From: Tom Kowalske <kowalsketom@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2026 5:10 PM
To: Assembly <assembly@petersburgak.gov>
Subject: Questions for Tidal Kowalske Rebuttal

Hello, Assembly members. I hope you are able to get out to enjoy the break in the weather. Lord knows we deserve one.

I would like to put on the record my rebuttal to Tidal's responses to Jeff Meucci's questions. My comments are in red. The responses were far from satisfactory and full of misinformation and flat out lies. Thank you, Jeff, for your work on this. I think we should look at this very carefully and objectively. Thank you all for your time and service.

Tom Kowalske

The questions presented regarding the Tidal Network project reflect valid community interests, though they would benefit from additional context regarding the specific nature of this initiative. This is not a commercial experiment by a private internet service provider; it is a federally funded Tribal infrastructure project undertaken by the Central Council of the Tlingit & Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska. Our mandate is not merely to sell internet service, but to construct a permanent public utility infrastructure that ensures the safety, resilience, and economic future of our communities. How can they provide for an economic future for the folks with properties adjacent to the tower on Mill Rd. Property values will decrease, and selling these properties will be close to impossible. Years of investments on these properties and those nearby will now be unrealized. Negative health effects and a decrease in quality of life may cause additional expenses. Some insurance companies will not cover people living within a certain distance of a tower, thus causing an increase in the cost of coverage. Additionally, at great costs, APT recently built new fiber-optic cable infrastructure in many communities in SEAK, including Petersburg where we have an office and a team of technicians standing by for quick and reliable service. Tidal's infrastructure availability, on top of Starlink, may cause a significant reduction in APT's bottom line, which could lead to the closure of their office and eventually the elimination of the service of both GCI and APT, thus eliminating the coverage by terrestrial cable service, resulting in a single satellite source for satellite carrier. This is not acceptable.
For too long, Southeast Alaska has relied on aging, single-point-of-failure networks that leave our people, schools, hospitals, and emergency responders vulnerable. APT is currently installing brand-new fiber-optic cable throughout all of Petersburg. This will be added to the already existing GCI fiberoptic ground cable, Starlink, and cellular service by both AT&T and GCI. *The infrastructure we are building is designed first and foremost for regional resilience for ALL CITIZENS not just Tribal Citizens. These towers provide the critical "middle mile" and "last mile" redundancy required to keep services connected.* Since installing Starlink two years ago and being served by a 100' cellular

mono pole nearby, I have not lost internet at my residence, which is less than 500' from the tower on Mill Rd. *Furthermore, this infrastructure is an open platform; we are creating capacity that other carriers, public agencies, and emergency services can utilize to improve their own coverage without the cost of building duplicate towers.* If this were true, then why did they not partner up with the existing 100' tower located on Hungerford Hill just 1,300' from the Mill Rd site?
The location and specifications of our sites are driven by rigorous engineering and federal mandates to reach unserved households, not by profit margins. How can this be true when residents near the Mill Rd tower are well served by GCI ground fiber-optic cable, Starlink satellite, and new GCI ground fiber-optic cable? Tidal is currently trying to build towers on a land-slide prone mountain side in Sitka despite geologic surveys done in that area. It is clear in their dealings with residents near proposed tower placements that their bottom line is the only thing they are concerned about. There have been alternative offerings for the responsible placement of towers in all three towns and Tidal dismissed every one saying that "it will add additional cost to the project," clearly indicating that their bottom line is more important than any other concern brought to their attention, especially by those residents living near proposed sites. *We are bringing millions of dollars in federal investment back to Alaska, creating local jobs, and solving connectivity gaps.) We welcome this dialogue to clarify the technical and operational realities of the project, with the understanding that our commitment to modernizing this region's infrastructure is unwavering.* There are no connectivity gaps around the Mill Rd tower. In order to be granted the grant, Tidal said on their application that they would use the 50 million dollar grant to serve remote native communities on tribal lands that do have gaps in service. Nothing could be further from the truth. Petersburg is far from this description. Communities like Yakutat, Angoon, Gustavus, Klawock, Thorne Bay, Skagway, Pelican, Saxaman, and Tenakee Springs might actually need or want this service, but Tidal has not done any work in these towns. Tidal indicates they are working with Hoonah, Craig, Kasaan, Hydaburg, and Haines, but it's all talk so far.

