

July 28, 2010

BY ELECTRONIC AND OVERNIGHT DELIVERY

Hon. Daniel F. Caruso, Chairman
and Members of the Connecticut Siting Council
Connecticut Siting Council
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051

Re: Docket No. 388
AT&T Application for Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need
1990 Litchfield Turnpike, Woodbridge, Connecticut

Dear Chairman Caruso and Members of the Council:


Please note our objection to the request to intervene by the Woodbridge Conservation Commission (the "Conservation Commission") dated today July 28, 2010. The Conservation Commission has been on actual notice of AT&T's application since the date of its service of a copy of the application on September 23, 2009, as evidenced in the application of AT&T (the "Applicant"). The Chair of the Conservation Commission provided limited appearance testimony on behalf of the Commission at the hearing on January 12, 2010. The Conservation Commission has also provided post-hearing comments to the Council. In short there has been ample opportunity to intervene prior to today, the day before a final determination of the Council.

Literally, today at 2:37 pm we received the request to intervene and reopen Docket 388. The request at this late date would be unduly prejudicial to the Applicant to grant. Moreover, there are less than 45 days left in the 360-day statutory date for a decision by the Siting Council in this proceeding. Clearly the Conservation Commission engaged the services of Mr. David Maxson and Attorney Ainsworth and requisitioned the information some time ago with the intention of submitting same to the Siting Council. Obviously they could have sought intervention at a much earlier date and have sought to do so now at the very last minute when it is clear the Council is prepared to grant the Applicant's proposal.

We reserve our right to fully respond to the substance of the information contained in the submittal if required. Despite the purported substantive information, we see no substantive evidence proffered which materially addresses actual use and construction of CL&P infrastructure and the actual limitations of utilizing same.

Given the foregoing, we formally request that the Council proceed to a final vote as scheduled based on the prejudice to the Applicant by any other action.

Very truly yours,



Daniel M. Laub

cc: Keith Ainsworth, Esq.; Michele Briggs, AT&T; Christopher B. Fisher, Esq.