

**From:** [Bob Norman](#)  
**To:** [Bolstridge, Karen](#)  
**Subject:** Ext. USCC tower Big Lake Twp.  
**Date:** Friday, September 19, 2014 11:40:51 AM

---

Karen,

I must say this Notice Of Extension for the US Cellar Tower in Big Lake Twp. is becoming more ludicrous. After the 8/13/14 meeting at the Princeton Elementary School I sent you an e-mail confirming my support for this telecommunication tower. It is a matter of safety as expressed by many who spoke at the meeting.

Why would a special meeting be reopened at a location in Brewer, Me. to hear a testimony by Scott Kadey who is from the Washington, DC area obviously coming to support his father Dana Kadey who opposes this facility. ? This meeting location is quite an inconvenience to the residents of Big Lake Twp. who might be interested in hearing the testimony of Scott Kadey. The residents of Big Lake Twp. also know that the only reason Mr. Kadey opposes this facility is that he wants it on his property for his own personal gain.

I can't believe you and your committee have prolonged this project for the benefit that so many want and need. It's funny also that each of the 3 opponents that spoke at the 8/13 meeting all have cell phones.

Regards,

Bob Norman

**From:** [Pam Cochran](#)  
**To:** [Bolstridge, Karen](#)  
**Subject:** DP 4944  
**Date:** Friday, September 19, 2014 1:40:31 PM

---

I was very upset to receive the Notice of Extension letter re: DP 4944 yesterday. I am frustrated to think you have postponed a decision once again.

It really upset me to read further and find: the hearing will be reopened at 9:00 a.m. on Wed., Oct. 8, 2014.....for the limited purpose of allowing Scott Kadey to testify on DP 4944. My frustration stems from the fact everyone else was told they could send written comments to the Bangor address or to your email. I am not sure why this one person merits a special hearing. He is not a resident and he left here when he graduated in the late 1980s and has not been back except to rarely visit his father Dana Kadey.

It seems like a very shady deal to say the least. Especially since it will be in Brewer at 9:00 a.m. Sure, we are offered a chance to send rebuttals to your address or email but we would have to be in attendance to hear what he had to say. It seems unfair to say the least that you hold a 'special' hearing for just one person. I'm sure he could have received the information regarding DP 4944 and mailed or emailed his opinion just like anyone else since he was not in attendance at the August hearing.

As I'm sure you realize, Big Lake Twp is a 2 hour ride from Brewer, an inconvenience for a 9:00 a.m. hearing. It should also be evident many more people want to have the cell phone tower than the very few who have opposed it's location for their own varied reasons.

Sincerely frustrated, Pamela Cochran

P.S. Please keep in mind this cell phone tower would benefit not only Big Lake Twp. but also residents of Princeton, Grand Lake Stream, Indian Township, Camp owners on the Yates Point Road, The Big Lake Camp Grounds, and The Stud Mill Road not to mention the Fire Dept., Indian Township Police Dept. and the Ambulances of this area.

**From:** [C. Newman](#)  
**To:** [Bolstridge, Karen](#)  
**Subject:** Cell Phone Tower Big Lake Twp  
**Date:** Friday, September 19, 2014 4:06:43 PM

---

I am in favor of the tower on the Cochran property, and the meeting that is set for the limited purpose of hearing Mr. Scott Kadey testify is outrageous, anyone attending should be allowed to speak. Mr. Scott Kadey does not even live in this area..

We need this tower. my cell is the only phone I have and it's hit or miss here in this area.. The Cochrans have the perfect spot and so richly deserve this. To move the tower to another property right next door as Mr. Kadey's father has suggested is nothing but greed in my opinion. Keep the proposed tower on the original site..

We need good cell service, It would not only be good for Big Lake, Princeton, but for Grand Lake Stream and the other small towns.

I was not able to attend the meetings as I do work, But i want my voice heard. Allow the tower to be built on the Cochran's property..

Thank you  
Carol Newman  
Princeton Me

**From:** [leslie.monk@rocketmail.com](mailto:leslie.monk@rocketmail.com)  
**To:** [Bolstridge, Karen](#)  
**Cc:** [RepBethTurner@gmail.com](mailto:RepBethTurner@gmail.com); [SenDavid.Burns@legislature.maine.gov](mailto:SenDavid.Burns@legislature.maine.gov)  
**Subject:** Big Lake Township Cell Tower  
**Date:** Saturday, September 20, 2014 9:12:01 AM

---

I sent a prior email to be added to public record regarding the cell phone tower in Big Lake Township. I noticed this morning that my email has not been added. I sent my email on September 4.

I am very much in favor of a cell phone tower in Big Lake Township. I do not believe that the tower will hurt the natural beauty in our area. When I look up at the sky (day or night) I look at the stars, etc. A tower may be seen from certain areas, but the benefits far outweigh the negatives.

I live and play in the area, with my husband and two small children. There is virtually no cell service in that area, which could mean life or death in an emergency situation. I pray that I never need the service for that reason, but I worry that it is inevitable that someone will suffer unnecessarily if we do not get better cell service in this area.

Please also keep in mind how often land lines are down in this area. A cell tower would alleviate a lot of unneeded stress for families in this area when this happens.

Sincerely,

Leslie Monk  
9 Petticoat Hill  
Princeton, ME 04668

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [margaret\\_cochran](mailto:margaret_cochran)  
**To:** [Bolstridge, Karen](mailto:bolstridge_karen)  
**Cc:** [repbethturner@gmail.com](mailto:repbethturner@gmail.com); [sendavidburns@legislature.manie.gov](mailto:sendavidburns@legislature.manie.gov)  
**Subject:** Cell tower in Big Lake Twsp.  
**Date:** Saturday, September 20, 2014 10:12:42 AM

---

I just have a question about this latest development on the cell tower in Big Lake Township. Actually, I have three or four/

1. If what we had to say at the hearing in Princeton on August 13, 2014 has no influence on the outcome, why is there a special hearing for one person to speak?
2. Why is what he has to say matter more than the hundreds of proponents who are for the tower?
3. Why, if Scott Kadey is so interested in his property, is the meeting being held in Brewer? It makes it very difficult for the working people who actually live in this county and township and surrounding area to attend. If he was so interested in his property, why did he not make the time to come to the hearing in August?

I guess I have a lot of questions. I will say, my husband has been diagnosed with cancer and we have lots of phone calls going back and forth and the cell phone keeps us connected when we are away from home WHEN we can get reception which is not dependable here or in the surrounding area.

Thank you,  
Margaret S. Cochran

**From:** [Bethany Borden](#)  
**To:** [Bolstridge, Karen](#)  
**Cc:** [RepBethTurner@gmail.com](mailto:RepBethTurner@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** cell phone tower in Big Lake Township  
**Date:** Saturday, September 20, 2014 11:01:33 AM

---

I'm a single mother with three children and I live in Princeton. If its decided that the cell phone tower can be built, it will benefit me as well as many others. And to be honest, i dont understand what all the fuss is about. Even if it weren't going to benefit anyone besides Chris and Melanie Cochran, they have two children with special needs and they have a right to be able to contact emergency services if they need to. There are very few people that use land lines anymore, cell phones are a way of life now. Nothing is uglier than telephone poles but people don't complain about that because they want their electricity. And this cell phone tower will be a lot less intrusive than telephone poles are, They are even making cell phone towers in national parks now, these towers are made to look like tree's. And quite frankly, i don't understand how anyone has the right to tell anyone else that they cant put something on their own property. I could understand if someone was wanting to build this right in the middle of town and they were possibly creating an eye sore in a largely public area, but Big Lake Township is at the very end of Princeton in an area that few people will ever see it or know that its there. I know someone who works for the fire department who has stated that the tower will even benefit the department. How can we say no to something that will even benefit our emergency services? This isnt just about one family, its about the whole town and what is best for the town. And in this case, the benefits/pros by far out weight the cons. I think its a little bit ridiculous that this has turned into the problem that it has, and that it is taking so long to make a decision. I hope that the delays in making a decision turn out to be worth the wait.

