

Dear House Environment and Energy members,

I have some first-hand experience with a GMP power line upgrade that was proposed for a back road in Danby in a very sensitive Karst aquifer.

Only because of Act 250 was there notification of the project, which evolved over time to involve undergrounding portions of the line.

Issues about the type of chemical used to treat the poles where they may come into contact with groundwater were able to be raised and discussed as a result of Act 250.

Because of Act 250, we were able to do a walk along the road with the affected landowners and GMP staff, where the details were worked out. There was no hearing or contested case. The work was done within the last year. I happened to speak to an affected neighbor about it last week who said the GMP crew were very good, they even did the work of moving their chicken coop which was too close to the work area. However they did contrast the on-the-ground crew with the office people who they did not find to be as easy to deal with.

Without Act 250, without notification to affected landowners, without the opportunity to do site visits and identify key issues, is GMP proposing to offer the same types of considerations to assure that the local interests are protected? Based on this experience, Act 250 added real value to the outcome.

Another power line upgrade was proposed for a different road in Danby which had no issues and as far as I know went through Act 250 with no problem.

I highly recommend keeping Act 250 in place for GMP power line upgrades and relocations. If there are delays, they are for good reason.

Thank you for considering these observations.

Annette

Annette Smith
Executive Director
Vermonters for a Clean Environment
789 Baker Brook Road
Danby, VT
(802)446-2094
vce@vce.org