


**FCC NEPA Summary Report
(47 CFR Subpart I, Chapter I, Sections I.1301-I.1319)**

	Site type (choose one): <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Raw land <input type="checkbox"/> Tower colo <input type="checkbox"/> Other colo <input type="checkbox"/> Tower Replacement	Site ID: Amtrak Stonington 3 / CTNL813	Site Address: 166 Pawcatuck Road, Stonington, Connecticut
---	---	--	---

1. Is the antenna structure located in an officially designated wilderness area?

According to a review of the Land Resources Map (Appendix F) and the Department of Agriculture's list of wilderness areas (<http://www.wilderness.net/index.cfm?fuse=NWPS>), the Project Site is not located in an officially designated wilderness area. In addition, according to EBI's review of available on-line resources, the Project Site is not located in a National Park (www.nps.gov/gis), NPS Interactive Map Center), a designated Scenic and Wild River (<http://www.rivers.gov/wildriverslist.html>), a land area managed by the Bureau of Land Management (www.blm.gov/nhp/facts/index.htm), or within 1 mile of a National Scenic Trail as identified by the National Park Service (http://www.nps.gov/ncrc/programs/nts/nts_trails.html).

2. Is the antenna structure located in an officially designated wildlife preserve?

According to a review of the Land Resources Map (Appendix F), the Project Site is not located in an officially designated wildlife preserve. In addition, according to EBI's review of available on-line resources, the Project Site is not located in a US Fish and Wildlife Service National Wildlife Refuge (<http://www.fws.gov/refuges/refugeLocatorMaps/index.html>).

3. Will the antenna structure likely affect threatened or endangered species or designated critical habitats? (Ref. 50 CFR Part 402)

According to a review of the Land Resources Map (Appendix F), no federally-listed threatened or endangered species habitats or designated critical habitats are located in the vicinity of the Project Site.

The Land Resources Map (Appendix F) also contains data from the Natural Diversity Data Base (NDDDB), which represent approximate locations of endangered, threatened and special concern species and significant natural communities in Connecticut. These data are compiled and maintained in the NDDDB. The maps are intended to be a pre-screening tool to identify potential impacts to state-listed species. Based on our review, there are no state-listed species in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, based on the information currently available to us, provided by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFV) dated January 4, 2010, and a review of the listed endangered species for Connecticut, one federally listed endangered or threatened species was identified in New London County. The following table compares the species habitat and the conditions at the Project Site:

Status	Listing	Species Habitat	Project Site Habitat	Determination of Effect
Federally Threatened	Piping Plover	Coastal beaches	Cleared agricultural field along Amtrak Right-of-Way	No Effect- no coastal beaches at Project Site

Based on a review of the state list of threatened and endangered species, the habitat at the Project Site does not match the habitats of listed threatened and endangered species identified in the vicinity of the Project Site. Copies of this correspondence are included in Appendix G.

Additionally based upon the proposed monopole design and 120-foot height it is unlikely that the proposed telecommunications installation would adversely impact migratory bird species protected under

the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Endangered Species Act. Therefore, EBI concludes that the proposed project is unlikely to affect threatened or endangered species.

4. Will the antenna structure affect districts, sites, buildings, structures, or objects significant in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, or culture that are listed, or potentially eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)? (Ref. 36 CFR Part 800 regulations implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act).

EBI reviewed the proposed project plans against the Exclusions of the *Nationwide Programmatic Agreement Regarding the Section 106 National Historic Preservation Act Review Process* (NPA). EBI concluded that the proposed tower construction does not meet any of the Exclusions listed in Section III of the NPA. Therefore, consultation with the Connecticut State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) was required.

Based on EBI's review of files online at the National Register Information System (www.nr.nps.gov), Connecticut SHPO, and the map of Known Cultural Resources provided by Heritage Consultants, LLC, no Historic Properties were identified within the ½-mile Area of Potential Effect (APE) for visual effects of the proposed tower.

Vanessa P. Sullivan, Field Archaeologist under the direct supervision of EBI Senior Archaeologist Christine Kimbrough, PhD, RPA, performed a Phase I Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment of the proposed Project Site for the likelihood of containing archaeological resources. Ms. Sullivan concluded that "In light of the available information, it is my professional opinion that the APE-DE for the present project is not sensitive for the presence of significant prehistoric or historic archaeological resources. Accordingly, I recommend that no further archeological research be conducted in conjunction with the present project."

EBI submitted project plans, the results of the archaeological survey, and a request for comment on FCC Form 620 to the Connecticut SHPO on September 29, 2009. In correspondence dated September 30, 2009, the Connecticut SHPO concurred with our determination, stating that "the proposed undertaking will have no effect of historic; architectural; or archaeological resources listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places." Please see Appendix D for copies of this correspondence.

