



citizen and not as a representative of any organization. I also want to reiterate for the record that, while some of the Siting Council members might know me as the Executive Director of the state Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), I am speaking entirely as an individual citizen. To the extent that the CEQ might have any official role or responsibility in reviewing this application, I am not involved. Upon learning of this application in my neighborhood, I contacted the Office of State Ethics and recused myself from the proceeding at the March 26, 2008 CEQ meeting. Responsibility at the CEQ office was assigned to Environmental Analyst Peter Hearn. I participated in no discussions or correspondence related to this docket. And, of course, all of the time I spend at hearings or meetings related to this docket is my own vacation time, and all preparation, printing, etc. is done out of the office at my own expense. (This disclaimer might seem overly detailed, but I want the record to be clear.)

## 2. Scenic Quality of Proposed Location

Q3. Please describe the topography of the proposed locations for the tower.

This area is marked by a ridgeline running from southwest to northeast. The ridgeline is a part of the Eastern Border Fault (the "EBF"), as shown on Intervenor's Exhibit A. The Eastern Border Fault is prominent because it rises out of the Connecticut River Valley, marking the abrupt transition from the valley to the eastern highlands.

One of the best ways to experience the EBF is to drive east on Route 2. Just east of Exit 9, Neipsic Road, the road turns left and goes steeply upward. As one views the forests on both sides, he/she can see the immediate changes in vegetation (more paper birch trees, fewer eastern cottonwood trees, for example), rocks (with granite and

other igneous rock replacing the sand and sandstone of the valley) and even in the visible wildlife (see below).

Q4. Please describe the steps taken by the Town of Glastonbury to protect this ridgeline.

The 2007-2017 Glastonbury Plan of Conservation and Development, which has previously been admitted as an exhibit to this Docket, calls for the protection of ridgelines (as well as forested slopes) on no fewer than seven pages (with pp. 30, 56, 57, and 63 as examples of detailed text). A “ridgeline” in Glastonbury is a very precise term, in that there are only two, of which the EBF is the more prominent.

The Town of Glastonbury, with the cooperation of local land trusts, individual citizens, and developers, has made an extraordinary effort to protect the scenic values of the EBF ridgeline and slope in the area of the proposed towers. Intervenor’s Exhibit 2 shows open space, including conservation easements, in the immediate vicinity. These green spaces add much to the quality of life in the neighborhoods.

JB Williams Memorial Park was preserved by the town more than 40 years ago. Throughout the 1960’s, 1970’s, 1980’s, 1990’s and the current decade, the town has added to the inventory of protected lands along this ridge (including the recent donations by the Waring and Whitehouse families of substantial acreage south of the proposed facility). The tireless work of a long line of town boards and commissions has left the current residents a gift that deserves careful examination by all parties in all regulatory matters.

In short, the proposed sites are not just two dots on a map: they are points along the slope that defines the central part of Glastonbury and Connecticut.

Q5. Please explain your connection to this ridgeline.

The presence of a conservation easement on the slope directly behind our home figured prominently in our decision to buy our property 25 years ago and in our decision to stay in our home for 25 years.

### 3. Bird Migration As a Scenic Resource

Q6. In addition to the general scenic amenity provided by the ridgeline as discussed in the Town of Glastonbury Plan of Conservation and Development, explain how the migration of birds along the ridgeline is a “scenic resource”.

The location and direction (i.e., northeast-southwest) of the EBF in Glastonbury evidently is attractive to migrating birds, especially birds that soar. Having observed birds on and near our property almost daily for 25 years, I offer the following of my own backyard observations as evidence:

- Each spring for the last three years, I have watched an adult Bald Eagle migrating from southwest to northeast along this ridge.
- Hawk migration can be spectacular under favorable weather conditions. For example, on Sunday May 4, 2008, the sky cleared suddenly in early afternoon and migration conditions for hawks were evidently quite good. In 30 minutes of observation, I watched 11 hawks of four species (including an osprey) following the EBF.
- On the very next morning (May 5), I watched a Great Blue Heron soar along the same path. As the heron never flapped, it appeared to be following a course related to the lift from air currents connected to the slope.

- I see Common Nighthawks (a declining species) follow this path nearly every spring and fall.

To watch a Bald Eagle soar along the slope, over the trees, just as the scene might have appeared 300 years ago, is a remarkable experience, especially in this part of the country. Watching one soar past a telecommunications tower is not at all the same experience.