1) By what means was it determined that Petersburg was unserved or underserved as a stipulation of the grant requirements.
We determined Petersburg's eligibility through a combination of federal standards, independent technical data, and direct community feedback. Under the Tribal Broadband Connectivity Program, the NTIA explicitly empowers Tribes to "self-certify" unserved areas, recognizing that national maps often fail to reflect on-the-ground realities. To validate this, we utilized third-party testing data from Ookla to prove actual speeds fell below the federal "qualifying broadband" threshold of 25 Mbps download and 3 Mbps upload. Several Petersburg residents with testing equipment could not find any gaps in service. *Furthermore, our analysis of Census data indicated that approximately 7% of the Petersburg population is unserved or underserved*. What census data? Why don't they show us when we ask for it? Why don't they just rely on

the Data from Ookla if is actually exists? *This data-driven approach, supported by our own surveys of Southeast Alaska residents, ensures we are targeting true coverage gaps and directing federal tax dollars to the specific neighborhoods that private investment has overlooked*. What survey? Hundreds of people have been vetted in Petersburg in recent days, and not a single person said they have been surveyed. The specific neighborhoods mentioned here that have been overlooked cannot include the Mill Rd neighborhood; APT, GCI, AT&T, and Starlink are all being utilized here.
2)What was the actual process involved in making that determination?

The process began with data analysis where we cross-referenced Census figures which indicated 7% of Petersburg was unserved with third-party speed test data from Ookla (3rd party speed testing) to confirm that actual performance fell below the federal 25/3 Mbps standard and drive testing with our equipment and engineers. This is likely based on very old data. Several Petersburg residents with testing equipment could not find any gaps in service in the area that the Mill Rd tower will cover. Why will they not show us the real data when asked? *We validated these technical findings through a direct survey of Southeast Alaska residents, allowing us to pinpoint specific "weak spots" and service gaps that provider maps often fail to capture*. What survey? Hundreds of people have been vetted in Petersburg, and not a single person said they have been surveyed. *Using this evidence, Tlingit & Haida then exercised its authority under the grant rules to formally "self-certify" in these areas as unserved to the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA).* Their whole premise for justifying the work in Petersburg is based on out-of-date data and from surveys from residence of other towns outside of Petersburg. *This recognized legal process allowed us to bypass inaccurate national coverage maps and secure federal approval to direct funding exactly where it is needed most. We also conducted drive testing of signal strength*. Refer to my previous comment.

2) How many people were considered or contacted?
We considered the entire population of the service area through a comprehensive, two-pronged outreach campaign conducted in the summer of 2021. These efforts did not include the population in Petersburg. Hundreds of people have been vetted in Petersburg, and not a single person said they have been surveyed. *To ensure no one was missed, we utilized a Universal Residential Mailing List to ensure our members were specifically engaged.* These efforts did not include the population in Petersburg prior to building the tower on Mill Rd. *This mass outreach allowed us to distribute surveys to thousands of residents, gathering real-world data to validate our Census analysis.* Ditto my previous comment. *By combining direct mailings, we ensured our determination was based on the actual experiences of the whole community rather than just a small sample or theoretical coverage maps*. Ditto my previous comment. *Over 12,000 surveys were sent out.* Ditto my previous comment. *We have also conducted a new survey in 2025 to gather community feedback. We have held public meetings in communities including Petersburg.* Did they hold a public meeting in Petersburg? I am

not aware of any. One was planned in December but was canceled. *We are working with Petersburg Indian Association to lease their 2.5Ghz spectrum. We have worked with the City of Petersburg including the planning department, fire, electrical, and harbor master.* They certainly are not working with the people that live around these tower sites. Tidal Representatives have been short, dismissive, rude, and downright disrespectful in their dealings with residents here in Petersburg, but also with the folks that live in Sitka and Wrangell that tried to work with them.

