



**Connecticut
Light & Power**
The Northeast Utilities System

NEEWS
Interstate
Reliability Project

RECEIVED
FEB - 6 2012
CONNECTICUT
SITING COUNCIL

February 3, 2012

Mr. Robert Stein, Chairman
Connecticut Siting Council
Ten Franklin Square
New Britain, CT

ORIGINAL

Re: Connecticut Siting Council Docket No.424
Interstate Reliability Project
Addition to CL&P's Bulk Filing #3

Dear Chairman Stein:

On January 6, 2012, the statutory deadline, I sent you a letter summarizing advance municipal consultations for the Interstate Reliability Project, including two bulk filings of municipal consultation materials. Subsequently, on January 31, 2012, the Town Manager of Mansfield sent me a letter with that town's comments and recommendations following municipal consultation. Please find enclosed four copies of that letter to be added to the other "Recommendations and Correspondence From Municipalities" as item 3.22 in CL&P's Bulk Filing #3.

I am also enclosing revised indices for CL&P's Bulk Filings #2 and #3 reflecting this addition as well as additions that were sent to you by Carmody and Torrance on January 31, 2012.

Sincerely,

Anthony P. Mele, Project Manager

Enclosure

cc. Mayor Elizabeth C. Patterson, Town of Mansfield, w/ revised BF indices
Service List dated January 26, 2012, w/ revised BF indices

NEW ENGLAND
**EAST - WEST
SOLUTION**

Northeast Utilities System
P.O. Box 270
Hartford, CT 06141-0270

TOWN OF MANSFIELD
OFFICE OF THE TOWN MANAGER



Matthew W. Hart, Town Manager

AUDREY P. BECK BUILDING
FOUR SOUTH EAGLEVILLE ROAD
MANSFIELD, CT 06268-2599
(860) 429-3336
Fax: (860) 429-6863

January 31, 2012

Mr. Anthony Mele
Transmission Project Manager
Northeast Utilities
107 Selden Street
Berlin, CT 06037

Subject: Interstate Reliability Project

Dear Mr. Mele:

Thank you for providing us with the opportunity to review the Municipal Consultation Filing (MCF) for the proposed Interstate Reliability Project. The information provided both at the community open house and at meetings of the Planning and Zoning Commission and Town Council was of great assistance to both Town staff and officials in our review of the proposed project. While the Town recognizes that Northeast Utilities has already submitted its formal application to the Connecticut Siting Council, we wanted to take this opportunity to formally present our position on the proposed project. We respectfully request that the comments and recommendations in this letter be carefully considered as you continue through the siting process.

After reviewing the changes to the proposed project that were submitted as part of the recent MCF, the Town Council found that the changes made to the preferred alternative since the original submission in 2008 do not effectively address concerns regarding impacts to natural resources and communities as a whole. Therefore, we remain opposed to the proposed route through eastern Connecticut. Specifically, the Council finds:

- There is inadequate consideration given to reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, particularly alternate routes such as a highway centric route, that have a less invasive impact on this and other Eastern Connecticut communities;
- There is inadequate consideration given to mitigating the impact of the preferred alternative, such as minimizing the clear cutting of trees and buffering the visual impact of the project;
- There is a high likelihood of detrimental land use impacts to properties in Mansfield and other eastern Connecticut towns through which the project is planned. In particular, the proposed project would detrimentally impact property values for abutting private schools, childcare centers and residences as a result of the visual impact and general market reluctance to locate next to power lines;

- The proposed project would reduce the functional value of existing and potential farmland and the recreational value of Mansfield Hollow State Park; and
- The proposed project will have a detrimental impact to the rural character of the area without any compensating benefit from the proposed transmission lines to this area of the state.

However, the Council also recognizes that should the route through eastern Connecticut be approved by the Connecticut Siting Council, it would be beneficial for the Town to be on record as to what alternatives or variations would minimize the negative impacts listed above. Therefore, while we remain opposed to this route, we offer the following recommendations to minimize the impact on the Town if the route is ultimately approved by the Siting Council:

- **Recommend that the Siting Council require the use of the Mansfield underground variation and a modified Mount Hope underground variation**

The MCF included two underground variations for Mansfield, one which extended from a point southwest of the Woodmont Drive cul-de-sac to a point west of Conantville Brook ('Mansfield Variation') and another which extended from a point north of the Sawmill Brook Lane cul-de-sac to a point northwest of the Hawthorne Lane cul-de-sac ('Mount Hope Variation').

After reviewing the two variations, we believe that it would be in the best interest of the Town to have the Mansfield Underground variation implemented as proposed in the MCF, and to have the Mount Hope Variation implemented with the following modifications:

- Relocate the western terminus of the Mount Hope variation to a point west of Sawmill Brook Lane to minimize the impacts of the transmission line on that residential neighborhood; and
- Relocate the eastern terminus to west of Route 195/Storrs Road to minimize impacts on farmland located east of Route 195.

As part of the implementation of any underground variation, we respectfully request that the transition stations be designed using the smallest footprint possible to reduce the amount of clearing needed for the stations. Additionally, these stations should be screened from surrounding properties by mature vegetation.

The benefits offered by placing the proposed transmission line underground include:

- Elimination of electrical magnetic field concerns for surrounding residential areas;
- Significant reduction in the amount of vegetation that must be cleared; and
- Elimination of the visual impacts of the second overhead transmission line.

Use of these variations is consistent with Section 16-50(p)(i) of the Connecticut General Statutes addresses undergrounding of new 345 kilovolt facilities:

For a facility described in subdivision (1) of subsection (a) of section 16-50i, with a capacity of three hundred forty-five kilovolts or greater, there shall be a presumption that a proposal to place the overhead portions, if any, of such facility adjacent to residential areas, private or public schools, licensed child day care facilities, licensed youth camps or public playgrounds is inconsistent with the purposes of this chapter. An applicant may rebut this presumption by demonstrating to the council that it will be technologically infeasible to bury the facility. In determining such infeasibility, the council shall consider the effect of burying the facility on the reliability of the electric transmission system of the state and whether the cost of any

contemplated technology or design configuration may result in an unreasonable economic burden on the ratepayers of the state.

▪ **Recommend that the Siting Council require the use of EMF Best Management Practices Poles between Route 195 and Mansfield Hollow**

As noted above, the Town has recommended that the eastern terminus of the Mount Hope underground variation be moved to the west side of Route 195 to minimize impacts on the active farmland located east of 195. However, as the area between Route 195 and Mansfield Hollow also contains the Mount Hope Montessori School, Green Dragon Daycare as well as numerous homes, additional mitigation of EMF impacts is needed to protect the residents and children attending school in the area. Therefore, the Town recommends that the EMF Best Management Practices (BMP) Poles be implemented between the eastern terminus of the modified Mount Hope underground variation described above and Mansfield Hollow.

