

Tower Comments and Responses

No.	Date/Time Rec'd	From	Public Comment/Question Summary	Washington County Response
1	3/26/08 @9:15 PM	Russell Plante	Maryland State Trooper in favor of new system and supports tower.	Washington County appreciates your support of it's effort to provide emergency communications in Southern Washington County for the safety of our citizens and first responders.
2	3/26/08 @7:00 PM	Potomac Valley Fire Co. Inc.	Fire Company located in community affected by tower coverage, supporting the tower.	Washington County appreciates your support of it's effort to provide emergency communications in Southern Washington County for the safety of our citizens and first responders.
3	3/25/08 @11:30 AM	Boonsboro Ambulance & Rescue Services Inc.	Company support of tower.	Washington County appreciates your support of it's effort to provide emergency communications in Southern Washington County for the safety of our citizens and first responders.
4	3/26/08 @10:27 PM	Tom Clemens	Public not permitted to comment against tower, but users commented on why its needed. What alternative sites were examined, why were they rejected, why Keep Tryst location and why this style tower?	The County plans to hold a public hearing to take public testimony in the near future.
5	3/27/08 @9:03 AM	Charles Bailey	Applaud idea that EMS communications for this region. Appalled that its not available now. Why not defray costs by leasing space.	Washington County appreciates your support of it's effort to provide emergency communications in Southern Washington County for the safety of our citizens and first responders.
6	3/27/08 @8:40 AM	C. S. Vann	Wondering if the planners have really explored all possible options. Seems tower is an easy and inexpensive fix for problems the area has had for years. Why not satellite coverage or other more advance technology. Could affect tourist trade as well.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Satellite coverage is an ongoing cost and not fiscally possible. While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology.
7	3/27/08 @12:36 PM	Jim Laird	Can't believe the County can't find a better way to get coverage in South County. Please consult a different engineer. Cell companies hide their towers when given no other option.	Monopole does not work for Microwave because of its flexibility and a monopole cannot hold the number of antennas required. Guyed tower requires more acreage. Disguised tower was proposed and rejected by the NPS.
8	3/26/08 @11:05 AM	Linda Finn	Tower will unnecessarily harm the scenic beauty of three national parks. County can provide emergency communications while protecting national parks and must work the NPS. Comp Plan - Balance Future Growth with the need to preserve historical, cultural and scenic beauty. NPS convinced alternative exist. - FORM LETTER.	Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.

Tower Comments and Responses

9	3/26/08 @11:14 AM	Dennis Graham	Tower will unnecessarily harm the scenic beauty of three national parks. County can provide emergency communications while protecting national parks and must work the NPS. Comp Plan - Balance Future Growth with the need to preserve historical, cultural and scenic beauty. NPS convinced alternative exist. - FORM LETTER.	Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.
10	3/26/08 @11:50 AM	Briana Wagner	Tower will unnecessarily harm the scenic beauty of three national parks. County can provide emergency communications while protecting national parks and must work the NPS. Comp Plan - Balance Future Growth with the need to preserve historical, cultural and scenic beauty. NPS convinced alternative exist. - FORM LETTER.	Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.
11	3/26/08 @12:18 PM	William Walsh	Tower will unnecessarily harm the scenic beauty of three national parks. County can provide emergency communications while protecting national parks and must work the NPS. Comp Plan - Balance Future Growth with the need to preserve historical, cultural and scenic beauty. NPS convinced alternative exist. - FORM LETTER.	Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.
12	3/26/08 @9:37 PM	William Ryder	Tower will unnecessarily harm the scenic beauty of three national parks. County can provide emergency communications while protecting national parks and must work the NPS. Comp Plan - Balance Future Growth with the need to preserve historical, cultural and scenic beauty. NPS convinced alternative exist. - FORM LETTER.	Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.
13	3/26/08 @6:50 PM	Judith Layman	Tower will unnecessarily harm the scenic beauty of three national parks. County can provide emergency communications while protecting national parks and must work the NPS. Comp Plan - Balance Future Growth with the need to preserve historical, cultural and scenic beauty. NPS convinced alternative exist. - FORM LETTER.	Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.
14	3/26/08 @7:10 PM	Joseph Colbourn	Tower will unnecessarily harm the scenic beauty of three national parks. County can provide emergency communications while protecting national parks and must work the NPS. Comp Plan - Balance Future Growth with the need to preserve historical, cultural and scenic beauty. NPS convinced alternative exist. - FORM LETTER.	Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.

Tower Comments and Responses

15	3/26/08 @6:08 PM	Ernest Pruitt	Tower will unnecessarily harm the scenic beauty of three national parks. County can provide emergency communications while protecting national parks and must work the NPS. Comp Plan - Balance Future Growth with the need to preserve historical, cultural and scenic beauty. NPS convinced alternative exist. - FORM LETTER.	Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.
16	3/27/08 @6:22 PM	Ken Hawes	Tower will unnecessarily harm the scenic beauty of three national parks. County can provide emergency communications while protecting national parks and must work the NPS. Comp Plan - Balance Future Growth with the need to preserve historical, cultural and scenic beauty. NPS convinced alternative exist. - FORM LETTER.	Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.
17	3/27/08 @6:21 AM	Pamela Edwards	Tower will unnecessarily harm the scenic beauty of three national parks. County can provide emergency communications while protecting national parks and must work the NPS. Comp Plan - Balance Future Growth with the need to preserve historical, cultural and scenic beauty. NPS convinced alternative exist. - FORM LETTER.	Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.
18	3/28/08 @10:42 PM	Tina Angle	Please don't build tower. Agree with position and suggestions of NPS.	Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.
19	3/28/08 @10:43 PM	Lawrence Angle	Preserve our beautiful County. Please don't build tower. Agree with position and suggestions of NPS.	Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.
20	3/27/08 @11:57 PM	Steve Specht	Suggest using Gapland Fire Station #8 property for the tower to cover 70-80% of south County and another lower profile tower on slopes of Loudoun Heights to cover Weverton-Sandy Hook area. Also suggest commercial users on tower to help Sta. #8 funding shortfalls.	Implementing this recommendation would prevent the county from meeting the system performance requirements.

Tower Comments and Responses

21	3/28/2008	Mike DiLeo	Home is less than .3 miles from site. Do not dispute the "reason" for the tower. Height is the problem. NPS solutions of federal property, building two smaller towers resulting in more coverage seems to have merit. Suggest seeking the help of the NPS to find common ground that all could embrace.	Implementing this recommendation would prevent the county from meeting the system performance requirements. Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.
22	3/28/08 @3:15 PM	Firnhaber Family	Region is zoned conservation for a reason. Tower is contradictory to zoning and would diminish the appearance to the threshold into MD and Wash. Co. Do not want this monstrosity in "my face." Rumored that NPS has suggested two towers on Fed. Land. Should accept offer. Protect value of homes.	This site is in conformance with County zoning. We are not aware of any other regulations or specific uses at this site. Implementing this recommendation would prevent the county from meeting the system performance requirements.
23	3/28/08 @4:00 PM	Dr. Edmund & Roberta Niklewski	Opposed to tower and urge BCC to work cooperatively with NPS officials to find alternatives. NPS is willing to work out a solution and has suggested 85' tower on Fed land where it won't scar the scenic view from three parks. Tower will have negative impact on parks.	Implementing this recommendation would prevent the county from meeting the system performance requirements. Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.
24	3/28/08 @4:22 PM	Robert & Marilyn Wood	Please find an alternative to the tower or build two towers at different locations.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Implementing this recommendation would prevent the county from meeting the system performance requirements.
25	3/28/08 @6:44 PM	Daniel Kremintzer	Applaud the County for making the right choice to put a tower at Keep Tryst. The community need for emergency communications is far more important than other things. Asking County to consider leasing cell space to improve cell coverage also.	Washington County appreciates your support of it's effort to provide emergency communications in Southern Washington County for the safety of our citizens and first responders.
26	3/29/08 @6:43 AM	Christie Tyler	Frustrated at not knowing about the tower until 3/27/08 newspaper article seeing my and neighbors homes in photos. Who is going to compensate me for loss in property value? Have two small children, is their health hazard? Alternate locations need to be explored. With today's technology, there must be another means. Will continue to fight.	We do not anticipate any loss in property value and therefore no compensation will be forthcoming. No health hazards are known at this time. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Satellite coverage is an ongoing cost and not fiscally possible. While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology.

