

**STATE OF VERMONT
PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Case No. 25-2931-PET

Application of Vertex Towers, LLC and Bell Atlantic Mobile Systems, LLC d/b/a Verizon Wireless, for a Certificate of Public Good, pursuant to 30 V.S.A. § 248a, Authorizing the construction of a Telecommunications Facility in Rochester, Vt.	
---	--

**INTERVENOR'S REPLY TO RESPONSE OF PETITIONER TO
MOTIONS TO INTERVENE**

NOW come Jake & Bonnie Wildwood and reply to Petitioner's response to Motions to Intervene. Vertex/Verizon claims that we, as abutters, do not have a right to intervene in this case because we raise similar issues that the Town has already raised. We disagree. Just because *some* of our interests are also included in our Town's response, that does not mean the town's response and interests are *exactly aligned* with our own as abutters to the site and the Town may decide to agree to terms or compromises that are beyond what *we believe* are reasonable.

Our business and house (located in the same building) is one of the closest structures to the proposed tower, so we hope that the PUC will take this into consideration when weighing our interests.

Vertex/Verizon specifically noted that one of our interests is to reduce harm to our *neighbors* via possible runoff or construction-related problems and thus this worry does not apply as a *personal interest* of our own. The potential for washed-out roads and damage to neighbors' properties *do* concern us in that we are all interrelated here -- during Tropical Storm Irene our area was cut-off from all sides and we became isolated as a town. It was terrible for families, properties, and businesses in the area and many properties were never redeveloped after damage. We were here for that and remember it well. Any extra risk from road construction/widening/enlargement on steep grades (which is a must for this project to go forward) must be weighed heavily here.

Vertex/Verizon also specifically noted that we cannot intervene on the basis of possible loss or reduction in business due to the tower's visual effect on tourism, but our Town Plan specifically protects the Scenic Byway we are located at against such eyesores that could potentially turn-off people from the area. The tower would become part of the mountain backdrop of our town and, considering how a similar tower looks just south of us in Stockbridge, it would be *quite* the eyesore. Photos provided both by Vertex and by numerous observers prove that it would be visible from many locations.

Vertex/Verizon further noted that depreciation of property values *cannot* be considered when deciding to greenlight tower development. Regardless, this is a concern of ours as this tower is proposed at a site *very* close to us and many people do *not* want to live close to cell towers for all manner of reasons. If our family needed to sell later-on, it would definitely have an impact on who would be willing to buy.

Unfortunately, the PDF files of our submitted Motion to Intervene do *not* have the full text of what we wrote when we submitted, so some of our comments were shortened in what is publicly available. We originally went on for a length about how the proposed Vertex/Verizon tower would mostly replicate the AT&T/et al. coverage already available which is in evidence from *their own proposed coverage maps* -- and it would. Vertex/Verizon noted that co-location in the church steeple was not an option that is practical and that "small cell" units are not an option. We strongly disagree on the latter -- and the latter is really the only effective way to provide service into the areas of the town that aren't serviced already by AT&T/et al. -- up Route 73 and Bingo areas, farther into the Hollow and north of town, the "areas in shade" from ridges, and whatnot.

The Town Plan is the most important piece of evidence in support for denial of this project and, as both the Rochester Selectboard and Planning Commission have found, this project would violate our Town Plan in many areas and we think that this is reason-enough to not grant Vertex/Verizon permission to proceed.

While we agree that the Rochester Selectboard and Planning Commission have both done due diligence in researching the various ways the tower project does *not* comply with the Town Plan, we are not entirely satisfied that the Town's interests and arguments are sufficiently-strong to protect *our* interests and the Town Plan's *rules* as well.

As pertains to our Motion to Intervene and the Town Plan, we are mostly concerned with proper development of the area, the infringement of the Scenic Byway section *in our Town Plan* that should prohibit construction of a tower along its route, aesthetics, and any harm to wildlife, endangered species, health, wetlands, etc. mentioned in it. Vertex/Verizon noted in their response that the wetland is not of a type that can be considered. This is erroneous -- the Town Plan specifically mentions that *any wetland* is something to be considered and does not differentiate on grades of wetlands.

We have particularized interests that no other party can protect. The only way to protect our interests is by participating in this proceeding. Our Motion to Intervene should be granted.

Respectfully submitted this 9th day of February, 2026 in Rochester by,

/s/ Jake & Bonnie Wildwood
Jake & Bonnie Wildwood
(also speaking for Mary & Bob Atwood)
645 VT Route 100 S
Rochester, VT 05767