STATE OF CONNECTICUT CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

IN RE:

APPLICATION OF MESSAGE CENTER MANAGEMENT, INC. (MCM) FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF A REPLACEMENT TELECOMMUNICATIONS TOWER FACILITY AT 4 DITTMAR ROAD IN THE TOWN OF REDDING, CONNECTICUT

DOCKET NO. 425

February 16, 2012

APPLICANT RESPONSES TO SITING COUNCIL INTERROGATORIES SET I

- Q1. Of the letters sent to abutting property owners, how many certified mail receipts did Message Center Management receive? If any receipts were not returned, which owners did not receive their notice? Did Message Center Management make additional attempts to contact those property owners?
- A1. Seven of the nine mail receipts were received. Please see copies of green card receipts received included in <u>Attachment 1</u>.

The December 29, 2011 letter to Douglas Yeomans was returned as undelivered on January 13, 2011. A follow up letter was sent first class mail to the address available through the Redding Tax Assessor's records (233 Lonetown Road in Redding) as well as to a Bethel, Connecticut post office box address obtained through www.whitepages.com. The follow up letter sent by first class mail to 233 Lonetown Road was returned undelivered. The letter sent to P.O. Box 55 in Bethel, Connecticut was not returned. Please see Attachment 1 for the follow up correspondence in this regard.

The certified return receipt mailing to Anthony J. and Marsha Arzt was not received, however, the letter was also not returned undelivered. Follow up with the Post Office subsequently revealed that the letter, identified by certified return receipt label number 7196 9008 9040 0649 6211, was left unclaimed. The Postal Service subsequently returned the letter to the originating post office but ultimately did not deliver the letter to the return address. Please see Attachment 1 for the follow up correspondence to Mr. & Mrs. Arzt in this regard.

- Q2. When did T-Mobile first contact Message Center Management about locating its antennas at this facility?
- A2. Message Center Management was first contacted by T-Mobile in June, 2008. Subsequently, an agreement was entered into in March of 2009.

- Q3. Has Message Center Management received any indication that the Town of Redding would be interested in placing antennas on the proposed tower?
- A3. In meetings with the Town Message Center Management has offered space availability for town antennas, but to date has not received any indication of the town's interest.
- Q4. Would any blasting be required for this site?
- A4. In response to a request of the neighbors and the Town of Redding that the replacement tower occupy the same location as the existing tower, a geotechnical investigation of the proposed tower replacement site was completed in October 2011 to ensure that use of the existing location is feasible.

The results of the investigation indicate that glacial till underlies the site at 8.5 feet below grade surface ("bgs") with bedrock situated at 15 feet bgs. Valmont Structures was consulted to evaluate alternative foundation types that would fit within the geologic and spatial restraints of the site. It was determined that a rock anchor supported caisson foundation design is feasible for the proposed replacement tower foundation thereby minimizing the need to blast any bedrock and containing the foundation within the confines of the compound area.

- Q5. Would the proposed facility comply with recommended guidelines of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for minimizing the potential for telecommunications towers to impact bird species?
- A5. Yes. Please see Attachment 2.
- Q6. Would the proposed facility impact an Important Bird Area identified by the Audubon Society?
- A6. No. Please see Attachment 2.
- Q7. In addition to the commercial wireless carriers identified in the application as intending to place their antennas on the replacement tower (T-Mobile, Sprint/Nextel, and AT&T), will there be any paging or other similar antennas on the replacement tower.
- A7. No paging or similar antennas are planned for the replacement tower at this time. Paging or similar antennas may be considered in the future should a paging service or similar entity require same. Any additional antennas would be the subject of Siting Council review.
- Q8. How many carriers would the replacement tower be designed to accommodate in total?

A8. As proposed the 127' replacement tower will accommodate three (3) wireless carriers. The tower and foundation will be designed to be extendable to 147' which could accommodate a total of five (5) carriers.

Respectfully submitted, Message Center Management, Inc.