3) Given the fixed population of Petersburg, how does Tlingit & Haida Council plan to achieve the license requirements of providing 50% coverage within 4 years and 80% coverage within 8 years to of fixed population without displacing customers from existing internet provider?
The FCC license requirements are based on signal availability rather than subscriber adoption. To meet the 4-year and 8-year milestones, we are only required to ensure our wireless signal physically reaches those percentages of the population, not that those residents switch to our service. By building a tower to reach the community, the broadcast radius will inherently cover a large portion of the town and satisfy the FCC coverage requirement without requiring a single customer to leave their current provider. This allows us to meet our federal obligations by adding a new option for redundancy and competition rather than displacing existing services. The data they used is out-of-date from a period before APT ran the new land cable and before Starlink became an affordable redundant option. Waiting for a response from APT and GCI to validate this assumption.

4)Given that any Petersburg Borough resident is currently served internet access by Starlink, exactly how can Tlingit and Haida/Tidal Network claim that there exists “unserved” in SE Alaska.
While Starlink is a valuable tool (and Tidal Network is a reseller of Starlink for government use), it does not disqualify an area from being "unserved" for infrastructure grants for two key reasons: So, since they are using Starlink to provide service to unserved in the area near Mill Rd, the statement above indicates that the residents will remain unserved since Starlink does not disqualify an area from being unserved.
Grant Definition of "Reliable Broadband": Federal grant programs (like NTIA TBCP) prioritize “terrestrial" infrastructure (fiber/fixed wireless) over satellite to ensure long-term, scalable
capacity. Satellite services are often excluded from the "served" definition in these specific Notices of Funding Opportunity (NOFO). This is a very misleading statement that is not true for Petersburg. The towers that Tidal is erecting in Petersburg will provide internet by linking to Starlink satellites. This whole statement concerns the population in SEAK that does not have terrestrial ground cable internet. Petersburg has two companies: GCI and APT, both of which provide terrestrial infrastructure. Referring to “grant Definitions is very interesting here since they appear to be working outside all

of the stipulations of the grant and will not share the grant and its entirety when asked to see it.

Affordability & Equipment Cost: "Access" includes affordability. High upfront equipment costs ($599+) and monthly fees for LEO satellite can be prohibitive for many households. Tidal Network's fixed wireless solution offers a lower barrier to entry, ensuring equitable access for all income levels. Now that a majority of the population in Petersburg purchased the Starlink equipment, does that mean they will reimburse us? Otherwise, why would we want to switch after already spending the $599 to switch to Tidal. The towers in Petersburg will use Starlink to provide service, so monthly fees will still exist for Tidal customers in Petersburg. APT will be a better option once Starlink Equipment ages and needs replacement.

5G towers and Starlink are complementary technologies that work together to create a "hybrid" network, offering far greater reliability than either could provide alone. In Southeast Alaska, dense tree canopies and steep terrain often block the clear view of the sky that Starlink requires, creating "dead zones" for satellite service. This applies mostly to people living deep in the woods. There are no residents near the Mill Rd site to which fits this description. Not to mention there is almost always a clearing above a house on its roof to access a clear view of the sky. Additionally, terrestrial infrastructure is currently available in Petersburg to overcome dead zone limitations where they do exist. *Our towers can reach these blocked homes by transmitting signals horizontally under the canopy or around terrain obstacles.* This only applies in places where the trees are all tall, the land is flat, and the towers are short. These conditions do not occur in Petersburg. *Additionally, using both systems creates critical redundancy: towers can offload heavy data traffic to keep satellite speeds fast, while Starlink can provide emergency backhaul connectivity if a physical cable to a tower is ever cut.* Tidal is not installing cable and Starlink on their towers, just Starlink for the towers south of town in Petersburg. The amount of data traffic for the very small population centers in Petersburg does not experience slow speeds due to the relief from the combination of GCI, APT, and Starlink. This includes cruise ship traffic now that most cruise ships are outfitted with Starlink. *This multi-technology approach ensures that 911, telehealth, and schools stay online even if one specific path fails.* This was a true statement long before Tidal broke ground in Petersburg.