Sincerely,  
Bethany

**From:** [chrisnmel@pwless.net](mailto:chrisnmel@pwless.net)  
**To:** [Bolstridge, Karen](#)  
**Cc:** [RepBethTurner@gmail.com](mailto:RepBethTurner@gmail.com); [SenDavid.Burns@legislature.maine.gov](mailto:SenDavid.Burns@legislature.maine.gov)  
**Date:** Saturday, September 20, 2014 11:32:16 AM

---

Good Morning! My husband Christopher Cochran and I would first like to thank all of the commissioners for their time and effort put into considering the proposed tower on our property. We would also like to thank you all for coming to Princeton and holding a public hearing for interested people. We understand that you have put much time and effort into this proposal. We are also writing to you now with a few questions and concerns. We are concerned about the process following the public hearing that was held in August. The hearing was held at a difficult time for people to attend. Many interested people were not aware of this meeting. The Princeton Town Office was unaware of this hearing. The Passamaquoddy Tribal Council were also unaware of this hearing. Many people had to leave work early, not go to work that day, or not be able to attend the hearing at all. As you could see... many people still came to the hearing to show their support for the construction of the tower. At the end of the hearing we were asked to send emails to the commission stating for public record if we were in favor or not in favor of the tower. I have seen the public records myself. I see that most are in favor of constructing the tower. Some people have come to me concerned that their emails have not been entered into the public records. I am unsure of the reasoning for this. I would also like to ask why the hearing will be closed and reopened again? Is this for the one person that demanded any further actions of this proposal be halted? Why was Mr. Scott Kadey not asked to send a formal email with his comments on the proposal like the many people that went to the public hearing in August? As people who couldn't make the hearing were advised to do. Does reopening the hearing for Wednesday, October 8 mean that interested persons that could not make the August hearing in Princeton can come to the hearing in October to testify? Or is the hearing just for Mr. Kadey? If yes. Why is it being held just for him? We would also like to ask why the reopening of the hearing is being held in Brewer on such a day and time that would not be possible for many to attend? I am receiving many messages and emails with many concerns about how this process is going. We know that you are all very busy people, but it seems that there are many questions and concerns from the majority of the town and area that should be considered. Please consider this a public record. Thank you so much for your attention in this process!

Sincerely,

Chris and Melanie Cochran  
PO Box 143  
Princeton, Maine  
04668

or

983 West St.  
Big Lake Twp., ME  
04668

**From:** [Sharon Norman](#)  
**To:** [Bolstridge, Karen](#)  
**Cc:** [Beth Turner](#); [sendavid.burns@legislature.maine.gov](mailto:sendavid.burns@legislature.maine.gov)  
**Subject:** Cell tower in Big Lake Township  
**Date:** Saturday, September 20, 2014 4:13:20 PM

---

Hi Karen,

I understand you are not in the office, but I wanted to write my concern about the "new" hearing on the U.S. Cell Tower in Big Lake Township scheduled for Oct. 8 @ 9:00 a.m. in Brewer. I wrote to you, via email, after the Aug mtg to comment as we were instructed to do at the hearing at Princeton Elementary School. I do understand there is a process. What I don't understand in this situation is why schedule a separate hearing to listen to one individual. If I as a supporter of the tower wish to have another hearing, would I be afforded the same opportunity? If this is the case this "process" could go on into the next year. I understand you have a need to listen to all sides which is appreciated. Everyone had the "same" opportunity at the hearing to express his/her opinions plus you extended the date to forward comments to you. That was appreciated. But for those of us who have spotty cell service at best, we would like the tower in place sooner rather than later.

Thank you for the chance to express how important this cell tower is to so many of us.

Sincerely,

Sharon Norman

Big Lake Township

**From:** [Pam Cochran](#)  
**To:** [Bolstridge, Karen](#)  
**Cc:** [SenDavidBurns@legislature.maine.gov](mailto:SenDavidBurns@legislature.maine.gov); [repbethturner@gmail.com](mailto:repbethturner@gmail.com); [chrisnmel@pwless.net](mailto:chrisnmel@pwless.net)  
**Subject:** DP 4944  
**Date:** Saturday, September 20, 2014 5:05:51 PM

---

Karen,

First I wish to apologize for not having all the facts correctly stated in my earlier email. I did not realize Scott Kadey had acquired any property in Big Lake Twp. This fact seems to have been overlooked by others as well since I thought all of the neighbors of this property received notification of the proposal at a much earlier date.

Second I wish to express my continued support of having this cell phone tower installed on Chris Cochran's property. I do not think the location will cause excessive noise from the wind or too much light obstructing the night skies. Lights from the Princeton Airport and from the mill in Baileyville, (Woodland) are visible from lots of locations in our area and they do not present any issues. My home and property are located across the street from the Chris Cochran property and I look forward to the tower and improved cell phone service. Presently we have to search for service which can be stressful during storms, illness and power outages.

Thank you,

Pamela Cochran

998 West St., Big Lake Twp.

P.O.Box 693

Princeton, ME 04668

**From:** [Deborah Daggett](#)  
**To:** [Bolstridge, Karen](#)  
**Cc:** [SenDavid.Burns@legislature.maine.gov](mailto:SenDavid.Burns@legislature.maine.gov); [RepBethTurner@gmail.com](mailto:RepBethTurner@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** DP 4944 Big Lake Township  
**Date:** Sunday, September 21, 2014 12:21:54 PM

---

Karen,

I am writing in support of the cell tower on Big Lake Township. Having a cell tower would improve safety and communication in this rural area, for it's residents as well as those who spend time in the area for whatever reasons. Please enter this testimony as public record.

Thank you,  
Deborah Daggett

**From:** [Brad R](#)  
**To:** [Bolstridge, Karen](#); [senatorburns@myfairpoint.net](mailto:senatorburns@myfairpoint.net); [repbethturner@gmail.com](mailto:repbethturner@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** US Cellular Tower for Big Lake Township.  
**Date:** Sunday, September 21, 2014 8:48:06 PM

---

I am writing to voice my concerns on the recent letter that was mailed to the Cochran's this past week. I support the building of a cell tower on the Cochran property in Big Lake Twp.

It seems that the comment period has been extended again.... This hardly seems necessary to hold a hearing for Scott Kadey. Scott Kadey is Dana Kadey's son and there is no reason that he could not submit his comments just like everyone else has. I feel it is unfair that a person that lives in Conneticut should be allowed their own "limited" hearing to speak for 3 minutes the same as everyone that spoke at the August 12 hearing did.

When the hearing was held in Princeton in August we all were led to believe that a decision would be made at the September meeting. Now it will be November before a decision is made on wether the tower is to be constructed or not.

