



STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Ten Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051

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

E-Mail: [siting.council@ct.gov](mailto:siting.council@ct.gov)

[www.ct.gov/csc](http://www.ct.gov/csc)

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

April 26, 2016

Windham Solar LLC  
c/o Ecos Energy LLC  
ATTN: Steve Broyer  
222 South 9<sup>th</sup> Street  
Suite 1600  
Minneapolis, MN 55402

RE: **PETITION NO. 1220** - Windham Solar LLC petition for a declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the proposed construction, maintenance and operation of three 2.0 Megawatt and one 1.0 Megawatt Solar Photovoltaic Electric Generating facilities located at 1219 and 1240 Voluntown Road, Griswold, Connecticut.

Dear Mr. Broyer:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than May 2, 2016. To help expedite the Council's review, please file individual responses as soon as they are available.

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

Any request for an extension of time to submit responses to interrogatories shall be submitted to the Council in writing pursuant to §16-50j-22a of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies.

Yours very truly,

Melanie A. Bachman  
Acting Executive Director

MB/MP/lm

c: Council Members  
Michael Melone, Windham Solar LLC, c/o Allco Renewable Energy Limited

**Petition No. 1220**  
**Interrogatories**  
**Set Two**  
**April 26, 2016**  
**General Questions**

39. Referencing the response to question 22 of the first set of interrogatories, provide the status of the wildlife biologist review of the site with respect to federally-listed and State-listed species, including but not limited to the northern long-eared bat. In general, does the site have large trees in the 12-inch diameter or greater range in the proposed tree clearing area?
40. Has Windham Solar LLC (WS) considered the municipal comments filed by Mario J. Tristany, Jr., Griswold Town Planner dated April 20, 2016 including but limited to the request to shift the western-most array to the east and also maintain and supplement the landscape screening to the north of the northern-most arrays? The municipal comments may be viewed at: <http://www.ct.gov/csc/cwp/view.asp?a=2397&q=578334>
41. Has WS also considered the Griswold Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Conservation Commission & Aquifer Protection Agency comments dated April 25, 2016? Would WS be amenable to prohibiting the use of herbicides and similar chemicals in the upland review areas? Please identify any chemicals or cleaning agents that would be used to periodically clean solar panels. These municipal agency comments may also be viewed from the Council's website at: <http://www.ct.gov/csc/cwp/view.asp?a=2397&q=578334>
42. If WS is modifying its project as a result of municipal comments, public input and/or other reasons, please provide the following updates to the Petition and previous interrogatory responses:
- a) Provide the most up to date Overall Site Plan drawing (i.e. Sheet 4 of 12 from the Petition) taking into account any revisions that have been made to the number and locations of solar panels proposed, megawatts proposed at this time, access proposed, supplemental landscaping plantings proposed, etc. Explain in writing the reasons for the changes such as municipal comments and resident concerns, environmental issues at the site, etc. Indicate how many feet the western-most array would be shifted to the east, if applicable. If the northern-most arrays are re-arranged for a greater buffer to Culver Road and to allow landscaping, indicate this also.
  - b) Would the cut and fill estimates be approximately the same as already provided in response to question 16, set one?
  - c) Would the acreages of tree clearing remain approximately the same as in the response to question 23, set one with 20.8 acres total including 1.8 acres with wetland buffers, or, for example, would the wetland buffer area clearing increase with a shift to east (of the western-most array)? Provide the revised tree clearing areas estimate, if applicable. If the total tree clearing area changed from 20.8 acres, recalculate the carbon debt payback based on the new acreage of tree clearing versus proposed energy generated (similar to the response to question 24 of the first set of interrogatories).