

My name is Ralph Hutchinson and I have a house on Dallas Hill. My land abuts the lot on which this cell tower will be built if approved. It wasn't that long ago that I testified before you about the previous cell tower project put forth by Rising Tide on this exact same piece of land. That tower was only 190 feet tall with no lighting. Imagine my surprise and dismay that I have to be here again, testifying against yet another tower, much taller and lit up 24 hours a day, on the same piece of property as the previous tower that your Commission denied.

The previous application by Rising Tide was denied because "the Commission finds that the proposed Project would be unlike other existing commercial uses within the subdistrict in that the 190-foot tall communications tower would present a significant change to existing character of the area and is wholly incomparable to the other types of commercial uses that currently exist in this residential subdistrict. The Commission concludes that the proposed Project would not be compatible with the existing residential uses in the Dallas Hill D-RS2 subdistrict and is therefore not an allowed use."

It was clear to the residents of Dallas Hill as well as the Commission that this type of project was not a good fit for Dallas Hill. Now a tower that is over 100 feet taller and continuously lighted is being proposed. The only difference is that it was moved slightly, I believe about 93 feet, over a line so that it is now in the General Management District rather than the D-RS2. This seems like a move that is truly against the spirit of the Commission's land use guidelines, and it feels a bit like a dirty trick. For some reason, the smaller unlit cell tower was not compatible with the neighborhood on Dallas Hill, but a much taller tower that will be lit day and night is somehow compatible because it was bumped over an arbitrary line.

Chapter 10.06- D of your land use regulations states:

"Where two or more protection subdistricts apply to a single land area, the combination of the more protective standards for each subdistrict shall apply."

I take this to mean that since Mr. Beauregard's lot where this tower will be located is a single land area that contains 2 subdistricts, the stricter standards should apply, and those standards are of the D-RS2 subdistrict. You have already turned down a smaller cell tower according to your standards in that subdistrict. To my mind, that should end this whole thing.

In addition, Chapter 10.06- J.30, states that in a M-GM subdistrict:

structures.... are to be of similar type, scale and intensity as other allowed uses. You have already turned down this tower according to these standards. A 300 foot lighted tower is certainly not in keeping with other uses on Dallas Hill.

10.24-C (GENERAL CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL OF PERMIT APPLICATIONS) states:

"Adequate provision has been made for fitting the proposal harmoniously into the existing natural environment in order to ensure there will be no undue adverse effect on existing uses, scenic character, and natural and historic resources in the area likely to be affected by the proposal."

There is no way that this 300 foot lighted cell tower fits harmoniously into the existing natural environment of the area. It will have an adverse effect on the scenic character of the entire area, including Saddleback, the Appalachian Trail, the nearby snowmobile trails, Rangeley Lake and other nearby bodies of water, the historic Upper Dallas schoolhouse that was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1990. As you ruled before, it simply does NOT fit in with the character of the neighborhood.

10.25- E :NATURAL CHARACTER AND CULTURAL RESOURCES reads:

Scenic Character.a. - "The design of proposed development shall take into account the scenic character of the surrounding area. Structures shall be located, designed and landscaped to reasonably minimize their visual impact on the surrounding area, particularly when viewed from existing roadways, with attention to designated scenic byways; major water bodies; coastal wetlands; permanent trails; or public property.

Rising Tide has simply dismissed any objections that this tower will be an eyesore. I disagree. It will be a permanent eyesore to the surrounding area.

Dallas Hill is a Prospective Zoned Area. The Commission, recognizing the special and unique quality of the Rangeley area wrote special zoning for this area. Prospective zoning also enables local and seasonal residents, landowners and citizens of Maine to have a say in establishing development patterns. Repeatedly, an overwhelming percentage of people told the Commission that new mixed use development should be respectful of the dark night sky, as well as the scenic character of the area. This extremely tall lighted cell tower in this location totally breaks that trust that residents of the area will have a say in development.

I agree that good communication is important to everyone, and I want them to have it. But your Commission has already ruled that Dallas Hill is not a good place for that tower. Why this second try at a higher tower? I agree with the people at the National Parks Service that this tower will impact the Appalachian Trail and they suggest either a shorter, unlit tower. Or perhaps find a location where the tower will not be as visible from so many places, and will not need to be lighted. This might be the cheapest and easiest location for Rising Tide to build the tower, but a permanent structure like this should be placed thoughtfully, where it respects the scenic character that makes Rangeley so special.

Please deny this tower on Dallas Hill once again, and work with Rising Tide to find a more suitable location that will provide the needed communication and retain the scenic character and dark night sky.

From: [Andrew Jacobs](#)
To: [Bolstridge, Karen](#)
Subject: Proposed Tower - Dallas Plantation
Date: Thursday, September 16, 2021 2:05:54 PM
Attachments: [Cell Phone Tower.docx](#)

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of the State of Maine Mail System. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Karen,

Please see the attached document for my response to the proposed cell phone tower in Dallas Plantation.

Thank you!

