

**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 BRAD GANNON

Q1. Mr. Gannon, please summarize your professional background in telecommunications.

A. I am a partner at MCF Communications bg, Inc. ("MCF"). I have been part of the telecommunications industry for 7 years and my primary focus is on property development, site acquisition, lease contract negotiations, permitting and construction of newly-approved towers.

I have successfully completed various aspects of development activities for more than 80 sites in Connecticut in addition to other sites throughout New England.

Q2. What is the purpose of your testimony?

A. My testimony provides background information relating to this application for a certificate of environmental compatibility and public need for the proposed Bolton facility. In addition, I will address the specific site search resulting in the

proposed site and MCF and T-Mobile's activities prior to initiation of this application.

Q3. What is MCF's and T-Mobile's relationship in this application?

A. As described in detail below, MCF has a working relationship with T-Mobile to co-develop new tower facilities in the State of Connecticut. T-Mobile identified a need for a new facility in this area of Bolton and MCF conducted the site search. The arrangement between T-Mobile and MCF provides for MCF and T-Mobile to make a joint application to the Council; for MCF to own, construct and maintain the site as the Certificate holder; and for T-Mobile to serve as the anchor tenant.

Q4. How does MCF conduct a site search?

A. MCF maintains a close relationship with T-Mobile, follows the development activities of others and has an in-depth understanding of the fluctuating market conditions. When T-Mobile contacted MCF regarding the need for a new facility in this area of Bolton, MCF began its review of the area. The first activity after assignment of a search ring to acquisition personnel is a review of the area for a suitable existing structure. Only once MCF exhausts its search for existing structures on which to locate does it then begin to study the area for suitable locations to construct a new facility.

Once it is determined that no existing structures are suitable for co-location does MCF then begin to search for sites to construct a new facility.

Potential locations are studied by radio frequency engineers to determine whether the locations will meet the technical requirements for a site in the area. Obviously, the list of potential locations is further refined based on the willingness of property owners to make their property available.

Q6. Please describe MCF's search for the proposed Bolton wireless facility.

A. MCF commenced a search for a site in this area of Bolton around August 9th, 2005. In that area, MCF found no existing towers suitable for use as a wireless communications facility. In addition, MCF identified no existing structures which were suitable for use and available. MCF did investigate the existing CL&P distribution lines on the property at 12 Carpenter Road. However, the height of these wooden poles was not sufficient to meet T-Mobile's RF needs in this area. In addition, CL&P has indicated that it is not willing to allow any carrier to co-locate on these lines.

Turning to locations for a new tower proposal, MCF found that site selection in the area was limited by residential development throughout the area. In addition, MCF investigated several parcels of land in the search area owned by the Town of Manchester. After discussing these parcels with the Town on several occasions, the Town indicated to MCF that these properties were classified as Class II Watershed and that the Town of Manchester was not willing to change the classification of those properties to permit the proposed Facility. The proposed Veo property was uniquely suited to development of a tower site

due to its large size and natural screening due to mature vegetation on the Site as well as its proximity to Interstate I-384.

Q7. Have the Applicants consulted with municipal officials with regard to their plans?

A. Yes. In compliance with Section 16-50/(e), consultation with municipal officials was undertaken by MCF. On behalf of MCF, I hand-delivered copies of the technical report to both the Town of Bolton and the Town of Manchester. In addition, I have met with various representatives from both towns prior to the filing of this Application. I have continued to discuss this Application with those representatives since the filing of this Application.

Q8. Have the Applicants had any contact with the neighbors regarding this Application?

Prior to December 2, 2006, MCF contacted numerous neighbors by telephone and also sent out a certified mailing to all abutting property owners inviting them to a visit of the Site and informational meeting on December 2, 2006. On that date, I conducted an informal meeting with numerous neighbors. The neighbors met me at the Site and voiced their questions and concerns regarding the proposed Facility.

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

1-16-07

Date

Brad Gannon

Brad Gannon

Subscribed and sworn before me this 16th day of January, 2007.

By:

Notary

KASEY M. VIVENZIO
NOTARY PUBLIC
STATE OF RHODE ISLAND
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES 1-13-09