By its attorney:

Daniel M. Laub

445 Hamilton Avenue

14th Floor

White Plains, NY 10601

T: 914.761.1300 F: 914.761.5372

dlaub@cuddyfeder.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this day an original and copies of the foregoing were sent by electronic mail and overnight delivery to the Connecticut Siting Council with copy by electronic mail and first class mail to:

T-Mobile Northeast LLC Julie D. Kohler, Esq. Cohen and Wolf, P.C. 1115 Broad Street Bridgeport, CT jkohler@cohenandwolf.com

Town of Redding Brad N. Mondschein, Esq. Pullman & Comley, LLC 90 State House Square Hartford, CT 06103 bmondscein@pullcom.com

Dated: Febr 16, 2012

Daniel M. Laub

cc: Maria Scotti, MCM

Virginia King, MCM Hans Fiedler, T-Mobile Christopher B. Fisher, Esq.

Attachment 1





January 17, 2012

445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th Floor White Plains, New York 10601 Tel 914.761.1300 Fax 914.761.5372 www.cuddyfeder.com

VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL

Douglas K. Yeomans 233 Lonetown Road Redding, CT 06896-1506 Map ID 7-104 Douglas K. Yeomans P.O. Box 55 Bethel, CT 06801-0055 Map ID 7-104

Re:

Message Center Management, Inc. (MCM)

Proposed Replacement Wireless Telecommunications Facility

4 Dittmar Road Redding, Connecticut

Application to the State of Connecticut Siting Council

Dear Mr. Yeomans:

Our office previously attempted to contact you on behalf of our clients Message Center Management, Inc. (MCM) with respect to the above referenced matter. A certified return receipt letter to you dated December 29, 2011 was sent to your attention but was returned to our office. This letter, along with a copy of our original December 29th letter, is being sent via first class mail to the address available through the Town of Redding Tax Assessor's office as well as a publicly available address in hopes that this method may be successful in reaching you.

On January 9th our client filed an application with the State of Connecticut Siting Council for approval of a proposed wireless communications tower facility (the "Facility") within the Town of Redding. State law requires that owners of record of property that abuts a parcel on which a facility is proposed be sent notice of an applicant's intent to file an application with the Siting Council.

The property being considered for the proposed Facility is the parcel located at 4 Dittmar Road and identified on the tax map as Map 1, Lot 10 which currently hosts an existing lattice tower facility. The existing lattice tower will be removed. The proposed replacement Facility will be in the same location as the existing lattice tower in the north eastern quarter of the 5.58 acre parcel and will consist of a 127-foot self-supporting monopole tower with stealth features to resemble an evergreen tree (commonly referred to as a monopine), antennas, and new ground based equipment on a concrete pad as well as existing equipment will be located within an expanded tower compound. The tower will be expandable to 147' in height to accommodate additional collocation in the future if needed.

Vehicular access to the facility compound will be provided by using the existing driveway. Utility connections that are already in place would be maintained and upgraded as necessary.

The location, height and other features of the proposed Facility are subject to review and potential change by the Connecticut Siting Council under the provisions of Connecticut General Statutes §16-50g et seq.

If you have any questions concerning this application, please do not hesitate to contact the Connecticut Siting Council or the undersigned.

Very truly yours,

Daniel M. Laub

Enclosure

C&F: 1827351.1



445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th Floor White Plains, New York 10601 Tel 914.761.1300 Fax 914.761.5372 www.cuddyfeder.com

December 29, 2011

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Map ID 7-104 Douglas K Yeomans 233 Lonetown Road W. Redding, CT 06896

Re:

Message Center Management, Inc (MCM)

Proposed Replacement Wireless Telecommunications Facility

4 Dittmar Road Redding, Connecticut

Application to the State of Connecticut Siting Council

Dear Mr. Yeomans:

We are writing to you on behalf of our client Message Center Management, Inc. (MCM), in order to inform you of our client's intent to file an application with the State of Connecticut Siting Council for approval of a proposed replacement wireless communications tower facility ("Facility") within the Town of Redding.