4) What are the specifications needed for sites chosen for telecommunications towers being erected? Site locations and requirements…..

Sites must be buildable, legally permissible, and safe. Some of the sites Tidal is currently pushing for in Sitka are on steep, slide-prone mountain sides. *They must support required coverage, have access to power and backhaul, allow construction and maintenance access, and meet engineering, environmental, cultural, and zoning requirements.* Some of the sites in Sitka do not meet geological requirements. It's believed that these particular sites were picked as pay-back to the residents of Sitka

who are fighting them. *Community impacts such as visibility and proximity are also evaluated.* The tower on Mill Rd is an eyesore that takes away from the beautiful scenery in that area and reduces quality of life for all the folks that now have a tower in their window views and while recreating on Mill Rd. *Site selection is a precise engineering process driven by the need to clear dense vegetation and terrain to reach households. Every location is determined by radio frequency (RF) modeling rather than preference, ensuring the tower has the necessary height to provide reliable service.* I am no expert, but RF signal testing near Mill Rd by locals indicated no gap in service. Additionally, this area is covered by GCI and APT ground cable and Starlink Satellite service. Signal testing in town also showed very strong radio frequencies for all population centers. *Before any construction begins, sites must pass strict federal environmental (NEPA) and historic preservation reviews, as well as geotechnical surveys to ensure the structure meets national codes for wind, snow, and seismic resilience.* Not true, they are trying to put towers on land slide prone mountain sides in Sitka. *(We prioritize locations that allow towers to remain under 200 feet to avoid FAA lighting requirements and always evaluate existing structures for colocation first to minimize new construction.* There are existing towers and private properties that, in combination, would be ample to provide the coverage that Tidal is aiming to achieve. Not only did Tidal instantly dismiss every alternative proposed by residents in Petersburg, Sitka, and Wrangell, but they did so in a disrespectful fashion.

5)Who is responsible for maintaining and servicing completed towers and what are the plans for dismantling the towers when new technology arrives?

Maintenance: Tidal Network, an enterprise of Tlingit & Haida, retains full ownership and operational responsibility. We employ local and regional technicians to service the equipment. They do not have local technicians planned to service the towers in Petersburg. If the equipment fails, then we will have to wait until they send a tech from another city, which would take a day or two. APT does have technicians here in Petersburg and is a more reliable option.

Decommissioning: Industry standard leases and permits include a removal bond or clause. If the tower becomes obsolete, Tidal Network is responsible for dismantling the structure and restoring the site.

However, towers are vertical real estate; as technology evolves (e.g., 6G), we simply swap the antennas on top rather than removing the tower. The tower on Mill Rd was obsolete before it went up, but it still went up. This is a typical answer by Tidal with very little merit. When they quit using this tower, they will likely be out of money to take it down. Otherwise, they will claim sovereign immunity in the face of a lawsuit, and they know this, so they have made many promises they know they will not be held accountable for.

5) How would you suggest that local government officials respond to health concerns from community members?

Local government officials should respond to health concerns with a factual, calm, and empathetic approach that prioritizes independent verification. How about these references: The most effective response is to assure residents that the project adheres

to strict Federal Communications Commission (FCC) safety standards, with independent engineering studies confirming that ground-level exposure is typically less than 1% of federal limits lower than what they receive from their own cell phones or Wi-Fi routers. Officials should emphasize that this is a matter of compliance, not opinion, noting that federal law (the Telecommunications Act of 1996) prohibits local governments from blocking infrastructure on health grounds when it meets verified FCC safety guidelines. By focusing on the testing that occurs, officials can validate the community's desire for safety while confirming that those protections are already in place.

