

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

CAMDEN PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
August 21, 2014

PRESENT: Chair Lowrie Sargent; Members Richard Bernhard, Richard Householder and Jan MacKinnon; and CEO Steve Wilson

ABSENT: John Scholz

The meeting of the Planning Board convened at 5:00 pm.

1. Public Input on Non-agenda Items: No one came forward to speak.

2. MINUTES:

July 31, 2014:

There were two substantive changes made to the draft Minutes; one correction was included in the Final version.

Page 2 Line 49: "...useable public green space."

Page 2 Line 84: "...vibrant spaces for people to use..."

MOTION by Mr. Householder seconded by Ms. MacKinnon that the Minutes of the Planning Board meeting of July 31, 2014, as amended be approved.

VOTE: 4-0-0

3. SITE PLAN REVIEW: Residential Pier

Robert and Karen Brace: Map 124 Lot 88: Coastal Residential District (CR): Outer Harbor: 25 Harbor Road

The Applicants were represented by Attorney Brian Rayback and agent Will Gartley of Gartley and Dorsky Engineering and Surveying. Mr. Gartley summarized the proposal:

- A new pier in the Outer Harbor that will measure 100' from Mean High Water (MHW) to Mean Low Water (MLW)
- The shore has been stabilized and the pier will be accessed by an existing pathway and stairs that cross the slope
- A 50' gangway and float system (ramp is 44' long)
- Installation of low-level post lighting – lighted only when being used
- No excavation is necessary – the pier will sit on rocks
- The Application has been before the Harbor Committee
- The pier is subject to Army Corps and DEP approval
- Because the system is seasonal and will not permanently extend beyond the MLW line, a Submerged Lands Lease from the Maine Department of Conservation is not required

Harbor Committee Recommendation

45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88

The Minutes of the Harbor Committee meeting of August 11, 2014, shows the Harbor Committee voted 4-1 *not* to recommend passage of this pier to the Select Board. According to Mr. Gartley and Steve Pixley, Camden’s Harbor Master, the Harbor Committee’s decision reflected their frustration with the ambiguities within the Ordinance that, they say, makes the job of judging compliance with Ordinance standards impossible. Members have made clear their position that they do not support the construction of any more piers within either of Camden’s harbors, and last spring they drafted changes to the Harbor Ordinance to affect this change. The Committee tried, without success, to bring this issue before the Select Board and the public for discussion. Working with the current Ordinance, the Committee judged the Brace’s pier application based on their opinion that the ambiguous language – especially with regard to assessing whether or not the pier will conflict or interfere with other harbor uses -- makes it impossible to approve any new pier.

Mr. Pixley, who is not a voting member of the Harbor Committee, disagreed with the Committee’s decision because of the proposed location of the pier in the Outer Harbor where there is not much going on. The water in the area of the pier is too shallow for large boats to travel and for moorings to be set – at low tide the pier will be entirely out of the water and only a few feet at the float. He understands why the Harbor Committee believes it is difficult to determine how much - if any- impact a pier might have, but this is an area of very low impact and he see no problem with regard to the safety of harbor users.

Mr. Gartley informed the Board that he met with the Harbor Committee to discuss revisions to the Ordinance language that would make the language and intent much more clear, but the Committee doesn’t want any more piers and that is where the Select Board disagrees.

Mr. Sargent reviewed the three objections raised by the Harbor Committee to the Brace pier:

- “May eliminate or interfere with existing and designed mooring and anchorage areas and access thereto.”
- The Harbor Committee stated their objection here had to do with future mooring and anchorage areas – the Planning Board dismissed that objection because it is the existing situation that is to be addressed.
- “Block or interfere with public rites of passage and uses of the shores and flats”; and
 - “Adversely affect small recreational boating activities”

The Planning Board found that because of limited public access in this area of the Outer Harbor there is not much use by the public of the shore; and because the water is so shallow, there is not much use of the areas between MLW and MHW by small boats. Members disagreed with the Harbor Committee’s recommendation, and discussed the fact that the Committee’s opinion is advisory in nature and not binding upon the Planning Board or the Select Board; the Planning Board is only required to acknowledge that they have received this recommendation - not to act upon it, and can continue with their review of the Application. The Select Board,

89 however, would have to find the Planning Board made an error in their review of this pier in
90 order to overturn the Board’s decision.

