

ATTACHMENT 11

**Summary of Written Municipal and Regional Comments Submitted to Applicants
(From announcement of new route to submission of SEC Application)**

Municipal/Regional Entity	Date	Opinions/Issues
Whitefield Selectmen and Planning Board – Letter to DOE	10/9/13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple tall structures at aesthetic gateway to Village and Mountain View Grand – Route 3. • Safety with respect to proposed Mount Washington Regional Airport runway extension. • Pondicherry National Refuge. • Property values. • Burns Lake and lakeside cottages; Dalton Mountain and Kimball Hill; Forest Lake State Park Road and Forest Lake. • Buried lines more secure and reliable during storms. • Municipal assessment challenges and timeframe for depreciation of lines.
Whitefield Planning Board – Comment letter	9/8/15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bury lines through Whitefield. • Most overhead structures of any town on the route; Structures up to 100’, higher than existing ones and above tree line. • Scenic views at Rt. 3 and Rt. 116 crossings. • Adversely impacts large swaths of the town’s visual landscape, central historic and business district, and natural and preserved areas. • Does not fit with Master Plan; and would negatively affect the orderly development of Whitefield and the region, property values, business prospects and economic development. • Impacts avoided if underground. • Requests equal treatment with other towns where line is buried.

Bristol Select Board – Letter to Eversource	9/21/15	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Appreciate applicant’s efforts to address some of the concerns in NH.• Visual impact is greatest concern.• Expansion of ROW.• Visual impacts to historic site in Pemigewasset River area.• UG option creates more temporary jobs than OH does.• Impact on property values.• PSNH challenges to local tax assessments, which cost towns money in legal fees.• Invest “Forward NH Fund” into burial of line and stopping abatement proceedings, which would benefit tourism and economic development more than Forward NH Fund.• Prefer DEIS Alternative 4A, to bury the line.
--	---------	--

<p>New Hampton Selectmen – Comment Letter</p>	<p>9/10/15</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No public need for the project, so any disruption, inconvenience or financial cost should be borne by the applicant. • DEIS says UG along existing roadways results in fewest environmental impacts, more tax revenue and temporary and construction jobs and does not affect property values. • Tax assessment litigation costs with towns. • Impacts on Pemigewasset River. • Tower within Designated Scenic Easement for Pemigewasset River. • Impacts on identified Native Indian sites on banks of Pemigewasset (notably “Long Carry” site). • Visual impacts of I-93 crossing at mile markers 73 and 71, and crossing of Rt. 104 and Pemigewasset River. • Industrialization of the rural character of the town and state. • DEIS Alternative 4A costs applicant more but provides maximum benefit to affected communities.
<p>Deerfield Selectmen – Comment Letter</p>	<p>7/1/13</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TM voted on 3/12/13 to oppose project as proposed at time. • Impairment of rural, small town character, scenic vistas and natural scenic beauty. • Inconsistent with Deerfield Master Plan. • Impact on property values and taxes paid by property owners to the town. • Possibility of negative health impacts. • Oppose any new OH lines in town; strong preference for burial of lines.