

Fri 8/21/2015

Dear Ms. Murray,

I am writing with graves concerns about the apparent scuttling of fair and specific SEC rules that were supposed to be written to coincide more with the legislative intent of SB 99. Specifically there are several areas of concern:

- Route Control: Applications must have evidence of legal control of the route: If they do NOT have legal control of the route, this will likely wreak havoc in legal battles for years, and hold the project up in court. Legal control of the route MUST be in the document.
- Transmission line setbacks: Transmission line setbacks should follow FERC and HUD standards or the suggestions in the SB-99 Health & Safety workgroup report.
- Visual Impact:
 - Assessment for transmission lines should extend a minimum of 10 miles
 - Assessments for Wind Turbines should extend at least 20 miles (and maybe more)
 - Assessments must be done in late Fall to early Spring when there are no leaves on the trees
- Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative impacts assessment needs to also be included in the application. Guidance on conducting cumulative impacts in federal environmental analysis processes already exists, such as Considering Cumulative Effects Under NEPA, CEQ, January 1997.
- Elective vs. Needed Projects: There is no reason why rate-payer funded or other elective projects should not be subject to municipal master plans, regulations and votes.
- Orderly Development and Municipal Views: Applications should include information regarding the effects of the proposed facility on the orderly development of the region, including views of municipal and regional planning commissions and municipal governing bodies regarding the proposed facility whether or not they have been expressed in writing but especially if written in the Master Plans and Zoning Ordinances of the host, abutting or impacted municipalities.

Thank you for taking time to read my concerns. Please work to make this process fair and just for all citizens and taxpayers.

Julie Moran
Colebrook