



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Ten Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051

Phone: (860) 827-2935 Fax: (860) 827-2950

E-Mail: siting.council@ct.gov

Web Site: portal.ct.gov/csc

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

July 27, 2023

Karim Mahfouz
South Gate Lane
Southport, CT 06890-1349
kmahfouz1@gmail.com

RE: **DOCKET NO. 516** – The United Illuminating Company (UI) application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the Fairfield to Congress Railroad Transmission Line 115-kV Rebuild Project that consists of the relocation and rebuild of its existing 115- kilovolt (kV) electric transmission lines from the railroad catenary structures to new steel monopole structures and related modifications along approximately 7.3 miles of the Connecticut Department of Transportation’s Metro-North Railroad corridor between Structure B648S located east of Sasco Creek in Fairfield and UI’s Congress Street Substation in Bridgeport, and the rebuild of two existing 115-kV transmission lines along 0.23 mile of existing UI right-of-way to facilitate interconnection of the rebuilt 115-kV electric transmission lines at UI’s existing Ash Creek, Resco, Pequonnock and Congress Street Substations traversing the municipalities of Bridgeport and Fairfield, Connecticut.

Dear Karim Mahfouz:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) is in receipt of your recent correspondence concerning Docket No. 516.

In reaching a final decision on an application, the Council carefully considers all of the facts contained in the evidentiary record that is developed by the Council, the applicant, parties and intervenors in the proceeding, and all of the concerns received from members of the public who speak at the public hearing or submit written statements to the Council.

Please note that you can view documents related to this proceeding on our website at portal.ct.gov/csc under the “Pending Matters” link. You may also keep apprised of Council events on the website calendar and agenda.

Thank you for your interest and concern in this very important matter. Your letter will be entered in the public comment file related to this matter.

Sincerely,

Melanie A. Bachman
Executive Director

MAB/MP/laf

c: Council Members

From: Karim Mahfouz <kmahfouz1@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 27, 2023 10:12 AM
To: Bachman, Melanie <Melanie.Bachman@ct.gov>
Subject: Fw: Docket 516 - Abutter Property Owner Comment

Hi Melanie - by way of introduction, I'm Karim Mahfouz, owner of 247 S Gate Lane in Southport CT and potentially impacted by the project proposed in Docket 516. It's a pleasure to 'meet' you. I spoke with Lisa in your office this morning and she suggested I reach out to you directly.

I would greatly appreciate your guidance on how to best voice my concerns around the project and process given my concerns around lack of transparency and property rights violations. In my opinion UI has not been acting in good faith and I am concerned about the fairness of this process overall.

Would you be available to discuss in person or over the phone? I am happy to meet at your convenience.

Thanks,
Karim Mahfouz

646-522-8402

From: Karim Mahfouz <kmahfouz1@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 27, 2023 9:55 AM
To: CSC-DL Siting Council <Siting.Council@ct.gov>
Cc: Carpenter, Jennifer <JCarpenter@fairfieldct.org>; Brenda L. Kupchick, First Selectwoman of Fairfield <firstselectwoman@fairfieldct.org>; Maryann Mahfouz <maryannmahfouz@gmail.com>; Jennifer.Leeper@cga.ct.gov
Subject: Docket 516 - Abutter Property Owner Comment

Dear Sitting Council

I hope this letter finds you well. I am writing to express my strong opposition to Docket 516, which is currently under consideration by the CT sitting council. As a concerned member of the community, I believe this docket poses potential risks and challenges that need to be carefully considered before any decisions are made.

While I understand that the intention behind Docket 516 may be to address certain issues or concerns in our community, I firmly believe that its implementation may have adverse effects on various aspects of our lives. I urge you to take the following points into consideration when evaluating the implications of this docket:

1. Trespassing and removal of screening vegetation without notification or permission on private property. I raised these concerns to UI on June 26, 2023, and they have yet to be addressed despite numerous follow ups. How are we to trust UI and its contractors will respect our property boundaries and rights during construction when they have a track record of ignoring them? During the construction will security be provided while strangers are working in my backyard? Is UI required to officially notify me when they are working on my property? I have never received any official notifications.

2. The height and placement of the new towers and lines on the property lines will negate the effectiveness of existing screening (which UI attempted to remove without my permission), ruin the aesthetics of my property, and diminish the value of my property without consideration.
3. Proposed construction work during irregular hours will negatively impact and disrupt our daily lives. I have school aged children and sleep is critical to success in school.
4. Tall towers and high voltage lines on my property line are a safety concern. They are only rated for Category 3 hurricanes per the evidentiary hearing and given their height and location could land on my property or home in the event they toppled.
5. Relocating the power lines to my property boundary would increase EMF exposure from the current state and limits my ability to develop that part of my property in the future.
6. UI did not use CT's definition of Wetlands when studying and describing the environmental impacts.
7. Lack of community input and concerns around a good faith process - to date my engagement with UI representatives has been quite frustrating. I listened to the July 25th Evidentiary Hearing and heard Leslie Downey misrepresent, cherry pick and diminish my concerns in response to the council's questions. I am concerned the siting council is not getting an accurate picture of the neighborhood concerns and lack of transparency.
8. The situation is particularly frustrating given there is vacant land along the north side of the tracks that could be used for this project. That option seems to have been dismissed by UI due to increased cost without weighing the costs to myself and my neighbors.

In conclusion, I respectfully request that you carefully consider the concerns raised by myself and fellow members of the community before making a decision on Docket 516. The potential consequences of this policy require thoughtful deliberation and a commitment to serving the best interests of the people you represent. I would welcome the opportunity to discuss further.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I hope you will give due consideration to the voice of the community and make decisions that promote the well-being and prosperity of all residents in our beautiful town.

Sincerely,

Karim Mahfouz
South Gate Lane
Southport, CT

