

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL**

IN RE:

APPLICATION OF GLOBAL SIGNAL  
ACQUISITIONS II FOR A CERTIFICATE OF  
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND  
PUBLIC NEED FOR THE RE-LOCATION,  
CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND  
OPERATION OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
FACILITY AT 1919 BOSTON POST ROAD,  
GUILFORD, CONNECTICUT

DOCKET NO. 349

DATE: January 8, 2008

**PRE-FILED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL LIBERTINE**

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

A. Michael Libertine and I am Director of Environmental Services for the Connecticut office of Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. ("VHB"), located at 54 Tuttle Place in Middletown, Connecticut.

Q2. Please state your qualifications.

A. I have a Bachelor of Science degree from the University of Connecticut with a concentration in Natural Resources Management and Bachelor of Arts degree from Stonehill College in Business. My background includes over 25 years of professional experience, including 17 years of environmental engineering consulting. I have been Project Manager for more than 1600 environmental site assessments and field investigations for property transfers in Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Florida and Canada. In addition, I have assisted in the permitting of more

than 500 wireless telecommunication facilities in New England during the past ten years. My responsibilities include: coordination and oversight of site screenings and environmental assessments to fulfill NEPA requirements, environmental site assessments, wetland delineations and assessments, vegetative/biological surveys, noise analyses, visual impacts analyses and regulatory permitting support.

Q3. Please describe your involvement in this matter.

A. VHB was responsible for preparing a Visual Resources Evaluation report for the proposed site at 1919 Boston Post Road in Guilford (the "Site"), which is located on property owned by Developers Diversified Realty ("DDR"). The purpose of this Visual Resources Evaluation Report was to evaluate the potential visibility of the proposed telecommunications facility ("Facility") from the surrounding areas.

VHB was also responsible for reviewing environmental resource information under the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA").

Q4. Please describe the process for conducting the Visual Resource Evaluation.

A. At the request of the Applicant, VHB conducted the Visual Resource Evaluation (found at Exhibit L of the Application), which included the preparation of a computer-generated viewshed map and performing a balloon float test at the Site on June 14, 2006. The predictive model is employed to assess potential

visibility throughout the entire Study Area (a two mile radius surrounding the site), including private property and/or otherwise inaccessible areas for field verification. The “balloon float” test and Study Area drive-through reconnaissance are conducted to obtain location and height representations of the proposed Facility, back-check the initial computer model results and provide documentation from publicly accessible areas. Results of both activities are analyzed and incorporated into the final viewshed map and report.

Q5. Please describe how you prepared the computer-generated viewshed analysis for the Visual Resources Evaluation.

A. Using ERSI’s ArcView® Spatial Analyst, a computer modeling tool, the areas from which the top of the tower is expected to be visible are calculated. This is based on information entered into the computer model, such as tower height, its ground elevation, existing vegetation and surrounding topography. Data incorporated in the model includes 7.5 minute digital elevation models (“DEMs”) and a digital forest layer for the project area. The forested areas within the study area are overlaid on the DEMs and then a series of constraints are applied to the computer model to achieve a realistic estimate of where the tower will be visible from within the surrounding landscape.

Also included in the viewshed model is a data layer, obtained from the Connecticut State Department of Environmental Protection (“DEP”), which depicts various land and water resources such as state parks and forests, recreational facilities, dedicated open space and DEP boat launches.

Additionally, information is gathered from the Connecticut State Department of

Transportation (“DOT”) and local officials to determine if there are any state- or locally-designated scenic or historic roadways within the Study Area.

As stated previously, the results of the in-field analysis (i.e., the balloon float test) are subsequently incorporated into the final viewshed map.

Q6. Please describe how you conducted the balloon test.

A. The balloon float test consisted of floating a balloon, four feet in diameter, to the height of 150 feet at the Site. Once the balloon was aloft, VHB staff photographed it from numerous vantage points within a two-mile radius (the “Study Area”) to determine the actual locations where the proposed tower will be visible.

Q7. How were the representative locations chosen?

A. The location of each photograph was recorded using a hand-held GPS receiver and subsequently plotted on a USGS 7.5 Minute topographic quad map, utilizing ESRI’s ArcView® Spatial Analyst software, to indicate their approximate distance and relative location to the proposed Facility.

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.

Q7. Please describe the visibility of the proposed Facility.

A. In general, the visibility of the proposed Facility will not differ from the visibility of the Existing Facility. Areas from which the proposed Facility will be at least partially visible year-round comprise approximately 51 acres or less than one percent (<1%) of the entire study area with 16 of those acres occurring on the Property itself. In comparison, the Existing Facility is currently visible from approximately 54 acres within the Study Area. We estimate approximately 2 residences will have partial views of the proposed Facility above the existing tree line.

In addition, the proposed Facility will be at least partially visible seasonally (during “leaf off” conditions) from an additional 45 acres and approximately 10 residences will achieve seasonal views of the proposed Facility.

Q8. Will the proposed Facility have any impact on any sensitive visual receptors such as scenic, historic or recreational sites or parks?

A. No, the proposed Facility will not impact any sensitive visual receptors. This opinion is supported by the State Historic Preservation Office (“SHPO”), which concluded that the proposed Facility will have no effect on historic, architectural or archeological resources listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Route 77, which is located within the Study Area, is a state-designated scenic roadway. In addition, the Cockaponsett State Forest is also located in the Study

Area. No views of the proposed Facility are anticipated from either of these sensitive visual receptors.

Q9. Please describe the results of the NEPA screen conducted by VHB.

A. At the request of the Applicant, VHB conducted 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 VHB's review, the proposed Facility does not fall under any listed categories of Section 1.1307. In addition, VHB 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.

VHB received back comments from DEP as well as the United States Department of the Interior stating that there are no known extant populations of Federal or State Endangered, Threatened or Species of Concern at the Site. As previously stated, we received comments from the SHPO concluding that the proposed Facility will have no effect on historic, architectural or archeological resources.

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.

1-8-08  
Date

Michael Libertine  
Michael Libertine

Subscribed and sworn before me this 8th day of January, 2008.

By: Patricia A. Logunski  
Notary  
My Commission  
expires August 31, 2010