The benefits offered by using EMF best management practices poles as described above include:

- Reduction of electrical magnetic field concerns for surrounding residential areas, the Mount Hope Montessori School and the Green Dragon Day Care Center; and
- Significant reduction in the amount of vegetation that must be cleared.

▪ **Recommend that the Siting Council require the use of the Hawthorne Lane Alternative**

As proposed, implementation of the preferred alternative in the vicinity of the Hawthorne Park subdivision would result in the loss of the visual buffer currently screening the existing transmission line from the homes located to the north of the cul-de-sac. The affected homeowners have been working with Northeast Utilities for several years on an alternative that would shift both the existing and proposed lines to the south, allowing the existing mature trees and vegetated buffer to remain. The Hawthorne Lane Alternative includes the relocation of the existing transmission line to the south, away from homes developed as part of the Hawthorne Park subdivision. As the preferred alternative would significantly degrade the properties located on the north side of the Hawthorne Lane cul-de-sac, the Town recommends that the Hawthorne Lane alternative be implemented in conjunction with the use of EMF BMP poles recommended above. To facilitate this alternative, the Town is in the process of amending an existing conservation easement to remove the area that would be crossed by the transmission lines.

▪ **Recommend that the Siting Council require the use of Design Option 2 for Mansfield Hollow**

Due to the limited right-of-way through Mansfield Hollow (150 feet as compared to 300 feet elsewhere), Northeast Utilities included two design options in the MCF to reduce right-of-way acquisition and clearing through the Hollow. Use of Design Option 2 would eliminate the need for any additional right-of-way and restrict clearing required for the new transmission line to the existing right-of-way. As this option is the least invasive, the Town recommends its use to protect the natural resources of the Hollow and minimize both the visual and physical impacts on the surrounding parkland.

▪ **Recommend Protection of Active Farmland**

As shown on the attached aerial photograph, the transmission route runs through active farmland. To minimize impacts on working farms, the Town recommends that the Siting Council require strict adherence to various mitigation measures by Northeast Utilities to minimize impacts on working farms. Such measures include but are not limited to: limiting

construction to non-crop/harvest seasons, ensuring that any soils disturbed or compacted through the process are restored to pre-construction conditions, ensuring that erosion and sedimentation controls are installed and monitored during construction, and financially compensating farmers for impacts to crop production caused by project construction and maintenance activities.

Please contact either myself or Linda M. Painter, Director of Planning and Development, if you have any questions regarding the comments and recommendations contained in this letter.

Sincerely,



Matthew W. Hart
Town Manager

Cc: Linda Roberts, Executive Director, Connecticut Siting Council
State Senator Donald Williams
State Representative Gregory Haddad
United States Representative Joseph Courtney
Mark Paquette, Executive Director, Windham Region Council of Governments
Town Council
Planning and Zoning Commission
Conservation Commission
Agriculture Committee



TOWN OF MANSFIELD
OFFICE OF THE TOWN MANAGER

Matthew W. Hart, Town Manager

AUDREY P. BECK BUILDING
FOUR SOUTH EAGLEVILLE ROAD
MANSFIELD, CT 06268-2599
(860) 429-3336
Fax: (860) 429-6863

January 31, 2012

Mr. Anthony Mele
Transmission Project Manager
Northeast Utilities
107 Selden Street
Berlin, CT 06037

Subject: Interstate Reliability Project

Dear Mr. Mele:

Thank you for providing us with the opportunity to review the Municipal Consultation Filing (MCF) for the proposed Interstate Reliability Project. The information provided both at the community open house and at meetings of the Planning and Zoning Commission and Town Council was of great assistance to both Town staff and officials in our review of the proposed project. While the Town recognizes that Northeast Utilities has already submitted its formal application to the Connecticut Siting Council, we wanted to take this opportunity to formally present our position on the proposed project. We respectfully request that the comments and recommendations in this letter be carefully considered as you continue through the siting process.

After reviewing the changes to the proposed project that were submitted as part of the recent MCF, the Town Council found that the changes made to the preferred alternative since the original submission in 2008 do not effectively address concerns regarding impacts to natural resources and communities as a whole. Therefore, we remain opposed to the proposed route through eastern Connecticut. Specifically, the Council finds:

- There is inadequate consideration given to reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, particularly alternate routes such as a highway centric route, that have a less invasive impact on this and other Eastern Connecticut communities;
- There is inadequate consideration given to mitigating the impact of the preferred alternative, such as minimizing the clear cutting of trees and buffering the visual impact of the project;
- There is a high likelihood of detrimental land use impacts to properties in Mansfield and other eastern Connecticut towns through which the project is planned. In particular, the proposed project would detrimentally impact property values for abutting private schools, childcare centers and residences as a result of the visual impact and general market reluctance to locate next to power lines;

- The proposed project would reduce the functional value of existing and potential farmland and the recreational value of Mansfield Hollow State Park; and
- The proposed project will have a detrimental impact to the rural character of the area without any compensating benefit from the proposed transmission lines to this area of the state.

However, the Council also recognizes that should the route through eastern Connecticut be approved by the Connecticut Siting Council, it would be beneficial for the Town to be on record as to what alternatives or variations would minimize the negative impacts listed above. Therefore, while we remain opposed to this route, we offer the following recommendations to minimize the impact on the Town if the route is ultimately approved by the Siting Council:

- **Recommend that the Siting Council require the use of the Mansfield underground variation and a modified Mount Hope underground variation**

The MCF included two underground variations for Mansfield, one which extended from a point southwest of the Woodmont Drive cul-de-sac to a point west of Conantville Brook ("Mansfield Variation") and another which extended from a point north of the Sawmill Brook Lane cul-de-sac to a point northwest of the Hawthorne Lane cul-de-sac ("Mount Hope Variation").

After reviewing the two variations, we believe that it would be in the best interest of the Town to have the Mansfield Underground variation implemented as proposed in the MCF, and to have the Mount Hope Variation implemented with the following modifications:

- Relocate the western terminus of the Mount Hope variation to a point west of Sawmill Brook Lane to minimize the impacts of the transmission line on that residential neighborhood; and
- Relocate the eastern terminus to west of Route 195/Storrs Road to minimize impacts on farmland located east of Route 195.

As part of the implementation of any underground variation, we respectfully request that the transition stations be designed using the smallest footprint possible to reduce the amount of clearing needed for the stations. Additionally, these stations should be screened from surrounding properties by mature vegetation.

