

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL**

IN RE:

APPLICATION OF MCF
COMMUNICATIONS bg, INC. AND
OMNIPOINT COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL
COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR
THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND
OPERATION OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS
FACILITY AT 12 CARPENTER ROAD IN THE
TOWN OF BOLTON, CONNECTICUT

DOCKET NO. 323

DATE: JANUARY 17, 2007

PRE-FILED TESTIMONY OF RODNEY BASCOM, P.E.

Q1. Mr. Bascom, please state your name and position.

A. Rodney Bascom and I am a Civil Engineer at Clough Harbour & Associates, LLP ("CHA"). CHA is located at 2139 Silas Deane Highway, Suite 212, Rocky Hill, Connecticut.

Q2. Please state your qualifications.

A. I received a bachelor's degree in civil engineering from Clarkson University in 1982. I am a licensed civil engineer in the State of Connecticut. I have worked in the engineering field for over 24 years and have been employed by CHA for 20 years. I have managed and assisted in the design and permitting of more than 1,000 wireless telecommunications facilities in New England and New York.

Q3. Please describe your involvement in this matter.

A. CHA was responsible for designing and preparing the site plans for the proposed Facility including the site access plan, the compound plan and tower elevation. CHA conducted a tree inventory of the site to determine the number of trees with a diameter of 6 inches or larger that would need to be removed for the construction of the site access driveway and compound. In addition, CHA was responsible for preparing the visual impact study and the Phase I Environmental Study. Finally, CHA supervised the NEPA Compliance study and documentation.

Q4. Please describe the site.

A. The site of the proposed Facility is located at 12 Carpenter Road in Bolton (the "Site"). The Property is split between the R-1 and R-2 residential zoning districts and the Site itself is located in the R-2 zoning district. The Property is located on Assessor's map 6, lot 27. The Property is 43 acres in size and is heavily wooded with mature vegetation. The property is owned by Terry L. Veo as Trustee. The Property is partially developed with two small multifamily buildings located on the Property. In addition, there is a row of CL&P distribution lines running from the southwest corner to the northeast corner of the Property. Large portions of the Property are wooded and undeveloped. The Site is located in the southeastern portion of the Property. The Property is an ideal location for

a telecommunications facility due to the topography, size, existence of mature trees and vegetation as well as its proximity to Interstate I-384.

Q5. Please describe the access driveway.

A. The access driveway would result in land disturbance and would require tree removal due to the fact that the Property is heavily wooded. The co-applicants will utilize an existing driveway which extends from Carpenter Road but would need to construct a large portion of the access driveway. The access driveway will be 515 feet in total. In addition, a tree buffer will be maintained along the access driveway and around the equipment compound.

Q6. Please describe the proposed Facility.

A. The Application consists of plans for a 130-foot monopole and associated equipment compound and access driveway. The proposed height of the monopole has now increased from the originally proposed 130 feet to 140 feet based upon the intervention and documentation submitted by Verizon Wireless. The compound area is 70 foot by 70 foot and will be fenced in with a chainlink fence and associated gate. The proposed Facility will accommodate antenna arrays and equipment for co-applicant Omnipoint Communications, Inc. ("T-Mobile") at 127 feet above ground level (AGL). In addition, the proposed Facility will accommodate intervenors Verizon Wireless (137 feet AGL), Sprint/Nextel (117 feet AGL) and New Cingular Wireless (107 feet AGL).

Q7. Please describe the process for conducting the Visibility Study.

A. At the request of MCF, CHA conducted the Visibility Study (found at Exhibit K of the Application), which included the preparation of a computer-generated viewshed map and a balloon float test at the Site on March 24, 2006 to verify the computer model. The balloon float test consisted of floating a balloon, 60 inches in diameter, to the height of 150 feet at the Site, the proposed height of the facility at the time of the float. The visibility analysis was then modified for the height reduction to 130 feet, the proposed height at the time of the Application filing. Once the balloon was aloft, CHA staff completed a field drive of the study area and photographed the balloon from numerous vantage points within a two-mile radius (the "Study Area") to determine the actual locations where the proposed tower will be visible. CHA focused on sensitive visual receptors. The location of each photograph was recorded and subsequently plotted on a USGS topographic quad map to indicate their approximate distance and relative location to the proposed Facility.