The property being considered for the proposed Facility is the parcel located at 4 Dittmar Road and identified on the tax map as map 1, lot 10 which currently hoists an existing lattice tower facility. The existing lattice tower will be removed. The proposed replacement Facility will be located in the same location as the existing lattice tower in the north eastern quarter of the 5.58 acre parcel and will consist of a 127-foot self-supporting monopole tower with stealth features to resemble an evergreen tree (commonly referred to as a monopine), antennas, and new ground based equipment on a concrete pad as well as existing equipment will be located within an expanded tower compound. The tower will be expandable to 147' in height to accommodate additional collocation in the future if needed.

Vehicular access to the facility compound will be provided by using the existing driveway. Utility connections that are already in place would be maintained and upgraded as necessary.

The location, height and other features of the proposed Facility are subject to review and potential change by the Connecticut Siting Council under the provisions of Connecticut General Statutes §16-50g et seq.

If you have any questions concerning this application, please do not hesitate to contact the Connecticut Siting Council or the undersigned after January 6, 2012, the date which the application is expected to be on file.

Very truly yours,

Cancel H. Laub /ag

CUDDY& FEDER

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th Floor White Plains, New York 10601-1807



Douglas K. Yeomans 233 Lonetown Road Redding, CT 06896-1506

MI

NIXIE

059 SE 1

00 01/23/12

RETURN TO SENDER NOT DELIVERABLE AS ADDRESSED UNABLE TO FORWARD

BC: 10601187214

*1458-00475-17-40

06896+1806 10601@1872

Laub, Daniel M.

U.S._Postal_Service_ [U.S._Postal_Service@usps.com] Wednesday, February 15, 2012 12:53 PM From:

Sent:

To: Laub. Daniel M.

U.S. Postal Service Track & Confirm email Restoration - 7196 9008 9040 0649 6211 Subject:

This is a post-only message. Please do not respond.

DANIEL LAUB has requested that you receive this restoration information for Track & Confirm as listed below.

Current Track & Confirm e-mail information provided by the U.S. Postal Service.

Label Number: 7196 9008 9040 0649 6211

Service Type: Certified Mail(TM)

Shipment Activity Date & Time Location

Delivered WHITE PLAINS NY 10606 01/31/12 9:43am

Processed through USPS WHITE PLAINS NY 10610 01/31/12 2:28am

Sort Facility

Unclaimed 01/25/12 10:04am REDDING CT

Notice Left REDDING CT 06896 01/03/12 12:06pm

Forwarded **REDDING CT** 12/31/11 12:22pm

Arrival at Unit REDDING CT 06896 12/31/11 9:22am

Processed through USPS STAMFORD CT 06910 12/31/11 5:13am

Sort Facility

Electronic Shipping 12/21/11

Info Received

USPS has not verified the validity of any email addresses submitted via its online Track & Confirm tool.

For more information, or if you have additional questions on Track & Confirm services and features, please visit the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) section of our Track & Confirm site at http://www.usps.com/shipping/trackandconfirmfags.htm



445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th Floor White Plains, New York 10601 Tel 914.761.1300 Fax 914.761.5372 www.cuddyfeder.com

February 16, 2012

VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL

Anthony J. and Marsha Arzt 230 Lonetown Road Redding, CT 06896 Map ID 1-2

Re:

Message Center Management, Inc. (MCM)

Proposed Replacement Wireless Telecommunications Facility

4 Dittmar Road Redding, Connecticut

Application to the State of Connecticut Siting Council

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Arzt:

Our office previously attempted to contact you on behalf of our clients Message Center Management, Inc. (MCM) with respect to the above referenced matter. A certified return receipt letter to you dated December 29, 2011 was sent to your attention but not indication of delivery nor the original letter was returned to our office. This letter is being sent via first class mail to the address available through the Town of Redding Tax Assessor's office in hopes that this method may be successful in reaching you.