The benefits offered by placing the proposed transmission line underground include:

- Elimination of electrical magnetic field concerns for surrounding residential areas;
- Significant reduction in the amount of vegetation that must be cleared; and
- Elimination of the visual impacts of the second overhead transmission line.

Use of these variations is consistent with Section 16-50(p)(i) of the Connecticut General Statutes addresses undergrounding of new 345 kilovolt facilities:

For a facility described in subdivision (1) of subsection (a) of section 16-50i, with a capacity of three hundred forty-five kilovolts or greater, there shall be a presumption that a proposal to place the overhead portions, if any, of such facility adjacent to residential areas, private or public schools, licensed child day care facilities, licensed youth camps or public playgrounds is inconsistent with the purposes of this chapter. An applicant may rebut this presumption by demonstrating to the council that it will be technologically infeasible to bury the facility. In determining such infeasibility, the council shall consider the effect of burying the facility on the reliability of the electric transmission system of the state and whether the cost of any

contemplated technology or design configuration may result in an unreasonable economic burden on the ratepayers of the state.

▪ **Recommend that the Siting Council require the use of EMF Best Management Practices Poles between Route 195 and Mansfield Hollow**

As noted above, the Town has recommended that the eastern terminus of the Mount Hope underground variation be moved to the west side of Route 195 to minimize impacts on the active farmland located east of 195. However, as the area between Route 195 and Mansfield Hollow also contains the Mount Hope Montessori School, Green Dragon Daycare as well as numerous homes, additional mitigation of EMF impacts is needed to protect the residents and children attending school in the area. Therefore, the Town recommends that the EMF Best Management Practices (BMP) Poles be implemented between the eastern terminus of the modified Mount Hope underground variation described above and Mansfield Hollow.

The benefits offered by using EMF best management practices poles as described above include:

- Reduction of electrical magnetic field concerns for surrounding residential areas, the Mount Hope Montessori School and the Green Dragon Day Care Center; and
- Significant reduction in the amount of vegetation that must be cleared.

▪ **Recommend that the Siting Council require the use of the Hawthorne Lane Alternative**

As proposed, implementation of the preferred alternative in the vicinity of the Hawthorne Park subdivision would result in the loss of the visual buffer currently screening the existing transmission line from the homes located to the north of the cul-de-sac. The affected homeowners have been working with Northeast Utilities for several years on an alternative that would shift both the existing and proposed lines to the south, allowing the existing mature trees and vegetated buffer to remain. The Hawthorne Lane Alternative includes the relocation of the existing transmission line to the south, away from homes developed as part of the Hawthorne Park subdivision. As the preferred alternative would significantly degrade the properties located on the north side of the Hawthorne Lane cul-de-sac, the Town recommends that the Hawthorne Lane alternative be implemented in conjunction with the use of EMF BMP poles recommended above. To facilitate this alternative, the Town is in the process of amending an existing conservation easement to remove the area that would be crossed by the transmission lines.

▪ **Recommend that the Siting Council require the use of Design Option 2 for Mansfield Hollow**

Due to the limited right-of-way through Mansfield Hollow (150 feet as compared to 300 feet elsewhere), Northeast Utilities included two design options in the MCF to reduce right-of-way acquisition and clearing through the Hollow. Use of Design Option 2 would eliminate the need for any additional right-of-way and restrict clearing required for the new transmission line to the existing right-of-way. As this option is the least invasive, the Town recommends its use to protect the natural resources of the Hollow and minimize both the visual and physical impacts on the surrounding parkland.

▪ **Recommend Protection of Active Farmland**

As shown on the attached aerial photograph, the transmission route runs through active farmland. To minimize impacts on working farms, the Town recommends that the Siting Council require strict adherence to various mitigation measures by Northeast Utilities to minimize impacts on working farms. Such measures include but are not limited to: limiting

construction to non-crop/harvest seasons, ensuring that any soils disturbed or compacted through the process are restored to pre-construction conditions, ensuring that erosion and sedimentation controls are installed and monitored during construction, and financially compensating farmers for impacts to crop production caused by project construction and maintenance activities.

Please contact either myself or Linda M. Painter, Director of Planning and Development, if you have any questions regarding the comments and recommendations contained in this letter.

Sincerely,



Matthew W. Hart
Town Manager

Cc: Linda Roberts, Executive Director, Connecticut Siting Council
State Senator Donald Williams
State Representative Gregory Haddad
United States Representative Joseph Courtney
Mark Paquette, Executive Director, Windham Region Council of Governments
Town Council
Planning and Zoning Commission
Conservation Commission
Agriculture Committee



TOWN OF MANSFIELD
OFFICE OF THE TOWN MANAGER

Matthew W. Hart, Town Manager

AUDREY P. BECK BUILDING
FOUR SOUTH EAGLEVILLE ROAD
MANSFIELD, CT 06268-2599
(860) 429-3336
Fax: (860) 429-6863

January 31, 2012

Mr. Anthony Mele
Transmission Project Manager
Northeast Utilities
107 Selden Street
Berlin, CT 06037

Subject: Interstate Reliability Project

Dear Mr. Mele:

Thank you for providing us with the opportunity to review the Municipal Consultation Filing (MCF) for the proposed Interstate Reliability Project. The information provided both at the community open house and at meetings of the Planning and Zoning Commission and Town Council was of great assistance to both Town staff and officials in our review of the proposed project. While the Town recognizes that Northeast Utilities has already submitted its formal application to the Connecticut Siting Council, we wanted to take this opportunity to formally present our position on the proposed project. We respectfully request that the comments and recommendations in this letter be carefully considered as you continue through the siting process.

After reviewing the changes to the proposed project that were submitted as part of the recent MCF, the Town Council found that the changes made to the preferred alternative since the original submission in 2008 do not effectively address concerns regarding impacts to natural resources and communities as a whole. Therefore, we remain opposed to the proposed route through eastern Connecticut. Specifically, the Council finds:

- There is inadequate consideration given to reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, particularly alternate routes such as a highway centric route, that have a less invasive impact on this and other Eastern Connecticut communities;
- There is inadequate consideration given to mitigating the impact of the preferred alternative, such as minimizing the clear cutting of trees and buffering the visual impact of the project;
- There is a high likelihood of detrimental land use impacts to properties in Mansfield and other eastern Connecticut towns through which the project is planned. In particular, the proposed project would detrimentally impact property values for abutting private schools, childcare centers and residences as a result of the visual impact and general market reluctance to locate next to power lines;

- The proposed project would reduce the functional value of existing and potential farmland and the recreational value of Mansfield Hollow State Park; and
- The proposed project will have a detrimental impact to the rural character of the area without any compensating benefit from the proposed transmission lines to this area of the state.

