

7/12/2017

No Eversource Jet Plowing Across Little Bay

About this petition

Eversource's Seacoast Reliability Project proposes jet plowing 8' under Little Bay in the Great Bay Estuary to connect transmission lines between the Madbury NH and the Newington NH substations. This jet plowing method is risky and poses serious adverse ecological impact on Little Bay and the greater nationally protected Great Bay Estuary. GeoInsight and Woods Hole Groups reviewed the Eversource Environmental Impact Study and concluded that because of "gaps in the data as well as limitations of analysis provided so far by the Applicant, it cannot assure the residents of Durham that there are no unreasonable adverse ecological effects or that the impact on natural resources will be manageably limited in the Little Bay, and that unreasonable adverse effects in the worst case will not migrate up north towards the mouth of the Oyster River or south beyond the mouth of the Great Bay." (<http://www.unionleader.com/article/20170303/NEWS05..>) The full response can be found here <https://www.ci.durham.nh.us/sites/default/files/fi...>

Importantly, the UNH Carsey School of Public Policy disputes Eversource's analysis of the need for this project (<https://carsey.unh.edu/publication/perspective/nh-...>)

We, the undersigned, request that this application be denied by the NH Site Evaluation Committee (SEC) because of the potential for serious environmental impact on the Great Bay Estuary watershed from jet plowing and other methods described in the Eversource application.

(<https://www.nhsec.nh.gov/projects/2015-04/2015-04....>)

7/12/2017



This petition has collected
846 signatures
using the online tools at iPetitions.com

Printed on 2017-07-05

Signatures

1. Name: Friends of Great Bay on 2017-04-09 18:05:40
Comments: Nancy Bulkley

2. Name: Katherine Morgan on 2017-04-09 18:31:37
Comments:

3. Name: Vivian Miller on 2017-04-09 19:14:25
Comments:

4. Name: Larry Gans on 2017-04-09 20:04:52
Comments:

5. Name: Laura Higginson on 2017-04-09 20:21:27
Comments: As a longtime resident of Durham, I have yet to be convinced that Eversource has the community's best interest at heart. Our environment is too precious to risk.

6. Name: Matthew Komonchak on 2017-04-09 20:33:21
Comments:

7. Name: Ann lane on 2017-04-09 20:39:02
Comments:

8. Name: Gretchen Browne on 2017-04-09 20:53:51
Comments:

9. Name: Robert Ryan on 2017-04-09 21:01:57
Comments:

10. Name: Jeannie Sowers on 2017-04-09 21:02:30
Comments:

11. Name: Sally Ford on 2017-04-09 21:16:52
Comments: The beautiful Little and Great Bay must be saved from untested, untried jet plowing. Eversource needs to rethink it. There must be a better way and with all the technology available in this 21st century.

12. Name: Beth Olshansky on 2017-04-09 21:17:30
Comments:

13. Name: Greg Miller on 2017-04-09 21:33:50
Comments:

-
14. Name: Erica Tauriello on 2017-04-09 21:43:19
Comments: Please don't allow Eversource or any utility to destroy the bay or our wonderful town.
-
15. Name: Sarah Grandy on 2017-04-09 21:45:25
Comments:
-
16. Name: Marie Katrak on 2017-04-09 21:49:24
Comments: This project has the potential of destroying the ecosystem and at the very least, seriously disrupting it.
-
17. Name: Vilmarie Sanchez-Rothkegel on 2017-04-09 21:59:22
Comments:
-
18. Name: James hollister on 2017-04-09 22:05:05
Comments: Please do not destroy great bay.
-
19. Name: Danuta Richards on 2017-04-09 22:05:53
Comments:
-
20. Name: Joan Friel on 2017-04-09 22:13:32
Comments: I do not want Eversource to jet plow Great Bay or put enhanced power lines thru Durham Ever!!!
-
21. Name: Angela Smith on 2017-04-09 22:13:36
Comments:
-
22. Name: Dudley Dudley on 2017-04-09 22:16:10
Comments:
-
23. Name: Vivian Miller on 2017-04-09 22:18:43
Comments:
-
24. Name: David Giroux on 2017-04-09 22:23:49
Comments:
-
25. Name: Matt Courtland on 2017-04-09 22:35:19
Comments:
-
26. Name: Francoise Meissner on 2017-04-09 22:43:18
Comments: Jet-plowing has not been proven to be safe and could cause irreparable

damage to the Great Bay estuary!

27. Name: Brenda Ryan on 2017-04-09 23:23:37
Comments:

28. Name: Nancy Sandberg on 2017-04-09 23:25:12
Comments:

29. Name: Jessica Raspa on 2017-04-09 23:30:50
Comments:

30. Name: Maryann Charos on 2017-04-09 23:31:26
Comments:

31. Name: David Hudson on 2017-04-09 23:34:28
Comments:

32. Name: Michael Firczuk on 2017-04-09 23:36:22
Comments: Do what is right: there are other and better solutions.

33. Name: Holly Harris on 2017-04-09 23:40:30
Comments:

34. Name: Marguerite Corvini on 2017-04-09 23:41:42
Comments:

35. Name: George Raspa on 2017-04-09 23:45:56
Comments:

36. Name: Michael Hoffman on 2017-04-09 23:56:38
Comments:

37. Name: Mary DeTurk on 2017-04-09 23:57:36
Comments:

38. Name: Wendy Harris on 2017-04-10 00:06:18
Comments:

39. Name: Nancy Bulkley on 2017-04-10 00:12:45
Comments:

40. Name: Laura Brown on 2017-04-10 00:17:16

Comments: I own an oyster farm in Great Bay and I am extremely concerned about the effects of the jet plowing on my live oyster bed. I have invested countless hours of hard work and finances into making this organic, earth friendly farm a healthy business. Recent reports don't make me feel like the jet plowing will be safe for the fragile ecosystem. There are other routes to take and I believe Eversource should find the most unobtrusive and safe route possible. Please support the bay and the community who cares about a beautiful, rare bay by saying no to Eversource.
Thank you.

41. Name: Ali Donahue on 2017-04-10 00:21:20
Comments:

42. Name: Allison on 2017-04-10 00:27:04
Comments:

43. Name: Dawn Zitney on 2017-04-10 00:29:02
Comments:

44. Name: Diana Carpinone on 2017-04-10 00:33:18
Comments:

45. Name: Jessica Ross on 2017-04-10 00:37:08
Comments:

46. Name: John Tauriello on 2017-04-10 00:43:24
Comments:

47. Name: Kathy Mears-Limric on 2017-04-10 00:43:50
Comments:

48. Name: Robert Grondahl on 2017-04-10 00:44:33
Comments:

49. Name: Amy Ferris on 2017-04-10 00:45:02
Comments:

50. Name: Michael Morneault on 2017-04-10 00:45:13
Comments:

51. Name: Virginia Cole on 2017-04-10 00:54:41
Comments: We must save this important part of our ecosystem of Great Bay and all the surrounding areas.

52. Name: Kasey Morneault on 2017-04-10 01:03:24
Comments:
-
53. Name: Karyn Cahill on 2017-04-10 01:03:51
Comments:
-
54. Name: Diana Carroll on 2017-04-10 01:07:46
Comments: Millions and millions of dollars have been spent to improve the health of Great Bay and there has been some progress but jet plowing may reverse the work that has been done. Who will pay for that?
-
55. Name: Linda Lewandowski Young on 2017-04-10 01:08:29
Comments:
-
56. Name: Const Harris on 2017-04-10 01:10:34
Comments: Questions need to be answered before any such excavation begins
-
57. Name: William Downey on 2017-04-10 01:12:22
Comments:
-
58. Name: Peter Sawtell on 2017-04-10 01:13:05
Comments:
-
59. Name: Eric Stern on 2017-04-10 01:19:22
Comments:
-
60. Name: Beverly Conway on 2017-04-10 01:19:24
Comments: Great Bay is too important to mess up!
-
61. Name: Richard Renner on 2017-04-10 01:19:57
Comments: Find another way please
-
62. Name: Nicole Smith on 2017-04-10 01:30:11
Comments:
-
63. Name: Lynn Holmes on 2017-04-10 01:36:37
Comments: Please deny this application because of the definite possibility for damage to the Great Bay Estuary.
-
64. Name: K Lord on 2017-04-10 01:38:10
Comments:
-

65. Name: Jochen Meissner on 2017-04-10 01:47:11
Comments:
-
66. Name: Tim Walls on 2017-04-10 01:56:30
Comments:
-
67. Name: Jonathan babon on 2017-04-10 01:59:56
Comments:
-
68. Name: Regis Miller on 2017-04-10 02:08:01
Comments: I am totally against jet plowing in the beautiful Little Bay. It will never survive this invasive endeavor.
-
69. Name: Tom Jackson on 2017-04-10 02:09:39
Comments: This is an unnecessary project that will only benefit Eversource, and will do significant damage to the estuary.
-
70. Name: Miranda Mail on 2017-04-10 02:14:59
Comments:
-
71. Name: Tyler Wentworth on 2017-04-10 02:15:06
Comments:
-
72. Name: Cheryl Hoffman on 2017-04-10 02:15:36
Comments: The bay is a delicate ecosystem. Stirring up the sediments will be detrimental to much of what we work so hard to preserve. I do not support the Eversource project.
-
73. Name: Giana Gelsey on 2017-04-10 02:15:57
Comments:
-
74. Name: Tomo Sakai on 2017-04-10 02:23:17
Comments:
-
75. Name: Colleen Morneault on 2017-04-10 02:37:08
Comments:
-
76. Name: Fred Meissner on 2017-04-10 02:55:19
Comments:
-
77. Name: Donna Guerrette on 2017-04-10 04:49:08
Comments:
-

78. Name: Marjorie Petruccelli on 2017-04-10 05:09:17
Comments:
-
79. Name: Alan Bennett on 2017-04-10 10:20:37
Comments:
-
80. Name: Kathleen Kerrigan on 2017-04-10 10:25:03
Comments:
-
81. Name: Abby Hood on 2017-04-10 10:30:33
Comments:
-
82. Name: Anne Zwart on 2017-04-10 10:38:45
Comments:
-
83. Name: Kendall Bird on 2017-04-10 10:52:22
Comments:
-
84. Name: Jessica Morgan on 2017-04-10 10:56:38
Comments:
-
85. Name: Alexandra Jacuch on 2017-04-10 11:07:07
Comments:
-
86. Name: Christy pasquale on 2017-04-10 11:10:18
Comments:
-
87. Name: JOhn stone on 2017-04-10 11:13:35
Comments:
-
88. Name: Nancy Webb on 2017-04-10 11:21:28
Comments:
-
89. Name: Rachel Wakefield on 2017-04-10 11:31:19
Comments:
-
90. Name: Mary Lee Worboys on 2017-04-10 11:44:24
Comments:
-
91. Name: Merrilyn San Soucie on 2017-04-10 11:48:43
Comments: We're upgrading treatment plants at considerable cost to protect the Bay, and they re allowed to do this?!