Thank you

Brad Richard  
643 West Street  
Princeton, ME 04668

**From:** [Gary](#)  
**To:** [Bolstridge, Karen](#)  
**Cc:** [repbethturner@gmail.com](mailto:repbethturner@gmail.com); [senatorburns@myfairpoint.net](mailto:senatorburns@myfairpoint.net)  
**Subject:** Big Lake Twp Cell Tower  
**Date:** Sunday, September 21, 2014 9:47:10 PM

---

Ms. Bolstridge,

I am writing you today in regards of the new cell phone tower that is proposed to go up in Big Lake Township. I am of the understanding that there is a delay in the building of said tower. As a concerned citizen and one that is not only a law enforcement officer but also an avid outdoorsman. The longer that this tower is delayed the longer people in emergency situations may be without life saving communications. I would just like to know what would hold up or delay such a tower being built. I for one feel that being such a rural community that more cell phone service coverage is a necessity. We have thousands of tourists or seasonal residents that would benefit from it as well. Please if you can explain to me why such an important project could be held up.

Thank you for your time,

Gary J. Bryant II  
A concerned citizen.

Sent from Samsung tablet

**From:** [Livesay, Nicholas](#)  
**To:** [Bolstridge, Karen](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Cochran, Melanie - Website: Share Your Views  
**Date:** Monday, September 22, 2014 4:03:38 PM

---

Please add to the record. These are comments that have been forwarded from the Governor's Office.

-----Original Message-----

From: [chrismel@pwless.net](mailto:chrismel@pwless.net) [<mailto:chrismel@pwless.net>]  
Sent: Sunday, September 21, 2014 11:10 AM  
To: Governor  
Subject: Cochran, Melanie - Website: Share Your Views

Melanie  
[chrismel@pwless.net](mailto:chrismel@pwless.net)  
207-796-0736  
PO Box 143  
Princeton, Maine 04668

I am writing in reference to a proposed cell phone tower on me and my husbands property. The LUPC has issued this as DP 4944. Almost two years ago Black Diamond Consultants knocked on our door asking if we would be interested in allowing a 250 foot tower on our property. With careful consideration we agreed to proceed with allowing the tower. Applications were submitted. Notifications sent to land owners. Permits were already approved. A public hearing was requested by very few local land owners. There was a hearing held at Princeton Elementary School on August 13, 2014. The hearing was located on a day and time that was very difficult for people to attend. The local town office and many locals were not even aware of this hearing. There was a huge attendance in favor of the tower. There was at least 50 people at this hearing. There was probably 5 people in attendance that were not in favor. At the end of the hearing we were advised by LUPC to send emails to the commission. If !

people were not able to attend the hearing, they were also advised to send an email. The hearing was documented to close on August 25th. That time has now been extended to October 27th! LUPC is reopening the hearing to allow one sole person who is not in favor of this tower to attend a hearing in Brewer on October 8, 2014. The community is in an uproar. There are concerns about allowing this one person to attend a hearing just for him. The questions are ... Why is this one person the only one to be allowed at this hearing? Why was he not advised to send his testimony in writing or email such as everyone else that couldn't attend the hearing was? I would also like to state that the people in the area that are not in favor are not against cell phone towers. They want the tower placed on the property of their choice. When the local townspeople heard about US Cellulars plan to construct this tower on our property...they were very excited. Excited for cell phone service. Excited fo! r our family. Having two children with Autism... the tower would be a great asset to the safety of our children as well as a financial help. Having cell phone service in this area will benefit so many people. In emergency situations cell phone service can be a critical life saver. We feel that those who are not in favor of the tower have had plenty of time and opportunity to let their voices be heard. Those in favor have also had plenty of time. This just seems to be lingering on and on. While there is a community wanting service in the area. We are all beginning to question how this has been handled by LUPC since the hearing in August. People are simply disgusted...

**From:** [Sue McIver](#)  
**To:** [Bolstridge, Karen](#)  
**Cc:** [RepBethTurner@gmail.com](mailto:RepBethTurner@gmail.com); [SenDavid.Burns@legislature.maine.gov](mailto:SenDavid.Burns@legislature.maine.gov)  
**Subject:** Cell Tower in Big Lake Township  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 23, 2014 8:35:47 AM

---

Good Morning,

First of all I would like to personally thank-you for all that you do for our Great State and County, it is very much appreciated. I am however very upset at the extensions on the cell tower in Big Lake Township. After attending the Meeting at the Princeton School it should have been a closed issue. With only 3 opposed.

We own a home on the Lake in Big Lake Township. We are one of the very few on the Lake that have cell service. The service is at certain parts of our home and property but in emergency situations we do have it. One year ago on July 19th my Husband and Grandson had just arrived at the Lake at 5:30 PM and were opening up windows. My Husband had been upstairs and went to go down the stairs when his Patella Tendon broke causing him to fall down a flight of stairs. He was unable to get up and stay up. Our 7 year old Grandson was able to call his Dad to come for help. If we had not had cell service a bad situation would have been so much worse as I was out and would not have returned home until around 10:30 PM. My husband would have had to lay there for hour and not to say how this would have affected our Grandson.

We were so blessed to have had service. I would like to have you move quickly on this so that our Neighbors can also have the service that is needed. It seems to me that greed is at the root of this delay as Mr. Kadey and his Son would like to have it on their property. We really feel that the Cochran property was a good choice, as the extra income would be a real blessing to the Cochran Family. Mrs. Cochran is unable to work as she has 2 Autistic Children and is a full time responsibility.

Please do not delay this any longer as many would definitely benefit from it. Isn't life more precious than the look of a Cell Tower. Please stop to think if you had a home in this area what would be best for the safety of your Family. Thank-You for taking the time to read this.

Respectfully Yours,

Sue McIver

Baileysville and Big Lake Township Resident

**From:** [Cochran-Barnes, Michele](#)  
**To:** [Bolstridge, Karen](#); [Beth Turner](#); [SenDavid.Burns@legislature.maine.gov](mailto:SenDavid.Burns@legislature.maine.gov)  
**Subject:** cell tower in Big Lake Township  
**Date:** Saturday, September 27, 2014 8:36:08 AM

---

Significant time has passed since the date which LURC set to be the "decision" date for allowing/not allowing a US Cellular tower to be constructed on the property of Christopher Cochran in Big Lake Township. Once again, you are extending this deadline; however, you are now doing so for one individual, Scott Kadey. In my opinion, I do not see this as an ethical decision. When you left Princeton Elementary School on August 13, 2014, you said that if people were not able to attend the public meeting to voice their concerns then they should contact you via email or phone, and now you are holding ANOTHER meeting for ONE individual. Are you treating all parties involved with equity?

Having a cell tower in Big Lake Township will not only benefit "Dixie" residents, but also surrounding areas as well. I think of my student(s) who live(s) on West Street who are unable to connect to WIFI with their MLTI devices because of lack of Internet service. US Cellular's Home Service would be a great asset to enhancing their learning and connectivity. Also, hunting season is upon us. It is essential to have cell phone service in case of emergency. In addition, we live in a low socioeconomic area, and many families could save \$600 dollars a year if they only could receive cell service then they could drop their land-line phone. The advantages of having a cell phone tower on the property of Christopher Cochran (at an elevation providing peak signal performance) far outweighs the disadvantages.