On January 9th our client filed an application with the State of Connecticut Siting Council for approval of a proposed wireless communications tower facility (the "Facility") within the Town of Redding. State law requires that owners of record of property that abuts a parcel on which a facility is proposed be sent notice of an applicant's intent to file an application with the Siting Council.

The property being considered for the proposed Facility is the parcel located at 4 Dittmar Road and identified on the tax map as Map 1, Lot 10 which currently hosts an existing lattice tower facility. The existing lattice tower will be removed. The proposed replacement Facility will be in the same location as the existing lattice tower in the north eastern quarter of the 5.58 acre parcel and will consist of a 127-foot self-supporting monopole tower with stealth features to resemble an evergreen tree (commonly referred to as a monopine), antennas, and new ground based equipment on a concrete pad as well as existing equipment will be located within an expanded tower compound. The tower will be expandable to 147' in height to accommodate additional collocation in the future if needed.

Vehicular access to the facility compound will be provided by using the existing driveway. Utility connections that are already in place would be maintained and upgraded as necessary.

The location, height and other features of the proposed Facility are subject to review and potential change by the Connecticut Siting Council under the provisions of Connecticut General Statutes §16-50g et seq.

If you have any questions concerning this application, please do not hesitate to contact the Connecticut Siting Council or the undersigned.

Very truly yours,

Daniel M. Laub

Enclosure

C&F: 1852303.1

Mh.

Attachment 2



ALL-POINTS TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION, P.C.

February 15, 2012

Message Center Management, Inc. 40 Woodland Street Hartford CT 06105

Re: CT Siting Council Docket 425
Responses to Pre-Hearing Interrogatories Nos. 5 and 6
4 Dittmar Road
Redding, Connecticut

Message Center Management ("MCM") proposes to construct a replacement wireless telecommunications tower and expanded compound (collectively, the "Facility") on a 5.6-acre parcel of land at 4 Dittmar Road in Redding, Connecticut. The existing telecommunications tower consists of a 110-foot, guyed lattice structure; existing antennas located at the top of the tower extend its total height above ground level ("AGL") to 116 feet. In addition to the existing tower and compound, the property is occupied by a residence and a tree farm. Land use within the general vicinity of the proposed Facility is mainly a mix of residential and undeveloped woodlands. The proposed Facility would consist of a 127-foot tall "monopine" tower with T-Mobile occupying the top platform at a centerline height of 120 feet AGL.

This letter is provided in response to Interrogatories submitted by the Connecticut Siting Council (the "Council") on February 2, 2012. Specifically:

- Interrogatory #5 Would the proposed facility comply with recommended guidelines of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to minimize the potential for telecommunications towers to impact bird species?
- Interrogatory #6 Would the proposed facility impact an Important Bird Area identified by the Audubon Society?

All-Points Technology Corporation, P.C. ("APT") is pleased to provide the following information in response to the Council's inquiries.

Compliance with USFWS's Interim Guidance on the Siting, Construction, Operation and Decommissioning of Communications Towers

The U.S Fish and Wildlife Service ("USFWS") prepared its *Interim Guidance on the Siting, Construction, Operation and Decommissioning of Communications Towers* (September 14, 2000), which recommends the 12 voluntary actions below be implemented in order to mitigate potential bird strikes that could result by the construction of telecommunications towers. With respect to Interrogatory #5, APT offers the responses, specific to the proposed Facility, following each of the recommended actions.

1. Any company/applicant/licensee proposing to construct a new communications tower should be strongly encouraged to collocate the communications equipment on an existing communications tower or other structure (e.g., billboard, water tower, or building mount). Depending on tower load factors, from 6 to 10 providers may collocate on an existing tower.

Collocation on the existing tower is not feasible due to structural considerations. In addition, collocation opportunities on an existing building or non-tower structure are not available in the area while achieving the required radio frequency ("RF") coverage objectives of T-Mobile.

2. If collocation is not feasible and a new tower or towers are to be constructed, communications service providers should be strongly encouraged to construct towers no more than 199 feet above ground level (AGL), using construction techniques which do not require guy wires (e.g., use a lattice structure, monopole, etc.). Such towers should be unlighted if Federal Administration regulations permit.

