed Facility in August of 2010. Included in Attachment 6 of AT&T's Application, the Visual Resource Evaluation Report is comprised of photographic documentation and photographic simulations from nearly 30 representative locations; a viewshed map, based largely on the results of a computer-generated visibility model; and a report narrative that discusses various aspects of the proposed site and its surroundings, a detailed explanation of the methodologies utilized in the preparation of the analysis and a summary of the key findings of the analysis. As part of the evaluation, VHB conducted a balloon float in June of 2010 that included, but was not limited to, an in-field assessment of potential visibility from the South Canaan Meeting House. During the June 2010 float, the balloon was not visible from the South Canaan Meeting House building or eastern portions of the South Canaan Meeting House parcel that front Route 63 (as photo-documented in View 24 of the Visual Resource Evaluation Report in Attachment 6 of AT&T's Application). Potential views from northern portions of the property (along Barnes Road) were obstructed by existing vegetation.*

*In order to further assess potential visibility during "leaf-off" conditions, AT&T requested that VHB conduct an additional evaluation once the leaves had fallen of the deciduous vegetation. As such, VHB conducted a publicly-noticed balloon float on November 12, 2010. Overall, potential year-round and seasonal (i.e. "leaf-off") visibility associated with the proposed Facility was consistent with observations made during VHB's August 2010 evaluation. The November 2010 balloon float provided VHB with the opportunity to further evaluate potential visibility from select areas and generate "leaf-off" photographic simulations from several locations where foliage effectively obstructs views during the spring/summer months. During this time, VHB staff also evaluated visibility from additional portions of the South Canaan Meeting House property and identified a small area of limited year-round visibility located in the rear (western) portion of the parcel, approximately 0.50-mile away from the proposed facility. Photographs and photographic simulations from this area are depicted in View 3 and View 5 of the supplemental submission by AT&T dated June 11, 2011, included as part of this docket.*

Q32. Please provide the material used, evidence collected and utilized and the criteria applied to support the assertion at tab 6 page 2 that "The balloon was not visible from this property [South Canaan Congregational Church"]."

A32. *Please see Response No. 31 above.*

Q33. Please (a) describe the basis, including any written and photographic material for the statement at tab 4 page 2 that "The parcel on which the facility is located exhibits no unique scenic, natural, historic or recreational characteristics." (b) Please relate the foregoing to the requirements for maintaining a "scenic road" designation in the state of Connecticut.

A33. *The privately-owned parcel on which the proposed facility is located is currently developed with an existing woods road (driveway) and seasonal cabin. The subject parcel is not listed on the National Register of Historic Places; contains no federally-listed or proposed, threatened or endangered species or critical habitats; is not identified as a state scenic preserve; and is not open to the public for any recreational purposes.*

*The segment of Route 7 that traverses Falls Village is designated as scenic by The Connecticut Department of Transportation (ConnDOT). ConnDOT lists the following requirements in order to achieve scenic designation:*

> *"A potential state scenic highway must abut significant natural or cultural features such as agricultural land or historic buildings and structures which are listed on the National or State Register of Historic Places, or afford vistas of marshes, shoreline, forests with mature trees, or other notable natural or geologic feature which singularly or in combination set the highway apart from other state highways as being distinct. The Highway shall have a minimum length of one (1) mile and shall abut development which is compatible with its surroundings. Such development must not detract from the scenic or natural character or visual qualities of the highway area."*

*As related to ConnDOT's listing criteria, the subject parcel does not abut the Route 7 right-of-way. While VHB has demonstrated that portions of the proposed monopole may be visible from select locations along Route 7, we do not believe that it would detract from the visual quality of the highway.*

Q34. At Tab 6, page 6, please describe the computation by which 513 acres was determined.

A34. Please see AT&T's Application Attachment 6 for a description of the visibility methodology and analysis.

Q35. Please (a) define the term "view shed" as used throughout the application, (b) Please provide the formula by which "view shed" was determined; (c) Please provide the basis for the determination of 19 houses.

A35. Simply put, the term "view shed" refers to those locations within a given area from where views of at least a portion of the proposed facility may be achieved. The number of residential properties with potential views is determined 1) based on field observations made from publicly-accessible locations (since VHB is unable to access private properties) during a balloon float(s); and 2) by a review of both the predictive visibility model and available aerial photography. Part (b) is addressed in the Visual Resource Evaluation Report contained in Attachment 6 of AT&T's Application.

Q36. Please detail the "studies completed by AT&T" (described as meeting "the consistency of the proposed Facility with these guidelines [Section 9.2 of the Zoning Regulations of the Town of Canaan]" illustrated in the table on page 20 of the application under the heading "9.2.4.a Resource Protection Guidelines" as those studies relate to:

(a) preserving environmentally sensitive areas;

(b) preserving unique wildlife habitats;

(c) preserving wetlands;

(d) preserving historic and archeological resources.

