

Ms. Monroe,

I have followed the comments of other members of the public regarding their experiences at the recent SEC hearings, with which I regret to say I agree. I would like to submit this comment with my reflections on the process I experienced in March of 2016. I know that this docket is unusual in its scope and the public interest it has sparked; I also understand that the SEC is operating under new rules. My comments are intended to help the SEC understand the process from the public's point of view and to identify areas in need of improvement.

Please bear in mind that I viewed these hearings as my only chance to speak directly to the SEC on this matter. I believe that many others also shared this view. I turned out in hopes that the SEC would listen to what I had to say when I spoke to them directly. I was grateful for the opportunity and took it very seriously.

I offer these thoughts for the SEC's consideration:

1. Ms. Pastoriza and others accurately portray the public question phase of the hearings. My written questions, like theirs, were either edited, not asked, or lumped with others in a fashion which made them unrecognizable. Because others have elaborated on this, I will not, except to say that the way in which the written questions were censored is unacceptable.
2. The question arises: why not just let the public ask their own questions? For what purpose are the questions vetted, rephrased or reformatted, and asked by a third party? Is the public not to be trusted? Should not the public have its chance to ask whatever questions it has, in its own voice?
3. The amount of time allotted to the Applicant to present its case at the beginning of the hearing, combined with the amount of time devoted to written questions, forces the public to wait for hours in order to speak to the SEC. The effect is to deprive interested members of the public of the chance to speak, since many cannot wait until late in the evening for their chance. I do not think that most people believe a written comment is the same as one spoken directly to the individuals making the decision, so suggestions to that effect are not well-received and can be interpreted as 'the brush off.'
4. The fact that the Applicant/SEC had already held a series of informational meetings in September and in January makes the Applicant's information presented at the March hearings redundant. Facilitating the only chance the public has to speak to the SEC should be paramount over a repetitious presentation of project information which is readily available to those who are interested.
5. The physical arrangement of the hearings, with the Applicant and SEC arrayed in front as if constituting one official body, gives the overwhelming impression that the public is the outsider and not a full party to the process.
6. Co-scheduling two of the SEC hearings with related hearings held by the DOE put the public in the position of deciding which of the two bodies to address, since each deals with a different set of issues. We had the spectacle of individuals who wished to address both bodies trying to

cram everything into three minutes, and being rudely interrupted if they went over time. Speakers representing the Applicant were not subject to time constraints.

7. Announcement of site visits on the days of the hearings must be made within the standard notice period of public events. In addition, municipalities and private property owners should receive individual notice of the visits to their towns and land. Municipalities and other interested parties should be invited to identify sites important to be viewed by the SEC.

I hope that the SEC will find these comments helpful as it moves forward. I urge you to make every effort to accommodate the public in this process.

Nancy Martland