91

92 **ARTICLE XII: SITE PLAN REVIEW**

93 The Application under review consists of the following submissions all dated July 23, 2014:

- 94 Letter of Application
- 95 C-1: Pier Plan
- 96 Site Location Map
- 97 Camden Tax Map 124 (Portion)
- 98 Abutter List
- 99 Photographs
- 100 AE-1: Aerial Photograph

101 And these documents:

- 102 Abutter List dated May 28, 2014
- 103 Warranty Deed dated May 4, 1988
- 104 FEMA FIRM Panel 230074 0014 B dated March 22, 2010
- 105 Boundary Survey Plan dated November 1981

106

107 The Board reviewed the Application for content and found there was sufficient
108 information to move forward to review. The Applicant was asked to supply information on
109 proposed exterior lighting. (See Attachment 1)

110

111 The Application also addressed the design standards for piers as reviewed by the Harbor
112 Committee (Chapter V of the Harbor and Waterway Ordinance Article VI Part C: Outer Harbor
113 piers), and the Board discussed the information contained within the Letter of Submission at
114 Pages 5-8.

115

116 Although members are familiar with the area in general, they will hold a Site Visit on
117 August 27 at 7:30am because of the issues raised by the Harbor Committee.

118

119 A Public Hearing will be advertised for the September 4 meeting.

120

121 **4. SITE PLAN REVIEW: ENLARGE an EXISTING COMMERCIAL WHARF**

122 **Appleton Family, LLC: Map 119 Lot 9: Transitional Harbor Business District (BTH):**
123 **Inner Harbor: 44 Bayview Street**

124

125 Sam Appleton, owner of the Waterfront Restaurant, the location of the proposed wharf
126 expansion, was present to discuss the Application. He noted that when the wharf was rebuilt
127 7 years ago, the then owners of the property left a 6' x 48' “hole” in the wharf line because
128 they did not want to add Site Plan Review to their list of required permits in order to create
129 that missing section of wharf. The area was originally left open to provide an area for a ramp
130 to access the floats below. The access was relocated but the “hole” was left with the intent of
131 recreating that ramp. That was never done and the resulting space below serves no marine

132 use; there is 6' of water and it is an awkward space to get in and out of even for dinghies and
133 other small boats. This addition would enhance his restaurant by increasing the size of the
134 dining deck and help fill the need in the summer for more outdoor seating; no new seats
135 would be added – tables are moved from inside to outside to accommodate customers in the
136 summer. The awning covering the present deck would be extended outward and the same
137 lighting used now would be replicated in the new area.

138
139 Mr. Appleton confirmed the Harbor Master's earlier statement that the Harbor Committee
140 had unanimously supported his Application when it was reviewed by them at their August 11
141 meeting. There is no reference within the Committee's meeting Minutes, however, and the
142 Planning Board will need something in writing from the Harbor Committee for their review of
143 the Application. Mr. Pixley recalls the Committee supported Mr. Appleton's request because the
144 addition will not extend beyond the Wharf Line; they wanted to make sure that this would not
145 lead to a situation where extending the line would be required.

146
147 ← The CEO will ask the Harbor Committee clerk to transcribe the portion of the recording from
148 the August 11 meeting that includes the discussion of the Appleton wharf.

149 ← The Harbormaster will provide notes regarding the discussion of the Appleton wharf at the
150 Harbor Committee meeting.

151

152 **ARTICLE XII: SITE PLAN REVIEW**

153 The Application under review consists of the following submissions:

154 Application for Site Plan Review dated July 28, 2014

155 Agent's letter dated February 6, 2014

156 Site Plan:

157 Camden Waterfront Restaurant Seawall Repair Plan and Section dated June 6, 2006,
158 stamped and sealed by Stephen Ruell, PE

159 Sheet 1: Wharf Extension Plan dated January 15, 2014

160 Sheet 2: Wharf Extension Section dated January 15, 2014

161 Sheet 3: Tax Map dated January 15, 2014

162 Site Plan Content Narrative

163 DEP NRPA Permit approved April 21, 2014

164 Site Location Map

165 Army Corps Permit dated March 28, 2014 (?)

166 Sign offs from:

167 Maine Historic Preservation Commission dated February 25, 2014

168 Penobscot Nation dated February 26, 2014

169 DOC Revised Submerged Lands Lease dated April 24, 2014

170 Two photographs of the site dated February 2014

171 Warranty Deed dated September 26, 2012

172

173 The Board reviewed the Application for completeness and, except for the missing
174 information on exterior lighting and an updated signed and stamped version of the Ruell Site

175 Plan to include the proposed project and a signature block, found the submissions provided
176 sufficient information to continue review. (See Attachment 2)
177 Members are familiar with the area will not hold a Site Visit.

