Karen Edwards

From: RobinM <melodyofharpists@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2019 4:08 PM
To: Michael Behrendt
Cc: Karen Edwards
Subject: Eversource response June 25 | tree trimming proposal for Durham Point Road

Greetings, Michael --

Please share this email with the Planning Board before tomorrow's public hearing. Thank you.

*

Dear members of the Planning Board --

I have read the responses of Eversource to the questions posed following the June 12th hearing (at: <https://www.ci.durham.nh.us/sites/default/files/fileattachments/planning_board/page/55132/response_from_eversource_6-25-19.pdf>), although I am disappointed, as you may be, that the response was provided only the day prior to the continued public hearing. That leaves little time for the Board and the public for review.

First, the above-referenced document lacks professionalism and accountability. It omits context, correspondence date, and the name and qualifications/position of the person or persons who wrote the responses. It is neither on Eversource letterhead nor in email format that includes the appropriate corporate and authorship information.

Second, I think it would be useful for at least two members of the Planning Board to meet with any candidate for a third-party arborist. Evaluating a paper resume is very different from face-to-face communication. Among other points, we should not rely on Eversource to relay the concerns of the community.

Third, the document notes *Ian Farley will always be available during the project via email to respond to any concerns* but provides no contact information for Mr. Farley. Of course it's possible that would be provided in a subsequent document. I do believe that the public should be able to contact both Eversource and a Town staff member, even over a weekend. Imagine a scenario where *something happens* on a Friday afternoon, with work to begin on a Monday morning.

Fourth, the Planning Board meets twice a month. Clearly, the Board must establish protocols for evaluating and communicating about work to date and work planned, preferably in concert with the third-party arborist.

Finally, would a non-subcommittee for this project be appropriate? (If I remember correctly, a formal subcommittee is subject to RSA 91-A, the *right to know* law, but there is an alternative approach. Todd Selig likely could recommend one.)

Board members may have considered all these points, of course. If so, thank you for considering my notes regardless.

Regards,

-- Robin