-
92. Name: Stephan Cleaves on 2017-04-10 11:53:28
Comments: The idea of plowing under a bay just to run some cables is ludicrous.
-
93. Name: Misa Pignataro on 2017-04-10 12:04:32
Comments:
-
94. Name: Bethanie mccann on 2017-04-10 12:33:10
Comments:
-
95. Name: christie nevius on 2017-04-10 12:38:11
Comments: No jet plowing!!
-
96. Name: Catherine Pauly on 2017-04-10 12:51:42
Comments:
-
97. Name: Kathryn Firczuk on 2017-04-10 12:55:58
Comments:
-
98. Name: DANIEL FORD on 2017-04-10 13:24:59
Comments:
-
99. Name: Carrie Gula on 2017-04-10 13:34:06
Comments:
-
100. Name: Lauren belliveau on 2017-04-10 13:38:49
Comments:
-
101. Name: Genevieve Church on 2017-04-10 13:39:03
Comments:
-
102. Name: Julia Dundorf on 2017-04-10 14:09:17
Comments:
-
103. Name: Becca Cole on 2017-04-10 14:30:23
Comments:
-
104. Name: Harry Tobias on 2017-04-10 14:31:04
Comments: There is no proof that this line is needed for power reliability. There is also too many items that have not been considered when jet plowing through the years of buildup of chemicals that now lie dormant under ground.
-

105. Name: Connor link on 2017-04-10 14:39:30
Comments:

106. Name: Connor link on 2017-04-10 14:39:42
Comments:

107. Name: Dot Noseworthy on 2017-04-10 15:12:21
Comments:

108. Name: William HM Beckett on 2017-04-10 15:12:31
Comments:

109. Name: Nick Smith on 2017-04-10 15:14:21
Comments: The bay is one of the most valuable cultural, ecological, and economic resources for our region. Don't jeopardize the long term health of the bay for short term Eversource profits that provide no benefit to our community.

110. Name: Adrian link on 2017-04-10 16:37:06
Comments:

111. Name: Amy Antonucci on 2017-04-10 17:03:45
Comments:

112. Name: Charles Forcey on 2017-04-10 17:04:00
Comments:

113. Name: Jaye ejarque on 2017-04-10 17:32:29
Comments:

114. Name: Marissa Winans on 2017-04-10 17:40:14
Comments: Please use your hearts and not your profits to guide you.

115. Name: Amanda Lathrop on 2017-04-10 17:47:50
Comments:

116. Name: Tom Haas on 2017-04-10 18:01:05
Comments:

117. Name: Kelly Salkoskas on 2017-04-10 18:01:16
Comments:

118. Name: Maggie Morrison on 2017-04-10 18:06:31

Comments: The health of Great Bay's ecosystem needs to be protected. Eversource, please consider the long term consequences of this decision. It will do irreplaceable harm to the Bay's fragile ecosystem.

119. Name: Helen Frink on 2017-04-10 18:19:53
Comments:

120. Name: Griffin on 2017-04-10 18:56:26
Comments: Please stop this!

121. Name: Susan Bennett on 2017-04-10 19:03:59
Comments:

122. Name: Sylvia Foster on 2017-04-10 19:32:43
Comments: The lives in the Bay are imperiled, everything from the eel grass to the oysters. Please consider this truth before you make the mistake of destroying an ecosystem.

123. Name: Felicia Ayer on 2017-04-10 23:54:37
Comments:

124. Name: Henry Bulkley on 2017-04-10 23:56:55
Comments:

125. Name: Jake Kaplan on 2017-04-11 00:13:43
Comments:

126. Name: Rita Calamari on 2017-04-11 00:14:24
Comments:

127. Name: Allison Friend-Gray on 2017-04-11 00:43:02
Comments:

128. Name: Lydia Hoffman on 2017-04-11 00:50:48
Comments:

129. Name: Andrea Staples on 2017-04-11 00:57:51
Comments:

130. Name: Ben Bulkley on 2017-04-11 01:49:26
Comments: A proper economic valuation of the damage to the green-scape and this jet plowing might have dictated a a different, less damaging proposal than jet plowing. The DES should have a heavy hand in guiding this... Eversource can't be impartial, they are

obligated to find the highest ROI.

-
131. Name: Robert Beyer on 2017-04-11 02:22:50
Comments:
-
132. Name: Bonnie on 2017-04-11 02:46:36
Comments:
-
133. Name: Rachel Gasowski on 2017-04-11 02:49:51
Comments:
-
134. Name: Nate Grove on 2017-04-11 10:09:46
Comments:
-
135. Name: Yvonne Grove on 2017-04-11 10:11:08
Comments:
-
136. Name: Jennifer Matthes on 2017-04-11 10:44:52
Comments:
-
137. Name: kathy Brunet on 2017-04-11 10:55:20
Comments:
-
138. Name: Nancy Harris on 2017-04-11 10:55:44
Comments:
-
139. Name: Mary Margaret Jaques on 2017-04-11 10:57:25
Comments:
-
140. Name: Tracey E Golini on 2017-04-11 11:00:09
Comments:
-
141. Name: Katie Hood on 2017-04-11 11:18:49
Comments:
-
142. Name: Ted Naughton on 2017-04-11 11:23:40
Comments:
-
143. Name: Robin Mower on 2017-04-11 11:23:55
Comments:
-
144. Name: Susan MacLennan on 2017-04-11 11:24:17

Comments:

145. Name: Rebecca Kell on 2017-04-11 11:42:20
Comments:

146. Name: Suzanne MacDonald on 2017-04-11 11:55:59
Comments:

147. Name: Richard Hallett on 2017-04-11 11:56:14
Comments:

148. Name: Leo Gagnon on 2017-04-11 11:58:04
Comments:

149. Name: Jill Vranicar on 2017-04-11 12:09:11
Comments: No to jet plowing under great bay....the estuary is an important key to health of the ecosystem and is already in peril from invasive species..... there has to be a better way

150. Name: Lisa on 2017-04-11 12:51:25
Comments:

151. Name: David Weber on 2017-04-11 13:04:59
Comments:

152. Name: elizabeth bulkley on 2017-04-11 13:36:06
Comments:

153. Name: Samantha Jeannotte on 2017-04-11 13:39:04
Comments:

154. Name: lauren roper on 2017-04-11 13:41:21
Comments: ██████████

155. Name: Sarah Arnett on 2017-04-11 13:45:31
Comments:

156. Name: Meaghan Campbell on 2017-04-11 13:49:46
Comments:

157. Name: Carolyn Anderson on 2017-04-11 13:55:45
Comments:

-
158. Name: Marion Mengert on 2017-04-11 14:00:12
Comments:
-
159. Name: Emma Page on 2017-04-11 14:02:39
Comments:
-
160. Name: Ben Chamberlain on 2017-04-11 14:08:16
Comments:
-
161. Name: Russell on 2017-04-11 14:29:37
Comments:
-
162. Name: Cyrene Nicholas on 2017-04-11 14:36:11
Comments:
-
163. Name: Mary Ehrenworth on 2017-04-11 14:44:08
Comments:
-
164. Name: arianna stroheker on 2017-04-11 15:08:48
Comments:
-
165. Name: Inna Kagan on 2017-04-11 15:18:31
Comments:
-
166. Name: Bruce Leichtman on 2017-04-11 15:18:33
Comments:
-
167. Name: Peter Taubman on 2017-04-11 15:24:06
Comments:
-
168. Name: Donna Kirk on 2017-04-11 15:45:23
Comments:
-
169. Name: David White on 2017-04-11 16:13:49
Comments:
-
170. Name: Valerie Thompson on 2017-04-11 16:19:08
Comments:
-
171. Name: Pieter Zwart on 2017-04-11 16:20:42
Comments:

172. Name: Joan Graf on 2017-04-11 16:52:28
Comments:

173. Name: Megan Turnbull on 2017-04-11 17:04:33
Comments:

174. Name: Lauren DeLong on 2017-04-11 17:15:02
Comments: Jet plowing is not worth the risk to our environment. I encourage us to find alternative and safer ways to connect transmission lines.

175. Name: Brian Turnbull on 2017-04-11 17:23:31
Comments:

176. Name: Betsy Cressy on 2017-04-11 18:23:18
Comments:

177. Name: Hannelore Moebius on 2017-04-11 18:26:43
Comments:

178. Name: Kir Harris on 2017-04-11 18:39:06
Comments:

179. Name: Patricia Yosha on 2017-04-11 18:42:15
Comments: Glad to see attention to this local issue. Keep up the action!

180. Name: Kathryn Ellis on 2017-04-11 19:31:23
Comments: We need to protect Great Bay and Little Bay, especially in a time when the need for this additional energy is in question. There is not enough evidence that this process is safe. Eversource needs to PROVE before they begin that this will not harm the ecosystems.

181. Name: Mary Woodward on 2017-04-11 21:05:34
Comments:

182. Name: Heidi Ely on 2017-04-11 21:55:25
Comments:

183. Name: Stefanie Daly on 2017-04-11 22:04:02
Comments:

184. Name: Virginia Berrien on 2017-04-11 22:07:03

Comments:

-
185. Name: Ruth Kane on 2017-04-11 22:08:56
Comments: There is not enough information and/or study behind this horrific plan. The bay is in constant assault and is in trouble and once it is gone it will be gone forever!
-
186. Name: Jeanne Wishengrad on 2017-04-11 22:34:12
Comments: I oppose this unnecessary, and potentially quite environmentally harmful project. It will benefit few, and there are better alternatives. We know better than this.
-
187. Name: Nancy Smith Miner on 2017-04-11 22:49:17
Comments:
-
188. Name: Skip Berrien on 2017-04-11 23:24:23
Comments:
-
189. Name: Kirk Brote on 2017-04-12 00:27:21
Comments:
-
190. Name: Leroy Jones on 2017-04-12 00:49:06
Comments:
-
191. Name: Carol Tuveson on 2017-04-12 00:58:58
Comments: Does Eversource have any examples of places the jet plow has been used that are similar to Little Bay? I find the lack of verifiable information from Eversource to be very problematic.
-
192. Name: Robin Cooley on 2017-04-12 01:03:15
Comments: I oppose this environmentally harmful project. I don't believe there is enough evidence to proceed with this project.
-
193. Name: Mimi Hallowell on 2017-04-12 01:27:25
Comments:
-
194. Name: Suzanne Loder on 2017-04-12 01:35:50
Comments: Please achieve your end by protecting the Bay from unreasonable adverse effects. Where is your verifiable information? No forward movement until it is provided and shown to be without negative impact.
-
195. Name: Jonathan Bromley on 2017-04-12 01:44:10
Comments:
-
196. Name: Jenny deluca on 2017-04-12 01:58:24

Comments:

197. Name: Enrica Jossi on 2017-04-12 02:05:38
Comments:

198. Name: Herb Moyer on 2017-04-12 02:40:41
Comments: The science does NOT support your proposed project; abandon it !

199. Name: Benjamin Paige on 2017-04-12 11:14:16
Comments:

200. Name: Thomas Moher on 2017-04-12 11:23:54
Comments:

201. Name: Nancy Webb on 2017-04-12 11:34:43
Comments: Go away! Find another route. Stay away from Little and Great Bay. We will stand strong and not let you touch our Bays.

