

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

From: [Rob Burgess](#)
To: [Bolstridge, Karen](#)
Subject: DP 5050 B
Date: Friday, September 17, 2021 11:42:20 AM

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.

Dear Ms. Bolstridge,

I offer the following comments with regard to the proposed 300' communications tower in Dallas Plantation:

Dear Members of the Land Use Planning Commission:

I am a part-time resident in the Rangeley area, and have been for the last 20 years. I am also President of Southern Maine Astronomers, a non-profit organization that promotes the science of astronomy and advocates for preserving dark skies, not only in southern and coastal Maine but everywhere throughout the state. I oppose this tower for several reasons.

Darkness is a natural resource that is vanishing. The careless spread of stray light into the night sky is not unlike the dumping of effluent into our rivers 50 years ago, where no one paid much attention to the destruction of a public resource. Today we have learned how darkness is part of the natural rhythm of life, and how its destruction has adverse impacts on all manner of wildlife habitats and life cycles, including human health. We have also come to realize that dark skies are integral to the quality of place, spurring, in part, eco-tourism to the Rangeley Lakes area. Any viewer of light pollution maps will see that Maine is about the last location east of the Mississippi that still has dark places and is within a day's drive of tens of millions of potential tourists who are anxious to experience the outdoors, including seeing a night sky they can no longer see at home.

The Rangeley Lakes region is one of the darkest areas remaining in the state and efforts are underway to possibly seek designation as a dark sky community by the International Dark Sky Association. Within the last year Maine has received two IDA designations – an International Dark Sky Sanctuary at the Katahdin Woods & Waters National Monument, and an International Dark Sky Park for the AMC's 100-mile Wilderness section of the AT. Maine is being promoted as a dark sky haven, and the Rangeley region could be next among them. (And just across the border, Mont Megantic has already been designated an International Dark Sky Reserve by IDA.) However, the insertion of this monstrous flashing tower in the midst of all the natural beauty of the area would be detrimental and an affront to any such designation. The Rangeley Lakes Heritage Trust has recently published a guide on 12 good stargazing areas in the area, including nearby Quill Hill, and I suspect this tower would be visible from many of them.

The tower itself would not create the kind of light pollution we are generally concerned about. However, the flashing nature of the strobes – white by day and red by night - would be highly disruptive to visitors seeking to enjoy the nighttime vistas of the region. If such a tower were to be built you should condition it upon the use of current technology that would only activate the strobes, for a short period of time, when an aircraft was in the vicinity. This is being considered for

the two new electrical transmission towers on either side of Merrymeeting Bay, based on the objections of area residents to the incessant flashing strobes currently in use.

Finally, I question the need for this tower in the face of what is happening above us. For better or worse, SpaceX is launching about 100 small Starlink satellites per month, with a goal to launch as many as 40,000 of them, to facilitate internet access and communications worldwide. While this development is the bane of professional and amateur astronomers alike, if we are going to be faced with it it does suggest that other technologies are fast emerging that may eliminate the need for towers. I think it is inappropriate and unwise to scar a pristine landscape with this kind of structure when its useful life might indeed be short.

For all of the foregoing reasons I urge you to reject the application. Thank you for your consideration.

Robert A. Burgess
64 Friendship Street
Brunswick, ME 04011

From: [Peter](#)
To: [Bolstridge, Karen](#)
Subject: FirstNet Tower
Date: Friday, September 17, 2021 4:40:01 PM

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.

To the Land Use Planning Commission:

I am writing to add my support for the proposed FirstNet cell tower on Dallas Hill. This tower will provide much-needed wireless communications for our emergency first responders and will improve cell reception and broadband access to area residents, visitors, and businesses. Rural areas in Maine, like Dallas Plantation and on Rangeley Lake, have suffered from low data speeds and dead zones for far too long. This tower will allow people to reliably work from home, access telehealth and education services and, most importantly, reach emergency services when they are needed.

These community benefits outweigh any negative scenic impacts created by the tower or the lights on the tower. While Dallas Plantation and the surrounding area is rural, it is not remote and it is not a wilderness. The area is already affected by lights from Rangeley Village, at least two lighted cell towers in the area, and lights from the airport.

I encourage you to approve the Rising Tide Tower application so that this critical piece of public safety infrastructure can be built as quickly as possible.

Sincerely,

Pete Roehrig
63 Faunce Road
Rangeley, ME 04970

From: kdhutch3@maine.rr.com
To: [Bolstridge, Karen](#)
Subject: DP5050- rebuttal
Date: Friday, September 17, 2021 5:18:26 PM
Attachments: [final cell tower rebuttal.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.

Hello Karen,
Could you please add this rebuttal letter to the public record on Development Permit 5050 Rising Tide Towers.

Thank you,
Ralph & Karen Hutchinson

This is not a referendum on whether the area needs a cell phone tower. This is a decision about whether this particular cell tower project belongs on this particular area of Dallas Hill.

First and foremost, we refer you to **Chapter 10.06- D**, which 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." This cell tower is proposed for a land area that is part of two subdistricts, the D-RS2 and the M-GM, so the stricter standards of the D-RS2 subdistrict must apply. In fact, the tower was first proposed for the D-RS2 subdistrict and was turned down by your Commission. It is now located a few feet away, just slightly over the line, placing it in the M-GM subdistrict. This violates the spirit of the regulations. Just because the tower is budged a few feet over the line does not mean that all of the Commission's reasons for denying this project should not apply to this tower as well.

Second, Rising Tide has failed to show that the tower will not have a negative impact on the scenic character of the area for miles around. During the site visit, there was no weather balloon or any other real props used to model the visual impact, only computer generated images. The "experts" that led this site visit had one goal, to push the idea that there would be no visual impact at all. The idea that no campers or boaters would ever be on the lake to see the tower is not true. I was present at the site visit, and at each stop it was clear that there would either be a huge visual impact, or it was impossible to tell because there was no balloon or other props to show the height of the tower. We simply were asked to take the word of the "experts" (paid by Black Diamond to push the project) and believe that this 300 foot tower was no big deal. There was also no photos or visits to the neighborhood on Dallas Hill that would be most impacted.

In both the M-GM and D-RS2 subdistricts, structures are to be of similar type, scale and intensity as other allowed uses. This requirement is completely ignored by this 300 foot tower. Adequate provision has not 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. Rising Tide insists that the tower will hardly be visible. How can this be? This is a 300 foot structure with blinking lights, which will be visible during the day and all night long. Rising Tide's dismissal of the negative visual impacts is misleading and dishonest.

Finally, Rising Tide has stated that there is simply nowhere else to locate this tower and that they are running out of time. The original area chosen by AT&T where the tower should be located for efficient reception was large. There were many areas within this circle that the tower could have been placed that would not be in a neighborhood, not as visually impactful and still supply good reception. Perhaps rather than concentrating and doubling down on this one small neighborhood on Dallas Hill, Rising Tide should have made a wider search. Has Rising Tide simply looked for the site that is the easiest and least expensive for their purposes? How can we know that they have done their due diligence in looking for the best site for this tower? When siting this tower, shouldn't this permanent structure be placed in a location that is best for the entire area, and not just Rising Tide and the big corporate cell tower companies?

We do not deny that good reception is necessary for the people of Rangeley. However, the placement of this tower matters! In a special area like Rangeley, this tower should be placed in a location that does not mar the beauty of the area and does not negatively impact a neighborhood. Please uphold your previous decision about DP5050, that this area of Dallas Hill is not appropriate for this tower. Work with Rising Tide to find a more appropriate location.

Thank you,

Ralph & Karen Hutchinson

43 Beans Corner

Dallas Plantation