

Submitted January 22, 2026

My name is Peter C. Bruhn and I am a property owner in Enosburgh, VT. I am writing today to voice my concern with the current telecommunication siting regulations/laws and strongly oppose H.527/S.159.

I am writing to strongly oppose H.527. The “ask” here is to not vote in law and language stripping Vermont towns and citizens of their right to determine the character of their own communities. Streamlined processes and measures to make it “more simple” for telecommunications to permanently bypass municipal authority should not be the goal and objective. Towns, citizens and communities should have a front seat and heavy voice in the process that in the end they/we alone will live with.

It seems section 248a is a streamlined process for telecommunications siting, and yet it appears to be a way to minimize Regional and Town Plans and the wishes of the residents. The decision rights of a town on land use should be protected, not minimized in order to “expedite” tower sitings in poor locations. I would ask you to think about the phrase “Public-Good”. What value does that statement have if the Public is not involved?

As a homeowner up on Chester A. Arthur Road, along with our neighbors, my wife and I have been wrapped up in the fight/process to defend aesthetics, values of our community along with health concerns. It’s a fight that is worth the energy. We have learned much through this experience. I have seen firsthand how the system is flawed and residents are forced to live with decisions made by those who have no stake in our landscape.

There seems to be a profound disconnect with the process to “further minimize and eliminate the public's voice”. The values of our community are sidelined in favor of the mandates of out-of-area experts. I would ask you again to consider the phrase “Public-Good”.

In our personal experience there was little to NO transparency from the telecommunication company. Additionally, I felt that the facts and information that the telecommunication company was eventually forced to bring forward, only after having to hire a personal expensive attorney, was misleading. From the initial public notice that was 3 sentences long highlighted in the real estate section of the local flyer, to not being included in the visual “balloon test”, and every step of the process, the resident/citizens had to be the ones to attempt to hold the telecommunication company accountable.

In our example, the project has been represented to the public as a “Cell Tower”. It is not a cell tower, but a private radio tower. Facts matter, and yet the telecommunications company misrepresented this detail not only to the public but to the town board members. Not until we engaged the telecommunications company through a lawyer did the facts come to light. This has created a lot of confusion and miss-trust. In the proposed tower for Enosburgh, the certificate of public good was denied by the PUC. So in this case (round 1) not only were the residents, and citizen voices heard, the PUC also weighed in correctly. That said, the telecommunication company has come back to reintroduce the project and a lower height of the tower by -20 feet. Nothing else has change that I am aware of other than the proposed lower height, and yet the tower is still being positioned as a cell tower of public-good, when in fact it is not.

As others have mentioned, and we have firsthand experience, the § 248a process is fundamentally inaccessible to the average Vermonter. The ePUC filing system is a technical and intimidating barrier. This can't be overstated. Without the transparent, face-to-face hearing process found in municipal zoning, residents feel shut out of decisions that directly impact their property values and quality of life. Rather than simply extending a flawed sunset, I urge the legislature to allow § 248a to expire. We must develop a siting process that integrates modern telecommunications needs with the protective standards of Act 250 and local bylaws. Please vote "No" on H.527. It is time to return siting authority to the communities most affected by these decisions.

Respectfully Peter