202. Name: Paul Gasowski on 2017-04-12 11:40:52
Comments:

203. Name: Dale Hепен on 2017-04-12 11:50:16
Comments:

204. Name: Kristin Houle on 2017-04-12 12:09:19
Comments: Great Bay is a treasured sensitive estuary with enough environmental threats. Please don't allow Eversource to stir up sediment and endanger water quality even more.

205. Name: Jesse Stabile Morrell on 2017-04-12 12:20:16
Comments:

206. Name: Linda Rief on 2017-04-12 12:34:31
Comments:

207. Name: Julie Reece on 2017-04-12 12:51:12
Comments:

208. Name: Sara Badger-Wilson on 2017-04-12 12:53:39
Comments:

209. Name: Linda Rhodes on 2017-04-12 12:55:19

Comments:

-
210. Name: Mary Bencks on 2017-04-12 12:58:22
Comments: Talking to a UNH student doing research at Jackson Lab last week woke me up on this issue. Just a few of the many areas of research in this estuary: Monitoring macro algae, Integrated Multi-Trophic Aquaculture, restoration of eelgrass and shellfish habitats... Plowing through this area is not the solution for moving energy. Eversource needs to find another way.
-
211. Name: Dana Judge on 2017-04-12 14:36:17
Comments:
-
212. Name: Matthew McKenna on 2017-04-12 14:52:53
Comments:
-
213. Name: Marian menelly on 2017-04-12 14:59:58
Comments:
-
214. Name: Shelley Mitchell on 2017-04-12 15:00:36
Comments:
-
215. Name: Nancy Winterbottom on 2017-04-12 15:35:36
Comments: PLEASE DESIST from such foolish ideas! We must find other ways to solve our challenges, but not underwater plowing in the estuaries!
-
216. Name: Chris Marion on 2017-04-12 15:57:37
Comments:
-
217. Name: Rich Kane on 2017-04-12 16:04:47
Comments: TOO RISKY FOR GREAT BAY
-
218. Name: Miranda Wilder on 2017-04-12 16:14:34
Comments: I am sick of the greed that is controlling the fate of our world. Eversource is a bunch of Trump-supporting fascists that deserves to go out of business. Get a green job or a job in sustainability, don't work for an evil corporation. I will not stand for the destruction of my world or its beautiful oceans.
-
219. Name: Amy on 2017-04-12 16:18:06
Comments:
-
220. Name: Ben Kremer on 2017-04-12 16:19:35
Comments:

-
221. Name: George Hilton on 2017-04-12 16:26:58
Comments:
-
222. Name: Hannah Medovnikov on 2017-04-12 16:56:29
Comments:
-
223. Name: Doreen Desmarais on 2017-04-12 17:21:47
Comments: This is just wrong. Period.
-
224. Name: Corry Hughes on 2017-04-12 17:36:26
Comments:
-
225. Name: Amy Martinese on 2017-04-12 17:36:47
Comments:
-
226. Name: Peter Gair on 2017-04-12 17:39:13
Comments:
-
227. Name: Madison Forsberg on 2017-04-12 17:42:27
Comments:
-
228. Name: Fran Houlihan on 2017-04-12 18:12:15
Comments: Rrequest that this application be denied by the NH Site Evaluation Committee (SEC) because of the potential for serious environmental impact on the Great Bay Estuary watershed from jet plowing and other methods described in the Eversource application.
-
229. Name: Annamarie Gasowski on 2017-04-12 18:49:35
Comments:
-
230. Name: Peter Tamposi on 2017-04-12 19:00:36
Comments:
-
231. Name: Ann Florio on 2017-04-12 19:30:31
Comments:
-
232. Name: zoe loter on 2017-04-12 19:43:52
Comments:
-
233. Name: Hannah Hughes on 2017-04-12 20:15:39
Comments:

-
234. Name: Catherine Goldwater on 2017-04-12 20:25:31
Comments:
-
235. Name: William hastings on 2017-04-12 20:31:38
Comments:
-
236. Name: Hayley Poff on 2017-04-12 21:03:00
Comments:
-
237. Name: Jennifer Messeder on 2017-04-12 21:13:38
Comments: While I want to support renewable infrastructure, I can't support infrastructure that damages the environment for a low return. Instead, let's look at creating local renewables that don't require long transmission lines and/or huge towers.
-
238. Name: Susan menelly on 2017-04-12 21:30:28
Comments: Allowing this disturbance to the bay is unthinkable and must be stopped .
-
239. Name: Sourdif on 2017-04-12 21:57:29
Comments:
-
240. Name: Neal Ferris on 2017-04-12 22:33:53
Comments: Enough problems already with the bay; this would make things worse.
-
241. Name: Jared tuveson on 2017-04-12 23:53:17
Comments:
-
242. Name: Stephanie A Scherr on 2017-04-13 01:06:52
Comments: Protect the Great Bay Estuary. NH is being attacked by irresponsible energy companies from Eversource to HydroQuebec's Northern Pass and Governor Sununu's pipeline pals. It's time to stand against unwanted, unneeded projects that are damaging to our natural resources. Support #NHOffshorewind. Find us on Facebook and Twitter to learn more.
-
243. Name: Bernadette Komonchak on 2017-04-13 01:09:00
Comments:
-
244. Name: Maria Garcia Bulkley on 2017-04-13 01:16:23
Comments: I enjoy vacationing in this area because of the beautiful Great Bay, and am concerned that the SRP will have a negative impact on the ecosystem / water quality.
-
245. Name: Lelia Lamson on 2017-04-13 01:47:39
Comments:

-
246. Name: CHRISTINE MCCALL on 2017-04-13 01:51:26
Comments: When are you going to wake up and realize if you kill Mother Earth we are all dead too. Get a grip and care
-
247. Name: Katherine Stroup on 2017-04-13 02:18:56
Comments: Northern Pass is a private company interested only in their own profit margin. There is no plus for the people of NH.
-
248. Name: Heather concannon on 2017-04-13 02:23:00
Comments:
-
249. Name: Janet Taylor on 2017-04-13 02:47:27
Comments: NO!
-
250. Name: Amy Simon on 2017-04-13 02:53:50
Comments:
-
251. Name: Lierin Sawyer on 2017-04-13 11:46:41
Comments:
-
252. Name: Kristin Forselius on 2017-04-13 11:56:21
Comments:
-
253. Name: Liz sawyer on 2017-04-13 11:58:50
Comments:
-
254. Name: April Walker on 2017-04-13 12:00:18
Comments:
-
255. Name: Renay Allen on 2017-04-13 12:02:16
Comments:
-
256. Name: geri jachim on 2017-04-13 12:06:58
Comments:
-
257. Name: Renee Nicholls on 2017-04-13 12:13:03
Comments:
-
258. Name: Patricia McCracken on 2017-04-13 12:48:45
Comments: With tides and winds why not renewable energies - leave endangered areas alone!

-
259. Name: Lara Demarest on 2017-04-13 13:18:00
Comments:
-
260. Name: Taylore on 2017-04-13 13:26:10
Comments:
-
261. Name: Jen Croot on 2017-04-13 13:44:25
Comments:
-
262. Name: George Thomas on 2017-04-13 13:48:34
Comments:
-
263. Name: Stefanie Griffin on 2017-04-13 15:13:26
Comments:
-
264. Name: Emily Grandell on 2017-04-13 15:52:58
Comments:
-
265. Name: Austin Helm on 2017-04-13 15:54:45
Comments: Lame
-
266. Name: Kitty Savage on 2017-04-13 15:56:38
Comments:
-
267. Name: Jennifer Pavlik on 2017-04-13 17:04:53
Comments:
-
268. Name: Brendan Connell on 2017-04-13 17:49:04
Comments:
-
269. Name: Maya Bogh on 2017-04-13 18:15:58
Comments: No jet plowing on Little Bay - do not jeopardize our already fragile natural environment further.
-
270. Name: Heidi Beaudette on 2017-04-13 18:17:59
Comments:
-
271. Name: Nancy Clarke on 2017-04-13 18:23:26
Comments:
-
272. Name: cindy jones on 2017-04-13 18:35:29

Comments: The construction and devastation to our natural resources will soon be at our doorstep, then it will be too late for petitions and to turn back!! We need 1,000's of signatures!!

273. Name: Eliza Stewart-MacDougall on 2017-04-13 18:37:42
Comments: NO, NO, NO, Eversource!!!!!!

274. Name: Sandy on 2017-04-13 18:38:14
Comments:

275. Name: Peggy Barry on 2017-04-13 18:55:53
Comments:

276. Name: Laura Chapin on 2017-04-13 19:48:24
Comments:

277. Name: David Vroom on 2017-04-13 20:07:46
Comments:

278. Name: Julie J McCabe on 2017-04-13 20:45:14
Comments: NO!

279. Name: Kim Stroup on 2017-04-13 20:50:24
Comments:

280. Name: Robert Glowacky on 2017-04-13 20:51:31
Comments:

281. Name: Linda Sternock on 2017-04-13 21:08:55
Comments:

282. Name: Erin Sandler on 2017-04-13 21:53:07
Comments:

283. Name: Elisabeth Kennedy on 2017-04-13 23:15:37
Comments:

284. Name: Julia Rodriguez on 2017-04-13 23:43:05
Comments:

285. Name: Jo Collier on 2017-04-14 00:56:18
Comments:

-
286. Name: Kari on 2017-04-14 00:58:41
Comments:
-
287. Name: Jean Lewandowski on 2017-04-14 01:21:08
Comments: Look who benefits from this: not the people or the environment; only Eversource. So no.
-
288. Name: Deb on 2017-04-14 02:36:34
Comments: NO!
-
289. Name: Tracey Benkosky on 2017-04-14 02:43:07
Comments:
-
290. Name: Wendy Green on 2017-04-14 04:06:21
Comments:
-
291. Name: m holly trott on 2017-04-14 09:10:55
Comments:
-
292. Name: Ellen O'Brien on 2017-04-14 10:16:47
Comments:
-
293. Name: Karen Tinkham on 2017-04-14 10:35:26
Comments:
-
294. Name: Dina Dudarevitch on 2017-04-14 10:56:04
Comments:
-
295. Name: Sandy Devins on 2017-04-14 13:35:30
Comments: No to Jet Plowing. There are alternative ways and less invasive approaches.
-
296. Name: Kyle Pauly on 2017-04-14 14:23:05
Comments:
-
297. Name: Elaina Hatsis on 2017-04-14 14:54:57
Comments:
-
298. Name: Karen Niland on 2017-04-14 16:44:42
Comments:
-
299. Name: Tania Marino on 2017-04-14 16:59:55

Comments:

300. Name: Shannon Brenner on 2017-04-14 17:06:05
Comments:

301. Name: Michael Fleming on 2017-04-14 18:50:10
Comments:

302. Name: Genevieve Ellison on 2017-04-14 20:35:58
Comments:

303. Name: Krista Clark on 2017-04-14 21:00:49
Comments:

304. Name: Frank Windsor on 2017-04-14 21:08:57
Comments: I live on the Oyster River, boat and fish in the Great Bay Estuary. I oppose any activity that will potentially harm the Estuary.