A36. Please see AT&T's Application, Section VI; Attachments 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 & 9.

Q37. Please provide (in feet) the distances from the closest points of (a) the compound area; and (b) the access drive, to the Hollenbeck River.

A37. The compound area is approximately 970' east of the Hollenbeck River and the closest point of the access drive is approximately 490' east of the Hollenbeck River.

Q38. Please provide (in feet) the distances from the closest points of (a) the compound area; and (b) the access drive, to the Wangum Lake Brook.

A.38. The compound area is approximately 2,020' south of Wangum Lake Brook and the closest point of the access drive is approximately 1,450' south of Wangum Lake Brook.

Q39. Please provide (in feet) the distances from the closest points of (a) the compound area; and (b) the access drive, to Robbins Swamp.

A39. The compound area is approximately 1,800' east of Robbins Swamp and the closest point of the access drive is approximately 200' south of Robbins Swamp.

Q40. Please proved (in feet) the distances from the closest points of (a) the compound area; and (b) the access drive, to the closes wetland other than the foregoing (interrogatories 32, 33 and 34) and provide a description of same.

A40. The closest wetland was delineated approximately 200 feet from the proposed access drive entrance on Barnes Road. Please see Attachment 4 of AT&T's Application.

Q41. Please provide (in feet) the distances from the closest points of (a) the compound area; and (b) the access drive, to any amphibian habitat, and provide a description and location of the habitat(s).

A41. *Connecticut is home to 22 native species of amphibians: 12 species of salamanders, 7 frogs and 3 toads. Depending upon the specific species, a wide variety of habitats support these*

*species from terrestrial forest to swamps, bogs and vernal pools. Common forest species such as red-spotted newt (during terrestrial eft stage) and northern redback salamander would be expected to occur in suitable upland forest habitat that characterizes portions of the forest habitat that encompasses the proposed access drive. The proposed compound area consists of exposed bedrock and shallow soils providing a fairly dry environment that is not well suited to these two common terrestrial salamander species, which typically prefer moister habitat than the compound area provides. Therefore, the species are not anticipated to be particularly abundant in the proposed compound area.*

Q42. Please provide (in feet) the distances from the closest points of (a) the compound area; and (b) the access drive, to any bog turtle habitat, and provide a description and location of the habitat(s).

A42. *Bog turtles prefer calcareous (containing calcium carbonate, calcium or lime) wetlands such as open sphagnum bogs, wet meadows and wet pastures (http://www.ct.gov/dep/cwp/view.asp?a=2723&q=325976&depNav_GID=1655). The subject property does not contain this habitat type. Although not confirmed, the nearest possible habitat for bog turtle is the wetland system located ±200 feet north of the proposed access drive entrance off Barnes Road. However, the NDDB Program was contacted to determine the impact of the proposed development project on state listed species and it was determined that "...there are no known extant populations of Federal or State Endangered, Threatened or Special Concern Speices that occur at the site in question." (See AT&T's Application, Section VI, Attachment 8). Bog turtle is a State Endangered species.*

Q43. Please provide (in feet) the distances from the closes points of (a) the compound area; and (b) the access drive, to any Easter box turtle habitat, and provide a description and location of the habitat(s).

A43. *In Connecticut, eastern box turtles are restricted to low-lying areas of the state, specifically coastal areas, the Central Connecticut Lowland, and the hilly regions of southwestern Connecticut.* [1] *Box turtles are widely distributed from sea level up to 500 feet, becoming increasingly scarce and localized to an elevation maximum of just above 700 feet.* [2] *The eastern box turtle favors old field habitat and deciduous forest ecotones, including powerline cuts and logged-over woodland.* [3] *Although strictly terrestrial, this species is seldom found far from water, usually a small stream or pond.* [4] *The lowest elevation of AT&T's proposed development area is 660 feet along Barnes Road and therefore according to the referenced scientific literature eastern box turtle are not anticipated to occur on the site. In addition, the NDDB Program was contacted to determine the impact of proposed development project on state listed species and it was determined that "...there are no known extant populations of Federal or State Endangered, Threatened or Special Concern Speices that occur*

---

[1] Klemens, M. W. (1993). Amphibians and Reptiles of Connecticut and Adjacent Regions. State Geological and Natural History Survey of Connecticut, Bulletin 112.
[2] Klemens, M. W. (1993). Amphibians and Reptiles of Connecticut and Adjacent Regions. State Geological and Natural History Survey of Connecticut, Bulletin 112.
[3] Klemens, M. W. (1993). Amphibians and Reptiles of Connecticut and Adjacent Regions. State Geological and Natural History Survey of Connecticut, Bulletin 112.
[4] Klemens, M. W. (1993). Amphibians and Reptiles of Connecticut and Adjacent Regions. State Geological and Natural History Survey of Connecticut, Bulletin 112.