However, the Council also recognizes that should the route through eastern Connecticut be approved by the Connecticut Siting Council, it would be beneficial for the Town to be on record as to what alternatives or variations would minimize the negative impacts listed above. Therefore, while we remain opposed to this route, we offer the following recommendations to minimize the impact on the Town if the route is ultimately approved by the Siting Council:

- **Recommend that the Siting Council require the use of the Mansfield underground variation and a modified Mount Hope underground variation**

The MCF included two underground variations for Mansfield, one which extended from a point southwest of the Woodmont Drive cul-de-sac to a point west of Conantville Brook ('Mansfield Variation') and another which extended from a point north of the Sawmill Brook Lane cul-de-sac to a point northwest of the Hawthorne Lane cul-de-sac ('Mount Hope Variation').

After reviewing the two variations, we believe that it would be in the best interest of the Town to have the Mansfield Underground variation implemented as proposed in the MCF, and to have the Mount Hope Variation implemented with the following modifications:

- Relocate the western terminus of the Mount Hope variation to a point west of Sawmill Brook Lane to minimize the impacts of the transmission line on that residential neighborhood; and
- Relocate the eastern terminus to west of Route 195/Storrs Road to minimize impacts on farmland located east of Route 195.

As part of the implementation of any underground variation, we respectfully request that the transition stations be designed using the smallest footprint possible to reduce the amount of clearing needed for the stations. Additionally, these stations should be screened from surrounding properties by mature vegetation.

The benefits offered by placing the proposed transmission line underground include:

- Elimination of electrical magnetic field concerns for surrounding residential areas;
- Significant reduction in the amount of vegetation that must be cleared; and
- Elimination of the visual impacts of the second overhead transmission line.

Use of these variations is consistent with Section 16-50(p)(i) of the Connecticut General Statutes addresses undergrounding of new 345 kilovolt facilities:

For a facility described in subdivision (1) of subsection (a) of section 16-50i, with a capacity of three hundred forty-five kilovolts or greater, there shall be a presumption that a proposal to place the overhead portions, if any, of such facility adjacent to residential areas, private or public schools, licensed child day care facilities, licensed youth camps or public playgrounds is inconsistent with the purposes of this chapter. An applicant may rebut this presumption by demonstrating to the council that it will be technologically infeasible to bury the facility. In determining such infeasibility, the council shall consider the effect of burying the facility on the reliability of the electric transmission system of the state and whether the cost of any

contemplated technology or design configuration may result in an unreasonable economic burden on the ratepayers of the state.

▪ **Recommend that the Siting Council require the use of EMF Best Management Practices Poles between Route 195 and Mansfield Hollow**

As noted above, the Town has recommended that the eastern terminus of the Mount Hope underground variation be moved to the west side of Route 195 to minimize impacts on the active farmland located east of 195. However, as the area between Route 195 and Mansfield Hollow also contains the Mount Hope Montessori School, Green Dragon Daycare as well as numerous homes, additional mitigation of EMF impacts is needed to protect the residents and children attending school in the area. Therefore, the Town recommends that the EMF Best Management Practices (BMP) Poles be implemented between the eastern terminus of the modified Mount Hope underground variation described above and Mansfield Hollow.

The benefits offered by using EMF best management practices poles as described above include:

- Reduction of electrical magnetic field concerns for surrounding residential areas, the Mount Hope Montessori School and the Green Dragon Day Care Center; and
- Significant reduction in the amount of vegetation that must be cleared.

▪ **Recommend that the Siting Council require the use of the Hawthorne Lane Alternative**

As proposed, implementation of the preferred alternative in the vicinity of the Hawthorne Park subdivision would result in the loss of the visual buffer currently screening the existing transmission line from the homes located to the north of the cul-de-sac. The affected homeowners have been working with Northeast Utilities for several years on an alternative that would shift both the existing and proposed lines to the south, allowing the existing mature trees and vegetated buffer to remain. The Hawthorne Lane Alternative includes the relocation of the existing transmission line to the south, away from homes developed as part of the Hawthorne Park subdivision. As the preferred alternative would significantly degrade the properties located on the north side of the Hawthorne Lane cul-de-sac, the Town recommends that the Hawthorne Lane alternative be implemented in conjunction with the use of EMF BMP poles recommended above. To facilitate this alternative, the Town is in the process of amending an existing conservation easement to remove the area that would be crossed by the transmission lines.

▪ **Recommend that the Siting Council require the use of Design Option 2 for Mansfield Hollow**

Due to the limited right-of-way through Mansfield Hollow (150 feet as compared to 300 feet elsewhere), Northeast Utilities included two design options in the MCF to reduce right-of-way acquisition and clearing through the Hollow. Use of Design Option 2 would eliminate the need for any additional right-of-way and restrict clearing required for the new transmission line to the existing right-of-way. As this option is the least invasive, the Town recommends its use to protect the natural resources of the Hollow and minimize both the visual and physical impacts on the surrounding parkland.

▪ **Recommend Protection of Active Farmland**

As shown on the attached aerial photograph, the transmission route runs through active farmland. To minimize impacts on working farms, the Town recommends that the Siting Council require strict adherence to various mitigation measures by Northeast Utilities to minimize impacts on working farms. Such measures include but are not limited to: limiting

construction to non-crop/harvest seasons, ensuring that any soils disturbed or compacted through the process are restored to pre-construction conditions, ensuring that erosion and sedimentation controls are installed and monitored during construction, and financially compensating farmers for impacts to crop production caused by project construction and maintenance activities.

Please contact either myself or Linda M. Painter, Director of Planning and Development, if you have any questions regarding the comments and recommendations contained in this letter.

Sincerely,



Matthew W. Hart
Town Manager

Cc: Linda Roberts, Executive Director, Connecticut Siting Council
State Senator Donald Williams
State Representative Gregory Haddad
United States Representative Joseph Courtney
Mark Paquette, Executive Director, Windham Region Council of Governments
Town Council
Planning and Zoning Commission
Conservation Commission
Agriculture Committee

TOWN OF MANSFIELD
OFFICE OF THE TOWN MANAGER



Matthew W. Hart, Town Manager

AUDREY P. BECK BUILDING
FOUR SOUTH EAGLEVILLE ROAD
MANSFIELD, CT 06268-2599
(860) 429-3336
Fax: (860) 429-6863

January 31, 2012

Mr. Anthony Mele
Transmission Project Manager
Northeast Utilities
107 Selden Street
Berlin, CT 06037

Subject: Interstate Reliability Project

Dear Mr. Mele:

Thank you for providing us with the opportunity to review the Municipal Consultation Filing (MCF) for the proposed Interstate Reliability Project. The information provided both at the community open house and at meetings of the Planning and Zoning Commission and Town Council was of great assistance to both Town staff and officials in our review of the proposed project. While the Town recognizes that Northeast Utilities has already submitted its formal application to the Connecticut Siting Council, we wanted to take this opportunity to formally present our position on the proposed project. We respectfully request that the comments and recommendations in this letter be carefully considered as you continue through the siting process.