It is with hope that you will act on this final date with the decision "declaring it to be in public interest, for the public benefit, for the good order of the people of this State and for the benefit of the property owners and residents of the unorganized and deorganized townships of the State..." (TITLE 12. CONSERVATION LAND USE PLANNING 12 § 681. Purpose and Scope)

Sincerely,

--

Michele Cochran-Barnes  
assistant to the principal Princeton Elementary School  
AP ELA grades 5-8 (G/T) and K-8 Computer Teacher  
MLTI teacher & tech lead  
RTI & curriculum mapper coach  
WJSHS varsity volleyball coach

**From:** [Livesay, Nicholas](#)  
**To:** [Bolstridge, Karen](#)  
**Subject:** FW: FW: Cochran, Melanie - Website: Share Your Views  
**Date:** Monday, September 29, 2014 9:27:30 AM

---

FYI

-----Original Message-----

From: Eastman, Kathy  
Sent: Monday, September 29, 2014 9:22 AM  
To: Condon, Patricia A.; Livesay, Nicholas; Wells, Mari; Whitcomb, Walt  
Subject: FW: FW: Cochran, Melanie - Website: Share Your Views

FYI - Mrs. Cochran's response.

Thanks,  
Kathy

-----Original Message-----

From: chrisnmel@pwless.net [<mailto:chrisnmel@pwless.net>]  
Sent: Sunday, September 28, 2014 9:14 AM  
To: Eastman, Kathy  
Subject: Re: FW: Cochran, Melanie - Website: Share Your Views

Mrs. Eastman,

Thank you so much for addressing my concerns. I also appreciate Mr. Livesay's response. I am aware of how much time and effort has been put into this proposal by LUPC. I also was under the impression that Dana Kadey was the owner of the property spoken of. This must have been a recent transaction between Dana Kadey and his son Scott Kadey. I have lived in Big Lake Twp. all of my life (except for six years) and Dana Kadey has always been the owner of that property...As far as I know. I apologize to you and LUPC for the misunderstanding. I know you are all busy people. Thank you so much for your time in this matter.

Sincerely,

Melanie Cochran

- > Good afternoon Mrs. Cochran:
- >
- > Your email (below) to the Governor's Office was forwarded to us here
- > at the Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry for a response.
- >
- > First, let me thank you for contacting us with your concerns. I have
- > asked Nick Livesay, our Executive Director for LUPC to field your
- > concerns. Below is his response:
- >
- > The matter Mrs. Cochran refers to relates to ongoing permit
- > application review for a 250 foot cell tower proposed in Big Lake
- > Township. I will see that her email is added to the permitting record.
- >
- > As background, on August 13, the Commission held a public hearing on

- > the proposal in Princeton, a town neighboring Big Lake. Princeton was
- > selected because it was the closest location to the proposed cell
- > tower site with a facility (a school) where the Commission could hold
- > the public hearing. Consistent with the Commission's rules, notice of
- > the hearing was published twice in the Bangor Dailey News and mailed
- > to persons owning or leasing land within 1,000 feet of the proposed
- > project, County Commissioners, legislators representing Big Lake Twp. (Sen. Burns and Rep.
- > Turner, both of whom requested a public hearing), and individuals
- > requesting to be notified.
- >
- > Following the Aug. 13 public hearing and just before the written
- > comment period after the hearing was scheduled to close, the
- > Commission received a comment from Mr. Scott Kadey claiming that he
- > owns land in Princeton abutting the property proposed for development
- > with the cell tower. The boundary between Big Lake and Princeton runs
- > along the rear of the Cochrans' Big Lake property and Mr. Scott Kadey
- > claimed he owns the property on the Princeton side of the boundary.
- > He also claimed that he had not received notice of the public hearing
- > and that as an abutting property owner he should have received notice.
- > He called for the permitting process to be stopped.
- >
- > This claim of ownership came as a surprise to the Commission. Up to
- > that point Mr. Dana Kadey (Scott's father) and one of the individuals
- > who requested a public hearing, had continually conducted himself as
- > though, and created the impression that, he was the owner. Most
- > recently, for example, on Aug. 12 the Commission held a site visit.
- > During this visit the Commission toured the Cochrans' property and surrounding locations.
- > One of the surrounding locations visited by the Commission, at the
- > request of Mr. Dana Kadey, was the property immediately behind the Cochrans'. Mr.
- > Dana Kadey led the Commission down a long access road to and across
- > this property and then at the public hearing discussed how he and the
- > property would be affected by the proposal. The clear impression created by Mr.
- > Dana Kadey both during the site visit and public hearing was that he
- > owns the property.
- >
- > When the Commission received Mr. Scott Kadey's comment that he owns
- > the property and that he had only learned of the public hearing after
- > Aug. 13 he was asked to provide a book and page reference to his deed.
- > The initial reference he provided was to a deed in which Scott
- > conveyed property to Dana. The Town of Princeton's tax card provides
- > similarly confusing information, listing multiple deeds, none of which show Mr.
- > Scott Kadey as the owner of the Princeton property. More recently, Mr.
- > Scott Kadey provided reference to a different deed, not listed on the
- > tax card, showing Mr. Dana Kadey conveyed the property in question to Mr.
- > Scott Kadey.
- >
- > Public notice requirements are taken seriously by Maine courts.
- > Recently, a stormwater permitting decision by the Department of
- > Environmental Protection was vacated because an individual was not properly notified.
- > My understanding is that this individual likely was aware of the
- > proposed train layover facility that was the subject of the
- > permitting. While in light of the facts in the cell tower permitting
- > matter it is not clear that the Commission's notice of the public
- > hearing was deficient in that notice was provided to Mr. Dana Kadey
- > and not to Mr. Scott Kadey, after consultation with the Office of the
- > Attorney General, the Chair of the Commission issued a procedural
- > order to reopen the public hearing for the purpose of allowing Mr. Scott Kadey to testify. This will
- > occur on Oct.
- > 8, the same day as the Commission's next meeting. Mr. Scott Kadey
- > will have 3 to 5 minutes to testify; the same approximate time others

> were given. Consistent with the Commission's rules, the public will  
> have 10 days following the reopening of the hearing to provide any  
> final written comments and 7 days after that to provide any rebuttal comments.  
>  
> It is then expected that the Commission will make a decision on the  
> cell tower application at its November meeting.  
>  
> I certainly can appreciate Mrs. Cochran's frustration. The Commission  
> is working to do its best to ensure a fair permitting process for all.  
>  
> Please let me know if you have any questions.  
>  
> Thanks  
> Nick  
>  
> Thank you,  
>  
> Kathy Eastman  
> Assistant to Commissioner Whitcomb  
> Department of Agriculture, Conservation & Forestry  
> 22 State House Station  
> Augusta, ME 04333-0022  
> 207-287-3419  
>  
> This e-mail is intended for the exclusive use of the individual or  
> entity above. It may contain information which is privileged and/or  
> confidential under both state and federal law. If you are not the  
> intended recipient, you are notified that any further dissemination,  
> copy or disclosure of this communication is strictly prohibited. If  
> you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify me and destroy this e-mail.  
> Your cooperation in protecting confidential information is greatly  
> appreciated.