*at the site in question." (See AT&T's Application, Section VI, Attachment 8) The eastern box turtle is a State Special Concern species.*

Q44. Please provide (in feet) the distances from the closes points of (a) the compound area; and (b) the access drive, to any timber rattlesnake habitat, and provide a description and location of the habitat(s).

A44. *Timber rattlesnake habitat consists of deciduous forests (often second growth) in rugged terrain with steep ledges, rock slides and a nearby water supply (http://www.ct.gov/dep/cwp/view.asp?a=2723&q=326068&depNav_GID=1655). Although potential habitat for timber rattlesnake may occur on the subject property, the NDDB Program was contacted to determine the impact of proposed development project on state listed species, including timber rattlesnake (State Endangered Species) and it was determined that "...there are no known extant populations of Federal or State Endangered, Threatened or Special Concern Speices that occur at the site in question." (See AT&T's Application, Section VI, Attachment 8) Timber rattlesnake is a State Endangered species.*

Q45. Please provide (in feet) the distances from the closest points of (a) the compound area; and (b) the access drive, to any northern metalmark butterfly habitat, and provide a description and location of the habitat(s).

A45. *Northern metalmark butterfly habitat consists of rocky shale or limestone areas5. As confirmed by mapping and field observations, bedrock at the Site is classified as Gneiss of Highlands massifs consisting of gray, medium-grained, well layered gneiss[6] so the appropriate northern metalmark butterfly habitat is not provided by the Site. In addition, the NDDB Program was contacted to determine the impact of proposed development project on state listed species and it was determined that "...there are no known extant populations of Federal or State Endangered, Threatened or Special Concern Speices that occur at the site in question." (See AT&T's Application, Section VI, Attachment 8) The northern metalmark butterfly is a State Endangered species.*

Q46. Please provide (in feet) the distances from the closest points of (a) the compound area; and (b) the access drive, to any small whorl pogonia habitat, and provide a description and location of the habitat(s).

A46. *Habitat requirements for small whorl pogonia include flats or slope bases having a moderate to light shrub layer and a relatively open canopy.* [7] *Soil characteristics consistently found within this species' habitat include a sandy loam textured soil type having a fragipan or restrictive layer below the soil surface, allowing for lateral water movement.*[8] *Soils at most sites*

---

[5] The Life Histories of Connecticut Butterflies (2007). The Connecticut Butterfly Association, Inc.

[6] *Bedrock Geologic Map of Connecticut.* Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection. John Rogers. 1985.

[7] National Heritage & Endangered Species Program, Division of Fisheries & Wildlife, Massachusetts Rare and Endangered Plants-Small Whorled Pogonia

[8] National Heritage & Endangered Species Program, Division of Fisheries & Wildlife, Massachusetts Rare and Endangered Plants-Small Whorled Pogonia

*are highly acidic and nutrient poor, with moderately high soil moisture values.*[9] *Soils underlying and surrounding the project area were field classified as Hollis-Chatfield-Rock outcrop complex (soil symbol – 75), consisting respectively of somewhat excessively drained, shallow (10 to 20 inches to bedrock) and well drained, moderately shallow (20 to 40 inches to bedrock) glacial till soils. Therefore, the soils located in the project area do not provide the appropriate characteristics, particularly from a textural (e.g., too fine) and moisture level (e.g., too dry), to support small whorl pogonia habitat. In addition, the NDDB Program was contacted to determine the impact of proposed development project on state listed species and it was determined that "...there are no known extant populations of Federal or State Endangered, Threatened or Special Concern Species that occur at the site in question." (See AT&T's Application, Section VI, Attachment 8) The small whorled pogonia is a State Endangered species.*

Q47. Please provide (in feet) the distances from the closest points of (a) the compound area; and (b) the access drive, to any Blue-spotted salamander habitat, and provide a description and location of the habitat(s).

A47. *Blue-spotted salamander complex habitat is associated with riparian red maple swamps. It usually breeds in slightly flowing water and is found in marble valleys as well as acidic areas underlain by sandy soils. (http://www.ct.gov/Dep/cwp/view.asp?a=2723&q=325806&depNav_GID=1655). The subject property does not contain this habitat type. Although not confirmed, the nearest possible habitat for blue-spotted salamander complex is potentially the forested riparian habitat bordering Hollenbeck River located ±700 feet west of the proposed compound. The NDDB Program was contacted to determine the impact of proposed development project on state listed species and it was determined that "...there are no known extant populations of Federal or State Endangered, Threatened or Special Concern Species that occur at the site in question." (See AT&T's Application, Section VI, Attachment 8) The blue-spotted salamander complex is a State Special Concern species.*

Q48. . Please provide (in feet) the distances from the closest points of (a) the compound area; and (b) the access drive, to any Northern spring salamander habitat, and provide a description and location of the habitat(s).

