

Dear Committee Members,

My Husband and I are property owners in Enosburgh, VT, less than a 1/2 mile from an "approved " 153' Telecommunication Tower to be installed by Industrial Tower and Wireless. To quickly weigh in on the need for updating the PUC process and Section 248a, I would like to point out a few changes needed based on our frustrating experience.

- Notification process and community involvement needs to include a mile radius (not just abutters) and public notice of some sort to include highlights of the facts of the proposal. In our case, many think to this day that it is a cell tower with wireless service, broadband, etc. The fact that it is a radio tower targeted for businesses has been lost...there is no general "public good" slated for this community. Our neighborhood had to force it onto a Town Meeting Agenda, in which we then discovered that the selectmen weren't fully aware of the proposal. If our neighborhood hadn't raised our hand, this proposal would have been approved without a peep from concerned property owners. I understand that ITW's approvals in Eden and Fairfax were quietly approved with limited inclusion from the community.
- Health Effects-this is one of our biggest concerns but can't be argued according to the telecommunications Act of 1996. The Board of Health should be involved in the permitting process, the set back requirements from homes, and the placement and proximity to schools and daycares. The studies are real on the effects of EMF on health, why do we have to ignore them based on an outdated 1996 Act? Why can't the state of Vermont be proactive on protecting the community from health effects? I know many, myself included, who suffer from tinnitus, a well known side effect of EMF.
- Historic Sites-In our case the notification was sent to the classified ads in a local newspaper (small print, last page) listing the address using the longitude and latitude coordinates. The ad asks if anyone had "interest in expressing comments" that the proposed project had on any historic sites... Very minimal information with no mention of the Historical Hamlet of Bordoville where the historic Seventh Day Adventist Church is located! No notification was sent to the Church leaders and members. This minimal requirement with no oversight on how the community and historic sites are notified must be changed. There must be clearer expectations and enough time to respond from those that live here. Vermont's beautiful, historic, scenic landmarks are quickly disappearing...and in this case the benefactors are 1 landowner and an aggressive Massachusetts industrial company.
- Aesthetics- in our experience, there was no full Quechee Test done with the Rutland Renewables Act-which would evaluate impact from public properties. The Balloon Test

was "stealth like " --done in January of 2022-2 months before abutters' notification. No one was included in this test or given the chance to see what the impact will be with our own eyes. There must be community involvement in the sitings and impact on the scenic beauty of Vermont. These outside telecommunications companies don't fully understand what the lure and beauty of Vermont truly is...we all must be stewards to our beautiful state of Vermont...there is no other state in New England that looks and feels the way Vermont does, which is why many tourists come here.

- There have only been a few contested cases with the PUC (with Enosbury being one of them) with little hope of a fair decision because the PUC has only denied 1 case in over a decade. How can impacted neighbors' voices be heard in the decision making process of these ugly facilities that have potential health impacts on us? Would spending several hundred thousand dollars on lawyers and Aesthetic Experts help a case have more weight in favor of a fair decision? There is practically no chance in getting a fair decision currently and this needs to change.

My research on the Telecommunications Industry over the past 10 months has been enlightening and alarming all at once. One article I read stated that once a telecom company gets approved for a site, the decision rights of the town, region, and state are gone...no more decision rights for those of us who live here... In our case, the permit will be for 99 years. Shouldn't we ensure the decisions before the permits are issued are great ones and include the impacted communities? Another quick note to consider is the emerging technology of wireless-- making ugly telecommunication towers obsolete and eyesores in a few short years (new satellite technology already in use).

Thank you for allowing our voices to be heard. We also want Annette Smith's recommendations to become real. We want 248a's sunseting to be postponed for 1 year to allow for a stakeholder committee for the intervening time to update the PUC process and Section 248a.

Sandra Bruhn
6913 Chester Arthur Rd
Enosburg, VT