

Dear Senate Finance Committee,

Today is the deadline for comments on the Proposal for Decision in the Ira Industrial Tower case. The attached comments will be of interest to you to understand what citizens are experiencing at the PUC in Section 248a tower cases.

The telecom Hearing Officer, Gregg Faber is not a lawyer. He is, however, the PUC's point person on telecom issues. He issued a Proposal for Decision to approve the lattice tower in Ira. He correctly calls it a lattice tower in the description. But in the Aesthetics section he calls it a monopole. Mr. Faber made the same error in the Enosburgh Industrial tower case, called it a lattice tower in the description and a monopole in the Aesthetics section.

This type of sloppy work is not lost on Vermonters whose properties and lives are affected by these tower proposals. In both these cases, Industrial Tower & Wireless filed suit against the PUC in Federal Court.

The neighbors of the towers proposed for Enosburgh and Ira did everything they were supposed to and more, in an effort to have a voice in what happens in their communities. In both instances, the town boards stayed out of it due to their relationships with the leasing landowners. In both cases, the leasing landowner became belligerent and hostile to the neighbors. These create ugly dynamics for neighbors who intervene in PUC cases.

Both of these cases are now in the hands of the full PUC. We shall see how they grapple with the Hearing Officer's lack of attention to details. There was no site visit in either case, no balloon test so the intervenors could evaluate the aesthetics. And neither tower is for cell antennas, they are for a private radio service. Industrial intends to build these towers all over Vermont. The way the system is working right now, all towers get approved.

The Enosburgh tower case went through the full PUC process and is, as far as I know, the only contested case for a tower other than the Verizon denial I previously submitted. The Ira tower, the subject of the attached, went through a more abbreviated process. The outcome was the same, so far.

Thank you for hearing people's experiences. We can do better.

Annette