Andrew Jacobs

September 14, 2021

To whom it may concern,

I am writing this letter regarding the proposed cell phone tower located off Dallas Hill Road in Dallas Plantation, Maine. As a new homeowner directly adjacent to the proposed tower at 48 Beans Corner Road, I have decided to be completely open to the idea and hear both sides to the argument. I figured being somewhat new to the neighborhood it was fair for me to be openminded in determining if it's a need or not within the area. I decided to invest the time and come to the meeting at Sugarloaf Mountain Hotel and hear what everyone had to say from the company heading the proposed tower to both sides of the current residents that live in the area full time.

For years, I have been visiting the Rangeley area! It's a stunning location with so much to look forward to each visit! Every time I came through the Rangeley area, I knew this was the location to invest my hard-earned money into when I was ready for that "getaway home". I have been working 6 days a week taking my family business to the next level so I could make this a dream a reality. This spring, I found the perfect home on Beans Corner Road. The second I stepped foot on the property, I knew it had to be mine. I went forward, made an offer, and did what I couldn't resist. In the end, I couldn't be happier with my decision!

While sitting in the Public Hearing on September 7th, I listened to every word that was said. I truly appreciate the hard work that Rising Tide Towers has invested to "make it a safer area". However, I have concluded that it just sounds like "Corporate Greed". I understand that's a strong statement so I would be happy to explain. The reasoning for my statement was the fact that the previous tower was located just a few feet from the current proposal and just past the residential line on the map (I could be mislabeling what this is actually called, my apologies). It's now proposed to be larger than the first and only a few feet down the hill? I was honestly mind blown with that proposal. The following day I decided to take a ride and compare some of the locations in which were discussed so I could see it for myself. Obviously, it's hard to imagine a 300-foot tower, but I can't seem to wrap my head around the fact that it will be "hard to see, because of the lattice design" or "there are other towers that people don't mind/notice". Since the meeting, I now notice nothing but these large cell phone towers in these stunning locations and the absolute pollution they leave within the views. Let's add another just because we already have a bunch that don't bother anyone? I'm still lost. At what amount are there too many now? After that, I made my way up Dallas Hill Road towards Saddleback Mountain to find that I only lost cell phone service for a total of 34 seconds of my ride. I was going the speed limit, I have Verizon Wireless, and I only saw four homes. Four is four, but are they full time or part time, like myself? Either way, it's still four homes.

I understand that safety is important, I do. But these Communication Companies have resources to boost cell phone coverage, as I had it growing up within my family home. Its 2021 and there are lots of options in our world to keep residents safe. Choosing a different cell phone provider, utilizing a land line, or getting that service booster I had growing up to say the least. Technology is getting better each year; we have plenty of solutions that are easily

accessible to everyone. In my eyes, it's about one's willingness to find a solution for themselves. My favorite saying of all time is "if you want something done, then sometimes you just might need to do it yourself". I get it's a bold saying, I do. But it's also a **Personal Decision** to live where you do, regardless of the current real estate market. Each day we make decisions that will affect ourselves for the long or short term. Do what's right for you and your family, that's common sense.

As I mentioned before, I went into this entire process with an open mind. It's important to do so and I live by that. I've treated the whole process as if "I wouldn't judge a book by its cover". I even run my retail business living by this saying. Since I'm not living at my home in Dallas Planation full-time, unlike many others, I figured this would be the best way to offer my opinion. I will be at the home on mainly weekends and holidays to be completely honest with whomever reads this.

My property lies directly next to the proposed tower. The view could be damaged, my real-estate investment might even be ruined by the idea, and more importantly what about disruption with wildlife? Maine is huge, so I get that there's plenty of places for them to go, but it's also taking something from them too. The best part about waking up in the morning is seeing the wildlife in the backyard. It's even quite enjoyable seeing them on my security cameras when I am not up in the area. I mentioned, I just purchased the home, so I'm not looking to sell it, but please consider the following question. Would you purchase a home with a 300-foot lit at night tower located on top of the home with a large red flashing light on top? Consider my personal question if you will, but also consider it within other homeowners/landowners close by and how it can affect them financially down the road. Are these even safe to live oh so close to? Based on estimating simple measurements, it seems it could be about one football field away from my bedrooms where myself and my family sleep at night, but I could be off a few yards to be honest.

I have come to conclusion that I am completely against the proposed 300-foot tower based off my personal research, regardless of the fact it could be next to my home. I understand that others may disagree with my research and things I have said, but we're all entitled to do the same things. I challenge those individuals to do what I did and see it for yourself, put the time in, and come up with an opinion based off actual facts and not completely about the location in which you live and what one company is telling us we "need" in the area or at that **exact location**.

Lastly, I feel like both parties could come to an agreement of sorts. We do it in our personal lives every day, let alone in business. This is obviously a business transaction of sorts and I understand how businesses work. I have one. We're all in business to make money so I am not stating that this shouldn't happen, but maybe it's actually needed in a better location in which residents and tourists actually have zero line of communication? I hope you will please consider my research in making your final decision and do what is actually best for a larger portion of Maine.

All my best,

Andrew Jacobs