305. Name: Amy Tank on 2017-04-14 21:38:34
Comments: We need to protect the environment!!!

306. Name: Cynthia Cooley on 2017-04-14 21:41:22
Comments:

307. Name: Nick Tulloh on 2017-04-14 21:51:31
Comments:

308. Name: Donald Brautigam on 2017-04-15 00:21:37
Comments:

309. Name: Gordon Williams on 2017-04-15 01:11:58
Comments: No

310. Name: Helen Hanan on 2017-04-15 01:39:59
Comments:

311. Name: Anne Eiseman on 2017-04-15 12:18:06
Comments:

312. Name: Stacey stein taylor on 2017-04-15 12:56:00
Comments:

313. Name: Carol Ehlen on 2017-04-15 14:19:39
Comments: Do not jet plow across Little Bay. There is not sufficient information or studies done that prove that there will be no environmental risk to the ecology of Little Bay.
-
314. Name: Christine Deptula on 2017-04-15 16:32:09
Comments:
-
315. Name: marjorie wolfson on 2017-04-15 22:37:21
Comments:
-
316. Name: Michelle Goffic on 2017-04-16 02:49:50
Comments:
-
317. Name: Jennifer Sanders on 2017-04-16 19:59:22
Comments: Little Bay is a precious resource. No digging!!!
-
318. Name: Kirsten Bornkessel on 2017-04-16 20:55:35
Comments:
-
319. Name: Grace Castonguay on 2017-04-16 20:57:18
Comments:
-
320. Name: Shannon Foulds on 2017-04-16 20:57:29
Comments:
-
321. Name: Jackson Deely on 2017-04-16 20:58:52
Comments:
-
322. Name: Marian bulkley on 2017-04-16 20:59:39
Comments:
-
323. Name: phoebe niland on 2017-04-16 21:00:28
Comments:
-
324. Name: Chandler Norling on 2017-04-16 21:01:25
Comments:
-
325. Name: Jessica each on 2017-04-16 22:42:16
Comments:
-
326. Name: Brunda Katikireddy on 2017-04-16 23:16:14

Comments:

327. Name: Nancy Schieb on 2017-04-16 23:34:24
Comments:

328. Name: Michelle Grenier on 2017-04-17 00:29:19
Comments:

329. Name: Carol Birch on 2017-04-17 00:35:43
Comments:

330. Name: John Carroll on 2017-04-17 00:37:41
Comments:

331. Name: Matt Fitch on 2017-04-17 00:53:08
Comments:

332. Name: David Buck on 2017-04-17 01:33:11
Comments:

333. Name: Joe Morrell on 2017-04-17 01:36:23
Comments:

334. Name: Michael Lambert on 2017-04-17 02:13:02
Comments:

335. Name: Diane McCann on 2017-04-17 02:23:58
Comments: The Eversource company has been trying to convince NH residents that this project will benefit NH residents . They have not made their case and they are risking our natural resource.Please deny this company's efforts here on the Seacoast .Thank you Diane McCann

336. Name: Brian Locke on 2017-04-17 10:10:12
Comments: I'm very concerned about the impact of the Eversource Seacoast Reliability project on an estuary that is already stressed by an increasingly urban environment. This is a short sighted project and should be denied by the NH Site Evaluation Committee.

337. Name: Daniel M Keefe on 2017-04-17 10:50:36
Comments: Seems like there must be a better alternative that wouldn't involve ruining the bay, and the skyline. I'll vote no. Eversource isn't a local company anymore. Just an out of state holding co. Looking to make money.

Pretty sure they were behind the mural in the post office as well.

-
338. Name: Beth macpherson on 2017-04-17 11:50:11
Comments:
-
339. Name: Michele L Tremblay on 2017-04-17 12:22:43
Comments:
-
340. Name: David Ellis on 2017-04-17 16:55:21
Comments:
-
341. Name: Mark Keller on 2017-04-17 17:11:53
Comments: This project has no benefit to the local community and destroys Little Bay in the name of corporate profits - urge the NH Site Evaluation Committee to deny the Eversource application.
-
342. Name: NellAnn Hiatt on 2017-04-17 18:18:23
Comments:
-
343. Name: Erin Hardie Hale on 2017-04-18 01:08:09
Comments:
-
344. Name: Heather on 2017-04-18 01:18:07
Comments:
-
345. Name: Kristin Claire on 2017-04-18 01:53:26
Comments:
-
346. Name: Gale Carey on 2017-04-18 02:50:21
Comments:
-
347. Name: Kimberly Hislop on 2017-04-18 07:57:53
Comments:
-
348. Name: elizabeth dudley on 2017-04-18 11:07:12
Comments:
-
349. Name: Bessie palmisciano on 2017-04-18 11:52:56
Comments: Great bay is an environmental treasure and an economic boon to our region.
NO TO THIS PLAN.
-
350. Name: Pamela Wright on 2017-04-18 12:40:22
Comments:

-
351. Name: Gary Weisman on 2017-04-18 12:45:55
Comments:
-
352. Name: Ian Fleischer on 2017-04-18 12:52:08
Comments:
-
353. Name: Kathy Collins on 2017-04-18 13:08:16
Comments:
-
354. Name: Yael DeCapo on 2017-04-18 13:21:36
Comments:
-
355. Name: Cleo Huggins on 2017-04-18 13:32:18
Comments: Let's at least fill in the "gaps in the data" before jet plowing.
-
356. Name: David Hackenburg on 2017-04-18 13:35:07
Comments:
-
357. Name: CHRISTINE PASQUALE on 2017-04-18 13:55:51
Comments: NO to this plan
-
358. Name: Hugh Tyler on 2017-04-18 13:57:45
Comments:
-
359. Name: Jillian Hall on 2017-04-18 14:19:02
Comments:
-
360. Name: Joshua Carloni on 2017-04-18 14:21:00
Comments:
-
361. Name: Todd Rollins on 2017-04-18 14:23:08
Comments:
-
362. Name: Carolyn Cote on 2017-04-18 14:24:58
Comments: Ever source, you need to STOP trying to RUIN NH! With your attempts at this AND Northern Pass, you've really angered your customers! I hate this monopoly and truly wish I could choose ANY company EXCEPT you!! STOP!!!!
-
363. Name: Biagio Caretti on 2017-04-18 14:26:45
Comments: Please assess alternative methods. Please have Eversource prepare impact purse that will legally guarantee/bind monies for remediation as determined by other

parties.

364. Name: John Luzadre on 2017-04-18 14:32:18
Comments:

365. Name: Katrine MacGregor on 2017-04-18 14:42:03
Comments:

366. Name: Wayne Devey on 2017-04-18 14:46:28
Comments:

367. Name: John MacGregor on 2017-04-18 14:47:22
Comments:

368. Name: Benjamin Doyle on 2017-04-18 14:48:53
Comments:

369. Name: K Wm Fruson on 2017-04-18 14:51:48
Comments: It would be a sad day to lose a fine high quality environmentally conscious oyster farm in Great Bay like Laura Brown's Fox Point Oysters.

370. Name: Celeste Gingras on 2017-04-18 14:52:33
Comments: This would harm all the active aquaculture currently alive in Great Bay!

371. Name: Christa Liakos on 2017-04-18 14:55:19
Comments: I am writing in support of this petition, and to express my sadness and distress that Eversource is trying to go through with this plan that will have negative effects on the Great Bay's ecosystem for years to come. The negatives far outweigh the positives in this situation. We should be proud stewards of our land and protect it from corporate enterprises that have no regard for the safety of our planet and natural resources. We need to do what's right and protect this area for future generations.

372. Name: Ruth Devey on 2017-04-18 15:00:38
Comments:

373. Name: Molly Bolster on 2017-04-18 15:11:05
Comments:

374. Name: kim parrett on 2017-04-18 15:15:21
Comments:

375. Name: Alex Auty on 2017-04-18 15:15:24
Comments:

376. Name: Donald Golini on 2017-04-18 15:28:29
Comments:

377. Name: Tony Kryzak on 2017-04-18 15:32:25
Comments:

378. Name: Caitlin Wollack on 2017-04-18 15:36:46
Comments:

379. Name: Brian Mahan on 2017-04-18 15:42:41
Comments:

380. Name: Danielle Auger on 2017-04-18 15:46:04
Comments:

381. Name: Matt Louis on 2017-04-18 15:48:08
Comments:

382. Name: Cari on 2017-04-18 15:49:19
Comments: Please assess alternative methods. There are significant risks to our waterways with this project.

383. Name: Alexandra Lyons on 2017-04-18 16:12:19
Comments:

384. Name: Jeff Donald on 2017-04-18 16:19:32
Comments:

385. Name: Rachel Swanson on 2017-04-18 16:22:27
Comments:

386. Name: Amy Broman on 2017-04-18 16:37:31
Comments: Three key points I would like to see clarified:

1, Data indicating that this project is necessary (I.e. Numbers indicating the current transmission lines are overloaded).

2, A more comprehensive analysis of environmental impact. A project of this size and potential impact requires more than "snapshot modeling" in order to provide a concise list of impact, as well as its severity.

3, Other potential solutions to the problem at hand: I.e. Why is this transmission line and dredge the only way? If not, what else has been considered, and ruled out?