> -----Original Message-----

> From: chrisnmel@pwless.net [<mailto:chrisnmel@pwless.net>]  
> Sent: Sunday, September 21, 2014 11:10 AM  
> To: Governor  
> Subject: Cochran, Melanie - Website: Share Your Views

> Melanie  
> chrisnmel@pwless.net  
> 207-796-0736  
> PO Box 143  
> Princeton, Maine 04668

> I am writing in reference to a proposed cell phone tower on me and my  
> husbands property. The LUPC has issued this as DP 4944. Almost two  
> years ago Black Diamond Consultants knocked on our door asking if we  
> would be interested in allowing a 250 foot tower on our property. With  
> careful consideration we agreed to proceed with allowing the tower.  
> Applications were submitted. Notifications sent to land owners.  
> Permits were already approved. A public hearing was requested by very few local land owners.  
> There was a hearing held at Princeton Elementary School on August 13,  
> 2014. The hearing was located on a day and time that was very  
> difficult for people to attend. The local town office and many locals  
> were not even aware of this hearing. There was a huge attendance in favor of the tower.  
> There was at least 50 people at this hearing. There was probably 5

> people in attendance that were not in favor. At the end of the hearing  
> we were advised by LUPC to send emails to the commission. If !  
> people were not able to attend the hearing, they were also advised to  
> send an email. The hearing was documented to close on August 25th.  
> That time has now been extended to October 27th! LUPC is reopening the  
> hearing to allow one sole person who is not in favor of this tower to  
> attend a hearing in Brewer on October 8, 2014. The community is in an  
> uproar. There are concerns about allowing this one person to attend a  
> hearing just for him. The questions are ... Why is this one person the  
> only one to be allowed at this hearing? Why was he not advised to send  
> his testimony in writing or email such as everyone else that couldn't  
> attend the hearing was? I would also like to state that the people in  
> the area that are not in favor are not against cell phone towers. They  
> want the tower placed on the property of their choice. When the local  
> townspeople heard about US Cellulars plan to construct this tower on  
> our property...they were very excited. Excited for cell phone service. Excited fo!  
> r our family. Having two children with Autism... the tower would be a  
> great asset to the safety of our children as well as a financial help.  
> Having cell phone service in this area will benefit so many people. In  
> emergency situations cell phone service can be a critical life saver.  
> We feel that those who are not in favor of the tower have had plenty  
> of time and opportunity to let their voices be heard. Those in favor  
> have also had plenty of time. This just seems to be lingering on and  
> on. While there is a community wanting service in the area. We are all  
> beginning to question how this has been handled by LUPC since the  
> hearing in August. People are simply disgusted...  
>  
>

**From:** [Rep. Beth P. Turner](#)  
**To:** [Bolstridge, Karen](#)  
**Subject:** LUPC meeting Oct. 8th  
**Date:** Friday, October 03, 2014 1:47:17 PM

---

Karen,

I see on the agenda that the commission meeting will start next Wednesday at 9:30 but before that there will be a short period they will be reopening the public hearing on the US cellular tower for Scott Kadey. I would like to be there so will it be at 9:00 or will it be earlier. Just want to make sure I am there.

Thanks,  
Beth

Representative Beth P Turner  
Proudly serving District 11  
59 Communities in Hancock, Penobscot and Washington Counties

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [Brad R](#)  
**To:** [Bolstridge, Karen](#)  
**Cc:** [Beth Turner](#)  
**Subject:** Big Lake Twp Cell Tower  
**Date:** Thursday, October 16, 2014 8:30:59 AM

---

I would like to state for the record again that I support the building cell tower on Chris and Melanie Cochran's property in Big Lake Twp.

I was born and raised in Baileyville, Washington County, went to college, came home and have lived here for the past 14 years. I have 2 boys that truly enjoy the outdoors. We hunt, fish, trap, and recreate all over this area. We own a camp on Big Lake as well and enjoy fishing and boating all over this lake. This tower will give myself as well as many other residents a sense of security that we can call for help if an emergency arises.

A cell tower is not going to "ruin" our area, it can only enhance it. I have personally talked with many of the summer residents all over the lake and they support the cell tower.

We live here 365 days a year, Cell coverage is no longer a convenience but a necessity. The people that have attended the hearings, written in on several occasions have given overwhelming support for the tower. Washington county is an extremely poor area and I have to think that this is another step that can help us progress as a community.

I feel that this process has gone on far too long. It has been close to 2 years since the process began. It is sad that it takes this long to get things done in this day and age. As year around residence of Princeton I live less than 1 mile from the proposed site and we deserve this tower as soon as possible. Please consider the people that need this tower to enhance our way of life.

Thank you for your consideration.

Brad and Kristina Richard

643 West Street

Princeton, ME 04668

**From:** [Alise DeMaris](#)  
**To:** [Bolstridge, Karen](#)  
**Subject:** Re: DP 4944  
**Date:** Monday, October 20, 2014 7:06:05 AM

---

Dear Ms. Bolstridge,

I think there were several emails by Mike Marshall and others that indicated that there were attachments to the short emails they sent, but the attachments were never scanned in. However, I was more worried about not being able to access the files showing the plans for the tower. I had looked at them on the website before as exhibits 6a-6e, but the links did not appear to be working when I tried to look at them this weekend. Those documents had all of the important details about the tower, and it would be nice to have them available for review. Thank you again for your consideration in this.

Best Regards,  
Alise DeMaris

On Mon, Oct 20, 2014 at 6:58 AM, Bolstridge, Karen <[Karen.Bolstridge@maine.gov](mailto:Karen.Bolstridge@maine.gov)> wrote:

We will be trying to place all the new public comments on the website at 5:00 pm today; however, if there is something specific you would like that is not on the website I could try to scan it for you.

Thanks

*Karen E. Bolstridge*

Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry

Land Use Planning Commission

Downeast Regional Representative

106 Hogan Road; Suite 8

Bangor, Maine 04401

[\(207\) 941-4052](tel:(207)941-4052)

[\(207\) 941-4222](tel:(207)941-4222) (fax)

[www.maine.gov/acf](http://www.maine.gov/acf)

**From:** Alise DeMaris [mailto:[alisedemaris@gmail.com](mailto:alisedemaris@gmail.com)]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 20, 2014 6:54 AM  
**To:** Bolstridge, Karen  
**Subject:** Re: DP 4944

Dear Ms. Bolstridge,

I do appreciate everything that you are able to put on the website; as I live and work in Windham, it would be very difficult to access hard copy files kept in Bangor. I can't imagine how time consuming this whole process must be, and I want to thank you and your office very much for the time and effort you have invested in this.

Best Regards,

Alise DeMaris

On Mon, Oct 20, 2014 at 6:48 AM, Bolstridge, Karen  
<[Karen.Bolstridge@maine.gov](mailto:Karen.Bolstridge@maine.gov)> wrote:

Thank you for your comments.

Yes, all the exhibits are not available on the website. We put what we can on there, time allowing, as a courtesy to the public. All files are always available at my office for anyone to review or copy.

*Karen E. Bolstridge*

Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry

Land Use Planning Commission

Downeast Regional Representative

106 Hogan Road; Suite 8

Bangor, Maine 04401

[\(207\) 941-4052](tel:(207)941-4052)

[\(207\) 941-4222](tel:(207)941-4222) (fax)

[www.maine.gov/acf](http://www.maine.gov/acf)

**From:** Alise DeMaris [mailto:[alisedemaris@gmail.com](mailto:alisedemaris@gmail.com)]

**Sent:** Sunday, October 19, 2014 6:31 PM

**To:** Bolstridge, Karen  
**Subject:** DP 4944

Dear Ms. Bolstridge and LUPC,

I am writing in reference to Development Permit 4944, the proposed communications tower in Big Lake Township, ME. I am both submitting a new letter and attaching a letter that I sent on 08/24/2014 that was not included in the public files. Unfortunately, the website with the public files for the proposal appears to be experiencing a technical problem; exhibits 6a-6e, which contain much of the technical information on the proposal, are not able to be accessed at this time. I regret not being able to review them before the 10/20/2014 deadline for submitting a response. However, after reviewing the available files, I would like to make the following comments.

