

Geography

	How do you feel about the benefits of cell service in areas of Bridger Canyon that don't now have it?	How do you feel about the possible negative impacts of cell towers in the Canyon?	How do you feel about the specific proposal for a 165 foot tower in Aspen Meadow?	Do you now get cell service where you need it in Bridger Canyon?	Where do you live or own property in the Canyon?	Do you use a cell phone?
Aspen Meadow	2.29	4.14	1.57	4.29	7	3.14
Jackson Creek	3.76	3.12	3.12	2.60	25	4.00
Lower Canyon (south of Jackson Creek)	3.85	2.76	3.32	1.91	34	3.91
Upper Canyon (north of Jackson Creek)	4.00	2.48	3.71	1.10	21	4.10
With Comment	3.38	3.34	2.64			
No Comment	4.14	2.41	3.82			
	1=indifferent	1=indifferent	1=strongly oppose	1=no service	number reporting	1=never
	5 = very positive	5=very worried	5=strongly support	5=good signal	(other not shown)	5=frequently

Tell us more!

Pro/Con

Bridger Canyon has enough development already...let's at least keep from further polluting our viewshed with a 165 ft structure...no one is suffering from lack of cell service in the Canyon...it takes a couple of minutes to drive past the "M" to get it if need be....

There is the possibility that making cellphone service more available will increase development pressure on our beloved canyon.

I hate to sacrifice the visual environment of the canyon for mere convenience or extremely rare safety events. Alltel's feet should be held to the fire until they find a better location and design. We don't need to sell Bridger Canyon cheap.

If people can't live without cell service they should live in town.

I live in Bridger Canyon and feel strongly that we do not need a cell tower in Aspen Meadows. I have Verizon cell service and have no problems with reception. If anyone has a problem with cell phone service, they should switch to Verizon.

I LOVE that my cell phone doesn't work here.

Montana prides itself on being Big Sky country. I consider cell towers to be pollution of the view and contrary to the Big Sky motto. The views of the Bridgers are not to be taken for granted. They are precious and the reason many have chosen to re-locate here. Once they are gone, they are gone forever. A tower of the proposed height is a disservice to all who live here and appreciate the wide open views and skies.

Most of us moved here to be in the country---not look at a 165 ft. tower, esp. on Green Mt.

The ability to receive a communicative signal up Bridger Canyon clearly outweighs any negative impact a tower would create. I use my cell for work, even though I personally pay for the service. I plan to drop my land line if a tower is installed.

Public safety must override aesthetics concerns that can be mitigated with prudent construction specifications.

We strongly support having a cell tower in the Canyon. It is a significant inconvenience now not having reception,

Cell towers can be made fairly invisible. The benefit outweigh the minor aesthetic issues...

Cell phone service is desperately needed in the Bridger Canyon to stay abreast with current technology.

For anyone that works and lives in the canyon the inability to receive cell service in the canyon is a huge negative. There is a lot of drive time involved when you live in the canyon. With no cell service the drive time is not productive.

I don't even notice cell towers anymore. I think it is important that the North end of Jackson Creek Road is covered - especially the Bridger Canyon Fire Station. I have seen cell towers disguised as trees that are nearly invisible.

Considering the number of cell phones now in the Bridger Canyon, it seems only reasonable that we should be able to use them as can others elsewhere. The Aspen Meadows location, or any other having the same coverage, would be a very welcome advantage, since it would enhance computer access as well.

Strongly oppose even tho cell reception would be convenient at times.

We all lived w/o cell phones not that long ago!!

If you keep bringing the city to rural areas, eventually there will be no rural areas. The more conveniences you have the more people and traffic, less quiet, less wildlife, etc. I wonder if persons wanting cell service would be willing to have a tower in their backyard or in their viewshed.

How many cell towers do we need? I think the canyon has pretty good cell service now.

I would be strongly opposed if the site were in my back yard. I would also be strongly opposed if by approving this tower, it "opened the door" to additional installations in Bridger Canyon.

I don't think we need 100% coverage. We live here because we rejected what that tower would bring....depredation of our vistas. I am totally opposed and will do whatever I can to oppose construction of this tower.