A48. *Northern spring salamander habitat consists of cool and well-shaded mountain springs at high elevations, and wet depressions beneath logs, stones, or leaves in surrounding forests (http://www.ct.gov/dep/cwp/view.asp?a=2723&q=326094&depNav_GID=1655). No springs or wet depressions that may provide northern spring salamander habitat were identified during the wetland investigation in the project area. The nearest northern spring salamander habitat to the proposed project is not know, although it would be no closer than 200 feet from the proposed project. In addition, the NDDB Program was contacted to determine the impact of proposed development project on state listed species and it was determined that "...there are no known extant populations of Federal or State Endangered, Threatened or Special Concern Species that*

---

[9] von Oettingen, S.L. (1992). Small Whorled Pogonia (*Isotria medeoloides*) Recovery Plan. New England Field Office U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

*occur at the site in question." (See AT&T's Application, Section VI, Attachment 8) The northern spring salamander is a State Threatened species.*

Q49. Please provide (in feet) the distances from the closest points of (a) the compound area; and (b) the access drive, to any Northern slimy salamander habitat, and provide a description and location of the habitat(s).

A49. *Northern slimy salamander habitat consists of steep, moist, rocky slopes in mature, second growth deciduous or hemlock forests; rotting logs and a thick layer of leaf litter should be present (http://www.ct.gov/dep/cwp/view.asp?a=2723&q=326086&depNav_GID=1655). Soils underlying and surrounding the project area were field classified as Hollis-Chatfield-Rock outcrop complex (soil symbol – 75), consisting respectively of somewhat excessively drained, shallow (10 to 20 inches to bedrock) and well drained, moderately shallow (20 to 40 inches to bedrock) glacial till soils. These soils would not be considered to provide "moist" habitat suitable for northern slimy salamander. The nearest northern spring salamander habitat to the proposed project is not know, although it would be no closer than 200 feet from the proposed project. In addition, the NDDB Program was contacted to determine the impact of proposed development project on state listed species and it was determined that "...there are no known extant populations of Federal or State Endangered, Threatened or Special Concern Species that occur at the site in question." (See AT&T's Application, Section VI, Attachment 8) The northern slimy salamander is a State Threatened species.*

Q50. Please provide (in feet) the distances from the closest points of (a) the compound area; and (b) the access drive, to any American bittern habitat, and provide a description and location of the habitat(s).

A50. *American bittern habitat consists of freshwater and saltwater wetlands (http://www.ct.gov/dep/cwp/view.asp?a=2723&q=325954&depNav_GID=1655). This habitat is not located in the project area. Although not confirmed, the nearest possible habitat for American bittern is the wetland system located ±200 feet north of the proposed access drive entrance off Barnes Road. However, the NDDB Program was contacted to determine the impact of proposed development project on state listed species and it was determined that "...there are no known extant populations of Federal or State Endangered, Threatened or Special Concern Species that occur at the site in question." (See AT&T's Application, Section VI, Attachment 8) The American bittern is a State Endangered species.*

Q51. Please provide (in feet) the distances from the closest points of (a) the compound area; and (b) the access drive, to any Bald eagle habitat, and provide a description and location of the habitat(s).

A51. *Bald eagle habitat includes lakes, marshes, rivers, or seacoasts, where there are tall trees nearby for nesting and roosting and plenty of fish for eating (http://www.ct.gov/dep/cwp/view.asp?a=2723&q=325972&depNav_GID=1655). No eagle nests were observed in the proposed project area. The nearest potential habitat for bald eagle is the Hollenbeck River, located ±700 feet west of the proposed compound. However, the NDDB Program was contacted to determine the impact of proposed development project on state listed*

*species and it was determined that "...there are no known extant populations of Federal or State Endangered, Threatened or Special Concern Species that occur at the site in question." (See AT&T's Application, Section VI, Attachment 8). The bald eagle is a State Threatened species.*

Q52. Please provide (in feet) the distances from the closest points of (a) the compound area; and (b) the access drive, to any Burbot habitat, and provide a description and location of the habitat(s).

A52. *There is a documented population of burbot fish in the Hollenbeck River, which is located ±1,000 feet west of the proposed compound. As previously discussed in the response to Question 3, no adverse impact to the watershed of the Hollenbeck River is anticipated by the proposed Facility. In addition, the NDDB Program was contacted to determine the impact of proposed development project on state listed species and it was determined that "...there are no known extant populations of Federal or State Endangered, Threatened or Special Concern Species that occur at the site in question." (See AT&T's Application, Section VI, Attachment 8) Burbot is a State Endangered species.*

Q53. Please provide (in feet) the distances from the closest points of (a) the compound area; and (b) the access drive, to any whippoorwill habitat, and provide a description and location of the habitat(s).