The proposed Facility would consist of a free-standing 127-foot tall monopole (disguised as a pine tree) which requires neither guy wires nor lighting. It would replace an existing structure that is currently guyed.

3. If constructing multiple towers, providers should consider the cumulative impacts of all of those towers to migratory birds and threatened and endangered species as well as the impacts of each individual tower.

Multiple towers are not proposed as part of this project. The proposed Facility would replace an existing guyed lattice tower.

4. If at all possible, new towers should be sited within existing "antenna farms" (clusters of towers). Towers should not be sited in or near wetlands, or other known bird concentration areas (e.g., state or Federal refuges, staging areas, rookeries), in known migratory or daily movement flyways, or in habitat of threatened or endangered species. Towers should not be sited in areas with a high incidence of fog, mist, and low ceilings.

There are no existing "antenna farms" in the area; however, the proposed Facility would replace an existing tower. In Connecticut, seasonal atmospheric conditions can occasionally produce fog, mist and/or low ceilings. The proposed Facility location is not within a migratory or daily movement flyway. According to the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection ("CTDEEP"), there are no known extant populations of state of Federal Endangered, Threatened or Special Concern Species at the project site (D. McKay, CTDEEP, correspondence, June 27, 2011).

5. If taller (>199 feet AGL) towers requiring lights for aviation safety must be constructed, the minimum amount of pilot warning and obstruction avoidance lighting required by the FAA should be used.

The proposed Facility height is 127 feet AGL, less than 199 feet, and would not require any aviation safety lighting.

6. Tower designs using guy wires for support which are proposed to be located in known raptor or waterbird concentration areas or daily movement routes, or in major migratory bird movement routes or stopover sites, should have daytime visual markers on the wires to prevent collisions by these diurnally moving species.

The proposed Facility would be free-standing and would not require guy wires or visual marking.

7. Towers and appendant facilities should be sited, designed and constructed so as to avoid or minimize habitat loss within and adjacent to the tower "footprint." However, a larger tower footprint is preferable to the use of guy wires in construction. Road access and fencing should be minimized to reduce or prevent habitat fragmentation and disturbance, and to reduce above ground obstacles to birds in flight.

The proposed tower and appendant facilities would be sited, designed and constructed to accommodate the required equipment and to allow for future collocations within the smallest footprint possible. The proposed Facility would be located on an existing developed property, replaces an existing tower and compound and its construction would minimize disturbance to mature vegetation. Access to the proposed Facility would utilize the existing access that serves the current tower.

8. If significant numbers of breeding, feeding, or roosting birds are known to habitually use the proposed tower construction area, relocation to an alternate site should be recommended. If this is not an option, seasonal; restrictions on construction may be advisable in order to avoid disturbance during periods of high bird activity.

Significant numbers of breeding, feeding, or roosting birds are not known to habitually use the proposed tower construction area or surrounding properties.

9. In order to reduce the number of towers needed in the future, providers should be encouraged to design new towers structurally and electrically to accommodate the applicant/licensee's antennas and comparable antennas for at least two additional users (minimum of three users for each tower structure), unless this design would require the addition of lights or guy wires to an otherwise unlighted and/or unguyed tower.

The proposed Facility has been designed in accordance with this guidance, as it would accommodate a total four antenna platform positions. The proposed, free-standing Facility would be neither lighted nor guyed.

10. Security lighting for on-ground facilities and equipment should be down-shielded to keep light within the boundaries of the site.

Security lighting for on-ground facilities would be down-shielded using Dark Sky compliant fixtures set on motion sensor with timer.

11. If a tower is constructed or proposed for construction, Service personnel or researchers from the Communication Tower Working Group should be allowed access to the site to evaluate bird use, conduct, dead-bird searches, to place net catchments below the towers but above the ground, and to place radar, Global Positioning System, infrared, thermal imagery, and acoustical monitoring equipment as necessary to assess and verify bird movements and to gain information on the impacts of various tower sizes, configurations, and lighting systems.