Tower Comments and Responses

27	3/29/08 @7:22 AM	Miriam and Leo Reisberg	35-year south county resident. Emer. Response takes 45 minutes here. Problem is inadequate number of responders, not communications. Priorities should be reordered and funds spent on increased personnel. What's the point of the tower if there's no one answers the phone?	Fire and rescue personnel in this area are volunteers and would welcome new volunteers.
28	3/29/08 @12:46 PM	Vincent Vaughn	Please don't do this as I can see half a dozen of them already.	Washington County has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file).
29	3/29/08 @4:27 PM	Richard J Hamilton	Strongly opposed to height and location. Info available to public appears that County doesn't care about this horrible intrusion forever on viewsheds. Please consider the willingness of the NPS to help with a less intrusive solution. We've gotten along very well with substandard communications in that area, a little longer won't make much difference.	Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.
30	3/29/08 @6:32 PM	Sharpsburg VFC	Current low band system is unsafe and can very easily cost someone's life one day. Have been on numerous call where current radio could not transmit. Please take all this info into consideration, not only for local F&R, but for our tax paying citizens.	Washington County appreciates your support of it's effort to provide emergency communications in Southern Washington County for the safety of our citizens and first responders.
31	3/29/08 @8:03 PM	David Biser	Please work with the NPS and their engineers to find an alternative to your unsightly proposal. Quoting Dennis Frye "Our interest is to compromise with the county to provide similar coverage without the eyesore, and with technology and creative thinking it can be done."	Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.
32	3/29/08 @9:14 PM	Margaret Biser	Continue to search for alternative locations for the tower. In the County's interest to be sensitive to the scenery. Urge thorough exploration of option before negatively impacting county treasures.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Satellite coverage is an ongoing cost and not fiscally possible. While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology.

Tower Comments and Responses

33	3/30/08 @4:07 PM	James E. Harrah	To the BCC, Difficult responsibilities, but don't take the easy way out. Consider other alternatives and if they don't work, then seek out the tough, yet correct solution.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements. Satellite coverage is an ongoing cost and not fiscally possible. While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology.
34	3/30/08 @8:51 PM	Sandra Bloom	Adamantly opposed the siting of a cell tower near the Appalachian Trail. Please suspend plans and allow public input on the issue.	The proposed tower is not a cell tower and the County Commissioners have publicly stated that no commercial users will be permitted to use this tower. It will be limited to only government and public safety users. The County plans to hold a public hearing to take public testimony in the near future.
35	3/30/08 @9:05 PM	Patricia Schooley	Blighting our County. What other technologies have been considered. Can more short towers be used or existing towers?	Satellite coverage is an ongoing cost and not fiscally possible. While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology. Implementing this recommendation would prevent the county from meeting the system performance requirements.
36	3/31/08 @9:40 AM	Kourtney Lowery	No one doubting significance of tower. There may be alternatives to obstructing a federally protected view. Go to Weverton Cliffs and imagine the view with the tower.	Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.
37	3/31/2008	Save Historic Antietam Foundation	On behalf of BOD and >600 members, oppose tower. Little scientific info provided on excessive height eyesore. Scenic view protected by 3 Nat. Parks, diminish viewshed. NPS has a lot of experience in alternatives to large monopoles. Why not take advantage of their expertise. Violates comprehensive plan. Maybe the Co. should work with the NPS.	Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers. Monopole does not work for Microwave because of its flexibility and a monopole cannot hold the number of antennas required. Guyed tower requires more acreage. Disguised tower was proposed and rejected by the NPS. This site is in conformance with County zoning. We are not aware of any other regulations or specific uses at this site.

Tower Comments and Responses

38	3/31/08 @ 2:12 PM	Diane Younkins	<p>Not satisfied that Co. has tried hard enough to pursue other options. Understand there is an option to place tower near Pleasant Valley Elem. Have you considered negotiating with others (NPS or Loudoun Broadband MW). What already exists? How can we make other options work? Where can we place less obtrusive sites?</p>	<p>The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Satellite coverage is an ongoing cost and not fiscally possible. While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology. Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.</p>
39	3/31/08 @2:17 PM	Marc	<p>Against tower. Understand the need for F&R communications, but there must be alternatives.</p>	<p>The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements. Satellite coverage is an ongoing cost and not fiscally possible. While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology.</p>
40	3/31/08 @3:02 PM	Chris Kaldahl	<p>View from "Jefferson Rock worth crossing the Atlantic for." Against obtrusive tower in one of the regions most picturesque viewscapes.</p>	<p>The proposed Keep Tryst site is not visible from Jefferson Rock. Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.</p>
41	3/31/08 @7:28 PM	Brian Nicolosi	<p>People live in this area because of the history and scenery. They're willing to put love of where they live above their safety speaks volumes. Shocked that the NPS has not intervened more in this insult to history. Please search for an alternative.</p>	<p>Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006 and has evaluated every site suggested by the NPS. Satellite coverage is an ongoing cost and not fiscally possible. While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology.</p>

Tower Comments and Responses

42	3/31/08 @9:13 PM	Beth and Christopher Firme	Request info on alternative sites, a formal public hearing and that the FCC have the county conduct an EIS for this tower. Will be looking at the County's tower ordinance. Three tower alternative - one at Pleasant Valley Elementary School, east of the ridge, one at Dargan Fire Station for west of the ridge and one at Trego Mtn Road - at minimum heights that would have effect to surrounding viewsheds.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). The County plans to hold a public hearing to take public testimony in the near future. This site is in conformance with County zoning. Implementing this recommendation would prevent the county from meeting the system performance requirements.
43	3/31/08 @9:21 PM	Gordan and Constance Sanders	Would like everyone to have a say in the matter of the tower. Let's get NPS Engineers and Motorola engineers to study the NPS sites.	The County plans to hold a public hearing to take public testimony in the near future. Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.
44	3/31/08 @9:30 PM	David Brown	Opposed to tower, please reconsider.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements. Satellite coverage is an ongoing cost and not fiscally possible. While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology.
45	3/31/08 @9:38 PM	Thomas Dahbura	Give this some more thought. Would think you would have evaluated all alternatives available and used better resources.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements. Satellite coverage is an ongoing cost and not fiscally possible. While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology.
46	3/31/2008	Kathy Bilton	Ruin wonderful viewshed in Harper's Ferry area. Understand the need for communications. Have I read correctly?-that the NPS has been unable to convince the county to look seriously at other alternatives? Urge county to look at all the alternatives.	Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers. While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology.

Tower Comments and Responses

47	3/31/2008	Nancy Nicolosi	Opposed to tower. This cannot be the best solution. Also, should never hold a public meeting like that again, not fair.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements. Satellite coverage is an ongoing cost and not fiscally possible. While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology. The County plans to hold a public hearing to take public testimony in the near future.
48	4/1/2008	Sarah Mittlefehldt	Negative impact on national resources, alternative options were not thoroughly investigated and citizens affected have not been included in the decision making process.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements. Satellite coverage is an ongoing cost and not fiscally possible. While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology. The County plans to hold a public hearing to take public testimony in the near future.
49	4/1/2008	Eleanor A. Hubbard	Appalled at public meeting format, urge county to hold another meeting. Writing opinion is not adequate. Open discussion would have let citizens know that the NPS offered a federal site. Support better communications, but urge county to work with the NPS.	The County plans to hold a public hearing to take public testimony in the near future. Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.
50	4/1/08 @12:20 AM	Richard A. McDonough	Opposed to tower - <1mi from Appalachian Trail, <1/2 mi from C&O and impact view from Harper's Ferry. Eyesore will dominant view from significant historic and natural park lands.	Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.
51	4/1/08 @5:36 AM	Dennis Frye	Opposed to tower. Urge County to continue to work with NPS officials to determine viable alternatives to eliminate this eyesore on this bucolic and historic landscape. NPS engineer attended public meeting and has since informed NPS officials that alternatives are available and he looks forward to the County's invitation to meet and explore alternatives.	Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.
52	4/1/2008	Pleasant Valley Community Service/Ruritan Club	Ruritan Club is in favor of the tower. Has been aware of the need for better communication. Good luck in your endeavor to better serve our community.	Washington County appreciates your support of it's effort to provide emergency communications in Southern Washington County for the safety of our citizens and first responders.

Tower Comments and Responses

53	4/1/2008 @9:12 AM	David Byers	Express concern, anger & disappointment about the tower that would be an insult to our community, history and natural beauty of our land.	Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.
54	4/1/08 @10:10 AM	Herbert L. Doggett	Impact of tower will be devastating to public land. There are alternative locations. Do the right thing.	Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements.
55	4/1/08 @10:53 AM	Sarah Sullivan	Appalachian Trail Conservancy Member objecting to location of tower. Realize importance of emergency communications in that area. Nothing more disgusting than standing on a beautiful mtn. top and seeing a large tower. County should be ashamed to have visitors see this and should be more cooperative with the NPS and residents.	Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. Washington County has continually requested help from the National Park Service engineers since October of 2006 when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and to date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers. The County plans to hold a public hearing to take public testimony in the near future.
56	4/1/08 @ 1:55 PM	Christopher Adonis	The Appalachian Trail Conservancy requested that I provide my thoughts. Put tower in one of the many ugly new subdivisions or construction sites in the Hagerstown area.	Implementing this recommendation would prevent the county from meeting the system performance requirements.
57	4/1/08 @ 1:48 PM	Wilson Riley	Attached Potomac Appalachian Trail Club letter. PATC recognizes importance of communications, but mindful of natural beauty of region and scenic landscapes. Reconsider tower location. Jefferson quote. Appears WC has done little to examine alternatives. Quotes Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Develop alternative. Letter by Lee B. Sheaffer Jr., President PATC	Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology. This site is in conformance with County zoning.
58	4/1/08 @ 4:55 PM	harpersferryhostel.org	Tower going against everything people have worked years to preserve. If you're worried about communication work with "them" on a compromise or prevent accidents with wider shoulders, safe and legal access to the AT and C&O. This would cut down on accidents and give better access for emergency personnel.	Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.