A good reference that addresses this issue is published by the FCC: According to the court decision on August 13, 2021, the FCC failed to update its 1996 safety guidelines for RF radiation exposure. These 1996 limits were designed to protect against "thermal effect" of exposure to RF radiation, but not "non-thermal" effects. The FCC was mandated to update the guidelines for exposure to radiofrequency radiation. Their limits (1) fails to acknowledge evidence of negative health effects caused by exposure to RF radiation at levels below the limits, including evidence of cancer, radiation sickness, and adverse effects on sleep, memory, learning, perception, motor abilities, prenatal and reproductive health, and children's health; (2) fails to respond to comments concerning environmental harm caused by RF radiation; (3) fails to discuss the implications of long-term exposure to RF radiation, exposure to RF pulsation or modulation (two methods of imbuing radio waves with information), and the implications of technological developments that have occurred since 1996, including the ubiquity of wireless devices and Wi-Fi, and the emergence of "5G" technology.
https://tidalnet.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/Local-Government-Officials-Guide-to-Transmitting-Antenna-RF-Emission-Safety-PDF.pdf

Also from the Court Decision: Petitioners point to multiple studies and reports, which were published after 1996 and are in the administrative record, purporting to show that RF radiation at levels below the Commission's current limits causes negative health effects unrelated to cancer, such as reproductive problems and neurological problems that span from effects on memory to motor abilities. See, e.g., J.A. 3,068 (BIOINITIATIVE WORKING GROUP, BIOINITIATIVE REPORT (Cindy Sage & David O. Carpenter eds., 2012) (describing evidence that human sperm and their DNA are damaged by low levels of RF radiation)); J.A. 5,243 (Igor Yakymenko et al., Oxidative Mechanisms of Biological Activity of Low-Intensity Radiofrequency Radiation, ELECTROMAGNETIC BIOLOGY & MED., EARLY ONLINE, 1–16 (2015)); J.A. 5,259–69 (Henrietta Nittby et al., Increased Blood-Brain Barrier Permeability in Mammalian Brian 7 Days After Exposure to the Radiation from a GSM-900 Mobile Phone, 16 PATHOPHYSIOLOGY 103 (2009)); J.A. 5,320–68 (Henry Lai, A Summary of Recent Literature on Neurobiological Effects of Radiofrequency Radiation, in MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC HEALTH 187–222 (M. Markov ed., 2018)); J.A. 5,994–6,007 (Milena Foerster et al., A Prospective Cohort Study of Adolescents' Memory Performance and Individual Brain Dose of Microwave Radiation from Wireless Communication, 126 ENV'T HEALTH PERSPS. 077007 (July 2018)). Petitioners also point to approximately 200 comments submitted by individuals who advised the

Commission that either they or their family members suffer from radiation sickness, “a constellation of mainly neurological symptoms that manifest as a result of RF[] exposure.” Pet’rs’ Br. at 30–31, 30 n.99.

https://www.fcc.gov/general/radio-frequency-safety-0

The FCC adopts exposure limits directly from these non-profit scientific organizations. These groups spend years reviewing thousands of peer-reviewed papers to set the "safe" threshold (MPE - Maximum Permissible Exposure). See above comments.From the decision: In the Department of the Interior’s expert view, the Commission’s RF radiation limits “continue to be based on thermal heating, a criterion now nearly 30 years out of date and inapplicable today.” J.A. 8,383. “The [current environmental] problem,” according to the Department of the Interior, “appears to focus on very low-level, non-thermal electromagnetic radiation.” Id. Although the Commission has repeatedly claimed that it considered “inputs from [its] sister federal agencies[,]” 2019 Order, 34 FCC Rcd. at 11,689, the Commission entirely failed to address the environmental harm concerns raised by the Department of the Interior.

IEEE (Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers) / ANSI:

Specifically, the IEEE C95.1 standard. This is the technical standard for safety levels with respect to human exposure to electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields.