I am most concerned about the creep of blight in the name of convenience. BC is an extraordinary region, we have only to look to the west of downtown Bozeman to see the benefits of zoning that puts community input and values first over expediency or commercial demands. With each small, incremental affront to the BC landscape, the bar is lowered, making the next affronts that much more possible.

Since nobody in Bridger Canyon needs communications to escape poverty, it's interesting to consider the other element of this piece, that places with No Service, become scarcer and will have value... the scarcer they get. Given that we all have very reliable, proven alternatives, perhaps we should take pride in being one of those places Where There Be Dragons. Personally, I'd rather have a new neighbor who is intrigued rather than repulsed by the idea that there is no cell coverage at his new house.

Dependable cell service in Bridger Canyon will provide a real convenience and possibly cost saving to those not wanting to pay for a land line. It also provides a vital safety tool for hunters, skiers, snowmobilers, etc. as well as motor vehicle accident victims and additional communication channel for Bridger Canyon Fire. The visibility of the tower is not ideal but cell towers are a way of life in many areas and I feel the benefits outweigh the visual impact.

With a road up every coulee and a house on every ridge we are hardly a pristine area any more. So, I suppose a cell tower should be accepted as another part of the development of the canyon.

I believe that cell service in Bridger Canyon poses significantly more benefits than detriments; however, the placement of the cell tower is of critical concern. It needs to be placed so that it has minimal environmental impact and does not materially distract from the areas natural beauty and unspoiled vistas.

For me, it comes down to balancing preservation/conservation of canyon resources -- including aesthetics -- and benefits to be gained by canyon residents. Always a very difficult path to navigate!

It would be nice to have cell signals at Bridger Bowl and surrounding areas, however, I wouldn't want it in my viewshed, as I think would be the prevailing opinion of others. There's only a few spots, leading up to Jackson Creek Road, where a signal is lost.

I have mixed feelings about the height and location of the tower, but also think it would be good to be able to have cell phone reception to/from the fire station.

I have very mixed feelings about a cellphone tower coming into Bridger Canyon. On the one hand I would benefit by saving money ditching my landline and increasing public safety by being able to reports accidents, fires, etc. On the other, I greatly fear the aesthetic impact of a tower and it opening the door for more towers in the future.

My middle of the road answers reflect the fact that this proposed tower would not significantly impact me either positively or negatively. I believe that input from those impacted directly - either with improved service or impaired viewscape - are most important to this discussion.

I generally support the concept of better cell service in the canyon but NOT at the expense of values we all cherish. I am not a NIMBY, I would benefit directly from this proposal in terms of service but question whether it is worth potential trade-offs.

Safety

I have skied at Bridger Bowl for 37 years, and with the new terrain expansion, a cell tower would also give me a clear source of emergency communication.

I understand that there are drawbacks, however, the benefit of having cell service for safety purposes far outweighs those drawbacks.

Finally, do we need drivers distracted by talking or texting on their cellphones during ski season, or any time for that matter, on a two-lane road with a 70 mph speed limit?

This canyon is one of the few places in the country that is in the country without being isolated. Help is available almost everywhere in the canyon if needed. As it stands now there is only a distance of about 10 miles from Bridger Bowl to Bozeman that does not have coverage. I am concerned about drivers being less vigilant while speaking on cell phones. There are many deer and other animals killed here annually by good drivers and the possibility of being distracted by cell phone use increases the likelihood of more accidents with animals, not to mention the multitude of skiers coming and going every day in the season who would certainly increase that possibility. My thinking is that the advantage of being able to talk while driving in the canyon is not worth the possible cost in terms of lives, both human and four legged. Accidents impact the population in other ways as well. Many states have outlawed the use of cell phones while driving, for good reason, in my humble opinion.

I wonder if the company that stands to profit from cell towers would be willing to collaborate with insurance companies to help lower insurance rates while increasing liability coverage for the drivers that are sure to be putting in claims in the future if cell phone usage is possible. There are not a lot of white crosses on Hiway 86 like in the Gallatin Canyon, and I would be deeply saddened if even one more was added that was caused directly or indirectly by cell phone talking or texting or taking pictures or surfing the web or downloading music orEven though we are technologically advanced compared to the last generation, I think it behooves us to act responsibly when we are given the option. All the conditions of approval for conditional use would not be equal in value to the potential hazards.