With prior notification to MCM, USFWS personnel would be allowed access to the proposed Facility to conduct evaluations.

12. Towers no longer in use or determined to be obsolete should be removed within 12 months of cessation of use.

If the proposed Facility was no longer in use or determined to be obsolete, it would be removed within 12 months of cessation of use.

Proximity to Important Bird Areas

With respect to Interrogatory #6, Audubon Connecticut has identified 27 important Bird Area Sites ("IBAs") in the state. The closest IBA to the proposed Facility is the Nature Conservancy Center's Devil's Den Preserve, located approximately 4.1 miles to the south. Due to its distance from the project site, this IBA would not experience an adverse impact resulting from development of the proposed Facility. Therefore, no seasonal restrictions would be recommended for the project.

Other Supporting Avian Data

In addition to Audubon's IBAs, APT researched several avian source data for the State of Connecticut. The following analysis and attached graphics identify these avian resources and their proximities to the project site, and demonstrates that no adverse impacts to avian resources would result from development of the proposed Facility.

Critical Habitat

Connecticut Critical Habitats depict the classification and distribution of 25 rare and specialized wildlife habitats in the state resulting in the creation of habitat maps to be used in land use planning and natural resource protection. It represents a compilation of ecological information collected over many years by state agencies, conservation organizations and many individuals. The Connecticut Critical Habitats information can serve to highlight ecologically significant areas and to target areas of species diversity for land conservation and protection. The nearest Critical Habitat is associated with the Saugatuck River floodplain and forest; this resource is located over two (2) miles southwest of the proposed Facility site. Based on the distance from the proposed Facility site and this resource, no adverse impacts are anticipated and no seasonal restrictions would be recommended for the project.

Breeding Bird Survey Route

The North American Breeding Bird Survey is a cooperative effort between various agencies and volunteer groups to monitor the status and trends of North American bird populations. Routes area randomly located to sample habitats that are representative of an entire region. Each year during the height of the avian breeding season (June for most of the United States) participants skilled in avian identification collect bird population data along roadside survey routes. Each survey route is approximately 24.5 miles long and contains 50 stops located at 0.5-mile intervals. At each stop, a three-minute count is conducted. During each count, every bird seen or heard within a 0.25-mile radius is recorded. The resulting data are used by conservation managers, scientists, and the general public to estimate population trends and relative abundances and to assess bird conservation priorities. No survey routes are located within the towns of Redding or

Bethel. The nearest survey route is located approximately 5.1 miles to the east (Long Hill Breeding Bird Survey Route). This route generally begins in Trumbull and winds its way north through Monroe, Newtown, Southbury, and terminates in Roxbury. Bird survey routes do not represent a potential restriction to development, including the proposed Facility.

Hawk Watch Site

The Hawk Migration Association of North America ("HMANA") is a membership-based organization committed to the conservation of raptors through the scientific study, enjoyment and appreciation of raptor migration. HMANA collects hawk count data from almost 200 affiliated raptor monitoring sites throughout the United States, Canada and Mexico, identified as "Hawk Watch Sites." The nearest Hawk Watch Site is located approximately 1.76 miles east/southeast of the proposed Facility, within Huntington State Park. Hawk Watch Sites do not represent a potential restriction to development, including the proposed Facility.

Bald Eagle Site

Bald Eagle Sites consist of locations of midwinter Bald Eagle counts from 1986 to 2005 with an update provided in 2008. This survey was initiated in 1979 by the National Wildlife Federation. This database includes information on statewide, regional and national trends. Survey routes are included in the database only if they were surveyed consistently in at least four years and where at least four eagles were counted in a single year. No Bald Eagle Sites are located within the Town of Redding or abutting municipalities; the nearest Bald Eagle Site is located on Lake Candlewood, approximately 6.9 miles north/northwest of the proposed Facility. Due to the distance separating the proposed Facility and Lake Candlewood, no impacts to bald eagles would result from the development and no seasonal restrictions would be recommended.