A53. *Whip-poor-wills nest in forested habitat with an open understory, often adjacent to shrubby herbaceous areas[10]. The birds are nocturnal and forage in these open areas at dusk and dawn and during moonlit nights.[11] The dominant vegetation type encompassing the project area is classified as Northern red oak-Black oak-Chestnut oak (Quercus rubra – Quercus velutina – Quercus primus) forests.[12] This forest community occurs on shallow rocky soils on upper slopes and summits, such as those encountered at the project area. Eastern white pine (Pinus strobus), pignut hickory (Carya glabra), and white oak (Quercus alba) are also a component of the canopy. The shrub layer is generally undeveloped due to a closed canopy and limited resources for abundant vegetation to colonize the understory. There are no shrubby herbaceous areas immediately adjacent to the proposed development areas that would be considered as providing suitable whip-poor-will habitat. In addition, the NDDB Program was contacted to determine the impact of proposed development project on state listed species and it was determined that "...there are no known extant populations of Federal or State Endangered, Threatened or Special Concern Species that occur at the site in question." (See AT&T's Application, Section VI, Attachment 8) Whip-poor-will is is a State Special Concern species.*

Q54. Please provide (in feet) the distances from the closest points of (a) the compound area; and (b) the access drive, to any golden eagle habitat, and provide a description and location of the habitat(s).

---

[10] Cink, C. L. 2002. Whip-poor-will (*Caprimulgus vociferus*), The Birds of North America Online (A. Poole, Ed.). Ithaca: Cornell Lab of Ornithology; Retrieved from the Birds of North America Online: http://bna.birds.cornell.edu/bna/species/620 [Accessed 7/15/09].

[11] Cink, C. L. 2002. Ibid.

[12] Metzler, K.J., Barrett, J.P. *State Geological and Natural History Survey of Connecticut. The Vegetation of Connecticut, A Preliminary Classification*. Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection. Report of Investigations No. 12. 2006

A54. *Golden eagles are an uncommon visitor in Connecticut with occasional sightings during the winter months typically near large river systems that remain unfrozen during the winter. Golden eagle habitat generally consists of open country, in prairies, arctic and alpine tundra, open wooded country, and barren areas, especially in hilly or mountainous regions. Golden eagles nest on rock ledge of cliff or in a large tree. (http://www.natureserve.org/explorer/servlet/NatureServe?searchSciOrCommonName=golden+eagle) No eagle nests were observed in the proposed project area. Golden eagles are not a federally- or state-listed species in Connecticut.*

Q55. Please provide (in feet) the distances from the closest points of (a) the compound area; and (b) the access drive, to any ruffed grouse habitat, and provide a description and location of the habitat(s).

A55. *Ruffed grouse utilize a variety of forest habitats containing a mixture of age classes and forest openings. The forested habitat provided by the subject property, including areas in proximity to the proposed access drive and compound, could be utilized by ruffed grouse. Considering the abundance of surrounding forested habitat and the use of the existing access drive to limit the clearing of additional trees, the proposed development is not considered to result in a significant loss of ruffed grouse habitat if indeed this species is present on the subject property. Due to the availability of significant forested habitat, any ruffed grouse present in proximity to the proposed development areas would easily disperse into this adjoining habitat. In addition, considering the unmanned nature of the proposed Facility and the low traffic it would generate (i.e., visit by a technician approximately once per month), no long term impact to this species is anticipated. Ruffed grouse is not a Federal- or State-listed rare species in Connecticut.*

Q56. Please provide (in feet) the distances from the closest points of (a) the compound area; and (b) the access drive, to any yellow ladies slipper habitat, and provide a description and location of the habitat(s).

A56. *Yellow Lady's-slipper habitat consists of swamps and semi-open calcarious (limestone) fens, especially limestone wetlands.*[13] *The subject property does not contain this habitat type. Although not confirmed, the nearest possible habitat for Yellow Lady's-slipper is the wetland system located ±200 feet north of the proposed access drive entrance off Barnes Road. However, the NDDB Program was contacted to determine the impact of proposed development project on state listed species and it was determined that "...there are no known extant populations of Federal or State Endangered, Threatened or Special Concern Species that occur at the site in question." (See AT&T's Application, Section VI, Attachment 8) Yellow Lady's-slipper is a State Special Concern species.*

Q57. Please provide (in feet) the distances from the closest points of (a) the compound area; and (b) the access drive, to any showy ladies slipper habitat, and provide a description and location of the habitat(s).

---

[13] Massachusetts Division of Fisheries & Wildlife Natural Heritage & Endangered Species Program Yellow Lady's-slipper fact sheet. January 16, 2009. http://www.mass.gov/dfwele/dfw/nhesp/species_info/mesa_list/mesa_list.htm#PLANTS

A57. *Showy Lady's-slipper habitat consists of coniferous forested fens (wet, calcarious [limestone] swamps) and naturally open peatlands influenced by calcareous (or alkaline) groundwater seepage.*[14] *The subject property does not contain this habitat type. Although not confirmed, the nearest possible habitat for Showy Lady's-slipper is the wetland system located ±200 feet north of the proposed access drive entrance off Barnes Road. However, the NDDB Program was contacted to determine the impact of proposed development project on state listed species and it was determined that "...there are no known extant populations of Federal or State Endangered, Threatened or Special Concern Species that occur at the site in question." (See AT&T's Application, Section VI, Attachment 8) Showy Lady's-slipper is a State Endangered species.*

Q58. Please provide (in feet) the distances from the closest points of (a) the compound area; and (b) the access drive, to any northern leopard frog habitat, and provide a description and location of the habitat(s).