One issue all the individuals who support the tower based on the rationale of increased safety have failed to consider is the poor emergency response time in the Big Lake Township area. Princeton does not have a police department or full time emergency medical workers. The two health clinics mentioned by Melanie Cochran are in Princeton and Indian Township, but they do not provide emergency care; they are for routine healthcare only and are simply not equipped for dealing with life-threatening injuries and illnesses. In addition, they are only open during business hours. Emergency response time for emergency medical workers in Big Lake township is often over 20 minutes. It is over 7 miles of narrow, bumpy roads (travel time estimated at 17 minutes) from the Indian Township Police Department and ambulance center to the location of the tower, which is only the beginning of the remote woods roads on which many of the camps are located. It is more than twice that distance and an estimated travel time of 36 minutes to the end of the Yates Point Road, which has multiple camps along it. If you are in dire need of medical help in Big Lake Township, particularly off the main street, your prospects are not significantly improved by being able to call for help, because it takes so long for help to arrive. If US Cellular is truly invested in the community's best interests, it should place the tower on town property in Princeton. Were they to do so, the monthly lease payments could help offset the costs of emergency workers and equipment so that anyone who has an emergency can actually get help in time once they contact emergency services.

In addition, having a cellphone connection without adequate emergency response personnel might actually do more harm than good. It could easily create an illusion of safety so that people neglect to adequately prepare for remote outdoor activities, fail to let others know where they are going beforehand, or even take more risks because they feel that they would be rescued should they get into trouble. How often do you hear a conversational exchange where one person asks if another carries a spare tire or other emergency equipment and they reply, "It's all right; I have my cell phone with me all the time?" This trust in the ability to get help if needed could actually lead to an increase in outdoor injuries, lost hunters or hikers, etc. Using a cell phone as a lifeline is simply unwise, particularly in an area with such poor emergency responses.

Throughout this entire process, I have been unimpressed by US Cellular's integrity as a business. It has not followed proper protocol for notifying adjacent property owners, including Mike Marshall and Scott Kadey, and it has hired a biased

consulting firm, Black Diamond Consultants, to do a cursory survey and compile an inaccurate report. It also appears to be pushing for a very large tower for the sole purpose of financial gain when a smaller tower would serve essentially the same purpose.

In a letter dated 09/05/2014, Jim Herbert stated that US Cellular's own engineer found that the 190' tower would meet the FCC's coverage requirements, but that the tower height location would "reduce the opportunities for colocation" for that particular tower. In other words, a 190' tower would meet the community's needs, but limit US Cellular's opportunities to profit from a tower at the expense of the community's aesthetic appeal. If a 190' tower would not serve the needs of the surrounding area, how could US Cellular expect to find customers for its colocation sites below the top of the tower? A 190' tower would not have to be lit in the same way as a 250' tower, could be narrower, and would not be as visible from as much of the lake. In all of these ways, a 190' tower would have less negative impact while still serving the same function, with the notable exception of not being able to earn profit for US Cellular.

In a letter dated 08/26/2014, Melanie Cochran stated that she and her husband discussed the proposed tower with her neighbors and the community prior to approving their property for the project. However, at least three neighbors with abutting properties, including Scott Kadey, were neither contacted by the Cochrans nor US Cellular prior to the arrival of the Black Diamond Consultants, and some were not made aware of the project until even later in the process. I understand that this is not in accordance with the regulations for the erection of communications towers and that, aside from any personal communication with the Cochrans, US Cellular should have formally notified all abutting property owners in advance.

If US Cellular is delinquent in its treatment of the community prior to the erection of the tower, how are we to have any confidence that they will act in the best interests of the community once they have what they want: permission to build the tower at the proposed site? What happens if, in a few years, towers become obsolete with advances in satellite communications? Will it be properly dismantled, or left as an unsafe and deteriorating eyesore for the community?

Please consider reducing the tower's height to below 200' or moving its location to an area that would have a lesser visual impact on Big Lake Township's population center and Big Lake. Several people, including Roger Ritter, suggested placing the tower in Indian Township. Perhaps making use of existing structures, such as the tower in Grand Lake Stream, could also solve the problem. Don Flewelling, a representative of Pioneer Broadband, wrote of the feasibility of alternative locations in his letter on 08/07/2014. In addition, contrary to what many people (such as Melanie Cochran and Sue McIver) have expressed, the individuals in opposition to the tower are not set on any specific alternative property, but would simply rather see a shorter, less obtrusive tower in any less visible location.

In short, communication professionals from companies such as Pioneer Broadband and even US Cellular itself admit that a shorter tower or alternate location would serve the community well. Please consider the impact of the proposed tower on the community and all alternatives before you reach a decision. Thank you for your attention to this matter and dedication to our great state.

Best Regards,

Alise DeMaris

Windham, ME

08/24/2014

Dear Ms. Bolstridge and the Land Use Planning Commission,

I am a former resident and frequent visitor to Big Lake Township, Maine. I am writing in reference to the proposed communications tower to be built by U.S. Cellular at 983 West Street in Big Lake Township.

Big Lake Township is an area with little to recommend it other than its extraordinary natural beauty. It is in an economically depressed area with few occupational or recreational opportunities. However, its largely undeveloped landscape with the Maine woods, Pocomoonshine Mountain, and Big Lake offers the perfect place to get away from civilization and hunt, fish, hike, or simply enjoy nature and the outdoors. Places like this are increasingly rare, even in Maine. I think the proposed height and placement of the tower would significantly detract from Big Lake Townships's best feature, its wilderness appeal.

When I was growing up in Big Lake Township, I took for granted how lovely it really is, and how few places have those same assets. I did not realize how few people get to appreciate a night sky without light pollution or fishing on a lake without seeing a single sign of other people's existence. I loved to climb Pocomoonshine Mountain, go to the scenic outlook facing Big Lake, and enjoy the unobstructed view of woods and water. Now that I live in a more populated area, I realize that what Big Lake Township has is priceless, and I hope it can be preserved.

Unfortunately, the proposed tower is visible from a significant portion of Big Lake and much of Pocomoonshine Mountain, with its hiking trails and scenic outlooks. These are important public areas enjoyed by residents and visitors alike. Big Lake Township and the surrounding communities rely on money from visitors and tourists who come to hunt, fish, and enjoy the Maine wilderness. The community also has many seasonal residents, drawn to the beauty of Big Lake, who help support the economy. I recognize that both residents of and visitors to Big Lake Township would appreciate better cell phone service in the area. While there is currently adequate reception to communicate, the quality of calls is less than desirable. However, I think that putting the tower at a location further away from Big Lake, Pocomoonshine Mountain, and the community's population center for all but the summer season would meet the need for better cell phone service while preserving Big Lake Township's appeal as a place to enjoy the outdoors.