-
387. Name: Mark Bouthillier on 2017-04-18 16:44:35
Comments:
-
388. Name: Nancy Deleeuw on 2017-04-18 16:45:42
Comments:
-
389. Name: Abby Sapochetti on 2017-04-18 16:47:35
Comments:
-
390. Name: Daniel Demers on 2017-04-18 16:51:40
Comments:
-
391. Name: Rebecca M Dudley on 2017-04-18 17:07:22
Comments:
-
392. Name: Samantha Lyons on 2017-04-18 17:14:19
Comments:
-
393. Name: Emily on 2017-04-18 17:30:21
Comments:
-
394. Name: Matthew Robertson on 2017-04-18 17:42:37
Comments:
-
395. Name: Emma Collins on 2017-04-18 17:51:54
Comments:
-
396. Name: Jill Swasey on 2017-04-18 18:05:02
Comments: There is no clearly defined need for this project and the risk of adverse ecological impacts is too high. Deny this project.
-
397. Name: Hannah Ferris on 2017-04-18 18:21:44
Comments:
-
398. Name: Kate Knox on 2017-04-18 18:32:16
Comments:
-
399. Name: Clay Bedford on 2017-04-18 18:49:34
Comments: Protect the great bay at all costs
-
400. Name: Shelley Parish on 2017-04-18 18:56:06

Comments:

-
401. Name: Marjorie crean on 2017-04-18 18:56:41
Comments: The Great Bay is important to fisheries and clams, do not allow Evrrsource to disturbed the natural habitat, they are only interested in profit, and are persistent on forcing this project on New Hampshire
-
402. Name: Heather Froumy on 2017-04-18 19:10:13
Comments: Other alternatives should be considered;as the health of the estuary has huge detrimental impacts to the environment.
-
403. Name: Nicholas Golini on 2017-04-18 19:43:37
Comments:
-
404. Name: Gail Mills on 2017-04-18 19:46:09
Comments: We must protect our environment. Please deny this application.
-
405. Name: Susan Curtis on 2017-04-18 21:28:55
Comments:
-
406. Name: Jessica Kliskey on 2017-04-18 21:48:33
Comments:
-
407. Name: Erika singson on 2017-04-18 22:04:44
Comments:
-
408. Name: Jonathan Bunker on 2017-04-18 22:13:13
Comments: Find an alternative route just like they did for the pipeline out in western Massachusetts.
-
409. Name: Lorraine Murphy on 2017-04-18 23:02:21
Comments: Many years and hard work have gone into protecting and improving health of Great Bay Estuary, lets continue that effort.
-
410. Name: Allison on 2017-04-18 23:06:56
Comments:
-
411. Name: Samara robertson on 2017-04-18 23:12:04
Comments:
-
412. Name: Alexis Lang on 2017-04-18 23:43:27
Comments:
-

413. Name: Salme Cook on 2017-04-19 00:11:00
Comments:

414. Name: Jay baker on 2017-04-19 01:10:26
Comments:

415. Name: Devin Cahill on 2017-04-19 01:17:51
Comments:

416. Name: Liam cahill on 2017-04-19 01:21:47
Comments:

417. Name: Beryl Harper on 2017-04-19 01:43:51
Comments:

418. Name: Brenda Lyons on 2017-04-19 01:53:38
Comments: Please do not allow this to go forward.

419. Name: Brenda Lyons on 2017-04-19 01:57:02
Comments:

420. Name: Dean Michaud on 2017-04-19 02:03:06
Comments:

421. Name: Chelsea R Michaud on 2017-04-19 02:08:30
Comments: Protect our Bays

422. Name: Casey Michaud on 2017-04-19 02:10:59
Comments:

423. Name: Cynthia Gunn on 2017-04-19 02:26:46
Comments:

424. Name: Dawn lewis on 2017-04-19 02:49:22
Comments: Eversource. The evil empire.

425. Name: Sean Holt on 2017-04-19 04:07:30
Comments:

426. Name: Tim Walls on 2017-04-19 04:11:28
Comments:

427. Name: Brenna Cahill on 2017-04-19 05:07:30
Comments:

428. Name: Jessika Kearns on 2017-04-19 05:20:45
Comments: Find a more ecological route that doesn't also devastate local oyster farmers.

429. Name: Jacob Kearns on 2017-04-19 05:22:49
Comments:

430. Name: Doug Wiberg on 2017-04-19 10:02:46
Comments:

431. Name: Lisa Gonzales on 2017-04-19 10:20:34
Comments:

432. Name: John Parrett on 2017-04-19 12:31:42
Comments:

433. Name: Mary Lee on 2017-04-19 13:07:32
Comments:

434. Name: Enna Grazier on 2017-04-19 13:08:35
Comments: A healthy Great Bay is essential for our region: it impacts recreation, tourism, commerce and transportation. Protecting the fragile ecosystem of the Great Bay is essential to our community.

435. Name: Eleanor Harrison-Buck on 2017-04-19 13:27:18
Comments:

436. Name: Michelle Marino on 2017-04-19 13:28:14
Comments:

437. Name: Lucille Gorham on 2017-04-19 13:30:33
Comments:

438. Name: Maura Fay on 2017-04-19 13:41:26
Comments:

439. Name: Hallie Miller on 2017-04-19 13:42:25
Comments:

440. Name: Emily Griffin on 2017-04-19 13:47:33

Comments:

441. Name: Erick ruuttila on 2017-04-19 13:47:38
Comments:

442. Name: Olivia Moore on 2017-04-19 13:49:30
Comments:

443. Name: Annah Todd on 2017-04-19 13:51:17
Comments:

444. Name: Jake Tucci on 2017-04-19 13:53:20
Comments:

445. Name: Nicole Marino on 2017-04-19 13:57:07
Comments:

446. Name: Daniel Tauriello on 2017-04-19 13:58:03
Comments:

447. Name: Katelyn Thompson on 2017-04-19 13:58:44
Comments:

448. Name: Marjorie Themeli on 2017-04-19 14:02:49
Comments:

449. Name: Molly J McPhee on 2017-04-19 14:04:42
Comments:

450. Name: Ciera Gobron on 2017-04-19 14:08:32
Comments:

451. Name: Catherine McNally on 2017-04-19 14:14:33
Comments:

452. Name: Gaelyn Spencer on 2017-04-19 14:19:22
Comments:

453. Name: Ashley Ayer on 2017-04-19 14:27:29
Comments:

454. Name: daniela rossi on 2017-04-19 14:30:10

Comments:

455. Name: Leah Hetzel on 2017-04-19 14:33:39
Comments: Good luck! I hope we can make a great difference.

456. Name: Denise Sassaman on 2017-04-19 14:36:46
Comments:

457. Name: Marcela Dorfsman Hopkins on 2017-04-19 14:37:54
Comments:

458. Name: Tom DeCapo on 2017-04-19 14:52:38
Comments:

459. Name: Sean Fogarty on 2017-04-19 14:52:53
Comments: There is simply no sound reasoning behind expansion of fossil fuel infrastructure. Take that money and invest in renewable energy projects!

460. Name: Alex Lombardo on 2017-04-19 15:00:37
Comments:

461. Name: Kristina Moritz on 2017-04-19 15:01:39
Comments:

462. Name: Stacey Frenette on 2017-04-19 15:01:51
Comments:

463. Name: Amanda Barba on 2017-04-19 15:03:27
Comments:

464. Name: Conner Kolter on 2017-04-19 15:07:24
Comments:

465. Name: Forrest Hoffman on 2017-04-19 15:09:09
Comments:

466. Name: Harry McCoy on 2017-04-19 15:10:13
Comments:

467. Name: Courtney Stevens on 2017-04-19 15:14:42
Comments:

468. Name: Martina on 2017-04-19 15:33:33

Comments:

469. Name: Michelle Sanborn on 2017-04-19 15:34:48

Comments: We the People, We Decide! We have an inherent and unalienable right to protect the human and natural communities where we live. My community enacted a Community Bill of Rights prohibiting an energy project and the developer packed up and left! We worked with www.celdf.org to draft our rights-based ordinance.

470. Name: Judith Simpson on 2017-04-19 15:44:09

Comments: Alternatives should be pursued. Great Bay is an important ecological asset to this area.

471. Name: Jan Barber on 2017-04-19 16:10:58

Comments:

472. Name: Robert Piehler on 2017-04-19 16:13:23

Comments: It is not needed why risk harm to this important place

473. Name: Bette Bramante on 2017-04-19 16:32:55

Comments:

474. Name: Gretchen McDonald on 2017-04-19 17:02:45

Comments:

475. Name: Andrew McQuade on 2017-04-19 17:46:22

Comments:

476. Name: Suzette Beevers on 2017-04-19 17:52:10

Comments:

477. Name: Megan B on 2017-04-19 17:57:11

Comments:

478. Name: Chelsea emery on 2017-04-19 18:00:28

Comments:

479. Name: Molly McQuade on 2017-04-19 18:02:22

Comments:

480. Name: joe polychronis on 2017-04-19 18:04:59

Comments:

517

481. Name: Amy C Ferris on 2017-04-19 18:49:16
Comments:

482. Name: Jean mcpeak on 2017-04-19 18:53:39
Comments: Please leave Little Bay alone. Educate people about saving energy instead.
Thank you.

483. Name: Hayley Poff on 2017-04-19 18:54:50
Comments:

484. Name: Emmet Todd on 2017-04-19 18:54:55
Comments:

485. Name: Abby ferris on 2017-04-19 19:02:21
Comments:

486. Name: Alex L Griffin on 2017-04-19 19:06:01
Comments:

487. Name: rebecca schneider on 2017-04-19 19:24:59
Comments:

488. Name: John J Lowy on 2017-04-19 19:40:21
Comments:

489. Name: Morgan Beatty on 2017-04-19 20:02:12
Comments:

490. Name: Kristen T on 2017-04-19 20:03:38
Comments:

491. Name: Coburn Blunt on 2017-04-19 20:04:56
Comments:

492. Name: Kyle McAdam on 2017-04-19 20:05:41
Comments:

493. Name: Lindsay Jakows on 2017-04-19 20:06:45
Comments:

494. Name: Gianna Tempere on 2017-04-19 20:07:32
Comments:

-
495. Name: Will Silverstein on 2017-04-19 20:17:54
Comments:
-
496. Name: Allison Weidinger on 2017-04-19 20:21:31
Comments:
-
497. Name: Randy Hunnids on 2017-04-19 20:21:45
Comments:
-
498. Name: Alexis Lapolla on 2017-04-19 20:22:18
Comments:
-
499. Name: Korey Dean on 2017-04-19 20:22:33
Comments:
-
500. Name: Sam Buzzell on 2017-04-19 20:29:03
Comments: This is absolutely unnecessary and will only benefit the already full wallets of the greedy bloodsuckers who are the CEOs and politicians. Let's prevent this project and protect our already fragile environments, namely the Great Bay.
-
501. Name: Cynthia Chase on 2017-04-19 20:40:14
Comments:
-
502. Name: Frances Cornick on 2017-04-19 20:42:15
Comments:
-
503. Name: Kelsey Lozier on 2017-04-19 20:42:27
Comments:
-
504. Name: Jaime adams on 2017-04-19 20:55:28
Comments:
-
505. Name: Robyn on 2017-04-19 20:57:22
Comments: Adams Point is a very special natural area and a popular location for enjoying the outdoors. Please reconsider these plans that will disturb the environment.
-
506. Name: Lauren Goulet on 2017-04-19 21:03:55
Comments:
-
507. Name: Thomas Haas on 2017-04-19 21:03:59
Comments: This project could damage much of the already hurting ecosystem in Little

Bay by displacing settled heavy metals and dispersing them freely into the water. Furthermore, the electromagnetic frequencies emitted by these power lines could negatively affect fishes' ability to sense their natural rhythms of migration, feeding and breathing. Not only this, but ever since has been uncooperative with several towns along the way of this power line, vocalizing to town hall meetings their desire to find the most "economically feasible" route being the reason they chose this one. That means they could put the power line (which in itself is unnecessary due to the necessity for our country to shift its infrastructure towards carbon neutral or carbon negative merge sources) elsewhere, but they have chosen an environmentally harmful option because it is less expensive for them.