NCRP (National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements):

The FCC adopted the NCRP's recommended limits for field strength and power density. This is more cherry-picked out-of-date data the FCC tried to use in the lawsuit. More from the judge’s decision: the FCC ignored substantial information and material from, for example, the American Academy of Pediatrics, J.A. 4,533; the Council of Europe, J.A. 4,242–44, 4,247–57; the Cities of Boston and Philadelphia, J.A. 4,592–99; medical associations, see, e.g., J.A. 4,536–40 (California Medical Association); thousands of physicians and scientists from around the world, see, e.g., J.A. 4,197–4,206 (letter to United Nations); J.A. 4,208–17 (letter to European Union); J.A. 5,173–86 (Frieburger Appeal by over one thousand German physicians); and hundreds of people who were themselves or who had loved ones suffering from the alleged effects of RF radiation, see, e.g., J.A. 8,774–9,940; see also J.A. 4,218–39 (collecting statements from physicians and health organizations expressing concern about health effects of RF radiation.

ICNIRP (International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection):

While European-based, their guidelines largely align with IEEE/FCC limits and are cited by the World Health Organization (WHO) as evidence of safety.

FDA (Food & Drug Administration): The FDA has clearly stated that "the weight of scientific evidence has not linked cell phone radio frequency radiation with any health problems."

They actively review animal studies (like the NTP Study) and have concluded that the findings in rats (exposed to massive, whole-body doses) do not apply to humans using cell phones. More from the decision: And they state the FDA’s conclusion that, in light of that information, exposure to RF radiation at levels below the Commission’s current limits does not cause harmful health effects. But they offer “no articulation of the factual . . . bases” for the FDA’s conclusion. Am. Horse, 812 F.2d at 6 (internal quotation marks omitted). In other words, they do not explain why the FDA determined, despite the studies and comments that Petitioners cite, that exposure to RF radiation at

levels below the Commission's current limits does not cause harmful health effects. Such conclusory statements "cannot substitute for a reasoned explanation," for they provide "neither assurance that the [FDA] considered the relevant factors nor [do they reveal] a discernable path to which the court may defer."

National Cancer Institute (NCI): They maintain that there is currently no consistent evidence that non-ionizing radiation increases cancer risk. From decision: petitioners first argue that the Commission failed to respond to record evidence that exposure to RF radiation at levels below the Commission's current limits may cause cancer. Specifically, Petitioners argue the Commission failed to mention the IARC's classification of RF radiation as possibly carcinogenic to humans, and its 2013 monograph regarding that classification, on which the Commission's notice of inquiry specifically sought comment. Petitioners also argue that the Commission failed to adequately respond to two 2018 studies—the National Toxicology Program ("NTP") study and the Ramazzini Institute study—that found increases in the incidences of certain types of cancer in rodents exposed to RF radiation. Had these 2018 studies been available prior to the IARC's publication of its monograph, Petitioners assert, the IARC would have likely classified RF radiation as "probably carcinogenic," rather than "possibly carcinogenic." This is so, according to Petitioners, because the IARC will classify an agent as "possibly carcinogenic" if there is "limited evidence" that it causes cancer in humans and animals, and as "probably carcinogenic" if there is "limited evidence" that it causes cancer in humans and "sufficient evidence" that it causes cancer in animals. In its 2013 monograph, the IARC found "limited evidence" that RF radiation causes cancer in humans and animals, and therefore classified RF radiation as "possibly carcinogenic." Int'l Agency for Rsch. on Cancer, Non-Ionizing Radiation, Part 2: Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields, 102 IARC MONOGRAPHS ON THE EVALUATION OF CARCINOGENIC RISKS TO HUMANS 419 (2013).

6) How would you suggest that local government officials respond to decreased property values due to proximity to towers being built? Would you buy a house under a tower? Our local real estate agent stated at the Planning Commission meeting on Jan 13 that property values will decrease as much as 20%. Some properties will have a very difficult time selling.

While this is a common concern, credible studies on this topic are mixed and often show negligible long-term impact, particularly in rural/semi-rural areas where connectivity is a utility that adds value. However, in a place where aesthetic value ranks very high in the quality of life, a 150' tower will hurt not just property owners in the area, but also folks who use the area to recreate. In the case of Mill Rd, many folks who live in the area use Mill Rd in the same manner that folks use City Creek Trail. Imagine the effect of a 150' lattice tower in the middle of the City Creek trail would have on the experience of folks trying to enjoy the nature walk.

