
From: darlene.kingrealtynh@roadrunner.com
Sent: Saturday, June 18, 2011 2:27 PM
To: Undisclosed-Recipient;
Subject: Fw: The Northern Pass now shows how much they LIE, take a look at the biggest land theft in history proposed by NP/ Selectmen of towns take note of legal help being offered to towns legal counsel to insure that town regulations can be enforced

----- Original Message -----

From: darlene.kingrealtynh@roadrunner.com
Sent: Saturday, June 18, 2011 2:25 PM
Subject: The Northern Pass now shows how much they LIE, take a look at the biggest land theft in history proposed by NP/ Selectmen of towns take note of legal help being offered to towns legal counsel to insure that town regulations can be enforced

IT IS LONG PAST TIME TO GET MAD/VERY MAD. All the lies! No wonder the early Americans took up arms to defend. It is time to defend ourselves now . Now agains tthe Northern Pass. Arm yourself with your tongue and your voice . Spread the word. The NP is coming unless we ban together and stop them. Unless we make Keene and Nashua, Conway and... understand that it is not just the 31 towns along the projected route that will see our way of life go down the toilet. They too will suffer . All of the state of NH will suffer. In days of old the warning was "The British are coming , the British are coming , the British are coming " And now the warning The NP is coming , the NP is coming , the NP is coming. Take up arms (tongue and voice

arms). We can afford no less than our ancestors to be silent.

Bury the Northern Pass

June 17, 2011

The Biggest Land Grab in New Hampshire History



On its new website that went up late this Friday afternoon, Northern Pass reveals what would be the biggest land grab in New Hampshire history. From Deerfield to Pittsburg, private property would have to be taken for a project with no public need or justification..

Of the 31 towns and cities on the proposed route, 22 would see the taking of land by eminent domain either to create a new right of way or to "expand" an existing right of way (ROW). Nine towns would be scarred with entirely new ROWs; thirteen towns would have existing ROWs "expanded" beyond current widths to accommodate the proposed HVDC line, which would be added alongside one or two HVAC lines. ("Expanded" is NP's term.)

In reality, both situations represent new ROWs. The difference between them is simply whether the new ROW would be created to abut an existing ROW or not. It doesn't matter whether 10', 25', 50' or 250' is taken if your house or land is seized by eminent domain.

For instance, over five miles of the seven mile ROW in Deerfield would have to be "expanded" by an unspecified amount. This information is oddly phrased to suggest that the "expansion" would somehow occur within the existing ROW. It would (could) not. The new ROW of unspecified width would run alongside the current ROW.

Deerfield, NH is located along the preliminary preferred route for The Northern Pass. As currently proposed, the transmission line in Deerfield will be:

- Constructed in existing transmission rights of way where 115 kV transmission lines exist today
- 7.33 miles long (of this distance, right of way expansion is planned for approximately 5.23 miles)
- 345 kV AC (alternating current)

Northern Pass website: "Community" page for Deerfield

Northern Pass is proposing an eminent domain nightmare.

The highest towers are proposed for two towns that host the White Mountain National Forest, the National Scenic Appalachian Trail (AT), and the lower part of Franconia Notch State Park: Lincoln and Easton. These mammoth towers will cross the AT, run close to South Kinsman, a popular hiking destination on the AMC's Four Thousand Footer list, and be visible from the I-93 gateway approach.

Northern Pass is proposing an outrage to federal and state scenic treasures.

Towns that would see private property seized by eminent domain to create new ROWs of unspecified widths that do not abut current ROWs: Chichester, Clarksville, Colebrook, Columbia, Dalton, Northumberland, Pittsburg, Stewartstown, Stratford.

(Clarksville, Colebrook, Columbia, Pittsburg, Stewartstown, and Stratford carry the note that "this route is not final; project representatives are working with landowners and town officials to reevaluate certain segments of the preferred route, and to explore whether there might be other feasible routing options—particularly in the North Country—that could achieve broader community support." This is the so-called Plan B through the large land holdings in eastern Coos County that NP has unsuccessfully been trying to negotiate for months.)

Towns that would see private property seized by eminent domain to create new ROWs of unspecified widths that do abut current ROWs: Allenstown, Bethlehem, Bridgewater, Campton, Canterbury, Concord, Deerfield, Franklin, Hill, New Hampton, Northfield, Pembroke, Woodstock.

For the "most common tower height" in each town, whatever that may mean, and for details about the lengths (but not the widths) of abutting and non-abutting new ROWs, see: <http://northernpass.us/communities>.