178
179 A Public Hearing will be advertised for the September 4 meeting.

180
181 **5. SITE PLAN REVIEW/NEW WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY**
182 **Northeast Wireless Networks: Map 120 Lot 87: 36 Washington Street**

183
184 Maureen Hopkins of Tilson Technologies is the project coordinator for the Northeast
185 Wireless Networks proposed project to add wireless transmitters to the smokestack at the
186 Knox Mill property owned by Matt Orne (AHP Camden, LLC). Northeast will be leasing
187 bandwidth from AT&T who has a license in Knox County. Tilson is working with
188 Northeast to expand their capacity in Maine from 120 sites to 175 by the end of the year.
189 The proposal is to mount seven antennae on the smokestack at varying heights: 3 51" x 6"
190 panels at 148' and 152'; and 1 3' diameter parabolic antenna at 153'. They will be secured to
191 rings that fit down over the top of the stack and none will project above the top of the 170'
192 stack nor protrude out from the stack at more than 8". (Right now these antennae are
193 mounted at a temporary site at 15 Elm Street.)

194
195 Ms. Hopkins informed the Board that a survey shows that the stack has been found to
196 be structurally sound, but Mr. Orne is moving forward with a very extensive (\$150K)
197 project to improve the integrity of the stack in any case. Northeast has a lease for 130SF at
198 the base of the stack as well where they will install 46"x42" cabinets to connect 1 ¼" co-ax
199 cables from the power source up the stack – in bundles of three) to the antennae. (Cables
200 will be painted to match the stack once it has been refurbished.) There is an existing 8 ½'
201 wall surrounding the base of the stack that will serve to screen the cabinets and to protect the
202 public. Although no generator is proposed for this site at this time one could be added in the
203 future. Out of all the sites in Maine so far only 15 have had generators added once they
204 were up and running – there will be no noise associated with this project. However, nothing
205 in the lease precludes adding a generator, nor does it preclude Mr. Orne from leasing stack
206 space to other providers. Normal leases are for 10' increments on “towers” and it is
207 possible, especially once the stack is improved, that other antennae could be added. There
208 are five providers licensed in this area – Sprint, T-Mobile, Verizon, US Cellular, and
209 Northeast. Even with upgrades, the stack may not be able to carry five sets of antennae.

210
211 Northeast anticipates beginning installation soon since they want to be up and
212 running by the end of the year. Since they are using an existing structure there are not as
213 many issues.

214
215 **Wireless Telecommunications Facility Siting Ordinance:**

216
217 The Ordinance provides for two review processes – one for installation in an existing
218 building and one for a new facility. The Chair and CEO believe this situation is the former *if* Mr.

219 Orne will add a “roof” to the stack so it will meet the Ordinance definition of “Building” – “Any
220 structure which has a roof.”

221 Mr. Householder also noted that the Ordinance contains the following exemption from
222 review: “3. Parabolic Antennas less than seven (7) feet in diameter.” This means that
223 Northeast’s 5 foot parabolic antenna will not need to be included in the review; the Board will be
224 reviewing an installation of six antennae.

225

226 **5.3 Submission requirements for locating antennas in existing buildings:**

227

228 The submissions to support the Application are extensive: A binder contains the
229 Application for Site Plan Review and supporting documentation. The Board reviewed the
230 submissions against the Ordinance requirements (see Attachment 3).

231

232 The Chair proceeded to discuss Section VII Standards of Review so the Applicant would
233 know if any other information might be required to provide sufficient information for the Board
234 to complete review. Because one of the Approval Standards addresses Visual Impact, the Chair
235 turned to Section 5.4 Items 7 and 8 to specify what would be required of a complete Visual
236 Impact Assessment.

237

238 7. A visual impact assessment by a qualified professional which shall include photo simulations
239 of the proposed facility taken from perspectives determined by the Planning Board during the
240 site plan review pre-application meeting pursuant to Article XII, Section 2 of the Zoning
241 Ordinance. Each photo must be labeled with the line of sight, elevation, and with the date taken
242 imprinted on the photograph. The photo must show the color of the facility and method of
243 screening.

244

245 8. A narrative discussing:

246 a. the extent to which the proposed facility would be visible from or within a designated scenic
247 resource,

248 b. the tree line elevation of vegetation within 100 feet of the facility, and

249 c. the distance to the proposed facility from the designated scenic resource’s noted viewpoints.

250

251 The Applicant should provide a letter explaining specifically why certain standards will
252 not apply to this Application.