A58. *Northern leopard frog habitat is associated with seasonal wet meadows and forests located on the floodplain or a river or large stream. (http://www.ct.gov/Dep/cwp/view.asp?a=2723&q=325754&depNav_GID=1655). The subject property does not contain this habitat type. Although not confirmed, the nearest possible habitat for leopard frog is potentially the forested riparian habitat bordering Hollenbeck River located ±700 feet west of the proposed compound. However, the NDDB Program was contacted to determine the impact of proposed development project on state listed species and it was determined that "...there are no known extant populations of Federal or State Endangered, Threatened or Special Concern Species that occur at the site in question." (See AT&T's Application, Section VI, Attachment 8) The northern leopard frog is a State Special Concern species.*

Q59. Please provide (in feet) the distances from the closest points of (a) the compound area; and (b) the access drive, to any Scotts Spleenwort habitat, and provide a description and location of the habitat(s).

A59. *Small boulders, including glacial erratic, of limestone that may provide Scott's spleenwort habitat, were observed along the top of Cobble Hill, particularly along the north slope, over 1,000 feet east of the proposed Facility. (See 10/18/10 Application, Section VI, Attachment 8) Since the proposed access drive is from the northwest, the access drive would be more distant from these limestone boulders/erratic. Scott's spleenwort is not a federal- or state-listed rare species in Connecticut. Due to the significant buffer separating the proposed development areas and these limestone features, no impact to these ferns is anticipated.*

Q60. Please provide (in feet) the distances from the closest points of (a) the compound area; and (b) the access drive, to any "Limestone Erratics" - limestone boulders supporting sensitive ferns,

---

[14] Massachusetts Division of Fisheries & Wildlife Natural Heritage & Endangered Species Program Showy Lady's-slipper fact sheet. January 16, 2009.
http://www.mass.gov/dfwele/dfw/nhesp/species_info/mesa_list/mesa_list.htm#PLANTS

including the "walking fern" and "Scotts Spleenwort" specific to limestone habitats, and provide a description and location of the habitat(s).

A60. *Small boulders, including glacial erratic, of limestone were observed along the top of Cobble Hill, particularly along the north slope, over 1,000 feet east of the proposed Facility. (See 10/18/10 Application, Section VI, Attachment 8) Since the proposed access drive is from the northwest, the access drive would be more distant from these limestone boulders/erratic. These species are not federal- or state-listed rare species in Connecticut. Due to the significant buffer separating the proposed development areas and these limestone features, no impact to these ferns is anticipated.*

Q61. Attached hereto is current Nature Conservancy description of environmental features and such species of the Northwest Highlands, including areas described as the Hollenbeck Preserve and Robbins Swamp. This description mentions the presence of more than 150 rare and endangered species. (a) Please describe all environmental features that occur in the tower's proposed reliable coverage area; (c) please describe the power density and frequency levels of RF emissions from the proposed facility when operating at full capacity with Cingular Wireless' antennas in use, on such environmental features and species and their habitats within the proposed reliable coverage area; (d) please describe the power density and frequency levels of RF emissions from the proposed facility when operating at full capacity with all antennas of four co-located carriers in use on such environmental features and species and their habitats within the proposed reliable coverage area.

A61. As noted above in Response No. 27, Congress expressly preempted State and local governments from regulating wireless facilities on the basis of radio frequency emissions. 47 U.S.C. §332(c)(7)(b)(iv). See Cellular Phone Taskforce v. FCC, 205 F.3d 82 (2d Cir. 2000).

Moreover, the Connecticut Supreme Court also held that the "biological effects of high frequency radio wave emissions on wildlife" are "beyond the statutory authority" of the Siting Council. See Bornemann v Conn. Siting Council, 287 Conn. 177, 183 (2008).

Please see Attachment 4 of AT&T's Application for confirmation that AT&T's proposed facility complies with FCC standards for emissions, which report was calculated using worst case conditions.

Q62. Please provide full citations to any environmental or scientific studies consulted by the applicant and its consultants relating to the environmental assessment of the RF emissions from the proposed facility on each of the environmental features and species referred to above in interrogatories 61 a, b, c and d.

A.62. Please see Response No. 61 above.

Q63. Please identify and provide copies of any submissions by the applicant to the federal communications Commission pursuant to 47 C.F.R. §1.1307(3) relating to the subjects of interrogatories 61 a, b, c and d.