In the unlikely event that unanticipated Historic Properties, cultural artifacts, archeological deposits, or human remains are inadvertently encountered during the proposed construction and associated excavation activities, *T-Mobile Northeast, LLC* must halt activities immediately and contact the appropriate local officials and state agencies, in accordance with Federal and State regulations (36 CFR 800.13(b)).

5. Will the antenna structure affect Indian religious site(s)

Based on the requirements of the *Nationwide Programmatic Agreement Regarding the Section 106 National Historic Preservation Act Review Process* (NPA), Tribal consultation was required for this project because the proposed tower construction did not meet Exclusions A, B, C or F of the NPA.

EBI submitted documentation regarding the proposed project to the FCC's Tower Construction Notification System (TCNS). On September 25, 2009 the FCC's TCNS sent the project information to Tribes listed on their database who have interest in the state in which the project is planned. Additionally, EBI submitted follow-up requests for comment to each of the Tribes indicated by the TCNS to have a potential interest in the area of the project.

Tribal communication to date for this project is summarized in the following table.

#	Tribe Name	Initial Notification (via TCNS)	Response to Initial Contact	Second Contact Attempt	Response to Second Attempt	Action Recommended
1	Mohegan Indian Tribe	September 25, 2009	Concurrence received December 15, 2009	N/A	N/A	No Further Action
2	Mashantucket Pequot Tribe	September 25, 2009	Request for Archeology Phase I Survey Received September 23, 2009	Archeology Report Submitted December 14, 2009	Concurrence received December 16, 2009	No Further Action
3	Narragansett Indian Tribe	September 25, 2009	Concurrence received December 4, 2009	N/A	N/A	No Further Action

Please note, in the unlikely event that unanticipated Historic Properties, cultural artifacts, archeological deposits, or human remains are inadvertently encountered during the proposed construction and associated excavation activities, *T-Mobile Northeast, LLC* must halt activities immediately and contact the appropriate tribal governments, local officials and state agencies, in accordance with Federal and State regulations (36 CFR 800.13(b)).

Correspondence between EBI and the Tribes that includes copies of the Tower Construction Notification System emails, follow-up correspondence, and Tribal responses are appended to this *Report* (Appendix E).

6. Will the antenna structure be located in a floodplain? (Ref. Executive Order 11988 and 40 CFR Part 6, Appendix A)

According to the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map data for Stonington, Connecticut (Community Map #090106, Panel #0017F) included on the Land Resources Map (Appendix F), the Project Site is not located within a 100-year floodplain. A review of the Flood Insight Flood Zone determination (Appendix I) confirmed that the Project Site is not located within a floodplain.

7. Will construction of the antenna structure involve significant change in surface features (e.g. wetlands, deforestation, or water diversion)? (Ref. Executive Order 11990 and 40 CFR Part 6, Appendix A)

It is EBI's opinion that no documented or potential wetlands are located at or within a 100-foot radius of the proposed tower based upon the following facts:

- Limited or no hydric vegetation was observed at the tower site and soils were noted to be disturbed and compacted. Additionally, no surface water was observed at the proposed tower site.
- According to the Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) information (Appendix H), which is included on the Wetlands Map, no mapped wetlands are located at or within close proximity to the proposed tower site.
- According to the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey (WSS) website (<http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/>), the dominant soil composition in the vicinity of the Project Site is classified as Canton and Charlton soils, 3 to 8 percent slopes, very stony (61B). The Canton component makes up 45 percent of the map unit. The Charlton component makes up 35 percent of the map unit. This component is on hills, uplands. These soils do not meet the characteristics of hydric soils necessary to support wetland vegetation.

The area proposed to be occupied by *T-Mobile Northeast, LLC* consists of disturbed agricultural lands which are relatively rocky, yet have generally flat topography. The proposed construction plans do not call for

the removal of mature trees; therefore, the proposed installation will not result in deforestation. According to the proposed construction plans and onsite observations, surface water body diversion will not occur.

8. Is the antenna structure located in a residential neighborhood and required to be equipped with high intensity white lights?

According to client representatives and site plans, the proposed installation will not include high intensity white lights and be located in a residential neighborhood.

9a. Will the antenna structure equal or exceed total power (of all channels) of 2000 Watts ERP (3280 EIRP) and have antenna located less than 10 meters above the ground?

9b. Will the rooftop antenna project equal or exceed total power (of all channels) of 2000 Watts ERP (3280 EIRP)?

An evaluation to determine whether radiofrequency (RF) emissions standards are met was not included as part of this *Report*. EBI understands that client representatives will evaluate the project to ensure compliance with applicable RF standards.