Q8. How were the representative locations chosen?

A. Several photo locations were selected prior to the in-field evaluation, utilizing a preliminary version of the viewshed map to identify areas adjacent to public roads from where the proposed Facility might be visible. Other locations were identified based on in-field observations made during the time that the photographic documentation was being conducted, including areas along public roadways where the tower may be partially visible. In addition, CHA focused its efforts on sensitive visual receptors including residential and historical areas.

Q9. Please describe how you prepared the viewshed analysis for the Visibility Study.

A. The viewshed map was prepared by utilizing USGS topography maps and 2004 aerial photographs to determine the topography, ground elevation of the proposed Facility and the surrounding vegetation limits within the 2-mile study area. From these, the limits of visibility were estimated using a computer model including topography and an assumed 65' vegetation elevation as constraints. The limits of visibility were then field verified during the balloon float and adjusted accordingly.

Also included in the viewshed model was information gathered during a field review for sensitive visual receptors. These receptors were also determined by a review of the town GIS data and street maps. Additionally, information is gathered from the Connecticut State Department of Transportation ("DOT") and local officials to determine if there any state or locally designated scenic or historic roadways are located in the study area.

Q10. Please describe the visibility of the proposed Facility.

A. Areas from which the proposed Facility will be at least partially visible year-round comprise only 37 acres or approximately .5% of the entire study area, with much of that visibility occurring on the host property itself. The proposed Facility will be visible along portions of Carpenter Road and Interstate I-384. The size of the host property and the existing mature vegetation on the site serve to

minimize the visual effects of the proposed Facility. We estimate approximately 3 residences will have partial, year-round views of the proposed Facility.

In addition, only 88 acres or approximately 1% of the entire study area will have seasonal views of a portion of the Facility. Approximately 20 residences will have partial, seasonal views of the proposed Facility.

Q11. Please describe the results of the Phase I Environmental Study conducted by CHA.

A. At the request of MCF, CHA conducted a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment ("Phase I") of the property located at 12 Carpenter Road, the results of which are found at Exhibit J of the Certificate Application. CHA reviewed the materials provided by MCF concerning the location of the proposed Facility, access drive and utility easements. The purpose of the Phase I was to identify recognized environmental conditions, as defined by the American Society for Testing and Materials ("ASTM"). The Phase I found the following: there are no wetlands in the vicinity of the facility (which was confirmed with Site Inspection), there are no on-site or off-site sources of contamination and there is no evidence of recognized environmental conditions associated with the Site.

Q12. Please describe the results of the NEPA screen conducted by CHA.

A. At the request of MCF, CHA supervised the conducting of a NEPA screen to determine if the proposed Facility falls under any listed categories of Section 1.1307 under NEPA, the results of which are found at Exhibit N of the Certificate Application. Based upon CHA's review, the proposed Facility does not fall under any listed categories of Section 1.1307. In addition, CHA corresponded with numerous agencies including the State of Connecticut Department of

Environmental Protection ("DEP"), the United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, the Connecticut Commission on Culture & Tourism, Historic Preservation & Museum Division, among others. Based upon the NEPA screen and agency correspondence, the Site is categorically excluded from any requirement for further environmental review by the FCC in accordance with NEPA and no permit is required by that agency prior to construction of the proposed Facility.

The statements above are true and complete to the best of my knowledge.

11/17/07
Date


Rodney A. Bascom, P.E.

Subscribed and sworn before me this 17 day of January, 2007.

By: 
Notary


CATHY A. DIANA
NOTARY PUBLIC
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES JAN. 31, 2012