I am concerned about people driving up and down the canyon while on the cell phone, especially during the busy ski season, on slick roads. It is nice to see people pulled over to finish their conversation before they enter the canyon as it stands now. We are asking for more accidents if we increase cell coverage.

Coverage/Location/Design

I am interested about how this tower would or would not conform to our zoning. Seems to me that a 165 foot tower slightly exceeds the 35 foot maximum elevation permitted for structures. If the antennas were located at the top of Bridger Bowl, service could be provided for most of the canyon and not require a 165 foot tower.

just wanted to ask what coverage will the new tower provide . what area is covered

I would like cell service but not like a 165 foot cell tower in my back yard. I would imagine the residents of Aspen Meadow object. Isn't there a spot (top of Bridger Bowl??) that would not have such a negative impact on the canyon?

A cell phone tower on Green Mountain would not help with reception on Kelly Canyon road (where we live). So, I am opposed to a tower that would not provide service to us.

We are afraid it will not reach us.

Unfortunately I do not have constructive thoughts about alternative locations for a tower. But I would think there might be options in less densely populated areas of the canyon and perhaps at higher points. I am also unclear on the benefits of a tower of canyon cell reception. I have heard different theories ranging from much improved reception (if you are with the right provider) to no improvement at least in the immediate area of the tower.

Is this the best location they can find for the tower? Seems a more remote, undeveloped area would be more appropriate.

If there are those who want cell service to the north in Bridger Canyon it would be suitable for them to come forward with a proposed location, and a reasonable structure.

It does not appear the location of the tower will be of much value to residents of Bridger Canyon except for a handful.

There are about 6 or 7 homes located in Bridger Bowl and about a dozen condos. Most of them appear to be rental units so service to that particular area would not be of benefit to many permanent residents. It would provide cell service for people visiting the slopes for recreational purposes....generally about 5 months a year. If the tower will possibly service only the upper slopes....can anyone ski and talk on a cell phone at the same time?

It could also be of great value for those who would see Bridger Bowl developed as a resort.

There is currently a facility operated on Bridger Ridge by Little Apple Technology. It would be more logical for AT&T (formerly ALLTEL) to utilize an existing structure. There are at least 2 towers planned, and seemingly approved, for lower Green Mountain already. One is to be 346 ft tall and another 292 feet tall. These are to be located within 2.62 miles of Aspen Meadow so it appears illogical to me to build another tower within such close proximity of those already approved.

If the intent is to service those near Bridger Bowl it would seem to me to be a better choice to either add the facility to the Little Apple Tower or locate it at Bridger Bowl itself and pay the rent to the Bowl.

I have seen photos of cell towers designed to look like pine trees. Obviously you can't hide a 165' tower and make it look like a pine tree....but if it becomes absolutely necessary to have a cell tower ELSEWHERE in the canyon, perhaps the scope and impact should be more modest and made to fit in to Montana. We don't need to look like every other metropolitan area of the country. If the cell company wants to be here maybe they should adapt to our local environment. Might be something for BCPOA to consider writing into their codes.

Surely there is a place closer to I 90 or in that area that would be more suitable.

My main concern beyond setting precedent for further towers from competing companies is the issue of a constantly blinking navigational warning signal that I assume would be part of the proposal. Some of these are WAY more obnoxious than others. The internet is full of stories of property owners adversely affected by light pollution emanating from cell towers.

A red blinking light for example is more palatable to me personally than a blinking white light strobe. In researching this, it turns out that USFWS recommends the use of solid red or pulsating red warning lights at night should be avoided. Current research indicates that solid or pulsating (beacon) red lights attract night-migrating birds at a much higher rate than white strobe lights. Red strobe lights have not yet been studied.

So my thoughts are if the height and location requires an aircraft warning beacon, these should be the minimum number, minimum intensity, and minimum number of flashes per minute (longest duration between flashes) allowable by the FAA. No lighted navigational warning light will be perfect but there must be some better than others and we should push for the least obtrusive as a required mitigation in writing if possible. Migrating bird concerns should be part of the discussion.

I do not want to see a tower with a flashing red light anywhere in Bridger canyon period.

In addition, any security lighting on the site, should be minimal and down shielded to prevent further light pollution sources.