A.63. Please see Response No. 61 above. Please see Attachment 7 of AT&T's Application demonstrating that the proposed facility does not pose a potential adverse impact to any of the listed categories of Section 1.1307 under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Q64. Please describe the boundaries of the "site" submitted to (a) the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and (b) Connecticut D.E.P. for determination of the extant populations of any Federal or State endangered, threatened or special concern species relating to this application.

A64. Please see Attachment 7 of AT&T's Application regarding the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service consultation information and requirements. Please see Attachment 8 of AT&T's Application for correspondence and information provided to the DEP.

Q65. Please identify all endangered, threatened or special concern species located anywhere in the reliable coverage area for the proposed facility, describing the location of their habitats in relation thereto.

A65. Please see Response No. 61 above.

Q66. Please provide the date and title of the most recent field study of state endangered, threatened or special concern species conducted by the Connecticut DEP relied upon in any part of the application.

A66. *Please see Response No.s 41 through 60 above.*

Q67. Please provide the date and title of the most recent field study of federally listed, threatened or endangered species conducted by any Federal agency relied upon in any part of the application.

A67. *Please see Response No.s 41 through 60 above.*

Q68. Please describe the broadband capabilities of the proposed facility and its projected reliable coverage area.

A68. Please see Response No. 12 of AT&T's Responses to Siting Council Interrogatories, dated January 26, 2011.

Q69. Regarding the suggested alternative site at the Century Aggregate property (site 13, on the Site Search Summary), please describe and provide a map of the projected reliable coverage area from this site together with a description and map of "the area where coverage is needed" as described on page 24 of the application, in relation to (a) the 880 MHz signal; and (b) the 1900 MHz signal.

A69. Attached as Exhibit C are propagation plots depicting proposed coverage from the Century Aggregate site located at 74 Sand Road at 850 MHz and 1900 MHz. As clearly demonstrated in the attached propagation maps, a facility at this location would not provide service to the area

targeted for service by the proposed facility. As such, the Century Aggregate site is not a feasible alternative to the proposed site.

Q70. Please describe and provide a map of the complete existing reliable coverage area from AT&T Site 1134 in relation to (a) the 880 MHz signal; and (b) the 1900 MHz signal.

A70. Attached in Exhibit D are propagation maps that depict service from AT&T's Site CT1134 at 850 MHz and 1900 MHz.

Q71. At page 6 of the narrative, the application states "The company's member corporation is licensed by the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") to construct and operate a personal wireless services system, which has been interpreted as a 'cellular system', within the meaning of CGS Section 16-50i(a)(6).

(a) Please describe all services that the proposed facility will support.

Please see Response No. 12 of AT&T's Responses to Siting Council Interrogatories dated January 26, 2011.

(b) Please list all communities the proposed signals will serve.

Please see Attachment 2 of AT&T's Application.

(c) Please detail/explain why 9-1-1 services cannot be accomplished through booster antennas.

Assuming that the term "booster" is referring to a repeater, 911 services cannot be provided by a repeater system due to the fact that deployment of repeaters requires a strong donor signal from a nearby existing site to be repeated. Given that the area targeted for service is characterized by weak and unreliable signals, there is no donor site to provide the donor signal.
(d) Please detail/explain what determines that high-tension power line tower supports running from southeast to west to north will not serve the proposed coverage.

Please see AT&T's Response No. 3 to Siting Council Interrogatories dated January 26, 2011.

Q72. Please explain (a) what is meant by "worst case calculation of power density" (Tab 4, at E)? and (b) how is that different from power density output with four co-located carriers on the proposed tower when the tower is operational? (c) what provision is there for independent after-built monitoring of the power output by the applicant?

A72. The worst case calculation includes a calculation of the absolute maximum exposure that would occur if all transmitters were simultaneously operating at maximum power and the antennas were pointed directly at the ground. In actual operation, the transmitters rarely operate at maximum power and the antennas are not directed toward the ground.

The worst case power density calculation provided in Attachment 4 of AT&T's Application is the result for AT&T's proposed facility. Any other carriers that seek to co-locate on the

proposed facility would be required to demonstrate that its facility in conjunction with existing facilities comply with the FCC regulations. Given that details of future co-locators' facilities are not available at this time, a cumulative calculation is not feasible.

See Response No. 27 above regarding federal preemption of post installation monitoring.

Q73. Tab 4, page 4, "Tree Inventory" by CHA states that a total of 127 trees will be removed "within the area of the proposed access road and compound which need to be removed for construction of the facility." Please describe how many trees will be removed to accommodate the proposed drainage systems for the site, and please state the site total tree removal for the entire project, not just the access road and facility construction.

A73. The total tree removal count of 127 trees is accurate for the entire project.

Q74. Tab 5, page 3 states "Hydrologic Evaluation." Please provide all hydrologic engineering studies of the changes to the watershed to be caused by the proposed facility including access road, tower, compound and power shed.

A74. Please see Attachment 5 of AT&T's Application.