Tower Comments and Responses

59	4/1/08 @ 6:47 PM	Bob & Amy Sloan	Oppose tower in scenic overlook area by Harper's Ferry. Many residents understand the necessity for communications but alternatives should be considered. County had promoted scenic area. Suggest County look at other location or shorter tower(s).	Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology. This site is in conformance with County zoning.
60	4/1/08 @ 9:07 PM	Erin Hatfield	Meeting purposely not for everyone to hear. Would have been there if I knew. County should take a town vote and not just build. Give some solutions like making it look like a tree. Sandy Hook area roads need to be fixed and are as dangerous as having no phone signal. Need light to stop flashing so I can get across (Valley Road?). County has forgotten this little corner. Get your crap together and give us a proposal that won't make our town look like crap.	The County plans to hold a public hearing to take public testimony in the near future. Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Disguised tower was proposed and rejected by the NPS.
61	4/2/08 @ 7:56 AM	Daniel Weil Images	Appalled county is considering that colossal tower in the mist of one of most treasured area of this region. Good communication service to emergency personnel are vital, but the placement and height of the tower show zero good judgment or sensitivity. Always more than one solution to a problem, urge you to find one.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology. This site is in conformance with County zoning. Monopole does not work for Microwave because of its flexibility and a monopole cannot hold the number of antennas required. Guyed tower requires more acreage. Disguised tower was proposed and rejected by the NPS.
62	4/2/08 @ 9:43 AM	Rennie and Cynthia Blalock	Implore county to use another, less intrusive site. Going to desecrate another view for growth, always growth, when does growth become toxic?	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.

Tower Comments and Responses

63	4/2/08 @ 12:50 PM	Judy Lyons Wolf & Roger C. Wolf	<p>Opposed to location and design of tower. Support better communications. Support continued dialogue on best option to achieve best coverage with creating an eyesore. Please work with NPS, their engineers and anyone else with knowledge for a solution and keep residents well informed. Counting on County to do the best thing.</p>	<p>The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Satellite coverage is an ongoing cost and not fiscally possible. While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology. Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.</p>
64	4/2/08 @ 1:47 PM	Greg Moser	<p>While a tower wouldn't harm the usefulness of the park, it would greatly detract from the natural beauty. Can't we set aside one or two places where people can go to get the illusion of nature? Surely there is a way to place a tower out of view of the park lands. The only way I would tolerate such an eyesore is if it generated revenue for the park to repair the slackwater section of the towpath and maintain aqueducts indefinitely.</p>	<p>Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. The County Commissioners have authority over this site and have publically stated that no commercial users will be permitted to use this tower.</p>
65	4/2/08 @ 1:52 PM	Daniel Lantz	<p>PATC Member alarmed at tower proposal. Weverton Cliff vista has been included in National Geographic and other media. Isn't there another way, such as upgrading emergency responder radios? Could several smaller towers through Pleasant Valley or Dargan be used? Have been told that this tower would violate WC own zoning ordinance. Implore County to reconsider.</p>	<p>Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. Implementing these recommendations would prevent the county from meeting the system performance requirements. This site is in conformance with County zoning. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file).</p>

Tower Comments and Responses

66	4/2/08 @ 2:56 PM	George and Frances Alderson	Please consider the visual impact of the tower on (sites included in balloon test). No argument with county's desire to improve emergency communications. Would like to see alternatives. Understand the NPS is offering technical assistance and no doubt has its own contractors that have designed and installed systems in more difficult situations without harming landscapes. Please explore alternatives.	Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers. While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology.
67	4/2/08 @3:44 PM	Henryetta S. Livelsberger	Strong objection to the tower. This is the gateway to WC and erector set is not welcoming. NPS has offered sites and at PI meeting we were not told why they didn't work. NPS has several stealth towers on their land and WC should be insisting on stealth towers at all their sites. Motorola's engineers should meet with NPS engineers. Sure that money is playing a part in the decision to put the tower on Co. owned property.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Disguised tower was proposed and rejected by the NPS. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.
68	4/2/08 @ 5:08 PM	Stephanie Young	Oppose tower imposing on beautiful mountain views. Please rethink your decision and come up with a better solution.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology.

Tower Comments and Responses

69	4/2/08 @ 5:22 PM	Stephanie Whitenton-Cox and Eric Whitenton	<p>Why does the County act as if Sandy Hook is not the unique convergence of 2 Nat. Historic Parks, a Nat. Trail & an American Heritage River. Reference the Comp Plan and Zoning ord. 11/7/06 Report to BCC "Motorola and County staff have met with NPS to coordinate, reduce or eliminate adverse impacts on the cultural & historic area surrounding the site." If this was completed in 06 why is the NPS expressing disagreement now in Herald-Mail. NPS proposed a series of small towers. In Mont. Co. radios link to vehicles to amplify signal so tall towers are not needed. Assume current plan is easiest and most profitable for Co. and contractor. Quotes from Co. tower regulations. Assumes commercial use of tower. Microwave exposure harmful to living things. Bird kills connected to towers. More problems in this area with emergency response time, than with intercommunication once they respond.</p>	<p>Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006 and has evaluated every site suggested by the NPS. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements. Implementing the other recommendations here would prevent the county from meeting the system performance requirements. This site is in conformance with County zoning. The County Commissioners have authority over this site and have publically stated that no commercial users will be permitted to use this tower. No health hazards are known at this time. Fire and rescue personnel in this area are volunteers and would welcome new volunteers.</p>
70	4/2/08 @ 7:34 PM	Citizens for Protection of WC	<p>Citizen should be allowed to speak at public meetings held by public officials. Tower would trash some of the most scenic views in WC. Tourism is a valuable segment of our economy. Agree with emergency communications, but doubt 190' tower is necessary. Is the Co. taking the easiest and cheapest route because no one has the authority to stop them? NPS believes viable alternatives exist. Appears Co. is ignoring NPS offer. Does Co. have mindset "if it wasn't invented here, we aren't interested?"</p>	<p>The County plans to hold a public hearing to take public testimony in the near future. Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.</p>
71	4/2/08 @ 10:10 PM	Pam and Tom Byrne	<p>Please reconsider decision to build 190' tower. NPS offered other alternatives that could improve communications in Nat. Park Land and local communities and not be an eyesore. We count on NPS employees to do rescue work (such has helicopters to look for river drownings) and police work in and along these NPS lands. We count on tourist income. Please work with NPS, compared to WC, they have greater resources in land and personnel, greater motivation for improved communications. Tower may lower NPS attendance, less money for NPS and local business. Building the tower will likely result in poor relationship with the NPS and may cause poor relationship between MD and Feds.</p>	<p>Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.</p>

Tower Comments and Responses

72	4/3/08 @ 8:51 AM	Lonnie W. Dalrymple	Request Co. consider alternatives to tower that will be visible from Weverton Cliff, MD Hts & Loudoun Hts. Conflicts with Zoning Ord., Unnecessary eyesore to hiking trails, not all alternatives have been sufficiently considered, visually impacts other jurisdictions without their consultation. An upgrade to radios may be just as effective.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Satellite coverage is an ongoing cost and not fiscally possible. While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology. Implementing this recommendation would prevent the county from meeting the system performance requirements.
73	4/3/08 @ 9:26 AM	Melanie Winter	Opposed to tower. Affects viewshed from 3 Nat. Parks. Urge Co. to continue to work with the NPS on alternatives	Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file).
74	4/3/08 @ 9:39 AM	Dr. Frank McCluskey	Please preserve Harpers Ferry and do not build the tower.	Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file).
75	4/3/08 @ 9:45 AM	Dave Wiegand	I am in favor of the tower. It will assure our fire, police and EMS will have the proper and critical communication they need. Tower is needed to address the current life safety issues where poor communication could cause harm or death to our citizens. Please vote in favor of constructing the tower.	Washington County appreciates your support of it's effort to provide emergency communications in Southern Washington County for the safety of our citizens and first responders.
76	4/3/08 @ 9:54 AM	Ted King, Misty Cornett	Opposed to tower. Will affect viewsheds from 3 Nat. Parks. Urge Co. to continue to work with NPS. A NPS engineer attended PI meeting and has since informed NPS officials that alternatives are available. He looks forward to your invitation to meet. WC 40 year tradition in preserving heritage and beauty of south county.	Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers. Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.

