

April 26, 2010

S. Derek Phelps
Executive Director
Connecticut Siting Council
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051

Re: DOCKET NO. 370A –The Connecticut Light & Power Company application for Certificates of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the Manchester Substation to Meekville Junction Circuit Separation Project in Manchester, Connecticut.

Dear Mr. Phelps:

On April 8, 2010, the Connecticut Siting Council (“Council”) requested comments concerning the Petition for Reconsideration of the Denial of a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the Manchester to Meekville Junction Circuit Separation Project (“MMP”) filed in this proceeding by the Connecticut Light and Power Company (“CL&P”) dated April 7, 2010 (“Petition”). With its Petition, CL&P submitted additional evidence which it claims was not available at the time at the time of the Council’s final decision in this case. CL&P requested that the Council open Docket 370 for the limited purpose of reconsidering CL&P’s application for MMP, consider the comparative costs and benefits of the originally proposed MMP project versus the so-called MMP-V project (the alternate configuration considered by the Council in this proceeding) and issue a certificate for either configuration.

By way of background, on March 16, 2010, the Council issued a certificate for the Greater Springfield Reliability Project and found that MMP was needed. The Council, however, denied the certificate for MMP without prejudice in order to allow further consideration of the alternate MMP-V configuration. While the MMP line calls for a 2.2 mile 115 kV transmission line in an existing transmission right-of-way (“ROW”) in Manchester, the MMP-V line calls for a 345 kV line along that same 2.2 miles that also extends an additional 0.1 miles on the south end of the line and an additional 0.4 miles on the northern end of the line.

Richard Blumenthal, Attorney General for the State of Connecticut (“Attorney General”), respectfully submits that any consideration of the MMP-V route and configuration should be preceded by ample notice to both the City of Manchester and any and all residents who may be affected by the

345 kV MMP-V line, especially those that may be affected by the 0.5 mile portions of the MMP-V line which extend beyond the route originally proposed for the MMP line. CL&P's initial application in this case gave no notice or indication that the MMP segment of the project could be 345 kV or that it could extend beyond the initially proposed 2.2 mile route. Moreover, the additional 0.4 miles of 345 kV line contemplated for the northern end of the MMP-V route appears to be proximate to at least four homes.

Therefore, before the Council considers extending a 345 kV line beyond the route initially contemplated, it should require that ample notice is provided to all those affected by the MMP-V project. The Council should also provide those affected by this project with a meaningful opportunity to understand the proposal and participate in the Council's proceeding. Such notice is entirely consistent with Conn. Gen. Stat. § 16-50p(d), which provides that:

[i]f the council determines that the location of all or a part of the proposed facility should be modified, it may condition the certificate upon such modification, provided the municipalities, and persons residing or located in such municipalities, affected by the modification shall have had notice of the application as provided in subsection (b) of section 16-50l.

While Conn. Gen. Stat. § 16-50p(a)(1) does allow the Council in a certification proceeding to grant, deny, or grant "upon such terms, conditions, limitations or modifications of the construction . . . as the council may deem appropriate," the Council should not approve transmission line projects that differ markedly from that which was proposed in the application, either in terms of size (115 kV versus 345 kV, for example) or routing (such as extending the line beyond the route initially proposed), without making absolutely sure that those impacted by the alternate configuration are fully informed and have a reasonable opportunity to participate and be heard in the process.

Sincerely,

RICHARD BLUMENTHAL
ATTORNEY GENERAL

By: _____
Michael C. Wertheimer
Assistant Attorney General
Attorney General's Office
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051
Tel: (860) 827-2603
Fax: (860) 827-2893

cc: Service list