

STATE OF VERMONT
PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Case No. 26-0574-PET

Petition of Industrial Tower and Wireless, LLC requesting a certificate of public good, pursuant to 30 V.S.A. § 248a, authorizing the installation of wireless telecommunications equipment at Bordoville, Vermont	
--	--

PRE-FILED TESTIMONY OF PHILIPPA DORFMAN

on behalf of Intervenors Philippa Dorfman, Victor Tirrito, Bordoville SDA Church, Derek J. Jones, Colleen Sheppard, Sandra and Christopher Bruhn

October 9, 2026

Summary: Philippa Dorfman presents testimony about the aesthetics of the area and whether the project would have an undue adverse aesthetic effect.

Pre-filed Direct Testimony

Of Philippa Dorfman

1 **Q.1. Please identify yourself by full legal name, occupation, and address.**

2 A.1 My name is Philippa Dorfman (married name Fourie). I am the mother of two young
3 children, wife of Charles Fourie and I am a student heading towards nursing and a self-
4 employed Yoga teacher. I live at 394 Bordoville Rd., Enosburgh, VT 05450. My property abuts
5 the land where the proposed telecommunications facility would be located and our family
6 would be about 500 feet away from this radio tower.

7 **Q.2 What is the purpose of your testimony?**

8 A.2 The purpose of my testimony is to address issues associated with the impacts on local
9 aesthetics, its impact on the scenic beauty to the surrounding area and neighboring lives of the
10 proposed ITW Enosburgh Tower Project on Bordoville Rd. in Enosburgh, VT. But, also and
11 more concerningly, and perhaps because it is abundantly evident that my testimony will make
12 no difference, to illuminate what this tower proposal does to the peace within a rural
13 neighborhood; turning neighbors against neighbors for future generations to inherit - talk about
14 the greater good?

15 It should be that the town Select Board and Planning Commission as well as the NWRPC should
16 protect its neighborhoods, scenic beauty, and historic rural areas. It should be that his body of
17 governance is supposed to protect this state against the rise of billboards, and, thus it should
18 have been, radio towers too. To even fathom that the mindset in Vermont has gone so far as to

1 think that “throwing people into the volcano”¹ is necessary for the greater good is sheer
2 testament to the lack of intelligent discussions around solutions that would actually be good for
3 all parties and in fact meet the criteria for the “greater good”. To throw up towers all across this
4 beautiful state, when a deeper look would reveal they are not in fact for the greater good, is in
5 no way the answer to solving problems and merely means that bodies of governance have
6 given up in critical problem solving for the greater good. When you listen to the lures of a tower
7 company and its attempts to plow through a state and put up as many towers as it can for its
8 own business models successes, telling the people only what they want to hear and then the
9 people taking the bait is in effect destroying not only the beautiful vistas that Vermont is **known**
10 for but you end up destroying lives and peaceful neighborhoods as well. Department of Public
11 Service Telecom Division Director Hunter Thompson’s statement about throwing us into the
12 volcano simply shows that *my* words do not matter, because my two young children, husband,
13 and I are one of the families you would be tossing into that volcano. What seems only to matter
14 at this point, is the persuasive techniques a tower company has managed to get through:
15 pertaining to the “emergency services” as if there are no other alternative technologies out
16 there that could satisfy these needs.

17 It simply is not the case that this is the only location this proposed tower could go. Does this
18 body of governance have no foresight into the emergence of technologies such as satellite and
19 fiberoptics or any understanding of the outweighing negative impacts towers like these have in

¹<https://vtdigger.org/2026/04/24/opinion-vermont-is-throwing-people-into-the-volcano/>

1 comparison to their proposed public benefits?

2 We would never have moved to this property ten years ago if there was a looming radio tower
3 some 500 feet away from it. What we will have to do if they put one up that close to our family
4 home, whilst raising small children, is move, and yet, we are thrown into the volcano. That is
5 my purpose, whether you read any of my words or not I am here to tell you our truth.

6 This company was given the opportunity to mitigate four years ago in its first application but
7 they continued to say no a tower of 120' would not suffice and so did not choose to mitigate.

