

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify before your committee on H527, Learning only a few days before, that your committee was addressing this important issue I was grateful you granted me a slot in your busy schedule. Being my first time testifying in The House, I was unfamiliar with the process and very nervous. Alex's and Kathleen James' communication before hand was extremely helpful In lessening the anxiety of the day. I wasn't sure if what I shared about our experience with the complicated 248a process was presented well enough for your committee to grasp just how frustrating, overwhelming, unfriendly and expensive the present 248a process is.

After watching your committee discussion last Thursday WE FELT WE WERE HEARD. You renewed our faith in a governmental process You gave us hope. It was refreshing to hear all the different and creative ideas your individual committee members suggested to consider. It was impressive how your discussion included issues from all those who had testified before you. Most importantly you acknowledged the importance of the need for change in the Telecommunication Siting Process.

As presented in my testimony, the PUC 248a process may appear in theory and on paper as a good option for siting of telecommunication facilities. In reality it denies municipalities and individuals participation because it is too cumbersome and expensive. 248a misleads the public that they will be protected and supported by the state agencies who are designated mandatory parties. Yet ANR remained quiet and submitted nothing and they are the keeper of National Landmark, Lake Willoughby, The Historic Preservation Dept gave no input yet we have National Historic Registered Sites and State historic registered sites in Westmore. Finally, the Department of Public Service, advocated for the tower company not for Vermonters, DPS' Vermont's 10 year Telecommunication Plan suggests 40 foot towers rather than 140 foot towers, It states towers should not be built on speculation, and it even includes coverage maps of cell service yet these was never referred to or used as a guide in the process. DPS also never did any propagation studies, so the options for colocation were never considered. It also considers that satellites better serving our topography and making towers obsolete. There is no oversight or accountability of what these agencies do or not do in the present process.

Please remember, Westmore has two existing towers, one built in 2005 under Act 250, the second built in 2015 under 248a. Act 250 invited public input, honored the Town Plan, By-Laws and Telecommunications Ordinance, The Act 250 process and staff are more available to the public and the process is more transparent. This third tower is again under 248a yet no state agency checked to see if colocation was possible.

Lastly, could someone define the Certificate of Public Good. 240a fails to clarify Public Good. (The police, fire dept, EMS and municipal employees function in our town without this radio tower, as well does private companies; Fed Ex, UPS, Judy's Septic, etc.)

We look forward to viewing your Friday Committee Discussion Session. Thank you for all you do and how you fo it. You are appreciated.

Donna Dzugas-Smi