508. Name: Tom Morgan on 2017-04-19 21:10:31
Comments:

509. Name: Sam Smith on 2017-04-19 21:15:28
Comments:

510. Name: Clarice Perryman on 2017-04-19 21:21:44
Comments:

511. Name: Karl W on 2017-04-19 21:21:58
Comments:

512. Name: Devyn winter on 2017-04-19 21:25:10
Comments: I care very much about Adams pt and the creatures that reside there. I will fight tooth and nail for this space. It's the first place I take people when I show them my home. It's a place where I've taken my dog many times and I feel he was always happier there. Adams point is one of The few places near me that I can go in a 7 minute drive and find peace and solace.

513. Name: Joelle Lesniak on 2017-04-19 21:31:27
Comments:

514. Name: Roodle Love on 2017-04-19 21:32:24
Comments: Please don't damage this amazing ecosystem with unnecessary interference

515. Name: Heather Healy on 2017-04-19 21:34:20
Comments:

516. Name: montana doyle on 2017-04-19 21:39:57
Comments:

Name: Thomas H Ayer on 2017-04-19 21:40:38
Comments: we have had enough.

let the critters be.
go blow 8 feet somewhere else.

518. Name: Meghan Fisher on 2017-04-19 21:44:45
Comments:

519. Name: Kael Randall on 2017-04-19 21:49:43
Comments: Not down for it.

520. Name: Bradley K Hunter on 2017-04-19 22:01:47
Comments:

521. Name: Megan Bailey on 2017-04-19 22:05:19
Comments:

522. Name: Lee Getty on 2017-04-19 22:06:00
Comments: Eversource needs to stop trying to ruin New Hampshire's environment and the safety of the New Hampshire's citizens !

523. Name: Morgan James on 2017-04-19 22:08:27
Comments:

524. Name: Tim Walsh on 2017-04-19 22:25:16
Comments:

525. Name: Robert Keefe on 2017-04-19 22:29:05
Comments:

526. Name: Athena Valkanos on 2017-04-19 22:29:08
Comments:

527. Name: Janet Marshall on 2017-04-19 22:32:03
Comments:

528. Name: Melissa Potter on 2017-04-19 22:34:14
Comments: Keep the bay safe! No Eversource lines under our waterways!

529. Name: Adele Baudet on 2017-04-19 22:39:13
Comments:

530. Name: paige phoenix on 2017-04-19 22:41:29
Comments:

-
531. Name: Mairead mccarthy on 2017-04-19 22:53:55
Comments: The environment is forever. Profit is a human conception.
-
532. Name: Mary Tyler on 2017-04-19 22:54:11
Comments:
-
533. Name: Austin Helm on 2017-04-19 22:56:59
Comments: This will be an environmental disaster for great bay
-
534. Name: Donna Weisman on 2017-04-19 23:07:13
Comments:
-
535. Name: Molly Biron on 2017-04-19 23:08:57
Comments:
-
536. Name: Kala lewis on 2017-04-19 23:09:16
Comments: Do NOT RUIN OUR BELOVED BAY!!!
-
537. Name: julie settembrino on 2017-04-19 23:13:16
Comments:
-
538. Name: Whitney burke on 2017-04-19 23:14:35
Comments:
-
539. Name: Judith Gardner on 2017-04-19 23:23:14
Comments:
-
540. Name: Steve McPhee on 2017-04-19 23:24:40
Comments: We should be conserving and installing solar instead of this barbaric idea of more electric lines under a shallow, historically tainted bay.
-
541. Name: Peggy Lamson on 2017-04-19 23:24:59
Comments: We need to keep the Bay clean.
At present it is being destroyed by
pollutants.
Thank you,
M. Peggy Lamson
-
542. Name: Lauri Winter on 2017-04-19 23:29:17
Comments: Do not allow this! We have few precious places where nature can thrive!!!
-

543. Name: Courtney Mackey on 2017-04-19 23:30:48

Comments: Go mom!!! ♥☐

544. Name: Moriah Chardae on 2017-04-19 23:33:01

Comments:

545. Name: Giselle Hart on 2017-04-19 23:34:10

Comments: yo this is a bad idea, don't do it

546. Name: Molly McCown on 2017-04-19 23:48:01

Comments:

547. Name: Ashley on 2017-04-19 23:58:18

Comments:

548. Name: Daryn Clevesy on 2017-04-20 00:07:35

Comments:

549. Name: Susan ozkan on 2017-04-20 00:08:45

Comments:

550. Name: Kyra on 2017-04-20 00:09:02

Comments: Our ecosystem is messed up enough bc of climate change. Leave it be.

551. Name: Terry Cook on 2017-04-20 00:14:41

Comments: Leave Little & Great Bay alone!

552. Name: Phebe Miner on 2017-04-20 00:49:20

Comments:

553. Name: Zelita Morgan on 2017-04-20 00:57:19

Comments:

554. Name: Robert Ager on 2017-04-20 01:04:09

Comments: Stop EMF pollution

555. Name: Eva Ford on 2017-04-20 01:04:21

Comments:

556. Name: Melissa Prefontaine on 2017-04-20 01:33:30

Comments:

Comments

557. Name: Emma on 2017-04-20 01:38:16
Comments:

558. Name: aria eliscu on 2017-04-20 01:39:09
Comments:

559. Name: Ruth McQuade on 2017-04-20 01:49:49
Comments:

560. Name: Deb Klein on 2017-04-20 01:52:04
Comments: Really bad idea..

561. Name: Clay on 2017-04-20 01:58:19
Comments: Screw eversource

562. Name: Christopher Smith on 2017-04-20 02:01:46
Comments:

563. Name: Dawn on 2017-04-20 02:09:47
Comments:

564. Name: Sam Gendreau on 2017-04-20 02:11:55
Comments:

565. Name: Derek Sowers on 2017-04-20 02:13:38
Comments:

566. Name: Abigail Colby on 2017-04-20 02:26:47
Comments:

567. Name: Katie on 2017-04-20 02:35:40
Comments:

568. Name: Daniel Hackenjosh on 2017-04-20 02:55:19
Comments:

569. Name: Janet Poff on 2017-04-20 02:57:53
Comments:

570. Name: Gavin Cook on 2017-04-20 03:20:47
Comments:

571. Name: Lisa Demaine on 2017-04-20 03:21:47
Comments:
-
572. Name: Christina on 2017-04-20 03:59:48
Comments:
-
573. Name: Anna Prescott on 2017-04-20 04:17:10
Comments:
-
574. Name: Ian Bentley on 2017-04-20 04:19:07
Comments:
-
575. Name: Anya George on 2017-04-20 04:30:50
Comments:
-
576. Name: Thomas George on 2017-04-20 06:30:09
Comments:
-
577. Name: Peter Squires on 2017-04-20 09:20:27
Comments:
-
578. Name: Courtney on 2017-04-20 10:13:39
Comments:
-
579. Name: James weiner on 2017-04-20 10:17:47
Comments:
-
580. Name: Hollynn Francis on 2017-04-20 10:28:52
Comments:
-
581. Name: Amanda Albertson on 2017-04-20 10:43:40
Comments:
-
582. Name: Caroline Ruhm on 2017-04-20 12:06:59
Comments:
-
583. Name: Katherine Bouzianis on 2017-04-20 12:12:00
Comments:
-
584. Name: Sharon R MacDougall on 2017-04-20 12:29:39
Comments:
-

585. Name: Wanda Perry on 2017-04-20 12:32:48
Comments:

586. Name: Alexander Chase on 2017-04-20 12:57:17
Comments:

587. Name: Lindsey Chase on 2017-04-20 13:13:56
Comments:

588. Name: Jessica Purdy on 2017-04-20 13:15:38
Comments:

589. Name: William Arnold on 2017-04-20 13:19:49
Comments:

590. Name: Matthew Woodbury on 2017-04-20 14:05:41
Comments:

591. Name: Tia on 2017-04-20 14:12:32
Comments:

592. Name: Crystal Paradis on 2017-04-20 15:07:08
Comments:

593. Name: Silas Wellington Richards on 2017-04-20 15:08:45
Comments:

594. Name: Carolyn Isaak on 2017-04-20 16:18:12
Comments:

595. Name: Taylor nelson on 2017-04-20 16:19:39
Comments:

596. Name: Ashley Wettstein on 2017-04-20 16:21:10
Comments:

597. Name: Dennis Cahill on 2017-04-20 16:52:57
Comments: Save the Bay - no Jet Plowing !

598. Name: Lauren dow on 2017-04-20 17:34:22
Comments:

599. Name: Tara on 2017-04-20 19:25:42
Comments:

600. Name: Donna Berlin on 2017-04-20 19:52:42
Comments:

601. Name: Alexis Africano on 2017-04-20 20:15:48
Comments:

602. Name: Katie Conklin on 2017-04-20 20:35:38
Comments:

603. Name: Joe Bernitt on 2017-04-20 20:44:31
Comments: Rabble Rabble Rabble

604. Name: Hannah Zabkar on 2017-04-20 20:50:20
Comments:

605. Name: Nick Michaud on 2017-04-20 20:52:08
Comments: This is not OK.

606. Name: Ali on 2017-04-20 20:52:35
Comments:

607. Name: Robert Gaulin on 2017-04-20 20:54:04
Comments:

608. Name: Jing on 2017-04-20 21:02:43
Comments:

609. Name: Jeff Heim on 2017-04-20 21:17:17
Comments:

610. Name: Cheryl on 2017-04-20 21:27:17
Comments:

611. Name: Jennifer Brackett Piskovitz on 2017-04-20 22:36:44
Comments: Great Bay is beloved by many and we will fight to protect it as it plays a vital role in NH's culture, commerce, and tourism.