Q75. Tab 5, page 3 states "Aerial photos of the watershed show that the primary terrain cover is comprised of forested area with pockets of exposed rock outcrops." (a) Please provide hydrologic studies based upon the proposed removal of 127 trees; (b) and please provide hydrologic studies based upon removal of the additional trees necessary to accommodate the drainage systems proposed (see interrogatory number 60).

A75. Please see Attachment 5 of AT&T's Application.

Q76. Tab 5, page 4 states "Depth to bedrock is shallow, ranging from 0 to 20 inches. These soils are situated on steep slopes, which can create excessive drainage." Tab 5, page 3 states that "The steepness of the terrain subjects the gravel access road alignment to sheet flow and high velocity shallow concentrated flows that will concentrate on adjacent sides of the road subjecting it to erosion." Please explain and reconcile this statement with the statement in the "Environmental Assessment Statement" (Tab 4, page 1,1.Physical Impact, A. Water Flow and Quality") that "No water flow and/or water quality changes are anticipated as a result of the construction or operation of the proposed facility."

A76. Please see AT&T's Application Section VI.D Clearing, Grading and Drainage Assessment and Attachment 5.

Q77. In light of the application statement that the "proposed Facility on Cobble Hill will be visible from various vantage points in the community," please list all the criteria upon which the Industrial Zoned Century Aggregate property site was rejected.

A77. Please see AT&T's Application Attachments 2 and 10 (March 24, 2010 letter) and Response No. 69 above.

Q78. At page 9, the narrative states "The Facility proposed in this Application is an integral component of AT&T's network in its FCC licensed areas throughout the state". Please provide descriptions, maps, specifications and documents regarding AT&T's (a) existing and (b) planned network in the Town of Canaan, Connecticut and its contiguous neighboring towns; including complete existing reliable coverage areas for the (c) 880 MHz signal; and (d) for the 1900 MHz signal.

A78. Please see AT&T's Application, Section III and Attachment 1.

Q79. In light of the statement on page 11 of the application that "Other tall structures in and around the search ring included CL&P 115kv transmission line support structures that were also rejected by AT&T based on their relatively low ground elevation, relative heights and location south of the intervening terrain Cobble Hill Blocking potential coverage to the north." Please explain how (a) the CL&P transmission line support structures are "relatively low ground elevation" or "relative heights" in relation to Cobble Hill; and (b) how "blocking potential coverage to the north" is a criterion for filling "gaps in reliable coverage exist[ing] in the eastern portion of Falls Village along Routes 7, 126 and 63 and surrounding areas." (Application, page 9) and (c) how the existing boosters on Beebe Hill and Sand Road are currently utilized in the existing AT&T network; and (d) how the existing boosters on Beebe Hill and Sand Road do not satisfy the proposed coverage.

A.79. As shown in AT&T's Application, the ground elevation of the proposed site is 1,198' AMSL. The average ground elevation of the CL&P utility line is approximately 664' AMSL. As demonstrated in AT&T's Application Section 2 and AT&T's Response No. 3 to Siting Council Interrogatories, locating a facility on the CL&P utility line would not provide service to the area targeted for needed coverage. At the elevation of the CL&P line, the existing terrain would block any signal from reaching the area targeted for service.

AT&T has no information on existing boosters (assuming that "boosters" refer to repeaters) on Beebe Hill and Sand Road. Please see Response No. 71 above and AT&T's Application, Section V.C detailing why repeaters are not a viable alternative for the proposed facility.

Q80. Please compare the altitude of the "higher relative terrain" of the proposed tower site (Application page 12) to the height of the CL&P 115kv transmission line support structures mentioned at page 11 of the Application.

A80. Please see Response No. 79 above.

Q81. Please list all alternatives considered by the applicant in order to comply with the Siting Council's mandate to encourage co-location on existing towers, to avoid tower proliferation, in keeping with the Town's Plan of Conservation and Development.

A81. Please see AT&T's Application Section IV, Site Selection and Tower Sharing and Attachments 2 and 10.

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this day, a copy of the foregoing was sent electronically and by overnight delivery to the Connecticut Siting Council with copy to:

Ellery W. Sinclair
Town of Canaan (Falls Village)
201 Under Mountain Road
Falls Village, CT 06031
(860) 824-7454
wml61@comcast.net

Patty & Guy Rovezzi
36 Barnes Road
Falls Village, CT 06031
(860) 824-0358
rovezzi2005@yahoo.com

Frederick J. Laser
Town of Canaan
Planning and Zoning Commission
Town Hall
108 Main Street
P.O. Box 47
Falls Village, CT 06031
(860) 824-0707
zonelaser@aol.com

Dated: February 11, 2011

Lucia Chiocchio

cc: Michele Briggs, AT&T
David Vivian, SAI
Anthony Wells, C Squared
Scott Pollister, C Squared
Dean Gustafson, VHB
Michael Libertine, VHB
Christopher B. Fisher, Esq.