Tower Comments and Responses

77	4/3/08 @ 10:01 AM	Lynn Osmann	<p>Please consider alternatives to tower. NPS has offered alternatives that, while more costly in the short run, have long term benefits that justify cost. Quality of life and tourism (revenue) need to be addressed when making decisions. Tourist will choose other, more pristine locations. There is the unquantifiable issue of restorative quality of the natural beauty of the area. This translates into less effectiveness on the job for the thousands of individuals who depend on moments of aesthetic and ecological beauty as a pick-me-up in very busy lives. Please approve an alternate to this intrusive tower. You have an opportunity to be forward thinking and act in manner that serves as Nat. example. Please take that opportunity.</p>	<p>The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers. While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology.</p>
78	4/3/08 @ 10:06 AM	Curt Mason	<p>Thomas Jefferson, Jefferson Rock statement. View from Harpers Ferry continues to astound travelers. Oppose tower, will affect viewsheds from 3 parks. Urge Co to continue to work with NPS on a viable alternative. NPS engineer attended PI meeting and has since informed NPS officials that alternatives are available. He looks forward to your invitation to meet. WC 40 year tradition in preserving heritage and beauty of south county.</p>	<p>Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. The proposed Keep Tryst site is not visible from Jefferson Rock. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.</p>
79	4/3/08 @ 10:32 AM	LTC Steve Lowe	<p>Oppose tower and its height would cheapen the lands that were congressionally set aside and designed to protect the view of the Gap for the enjoyment of future generations and the preservation of significant layers of American history. Jefferson statement. 3 Nat. Parks would be diminished. Once tower is built, how many more infringements may pollute the viewshed. The Nat. Park idea was designed for all Americans to enjoy. One company must not and should not be granted the power through a local legislative body to corrupt such a national concept. If a company of few mars the Nat. Park concept the majority will suffer through non-legitimacy of our current county gov't. Your decision will affect two immediate states, 3 Nat. treasures and all Americans.</p>	<p>Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. The proposed Keep Tryst site is not visible from Jefferson Rock. The proposed tower will be a County owned tower on County owned land.</p>
80	4/3/08 @ 10:41 AM	Dcgallant@aol.com	<p>Spent 35 yrs on Capital Hill and know the demands placed on gov't for services. Also know this is the 21st century, cannot continue business as usual whether its destroying a forest or needing a tower. Destruction of God made in favor of man made is teaching young people that nothing matters except money and practical matters. Tower disrespects history, affects thousands and will impact generations to come.</p>	<p>Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.</p>

Tower Comments and Responses

81	4/3/08 @ 10:41 AM	John Allen Jr.	Do not allow viewshed of Harpers Ferry area to be ruined. Not only is the HFNHP an economic engine for the area, it embodies the history of all Americans.	Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.
82	4/3/08 @ 10:54 AM	Bob Murto	There is an alternative to the tower at Keep Tryst. I can see the whole mtn range from my property in Bakerton WV, so putting a tower on the back of my eleven acres would be less obtrusive.	Implementing this recommendation would prevent the county from meeting the system performance requirements.
83	4/3/08 @ 10:58 AM	Elizabeth Haney	Thomas Jefferson, Jefferson Rock statement. View from Harpers Ferry continues to astound travelers. Oppose tower, will affect viewsheds from 3 parks. Urge Co to continue to work with NPS on a viable alternative. NPS engineer attended PI meeting and has since informed NPS officials that alternatives are available. He looks forward to your invitation to meet. WC 40 year tradition in preserving heritage and beauty of south county. (Appears to be another form letter.)	The proposed Keep Tryst site is not visible from Jefferson Rock. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers. Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.
84	4/3/08 @ 11:02 AM	Tony and Jonna Mendez	Strongly object to tower proposal. Very concerned with historic and scenic sites. People in this area have strong feelings about littering the landscape with this type of technology. Not saying there shouldn't be a tower, but surely another site can be found. Need tower, but take time to find another place. We have worked with Motorola engineers over the years of our gov't svc and we know how creative they can be.	Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.
85	4/3/08 @ 1:10 PM	Linda Saylor	Opposed to tower. This is a county tower, thus my taxes are paying for it. Therefore, requesting county reduce the size of this tower or move it so it doesn't alter the beautiful views. According to news reports, NPS is offering alternatives.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers. Implementing this recommendation would prevent the county from meeting the system performance requirements.

Tower Comments and Responses

86	4/3/08 @ 1:22 PM	Kenneth & Ester Bolt	Have Cellular One cell service, but cannot get reception from home. Every time someone tries to put a tower up, it gets voted down. A tower cannot be any more of an eyesore than the power lines across the county. Please reconsider.	The proposed tower is not a cell tower and the County Commissioners have publicly stated that no commercial users will be permitted to use this tower. It will be limited to only government and public safety users. Washington County appreciates your support of its effort to provide emergency communications in Southern Washington County for the safety of our citizens and first responders.
87	4/3/08 @ 1:24 PM	Heidi Sowers	Opposed to tower. This is a county tower, thus my taxes are paying for it. Therefore, requesting county reduce the size of this tower or move it so it doesn't alter the beautiful views. According to news reports, NPS is offering alternatives.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers. Implementing this recommendation would prevent the county from meeting the system performance requirements.
88	4/3/08 @ 1:40 PM	Dan Stanton	Oppose tower, will affect viewsheds from 3 parks. Urge Co to continue to work with NPS on a viable alternative. NPS engineer attended PI meeting and has since informed NPS officials that alternatives are available. He looks forward to your invitation to meet. WC 40 year tradition in preserving heritage and beauty of south county.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers. Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.
89	4/3/08 @ 2:20 PM	Mike Miller	Tower is about to significantly alter a nationally treasured view that is described by Thomas Jefferson, "quote" appeared in Notes on the State of Virginia, published in 1785.	The proposed Keep Tryst site is not visible from Jefferson Rock. Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.
90	4/3/08 @ 2:32 PM	David Startzell	Express concern about tower. Urge County to work with ATC, PATC and NPS to identify alternatives. Viewshed from Weverton Cliffs a concern. Quote Comprehensive Plan. Crane test proved significant adverse impact on national parks. Support need for communications. ATC prides itself in working cooperatively with local communities to achieve needs while protecting trail treasures. NPS will consider putting tower on their land with a lease agreement or in a land exchange.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.

Tower Comments and Responses

91	4/3/08 @ 2:36 PM	Kurt Schwarz	Tower would do real harm to the points in WC that attract so many visitors. Viewshed of several historic overlook sites would be confronted by this monstrosity. NPS has offered assistance, please take advantage of their help.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.
92	4/3/08 @ 2:40 PM	Heart of the Civil War Heritage Area (HCWHA)	Mgmt Plan for HCWHA notes that unspoiled historic and scenic resources give HCWHA a competitive advantage; where authenticity of setting is not preserved, the impact of heritage tourism weakens. Quotes comprehensive plan. HCWHA is planning 150th anniversary of Civil War activities. 190' tower may discourage visits and hinder growth in tourism. Recognize need for emergency communications, but urge WC to look at alternatives.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology. I
93	4/3/08 @ 2:57 PM	Paul Shockley	Concerned about proposed tower impacting the AT, South Mtn. State Park, and three Nat. Parks. Disturbed about any more RF technology into the atmosphere. Creates a visually offending blow to beautiful natural landscape that is an "oasis" in an otherwise grim and stressful landscape.	Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.
94	4/3/08 @ 3:50 PM	Marjorie Yost	Express opposition. View from Harpers Ferry continues to astound travelers. Oppose tower, will affect viewsheds from 3 parks. Urge Co to continue to work with NPS on a viable alternative. NPS engineer attended PI meeting and has since informed NPS officials that alternatives are available. He looks forward to your invitation to meet. WC 40 year tradition in preserving heritage and beauty of south county. (Form letter.) Please work with NPS.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers. Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.
95	4/3/08 @ 3:57 PM	Laura M. Frye	Oppose 190' tower. Awed by beauty of Pleasant Valley. Please don't destroy with this tower. Certain, that with modern technology, other alternatives are available. Trust you care enough about WC citizens to explore every possible option.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Satellite coverage is an ongoing cost and not fiscally possible. While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology.

Tower Comments and Responses

96	4/3/08 @ 5:08 PM	Janet L. Stone	Express opposition. View from Harpers Ferry continues to astound travelers. Oppose tower, will affect viewsheds from 3 parks. Urge Co to continue to work with NPS on a viable alternative. NPS engineer attended PI meeting and has since informed NPS officials that alternatives are available. He looks forward to your invitation to meet. WC 40 year tradition in preserving heritage and beauty of south county. (Form letter.) Also kills birds. Please work with NPS.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers. Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.
97	4/3/08 @ 7:30 PM	Christopher Mullendore	In favor of tower. Important that emergency responders be able to communicate for the safety of WC citizens. If communications are poor, safety is in jeopardy. We should give them all the equipment they need to safely and effectively do their jobs, even if it means higher taxes.	Washington County appreciates your support of it's effort to provide emergency communications in Southern Washington County for the safety of our citizens and first responders.
98	4/3/08 @ 9:37 PM	Shirley Smith	Member PATC. Although not familiar with the area, am familiar with how obtrusive these towers can be, suspect there are many areas away from this natural setting where tower could go. 1. Conflicts with WC Zoning regs. 2. Why would local gov. erect such an unnecessary eyesore in conflict with hiking trail? 3. Can alternative upgrade be done to communication system. 4. Multiple smaller towers? 5. One of the best AT vistas on the trail. 6. Feds. visit Weverton Cliffs (visiting dignitaries).	1. This site is in conformance with County zoning. 2., 5., & 6. Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. 3. & 4. Implementing this recommendation would prevent the county from meeting the system performance requirements.
99	4/3/08 @ 10:58 PM	Jeffrey H. Marks	As a hiker, bicyclist and historian, urge you not to put a tower here. Wonderful area is home to three NPS. Would degrade view from Weverton Cliff, Loudon Hgts, MD Hgts, etc. Support need for rescue communications, a better way needs to be found. Let's preserve historic views.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Satellite coverage is an ongoing cost and not fiscally possible. While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology. Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.
100	4/4/08 @ 8:27 AM	Loretta and Herman Fischer	Please do not build tower near Harpers Ferry. This is unaesthetic. Will ruin view.	Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.