#### 4. Relative Environmental Impacts of Site A and Site B

Q7. Please explain additional environmental impacts to this area of the proposed tower not already included in the evidence before the Siting Council.

Siting Council staff has prepared a table comparing the characteristics of Site A and Site B, including environmental impacts. I wish to add to the analysis for two of the resources, trees and wetlands/watercourses.

- A. Trees. For many people who live in the Route 2 corridor, trees are virtually the only objects between their homes and the highway. People depend on the trees for visual screening and noise attenuation. While the table accurately notes the number of trees of six inches or greater in diameter at breast height (dbh) – 9 for Site A, 53 for Site B – it does not tell the whole story. The largest of the 9 trees to be cut at Site A is only 12” dbh. At Site B, the *majority* of the 53 trees to be removed are greater than 12” dbh, and some are two and three feet in diameter.
- B. Wetlands/Watercourses. Development of Site B will require disturbance of a small tributary to Hubbard Brook. Hubbard Brook at that point is of very high water quality. This assessment is based on the absence of development in most of the watershed and my observations of brook trout fingerlings in the stream. I

have observed wood turtles (a Connecticut species of special concern) in and near the stream on numerous occasions. Even if sediment from the site can be kept completely out of the stream, it would be preferable to avoid disturbing the wooded stream/wetland complex that provides habitat for the wood turtle and other wildlife.

5. Consideration of Alternatives

To the extent that alternatives are available which reduce the visual impact along the ridgeline, the visual resource would be protected. Even a slightly lower tower at Site A, particularly if it were camouflaged, would be a dramatic improvement over what is proposed.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Karl Wagener

Subscribed and sworn before me this 12<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2008.

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Dayle Hayward  
Notary Public

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL**

<b>Optasite Towers, LLC and Omnipoint Communications, Inc. Application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the Construction, Maintenance and Operation of a Telecommunicatons Facility at 58 Montano Road/618 Neipsic Road in the Town of Glastonbury, Connecticut</b>	) ) ) ) ) ) ) )	<b>Docket No. 359</b>      <b>June 12, 2008</b>
---	--------------------------------------	---

**WITNESS LIST**

The intervenor, Karl Wagener, will present the following witness at the public hearing to be held on June 19, 2008:

1. Karl Wagener.

Dated at Glastonbury, Connecticut this 12<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2008.

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney for the Intervenor  
Eric Knapp, Esq.  
[eknapp@bransewillis.com](mailto:eknapp@bransewillis.com)  
Branse, Willis & Knapp, LLC  
148 Eastern Boulevard  
Suite 301  
Glastonbury, CT 06033  
Tel.: (860) 659-3735  
Fax.: (860) 659-9368

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

This is to certify that a copy of the foregoing has been sent via email and first class mail, postage prepaid, on June 12, 2008, to:

Status Granted	Status Holder (name)	Representative (name, address & telephone number)
Applicant	Optasite Towers, LLC and Omnipoint Communications, Inc.	Julie D. Kohler, Esq. Carrie L. Larson, Esq. Cohen & Wolf 1115 Broad Street Bridgeport, CT 06604 (203) 368-0211 (203) 394-9901 -fax jkohler@cohenandwolf.com clarson@cohenandwolf.com
Party	Town of Glastonbury	Richard J. Johnson Town Manager Town of Glastonbury P.O. Box 6523 Glastonbury, CT 06033 richard.johnson@glastonbury-ct.gov

\_\_\_\_\_  
Eric Knapp





**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

This is to certify that a copy of the foregoing has been sent via email and first class mail, postage prepaid, on June 12, 2008, to:

Status Granted	Status Holder (name)	Representative (name, address & telephone number)
Applicant	Optasite Towers, LLC and Omnipoint Communications, Inc.	Julie D. Kohler, Esq. Carrie L. Larson, Esq. Cohen & Wolf 1115 Broad Street Bridgeport, CT 06604 (203) 368-0211 (203) 394-9901 -fax jkohler@cohenandwolf.com clarson@cohenandwolf.com
Party	Town of Glastonbury	Richard J. Johnson Town Manager Town of Glastonbury P.O. Box 6523 Glastonbury, CT 06033 richard.johnson@glastonbury-ct.gov

---

Eric Knapp