

Dorothy M. McPhaul ~ PO Box 601 ~ Sugar Hill, NH 03586

September 18, 2015

Chairman Martin Honigberg
New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee
21 South Fruit Street, Suite 10
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

Re: Rulemaking, Docket No. 2014-04

I want to say I am rather offended you raised your voice at me when I was speaking at the last public SEC hearing on September 15th. What I was stating was totally apropos to the rule making process. I wanted to remind you, when reviewing your rules, that the public represents many thousands of people who treasure their land and whose goal is to protect it, not to abuse and use it to increase their corporate profit, as is the goal of the energy industry.

I see nothing wrong with that; it is a FACT.

The energy company representatives object to any rule that offers an impediment to their project (see Kris Pastoriza's letter of September 18th). The public and their property values mean nothing. If one were to use neutral criteria and common sense, one would understand what absolutely biased rules they feel should be implemented.

I would also like to note our public representative, Ms. Wethersby, brought up public health and safety during a meeting; she and her comment were totally ignored by the other members of the SEC. There was no acknowledgment of the topic and no discussion.
(Meeting Transcript, April 2, page 16, Lines 19-23).

When Mr. Hawk suggested protecting the public with regards to towers and transmission lines and the EMF issue, the topic changed immediately to sound. When it was finally brought back to electric transmission lines, Vice-

Chairman Burack decided it “may be best just to leave this language as it is, and give the applicant an opportunity to bring their assessment in. And, if there are others who wish to challenge that or bring in data suggesting something different—some different analysis, certainly parties could do that as well.” (Meeting Transcript, April 15th, page 112, lines 17-23.) So... the applicant gets to chose the criteria with regards to transmission lines and public health and safety and, IF, some member of the public *happens* to know the issue is coming before the SEC and, IF, the public is paying attention and knows the date it will be discussed and, IF, the member of the public does not have a job and can get to Concord, then MAYBE the public will be protected? These rules are supposed to be in THE PUBLIC INTEREST?

I know one man who lost thirty thousand dollars on the sale of his house, a builder who lost a job for over one million dollars when the potential client heard about the towers and decided not to build and the examples go on and on. These people should NOT have to sacrifice a penny, or a half an acre of land, for which they worked hard, to give stockholders and executives of a private, for profit project more money! To me, that is robbery. The energy companies are responsible for taking monies, in people's property values, away from them and not compensating them for their loss. They should be prosecuted, not supported.

Just for your own edification, the towers were never going to be on my land or in my view. The unfairness of the studies, the rule making process and the rules themselves have forced me to object and try to defend the people.

Thank you for the opportunity to share my concerns.

Dorothy McPhaul
Sugar Hill