Tower Comments and Responses

101	4/4/08 @ 10:30 AM	Michelle and Andre Detommaso	Understand and appreciate the need for emergency services, but strongly against current tower design because 1. Site is an established residential area. 2. There are unanswered health concerns regarding towers in populated areas. 3. Purchased home here because of conservation zoning; tower does not coincide with ecological system. 4. Tower not designed to integrate into scenic landscape and will detract from property values. Consider use of other technologies, such as a system of repeaters. Abandon current proposal and propose another solution.	Monopole does not work for Microwave because of its flexibility and a monopole cannot hold the number of antennas required. Guyed tower requires more acreage. Disguised tower was proposed and rejected by the NPS. 2. No health hazards are known at this time. 4. We do not anticipate any loss in property value and therefore no compensation will be forthcoming. 3. This site is in conformance with County zoning. 4. Satellite coverage is an ongoing cost and not fiscally possible. While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file).
102	4/4/08 @ 8:58 AM	Fanny Johnson	Protest tower. Of course we need communications for emergency personnel, not in this location. Will ruin the view from HFNHP and C&O Canal. Please put necessary tower where it wont' spoil Nat. Parks.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.
103	4/4/08 @ 10:00 AM	Kathleen Hayes	Concerns regarding 190' tower - would pierce the lovely skyline over the Potomac, violates Co. zoning, would ruin pastoral landscape and vista from Weverton, MD Hgts, Loudoun Hgts, 340 bridge, Bolivar Hgts and some locations around Harpers Ferry. No clear evidence that tower is necessary. There are many opportunities to use public land for a series of repeater stations. Old railroad bed runs NW from Weverton to Roxbury (DNR land) and NPS owns land in this area - opportunities for land swaps. Each would promote a low-lying option that hides the facility from view. All should be thoroughly investigated.	This site is in conformance with County zoning. High risk events/accidents occurring in the Southern portion of the County require Public Safety and Local Government Communications (ie; high speed accidents, locations, high speed highways, river rafting with access via permits issued by the NPS, cliff rescues structure fires, etc.). Implementing these recommendations would prevent the county from meeting the system performance requirements.
104	4/4/08 @ 1:16 PM	Charlotte Melichar	Appalachian Trail enthusiast and a "conservation buyer." Urge DPW and the BCC to select a communications method that would have a less intrusive impact. Preservation of notable beautiful vistas requires continual efforts to minimize the impact of each new object. Least obtrusive plan, consistent with the community's (local authorities, surrounding areas and all who love and appreciate the AT) needs must be adopted. Advantages to WC in adopting a less obtrusive plan - enhanced reputation for responsible conservation efforts, increased appreciation from those who live in county and those who journey the trail. Please work with ATC and NPS to select an alternative.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers. A monopole does not work for Microwave because of its flexibility and a monopole cannot hold the number of antennas required. Guyed towers requires more acreage. A disguised tower was proposed and rejected by the NPS.

Tower Comments and Responses

105	4/4/08 @ 1:37 PM	Keith Kempton	Protest tower location. Strongly object to unnecessary structure in one of MD's most beautiful undisturbed areas. Destruction to and around AT and South Mtn. State Park, not to mention other NP's. Will be yet another huge eyesore.	Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file).
106	4/4/08 @ 1:48 PM	Richard Adamson	Express opposition. View from Harpers Ferry continues to astound travelers. Oppose tower, will affect viewsheds from 3 parks. Urge Co to continue to work with NPS on a viable alternative. NPS engineer attended PI meeting and has since informed NPS officials that alternatives are available. He looks forward to your invitation to meet. WC 40 year tradition in preserving heritage and beauty of south county. (Form letter.) Please work with NPS.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers. Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.
107	4/4/08 @ 2:13 PM	Lisa L. Keller	Residents of Pleasant Valley are opposed to tower. Please do not mar beauty of Pleasant Valley. Convinced alternatives exist. Please determine alternative to ensure that we won't see this steel monster in lovely valley. As tax paying citizen who is paying for the tower, I appreciate your consideration of my comments.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Satellite coverage is an ongoing cost and not fiscally possible. While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology.
108	4/4/08 @2:50 PM	National Parks Conservation Association	Comments on behalf of the NPCA and our 340,000 members across the country. Support the goal of adequate emergency communication, but concerned about location and height of tower and its impact on HFNHP, C&O Canal NHP and AT. Work with NPS to find and pursue options while not sacrificing parks. WC has a long history of protecting the natural and cultural heritage of SC. Comprehensive Plan prioritizes preservation of heritage. WC has the opportunity to work with the NPS, please do.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers. A monopole does not work for Microwave because of its flexibility and a monopole cannot hold the number of antennas required. Guyed towers requires more acreage. A disguised tower was proposed and rejected by the NPS. This site is in conformance with County zoning. We are not aware of any other regulations or specific uses at this site.

Tower Comments and Responses

109	4/4/08 @ 5:43 PM	Rick Canter	<p>Lattice style tower would pierce the lovely skyline over the Potomac like the Eiffel Tower. Violates County zoning and would ruin pastoral landscape. Would not expect County to rush with devel in this premier scenic and historic region. Concede the emergency communication is vital. Specific concern that multiple vistas affected on multiple hiking trails. Mar view from Weverton (Nat. Geo article) & visiting dignitaries. Mentions other parks where tower would be visible. No clear evidence that the tower is necessary. A telecommunication expert has advised me that an upgrade to the County's EMS radio network could have the same benefit at a huge tower and may cost less. Many opportunities to use public land for a series of low lying repeaters along 67 or through Dargan. RR bed running NW, Land swapping. Each would promote low lying options hiding the tower from residents or even terrorists.</p>	<p>This site is in conformance with County zoning. High risk events/accidents occurring in the Southern portion of the County require Public Safety and Local Government Communications (ie; high speed accidents, locations, high speed highways, river rafting with access via permits issued by the NPS, cliff rescues structure fires, etc.). Implementing these recommendations would prevent the county from meeting the system performance requirements.</p>
110	4/4/08 @10:28 PM	David A. House	<p>Volunteer Trail Overseer with PATC concerned about tower. Understand need for emergency communications, but not at the expense of permanently scaring the vistas around. Took part in balloon test, to Weverton Cliff, along Loudon Heights back to Harpers Ferry. Took 33 digital photos, view significantly impacted. Don't put tower at Keep Tryst, look for alternatives.</p>	<p>The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file).</p>
111	4/5/08 @11:42 AM	Bernard Demartini	<p>In response to a bulletin from the Appalachian Trail Conference about a 190 foot cell phone tower in Harpers Ferry. Cell phone tower may be needed, but not at this location. Beautiful and historic vistas at the confluence of the Potomac and Shenandoah is an important part of our heritage and needs to be preserved. Please reconsider location.</p>	<p>The proposed tower is not a cell tower and the County Commissioners have publicly stated that no commercial users will be permitted to use this tower. It will be limited to only government and public safety users. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file).</p>
112	4/5/08 @7:00 PM	Barbara Humes	<p>Oppose tower. Live in Harpers Ferry overlooking Maryland side of river and tower will ruin my viewshed. Tower will devalue my property. I consider this a "taking" and will expect compensation. There are viable alternatives suggested to you by the NPS. Urge County to continue working with NPS. Your job to protect the public interest. The telecommunications company can get what it needs without marring the landscape.</p>	<p>We do not anticipate any loss in property value and therefore no compensation will be forthcoming. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers. The proposed tower is not a cell tower and the County Commissioners have publicly stated that no commercial users will be permitted to use this tower. It will be limited to only government and public safety users.</p>

Tower Comments and Responses

113	4/5/08 @9:22 PM	Judy & Bill Coleman	Attended Public Meeting. Want County to consider other alternatives and work with NPS to find a better solution. Don't appreciate not being able to voice our concerns.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers. The County plans to hold a public hearing to take public testimony in the near future.
114	4/6/08 @10:22 AM	AJ Nicolosi	Could not open/read document attached to this e-mail.	
115	4/6/08 @12:44 PM	Chris Brunton	Keep Tryst site is right in the middle of the viewshed from MD. Hgts, Harpers Ferry and Loudon Hgts. A tower this tall, complete with flashing lights will totally change the viewshed of Keep Tryst Road. Look at other locations for you tower.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file).
116	4/6/08 @4:05 PM	Tom Gamper	Strongly opposed to tower for Weverton MD. Will ruin vistas from Weverton and MD Hgts, as well as 340 bridge, Bolivar and Loudon Hgts. Area need preserved. SMG has worked with the NPS. Project threatens the integrity of landscapes. Must be technical alternatives. Solve communication problems in a way that is respectful of the land the rights of future citizens.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Satellite coverage is an ongoing cost and not fiscally possible. While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology. Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.
117	4/6/08 @6:06 PM	MD Appalachian Trail Mgmt Committee	Tower will severely degrade the AT experience. Weverton is one of the most sweeping and spectacular vistas along the trail, part of what makes the trail special. Tower would have the most destructive impact on the trail in our area in decades. Tourist meca. Tower will threaten the interest of the hiking public. Concerned that proposal is being rushed through the county bureaucracy. Consider input from constituencies outside DPW, consider stealth alternatives (lower tower to move 2-3 miles up Route 67). Lambs Knoll was eventually built, but after a time consuming and expensive mitigation package was reached. Support mission to provide greater emergency communications.	Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. Timing of the PI Meeting was appropriate for the normal evolution of the project. Under regulations, the County's obligation was to disseminate information relating to the project. A disguised tower was proposed and rejected by the NPS. Implementing these recommendations would prevent the county from meeting the system performance requirements.