PSNH has repeatedly said that it would use eminent domain only rarely and as a last resort for this project. How does that square with the facts that NP has just announced: 22 towns and cities in NH would see private property seized by eminent domain for new abutting and non-abutting ROWs?

Hi All,

Given that Northern Pass made such a sneaky deal to mislead us that they were going to find "an alternate route" where they could "make the landowners happy" or some such garbage, I think that those of us in the direct line of fire should take out a full page ad in the Union Leader, Concord Monitor, and any other big papers, and rebut their sleazy smooth ads.

We may need to make this more personal, and start to bombard Patrick McDermott and other "friends" in PSNH along with the big wigs who care less about us, with emails, phone calls, and other acts of public outrage far beyond what we've done with our letters, phone calls, emails, and multiple visits to the State House.

We need to start marching in the streets for days and nights like the Arab nations are doing – refusing to leave, in huge numbers, and gaining huge momentum.

Got any ideas?

Julie

From Councilor Ray Burton: Northern Pass through the bedroom

Ray has circulated this email from a resident of Clarksville whose bedroom is on the dotted line. Thanks again to Ray for listening to and taking action on the concerns of the people.

"Subject: My home will be lost with the alternate route for Northern Pass in Clarksville

Dear -----:

I understand Governor Lynch was interviewed by NRP stating that PSNH needs to come up with an alternate route for Northern Pass. I am a full-time resident in Clarksville in Coos County. I have always been in opposition to the Northern Pass but I am even more passionate and heartfelty opposed since the latest second alternate route that runs through Clarksville appears to be running right through my bedroom.

I moved to NH from NJ six years ago & built a \$500,000 home with beautiful views of Lake Francis and mountains in NH, Vt, Maine and Canada. I work at Upper Connecticut Valley Hospital in Colebrook as the Chief Nursing Officer. The Governor appointed me to the NH Board of Nursing under the recommendation of the Executive Council. I also serve as a School Clerk and town auditor in Clarksville. I am trying to do what I can to give back to my community by serving these small town appointments and assuring the public safety by serving on the NH Board of Nursing.

I am very concerned and upset that our government officials would allow this to happen to me and other residents in this State. I find it very difficult to understand how the Governor and the elected officials, would have even allowed this plan to be considered. I am certain this 'plan' has been on the table and has been discussed for more then 2 years before 'we the people' heard about it.

It just seems wrong that I will lose my home because another state(s) wants energy from another country. Do I live in America???? or Russia???

I am not talking about the beautiful views that will be destroyed, I am not talking about the negative environmental impact nor am I talking about the health risks or the economic impact, I am talking about my home. My home, which we (my husband & I) have invested everything to build. He worked almost 30 yrs. for Exxon Mobil / Valero. We took his 30 years of stock and sold it 7 years ago to build our dream home. His life's work is, this home. Now, some company, who does not give 2 thoughts about us is going to be allowed to take my husband's life work away. I am appalled how Un-American this all is. I feel this is a HUGE injustice to us. Law abiding NH citizens who moved here for quality of life; we are trying to give back to the community we live and the State we live in.

Representative I hope you, as an elected official, have influence over the eminent domain discussions. I do not believe anyone should be able or allowed to take my land and home away from me.

I have no idea if you will ever personally read this email or if it will be "handled" by a staffer but as a constituent of this state and 2 voters who vote in every election. I hope you support my husband and I as an elected official who understands what an injustice this is.

If you are ever want to see what the Northern Pass will destroy I will be happy to have you or your designee see first hand how the Northern Pass will impact my husband and I in a very negative and sad way.

Thank you Representative for taking the time to read my concerns. I hope you are really listening and

understand how this project is/will hurt people on a very personal level. Remember, I am talking about my home, not the beautiful views or the other general concerns (which are all valid) but this concern is much more important because it is my home."

[signed by a Clarksville resident]

Need an orange tee or bumper sticker?

Atta Girls will be selling opposition items tomorrow at the Lupine Festival market on the Dow Field in Franconia (Exit 38). This is the final weekend of LF.

Enough is Enough

Enter your comment here: <http://burynorthernpass.blogspot.com/p/doe-contact-information.html> (All comments will be posted publicly once Normandeau Associates uploads them to the DOE-EIS site.)

Who is in the driver's seat?

The scoping comments on the latest DOE deadline extension are piling up; calls and emails to Brian Mills and others are jamming the lines and inboxes. Mills has responded to one opposition member that he views the DOE timetable as "applicant-driven." (For the editorial cartoonists out there: a 135' tower driving a DOE tank across NH?)

