

New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee
Pamela G. Monroe, Administrator
21 South Fruit Street, Suite 10
Concord, NH 03301

Dear Ms. Monroe:

Re: Frederic Fitts' Response to Applicant's Objection to Certain Petitions to Intervene in Docket No. 2015-06

Now comes Frederic Fitts of Whitefield to oppose the Applicant's Objection to participation as an intervenor in this docket.

The Applicant has opposed the participation of one "Frederick" "Fits" in its petition. That person, whoever he is, may speak for himself, but the spelling of both that first as well as last name is not mine. So the Applicant has filed its opposition to that person, and not to me. The Applicant, as a matter of fact in its petition, has absolutely not objected to my participation.

The Applicant will doubtlessly argue clerical error, and so I additionally argue that its imprecision and sloppiness caused it to miss its opportunity to deny me the right to participate, and I further assert that its petition is without merit:

1. According to Map 63 <http://www.northernpass.us/whitefield-nh.htm> my land lies approximately only 140 feet from the transmission right of way. But the distance the Applicant asserts (land within 100 feet in order to be a legitimate intervenor) is entirely arbitrary, capricious, and injurious to my rights and privileges. In no way does the placement of my land diminish my interests and rights nor diminish the substantial and adverse impact of the proposed power line construction on my interests, rights, and privileges of property and the enjoyment and exercise of it.
2. The Applicant's determination of proximity to the ROW utterly ignores the incredibly obvious reality that enormous towers easily visible from and proximate to my property degrades the property, diminishes its value, and defiles the landscape.
3. The attempt on the part of the Applicant to determine the standard for inclusion as an intervenor violates my property rights and interests by defining extraordinarily narrowly the grounds for opposition to the Applicant's plan. Numerous other, larger, and important measures of impact deserve acknowledgment as valid. Among them is the pernicious distribution of an unregulated electromagnetic field that ranges far beyond the right of way in a way that is injurious to and violative of my property protection rights.
4. The Applicant willfully ignores the impact on entire communities when it asserts that an arbitrary designation of 100-foot proximity constitutes the only standing to oppose its assault on the common landscape. The point is not simply that my rights are being trampled and ignored, though I affirm here that they are, but that the degradation of the common landscape means that all individuals who would be forced to see, to hear, to be exposed to electromagnetic radiation, and to suffer the loss of enjoyment of their property and the degrading of the value of their communities have standing to oppose, individually or collectively, this assault on protected rights.
5. I respectfully urge you to redefine and reframe the standard for opposition to this proposed assault on community rights just as I individually ask that you oppose any attempt by the Applicant to disqualify my individual participation as an intervenor.

Thank you.

Frederic Fitts