Tower Comments and Responses

118	4/6/08 @6:16 PM	Steve Lesche	Please consider other options. It is rare to find a spot that has been spared by modern progress. Ensure safety of community is important, but leave natural beauty of area is equally important.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Satellite coverage is an ongoing cost and not fiscally possible. While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology.
119	4/6/08 @6:27 PM	Eric Whitenton	Opposed to 190 tower plan. NPS plan for short towers deserves a proper public hearing. Has this been submitted to the FCC yet. How may we see the results of the review?	Shorter towers have been evaluated and implementing this recommendation would prevent the county from meeting the system performance requirements. Timing of the PI Meeting was appropriate for the normal evolution of the project. Under regulations, the County's obligation was to disseminate information relating to the project. This has not been submitted to the FCC for review. The County plans to hold a public hearing to take public testimony in the near future.
120	4/6/08 @8:34 PM	Brian Reynolds	Opposed to tower implementation without representation. Cannot force feed something like this down the throats of law-abiding, tax paying citizens without getting some resistance. Please seek alternative way to connect our emergency responders without changing the landscape forever with this metal monstrosity.	Timing of the PI Meeting was appropriate for the normal evolution of the project. Under regulations, the County's obligation was to disseminate information relating to the project. This has not been submitted to the FCC for review. The County plans to hold a public hearing to take public testimony in the near future. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Satellite coverage is an ongoing cost and not fiscally possible. While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology.
121	4/6/08 @9:28 PM	Mike O'Connor	Tower would pierce the lovely skyline over the Potomac like the Eiffel Tower. Violates County policies on zoning and would ruin pastoral landscape of premier scenic bastions of the region. Improved communication is important. Concerned with multiple vistas that would be affected. National Geographic cover, VIPs to Weverton. My understanding that there seems to be no clear evidence that this tower is necessary. Use public lands for a series of low lying repeater stations along Route 67. Should not make decisions in a vacuum, consider quality of life of our society.	This site is in conformance with County zoning. High risk events/accidents occurring in the Southern portion of the County that require Public Safety and Local Government Communications (ie; high speed accidents, locations, high speed highways, river rafting with access via permits issued by the NPS, cliff rescues structure fires, etc.) Shorter towers have been evaluated and implementing this recommendation would prevent the county from meeting the system performance requirements.

Tower Comments and Responses

122	4/6/08 @9:42 pm	Karlen Keto	Concerned that the tower plan has moved too secretly and not all sites and tower heights have been given careful thought. Apparently there are alternative to the project shown at the public information meeting. Agree with need to emergency tower, but should have citizen input.	Timing of the PI Meeting was appropriate for the normal evolution of the project. Under regulations, the County's obligation was to disseminate information relating to the project. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). The County plans to hold a public hearing to take public testimony in the near future.
123	4/7/08 @6:33 AM	Jim Downing	Not opposed to enhancement of emergency communications, but oppose the site and the site selection process. Request for all information pertaining to the radio project. Concerned over conduct at Public Meeting - lack of opportunity to interact with officials, ask question, cross examine the facts presented, no hard copies, not in depth detail of site selection, and no detail on options. Clarify no commercial users, how and under what authority will users be limited to to non-commercial users and for how long? Please include any regulatory citation used to enforce non-commercial usage. Concerned with timelines of this process - statement made that it was ongoing for four years, why was public comment postponed until the end? Why was the public comment process so regimented, to stifle dissent? Retired firefighter/EMS aware of communication needs, take offense to the tact undertaken to pit residents interests against first responders (if your against the tower, your against first responders). Issue of this magnitude needs a mature and fair debate. What are you afraid of -	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). The County plans to hold a public hearing to take public testimony in the near future. The County Commissioners have authority over this site and have publically stated that no commercial users will be permitted to use this tower. The tower will be limited to only government and public safety users. Timing of the PI Meeting was appropriate for the normal evolution of the project. Under regulations, the County's obligation was to disseminate information relating to the project.
			Opposition, dissent, disagreement? Why this site. What about zoning? What about the roads scenic byway designation? Were state waivers granted or sought, by whom and under who's authority? What is wrong with other sites? Will there be aircraft clearance lights on the tower? If not, will the tower interfere with state police helicopter operations in the area? Are there limitations on size and number?? To despoil this area is a travesty, to even consider it without public discourse is tyrannical. Appalled at the conduct of our public officials in the execution of this process - limitation placed on public comment and debate. Outraged that the process has moved so far forward before comment was solicited.	This site is in conformance with County zoning. No state waivers were sought for this tower. Clearance lights are not required on towers below 200' in height. There are numerous unlighted towers throughout the County that do not interfere with the operations of the Maryland State Police helicopters. Tower limitations and size are regulated by the design of the overall system and terrain. Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.
124	4/6/08 @10:16 PM	C. David Brown	Strongly protest the proposed tower. One of the few areas in MD both naturally beautiful and historically significant. Bring tourism to the area and why people live, work and play in MD. Hiked Weverton many times just to enjoy the view. Know there are alternative sites for the tower, please force the company to use one of those locations.	Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). The proposed tower will be a County owned tower on County owned land.

Tower Comments and Responses

125	4/6/08 @10:18 PM	John C. Dowdy	Please preserve the integrity of our landscape.	Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.
126	4/6/08 @11:49 PM	Kellie Wainscott	Contact Colorado. They have more challenging topography than Pleasant Valley, have more high risk situations and have done a fabulous job of balancing their landscape and emergency needs. I am your tourist dollar and could decide to vacation elsewhere.	Our vendor builds communications systems of this type worldwide and are considered experts in the field to find solutions for topography such as Washington County. The NPS originally stated in October of 2006 that they had engineers out of Colorado who could assist WC with alternatives. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.
127	4/7/08 @7:59 AM	Todd Bolton	Opposed to tower. Step back and consider the alternatives and allow greater public participation. WC is rich with scenic & cultural heritage. No doubt that we need to maintain highest standard for public safety, but must be mindful of preserving our heritage.	The County plans to hold a public hearing to take public testimony in the near future. Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.
128	4/7/08 @ 800 AM	Connie Jantz	Defacing on of "10 nicest place on the east coast." Do not believe in technology at the expense of everything else. Neighbors more prepared for emergencies than most/self reliant. BCC should actually discuss with community. County that normally takes our money and spends it elsewhere could actually perform its duty and look alternatives. Are you really concerned about WC citizens or is it the people who may flee DC in the event of another terrorist event? Our volunteer fire fighters come from Frederick, how will the tower help them? Why so concerned now? Only officers I ever see are the state troopers that set up speed traps on 67. What about falcons, etc. What about tourist dollars?	The County plans to hold a public hearing to take public testimony in the near future. Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. New system will provide interoperability with surrounding jurisdictions.
129	4/7/08 @8 :01 AM	Dorothy Boynton Rust	Tower location is a poor choice. Alternatives should be investigated. Proximity to AT, C&O and Harpers Ferry. Tower would seriously alter views. Area is also rich in American History. Urge to reconsider.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.
130	4/7/08 @ 8:01 AM	Kara Linthicum	Tower location is a poor choice. Alternatives should be investigated. Proximity to AT, C&O and Harpers Ferry. Tower would seriously alter views. Area is also rich in American History. Urge to reconsider.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.

