

**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 237 SANDY HOLLOW ROAD IN THE  
TOWN OF GROTON, CONNECTICUT

DOCKET NO. 343

DATE: OCTOBER 23, 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 22 years. I have managed and assisted in the 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 telecommunications facility (the "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 six 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 Site Assessment. Finally, CHA supervised the NEPA Compliance study and documentation.

Q4. Please describe the site.

A. The proposed Facility is located at 237 Sandy Hollow Road in Groton (the "Site" or the "Property"). The Property is located in the RS-20 residential zoning district. The Property is located on Assessor's map 261909, block 6, lot 5371. The Property is 3.35 acres in size and currently is developed with an ambulance facility. The Property is located southwest of the intersection of Allyn Street and Sandy Hollow Road just after the Interstate I-95, exit 89 off-ramp. The Site is located in the southern portion of the Property on the western side of the ambulance association building. The Property is an ideal location for a telecommunications facility due to its proximity to Interstate I-95.

Q5. Please describe the access driveway.

A. The Co-Applicants will utilize the existing paved access driveway on the Property. Therefore, the access driveway would result in no additional land disturbance.

Q6. Please describe the proposed Facility.

A. The Facility consists of a 130-foot monopole and associated equipment compound, access driveway and utility routing. The compound area is 1,975

square feet consisting of a 35 foot by 50 foot compound with an additional 15 foot by 15 foot “bump out” area and will be fenced in with a security 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 three additional wireless carriers at 117 feet AGL, 107 feet AGL and 97 feet AGL.

Of note, the “bump-out” area shown as part of the equipment compound is proposed to contain the ground equipment of T-Mobile. Therefore, the remaining 35 foot by 50 compound area will be reserved for additional wireless carriers and other users of the proposed Facility.

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 a balloon float test at the Site on July 25, 2006 and the preparation of a computer-generated viewshed map. The balloon float test consisted of floating a balloon, 60 inches in diameter, to the height of 120 feet at the Site, the height of the proposed Facility at the time of the balloon float. 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.

After completing the balloon float, the height of the tower was adjusted from 120 feet to the proposed 130 feet. The visibility study and the photosimulations were adjusted accordingly. Therefore, each of the photosimulations depict a balloon height of 120 feet and proposed Facility height of 130 feet.

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, and vegetation coverage within the surrounding 2-mile area. The average vegetation height was estimated to be approximately 65 feet in height.

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, hiking trails or recreational areas are located in the study area.

Of note, CHA did identify several sensitive visual receptors located within the study area. There are several historic sites located within the study area, particularly located around the downtown Mystic area. There are also several parks located within the study area. In addition, the Mystic Seaport, Avalonia Land Conservancy property and the Pequot Woods Park are also located within 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 20 acres or approximately .25% of the entire study area. Much of that visibility occurs within the I-95 corridor and the area immediately adjacent to I-95 near Exit 89. The proposed Facility will be visible along I-95, Sandy Hollow Road, Route 614, and Pequot Road. The topography in the area and the proximity to I-95 serve to minimize any potential visual impact. We estimate approximately 14 residences will have partial, year-round views of the proposed Facility.

In addition, only 56 acres or approximately .75% of the entire study area will have seasonal views of a portion of the Facility. Approximately 15 residences will have partial, seasonal views of the proposed Facility.

Q11. Will the proposed Facility have any visual impact on any sensitive visual receptors?

A. The proposed Facility will have no visual impact on sensitive visual receptors. CHA does not anticipate that the proposed Facility will be visible from any historic sites, scenic roadways, hiking trails or recreational areas. Therefore, the proposed Facility will not be visible, either year-round or seasonally, from the Mystic Seaport, the Pequot Woods Park, the Avalonia Land Conservancy property or any of the historic sites located in the downtown Mystic area.

Q12. Please describe the results of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment conducted by CHA.

At the request of MCF, CHA conducted a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment at the Site. The purpose of the Phase I was to identify any recognized environmental conditions at the Site. The results of the Phase I demonstrated that there is no evidence of any recognized environmental conditions at the Site and no further environmental investigations would be required.

Q13. Please describe CHA's involvement in preparing the NEPA compliance documentation.

A. In 2006, on behalf of MCF, BL Companies conducted and completed the NEPA compliance documentation. At that time, the Site configuration was slightly different from the current Application. In addition, since 2006, as discussed above, the tower height was adjusted from 120 feet AGL to 130 feet


AGL. Because of the changes to the proposed Facility, CHA updated the NEPA compliance documentation. As part of that update, CHA corresponded with both the State of Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection ("DEP") and State Historic Preservation Office ("SHPO"). Both DEP and SHPO had previously determined that the original proposal would have no effect. In follow-up utilizing the updated Site information, both DEP and SHPO indicated again that the proposed Facility will have no effect and that no additional follow-up is required.

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

10/19/07  
Date

  
Rodney A. Bascom, P.E., Partner

Subscribed and sworn before me this 19<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2007.

By:   
Notary

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