I think that to allow the U.S. Cellular tower to be built as proposed would be extremely shortsighted. We must be thoughtful and responsible in the way that we use our land and work to preserve nature while meeting the changing demands of technology, especially in an area so dependent on tourism. It would be regrettable

to permanently detract from the beauty of the area just so that cell phone service could be improved as quickly as possible. I hope that future generations will be able to enjoy the wilderness of Big Lake Township as much as I have been able to, so I urge the Land Use Planning Commission to consider the negative impact of this tower on the community and deny the application for the tower as proposed.

Sincerely,

Alise DeMaris

Windham, ME

**From:** [Rep Beth P. Turner](#)  
**To:** [Bolstridge, Karen](#)  
**Subject:** Link to Scott Kadey  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 14, 2014 9:35:32 AM

---

Karen,  
I've had several requests for the link to Scott Kadey's testimony but am unable to find the link on the agenda with the other links. Could you please forward it to me?

Thanks!  
Beth

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Scott Carle](#)  
**To:** [Bolstridge, Karen](#)  
**Subject:** Re: DP 4944 Proposed Telecommunications Tower  
**Date:** Thursday, October 16, 2014 1:31:25 PM

---

Sorry for being vague. I am concerned that not all the documentation for or against is not being posted on the website. I am referring the statement from Scott Kadey dated October 8th. I will be submitting a formal letter of support before the October 20th deadline. If you could let me know of the Commissions decision when that happens, that would be great.

Thanks

Scott Carle

--

Insanity: doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results. - Albert Einstein

On Thu, Oct 16, 2014 at 7:05 AM, Bolstridge, Karen <[Karen.Bolstridge@maine.gov](mailto:Karen.Bolstridge@maine.gov)> wrote:

Scott:

Thank you for your email

.

All documents for this project are available to view and copy at my office at the address below. As a courtesy we have placed some data on the website at the link below. Your question scope is too broad for me to know what you want, but you are welcome to come into the office and photocopy any of the files. If you know specifically what you are looking for I can pull that data for you.

[http://www.maine.gov/dacf/lupc/projects/dp4944/dp4944\\_biglaketwp.html](http://www.maine.gov/dacf/lupc/projects/dp4944/dp4944_biglaketwp.html)

Thanks

*Karen E. Bolstridge*

Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry

Land Use Planning Commission

Downeast Regional Representative

106 Hogan Road; Suite 8

Bangor, Maine 04401

[\(207\) 941-4052](tel:(207)941-4052)

[\(207\) 941-4222](tel:(207)941-4222) (fax)

[www.maine.gov/acf](http://www.maine.gov/acf)

**From:** Scott Carle [mailto:[scott@carle.us](mailto:scott@carle.us)]

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 15, 2014 8:13 PM

**To:** Bolstridge, Karen

**Subject:** DP 4944 Proposed Telecommunications Tower

Please keep me apprised on any developments on this proposal.

Thank you.

Scott Carle

--

Insanity: doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results.

- Albert Einstein

**From:** [Mark Ranalli](#)  
**To:** [Bolstridge, Karen](#)  
**Subject:** Big Lake Twp  
**Date:** Sunday, October 19, 2014 8:16:06 PM  
**Attachments:** [To the commissioners and staff of the LUPC.docx](#)

---

Hello Karen,

Upon reviewing the public record, it has come to my attention that the letter I submitted in August is not part of the posted public record. Therefore, I am resubmitting it to assure that it is indeed included in the record.

Thank you,  
Mark Ranalli

To the commissioners and staff of the LUPC

Re: proposed cell tower in Big Lake Twp.

First and foremost, Wesla and I wish to thank the Commissioners and their staff for taking our request for a public hearing under consideration and for granting the same. We appreciate that you would not only allow us the opportunity to air our concerns regarding the proposed cell tower in Big Lake Twp., but also that you would come out to the proposed site and visit our property as well as other areas in our community. Thank you for your dedication to the unorganized territories as well as to the people who live within them.

Our property, True North Farm, has been in my family for 44 years. Anyone over 60 years old would probably know it as the Libby farm. It was founded in the early eighteen hundreds and our home was constructed circa 1840. My wife, Wesla, and I came here as newlyweds and made this our home in 1989. We were drawn to this area and our property in particular by the richness of the surrounding lakes and forests and the sheer natural beauty of the area. We raised our three children here and passed on to them our love for this area and its beauty. Each and every morning for the past 25 years I greet the new day by gazing out of our second floor bedroom window and view Pocomoonshine Mountain framed by our gently rolling field.

As I attempted to articulate, albeit rather poorly, in the public hearing, neither Wesla nor myself have an objection to a cell tower in Big Lake Township providing it is necessary. We fully understand the need as well as the importance of telecommunications in our society today as our first responders and others so eloquently stated and demonstrated through their testimony. Our objection is with the extreme height of the tower at 250' and the location which is directly in our year round population center. We strongly believe that there are several alternative sites

that would not only better serve U.S. Cellular, but also preserve the natural beauty of the Big Lake, three historic farms, and the surrounding area. At the very least we could minimize the negative impact by relocating the facility.

I realize that U.S cellular has invested a great deal of time and resources into this application but that does not justify what we feel is a very poor choice in placement. A 250' cell tower on the proposed site would seriously compromise our skyline especially from our farms and most importantly the lake itself. Also, it will necessarily mar an otherwise unobstructed view of our night sky, something very rare even in our part of the world. Mr. Chris Cochran testified that we can already see a cell tower on Musquash Mountain 16 miles to the northwest so he asks, "What is another tower?" I for one don't follow his argument or reasoning. If we can clearly see a lighted tower, both day and night, that is 16 miles distant, how much more a tower approximately one thousand yards from the water's edge? What kind of logic is that?

Mr. Cochran made the same assessment concerning the view from Pocomoonshine Mountain in regards to Woodland Pulp, LLC which can be viewed from the east side of the mountain. Well, be that as it may, we cannot change that but surely that doesn't justify destroying a majestic view from the observation area on the West side. I take my family and any one visiting our area up to that overlook numerous times each year. I have done this since 1970 and hope to continue to do so into the foreseeable future.

My next concern is with the visual assessment itself which was conducted by ttl-architects out of Portland, ME. First of all, one would have to question how objective ttl could be in light of their relationship to the applicant. It would only stand to reason that that this presents a conflict of interest as it is clearly in their best interest to present the project in a favorable light. This assumption is also supported by the errors and inaccuracies within the report itself. To start with, we have to assume that the tether used on the balloon test was actually 250'. As far as I am aware this was not verified for the site visit or the visual assessment conducted in 2013. The representative from Black Diamond, the contractor involved in the construction, deployed the balloon and stated that it was 250' high. He stated that due to the wind the balloon could be "ten feet lower, give or take". Providing the tether was indeed 250', list and drift caused by the wind present at both deployments may have very well reduced the overall height of the balloon to approximately 200'. Furthermore, concerning three areas listed as of high importance in the assessment, two of ttl's conclusions were clearly erroneous. Concerning Big Lake, the report states that the balloon was not visible. In fact, if the trees at the base of the tower obscure 75 of the tower's base, a full 175' of the tower will be visible from Jameson Cove. Approximately half of the proposed tower will be visible from most of Jimmy Libby Cove and many areas in the Northern end of the Lake. The report states that there is no view of the tower from Pokey Mountain. Needless to say there most certainly is. As for our farm, the report states that the tower will be "partly visible". This is true but would not "mostly visible" or "highly visible" be a more accurate descriptive term? This is where the subjective nature of such an assessment is most obvious. As for the lake and the mountain I

would say their conclusions are at best, erroneous and at worst, deceptive. These discrepancies cast a shadow on the validity and objectivity of the entire assessment.