Tower Comments and Responses

131	4/7/08 @ 8:01 AM	Dieter H.B. Protsch	<p>Not allowing citizens to get involved in effort to erect tower is a disservice to those who live and work in our still lovely county. County has means and personnel to conduct an appropriate study and necessary tests to find an alternative to improve communications. Getting people involved will show your personal willingness to actively support our population as is so often promised by our elected officials. Size of tower might be overkill. Different location might be acceptable. County should seek the advice, support and offers of dedicated NPS professionals in our area.</p>	<p>The County plans to hold a public hearing to take public testimony in the near future. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Satellite coverage is an ongoing cost and not fiscally possible. While more advanced technology may be available to the military; this technology would not be available to public safety through commercial vendors. 802.11 is not relevant to public safety systems, as there are no portables or mobiles available that work on 802.11 technology. Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.</p>
132	4/7/08 @ 8:04 AM	Danielle Lantz	<p>Member North Chapter of PATC. Weverton Cliffs National Geographic listing. Federal Gov't individuals come to AT Headquarters base their opinion of AT by the view from Weverton. Shameful to provide them with any view other than an area resplendent in natural beauty. Couldn't you upgrade radios, built several lower towers? Tower violates county's zoning. Please reconsider. Affects national perspective of the AT.</p>	<p>Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. Implementing these recommendations would prevent the county from meeting the system performance requirements. This site is in conformance with County zoning.</p>
133	4/7/08 @ 9:18 AM	Mary Reed	<p>Please give more consideration to the alternate sites the parks have offered for the tower.</p>	<p>The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.</p>
134	4/7/08 @ 9:41 AM	Peggy Chesnutt	<p>At public meeting. Disappointed that no public comment was taken. Also disappointed that it wasn't made more public (advertising). People deserve to know what is going on in their community. Done research of effects of cell towers and microwave towers in communities and found sound evidence depending on visual impact and size of towers, property values ARE negatively affected. Photo attached to e-mail</p>	<p>The County plans to hold a public hearing to take public testimony in the near future. The County does not anticipate any loss in property value and therefore no compensation will be forthcoming.</p>

Tower Comments and Responses

135	4/7/08 @ 10:22 AM	Steven C. Golian	<p>Reconsider tower location. As a resident, find this an unwarranted impact. Like to hike to Weverton 2-3 time a month. Appreciate the importance to emergency communications, but find it hard to believe you would even consider, let alone propose a tower in this location, especially when you've been offered viable alternatives. Please don't construct this monstrosity.</p>	<p>The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.</p>
136	4/7/08 @ 10:28 AM	Ken and Patsy Hunter	<p>Strongly oppose tower. Close to three national parks that are responsible for considerable economic stimulus to the region. Understand that the NPS has been unable to convince the County that alternative locations could achieve the objectives and protect the scenic assets. Also understand that the NPS offered sites on NPS lands through exchange or lease, without success. Urge WC DPW to work cooperatively with the NPS to find a site that will not degrade the view.</p>	<p>Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.</p>
137	4/7/08 @ 10:46 AM	Greg Palmer	<p>Avid hiker. Appreciate the need to improve communications, but do not believe this is the best location and encourage you to work with the ATC and PATC to identify a more suitable location. Thousand of visitors every year, none of which hit the trail wanting to see a communications tower. Before you make the final decision, encourage you to hike to Weverton Cliffs and take in the view this tower will scar.</p>	<p>Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.</p>
138	4/7/08 @ 10:53 AM	Cynthia Majewski	<p>International fame and draw of Appalachian Trail. The AT is an accomplishment of the American Spirit and represents the fruit of hard work. Understand dependable communications for emergency services, but urge you to give those other suitable locations consideration and select the current site as only a last option.</p>	<p>Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file).</p>

Tower Comments and Responses

<p>139</p>	<p>4/7/08 @ 12:36 PM</p>	<p>Phillip Jones</p>	<p>Urge WC to work with NPS and other parties to find a mutually acceptable alternative to the Keep Tryst Rd/Sand Hook Rd site that will meet communications needs while avoiding an unnecessary blot on this historically significant region. Implore you to rigorously explore alternatives more in keeping with areas natural assets.</p>	<p>The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers. Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.</p>
<p>140</p>	<p>4/7/08 @ 12:47 PM</p>	<p>Walter D. Pershing Jr.</p>	<p>Feel these comments fairly reflect the mood and view of myself and my community neighbors. If the county's attitude at the public meeting remains unchanged, than this constituency will have to work to affect a level of greater respect for our will and if need be will guide us for the future in changing who sits at the helm and the performance of those entrusted with management of tasks conducted in County business. Comments - 1. no convincing rationale or crying need has been demonstrated that this facility will appreciably benefit the needs of residents in south county over other choices. 2. The picture has been built that County and residents must bear the cost of this for the tourists' convenience, there is something inheritably discomfoting of that attitude. There is no prospect that the Sheriff's office is going to be enabled to respond in anything close to a maximum of 15 minutes or communicate more effectively. It will only allow them to communicate over a dedicated line rather than use portable phone service, which we find extensively available in this area.</p>	<p>High risk events/accidents occurring in the Southern portion of the County that require Public Safety and Local Government Communications (ie; high speed accidents, locations, high speed highways, river rafting with access via permits issued by the NPS, cliff rescues structure fires, etc.) Response times or availability of emergency response is not at issue. Public safety communications is a factor for emergency responders safety once they are on the scene of an incident. This site is in conformance with County zoning. We are not aware of any other regulations or specific uses at this site. The tower will be limited to only government and public safety users. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file).</p>
			<p>Have had commendable rapid response three times in the last five years from fire/emergency rescue and fail to understand, bar another company 10 miles closer, how this proposed facility would ever be able to contribute an improvement to that. Though the Sandy Hook area may have zero contact with WC dispatch, there is no reason why it cannot be extended coverage from an alternate location in the Rt. 67 corridor. 3. Does the proposed tower site property have a specific use that precludes it being erected and if so, will it require rewriting and who other than WC will be entitled to share its use. 4. Have a copy of correspondence from Mr. Campbell, NPS to Mr. Kroboth, DPW and comfortably impressed that my County gov't has failed us by ignoring this assistance and choosing to seam roll ahead. I am both enraged and ashamed over this quality of County Gov't. 5. Is there such an incident laden burden that this upgrade needs to happen now and not a later date?</p>	<p>Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers. The County plans to hold a public hearing to take public testimony in the near future.</p>

Tower Comments and Responses

			In closing, constructive assistance has been ignored and the community is having something shoved down our throats by arrogant secondary county gov't individuals with the blessing of the BCC.	
141	4/7/08 @ 1:19 PM	Bill Failor	Can't we find a site that will not impact the C&O and meet the needs of a cell tower? There must be a place.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file).
142	4/7/08 @ 1:30 PM	Civil War Preservation Trust (CWPT)	On behalf of the CWPT, concern over negative impact of proposed tower site, located less than 1 mile from Harper's Ferry NHP and would be highly visible from several key historic NPS sites. Recognize and sympathize with the need to for communications. Strongly opposed proposed location that would create a prominent visual intrusion of visitors to parks and one of the most breathtaking landscapes in the nation. The balloon test definitively showed that the tower would be highly visible from historic locations. In the past WC has aggressively supported protection of Civil War resources and advocated for the inclusion of these resources in Harpers Ferry NHP. Hope that WC would continue its admirable support for the park and Civil War resources. Tower would also affect AT, and C&O. It's our experience that there's no one location where a cell or communications tower MUST be built. Hope that an alternative location can be found with consultation with the NPS.	Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.
143	4/7/08 @ 2:50 PM	Joanna Downing	Serious opposition to the tower. Live three doors down from the site and get a sick feeling every time I envision a behemoth structure looming over us. All for improving emergency communications-husband is a retire firefighter and have a medically fragile special needs child. Main concern is the process by which this whole thing has been run. Public meeting was inappropriate-not allowing public comment. Alternative sites have been swept under the rug. Should have more warning, more information, more time to respond and an open format to discuss issues. When will we hear back from our letters. Disappointed in how this was handled. You would not want to live under such a tower yourselves.	The County plans to hold a public hearing to take public testimony in the near future. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file).

Tower Comments and Responses

144	4/7/08 @ 3:02 PM	Stephanie Whitenton-Cox	<p>Regardless of what review was conducted prior to the March 2008 meeting, the guidelines of the FCC were not met. You need to stop now and find a solution that will keep WC from displaying an extreme lack of regard for protection and honoring our national treasure. Instead of making excuses, come up with a solution that does not include second rate technology and the destruction of federal and local monuments. Have evidence that full knowledge of all historic properties and archeological site affected may not have been fully known when the project started. Nov. 06 letter from Planning Commission stating Sandy Hook is a Rural Village triggering Historic District Commission review of certain building permits. FCC regulations. Preservation guidelines are included in our Code because of conflict between preserving our heritage and meeting the needs of modern society. You cannot through them out every time its a little difficult or costs more money. We need better than that. Why are so many people and entities outside WC more aware of the value of Sandy Hook than you are?</p>	<p>This site is in conformance with County zoning. We are not aware of any other regulations or specific uses at this site. The tower will be limited to only government and public safety users. Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.</p>
145	4/7/08 @ 3:38 PM	Craig Yost	<p>Opposed to tower. Affects viewshed from 3 Nat. Parks. Urge Co. to continue to work with the NPS on alternatives</p>	<p>The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.</p>
146	4/7/08 @ 4:43 PM	Bruce N. Attavian	<p>Opposed to tower. Support need for emergency communications, but hope you will seriously consider other alternatives that will protect the views of this scenic and historical area.</p>	<p>The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file).</p>
147	4/7/08 @ 5:05 PM	Richard Wm. Trott	<p>Feel the potential disruption of the visual quality of the peaceful and historic setting should be of great concern to not only Pleasant Valley residents, but everyone in surrounding Tri-State area. Know for a fact that there are numerous alternative means of communication systems that could solve current blank spots. Feel it is the obligation of the BCC, as elected representatives of the populace, to investigate all potential alternatives, especially those being offered by the NPS. Request additional open forum meetings for the public for updated status on the research being done and constituents to asked questions.</p>	<p>Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers. The County plans to hold a public hearing to take public testimony in the near future.</p>

