

**Jan Bodendorf <dancingcrane9@yahoo.com>**

Wed, Apr 14,  
2:42 PM

to me, msbest2017, fjjc4, Ran

Hi Kristen, Thank you again for helping me access the meeting last night. I read the minutes, and something is stated differently from the way I heard it. The minutes say that if ( and I think it's when, not if) AT&T wanted to swap 4G for 5G there would be another hearing. I understood the lawyer to say that once they are approved to use the tower they are not obligated to hold any hearings about that, they can just do it. I'm wondering if other people heard it the same way.

I would also like to explain to everyone that if I seemed untrusting of the utility it is bolstered by past experience with a utility not being at all forthright and trustworthy when it comes to cell tower installation. Some board members may remember how a few years back Vtel tried to sneak a tower onto Hopkins Hill, right between 1143 where I live, and the Royers' property. When I saw someone putting out stakes, he said he didn't know what they were for. When I saw a huge pole being put up, I questioned a worker and was told it was for a cellular array. When I called an executive at Vtel to question him, his first statement was " He shouldn't have told you that!" He then offered to pay me and the Royers \$5000 each if we let the pole stand without saying anything about it. Instead, I called the town manager, and Jennifer and I went to the select board meeting. It turned out the company had erected the pole under false pretenses, and the town and Hardwick electric refused to put power to the pole and it was taken down. So anyway, when a lawyer says "probably" this and "most likely" that, I tend to want information to be more definite and binding.

I would also like to point out that in point 12. of the advance notice, it is stated "The Compound will have sufficient room for future collocations, and the existing tower still has unleased vertical space for future use." Although the lawyer claimed that tower could probably not support more arrays, there's no reason they couldn't beef up the tower so that it would, the way they would for the current proposed additions.

Thank you to the board for listening, and hopefully the point about whether AT&T is required to hold hearings before swapping out equipment can be clarified, and if necessary corrected in the minutes. Thank you, Jan

**Ran Lahav**

Wed, Apr 14,  
5:34 PM

to Frank, Anne, Jan, me, SM, fjjc4@myfairpoint.net

Hello Kristen,

Let me voice my agreement with what my neighbor Jan Bodendorf said in her e-mail below, and I am quoting her here: "when a lawyer says 'probably' this and 'most likely' that, I tend to want information to be more definite and binding."

In yesterday's zoom meeting I felt that there were too many "most likely" and "probably" and "we have no reason to" and the like. To give a simple example, the size of the antenna will "most likely" be small and remain small, but personally I would feel very uncomfortable without anything legally binding to prohibit installing a huge dish if AT&T feels like it 4 or 5 years from now.

Likewise, the noise, or the traffic on the access road, or the lights on the towers, or the intensity of the radiation etc. etc. - I feel strongly that they should be specified clearly in a legally binding way, and not be left to the good will of AT&T.

It seems to me that it would be naive to expect that AT&T would do anything out of good will, or that they would avoid doing what is best for them just for our sake. They are a business, and they would do anything legal to maximize their profit.

For this reason, I believe that it is crucial that we specify very clearly and precisely - and narrowly! - what exactly they are entitled to do and what they are not. It is in their interest to minimize their restrictions and give us vague "probably"s and "most likely"s. It is in our interest, on the contrary, to maximize their restrictions to exactly their proposal and nothing more, leaving no vagueness or loopholes, so we would not be surprised in the near future.

I hope that the town would take this into consideration.

Kind regards, Ran.

=====

Ran Lahav, PhD

<http://dphilo.org/> and <https://philopractice.org/web/>