Flyways

The proposed Facility is located in west-central Connecticut, approximately 15.5 miles north of Long Island Sound. The Connecticut coast lies within the Atlantic Flyway, one of four generally recognized regional migratory bird flyways (Mississippi, Central and Pacific being the others). This regional flyway is used by migratory birds travelling to and from summering and wintering grounds. The Atlantic Flyway is particularly important for many species of migratory waterfowl and shorebirds, and Connecticut's coast serves as vital stopover habitat. Migratory land birds also stop along coastal habitats before making their way inland. Smaller inland migratory flyways are often concentrated along major riparian areas as birds make their way further inland to their preferred breeding habitats. The Housatonic River forms an important secondary flyway in western Connecticut as birds move north from the shoreline into interior portions of western and northwestern Connecticut.

The proposed Facility is not located within the Atlantic Flyway and is roughly 14 miles west of the Housatonic River. Therefore, no adverse impacts to avian habitat potentially used by migrating species are anticipated as a result of the proposed replacement Facility and no seasonal restrictions would be recommended.

Waterfowl Focus Areas

The Atlantic Joint Coast venture ("AJCV") is an affiliation of federal, state, regional and local partners working together to address bird conservation planning along the Atlantic Flyway. The AJCV has identified waterfowl focus areas recognizing the most important habitats for waterfowl along the Atlantic Flyway. Connecticut contains several of these waterfowl focus areas. The nearest waterfowl focus area to the project site is the Norwalk Islands, located approximately 9.5 miles to the south. Based on the distance of these resources to the project site, no direct impacts would occur from development of the proposed Facility.

CTDEEP Migratory Waterfowl Data

CTDEEP created a Geographic Information System ("GIS") data layer in 1999 identifying concentration areas of migratory waterfowl at specific locations in Connecticut. The intent of this data layer is to assist in the identification of migratory waterfowl resource areas in the event of an oil spill or other condition that might be a threat to waterfowl species. This data layer identifies conditions at a particular point in time and has not been updated since 1999.

No migratory waterfowl areas are located within the Town of Redding or neighboring municipalities. The nearest migratory waterfowl area is approximately 15.8 miles to the south (Westport Longshore Club Park). The associated species is identified as American Black Duck. Based on the distance to the project site, no impacts to migratory waterfowl habitat are anticipated to result from development of the proposed Facility.

CTDEEP Natural Diversity Data Base

CTDEEP's Natural Diversity Data Base ("NDDB") program performs hundreds of environmental reviews each year to determine the impact of proposed development projects on state listed species and to help landowners conserve the state's biodiversity. State agencies are required to ensure that any activity authorized, funded or performed by a state agency does not threaten the continued existence of endangered or threatened species. Maps have been developed to serve as a pre-screening tool to help applicants determine if there is a potential impact to state listed species.

The NDDB maps represent approximate locations of endangered, threatened and special concern species and significant natural communities in Connecticut. The locations of species and natural communities depicted on the maps are based on data collected over the years by CTDEEP staff, scientists, conservation groups, and landowners. In some cases an occurrence represents a location derived from literature, museum records and specimens. These data are compiled and

maintained in the NDDB. The general locations of species and communities are symbolized as shaded areas on the maps. Exact locations have been masked to protect sensitive species from collection and disturbance and to protect landowner's rights whenever species occur on private property.

The NDDB maps have been reviewed for the project site and CTDEEP personnel confirmed that there are no federal or state species of concern in the area that would be impacted by the proposed Facility.

Summary

In response to the Council's Interrogatories (Nos. 5 and 6), APT has determined that the proposed Facility complies with the USFWS guidelines for minimizing the potential impacts to birds. The nearest IBA to the proposed Facility is located approximately 4.1 miles to the south. No migratory bird species are anticipated to be impacted by development of the proposed Facility.

Sincerely,

All-Points Technology Corporation, P.C.

Michael Libertine

Director of Siting and Permitting

Attachments



