

If you don't completely bury the transmission lines the full length of the corridor, it will be a blight on the landscape immediately and ten years from now and 50 years from now and 100 years from now and possibly forever into the future.

If in the future it is proven that electromagnetic pulses from these transmission wires damage those beings, among them humans, who are near the towers, then it is a fair assumption that if those transmission wires are buried instead of out in the air, then the damage done to humans, among other beings, will be lessened by the conduit that holds the wires and the insulation of the ground around them.

If the transmission lines are buried instead of carried through the air at double to triple the height of the treeline, then it is a fair assumption that the damages that would otherwise have to be paid to affected residents out of the funds, which I believe I read were to be set aside as part of the project at a level of something like \$400,000,000 for damages created by the project, then those funds of \$400,000,000 could instead be used to dig, blast and bury those transmission lines, along the full 132 miles of length yet in contention. If it takes more than \$400,000,000 to do the entire length underground, then add in to the digging project all the costs that were saved by not having to buy all the structural metal of the towers varying in height between 85 and 155 feet the entire length of those 132 disputed miles. Between the fortune you are saving not having to pay for all those abominable structures, added to the \$400,000,000 that will not be needed for having not damaged the lives and property of the abutters, because the wires are instead underground, that should cover the costs of burying all the transmission wires.

In addition, if the wires are to be buried, they should be buried in a conduit large enough to allow people access inside, so that routine or emergency maintenance and repairs can be done within the conduit, spring, summer, fall or winter.

If the transmission wires are buried underground, there should be almost no damage to them during serious winter storms. All the future savings from storm damage that didn't have to be repaired over the next 100 years should be figured into the numbers.

There will be no future damage costs from aircraft or bird collisions with the wires or towers, which will, doubtless occur in the future, as you go out in time.

Further, aren't the transmissions lines safer underground, in an increasingly more dangerous world, from those who would choose to disrupt our utilities?

If the transmission wires are buried underground, all the costly upkeep to the hundreds (or thousands?) of proposed towers along that 132 miles route for the next hundred years will instead be \$0. Also, the wire in a properly sealed conduit underground should last much longer than if exposed to the sunlight and

elements, up in the air.

If the proposed 132 miles of up to 155 foot high towers are built, they will immediately create an industrial feel wherever they stand, day or night. In the daytime, the damage to the New Hampshire lifestyle will be apparent for all to see, in every moment, even from miles away. At nighttime, the stationary and blinking lights necessary to protect aircraft from collision will create the same futuristic sci-fi nightmare effect which you can now go and view along many stretches of the New Jersey Turnpike. This same horror will now be permanently planted along the length of the transmission corridor. People will need black-out curtains throughout their homes nearby to the corridor, in order to not be driven crazy by the many lights on the towers blinking in synchronized and non-synchronized patterns. For those unfortunate enough to be affected by these towers, life will never again be the same. Looking out from a peaceful home in the dark at the moon and stars, in tranquility, will be no more.

And, like New Jersey, towers beget towers. The thousands of high altitude blinking towers in New Jersey 30 years ago became tens of thousands of towers and now appear to be hundreds of thousands of towers. Once industry, politicians and utilities see such towers on the landscape, they assume the residents are "used to it" and then all bets are off. Forty or fifty years from now, New Hampshire will be playing catch-up with New Jersey, throughout the state, building thousands, then tens of thousands, then hundreds of thousands more towers for both industry and utilities.

Finally, when reading about the current proposal which buries 60 miles of the total 192 miles, I read that the cost estimates changing the project from overhead towers to underground went up very little. Perhaps those miles were along land that accommodated burying the wires more easily and made it less costly than elsewhere along the line--or maybe not--maybe just as much blasting will be needed all along the way in this Granite State. If it costs the same to build above ground or below ground, it should go below ground all the way. If it costs more, the \$400,000,000 and then some in other related savings, present and future, should still dictate that it all go below ground.

We should not allow our state to be destroyed in the name of progress. We should do it right for ourselves in the here and now and for all generations to come, underground all the way.

Sincerely, Carol Grasso