After reviewing the changes to the proposed project that were submitted as part of the recent MCF, the Town Council found that the changes made to the preferred alternative since the original submission in 2008 do not effectively address concerns regarding impacts to natural resources and communities as a whole. Therefore, we remain opposed to the proposed route through eastern Connecticut. Specifically, the Council finds:

- There is inadequate consideration given to reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, particularly alternate routes such as a highway centric route, that have a less invasive impact on this and other Eastern Connecticut communities;
- There is inadequate consideration given to mitigating the impact of the preferred alternative, such as minimizing the clear cutting of trees and buffering the visual impact of the project;
- There is a high likelihood of detrimental land use impacts to properties in Mansfield and other eastern Connecticut towns through which the project is planned. In particular, the proposed project would detrimentally impact property values for abutting private schools, childcare centers and residences as a result of the visual impact and general market reluctance to locate next to power lines;

- The proposed project would reduce the functional value of existing and potential farmland and the recreational value of Mansfield Hollow State Park; and
- The proposed project will have a detrimental impact to the rural character of the area without any compensating benefit from the proposed transmission lines to this area of the state.

However, the Council also recognizes that should the route through eastern Connecticut be approved by the Connecticut Siting Council, it would be beneficial for the Town to be on record as to what alternatives or variations would minimize the negative impacts listed above. Therefore, while we remain opposed to this route, we offer the following recommendations to minimize the impact on the Town if the route is ultimately approved by the Siting Council:

- **Recommend that the Siting Council require the use of the Mansfield underground variation and a modified Mount Hope underground variation**

The MCF included two underground variations for Mansfield, one which extended from a point southwest of the Woodmont Drive cul-de-sac to a point west of Conantville Brook ('Mansfield Variation') and another which extended from a point north of the Sawmill Brook Lane cul-de-sac to a point northwest of the Hawthorne Lane cul-de-sac ('Mount Hope Variation').

After reviewing the two variations, we believe that it would be in the best interest of the Town to have the Mansfield Underground variation implemented as proposed in the MCF, and to have the Mount Hope Variation implemented with the following modifications:

- Relocate the western terminus of the Mount Hope variation to a point west of Sawmill Brook Lane to minimize the impacts of the transmission line on that residential neighborhood; and
- Relocate the eastern terminus to west of Route 195/Storrs Road to minimize impacts on farmland located east of Route 195.

As part of the implementation of any underground variation, we respectfully request that the transition stations be designed using the smallest footprint possible to reduce the amount of clearing needed for the stations. Additionally, these stations should be screened from surrounding properties by mature vegetation.

The benefits offered by placing the proposed transmission line underground include:

- Elimination of electrical magnetic field concerns for surrounding residential areas;
- Significant reduction in the amount of vegetation that must be cleared; and
- Elimination of the visual impacts of the second overhead transmission line.

Use of these variations is consistent with Section 16-50(p)(i) of the Connecticut General Statutes addresses undergrounding of new 345 kilovolt facilities:

For a facility described in subdivision (1) of subsection (a) of section 16-50i, with a capacity of three hundred forty-five kilovolts or greater, there shall be a presumption that a proposal to place the overhead portions, if any, of such facility adjacent to residential areas, private or public schools, licensed child day care facilities, licensed youth camps or public playgrounds is inconsistent with the purposes of this chapter. An applicant may rebut this presumption by demonstrating to the council that it will be technologically infeasible to bury the facility. In determining such infeasibility, the council shall consider the effect of burying the facility on the reliability of the electric transmission system of the state and whether the cost of any

contemplated technology or design configuration may result in an unreasonable economic burden on the ratepayers of the state.

▪ **Recommend that the Siting Council require the use of EMF Best Management Practices Poles between Route 195 and Mansfield Hollow**

As noted above, the Town has recommended that the eastern terminus of the Mount Hope underground variation be moved to the west side of Route 195 to minimize impacts on the active farmland located east of 195. However, as the area between Route 195 and Mansfield Hollow also contains the Mount Hope Montessori School, Green Dragon Daycare as well as numerous homes, additional mitigation of EMF impacts is needed to protect the residents and children attending school in the area. Therefore, the Town recommends that the EMF Best Management Practices (BMP) Poles be implemented between the eastern terminus of the modified Mount Hope underground variation described above and Mansfield Hollow.

The benefits offered by using EMF best management practices poles as described above include:

- Reduction of electrical magnetic field concerns for surrounding residential areas, the Mount Hope Montessori School and the Green Dragon Day Care Center; and
- Significant reduction in the amount of vegetation that must be cleared.

▪ **Recommend that the Siting Council require the use of the Hawthorne Lane Alternative**

As proposed, implementation of the preferred alternative in the vicinity of the Hawthorne Park subdivision would result in the loss of the visual buffer currently screening the existing transmission line from the homes located to the north of the cul-de-sac. The affected homeowners have been working with Northeast Utilities for several years on an alternative that would shift both the existing and proposed lines to the south, allowing the existing mature trees and vegetated buffer to remain. The Hawthorne Lane Alternative includes the relocation of the existing transmission line to the south, away from homes developed as part of the Hawthorne Park subdivision. As the preferred alternative would significantly degrade the properties located on the north side of the Hawthorne Lane cul-de-sac, the Town recommends that the Hawthorne Lane alternative be implemented in conjunction with the use of EMF BMP poles recommended above. To facilitate this alternative, the Town is in the process of amending an existing conservation easement to remove the area that would be crossed by the transmission lines.

▪ **Recommend that the Siting Council require the use of Design Option 2 for Mansfield Hollow**

Due to the limited right-of-way through Mansfield Hollow (150 feet as compared to 300 feet elsewhere), Northeast Utilities included two design options in the MCF to reduce right-of-way acquisition and clearing through the Hollow. Use of Design Option 2 would eliminate the need for any additional right-of-way and restrict clearing required for the new transmission line to the existing right-of-way. As this option is the least invasive, the Town recommends its use to protect the natural resources of the Hollow and minimize both the visual and physical impacts on the surrounding parkland.