Tower Comments and Responses

148	4/7/08 @ 3:40 pm	Petition signed by 34 people - one signed statement "If it saves one life, its well worth it!"	* This region is surrounded by conservation zoned lands for a good reason. Not only will the tower diminish the appearance of South County, the historical area, the mountains and panoramic views, but the entrance to MD from two states. Location is within several hundred yards of historical home sites. Will reduce property values. Impact of tower's size it outrageous as a solution that we have concerns about your ability to solve. Will also send letters to state representatives and the FCC.	Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. Washington County does not anticipate any loss in property values.
149	4/7/2008	Jim & Liz Robinson	Harpers Ferry area is a nationally important historic site that attracts visitors from all over the country. Magnificent views from historic town and Civil War sties should remain unspoiled. Thomas Jefferson wrote about this glorious view. Tower would spoil that panorama and should be rejected on that basis alone. NPS has offered assistance and less obtrusive sites. The engineers of the NPS have met the challenge of the topography in the Pacific Northwest, they could surely help WC find a superior alternative to this awful project. Please put project on hold and work toward an alternative.	Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.
150	4/7/2008	Laura Picard	Opposed to tower. Urge County to continue to work with NPS officials to determine viable alternatives to eliminate this eyesore on this bucolic and historic landscape. NPS engineer attended public meeting and has since informed NPS officials that alternatives are available and he looks forward to Co invitation to meet. WC has 40 year tradition of preserving the heritage and beauty of south county. Please continue to work with NPS.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers. Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.
151	4/7/2008	Catherine Kelleher	Urge WC to press for alternatives to tower at Keep Tryst Road. Tower would be a clearly visible intrusion on the surrounding scenic area. Visit area many times a year and strongly advocate that those vistas be maintained, rather than destroyed by a problem that has other solutions.	The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.

Tower Comments and Responses

152	4/7/2008	Pamela Underhill	<p>Proposed tower site is within 1/2 mile of three national parks and is highly visible for several key scenic features within and adjacent to these units. AT is one of our Nation's most important scenic and recreational resources and is protected by federal legislation, designating the AT as our nation's first scenic trail. Our organization is very concerned about the negative visual impact the tower will have on the trail and its visitors. The tower would be visible from many highly scenic locations. If WC insists on proceeding with their current proposal, it is appropriate that our office request the FCC conduct a full environmental review consistent with NEPA Policy Act. Alternative site should be investigated including federal lands and a combination of two sites. We intend to ask the FCC to require that WC develop alternatives to the 190' tower.</p>	<p>The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.</p>
153	4/7/2008	Donald E. Briggs	<p>Proposed tower site is within 1/2 mile of three national parks. The C&O Canal towpath is recognized as a segment of our developing scenic trail. I encourage you to seek creative solutions that simultaneously address communications need while maintaining the integrity of views. If WC insists on proceeding with their current proposal, it is appropriate that our office request the FCC conduct a full environmental review consistent with NEPA Policy Act. We believe that alternatives exist that will serve the interests of County residents with compromising the national significance of the area.</p>	<p>The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens.</p>
154	4/7/2008	Jan and Gayla Kobialka	<p>Tower project would mar the historic landscape that attracts many tourists and tourists dollars we spend at your local businesses. This a nationally know historic site and views are an important park of our national patriotic heritage. Please halt this project and work with NPS to find a less destructive way of providing communications. We know NPS has offered engineering assistance and possible sites.</p>	<p>Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.</p>

Tower Comments and Responses

155	4/7/2008	Betsy Shade, MD	<p>The Keep Tryst location would put the tower in the middle of views from Weverton Cliffs, MD Hghts and Loudon Hghts and would be a terrible eyesore from Hundred Pound Battery also. Please put project on hold until alternatives suggest by NPS can be considered with full public review and comment. WC should take advantage of the NPS experience. Surely this project must have an environmental analysis before it goes any further.</p>	<p>Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers. The County plans to hold a public hearing to take public testimony in the near future.</p>
156	4/8/2008	Lee B. Sheaffer Jr	<p>Strong concerns regarding tower. Recognize the importance of communications, but also mindful of the natural beauty of the region. Ask you to reconsider the location. Crane test demonstrated that tower would be visible from many unique overlooks. Thomas Jefferson quote. PATC is deeply concerned with visual impact. Concerned WC appears to have done little to examine alternative locations. This seems contrary to the County's own strictures. Ask that you reconsider site.</p>	<p>Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Disguised tower was proposed and rejected by the NPS.</p>
157	4/8/08 @ 6:00 PM	Dave Barnes	<p>Support tower. Please be advised that Scott Faulkner in Jefferson County is again at it to block another project, see his note below on local left wing liberal blog. He has written to several families on this blog asking them to write to each of you using his sample letter. Safety and quality come first above all. Move forward with you tower and do not let these special interests that side with the NPS stop this project.</p>	<p>Washington County appreciates your support of it's effort to provide emergency communications in Southern Washington County for the safety of our citizens and first responders.</p>
158	4/9/2008	Stewart M. Brandborg	<p>Concerned about tower. National values are at stake here with significance far beyond WC. One of the most remarkable site on the Atlantic Coast. Tower would be a blot on the landscape that would harm the value of this area for visitors. Visible from main tourist routes and from all heights. Urge you to look at other options. NPS has experience in providing communications in rough landscapes. Please hold up project and get more alternatives on the table using the expertise of the NPS.</p>	<p>Washington County continues to appreciate the heritage and beauty of South County, however, the County also has an obligation as the first priority of government to provide public safety to our citizens. The county evaluated seven locations and Keep Tryst was the only site of the seven that met our system requirements (see table at end of file). Washington County has been actively negotiating with the NPS since October of 2006. Washington County requested help from the National Park Service engineers at that first meeting, when the NPS initially offered their engineering assistance and Washington County has evaluated every site suggested by NPS. To date, the County has not received assistance or been contacted by NPS engineers.</p>

Tower Comments and Responses

159	4/7/08 @ 9:06	Grace and Frank	<p>(Comments appear to indicate writer believes this to be a cell tower) - Fee it is a necessity not on Elk Mt. side but it might even help in where you can't get any signals. Don't see how it would scar the scenery since it is not on any park property and sort of in the distances. Look at what they did all along the top of the Catoctin Mts, a scene to behold. Go for it. Could it be painted green or gray?</p>	<p>Washington County appreciates your support of it's effort to provide emergency communications in Southern Washington County for the safety of our citizens and first responders. The proposed tower is not a cell tower and the County Commissioners have publicly stated that no commercial users will be permitted to use this tower. It will be limited to only government and public safety users. Disguised tower was proposed and rejected by the NPS.</p>
160	7/28/08 @ 12:42 PM	Karen Simms	<p>While we all know the importance of infrastructure, as a MD resident I am opposed to locating the tower close to both the Appalachian trail and historic parts like the C&O canal and Harper's Ferry. As National Gems, they also require our attention and protection! Washington County is beautiful, and should do everything in it's power to build up tourism to the area, much of which is based on enjoyment of our heritage, both natural and historical. I am sure that solutions can be found which meet both needs.</p>	<p>We as a Board have been working proactively for several years now to find a solution that would satisfy both of these elements. As a life long resident of this county I agree it is a gem. At the same time I have a greater responsibility to adequately protect the residents, businesses, responding safety personnel, and tourists in all areas of this county. If at the end of this process that means placing an emergency system component in such an area I would hope folks would understand that it was accomplished through and exhaustive effort and the only mosts viable option we have to accomplish to task at hand. Kristin Aleshire</p>
161				
162				

Tower Comments and Responses

163						
164	Site	RF Tower Height	MW Tower Height	Meets RF Coverage Requirements	Advantages	Disadvantages
165	No tower	0	0	No		1) Jeopardizes safety of Police, Fire, & EMS responders
166	Keep Tryst	190	85	Yes	1) WC owned site. 2) Provides coverage in critical areas	
167						
168	IDC	120	350	No	1) Provides additional coverage West of Md. Heights	1) Loss of coverage East of Md. Heights on 340 corridor. 2) 350' tower required to meet State of Md. Network connectivity requirement 3) Approval process for site development. 4) FCC licensing at site. 5) Site not owned by WC and out side of County.
169						
170						
171						
172						
173	Grandview	120	1000	No	1) Provides additional coverage West of Md. Heights	1) Loss of coverage East of Md. Heights on 340 corridor. 2) 1000' tower required to meet State of Md. Network connectivity requirement 3) Approval process for site development. 4) FCC licensing at site 5) Site not owned by WC and out side of County.
174						
175						
176						
177						
178	Nash	120	1000	No	1) Provides additional coverage West of Md. Heights	1) Loss of coverage East of Md. Heights on 340 corridor. 2) 1000' tower required to meet State of Md. Network connectivity requirement. 3) Approval process for site development. 4) FCC licensing at site 5) Site not owned by WC and out side of County.
179						
180						
181						
182						
183	Blue Ridge / Mannings School	N/A	N/A	No		1) Not a viable site. System interference into County
184						
185	Loudon Heights	N/A	N/A	No		1) Not a viable site. System interference into County
186	Maryland Heights	N/A	N/A	No		1) Undeveloped area
187						
188	BDA	N/A	N/A	No	1) Not a viable alternative	1) Not a viable alternative 2) Not sufficient isolation to achieve coverage
189						
190						
191						
192						
193						
194						
195						
196						
197						
198						