

To the SEC,

I disagree with the Applicants Response and Objection to Certain Petitions to Intervene filed on 2/26/2016. I feel the imposition of a 100' rule does not relegate my family and I to the status of "general public" in regards to the points I mentioned in my request below:

My responses are in italics.

1. Health and Safety –Our property is located less than 400' from the PSNH Right-of Way (ROW), known as the Coos Loop. It is important to note that there is a Natural Gas pipeline within this ROW, placing me and my family fully within the "incineration zone". Also, there have been findings that link childhood leukemia to exposure to high voltage EMF levels. ***The fact that the incineration zone extends past 400' renders the 100' intervenor cutoff immaterial in our particular situation.***

In regards to EMF, I can cite as many articles supporting negative health effects as I (as well as the Applicant) can cite those not supporting them. An "Inconclusive" result doesn't mean "no effects". What it means is there is enough risk there to warrant further study. Who are the Applicants to tell me what is or isn't safe for my family?

2. Property Value–Current poles are below the tree line, while the proposed towers are easily visible above the tree line. This will degrade our land's value to the extent where it will be "worthless". ***I can see farther than 100', or even 400', and so can any prospective buyers if I am forced to sell our land in the future to cover any health care costs for example. The new rules take into account visual impact in miles.***

4. Unreasonable use of the ROW –I believe the co-location of Northern Pass with the Coos Loop upgrades AND the Natural Gas pipeline leads to a dangerous and potentially deadly unreasonable use of the ROW. ***See response to Item 1 above.***

This project does not lend itself well to black and white. Imposing an extremely small cutoff point on those being affected the most is just an attempt on the part of the Applicant to take broad strokes at reducing the sheer number of intervenor requests on this project.

If the Applicants truly "listened" and not just "heard" they wouldn't attempt to put stringent, seemingly arbitrary requirements for intervention status.

I/we respectfully request that we be allowed to become Interveners without limitations in this Docket because the Applicants do not have the authority to establish a 100' distance from the ROW.

Mark Orzeck