Why the delay in announcing Plan B?

From our friends in Coos, we have received copies of these two comments that will be available online as soon as Normandeau posts them. The first speculates on why PSNH-NP is hung up on the new route through Coos:

"Unfortunately there's nothing new here. The federal regulatory process and NH political process is no more honest than Northern Pass's laughable advertisements about jobs, energy savings and tax revenues.

Here are the building blocks for reading the most recent NP/DOE/Lynch dance steps:

1. If the transmission lines require massive, widespread, hard-fought eminent domain takings, NP will ultimately lose. New Hampshire's people won't stand for it.
2. NP's original route through the top 40 miles of Coos County met fierce resistance, so they're working on a new route with fewer, larger land parcels. The big landowners have NP over the barrel so the negotiations are tough and taking a lot of time. (If you're one of 10 landowners whose consent is critical for NP to live another day, you've got the chance of a lifetime to extract a nice chunk out of the \$50 billion of economics in the Northern Pass deal!)
3. The DOE has never seen a transmission line it doesn't love, so they'll do anything to grease the skids for NP. The DOE's total disrespect for fairness and good process is so stunning you've sometimes got to pinch yourself to be sure you're not just having a bad dream in North Korea. This agency is working hand in glove with NP and will stonewall to the end of time to avoid having any serious analysis of alternatives like the existing Vermont route, burying the lines on railroad or highway ROWs or other things that some people could actually support. They tell us they have to run their process forward. Forget what the rules say, they'll look at alternatives later. But the DOE brazenly puts their process on hold, again and again, to give NP another chance, another chance and another chance to wedge their damaging, last-century (but ridiculously profitable!) above-

ground line proposal through some sleepy part of our state. There are DOE rules for the people (harsh, adverse), and a completely different set of DOE rules (cuddly and easy) for Northern Pass.

4. Governor Lynch has a professional politician's ability to say many different things to many people with the aim of cloaking true intentions. We believe he is 100% in favor of NP and is playing the opposition for gullible fools. Fast forward to today, and of course Lynch will say "NP has to go back to the drawing board" when that is exactly what NP is doing all on its own. It's a free option. This is merely Kabuki theater that makes Lynch look like a leader when in fact he is biding his time and waiting for the chance to congratulate NP for making tough compromises (the new route through Coos County) to make the project "better for the people".

5. If NP can cut a deal with the big financial landowners, a new route will be announced. The DOE, having timed out the process as yet another favor for NP, will quickly run some additional sham scoping meetings and mumble about keeping to the timetable for the permit. The meetings will of course address only NP's new proposal and none of the important alternatives.

6. After the new route is announced, Lynch will declare that he has stood tall for the people of New Hampshire and forced PSNH to make hard choices, blah. Jeb Bradley will meet extensively with PSNH lobbyists to prepare for his Senate lecture series, "Electricity 202 and Campaign Finance". And Northern Pass will once again start to move forward through the process, claiming inevitability, marginalizing remaining property rights issues and tossing all the property owners and businesses along the 140 miles of existing PSNH ROW under the bus.

That's how the game works. It's not about the right answer, fairness or honesty.

So, opposition, let's STOP being gullible. Let's get to the real work. We need to unelect and unappoint the politicians and bureaucrats who have shown us oh-so-clearly that they need new career opportunities..."

Is DOE really studying potential threats to the towers?

The second EIS comment forwarded by our friends in Coos requests that the real impacts be studied:

"Please study the impact this scoping sham is having on the mental health and financial stability of NH residents.

Study how much gas, wear and tear on vehicles, time away from work, time away from family, paper-ink-stamps used for mailing letters to elected officials, legal expense, sleep lost, and \$ lost from property sales not executed is costing affected US citizens.

Study the number of personal relationships that are suffering because of the eminent domain threat being blanketed on people like me who stand to lose property.

Study the shame NH citizens feel at having a governor who represents Hydro Quebec, and speaks as if he works for the electric company.

Study the outrage that scoping comment makers feel knowing that these scoping comments are still, as of to! day, June 15th, being processed by Normandeau Associates, the firm working for Northern Pass.