I have seen towers in other areas of the country that look like trees. Granted, they are not perfect reproductions, but blend in better than normal towers. This could be a good compromise.

-The tower if built should be required to be painted in such a manner as to blend into the landscape as best as possible.

- What about the summit of Green Mt. as an alternative site? Seems like light pollution concerns could be partially dealt with by changing the location. Less direct eye level effects would result in adjoining properties if the project itself was move to a location ABOVE residential areas. A higher location would likely lessen the current height proposal if re-sited properly.

Question: I know there are all types of communication structures at the top of Bridger Bowl (e.g. Little Apple Technologies has an internet communication device). Is this a potential site for a cell tower or is a cell tower substantially larger than these other devices?

For those concerned about how a cell phone tower would look, they have been disguised to fit into the geography in different parts of the country and the company installing the tower could be required to do so here as well (i.e. disguised as a lodge pole pine or some other pine tree for example)

Aspen Meadow

I ... have been working with a few people in the subdivision on this issue. In my view the proposed tower would be a clear violation of the Aspen Meadows restrictive covenants. There are mixed feelings among Aspen Meadows folks about legal action to enforce the covenants... If legal action is taken, I would much prefer that it be on behalf of several property owners in the subdivision (safety in numbers). But we ... will seriously consider legal action even if we have to go it alone.

However, it would be far better for everyone concerned if the matter could be resolved by other means than a law suit. For that reason I hope that there is close collaboration between BCPOA and the folks in Aspen Meadows so that we are not working at cross purposes. Of course if the conclusion of your survey is that most people favor the proposed tower, than I guess we will be unavoidable working at cross purposes.

As an Aspen Meadow resident how much traffic, what roads for maintenance etc will the tower engender, are there concerns for fire?

I live in Aspen Meadow and strongly oppose any cell tower in this subdivision.

I understand the advantage of the service; however, they will be driving right by my house to erect this, and the dust will be terrible depending on how much building is needed and how long it will take. Also, how considerate the drivers are to homeowners. We maintain our own roads here and I am also concerned as to how all this traffic will impact our roads. It doesn't seem fair if we have to repair what they rip up. I would like to talk to an Alltel rep who will give us an honest explanation of what this involves.

It is not appropriate to force it on a single family residential neighborhood who would see a destruction in their property values, significant increase in construction traffic on roads they must maintain at their own expense, and no financial remuneration to anyone within the community except one property owner.

The proposed service is in a PUD designated as single family since 1973. The covenants of Aspen Meadow prohibit commercial or industrial activities. The cell tower is contrary to the covenants and does not serve the residents of Aspen Meadow, nor Kelley Canyon.

I think the Aspen Meadows residents should have the final say on how it looks and the scenic affect to the canyon.

Very against the cell tower on Meadow Lane. Living in the area I do not want this cell tower destroying the view we so treasure. I moved to Montana and Bridger Canyon specifically to avoid these blemishes. I am also very concerned as to what it will do to my property value. I am more than willing to sacrifice cell service in the Canyon to avoid having a cell tower in my neighborhood.

Other

-I also worry about the pin cushion effect of competing companies unwilling to share their tower coverage with competitors at a fair rate- thus forcing competitors to build their own towers in close proximity. Is this being considered?

If this goes through - can a deal be made to couple the cell service with a local company to provide computer access also - or does this have to go through alltell?

Perhaps I misunderstood John Mizelle's suggestion about BCPOA requiring any future cell services to be added to his proposed tower. To me, that statement sounds rather self serving since AT&T (ALLTEL) would be insuring they collect additional rent from all future cell companies.

AT&T, which uses entirely different technology, is purchasing Alltel's Montana markets. The open question is what will AT&T's intentions be once they absorb Alltel's Montana operations? Will their GSM technology require different equipment or towers than Alltel's CDMA network? If so, what impacts, if any, can be anticipated, to the proposed site? Will AT&T want another tower(s) to accomodate their GSM network?

As a current customer of Alltel, they have not at all been attentive to customers, ie, no letters or emails, during this divestiture and have not provided updated roaming capabilities. It would appear to me that placing more towers is an effort to sweeten their deal for a sale. Let's wait to determine with whom we're really doing business.