253

254 ← The Applicant was asked to submit the following items:

- 255 • A statement from Mr. Orne affirming his intent to cap the stack
- 256 • A Visual Impact Assessment using the following five locations in Town – pictures long
257 range from the origin as well as a zoom in are required from each location:

- 258 ➤ From the Library grounds

- 259 ➤ From Chestnut Street – the photographer should drive down the street toward
260 downtown and shoot the picture from the first place the stack is visible

- 261 ➤ Alden Street

- 262 ➤ Knowlton Street

- 263 ➤ The intersection of Routes 1 and 52
264 • Written statements explaining why specific Approval Criteria do not apply to the project
265

266 **Article XII Site Plan Review:**

267
268 One of the triggers for requiring Site Plan Review is a Telecommunications Facility, and
269 the Applicant had submitted an Application for Site Plan Review.

270
271 XII 1 (6): “Proposals to construct new wireless telecommunications facilities, and any expansion
272 of an existing wireless telecommunications facility that increases the height of the facility by
273 more than 20 feet.”

274
275 After reviewing the definition in the Zoning Ordinance, the Board agreed that the
276 antennae on the smokestack could be classified as a Wireless Telecommunications Facility.
277 However, it appears that the language of Article XII, while ambiguous, would not apply in this
278 instance because the smokestack is an existing structure, and the antennae will not increase the
279 height of the smokestack. Because the stack already exists, and because the scope of the project
280 is so limited, most of the items reviewed under Site Plan would not apply. It was the unanimous
281 opinion of the Board that this Application did not have to go through Site Plan Review, but
282 rather it could be reviewed under Chapter XIII, the Wireless Telecommunications Facility Siting
283 Ordinance, only.

284
285 There will be no Site Visit since all members are very familiar with the site.

286
287 A Public Hearing will be advertised for September 18.

288
289 **4. DISCUSSION:**

- 290
291 1. There were no Minor Field Adjustments;
292
293 2. Future Agenda Items:
294 Camden Snow Bowl Lighting Plan: There is still no request for a review of the Lighting Plan.
295
296 3. Business Opportunity Zone:

297
298 The Board discussed revisions to the draft of the BOZ, but did not complete the review;
299 the discussion will be continued at the Comprehensive Plan Meeting on August 28.

300
301 There being no further business before the Board they adjourned at 7:30pm

302
303 Respectfully Submitted,

304
305
306 Jeanne Hollingsworth, Recording Secretary

1 **ATTACHMENT 1: BRACE PIER**

2
3 **Section 3 Site Plan Content:**

4 (a) *Owner's name and address*

5 Provided with Letter of Application.

6
7 (b) *Names and addresses of all abutting property owners*

8 List provided

9
10 (c) *Sketch map showing general location of the site within the Town*

11 Tax Map provided

12
13 (d) *Boundaries of all contiguous property under the control of the owner or applicant regardless*
14 *of whether all or part is being developed at this time.*

15 There is none.

16
17 (e) *Zoning classification(s) of the property lines of the property to be developed and the source*
18 *of this information.*

19 Shown on C-1

20
21 (f) *The bearing and distances of all property lines of the property to be developed and the source*
22 *of this information. The Board may require a formal boundary survey when sufficient*
23 *information is not available to establish on the ground, all property boundaries.*

24 Shown on C-1 and on survey provided.

25
26 (g) *The location of all building setbacks required by this Ordinance.*

27 Shown on C1

28 The Applicant's Agent confirmed that the pier to pier set back is met.

29
30 (l) *the location of open drainage courses, wetlands, stands of trees, and other important natural*
31 *features, with a description of such features to be retained and of any new landscaping planned.*

32 Shown on C-1

33
34 (m) *The Location and dimensions of any existing easements and copies of existing covenants or*
35 *deed restrictions.*

36 The Applicant stated there are no known easements or covenants and has provided a copy of the
37 deed.

38
39 (o) *Location and type of exterior lighting.*

40 ← **The Applicant was asked to supply a cut sheet showing the design of the low-voltage lamps that**
41 **will be installed on the pier**

42
43 (p) *Copies of applicable State and Federal approvals and permits, provided, however, that the*
44 *Board may approve site plans subject to the issuance of specified State approvals and permits*
45 *where it determines that it is not feasible for the applicant to obtain them at the time of site plan*
46 *review.*

47 DEP NRPA and Army Corps permits are required and have been applied for but not yet in hand.
48 Camden Flood Hazard Minor Development permit submitted to CEO.