8 Yet after losing at the Federal District Court and 2nd Circuit Appeals Court levels, they come
9 back a few years later and say oh well now a 120' tower will work. Does that not ring any alarm
10 bells for you?

11 **Q.3. How has your background informed your testimony in this case?**

12 A.3. I have ***already*** been through this ***entire*** process *with the same company and landowner in*
13 *the same exact location with all the same parties* several years ago where I directly witnessed
14 all of the hearing proceedings and heard, alongside you, and then the higher courts of appeal,
15 the mitigation strategies by ITW were rejected because a height of 120' would not allow its
16 tower to work in the way they intended. This should place me in a pretty solid position to state
17 that *if ITW under oath* has already stated in their previous testimony that a radio tower with
18 the height of 120' would not serve its intended communication purposes,² then I am in an

²7/24/26 Motion to Dismiss filed by Chris and Sandra Bruhn in Cas No. 26-0574-PET

1 “expert”-lay position to say that factually this tower will not provide the services that this
2 community seeks! This application is therefore in fact *not* for the public good and as a result
3 ITW should not be granted with a CPG for this project. Moreover, it seems abundantly clear to
4 me and many others that given the above statement, wouldn’t it be that ITW is simply trying to
5 get through with a 120’ application so it clears a pathway through the NWRPC on aesthetic
6 impact and then turn around later and reapply for an extended height in order to seek more co-
7 location/ antennae space? But by that time, everyone will only just want the tower to do its job
8 “properly” so likely an approval will go through so people can “try to get better cell service” and
9 yet there we would have a 140+ foot tower destroying the scenery which had been rejected
10 before based on just that. Without even a promise that any cell phone company would even
11 attach themselves to even a 140 foot tower with such a low density population in that area how
12 could it even be feasible that a cell company would do so with only one co-location space when
13 most of us who live there already have fine cell phone service, serviced by many of the main
14 service carriers already.

15 **Q.4. What is your experience with emergency service responses?**

16 A.4 I have been a resident of this town since we moved here in 2014. We send our children to
17 these school systems, pay our taxes, and spend our money in this community. I live on the
18 same road in which this tower is being proposed and emergency services respond to us
19 immediately when we are in need: between the time ITW applied initially and now we had to
20 have an ambulance come for our son, which came within minutes; we had to have a town
21 service truck get a tree off of our power line out of normal hours on a Sunday evening; and we

1 had a fire truck come as our wood stove pipe broke and I needed them to help me immediately;
2 in all instances we were serviced by EMS very soon after placing the calls, on our cell phones,
3 500 feet away from where they are proposing this tower. Our friends' cell phones work on our
4 property without using our internet, delivery trucks break down just past our house all the time
5 due to the nature of the class four road's steep decline and we watch them talk to their
6 roadside assistance on their cell phones or dispatch call units from Bordoville Rd. *already*. If you
7 think what I just said is non-evidential then where are the studies done in this small
8 neighborhood linking its need to these services? Wouldn't a body of governance deciding a
9 substantial case like this want to make sure they have checked all the boxes and not blindly sign
10 away the beauty of a place without covering all the bases?

11 **Q.5. Tell us about your property and how the proposed tower affects it.**

12 A.5. We bought 394 Bordoville property and we had our first child in 2015, spent our entire
13 savings to improve the home and its property in the years following, then had our second child
14 in 2023 mere months before the **first** application for the same tower came in. *We moved to this*
15 *neighborhood and purchased this property because of its aesthetic beauty and scenic*
16 *surroundings* and put our entire life savings into improving the structure of the house and the
17 property itself. Something we would never have even thought twice about had there been a
18 looming radio tower right next to the property (which it will if you approve it), and, something
19 our neighbors have noted they have been impressed about that we turned a house rotting to
20 the ground (once lived in by singer James Taylor) into a safe and beautiful family home even
21 living paycheck to paycheck. We have created a homestead with a lush vegetable and herb