Study the anger NH residents feel at knowing the DOE does whatever Northern Pass wants. Northern Pass wants to change the route? Fine, says the DOE. Northern Pass wants NOT to notify affected landowners? Fine, says the DOE. NP wants the meetings held in midwinter when travel is dangerous and potentially deadly for

citizens? Fine, says the DOE. Northern Pass wants to put up maps showing obliteration of private property to intimidate speakers at the scoping meetings? Fine again, says the DOE. NP wants to call the DOE meetings "NP" meetings and have guys stand up in the back and on the sides of seated citizens. Fine, says the DOE. Northern Pass wants to talk about where the towers WILL GO. Fine, says the DOE. Mr. Mills, I AM BEGINNING TO SEE A PATTERN!

Please study my conclusion/impression that the DOE is working for Hydro Quebec, and not working for the citizens of the US.

Please study my concern that these scoping comments are designed to find out if there is something in the environment that may negatively impact Hydro Quebec's towers, and not the converse. Did you hear me? These EIS studies are meant to study potential threats to proposed towers! Please study the statistical validity of that conclusion."

Enter your extended-comment-period request here: <http://burynorthernpass.blogspot.com/p/doe-contact-information.html>

Today's media: "Lynch in the middle"

Excepted from a Paula Tracy article in today's print edition of the Union Leader.

Online comments are here:
<http://www.unionleader.com/article/20110616/NEWS15/706169977/-1/news>

Northern Pass puts Lynch in middle .

Leadership challenged:

Stewartstown selectman says governor failing to speak definitively on hydroelectric power project.

By PAULA TRACY

New Hampshire Union Leader

STEWARTSTOWN — Gov. John Lynch has not led, but has instead followed the political winds on the issue of Northern Pass, leaving the North Country to dangle in the breeze, Selectman Allen Coats said Thursday.

.....

When the \$1.1 billion project was announced in Franklin last October, Lynch touted the benefits of the project, pointing to its economic impact and renewable power potential.

In November, selectmen wrote to Lynch with concerns about the proposed hydroelectric transmission line, especially with the plan to cut a right of way and install tall towers through the community.

To many in town, Coats said, the electric power was not worth what they perceived as the negative impact to tourism and property values.

Lynch answered the Stewartstown board's letter in December, saying that he believed "it is important to protect the unique character and natural beauty of the region."

Lynch pointed out that it was early in the regulatory process and outlined the steps that Northern Pass would have to take before the project could be approved or rejected.

He also outlined the process by which residents could express their concerns in the coming months. “I am confident that those entities will give a ll public input their full attention and consideration,” Lynch wrote.

“Although I have no direct role in regulatory procedures,” he wrote. “I am more than willing to listen to input from the communities and individuals who wish to share their views on the proposal. I welcome any ideas or concerns that you or your constituents wish to communicate to me.” Coats said the letter did not indicate that the governor was for or against the project.

In March, during town meetings, voters in towns along the Northern Pass route overwhelmingly voted to object to the project and the meetings that would be held in various towns to gather input on it. Despite the region’s firm opposition to the project, Coats said it still appeared that leaders, including Lynch, were not leading and were not taking a stand on the issue.

In April, the governor wrote a letter to the Department of Energy, saying th at he had heard from thousands of residents who expressed concern about the project and urged the DOE to fully investigate those concerns before issuing a permit.

Lynch spokesman Colin Manning said the governor told Public Service of New Hampshire — whose parent company Northeast Utilities owns 75 percent of the project — that the Northern Pass would not have his support if it was not supported by the communities it passed through. “Clearly that has not happened,” he said.

Coats said he hoped the governor and other officials who have been “waffling” on the Northern Pass are now squirming a bit in face of the overwhelming opposition to the project.

“I hope they are put between a rock and a hard place now,” Coats said. “They didn’t seem to care that this is a greed issue. It’s a money issue. Heck, (U.S. Sen. Kelly) Ayotte may have been paid by them (utilities who contributed to her campaign) but she’s made it clear that she is not in their pocket on this o ne,” Coats said, noting Ayotte has stated that she does not support the project as proposed.

He said other officials including Gov. Lynch and state Sen. John Gallus, R-Berlin, have waited to see in which direction the political winds would blow.

Coats said as a selectman, it is pretty simple. With just about everyone in town in opposition to the proposal, “You do what the people in town want.”

Coats said Franklin, which would receive a \$150 million converter station for the project, has more voters and support than North Country towns.

“We have only 1,000 people in this town,” he noted. Stewartstown is north of Colebrook and near the Canadian border.

“PSNH also has got all kinds of money,” which puts the small towns at a disadvantage in the David and Goliath match up, he said.

Still, Coats said of Lynch, “I don’t think he can write off the North Country.”