49
50 (q) *A signature block on the site plan, including space to record a reference to the order by*
51 *which the plan is approved.*
52 Provided on C1.

53 **Section 4(5): Additional Information for Piers**

54 In addition to items (a), (c), (d), (l), (m), (o) and (q) in Section 3, applications for Piers,
55 Wharves, Breakwaters and Boat Ramps shall include: *(Amended - 11/2/10)*

56 (a) A site plan stamped and sealed by an engineer registered in the State of Maine.
57 *C-1 is stamped and sealed by Will Gartley, PE*

58 (b) An elevation showing the height of the pier in relation to normal high water.
59 *Shown on C-1*

60 (c) A pier section.
61 *Shown on C-1*

62 (d) A detailed erosion control plan, including a schedule of construction. The schedule
63 shall include the kind of motorized equipment, how and when it will be used below
64 high or low water.

65 *There will be no excavation and all work will be done from a barge*

66 (e) A detailed plan showing how oils, greases or other contaminants will be separated and
67 handled.
68 *Not Applicable*

69 (f) Copies of required Maine Department of Conservation submerged lands lease,
70 Maine Department of Environmental Protection and United States Army Corps of
71 Engineers permits, provided, however, that the Board may approve site plans
72 subject to the issuance of specified State and Federal approvals and permits where it
73 determines that it is not feasible for the applicant to obtain them at the time of site
74 plan review.

75 *Applications for permits have been submitted. An email from the Department of*
76 *Conservation (dated August 19, 2014) confirms the seasonal exception applies to this pier*
77 *and that no Submerged Land Lease is required.)*
78

79 **Section 4: Supplemental Information**

80 The Planning Board may require any or all of the following submissions where it determines
81 that, due to the scale, nature of the proposed development or relationship to surrounding
82 properties, such information is necessary to assure compliance with the intent and purposes of
83 this Ordinance.

84 (1) Existing and proposed topography of the site at two-foot contour intervals, or such other
85 interval as the Board may determine, prepared and sealed by a surveyor licensed in the State of
86 Maine.

87 *Contour intervals are shown on C-. The Plan is stamped and sealed by Steven Tremblay PLS.*

88 (2) A storm water drainage and erosion control plan prepared by an engineer or landscape
89 architect registered in the State of Maine, showing:

90 (a) The existing and proposed method of handling storm water runoff.

91 (b) The direction of flow of the runoff through the use of arrows.

- 92 (c) The location, elevation, and size of all catch basins, dry wells, drainage ditches, swales,
93 retention basins, and storm sewers.
- 94 (c) Engineering calculations used to determine drainage requirements based upon a 25-year
95 storm frequency, if the project will significantly alter the existing drainage pattern due to such
96 factors as the amount of new impervious surfaces (such as paving and building area) being
97 proposed.
- 98 (e) Methods of controlling erosion and sedimentation during and after construction.
99 *These submissions are not required – there will be no construction on land.*
- 100 (3) A utility plan showing, in addition to provisions for water supply and wastewater disposal,
101 the location and nature of electrical, telephone, and any other utility services to be installed on
102 the site.
103 *Shown on C-1.*
- 104 (4) A planting schedule keyed to the site plan and indicating the varieties and sizes of trees,
105 shrubs, and other plants to be planted.
106 *Not applicable to this project.*
107
108

1 **ATTACHMENT 2: APPLETON WHARF**

2
3 **Section 3 Site Plan Content:**

4 (b) *Owner's name and address*

5 Included in Narrative.

6
7 (c) *Sketch map showing general location of the site within the Town*

8 Tax Map provided

9
10 (d) *Boundaries of all contiguous property under the control of the owner or applicant regardless*
11 *of whether all or part is being developed at this time.*

12 Shown on Sheet 3

13
14 (l) *The location of open drainage courses, wetlands, stands of trees, and other important natural*
15 *features, with a description of such features to be retained and of any new landscaping planned.*

16 Shown on C-1

17
18 (m) *The Location and dimensions of any existing easements and copies of existing covenants or*
19 *deed restrictions.*

20 The Applicant stated there are no known easements or covenants and has provided a copy of the
21 deed.

22
23 (o) *Location and type of exterior lighting.*

24 ← The Applicant was asked to provide a picture of the existing lighting to fill the requirement to
25 show the lighting designs.