1 garden, gave birth to both of our children here, and buried many of our beloved pets on this
2 property. We would not have stepped foot here or purchased this home and location back then
3 if there had been a giant lattice radio tower looming above and so close. What does that say
4 about what it will do to our future? We also bought this property never imagining we would
5 ever impose on our neighbors what our neighbor is now imposing on all of his, when quite
6 simply he has 700 more acres to choose from much farther away from any residences and we
7 have offered many chances for this company to mitigate. To drastically change the scenic
8 character and historic nature of this little hamlet in such a way would be unthinkable to us and
9 we haven't even lived here for nearly as long as the family who is, who should be the first to be
10 stewards of this land and try to protect its character from companies like this. We, all of us, as
11 people are smarter than this; there are better solutions, and yet, all we are asking, as neighbor
12 interveners, is to find a place on Hull's land where there is a large enough setback from where
13 people live to put the tower. Either that or put an antenna on his silo and set the tower deep
14 into Bakersfield where they say the main issue is and where there might be better locations
15 away from residences. The rhetoric that this tower would be the only way to ensure EMT
16 communications is simply just not factual when fiber optics and satellite offer the same
17 solutions with less invasive strategies, and we have been more than willing to work with them
18 on suggested strategies like finding an alternate location.

19 **Q.6. Have you previously provided testimony before the Vermont Public Utility Commission**
20 **or in other judicial or administrative proceedings?**

21 A.6. No.

Q.7. When did you first learn about this proposal to construct a lattice tower for a radio antenna on Bordoville Rd. in Enosburgh?

A.7. In the Spring of 2022 a few months after my son was born at our home with a planned homebirth, on Bordoville Rd. I received the same packet of notification then about that application that I did this time for the same application four years after they were denied for the first one.

Q.8. What information have you reviewed to prepare your testimony?

A.8 I have reviewed the ITW Enosburgh Tower Proposal Case No. 26-0574-PET filed with the PUC including testimony, public comments, discovery responses and other filings. I have reviewed the Town of Enosburgh's Zoning Bylaws, Tower Ordinance, and Town Plan. I have also reviewed the Regional Plan for the NWRPC.

Q.9. The applicant is proposing to erect a lattice tower in a specific location on private property on Bordoville Rd., to support an antenna for a radio network. Please describe the area where this tower is proposed, and explain whether the applicant's descriptions are accurate.

A.9. The proposed tower location is on private land near too many primary and seasonal residences, and several hundred feet away from our own home. The area is surrounded by forest, farmland, and an historic rural neighborhood. The lands surrounding the proposed tower location are undeveloped, residential, and/or agricultural, which all add to the natural beauty within the Bordoville hamlet. The applicant's description does not encompass the impact that the proposed tower would have on the neighbors for the surrounding area, nor

1 does it acknowledge its admittance from the previous application that a tower of this size
2 would be unsuitable to their project plan, and instead fall short with any feasible explanation of
3 that previous testimony. The fact that this tower size would only be able to potentially host one
4 extra antenna should be reason alone not to issue a CPG yet a tower this size and any bigger
5 will destroy the natural beauty for a long time to come for such a small option at giving the
6 good to the public.

7 **Q.10. Did you observe any balloon tests?**

8 A.10 As a neighbor abutter/adjoining landowner, for the first application, I was never notified
9 of any balloon test nor would the landowner allow us to do one of our own from the site
10 location. They never came to us to see what it would look like from our property. As far as I
11 know, there was no balloon test for the second application. Their simulations are based on the
12 information gathered for the first application. The fact that a balloon test is not required is an
13 abomination.

14 **Q.11 If you did not observe a balloon test, have you seen the applicant's photos in Exhibit**
15 **LH-6, the applicant's discovery response photo sets, and/or the drone photos taken by a**
16 **company hired by Intervenors, and what did you learn about the visibility of the proposed**
17 **tower?**

18 A.11 These simulated images are not the real thing and should not be valid. They are based
19 on information gathered in the first application. There is no photographic evidence submitted
20 by Petitioner in this case that is specifically for this so-called "new" application for the proposed
21 120 foot tower.