Manning said the governor’s stand has all along been that, while the project has value by providing up to 1,200 construction jobs, millions of dollars in local tax relief to the 31 communities through which it would pass, and renewable power to New England. Still, he has acknowledged all along that the project needs local support.

“There has been no change,” Manning said.

On Wednesday the DOE announced that the scoping — or comment — period has been reopened while Northern Pass officials work on new alternative routes for the project.

Also on Wednesday, Martin Murray, PSNH spokesman, said officials don't have a location or schedule yet.

Hey colleagues,

Do you think that we should consider a huge Rally in Concord on July 22 at that NP meeting? We would need to start it around 8:00 and take over the whole area around that meeting. We should also try to get lots of us into that meeting. It seems to me that this is a logical time to call for all those who are opposed to the liars, to rise up and be counted.

Julie Moran

Northern Pass Dog and Pony Show on the Road Again

Some of the opposition should go to watch this one. An invitation for a presentation titled **The Northern Pass Transmission Project: Facts, Answers, and What to Expect** July 22nd 2011 from 9-11 a.m. (arrival 8:30 for light breakfast and coffee) at the Local Government Center, 25 Triangle Park Drive Concord, NH 03301

9-10 a.m. Project Overview from clean energy to real revenue - followed by questions

10-11 a.m. Panel Discussion: What to Expect, What this will mean to your city or town

David R. Caron, Town Manager, Londonderry -Dave has dealt with a large energy project coming to his community. He will share his thoughts on advantages, disadvantages, and talk about his experience.

Elizabeth A. Dragon, Franklin City Manager-Elizabeth has been involved with the Northern Pass project for about a year and will share her thoughts and experience to date.

Dr. Lisa K. Shapiro, Chief economist at law firm Gallagher, Callahan & Gartrell
-Dr. Shapiro has analyzed the economic benefits of the Northern pass project (for communities and the state as a whole) and will share her findings. She will also be available to answer any questions you may have.

Please RSVP to Kelsey at 603 -410 - 3079

Just received this. Looks like we're breaking into the Boston media!
Valerie

**Subject: Fwd: Project Brings Power, Jobs,
Controversy - Project Economy News Story -
WCVB Boston**

<http://www.thebostonchannel.com/money/28235672/detail.html>

This comment will be in the public realm shortly and will be posted on the DOE EIS Site so we think it is **important enough for you to look at the DOE process and make up your own mind on whether it has been fair or not.** The Dannis' present one perspective. You may have a different one - it's up to you. **BUT YOUR VOICE MUST BE HEARD. TAKE THE TIME TO COMMENT TO BRIAN MILLS.** Now is the time.

From Sandy and Jim Dannis:

We are interveners in this proceeding. Our contact information is at the bottom of this comment.

We are filing this comment to express our strong objection to the DOE's decision announced this morning to once again make a special process accommodation for Northern Pass. We believe this action is without regard to what is fair to the public or in the public interest.

In the context of this proceeding to date, the DOE's decision to grant an open-ended extension to Northern Pass to seek to identify an alternative route in Coos County runs a high risk of being perceived by the New Hampshire public as bias and favoritism toward the applicant.

The DOE's practice of frequent procedural accommodations for Northern Pass stands in sharp contrast to your agency's unfavorable procedural treatment of the public.

For example, at the start of the process, the DOE refused the many requests from New Hampshire residents for a short delay in the scoping meetings to avoid the dangers and inconvenience of travel in winter. And throughout the process the DOE refused to require Northern Pass to put reasonable alternatives on the table -- burial of the lines on public rights of way, use of the existing Vermont route, etc. -- so that these alternatives could be assessed and commented on by the public. The DOE instead insisted on unfairly shifting onto the

public the almost insurmountable technical and financial burden of developing reasonable alternatives. As a result, the public scoping process was fatally flawed by the failure to include any reasonable alternatives for public comment.

We believe the extent of the DOE's appearance of bias and favoritism for Northern Pass, and the corollary appearance of unfairness to the public, has reached a level that many people in New Hampshire will find indefensible and repugnant.

We would submit that if the DOE feels it is somehow appropriate to continue to grant free passes to Northern Pass to change its preferred route, it would surely be appropriate for the DOE, at the same time, to finally require Northern Pass to submit a discussion of practical alternatives such as burying the lines on highway or railway rights of way (like the Champlain-Hudson project), or using the existing HVDC transmission line right of way in Vermont and New Hampshire. Why would you grant the applicant endless leave to massage its own preferred option while not standing up for the public and requiring a sufficient description of practical alternatives so that there can be a useful and robust public comment on the alternatives during the extended comment period?