26
27 (p) *Copies of applicable State and Federal approvals and permits, provided, however, that the*
28 *Board may approve site plans subject to the issuance of specified State approvals and permits*
29 *where it determines that it is not feasible for the applicant to obtain them at the time of site plan*
30 *review.*

31 DEP NRPA and Army Corps permits are required and have been applied for but not yet in hand.
32 Camden Flood Hazard Minor Development permit submitted to CEO.

33
34 (q) *A signature block on the site plan, including space to record a reference to the order by*
35 *which the plan is approved.*

36 ← Needs to be added to Ruell Site Plan

37 **Section 4(5): Additional Information for Piers**

38 In addition to items (a), (c), (d), (l), (m), (o) and (q) in Section 3, applications for Piers,
39 Wharves, Breakwaters and Boat Ramps shall include: (*Amended - 11/2/10*)

40 (a) A site plan stamped and sealed by an engineer registered in the State of Maine.

41 *Ruell Plan dated June 6, 2006*

42 ← The Applicant was asked to obtain a revised Plan that includes the proposed project (stamped and
43 sealed) - or a letter from an Engineer testifying to the adequacy of the 2006 Plan for this Application.

44 (b) An elevation showing the height of the pier in relation to normal high water.

- 45 *Shown on Ruell Plan*
46 (c) A pier section.
47 *Sheet 2*
48 (d) A detailed erosion control plan, including a schedule of construction. The schedule shall
49 include the kind of motorized equipment, how and when it will be used below high or low
50 water.
51 *There will be no excavation or soil disturbance*
52 (e) A detailed plan showing how oils, greases or other contaminants will be separated and
53 handled.
54 *Not Applicable*
55 (f) Copies of required Maine Department of Conservation submerged lands lease, Maine
56 Department of Environmental Protection and United States Army Corps of Engineers
57 permits, provided, however, that the Board may approve site plans subject to the
58 issuance of specified State and Federal approvals and permits where it determines that it is
59 not feasible for the applicant to obtain them at the time of site plan review.
60 *Permits have been submitted.*

61
62 **Section 4: Supplemental Information**

63 Due to the scale of the project the Board did not require any Supplemental Information

64

ATTACHMENT 3: NORTHEAST WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY

5.3 Installations in Existing Buildings

1. Documentation of the applicant's right, title, and interest in the lot where the facility will be sited, including the name and address of the landowner and the applicant.

The Applicant provided a copy of the Lease Agreement which gives them standing to apply.

2. A copy of the FCC license for the facility, or a signed affidavit from the owner or operator of the facility attesting that the facility will comply with FCC regulations.

The spectrum is leased from AT&T – they hold the license.

3. A USGS 7.5 minute topographic map showing the current location of all structures and wireless telecommunications facilities above 150 feet in height from ground level, except antennas located on roof tops, within a five (5) mile radius of the proposed facility. This requirement shall be deemed to have been met if the applicant submits current information (i.e., within thirty days of the date the application is filed) from the FCC Tower Registration Database. Include documentation of longitude and latitude.

The Applicant provided information and a map under cover pages titled Radio Frequency Signal Propagation Maps and Information From FCC Tower Registration Database -- the submissions filled requirement #3.

4. A site plan:

a. prepared and certified by a professional engineer registered in Maine indicating the location, type and height of the proposed facility, antenna capacity, on-site and abutting off-site land uses, means of access, setbacks from property lines. The site plan must include certification by a professional engineer registered in Maine that the proposed facility complies with all American National Standards Institute (ANSI) codes.

There are 4 Plans prepared by Sebago Technics for the project all dated August 6, 2014:

T-1: Title Sheet

C-1: Overall Site and Layout Plan

C-2: Tower Elevation and Antenna Plan

C-3: Construction Details

b. certification by the applicant that the proposed facility complies with all FCC standards for radio emissions;

The Applicant provided a letter from Northeast's General Counsel (William St. Lawrence) dated August 6, 201, and titled: Applicant's Certification of Compliance with FCC Radio Emission Standards. The Board accepted this letter as satisfying the submission requirement.

c. a boundary survey for the project performed by a land surveyor licensed by the State of Maine.

The Applicant provided a copy of a Standard Boundary Survey of the Knox Mill dated July 11, 1991, prepared, stamped and sealed by Michael Cummons, PLS.

5. Elevation drawings of the proposed facility, and any other proposed structures, showing height above ground level.

See C-2

6. A landscaping plan indicating the proposed placement of the facility on the site; location of existing structures, trees, and other significant site features; the type and location of plants proposed to screen the facility; the method of fencing, the color of the structure, and the proposed lighting method.

There is no landscaping planned or required