

STATE OF VERMONT  
PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Case No. 25-2931-PET

---

Petition of Bell Atlantic Mobile Systems, LLC  
and Vertex Towers, LLC requesting a  
certificate of public good, pursuant to 30  
V.S.A. § 248a, for the installation of wireless  
telecommunications equipment at 1030 Route  
100 in Rochester, Vermont

**TARA MURRAY'S AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

1. I, Tara Murray, am an intervener in the above matter.
2. I reside in Rochester at 64 State Garage Road.
3. My property abuts the property where the tower has been proposed.
4. On January 30, 2026 I called the Public Utility Commission and left a voicemail message for the Clerk asking to confirm the date deadline for Interveners to file responses to the petitioner.
6. On January 30, 2026 I emailed the Clerk asking same.
7. The online tab had 2-9-26 as a deadline and I just wished to confirm that.
8. On January 30, 2026 the Clerk called me by phone.
9. She confirmed that the deadline for responses was 3-9-26.
10. However, she stated that the Order on the Interveners' motions to intervene were already ruled on, complete and on her desk and would be filed and noticed that day.
11. I questioned why this could be decided prior to the deadline for responses to the petitioner.
12. The Clerk stated that she could hold the document and file it after the timeframe of 2-9-26 for responses to the petitioner. I stated that that sounded like it would be a rubber stamp and that we Interveners did not wish to work hard on preparing responses only to know that a decision was already made.
13. The Clerk stated that it was good news that my Motion to intervene was already granted. I asked

further about other interveners and she said they were all granted already as well. It was not until I was persistent in asking and she said she would read the whole decision that the Clerk informed me that the hearing officer had already ruled that the Interveners would be limited to one and that they must only speak on aesthetics.

14. I stated that we needed our right to respond and she said that he would hold the document and then issue it after the deadline of 3-9-26.

15. I again stated that that sounded wrong

16. The Clerk later stated she would have a new document issued.

17. I filed responses on 2-6-26 and 2-9-26 accordingly.

18. On February 17, 2026, I was notified that the Hearing Officer issued a Procedural Order Granting Motions to Intervene and Requests for Hearing, but only on aesthetics and limited responses to a coordinator.

Signed under the pains and penalties of perjury, this 17 day of March, 2026.

  
Tara Murray