▪ **Recommend Protection of Active Farmland**

As shown on the attached aerial photograph, the transmission route runs through active farmland. To minimize impacts on working farms, the Town recommends that the Siting Council require strict adherence to various mitigation measures by Northeast Utilities to minimize impacts on working farms. Such measures include but are not limited to: limiting

construction to non-crop/harvest seasons, ensuring that any soils disturbed or compacted through the process are restored to pre-construction conditions, ensuring that erosion and sedimentation controls are installed and monitored during construction, and financially compensating farmers for impacts to crop production caused by project construction and maintenance activities.

Please contact either myself or Linda M. Painter, Director of Planning and Development, if you have any questions regarding the comments and recommendations contained in this letter.

Sincerely,



Matthew W. Hart
Town Manager

Cc: Linda Roberts, Executive Director, Connecticut Siting Council
State Senator Donald Williams
State Representative Gregory Haddad
United States Representative Joseph Courtney
Mark Paquette, Executive Director, Windham Region Council of Governments
Town Council
Planning and Zoning Commission
Conservation Commission
Agriculture Committee

BULK FILING 3 INDEX (Revised February 3, 2012)

Recommendations and Correspondence From Municipalities

- 3.1 Town of Brooklyn letter, October 21, 2008
- 3.2 Town of Mansfield letter, October 30, 2008
- 3.3 Town of Lebanon letter, November 17, 2008
- 3.4 Town of Chaplin letter, December 1, 2008
- 3.5 Town of Mansfield letter, December 1, 2008
- 3.6 Town of Windham letter, December 3, 2008
- 3.7 Town of Mansfield Conservation Commission letter, February 24, 2009
- 3.8 Town of Thompson Conservation Commission letter, August 4, 2009
- 3.9 Town of Windham letter, December 8, 2011
- 3.10 Town of Brooklyn letter, December 21, 2011
- 3.22 Town of Mansfield letter, January 31, 2012

Written Public Comments

- 3.11 Brooklyn Comments:
 - Joel and Beverly Rosenberg, 2008 Open House Comment
 - Bigelow Hollow Fish & Game Club, 2008 Open House Comment
 - Heidi Nottelman, 2008 Open House Comment
- 3.12 Chaplin Comments:
 - Aaron Geromin, email dated May 31, 2011
 - Hill & Andrea Bullard, 2008 Open House Comment
 - Sarah Bullard & Dennis Thibeault, 2008 Open House Comment
- 3.13 Columbia Comments:
 - Richard Tarasio, Mansfield 2011 Open House Comment
- 3.14 Coventry Comments:
 - Unknown , 2008 Open House Comment
- 3.15 Hampton Comments:
 - Joanne Freeman, 2008 Open House Comment
 - Patrick Navin, 2008 Open House Comment
 - Richard Ross, Letter to Hampton Conservation Commission, October 8, 2008
- 3.16 Killingly Comments:
 - Faith Dugan, Killingly Open House, August 2011
 - Unknown, 2008 Open House comment
- 3.17 Lebanon Comments:

Unknown, Mansfield Open House comment, December 2011
Ed Hinkel, 2008 Open House comment

Lynn Ann Felber, 2008 Open House comment
Krause, 2008 Open House comment

3.18 Mansfield Comments:

Friends of Mansfield Hollow letter to Mansfield Town Manager Matt Hart, August 30, 2008
Friends of Mansfield Hollow letter, September 27, 2011
Project Manager Tony Mele's letter to Friends of Mansfield Hollow, October 25, 2011

David & Lauren Gosselin email, December 12, 2011
Tom Riguier, Mansfield Open House comment, December 2011
George Jacobi email, December 9, 2011

Victor Civie, Open House Comment 2008
Victor Civie letter, July 15, 2009
Anthony Fitzgerald letter to Civie attorney, August 12, 2009
Victor Civie letter, September 23, 2009
Victor & Richard Civie, Killingly Open House comment, August 2011
Victor & Richard Civie email, September 27, 2011
Victor & Richard Civie letter, December 21, 2011

Tom, Palmiria & Gabriel Mindek letter, October 26, 2008
Wayne & Chris Hawthorne letter, October 26, 2008
Scott & Christine Welden letter, October 26, 2008
Tracy & Brandon Hawthorne letter, October 26, 2008
Project Manager Tony Mele's letter to Hawthorne Lane residents, August 16, 2011

Mt. Hope School letter to Mayor Paterson, October 23, 2008
M. Campbell, 2008 Open House comment
Susan O'Keefe, 2008 Open House comment
Don Hoyle, 2008 Open House comment

Diane Dorfer email, October 28, 2008
Diane Dorfer letter, November 10, 2008

Arlen Albert letter to Mansfield Town Council, October 27, 2008

Mike and Miriam Kurland email, January 9, 2012
Coleen Spurlock email, January 10, 2012

3.19 Thompson Comments:

Raymond Dewey, Killingly Open House comment, August 2011
Al Landry, 2008 Open House comment
Al Landry, Killingly Open House comment, August 2011

3.20 Windham:

Jean De Smet, Mansfield Open House comment, December 2011
Stephanie Smith email, January 9, 2012
Deborah Russell email, January 20, 2012

3.21 Mansfield

Civie Letter to Kathy Shea, undated
CL&P Response to Civie, December 22, 2011

Bulk Filing 2 Index (Revised February 3, 2012)

Municipal Consultation Filing of August 19, 2008

- 2.1 Municipal Consultation Filing of August 19, 2008
- 2.2 CL&P Presentation to Lebanon's First Selectman Joyce Okonuk, August 14, 2008
- 2.3 CL&P Presentation to Coventry's Town Manager John Elsesser, August 22, 2008
- 2.4 CL&P Presentation to Columbia's First Selectman Donald Cianci, September 8, 2008
- 2.5 CL&P Presentation to Windham's Board of Selectmen, September 16, 2008
- 2.6 CL&P Presentation to Chaplin's First Selectman Bob Dubos, September 16, 2008
- 2.7 CL&P Presentation to Mansfield's Town Manager Matt Hart, October 1, 2008
- 2.8 CL&P Presentation to Hampton's Conservation Commission, October 21, 2008
- 2.9 CL&P Presentation to Killingly's Town Manager Bruce Benway, October 21, 2008
- 2.10 CL&P Presentation to Lebanon's First Selectman Joyce Okonuk, August 13, 2009
- 2.11 CL&P Presentation to Brooklyn's First Selectman Austin Tanner, March 17, 2011
- 2.12 CL&P Presentation to Columbia's First Selectman Carmen Vance, March 24, 2011
- 2.13 CL&P Presentation to Hampton's First Selectman Kate Donnelly, March 24, 2011
- 2.14 CL&P Presentation to Chaplin's First Selectman William Rose, April 21, 2011

