

From: Bolstridge, Karen
To: ["Jim Hebert"](#); ["Chad Hebert"](#); [Richard Trafton](#)
Cc: [Horn-Olsen, Samantha](#); [Livesay, Nicholas](#); [Bolstridge, Karen](#)
Subject: LUPC – DP 4944
Date: Friday, October 10, 2014 11:05:00 AM
Attachments: [dp4944_KeyIssues_9-29-14.pdf](#)
[FW: LUPC – DP 4944.pdf](#)

Jim:

Thank you for taking the time to attend the Commission Meeting on October 08, 2014 to hear the discussion on outstanding key issues related to the telecommunications tower proposed in Big Lake Township.

During that meeting, the Commission voiced questions about the project, location and design the answers to which would help assist in the review of the application.

Staff has summarize those questions for the applicant below; please provide the answers to staff.

1. Would a shorter tower necessitate building another tower, or multiple towers, elsewhere?
2. What other towers are anticipated in the area in the future? How will the height and capacity of this tower affect the construction of future towers?
3. What entities do you anticipate requesting co-location? Have any of those entities made initial requests? Could they be accommodated on a tower under 200'? How many co-locations would be available on a 200 foot tower?
4. Can the tower be more than 190' and still be unlighted? What is the maximum unlighted height, and would that height tower provide coverage to meet the FCC requirements?
5. Please provide a legend for the coverage maps for 190' and 200'.
6. Please expand upon your statements at the public hearing about how and what alternative sites were considered, and whether there are other possible sites with a lesser visual impact. Please note that specific alternatives, such as moving farther back on the lot, or the Sharon Hatch property, were raised by commenters.

Further, below and attached is an email sent by Nick Livesay on October 01, 2014. I am resending it to you at your corrected email address to insure you have a full copy with attachments so that you may answer any questions relayed in that email.

Let me know if you have any questions or if I can be of any assistance.

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
(207) 941-4222 (fax)
www.maine.gov/acf

From: Livesay, Nicholas
Sent: Wednesday, October 01, 2014 4:17 PM
To: 'jrhebert@blkdiamond.net'; Richard Trafton (rtrafton@traftonandmatzen.com)
Cc: Horn-Olsen, Samantha; Bolstridge, Karen
Subject: FW: LUPC – DP 4944

Jim:

When we spoke several weeks ago I indicated that we were reviewing the RF plots showing coverage for both a 250' and 190' tower in Big Lake. When you emailed the plot for the 250' tower you included a summary of observations made by Gerard Boland of U.S. Cellular. In general, this summary states that although the RF plots for the two different tower heights appear very similar, there are a number of reasons U.S. Cellular is proposing a 250' tower.

As you know and as outlined in the recent staff memo to the Commission regarding the review of DP 4944 (Mary York emailed a copy to you yesterday and I am forwarding that email here), the Commission's review responsibilities require it to evaluate the visual impact of the proposed tower. The applicable statutory and regulatory standards are quoted and cited in the memo. In particular, the Commission's rules state:

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 or shorelines.

Ch. 10.25,E,1,a.

With regard to the proposed cell tower, the tower height is a key feature of its design and whether the tower has been designed to reasonably minimize its visual impact likely will be one of the central determinations the Commission will have to make. As part of this analysis it is likely the Commission will consider whether the proposed 250' tower that requires lighting is a reasonable design when compared to the service that would be provided by a 190' unlighted tower.

When we last spoke, I indicated that it would be helpful if Gerald Boland or someone else could submit additional information elaborating on the general conclusion you passed on in your September 5 email. This remains the case.

In the meantime, we have attempted to learn what we can about the FCC Auction 901 referenced in your email. We understand that auction funding is important for the project and that through this auction U.S. Cellular will receive approximately \$526,000 for the current project, provided the FCC auction requirements are satisfied. We also understand that one of the key requirements is that U.S. Cellular provide a certain level of coverage to specific roads within a geographic area. Information available online indicates there are 18.89 road miles within the Princeton/Big Lake

geographic area subject to the FCC Auction 901. Can you or U.S. Cellular show where these road miles are in relation to the area of coverage shown on the plots? Also, in U.S. Cellular's bid, what portion of these road miles are proposed for coverage? Finally, what type and level of service is proposed by U.S. Cellular in bid to the FCC and how does this service compare to the FCC's requirements in order to receive FCC auction money? This and any other information that would assist the Commission in its understanding whether FCC auction money would remain available if a 190' tower were constructed, as opposed to a 250' tower, would be helpful.

Also, in your summary email from September 5 you indicate that opportunities for colocation would be reduced with a shorter tower. Has U.S. Cellular received requests for colocation? Will there be any difficulty accommodating those requests under either a 250' or 190' scenario? How much space would be available for future colocation in either tower height scenario? Any additional information on this topic area you think would be helpful would be appreciated.

Please let me know if you or U.S. Cellular will be able to provide the Commission additional information to help Commission members better understand the differences between a 190' tower and 250' tower as it applies the required visual impact standards.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Regards,
Nick