



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Ten Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051

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

E-Mail: siting.council@ct.gov

www.ct.gov/csc

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

August 22, 2014

Kenneth C. Baldwin, Esq.
Robinson & Cole LLP
280 Trumbull Street
Hartford, CT 06103-3597

RE: **DOCKET NO. 448** – Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a telecommunications facility located at Orange Tax Assessor Map 77, Block 3, Lot 1, 831 Derby Milford Road, Orange, Connecticut.

Dear Attorney Baldwin:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than September 9, 2014. To help expedite the Council's review, please file individual responses as soon as they are available.

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

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

Yours very truly,

Melanie Bachman
Acting Executive Director

c: Sandy Carter, Cellco Partnership
Parties and Intervenors

Docket No. 448
Pre-Hearing Questions to Cellco - Set 3
August 22, 2014

1. Would Cellco perform reform any mowing within its lease area at the site? If so, would mowing activities make the habitat less suited for box turtles? Please explain.
2. Please revise the vernal pool zonal calculations to parse out the vernal pool envelopes from the critical upland habitat zones. The current map creates single zones for 0-750'. How can one assess the percentage of development pre and post construction in the critical upland habitat zones (100-750 feet) when the envelopes (0-100 feet) have been amalgamated in those calculations?
3. Is the proposed tower site located at the interface between box turtle hibernation and summertime foraging habitat?
4. Is the lessor amenable to relocating the facility eastward on the ridge near the 150 foot topographic contour? If so, would this potential site better protect overall box turtle habitat compared to the original proposed site? Please explain.
5. Is the lessor amenable to relocating the facility as described in Exhibit 10, Question 2 (near farm buildings)? If so, would this potential site better protect overall box turtle habitat compared to the original proposed site and the site described in Question 4 above? Please explain.
6. Please explain how you distinguished tadpoles of *Rana palustris* from those of *Rana clamitans* in Potential Vernal Pool 1. Did you observe any adult *Rana palustris*?
7. Please indicate the location of the *Rana sylvatica* juveniles observed during the CSC's pre-hearing site visit on the Vernal Pool Map submitted in Exhibit 10, Question 2.
8. On the Vernal Pool Map submitted in Exhibit 10, Question 2, there are two pools labeled as "potential". Based on the juvenile wood frogs found during the CSC's site visit please confirm whether there is a vernal pool within 750 feet of the original proposed tower site.
9. On page 9 of the application, information regarding capacity relief is given for eight sectors on nearby sites but on page 3 of Exhibit 9, Attachment 2, capacity relief information is given for six adjacent sectors. Please clarify.
10. Is Cellco investigating a potential facility located at 111 New Haven Avenue in Derby? If so, would this location be designed to serve the same area or any portion of the area in Docket 448? Please explain.
11. If a site is viable at the Mount Saint Peter Cemetery in Derby, would it supplant the need for both the Docket 448 site and the 111 New Haven Avenue Derby site? Please explain.