Supplemental Municipal Consultation Filing of July 19, 2011

- 2.15 Supplemental Municipal Consultation Filing of July 19, 2011
- 2.16 CL&P Presentation to Mansfield's Town Manager Matt Hart, July 15, 2011
- 2.17 CL&P Presentation to Chaplin's First Selectman William Rose, July 21, 2011
- 2.18 CL&P Presentation to Putnam's Mayor Bob Viens, July 27, 2011
- 2.19 CL&P Presentation to Killingly's Town Manager Bruce Benway, July 27, 2011
- 2.20 CL&P Presentation to Thompson's First Selectman Larry Groh, July 27, 2011
- 2.21 CL&P Presentation to Columbia's First Selectman Carmen Vance, July 29, 2011
- 2.22 CL&P Presentation to Lebanon's First Selectman Joyce Okonuk, July 29, 2011
- 2.23 CL&P Presentation to Pomfret's Board of Selectmen, August 1, 2011
- 2.24 CL&P Presentation to Brooklyn's First Selectman Austin Tanner, August 4, 2011
- 2.25 CL&P Presentation to Coventry's Town Manager John Elsesser, August 4, 2011

2.26 CL&P Presentation to Hampton's First Selectman Kate Donnelly, August 4, 2011

2.27 CL&P Presentation to Mansfield's Town Council, August 22, 2011

2.28 CL&P Presentation to Hampton's Board of Selectmen, December 5, 2011

Correspondence to Municipal Officials

2.29 CL&P Letter to Mayor's and First Selectman, accompanying the official Municipal Consultation Filing, August 19, 2008

2.30 CL&P Letter to Brooklyn's First Selectman Roger Engle, September 11, 2008, MCF Process and Open House date

2.31 CL&P Letter to Hampton's First Selectman Maurice Bisson, September 11, 2008, MCF Process and Open House date

2.32 CL&P Letter to Mansfield's Town Manager Matt Hart, September 11, 2008, MCF Process and Open House date

2.33 CL&P Letter to Brooklyn's First Selectman Roger Engle, September 11, 2008, MCF Process and Open House date

2.34 CL&P Letter to Pomfret's First Selectman Jim Rivers, September 11, 2008, MCF Process and Open House date

2.35 CL&P Letter to Putnam's Mayor Bob Viens, September 11, 2008, MCF Process and Open House date

2.36 CL&P Letter to Thompson's First Selectman Larry Groh, September 11, 2008, MCF Process and Open House date

2.37 CL&P Letter to Killingly's Chairman of the Town Council Robert Young, November 25, 2008, Open House Comments

2.38 CL&P Letter to Putnam's Mayor Bob Viens, November 25, 2008, Open House Comments

2.39 CL&P Letter to Thompson's First Selectman Larry Groh, Jr., November 25, 2008, Open House Comments

2.40 CL&P Letter to Lebanon's First Selectman Joyce Okonuk, November 25, 2008, Open House Comments

2.41 CL&P Letter to Chaplin First Selectman Robert Dubos, November 25, 2008, Open House Comments

2.42 CL&P Letter to Coventry's Town Council Chairman Elizabeth Wolf, November 25, 2008, Open House Comments

2.43 CL&P Letter to Hampton's First Selectman Maurice Bisson, November 25, 2008, Open House Comments

2.44 CL&P Letter to Mansfield's Mayor Elizabeth Paterson, November 25, 2008, Open House Comments

2.45 CL&P Letter to Pomfret's First Selectman Jim Rivers, November 25, 2008, Open House Comments

- 2.46 CL&P Letter to Putnam's Mayor Bob Viens, November 25, 2008, Open House Comments
- 2.47 CL&P Letter to Windham's First Selectman Jean De Smet, November 25, 2008, Open House Comments
- 2.48 CL&P Letter to Brooklyn's First Selectman Roger Engle, November 25, 2008, Open House Comments
- 2.49 CL&P Letter to Columbia's First Selectman Donald Cianci, November 25, 2008, Open House Comments
- 2.50 CL&P Letter to Chaplin's First Selectman Robert Dubos, November 25, 2008, Open House Comments
- 2.51 CL&P Letter to Mansfield's Mayor Elizabeth Paterson, November 25, 2008, Open House Comments
- 2.52 CL&P Letter to Chaplin's First Selectman Robert Dubos, January 14, 2009, Response to Town Comments dated December 1, 2008
- 2.53 CL&P Letter to Lebanon's First Selectman Joyce Okonuk, January 15, 2009, Response to Town Comments dated November 17, 2010
- 2.54 CL&P Letter to Mansfield's Town Manager Matt Hart, January 16, 2009, Response to Town Comments dated October 30, 2008
- 2.55 CL&P Letter to Windham's Chair of Inland/Wetlands Susan Johnson, June 19, 2009, notice of work happening along the ROW in preparation of permits and the application
- 2.56 CL&P Letter to Brooklyn's Chair of Inland/Wetlands Commission Sherri Soucy, June 19, 2009, notice of work happening along the ROW in preparation of permits and the application
- 2.57 CL&P Letter to Chaplin's Chair of the Conservation Commission Juan Sanchez, June 19, 2009, notice of work happening along the ROW in preparation of permits and the application
- 2.58 CL&P Letter to Columbia's Chair of Inland/Wetlands Commission John Allen, June 19, 2009, notice of work happening along the ROW in preparation of permits and the application
- 2.59 CL&P Letter to Coventry's Chair of Inland/Wetlands Commission Darby Pollansky June 19, 2009, notice of work happening along the ROW in preparation of permits and the application
- 2.60 CL&P Letter to Hampton's Chair of Inland/Wetlands Commission Heather Gilmond, June 19, 2009, notice of work happening along the ROW in preparation of permits and the application
- 2.61 CL&P Letter to Killingly's Chair of Inland/Wetlands Commission Sandy Eggers, June 19, 2009, notice of work happening along the ROW in preparation of permits and the application
- 2.62 CL&P Letter to Lebanon's Chair of Inland/Wetlands Commission James McCaw, June 19, 2009, notice of work happening along the ROW in preparation of permits and the application
- 2.63 CL&P Letter to Windham's Chair of Inland/Wetlands Commission Susan Johnson, June 19, 2009, notice of work happening along the ROW in preparation of permits and the application
- 2.64 CL&P Letter to Mansfield's Chair of Inland/Wetlands Commission Rudy Favretti June 19, 2009, notice of work happening along the ROW in preparation of permits and the application