If the visual assessment carries any weight or is of any importance in this application, I would respectfully ask that you, the commissioners, disregard it based on its inaccuracies. May I suggest that in the future the LUPC should secure the firm for the assessment at the applicants cost. The secured firm should provide the LUPC with their findings in accordance with guidelines established by the LUPC. This process would preserve the objectivity of the findings and assure that any conflict of interest was removed.

In closing, I am asking you, the commissioners, to deny this application as it has been presented and to give U.S Cellular the opportunity to investigate possible alternative sites. I am aware of several alternative sites within Big Lake Twp. that are within the five mile radius of their optimal target in Princeton. I believe these locations would greatly reduce the visual impact on our community. Also, it has come to my attention that there is a town approved site behind the Princeton Elementary School that, if available, should be explored. I firmly believe we can "have our cake and eat it too". That is to say, we can have a tower that satisfies the needs of U.S. Cellular and their customers as well as preserves the natural beauty and landscape of our area. If we must have a tower in Big Lake Township, let us make every effort to minimize the negative visual impact it will ultimately have on our area. Let's be careful not to sacrifice the important on the altar of the urgent. We owe it to ourselves and to future generations.

Respectfully,

Mark Ranalli

55 True North Lane

Big Lake Township, ME

**From:** [Wesla Ranalli](#)  
**To:** [Bolstridge, Karen](#)  
**Subject:** Big Lake cell tower  
**Date:** Sunday, October 19, 2014 8:26:30 PM  
**Attachments:** [cell tower letter.docx](#)

---

Hi Karen,

I see my "cover letter" from August as part of the public record on the LUPC website but I do not see the attachment which contained my actual letter that I wished the commission to see. I have included it below and attached it in case it was not entered into the public record.

Thanks again,  
Wesla Ranalli

August 18, 2014

Dear LUPC Commissioners,

Currently, Big Lake Township, Maine is a rural residential area with no buildings over two stories tall or even street lamps to contribute to light pollution. The 250 foot tall telecommunications tower proposed to be built at 983 West Street, Big Lake Twp. will have an undeniable and unprecedented impact on the environmental aesthetics of the surrounding area. This, in addition to the perceived health effects of such towers, decreases the value of surrounding properties.

Big Lake Township and Princeton, Maine are two rural communities which rely on their one unique resource, pristine Maine lakes and woods, to attract tourism and boost their local economy. In addition, many local residents, such as ourselves, sought out this area for its rustic appeal and unspoiled views of nature. Consequently, this proposed tower is likely to have a negative financial impact on the residents of the surrounding area.

Although U.S. Cellular completed a visual impact study through a contractor, the resulting report contains errors and inconsistencies. For example, on page sixteen, Pocomoonshine Mountain is listed as an area of "high" significance. The report states that the tower is not visible from the fire tower road. It is visible from the scenic overlook that Georgia-Pacific Corporation constructed along with the fire tower access road in the 1990's. On page fourteen, Big Lake is also listed as high priority. The report states that the tower is not visible from Big Lake. From multiple vantage points it is visible to anglers and other users of this vast lake. These are only two examples of numerous errors. Therefore, the reports assessment that the proposed tower would have a minimal impact seems inaccurate.

I would propose that any firm contracted for a visual assessment should be retained and overseen by LUPC and not the organization seeking a permit. The applicant should pay the bill but not create the need for the firm to produce a favorable report despite the facts. After Julie Ann Larry of TTL Associates finished her presentation at the public hearing on August 13, 2014 in Princeton, US Cellular's

lawyer leaned in to her and said, "Good job, Julie". I assume he was satisfied and will be securing her services for future visual assessments.

The proposed location and height for the telecommunications tower will require U.S. Cellular to follow the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and Federal Communications Commission's regulations related to tower erection in close proximity to airports. These regulations require that towers over 200 feet located within over 8 miles from airports must either be lit with high intensity white obstruction lights at all hours or painted in a red and white striped pattern and lit only after dark (Hammerman, 2002). Although a tower visible to any populated area would be undesirable, the extreme height of this tower and lighting/painting requirements due to its location make it especially unsightly.

There is empirical support for the reduction of property values in areas where towers are built. Multiple sources, including Bond and Wang (2005) and McDonough (2003) state that telecommunications towers and similar structures often decrease surrounding property values by approximately ten to twenty percent. A detailed study by Sandy Bond, Ph.D., (2007) based on an analysis of residential property sales transaction data in Florida also found a decrease in property values, particularly for those closest to the towers. In addition to the decrease in value due to the visual impact of the tower, Dr. Bond concluded that the media has broadcast concerns about the potential health hazards of telecommunication towers, leading to public concern about residing near such structures and a consequent drop in prices of sites near such towers.

There is also legal precedent for individuals successfully suing for either removal of the tower or compensation for reduced property values after the construction of similar or even smaller telecommunications towers. According to McDonough (2003), the court's ruling in *Franklin v. Nextel* forced a 120 foot wireless tower to be dismantled because its image was "incongruous and damaging to the neighborhood" (p. 28). Community opposition to a 150 foot tower in Jacksonville, Florida resulted in the same outcome. In 2013, a Vermont court awarded Olga Julinska and Sergei Kniazev \$1,000,000 in compensation for the impact of a transmission tower near their rural mountaintop home in Wells, Vermont (Curtis, 2013). Furthermore, "in *Komis v. City of Sante Fe*, the Supreme Court of New Mexico awarded damages for the perceived decline in property value resulting from a source of stigma, even when no objective evidence demonstrated that the perceived nuisance was unsafe, and when market loss was not proven by comparable sales data." (McDonough, 2003, p. 25).

I am requesting that the tower be designed responsibly by: being relocated far enough away from the Princeton Airport to remove the necessity of excessive light pollution or bold paint colors, being redesigned to under 200 feet to reduce visibility while maintaining utility, be outfitted with lighting that is only activated by the close proximity of aircraft, and being placed at a site not visible from Big Lake. These modifications would still allow the tower to serve the intended purpose of increasing the quality of cell service to U.S. Cellular's customers while decreasing the negative visual impact and reducing the effect on property values.

Sincerely,

Wesla Ranalli

55 True North Lane

Big Lake Twp.

## References

Bond, S. (2007). *The Effect of Distance to Cell Phone Towers on House Prices in Florida*. *The Assessment Journal*, Fall Volume, Pages 362-370.

Bond, S. & Wang, K. (2005). The Impact of Cell Phone Towers on House Prices in Residential Neighborhoods. *The Assessment Journal*, Summer Volume, Pages 256-273.

Curtis, B. (2013). Rutland Jury Awards Couple \$1M in Battle with Utility over Tower. *Rutland Herald*.

Hammerman, T. (2002). FAA & FCC Tower Regulations. *Tower Times*. Retrieved from: <http://www.copyrightroyalties.com/wp-content/themes/copyright/pdf/tt0502.pdf>.

McDonough, C.C. (2003). The Impact of Wireless Towers on Residential Property Values. *Assessment Journal*, Volume 10, Issue 3, Pages 25-32.