Utility Value: In the modern digital economy, access to high-speed, diverse internet options is often a selling point for homebuyers. As stated above, we are already well covered by Mill Rd. The tower will cost residents who live near it much more than it will ever benefit them.

Officials should acknowledge the validity of residents' concerns while pivoting to the reality that reliable broadband is now a critical utility that supports property desirability rather than diminishing it. We do not need it, nor do we want it.
Independent studies have found no consistent measurable link between tower placement and reduced property values; conversely, the lack of high-speed internet is increasingly seen as a liability by homebuyers who require connectivity for remote work and education. Again, we are well covered near the Mill Rd tower and property value will decrease. Some properties will never be able to be sold and very little growth will occur in the surrounding area now there is a tower. *Officials can confidently state that in many markets, modern infrastructure is an amenity that stabilizes home prices, and that the broader economic benefits of connecting the community outweigh subjective aesthetic concerns.* We are already covered, and now we have a 150' tower eliminating all the investments we have made in the area. The positive growth in residential housing in the area seen in the past few years will now become stale.

7) *What will be the price per month for customers for the new broadband service?*

From January to October, introductory rates of $20.26 and then to $89.99 if the promotion is not extended. My current monthly Starlink bill is $90.00. There will be no advantage for the folks that already have Starlink to switch to Tidal's service. Interruptions will be longer with Tidal than with APT due to the lack of technical support in Petersburg.

Inclusions: This typically includes the necessary in-home equipment (router/receiver).
No Data Caps: Unlike many satellite or cellular plans, our fixed wireless plans are designed without punitive data caps. I don't have a data cap with my current service.

8) What are the chances of frequency interference related to a tower next to the Fire Hall and the general proximity to the new campus of the Petersburg Medical Center?
Zero.
Frequency Separation: Public safety radios (Fire/Police) typically operate on VHF (150 MHz), UHF (450 MHz), or 700/800 MHz bands. Tidal Network operates on 2.5 GHz (2500 MHz). There is a massive physical separation in the spectrum that prevents overlap.

Medical Equipment: Medical telemetry generally uses specific protected bands (like WMTS). 2.5 GHz is a standard commercial Wi-Fi/LTE band used safely in hospitals worldwide without interfering with medical devices.
The chance of harmful interference is non-existent because the tower, emergency responders, and medical equipment all operate in completely different, federally separated "lanes" of the radio spectrum.

Dedicated "Lanes" Prevent Crashes: Just as semi-trucks, airplanes, and trains travel on different paths to avoid collision, wireless signals use specific frequencies. Tidal Network uses the 2.5 GHz licensed band. Fire and EMS typically use VHF, UHF, or

700/800 MHz bands. These are far apart on the spectrum, meaning they physically cannot "talk over" or interfere with one another.

Medical Grade Protection: Modern medical equipment is built to strict FDA and FCC standards that require it to be "immune" to outside radio signals. Furthermore, the 2.5 GHz band is a "clean," licensed frequency, unlike the "noisy" unlicensed Wi-Fi bands where interference is more common.

Strict FCC Engineering: All our equipment is FCC-certified to stay strictly within its assigned lane. We also use high-quality filters and directional antennas that focus energy out toward homes, not down into nearby buildings like the Fire Hall or Medical Center. This setup is standard practice nationwide, where towers safely sit atop hospitals and police stations without issue.

9) The towers appear to have emergency power capabilities. How much fuel is needed and how is the surrounding environment protected from spills.

While we do not have a final tank size selected for every site, yet we adhere to the following:
Fuel Capacity: The generators utilize a sub-base fuel tank (located directly under the generator unit), are 100 gallons of diesel.

Spill Protection: We use UL-142 listed, UCL S601, UL2200 double-walled tanks. This means the inner tank holding the fuel is completely sealed inside a second outer steel tank. If the inner tank were to leak, the outer tank captures the fuel, preventing any release into the environment. What about a fire plan? Properties in the area of the Mill Rd site are vulnerable to fire damage from this tower and fuel source under the generator in the event the tower catches fire or a drought-driving ground fire finds its way to the generator.