- 2.65 CL&P Letter to Pomfret's Chair of Inland/Wetlands Commission David St. Martin, June 19, 2009, notice of work happening along the ROW in preparation of permits and the application
- 2.66 CL&P Letter to Windham's Chair of Inland/Wetlands Susan Johnson, June 19, 2009, notice of work happening along the ROW in preparation of permits and the application
- 2.67 CL&P Letter to Putnam's Chair of Inland/Wetlands Commission John Aghajanian, June 19, 2009, notice of work happening along the ROW in preparation of permits and the application
- 2.68 CL&P Letter to Thompson's Wetlands Enforcement Officer Judith Rondeau, June 19, 2009, notice of work happening along the ROW in preparation of permits and the application
- 2.69 CL&P Letter to Thompson's Conservation Officer Carolyn Werge, August 14, 2009, response to Thompson Conservation Commission letter dated August 4, 2009.
- 2.70 CL&P Letter to Columbia's Inland Wetlands Agent John Valente, May 13, 2010, follow-up of April 29, 2010 site visit
- 2.71 CL&P Letter to Mayors and First Selectmen accompanying the Supplemental Municipal Consultation Filing, July 19, 2011
- 2.72 CL&P Letter to Mayors and First Selectmen accompanying the Non-Transmission Alternative Study, December 5, 2011
- 2.73 CL&P Letter to Putnam's Mayor Richard "Pete" Place, transmitting Open House comments, December 15, 2011
- 2.74 CL&P Letter to Pomfret's First Selectman Jim Rivers, transmitting Open House comments, December 15, 2011
- 2.75 CL&P Letter to Thompon's First Selectman Larry Groh, transmitting Open House comments, December 15, 2011
- 2.76 CL&P Letter to Hampton's First Selectman Allan Cahill, transmitting Open House comments, December 15, 2011
- 2.77 CL&P Letter to Killingly's Town Council Chairman Dennis Alemian, Open House comments, December 15, 2011
- 2.78 CL&P Letter to Coventry's Town Council Chairman Elizabeth Woolf, Open House comments, December 15, 2011
- 2.79 CL&P Letter to Chaplin's First Selectman William Rose, Open House comments, December 15, 2011
- 2.80 CL&P Letter to Brooklyn's First Selectman Austin Tanner, Open House comments, December 15, 2011
- 2.81 CL&P Letter to Lebanon's First Selectman Joyce Okonuk, Open House comments, December 15, 2011
- 2.82 CL&P Letter to Mansfield's Mayor Elizabeth Paterson, Open House comments, December 15, 2011
- 2.83 CL&P Letter to Windham's Mayor Ernest Eldridge, Open House comments, December 15, 2011

- 2.84 CL&P Letter to Columbia's First Selectman Carmen Vance, Open House comments, December 15, 2011
- 2.85 CL&P Correspondence to Mansfield's Planning & Zoning Commission, Underground Electric Transmission Cables, December 28, 2011
- 2.135 CL&P Letter to Windham's Mayor Ernest Eldridge, Additional Resident Comments, January 30, 2012
- 2.136 CL&P Letter to Mansfield's Mayor Elizabeth Paterson, Additional Resident Comments, January 30, 2012

Customer Communications

- 2.86 CL&P Right-of-Way activity postcard, mailed week of May 5, 2008
- 2.87 "Strengthening the Region's Electric Grid" Brochure, mailed August 19, 2008, version 1
- 2.88 Invitation for the September 24, 2008 Open House in Brooklyn, mailed August 2008
- 2.89 Advertisement for the Open House in Brooklyn, September 2008
- 2.90 Invitation for the September 30, 2008 Open House in Willimantic, mailed August 2008
- 2.91 Advertisement for the Open House in Brooklyn, September 2008
- 2.92 Invitation for the October 22, 2008 Open House in Mansfield, mailed September 2008
- 2.93 Advertisement for the Open House in Mansfield, October 2008
- 2.94 Invitation for the November 5, 2008 Open House in Killingly, mailed September 2008
- 2.95 Advertisement for the Open House in Killingly, September 2008
- 2.96 Bill Insert 2008
- 2.97 Interstate Survey Postcard, December 2008, January 2008, March 2009, July 2009, October 2009, March 2010, April 2011, October 2011
- 2.98 Bill Insert 2009
- 2.99 "Strengthening the Region's Electric Grid" Brochure, mailed July 2009, version 1
- 2.100 Media Advisory "Hunters asked to take care near power lines", October 22, 2009
- 2.101 "Strengthening the Region's Electric Grid" Brochure, mailed July 2011, version 2
- 2.102 Bill Insert 2011
- 2.103 Invitation for the August 23, 2011 Open House in Killingly and September 14, 2011 Open House in Mansfield, mailed in August 2011
- 2.105 Advertisement for the Killingly & Mansfield Open Houses, August and September 2011
- 2.106 Sandwich Board for the August 23, 2011 Open House in Killingly

- 2.107 Sandwich Board for the September 14, 2011 Open House in Mansfield
- 2.108 Media Advisory Rescheduled Open House in Mansfield, October 24, 2011
- 2.109 Media Advisory Postponed Open House in Mansfield, October 31, 2011
- 2.110 Advertisement for the rescheduled Open House in Mansfield, November 3, 2011
- 2.111 Sandwich Board for the rescheduled November 3, 2011 Open House in Mansfield
- 2.112 Advertisement for the canceled rescheduled Open House in Mansfield, October and November 2011, due to the October snowstorm
- 2.113 Media Advisory Rescheduled Open House in Mansfield, November 30, 2011
- 2.114 Invitation for the rescheduled December 8 Open House in Mansfield, mailed in November 2011
- 2.115 Sandwich Board for the rescheduled December 8 Open House in Mansfield
- 2.116 Advertisement for the rescheduled Open House in Mansfield, November and December 2011

Open House Materials

- 2.117 Vegetation for Transmission Rights-of-Way handout
- 2.118 Managing Access to Transmission Rights-of-Way handout
- 2.119 Herbicide Use on Transmission Rights-of-Way handout
- 2.120 Making Requests for Wood handout
- 2.121 Restrictions on ATVs and Snowmobiles in Transmission Rights-of-Way handout
- 2.122 Transmission Rights-of-Way Activities in Agricultural Lands handout
- 2.123 Transmission Rights-of-Way Restoration handout
- 2.124 Permitted & Non-Permitted Use of Transmission Rights-of-Way handout
- 2.125 Electric & Magnetic Fields (EMF) handout
- 2.126 Transmission Lines & Property Values handout
- 2.127 "Strengthening the Region's Electric Grid", version 2 handout
- 2.128 Comment Card
- 2.129 Treeland to Shrubland handout
- 2.130 Tree and Shrub Planting Guide handout
- 2.131 Interstate "Need" Video
- 2.132 EMF DVD

2.133 Treeland to Shrubland DVD

2.134 Mansfield Hollow Truescape DVD