

4/6/2015

dmmcphaul101@gmail.com

Dear Attorney Weisner,

I am requesting you inform Commissioner Honigberg and the entire SEC commission of their total misunderstanding of one of my concerns as published in my letter to the SEC on March 23. This particular topic was published on page three of your agenda topics for April 2nd.

I requested a distinction be made on the application for a permit between "essential...necessary to keep the lights on" project versus an "elective" project, one not necessary to keep the lights on. I continued to state that "elective" projects should not receive the special privileges and powers given by the SEC to "essential" projects... such as the right to disobey town zoning laws, town master plans and other regulations the townspeople must obey. I mentioned ISO NE ONLY because they are currently the entity that makes the decision whether a project is essential or elective.

The commission totally missed the entire point of my submission. They first were focused on ISO NE, to which I only referred in the case they didn't know who would make that distinction. Then they seemed concerned with the terminology (necessary for systems reliability, versus "essential" etc.) and lastly, they never acknowledged my reference to the powers given by the SEC to projects to over rule towns plans, rules and regulations.

With an ever increasing number of energy projects, there needs to be some protections for our towns.

The commission closed the topic not aware of the reason for or any solutions to my concern. I request this topic be readdressed at your next meeting. It is of vital importance for towns and their residents.

Thank you,

Respectfully,  
Dorothy (Dolly) McPhaul  
Sugar Hill