1 **Q.12 Where is your residence in relation to the proposed tower?**

2 A.12 My residence is N-NW about 500 feet, give or take, from the location site. My property
3 abuts the property where the proposed tower would be located and we would see it everyday
4 out any South, East, or SouthEast facing windows in our home. We would be the ones you all
5 are willing to throw in the volcano to be exact.

6 **Q.13. Do you own any other properties in the area of the proposed tower?**

7 A.13 No, but the landowner trying to put the tower up sure does, 700+ acres in fact, of land he
8 could potentially offer a site for ITW to put a tower on much farther away from any residential
9 homes raising young children in a historic residential neighborhood.

10 **Q.14. As a local resident who is familiar with the character of the area, how would the tower**
11 **change the aesthetics of the area?**

12 A.14. The proposed tower would have an irreversible negative impact on the aesthetics of the
13 area. It would take away from the natural beauty and untouched vistas. Our neighborhood is
14 the highest density cluster of homes in the area. Any other location within a mile or two would
15 not impact an entire neighborhood the way this does.

16 **Q.15. Has the applicant taken steps to mitigate the aesthetic effect of the proposed tower?**

17 A.15 They have not mitigated the location when the property owner has 700+ acres to put it
18 on. Applying for a tower twenty feet less in height from the same tower proposed four years
19 ago, still negatively impacts the scenic beauty of this historic rural area. There are other
20 technologies out there serving the same purposes of improving EMS communication but with

1 less intrusive technologies.

2 **Q.16 In your opinion as an average person, would the tower be in character with the area or**
3 **would it create an undue adverse aesthetic impact on the area?**

4 A.16 I most certainly would never have taken a left into that neighborhood ten years ago to live
5 in and purchase a property near a tower like this proposal. So yes, the proposed tower would
6 not be in character with the area. It would deter many people such as myself from visiting it
7 and living here. We would have to move if this is issued but again, the head of the Vermont
8 Telecom Division said, “throw them into a volcano” for what? For “the greater good”? This is in
9 no way the only way to create the greater good when there are other less intrusive ways out
10 there right now. It would create an undue adverse aesthetic impact on the area for as long as it
11 stands. Erecting a 120’ commercial lattice tower that stands above the ridgeline would take
12 away from the Rural & Residential Ambiance of the area, a cherished aspect of this area.

13 **Q.17 Is there anything else you would like to say?**

14 A.17 The PUC *should* deny the proposed ITW tower project Case No. 26-0574-PET. The PUC
15 should take into consideration the negative impact the proposed tower would have on the
16 natural aesthetics of the area. Photos of the area does not do justice to how extraordinary the
17 untouched vistas are. The PUC should observe the previous case applied for the same structure
18 in the same spot with the same parties involved, and respect the proactive actions the
19 Neighbor Intervenors took to conserve and protect its natural resources in that case. The PUC
20 should recognize that the natural landscape that is so visually appealing is the number one
21 driver for small towns’ tourism-based economy. The PUC needs to be realistic in terms of the

1 height, they claimed prior to not suffice for its purpose and which they now are applying for at
2 120', will likely be added onto in height in the coming years and how that would also continue
3 to destroy the ridgeline even further. The PUC must not allow the same applicant to return to
4 the same site with the same landowner for a project the applicant previously said would not
5 meet its needs.

6 **Q.18 Does this conclude your testimony?**

7 A.18 Yes.

AFFIDAVIT OF PHILIPPA DORFMAN

1. I have provided pre-filed testimony and exhibits in the above-captioned matter.
2. I have personal knowledge of the information provided in my pre-filed testimony.
3. I am able to testify as to the validity of the information contained in my pre-filed testimony and exhibits.
4. I declare that the foregoing statements are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief. I understand that if the above statement is false, I may be subject to sanctions by the Commission pursuant to 30 V.S.A. § 30.

Dated at Enosburgh, Vermont this 9th day of October 2026.

/s/ PHILIPPA DORFMAN

PHILIPPA DORFMAN