We were disappointed to see in this morning's Federal Register notice that the DOE chose not to take even this minimal step toward procedural fairness.

We would once again request the DOE to seek to establish a better, fairer balance between the interests of the applicant and the public. We specifically request that if you allow any further amendments to the route by Northern Pass, you require, at the same time, a full description of practical alternatives (including without limitation burial on highway or railroad routes and use of the existing HVDC route) in advance of the extended public comment period.

We believe the appearance of a continued failure of the DOE to respect the interests of the public, and to show such clear bias and favoritism to Northern Pass, may severely undercut the public's perception of the integrity and legitimacy of the DOE's process.

In plain English, we may be reaching the point where this process will be perceived by many New Hampshire residents as a sham, with the outcome already pre-determined. It is in nobody's interest to allow this to happen.

Thank you for your consideration of this comment.

Alexandra M. Dannis

James G. Dannis

123 McGinty Road

Dalton, NH 03598

603-837-9246

sandydannis@gmail.com

Towns that have inacted or wish to enact legislation to prevent the NP from devistating their towns should have their legal counsel talk with CELD Community Action Legal Defense to make sure that the legislation that enact has the ability to hold up in court otherwise it could cost the towns a lot of money and be unaffactive. CELD has agreed to help the towns along the NP route to make sure that the planning board and town regulations will stand . Campton is one of the towns that recently voted to require all HVDC power lines go under ground. It is along with this email that I am forwarding the information to Campton's Selectmen(women) to have their legal counsel discuss with CELD making sure that what the towns wishes are successful (and not costly). See info below

Gail Darrell
New England Community Organizer
Community Environmental Legal Defense Fund
603.269.8542

www.celdf.org
email: gail@celdf.org

Some emails back and forth about this

Valerie,

Some of us have discussed these issues at some length. Our view, FWIW, is that the town ordinances that will have the best chance of ultimate success are those that can be keyed to a specific delegation of authority from the state legislature to towns. We believe zoning and site plan ordinances have the best chance of success (vs. a more general “anti-transmission line” type of approach) because there is a clear delegation of land use regulatory authority to towns; there is a great deal of experience with these kinds of ordinances (including by municipal lawyers who advise towns); and courts (including the NH Supremes) have upheld land use regulations even when they have the effect of stopping major projects.

As we have discussed with some of folks on this email, the NH PUC ultimately has an override for town land use ordinances that would limit or restrict transmission lines, subject to meeting a statutory standard. But if a substantial number of towns (say, >10 towns) were to adopt or enforce appropriate land use regulations with height limits, ridgeline protection, landscape requirements, tree line provisions, etc., this may be a critical mass that would be politically difficult for the PUC to try to override.

Now may be the right time to consider preparing model regulatory provisions for towns that may wish to update their regulatory suite. We would be happy to help with this.

Cheers, Jim and Sandy

From: Valerie Herres [mailto:infonorthcountrypowerline@gmail.com]

Sent: Friday, June 17, 2011 9:38 PM

To: Alan R. Baker; Atta Girl Records; Bill Schomberg; Birgitte Newbert; Bob Baker; C McLaren; Darlene King-Jennings; David Dobbins; Deb Reynolds; Ed Craxton; Gail Beaulieu; jim@dannis.net; Julie Moran; Kelly Mullen Wieser; Kris Pastoriza; Michael Ransmeier; Mike King; Pam and Peter Martin; Randy Farrell; Richard Samson; Rick Johnsen; Sandy Dannis; Susan Schibanoff; Tom Mullen; Will Abbott

Subject: Encouraging Towns to Write Ordinances and the Fact that NH Does not have Home Rule

Hi,

I know we've floated the idea about having towns passing ordinances regarding height of towers, to bury line and or not etc.. We did it with the town warrants which we knew at the time weren't binding but a wonderful mechanism to raise awareness and gauge how unpopular Northern Pass is.

However now that people are seriously considering doing these actions I would like to add some information to the mix which is that NH is not a home rule state (although there have been referendums to try to make it so but these have failed.)

If there is no home rule in NH then state law supersedes any local town ordinance. I am attaching a legal brief which is on line at http://www.nhlgc.org/attachments/services/legal/LegalBriefs_home_rule.pdf that discusses this very issue.

Before we decide to move forward and encourage this as a strategy we need to inform people what home rule means and what the legal brief states.

Maybe I'm interpreting this incorrectly but please take a few minutes to read the brief and send your thoughts.

Valerie