612. Name: Tyler Szczepanik on 2017-04-20 22:38:56
Comments:

-
613. Name: Michael Sargent on 2017-04-20 22:53:49
Comments:
-
614. Name: Nunya Biznass on 2017-04-20 23:18:45
Comments: Normal plowing maybe, but jet plowing?no way!
-
615. Name: Robert Moore on 2017-04-20 23:42:31
Comments:
-
616. Name: Thomas Beaulieu on 2017-04-21 00:15:34
Comments:
-
617. Name: Margaret Andrade on 2017-04-21 01:44:25
Comments: Seems to risky for the environment! I ask that there be no Jet Power across Little Bay!
-
618. Name: Elaina Hatsis on 2017-04-21 03:23:57
Comments:
-
619. Name: Deborah Johnson on 2017-04-21 05:16:34
Comments:
-
620. Name: Emily Jameson on 2017-04-21 11:11:26
Comments:
-
621. Name: Kristin Snow on 2017-04-21 12:52:10
Comments:
-
622. Name: meche Romoser on 2017-04-21 14:16:14
Comments:
-
623. Name: Summer Krstevska on 2017-04-21 16:26:57
Comments:
-
624. Name: Becki Wright on 2017-04-21 16:39:54
Comments:
-
625. Name: Bob Ferri on 2017-04-21 17:15:19
Comments: Conventional dredging would be less environmentally risky.
-
626. Name: Michael Lesser on 2017-04-21 18:13:03

Comments:

627. Name: Ursula balmer on 2017-04-21 18:37:22
Comments:

628. Name: Chris Phillips on 2017-04-21 19:05:22
Comments: As an oyster farmer in little bay and a resident on the oyster river I believe there has not been enough thorough testing of the plowing method and the possible effects on the wstershed.

629. Name: Jessica Carloni on 2017-04-21 19:06:26
Comments:

630. Name: Ashley on 2017-04-21 19:24:18
Comments:

631. Name: Mary Ann Krebs on 2017-04-21 19:33:26
Comments:

632. Name: Jenn Fischer on 2017-04-21 19:39:21
Comments: Please use other alternatives!!!

633. Name: Jennifer Renee on 2017-04-21 19:40:38
Comments: Please find a better alternative.

634. Name: Richard gsottschneider on 2017-04-21 19:57:49
Comments: Opposed to entire plan. No need.

635. Name: harriet forkey on 2017-04-21 20:18:16
Comments: There must be some alternatives! I don't even think the project is necessary or feasible. This area must be protected as the great bay estuary is precious fot this area.

636. Name: Karen M Fischer on 2017-04-21 20:24:33
Comments:

637. Name: Ashley Peters on 2017-04-21 20:30:38
Comments:

638. Name: Joan Drapeau on 2017-04-21 20:37:47
Comments:

Comments

639. Name: Bill Brown on 2017-04-21 21:25:47
Comments:

640. Name: Mary Ann Brown on 2017-04-21 21:34:50
Comments:

641. Name: Angela Lambert on 2017-04-21 21:56:59
Comments:

642. Name: Susan Dewhirst on 2017-04-21 22:12:14
Comments: Please don't mess with the fragile Great Bay.

643. Name: Meg Arnold on 2017-04-21 22:43:00
Comments:

644. Name: Gordon Fischer on 2017-04-21 22:48:38
Comments: Leave the Great Bay Estuary alone, it will be an ecological disaster and harm Oyster farmers that have invested time and money to earn a living. Sometimes the cheapest option is not the best.

645. Name: Ann Windsor on 2017-04-21 22:50:51
Comments:

646. Name: Maureen Seguin on 2017-04-21 23:02:24
Comments:

647. Name: Erika on 2017-04-21 23:10:07
Comments:

648. Name: phyllis heilbronner on 2017-04-22 00:14:23
Comments: I support the position that the Eversource application of jet plowing in the Great Bay Estuary watershed should be denied as now proposed.

649. Name: Joyce barker on 2017-04-22 00:14:53
Comments:

650. Name: Sara Cathey on 2017-04-22 00:30:18
Comments:

651. Name: Troy Finn on 2017-04-22 01:41:34
Comments:

652. Name: Keith Doucet on 2017-04-22 01:42:44
Comments:
-
653. Name: Brynn Potter on 2017-04-22 02:35:55
Comments:
-
654. Name: Mary Swanson on 2017-04-22 06:41:29
Comments:
-
655. Name: Dorene Stern on 2017-04-22 12:02:23
Comments:
-
656. Name: Virginia Beckett on 2017-04-22 12:49:47
Comments:
-
657. Name: Hunter munro on 2017-04-22 13:07:13
Comments: Nah dude!
-
658. Name: Paul Marino on 2017-04-22 13:35:06
Comments: Let's find another route.
-
659. Name: Suzanne Marino on 2017-04-22 13:39:08
Comments: Good luck!
-
660. Name: Sally Tobias on 2017-04-22 14:40:07
Comments:
-
661. Name: Brian Lukowski on 2017-04-22 17:18:23
Comments:
-
662. Name: Marcy Fischer on 2017-04-22 20:44:30
Comments:
-
663. Name: Lulu Pickering on 2017-04-22 22:32:37
Comments:
-
664. Name: K gsottschneider on 2017-04-22 23:01:48
Comments:
-
665. Name: Deborah Cardwell on 2017-04-23 10:43:00
Comments:
-

666. Name: Kerry Clift on 2017-04-23 11:16:21
Comments:

667. Name: Kimberly Josey on 2017-04-23 12:10:16
Comments:

668. Name: Isabelle MacDonald on 2017-04-23 14:11:16
Comments:

669. Name: Kristine bell on 2017-04-23 14:47:24
Comments: Signed by a resident of the area

670. Name: Jessica Steren on 2017-04-23 14:49:17
Comments:

671. Name: Marian Wolter on 2017-04-23 14:57:27
Comments:

672. Name: Ariana Greene on 2017-04-23 15:39:47
Comments:

673. Name: Donna Weisman on 2017-04-23 16:12:43
Comments: No Eversource Jet Plowing Across Little Bay.

674. Name: Molly Dwyer on 2017-04-23 18:22:16
Comments:

675. Name: Sarah jones on 2017-04-23 18:42:24
Comments:

676. Name: David Ellis on 2017-04-23 19:37:52
Comments:

677. Name: Susan Mair on 2017-04-23 21:32:24
Comments:

678. Name: Deborah Wiggin on 2017-04-23 23:35:32
Comments:

679. Name: Stephen Cardwell on 2017-04-24 00:29:23
Comments:

680. Name: Katie Homan on 2017-04-24 04:57:20
Comments:

681. Name: G Genest on 2017-04-24 09:34:10
Comments:

682. Name: Stephen Lyons on 2017-04-24 11:33:38
Comments:

683. Name: Lillian Wilson on 2017-04-24 12:24:07
Comments:

684. Name: Ted Sparr on 2017-04-24 12:52:39
Comments:

685. Name: Suzanne Berry on 2017-04-24 13:15:22
Comments:

686. Name: Heidi Lockwood on 2017-04-24 13:52:06
Comments: Let's avoid the kind of catastrophe that happened in the 90s with the contamination of the watershed around Pease tradeport.

687. Name: Tricia Banafato on 2017-04-24 14:54:01
Comments:

688. Name: Jessica Starkey on 2017-04-24 17:36:48
Comments:

689. Name: shona Mull on 2017-04-24 18:06:19
Comments:

690. Name: Benjamin Hayward on 2017-04-24 19:51:46
Comments:

691. Name: Julie Love on 2017-04-24 20:10:07
Comments:

692. Name: Dimitry Harris on 2017-04-24 20:13:11
Comments:

693. Name: Will Hastings on 2017-04-24 20:17:29
Comments:

-
694. Name: Don Kelley on 2017-04-24 20:20:16
Comments:
-
695. Name: Dan Olken on 2017-04-24 20:31:19
Comments: No, find another way
-
696. Name: Jessica Hayward on 2017-04-24 21:15:06
Comments:
-
697. Name: Maxim Harris on 2017-04-24 21:56:16
Comments:
-
698. Name: Kristen Mello on 2017-04-24 22:14:44
Comments:
-
699. Name: Brendan Maloney on 2017-04-24 22:15:16
Comments:
-
700. Name: James Stevens on 2017-04-25 00:18:42
Comments:
-
701. Name: Ryan J Contino on 2017-04-25 00:22:54
Comments:
-
702. Name: Matt Cooper on 2017-04-25 01:09:29
Comments:
-
703. Name: Lisa P Cote on 2017-04-25 01:56:22
Comments:
-
704. Name: Paige driscoll on 2017-04-25 02:10:15
Comments:
-
705. Name: Michelle Gibbons on 2017-04-25 03:21:58
Comments:
-
706. Name: Katelyn Foley on 2017-04-25 08:08:18
Comments: Protecting the environment is protecting our future.
-
707. Name: Robert rly on 2017-04-25 17:00:05
Comments:

-
708. Name: Alicia Gagne on 2017-04-26 11:38:04
Comments:
-
709. Name: George Stamos on 2017-04-26 15:49:35
Comments: Do not disrupt current conditions with Jet Plowing.
-
710. Name: Carden Welsh on 2017-04-26 19:12:46
Comments: We cannot risk further damage to this extremely important estuary.
-
711. Name: Kelly Ahlquist on 2017-04-27 05:30:24
Comments:
-
712. Name: Alex Kratzert on 2017-04-27 14:24:26
Comments:
-
713. Name: Stefanie Daly on 2017-04-28 18:12:46
Comments:
-
714. Name: Tom Fredenburg on 2017-04-28 18:19:22
Comments: I operate an oyster farm not far from this proposed project, and I can't see how we will protect our oysters from the silt it will create. There has to be a less risky way to do this.
-
715. Name: Gordon Williams on 2017-04-28 18:37:04
Comments:
-
716. Name: Carol Birch on 2017-04-28 18:43:44
Comments:
-
717. Name: Susan Cilia on 2017-04-28 22:24:16
Comments:
-
718. Name: David W Ellis on 2017-04-29 01:34:38
Comments: jet plowing is highly likely to cause significant increases in sedimentation elsewhere in the bays.
-
719. Name: Monica Jurrissen on 2017-04-29 11:37:46
Comments:
-
720. Name: ronda baker hill on 2017-04-29 12:51:19
Comments: This will have long term consequences for swimmers, kayakers, the fish and

shellfish we eat. this "least"expensive way to provide power to other NE states will have far reaching effects. Think Onassis Oil refinery proposal in the 70's Eversource has money and powerful backers but don't think that gives them the right to destroy something we may never be able to recover.

