

House Committee on Energy and Digital Infrastructure: H.527
Senate Finance Committee: S.159
Submitted January 21, 2026

My name is Sandra 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.

The experience that my Husband and I and our neighbors have with a telecommunications company, ITW, is exhausting. After a **very long** process ITW's CPG was denied by the PUC, but then was challenged and went all the way to the Federal Court which upheld the PUC's decision. This year, the day before Thanksgiving ITW has submitted another application for a tower in the same location as the previous application --only 20' lower!!!

Section 248a is a streamlined process for telecommunications siting, and yet it appears to be a way to ignore 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. These decisions are permanent (ITW's tower proposal is for 99 years).

Here are a few concerns with the current process:

- There are no setback requirements from residences, schools and nursing homes--siting requirements should be at least a mile away. Why do telecommunications companies appear to select the most obtrusive locations for towers? Is it cost savings for them at the expense of the residents?
- Balloon tests need to be coordinated with the community with advance notice so the town and residents can see the visual impact of the proposed tower. Currently there is no advance notice of when these are being conducted.
- Notification of the proposal should include the community, not just the abutters.
- The process to have your questions answered and voice heard are complex and elusive; and everything is time sensitive, so if you miss the deadline, you are out of luck. Clear communication of steps to take for the town and residents should be required in the notification process.
- If the Telecommunications siting doesn't comply with the Regional and Town Plans, it should NOT be approved.
- Transparency from the Telecommunications companies. In our case the tower is a "radio" tower with no co-location planned and yet it was positioned as a "cell" tower to the local community... What is the "public good"?

One other question to consider on Vermont telecommunication strategy-Vermont is a rural area and does not need the cell tower density that urban areas need, so why do we have this push to place so many towers in our bucolic state?

I respectfully urge the committee to consider changes that require true communication, transparency and partnership between the Vermont Communities and the

Telecommunication providers. The laws should provide protection to our communities, local government and to our beautiful state of Vermont!

Thank you for your time and your service to the people of Vermont.

Sandra Bruhn

sandrambruhn@gmail.com