721. Name: Mary caldwell on 2017-04-29 13:23:41
Comments:

722. Name: Sarah Caldwell on 2017-04-29 13:29:39
Comments:

723. Name: Sonia Byrnes on 2017-04-29 14:13:19
Comments:

724. Name: robin masia on 2017-04-29 23:45:10
Comments:

725. Name: Larry Gans on 2017-04-30 12:08:19
Comments:

726. Name: Kevin O'Sullivan on 2017-04-30 22:45:57
Comments:

727. Name: Jennifer Lee on 2017-05-01 00:59:07
Comments:

728. Name: Deborah Welch on 2017-05-01 13:23:15
Comments:

729. Name: Jane Bagnell on 2017-05-01 14:40:03
Comments:

730. Name: Elizabeth Pescosolido on 2017-05-01 17:18:34
Comments:

731. Name: Penelope Lee on 2017-05-02 10:37:44
Comments:

732. Name: Hannah Comstock on 2017-05-02 20:01:27
Comments:

733. Name: David Williams on 2017-05-02 21:13:46

Comments:

-
734. Name: Megan Gilbert on 2017-05-05 17:10:18
Comments:
-
735. Name: Nancy Smath on 2017-05-06 22:15:11
Comments:
-
736. Name: Justin E Maki on 2017-05-09 15:25:40
Comments:
-
737. Name: Matthew Larkin on 2017-05-09 18:20:54
Comments:
-
738. Name: Anne Hooper on 2017-05-09 20:29:12
Comments:
-
739. Name: Kathy Stroup on 2017-05-11 01:52:39
Comments:
-
740. Name: Jeremy Townsend on 2017-05-11 13:43:29
Comments: This needs to be stopped and all consequences considered carefully.
-
741. Name: Kristin Forselius on 2017-05-12 11:36:47
Comments:
-
742. Name: Peter Kralovic on 2017-05-28 09:30:25
Comments:
-
743. Name: Sara Zoe Patterson on 2017-05-29 20:53:03
Comments:
-
744. Name: Beth Kaputa on 2017-05-29 21:02:52
Comments:
-
745. Name: John Haslam on 2017-05-29 21:08:24
Comments: If that's the case, then by rights, no-one in management at Eversource should ever have lobster, oysters or other seafood anymore. They don't seem to care much about it, so why should they be able to partake of it?
-
746. Name: Dawn Przychodzien on 2017-05-29 21:20:16
Comments: I just cannot believe this. The destruction and devastation will ruin the

oysters.

747. Name: Veronique Ok on 2017-05-29 21:21:35
Comments:

748. Name: Bruce lavoie on 2017-05-29 21:24:17
Comments:

749. Name: Sherri Nixon on 2017-05-29 21:29:31
Comments:

750. Name: Rita on 2017-05-29 21:50:10
Comments:

751. Name: Shannon on 2017-05-29 21:52:52
Comments:

752. Name: Marcus Niemi on 2017-05-29 22:00:32
Comments:

753. Name: Jenna cooke on 2017-05-29 22:01:11
Comments:

754. Name: Jaymie Kierstead on 2017-05-29 22:02:14
Comments:

755. Name: Dawn Lewis on 2017-05-29 22:09:39
Comments:

756. Name: Andrew Rotondo on 2017-05-29 22:12:23
Comments: Fight the power!

757. Name: Gabriel Goldberg on 2017-05-29 22:16:11
Comments: No, Eversource, no.

758. Name: Emily Cann on 2017-05-29 22:16:38
Comments:

759. Name: Melissa duhamel on 2017-05-29 22:18:08
Comments:

760. Name: Kimberly Barnard on 2017-05-29 22:23:42

Comments: Unacceptable.

761. Name: Jodie-Lynn Corbeil on 2017-05-29 22:26:44
Comments:

762. Name: Amanda on 2017-05-29 22:33:03
Comments:

763. Name: Sarah Kozuma on 2017-05-29 22:34:43
Comments:

764. Name: Laura Brown on 2017-05-29 22:43:15
Comments:

765. Name: Jason deering on 2017-05-29 22:56:36
Comments:

766. Name: Don Campfield on 2017-05-29 23:02:19
Comments:

767. Name: Deborah Gomez on 2017-05-29 23:07:38
Comments:

768. Name: Amy Gendreau on 2017-05-29 23:10:49
Comments:

769. Name: Paul Eno on 2017-05-29 23:15:16
Comments:

770. Name: David Gomez on 2017-05-29 23:16:24
Comments:

771. Name: Katie Perkins on 2017-05-29 23:18:33
Comments:

772. Name: Kimberly Loosmann on 2017-05-29 23:19:13
Comments:

773. Name: Kaitlin Sylvester on 2017-05-29 23:19:24
Comments:

774. Name: Erin Allgood on 2017-05-29 23:33:33

Name: Stephanie Drener on

on

Comments:

-
775. Name: Trish Jeffrey on 2017-05-29 23:35:14
Comments: There must be another way; unacceptable.
-
776. Name: Molly Campbell on 2017-05-29 23:40:21
Comments:
-
777. Name: tara oconnor on 2017-05-29 23:45:08
Comments:
-
778. Name: Ken Linchey on 2017-05-30 00:05:27
Comments:
-
779. Name: Jennifer Walker on 2017-05-30 00:08:16
Comments: Please save the oysters-they help keep our waters clean!!
-
780. Name: Debra Kam on 2017-05-30 00:10:54
Comments:
-
781. Name: David Vroom on 2017-05-30 00:32:08
Comments:
-
782. Name: Joan Poehlman on 2017-05-30 00:42:48
Comments: Hell no!!
-
783. Name: Cynthia Harris on 2017-05-30 00:49:55
Comments:
-
784. Name: stephen poehlmsn on 2017-05-30 00:51:02
Comments: We cannot allow big energy to corrupt the environment. Everyone must stand up to protect our natural resources.
-
785. Name: Kristen Deshaies on 2017-05-30 01:06:56
Comments:
-
786. Name: Suzanne Caron on 2017-05-30 01:07:43
Comments:
-
787. Name: Erin fortin on 2017-05-30 01:08:17
Comments:
-

788. Name: Taylor Early on 2017-05-30 01:18:47
Comments:

789. Name: Andrew Gomez on 2017-05-30 01:25:09
Comments: Eversource is destroying nature and making us pay for it. Not cool

790. Name: Karen Barker on 2017-05-30 01:25:14
Comments:

791. Name: Barbara Lilly on 2017-05-30 01:41:29
Comments:

792. Name: Melissa Groves on 2017-05-30 01:44:48
Comments:

793. Name: Sara oberle on 2017-05-30 01:51:10
Comments:

794. Name: Katie Benway on 2017-05-30 02:03:16
Comments:

795. Name: Nichia on 2017-05-30 04:08:32
Comments:

796. Name: Aimee Mullahy on 2017-05-30 09:41:26
Comments:

797. Name: Denise Wheeler on 2017-05-30 11:20:29
Comments:

798. Name: Kevin Johnson on 2017-05-30 11:21:56
Comments:

799. Name: Gordon Thompson on 2017-05-30 12:11:55
Comments: Bad idea!

800. Name: Cynde Lingamfelter on 2017-05-30 12:38:42
Comments:

801. Name: Jeff Donald on 2017-05-30 12:58:11
Comments:

Comments:

802. Name: Julie edwards on 2017-05-30 13:49:07
Comments: Keep our environment clean and safe!

803. Name: Alan Perry on 2017-05-30 14:13:38
Comments:

804. Name: Jade Palermo on 2017-05-30 14:44:34
Comments:

805. Name: Sven Wiberg on 2017-05-30 15:07:57
Comments:

806. Name: Nicole Gibeault on 2017-05-30 15:34:56
Comments:

807. Name: Lisa Burk-McCoy on 2017-05-30 16:13:16
Comments:

808. Name: Amanda Oxx on 2017-05-30 16:41:32
Comments: Ive lived on little bay most of my life. It has gone from major striper runs, loads of lobster,crab,& sea life, to not much much left of anything. Its sad.

809. Name: Gwen Kenney on 2017-05-30 17:19:54
Comments:

810. Name: Jennifer Pribble on 2017-05-30 17:40:06
Comments:

811. Name: Thomas Zachary Taylor on 2017-05-30 19:38:31
Comments:

812. Name: Korrie Wedel on 2017-05-30 19:46:25
Comments:

813. Name: Emma J Baillargeon on 2017-05-30 20:04:21
Comments: Don't do this.

814. Name: Lenore Smith on 2017-05-30 20:28:20
Comments:

815. Name: Stephanie Diabon on 2017-05-30 21:16:40
Comments:

816. Name: Heather Gilbert on 2017-05-30 21:25:46
Comments: The Great Bay is all ready impaired! Please preserve what's left and better yet, improve it not make things worse!!!

817. Name: Zachary Cherry on 2017-05-30 22:01:43
Comments:

818. Name: Jordan Chichester on 2017-05-31 00:17:29
Comments:

819. Name: Laurie callery on 2017-05-31 02:48:20
Comments:

820. Name: Robert Wofchuck on 2017-05-31 12:38:32
Comments:

821. Name: Jennifer Purrenhage on 2017-05-31 14:28:21
Comments:

822. Name: Nancy frost on 2017-06-01 10:46:36
Comments:

823. Name: Jean Pauly on 2017-06-01 11:37:56
Comments:

824. Name: Martha Andersen on 2017-06-01 19:52:30
Comments:

825. Name: MARTIN GORHAM on 2017-06-01 21:58:39
Comments:

826. Name: John Puffer on 2017-06-02 00:12:13
Comments: Eversource has big provided data showing the power is needed. Also, an independent environmental impact report is needed. Do not go forward with this project!

827. Name: Susan Mair on 2017-06-04 00:49:21
Comments:

828. Name: Joseph on 2017-06-05 23:01:09
Comments:

829. Name: Linda Anderson on 2017-06-06 00:58:01
Comments:

830. Name: Jessica Dunbar on 2017-06-07 17:55:46
Comments:

831. Name: Gwynne Pollard on 2017-06-07 21:41:03
Comments:

832. Name: Diana Frost on 2017-06-08 18:43:32
Comments: I would be very sorry to see this danger to the environment.

833. Name: Henry Smith on 2017-06-09 12:59:10
Comments: I concur that Eversource's study is rife with holes and leaves more questions, calling into question its questionable assurances.

Far too risky a venture for the potential adverse effects this tunnel under GB could have, I do believe.

And one more question: Is this really needed?

-Henry M. Smith

834. Name: Pamela White on 2017-06-09 17:59:51
Comments: Save Great Bay.

835. Name: Nancy Linder on 2017-06-11 21:31:16
Comments:

836. Name: Ernst Linder on 2017-06-11 21:33:03
Comments:

837. Name: Adam N Churchley on 2017-06-12 15:24:52
Comments:

838. Name: nancy lukens on 2017-06-16 03:30:47
Comments: The conclusions of GeoInsight and Woods Hole, that Eversource's impact is insufficient to assure the safety or efficacy of jet-plowing to lay transmission lines under the Great Bay Estuary. I urge the SEC to deny the application, citing serious environmental impact.

839. Name: Trudi Puffer on 2017-06-17 22:08:47
Comments:

840. Name: Michaela Leonard on 2017-06-20 13:38:19
Comments:

841. Name: Jane Gallant on 2017-06-23 10:56:16
Comments: Save the Bay.

842. Name: Lisa Demaine on 2017-06-29 21:51:13
Comments:

843. Name: Sabrina on 2017-06-30 13:51:12
Comments:

844. Name: Laura Price on 2017-06-30 14:34:25
Comments:

845. Name: Jack Trifiro on 2017-06-30 15:04:09
Comments:

846. Name: Steve Holmgren on 2017-06-30 18:07:58
Comments:
