### STATE OF CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

**k** 

CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER CO.

\* APRIL 24, 2012 \* (7:10 p.m.)

\* DOCKET NO. 424

\*

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE CONNECTICUT

PORTION OF THE INTERSTATE

RELIABILITY PROJECT THAT TRAVERSES THE MUNICIPALITIES OF LEBANON, COLUMBIA, COVENTRY, MANSFIELD,

COLUMBIA, COVENTRY, MANSFIELD, \*
CHAPLIN, HAMPTON, BROOKLYN, POMFRET, \*
KILLINGLY, PUTNAM, THOMPSON, AND \*
WINDHAM, WHICH CONSISTS OF (A) NEW \*

OVERHEAD 345-kV ELECTRIC

TRANSMISSION LINES AND ASSOCIATED \*
FACILITIES EXTENDING BETWEEN CL&P'S \*
CARD STREET SUBSTATION IN THE TOWN \*
OF LEBANON, LAKE ROAD SWITCHING \*
STATION IN THE TOWN OF KILLINGLY, \*
AND THE CONNECTICUT/RHODE ISLAND \*

BORDER IN THE TOWN OF THOMPSON; AND \*
(B) RELATED ADDITIONS AT CL&P'S \*
EXISTING CARD STREET SUBSTATION, \*
LAKE ROAD SWITCHING STATION, AND \*
KILLINGLY SUBSTATION PROJECT FOR \*

KILLINGLY SUBSTATION, REQUEST FOR PARTY/INTERVENOR STATUS.
REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCE.

BEFORE: ROBIN STEIN, CHAIRMAN

BOARD MEMBERS: Larry P. Levesque, DPUC Designee Brian Golembiewski, DEP Designee

> Edward S. Wilensky James J. Murphy, Jr. Dr. Barbara Currier Bell

Colin C. Tait
Philip Ashton
Daniel Lynch, Jr.

STAFF MEMBERS: Linda Roberts, Executive Director Christina Walsh, Siting Analyst Melanie Bachman, Staff Attorney

POST REPORTING SERVICE HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 . . . Verbatim proceedings of a hearing 2 before the State of Connecticut Siting Council in the matter of an Application by The Connecticut Light and 3 4 Power Company for a Certificate of Environmental 5 Compatibility and Public Need, held at the Mansfield 6 Middle School Auditorium, 205 Spring Hill Road, Storrs, 7 Connecticut, on April 24, 2012 at 7:09 p.m., at which time 8 the parties were represented as hereinbefore set forth . . 9 10 11 CHAIRMAN ROBIN STEIN: Good evening, 12 everybody. My name is Robin Stein, I'm the Chairman of 13 the Connecticut Siting Council and we are here for Docket 14 No. 424. There are plenty of seats in the front, but I 15 can understand if for some reason you want to sit in the 16 back. Before I read our formal opening statement, I'd like 17 to welcome you to this third and final public comment 18 session on this Docket No. 424. I want to extend our 19 welcome on behalf of both the Council members and staff. 20 I also want to thank the town of Mansfield and the Mayor 21 Patterson for their hospitality. 22 Let me first tell you a little bit about 23 the Council. We are an executive branch agency of the 24 State of Connecticut. The scope of the Siting Council's

1 exclusive jurisdiction is to provide siting review with 2 respect to proposals to develop large-scale, utility 3 infrastructure, such as power plants, substations, and 4 high-voltage transmission lines like the ones that are the 5 subject of tonight's hearing. To the extent that reliable 6 electric utility service has become part of modern life 7 our job is to ensure that such infrastructure meshes as 8 well as possible with our State communities. 9 The public mission of the Siting Council is 10 to act as an independent arbiter that balances the 11 statewide need for these projects, at the lowest 12 reasonable cost to consumers, with the need to protect the 13 environment and ecology of the state. We have before us 14 tonight an application by The Connecticut Light and Power 15 Company, CL&P, for a high-voltage electric transmission 16 line upgrade. 17 Clearly, we don't know your towns as well 18 as you do, therefore, we appreciate you telling us how the 19 proposal might affect you. And that's why this listening 20 tour is so important. 21 Your comments made here are essential to 22 this important siting process. We take your comments and 23 input seriously and weigh them heavily in our deliberative

process. And it is on that basis that I thank you again

24

1	for taking the time to be here this evening.
2	And now for the more formal opening which
3	we're starting this hearing at approximately 7:10 p.m.
4	today, April 24, 2012 on Docket 424. The other members of
5	the council who are here, Brian Golembiewski, designee
6	from the Department of Environmental Protection, Larry
7	Levesque, designee from the Public Utilities Regulatory
8	Authority, Philip Ashton, Daniel Lynch, Senator James
9	Murphy, Dr. Barbara Bell and Edward Wilensky.
10	Members of the staff present are Linda
11	Roberts, our Executive Director, Melanie Bachman, Staff
12	Attorney, Christina Walsh, Siting Analyst, Lisa Fontaine,
13	Custodian of the Record, Gail Gregoriades, Court Reporter
14	and Aaron Demerist, Audio Technician.
15	This proceeding is a contested case under
16	the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act, and will be
17	conducted in accordance with the applicable provisions of
18	the Connecticut General Statutes and regulations of
19	Connecticut state agencies on an application by CL&P for
20	certificate of environmental compatibility and public need
21	for the Connecticut portion of the interstate reliability
22	project that traverses the municipalities of Lebanon,
23	Columbia, Coventry, Mansfield, Chaplain, Hampton,
24	Brooklyn, Pomfret, Killingly, Putnam, Thompson, and

1	Windham, which consists of (a) new overhead 345-kV
2	electric transmission lines and associated facilities
3	extending between CL&P's Card Street Substation in
4	Lebanon, the Lake Road Switching Station in the town of
5	Killingly, and the Connecticut/Rhode Island border in town
6	of Thompson; and (b) related additions at CL&P's existing
7	Card Street Substation, Lake Road Switching Station, and
8	Killingly Substation. The application was received by the
9	Council on December 23, 2011.
10	With respect to concerns regarding electric
11	and magnetic fields, EMF, in accordance with Public Act
12	04-246, our agency revised its "Best Management Practices
13	for the Construction of Electric Transmission Lines in
14	Connecticut." This document references the latest
15	information regarding scientific knowledge and consensus
16	on EMF health concerns. It also discusses advances in
17	transmission facility siting and design techniques that
18	can affect public exposure to EMF. This document, as well
19	as other informative EMF links can be found on the Siting
20	Council's website.
21	As required by law off-the-record
22	communications with any Council member or Council staff
23	member on the merits of this application is prohibited.
24	The parties and intervenors in the

1 preceding are as follows: The applicant CL&P, Party NRG, 2 party Victor Civie; Party EquiPower, party UI, party 3 Richard Civie and a Party, Edward Hill Bullard. 4 The hearing held tonight is solely for the 5 public to make brief oral statements into the record. Specifically, this is an opportunity for citizens who are 6 7 not formally participating in the process as a Party or 8 Intervenor to make their views known to the Council. 9 These public statements are not subject to cross-10 examination and the submission thereof, does not entitle 11 the submitter the right to cross-examine the Applicant, 12 Parties, Intervenors, or the Council. 13 We have a number of people who have signed 14 up and the sign-up sheets are in the back, so in fairness 15 to everyone I'd like to request that you limit your 16 statements to three minutes. If you have written 17 statements we can take them in. They will become part of 18 the hearings as well. We do have one of those mechanisms, 19 stoplight, I prefer not to use it, so again, I hope that 20 you can all keep your remarks to the three minutes. 21 As I said, written statements can be sent 22 to the Council within 30 days from this hearing date 23 either by yourselves or your friends and neighbors and 24 they will be given the same weight as spoken statements.

1	A verbatim transcript will be made of each hearing session
2	and all hearing transcripts will be deposited with the
3	Town Clerk offices in the towns previously mentioned. The
4	public hearings in the municipalities will conclude
5	tonight, The Council then will continue hearings for the
6	purpose of cross-examine of evidence by the Council Staff,
7	Parties and Intervenors. The evidentiary portion of this
8	hearing will begin on Monday, June 4, 2012 at 11:00 a.m.
9	at Central Connecticut State University.
10	Additional dates have been scheduled and
11	are posted on the Council's website. As I mentioned there
12	is, for those who haven't already signed up there is sign-
13	up sheet in the back.
14	For the benefit of the public who have not
15	been to the previous meetings, we've asked the applicant
16	to compile a short video that explains the general nature
17	of the application and $I^{\prime}$ ll ask the applicant to show the
18	video now.
19	(Whereupon, a video was shown.)
20	
21	CHAIRMAN STEIN: Thank you. Two things,
22	one is I've been told that the stoplight mechanism will be
23	at least we'll turn it on for advisory purposes. I hope
24	again that we don't have to use it. As you can guess it

works just like a stoplight. I'd also like to mention that there are a number of individuals here this evening representing Connecticut Light & Power and they will be available after the formal part of this hearing, for any of those of you who wish to -- if you have any specific questions you want to ask them. I'd like to start with government officials. I understand and the podium is obviously here in the front. We have on the list Mayor Eldrige. 

MAYOR ELDRIGE: Thank you very much and thank you for serving on this. This is not an easy task, I know that.

I am the mayor of Windham and Windham will be one that will be affected the most if we go to the alternative route. My letter to the project manager on December 9th regarding this interstate project, I stated my support for the proposed route through the Mansfield and the alternative route through Windham would clearly be just too expensive and too damaging to the environment and also needlessly destructive -- disturbed to the affected property owners as such. As you can see on there, it would just be an acquisition of land that you don't have the right-of-way, or CL&P doesn't have the right-of-way over.

And to that, the Town Council which I bring

1 forward is a resolution I was given on February 7th and 2 I'll just condense it down to basically say that, we gave one to the Siting Council here, that recommended that the 4 CL&P follow the preferred alignment route and use the 5 existing right-of-ways that are already there and oppose 6 the alternative route that require acquisition of new 7 right-of-ways across the private property of Windham. 8 The CL&P proposed route is clearly, you 9 know, with the right-of-ways that it has and the overhead 10 lines it makes most sense and it doesn't disturb the 11 environment and it costs minimally and it also is 12 consistent to the environmental preservation. 13 Besides, you know, just being common sense 14 it is also going to bring a lot of new jobs to this area 15 and new money to the area which is very important to any 16 community as such. So I would like to say is just that the 17 Town of Windham supports the CL&P's preferred route and 18 the proposed application. Thank you very much. 19 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Thank you. Are there any 20 other public officials, I don't have any. If not, yes, 21 would you like to please come up, give your name, and 22 please also, and this goes for everybody, spell your last 23 name. Thank you.

MATT HART: Matt Hart H-A-R-T, Town

24

- 1 Manager, Town of Mansfield. I believe I might be on the
- 2 list a little bit further down.
- 3 CHAIRMAN STEIN: You are.
- 4 MR. HART: Would it be okay for me to go
- 5 now or would you prefer --
- 6 CHAIRMAN STEIN: You're up there so go
- 7 ahead.
- 8 MR. HART: Okay, excellent, thank you. I am
- 9 joined this evening by Linda Painter our Director of
- 10 Planning and Development and welcome to Mansfield. Thank
- 11 you for coming out to address our issues, to listen to our
- 12 concerns. The Town of Mansfield, while we recognize the
- need for the project itself to meet regional power
- demands, we don't think the proposed route is the best
- 15 route for this project.
- I do want to point out, however, that we're
- not endorsing, we're not endorsing the Windham south
- 18 route, are sympathetic to the points raised by Mayor
- 19 Eldridge, our colleague and our neighbor. And our
- opposition to the proposed route, it's based on several
- 21 reasons and they're all detailed in the letter which we
- submitted, letter submitted under the signature of Betsy
- 23 Patterson, our Mayor which I think you have.
- 24 And our concerns include several factors

1 including what we think is inadequate consideration given 2 to the mitigation of the impacts of the project itself. 3 And that's really what I want to focus on, are several 4 proposed mitigation measures that we are suggesting to you 5 all that you consider. In Mansfield, in our town, we think 6 that the proposed project would negatively impact property 7 values for budding businesses, private schools, child care 8 facilities and homes as a result of the visual impact of 9 the project. 10 Public perception is a concern regarding 11 the safety of living or having schools and child care 12 facilities located near the lines. A general market reluctance, if you will, to locate next to such 13 14 facilities. We have detailed these in our Exhibit A. 15 Mostly the properties that would be impacted by the 16 proposed route, in Mansfield, are residential. 17 So I'd like to speak to our proposed 18 mitigation measures in some detail if I could. First would 19 be to relocate Pole 39 at the Highland Golf Range. And 20 these mitigation matters are not listed in any order of 21 priority. I do want to emphasize that. As depicted in our 22 Exhibit B, the transmission line runs through the Highland 23 Golf Range due to the layout of the range the transmission line doesn't -- the existing line doesn't interfere with 24

the use of that range, however, the proposed line would create an obstacle and we are recommending that this proposed Pole 39 be relocated to accommodate their concerns. We have heard that if that can't happen, we think the owner would be in a position where they would need to close the facility and we'd hate to see that occur.

Second mitigation measure that we would

Second mitigation measure that we would recommend is a use of the Mansfield underground variation that was described up above and a modified variation for the Mount Hope underground scenario. And those are depicted — those alterations to the Mount Hope variation are as follows, that you would relocate the western terminus of that variation to a point west of Saw Mill Brook Lane to minimize those impacts and relocate the eastern terminus to a point west of Route 195, Storrs Road.

And as part of the implementation of any underground variation, we think that the transition station should be designed to use the smallest footprint possible to reduce the amount of clearing that would be needed. And use of these variations we do think that would be consistent with state law.

A third measure that we're recommending

would be to use EMF best management practices particularly on the poles between Route 195, Storrs Road and Mansfield Hollow, that area of town does include two child care facilities and well as numerous private residences. So we think additional mitigation is needed there.

A fourth recommendation that we have for you would be to relocate -- require the utility to relocate the Mount Hope Montessori School. We talked about the public perception of the project and very concerned about that. The school has been informed by various parents, etcetera that they may be very reluctant to send their children to the school if the proposed line is put in place there. So we are recommending that the utility relocate that school.

A fifth measure that we are recommending would be to help facilitate a land swap between another day care facility on Bassetts Bridge Road known as The Green Dragon Day Care and Northeast Utilities itself. The existing transmission line corridor runs along the rear half of the day care's property; I guess there are ground shocks in that area that limit the use of the property by children. Northeast Utilities is currently licensing a piece of property that's nearby. We think a solution to this would be a land swap between the day care owner and

1 Northeast Utilities.

A sixth recommendation that we have for you would be to require the Hawthorne Lane alternative.

Implementation of the proposed route in the vicinity of this subdivision would result in the loss of the visual buffer that's presently there. So what we set out in Exhibit D of our submission, shows that the alternative would relocation the existing transmission line to the south away from the homes that are presently located there. And to facilitate this, the town has amended an existing conservation easement that we have in place.

A seventh recommendation that we have would be to use Design Option 2 in Mansfield Hollow State Park due to the limited right-of-way we think that the utilities should be required to use Design Option 2 which would eliminate the need for any additional right-of-way and restrict the clearing that would be required. We think that this is the least invasive option.

An eighth proposal, eighth mitigation measure would be various things that could be undertaken to help minimize the impacts on working farms. There are working farms in that area along Bassetts Bridge Road as you saw on your tour and we think the utilities should be required to strictly adhere to those mitigation measures

- that would help minimize the impact on those farms and that would include limiting construction to non-harvest seasons, restoring disturbed soils, minimizing the use of herbicides and pesticides, etcetera.
- And the final mitigation measure that we
  are recommending to you concerns construction access.

  While we understand the construction time frame will be
  limited, we think it is important to protect the adjacent
  single-family homes that are located there. Consequently
  the construction access roads should be located as far
  from the homes as possible.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- So, in summary, I know that I have just gone over quite a bit of detail; I think it is set out much more clearly in the letter that we have provided to you. We think that these mitigation matters are important.
- In summary again, the town is opposed to the proposed route, however, if the Siting Council does in fact endorse the proposed route, we would like you to do so only contingent upon the implementation of the various mitigation measures that we've described.
- 21 Thank you very much, happy to take any 22 questions that you might have.
- 23 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Thank you. It's not a Q 24 and A but we appreciate your comments.

# HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY APRIL 24, 2012

Now I'd like to -- is there someone else -- this
is the time for elected officials, I thought you were
coming up before.

TONY MORAN: I thought I would let the Town Manager go first. I'm Tony Moran. I am the Deputy Mayor of Mansfield. For 30 years I've lived in Mansfield Hollow and I lived there before the line went up and I can tell you that the consequences of that line on that community were quite significant.

The line went up before people really were afraid of EMF and all of the -- before they were really aware of the consequences of these power lines, but clearly property values around those lines have dropped. It's very clear that parents were are contemplating sending their children to the Montessori School are going to be particularly alarmed by the increased electricity flowing through the area, however you want to define what it is that they're afraid of. But they will be concerned and the school is really put at risk. The Council has heard a lot of testimony from members of the public from all over parts of town. And it is very clear to members of the Council that the impact of this line will be quite negative on certain areas of town.

We've agreed that there are mitigation

1

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

proposals and you've just heard the mitigation proposals 2 listed. We strongly support those. So I do hope that you 3 take this into very serious consideration and to have some 4 concern about the property owners and particularly the 5 businesses that will be directly impacted by these lines. 6 Thank you. 7 CHARIMAN STEIN: Thank you. Any other public official? If not, I'd like to go to the public 8 9 sign-up list. Please spell your last name and also if 10 you're speaking from either close to the proposal, give us 11 your address so we know specifically -- relate that to 12 your concern and finally I'll apologize in advance if I 13 mispronounce anybody. The first person on the list is Tony 14 Sheridan. 15 TONY SHERIDAN: Good evening, Tony Sheridan 16 S-H-E-R-I-D-A-N. I represent the Chamber of Commerce of

Eastern Connecticut. We have 1,600 companies and the footprint we are talking about footprint runs from Putnam to Fisher's Island the Rhode Island border and out to the Connecticut River. I'm here to talk about the importance of reliable safe source of energy, environmentally sound. There are several reasons why we need to find a way to try and balance the community needs which are terribly important and I speak as a former First Selectman of

1 Waterford of eights. So I recognize the importance of the 2 public import here and you folks are great to be here to 3 hear it all, but we also have an issue with supply, 4 reliable supply of electricity in this part of the state. 5 We really need to find a way to balance the needs and make 6 sure this project can go forward in a cost-effective 7 manner. There have cases where some of the power lines were required to be buried on the other end of the State 8 9 and it's cost prohibitive. I'm sure you folks are quite 10 aware of what I'm talking about. 11 I'm delighted to see that you are utilizing the existing right-of-ways. That's the smart thing to do, 12 13 minimize the environmental impact. Finally, I'd like to 14 say there is a jobs component to this that is quite 15 significant and, as God knows. We all need more jobs. 16 Again, thank you for the opportunity to say a few words 17 and you folks have a difficult job, so thank you. 18 ERIC HAMMERLING: Good evening. My name is 19 Eric Hammerling H-A-M-M-E-R-L-I-N-G. I am the Executive 20 Director of the Connecticut Forest and Park Association. 21 CFPA is the first non-profit conservation organization 22 established in Connecticut in 1895. CFPA may best be known 23 for maintaining 825 miles of blue-blazed hiking trails in 24 Connecticut through a network of outstanding volunteers

including several active volunteers involved with the
Friends of Mansfield Hollow. As you know, the Nipmuck
Blue-Blazed Trail runs through Mansfield Hollow State Park
and along the Fenton River in Mansfield as well as running
through the neighboring towns of Willington, Ashford and
Union.

Along the way, the Blue-Blazed Hiking Trail system crosses many different land ownerships, private, corporate utility, municipal and state. And we work with all land owners to keep these trails open and free for public use. The Nipmuck Trail is crossed twice in Mansfield by the route of the Interstate Reliability Project. We've worked effectively with CL&P for decades where transmission lines crossed the blue trails. In all situations that I am aware of, CL&P has been terrific at keeping CFPA informed well in advance of any transmission line maintenance work that has to be done. When necessary CL&P has helped with rerouting signage and materials, as well as, opening and closing trails in coordination with our volunteers to keep the public safe.

In some areas, CL&P has made its own lands available as a site for blue-blazed trails. Similarly, CL&P has been very good at providing briefings to CFPA on the status of its other transmission upgrade projects and

20

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY APRIL 24, 2012

1 we've had several opportunities over the past few years to 2 ask questions about the siting process, construction and 3 related environmental considerations, erosion controls and 4 basins, wildlife habitat, etcetera. 5 CFPA has not taken a formal position on the Interstate Reliability Project and we're certainly not in 6 7 the business of designing electric transmission lines. 8 Sustainable forestry, land conservation, environmental 9 education and trails are our mission focus. With that 10 being said, we've generally found CL&P and Northeast 11 Utilities to be excellent partners on the ground. When 12 construction within their right-of-ways would lead to a 13 conflict within existing trail, they've kept us informed 14 on timing and worked with us to make various site 15 improvements. 16 I wanted to speak tonight to thank CL&P for 17 its proactive communications efforts, their ongoing 18 commitment to land and trail conservation and to make a 19 request of them and you to continue these efforts to 20 communicate as the siting process moves forward. Thank 21 you. 22 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Richard Channey. 23 RICHARD CHANNEY: Good evening council 24 members -- Mansfield, Connecticut. I'd like to put into

1 the record an addendum to my letter to the Siting Council 2 dated March 21st, 2012. I am the owner of Highland Ridge 3 Golf Range at 164 Stafford Road, Mansfield Center, 4 Connecticut. We provide golf recreation to Mansfield and 5 surrounding communities. We work with youth and adult 6 groups, schools with golf teams such as UConn and E.O. 7 Smith and golf classed with Mansfield's Park and 8 Recreation and other organizations. 9 We provide winter golf and lessons with our 10 golf simulators in our new building. We are the only golf 11 range in the community. CL&P right-of-way runs right 12 through the middle of our property. We own the land under 13 the right-of-way. As we felt the new lines would block our 14 business, we met with Mark Kimble of CL&P on 3/2/12 at the 15 range to discuss having the lines go underground or moving 16 a pole or two to the left side of the range. He told us he 17 could not do this due to cost. As we have no other 18 alternative at this time but to accept their plan as is, I 19 wrote a letter to Executive Director, Linda Roberts of the 20 Siting Council dated 3/21/12, which is on file with them 21 and I have an enclosure to my letter. 22 Recently after siting from each of our golf 23 tees, we have come to a final conclusion that the new line 24 as proposed would block us in such a way that the range

1 would be unusable. Therefore, we feel that we would have 2 to close our range and golf business. My son, David, who 3 is the manager of the range and others we hire from time-4 to-time, would lose their jobs. 5 When we built the range, we felt that 6 building a driving range was the highest and best use of 7 the land, as the power line right away ruins the 35 acres 8 for any other use other than recreation. 9 Finally, as we have a very large investment 10 in this business, if we cannot work out some kind of a 11 solution to this problem we will be asking for a buyout so 12 that we can put the lines where they -- excuse me, asking 13 CL&P for a buyout so they can put their lines wherever 14 they want them. Thank you for your time and consideration 15 in this matter. I also want to thank Matt Hart for 16 speaking on our behalf, Linda Painter and Mayor Patterson. 17 Just one final note, in your packet from 18 the town there is a map and you can see our golf range 19 right there. If you go over way on the left-hand side, I'm 20 a little bit shaky on my legs, but way over on the side 21 here where it comes in, that piece right there is Highland 22 Ridge Golf Range. You can see it splits it right down the 23 middle. If we are able to move the poles, I can give

Connecticut Light and Power some additional land for the

24

right-of-way, as we have other land there. So we think one
pole, I think it's 38, if we move it a little bit forward
I don't think it would extend too much between the poles
and go down the left-hand side of our range that this
would work. I thank you for your time and consideration.

CHARIMAN STEIN: Thank you very much. The

CHARIMAN STEIN: Thank you very much. The next person on the list, Lee Hebert.

LEE HEBERT: Thank you, Commissioner and members of the Siting Council. My name is Lee Hebert H-E-B-E-R-T and I am out of Hampton, Connecticut. I've got a written statement for you, I'm just going to take a couple of pieces out of it for now and put something on the record. I'm going to reference the Energy Bill which is written and went into effect in 2011 and it's LCL No. 4531, an act concerning Connecticut's energy futures.

Dear Council Members, I request you deny CL&P's request based first on the fact our country does not need anymore power plants or transmission lines. And further, the applicant, CL&P, is not upholding Connecticut laws as mandated in Connecticut SB1, A couple of the key sections I ask you to consider is section 55 subsection G as a condition of their license the utilities must offer a time and use rate option as directed in the law. And in section 32, subsection 10, whenever available energy

alternatives are equivalent give preference to capacity
additions for conservation and load management.

Actually, if you look at the energy bill
you'll find conflict after conflict after conflict with -
I don't even know why they wrote it if you are going to

let these power lines go on, but it talks about reducing

the cost of energy and goes on and on and on.

And what I also included in here is a proposal that went to Norwich Public Utility and I've copied Governor Malloy and Commissioner Esty because it tracks with what they are trying to do with the energy bill. What it boils down to is our country wastes more energy every day that we could power multiple Japans 24-hours a day. The missing link is energy storage. This proposal covered a section of six different energy storage systems off the shelf at Norwich Public Utilities is considering. I was notified last week they're going to start a pilot program.

I've also included in here, as a reference, a letter that was written in Time Magazine by Michael Grunwald, Pulitzer Prize winner, that states energy efficiency is the missing fruit. We don't need any more power plants or transmission lines. You can get that pretty much anywhere on the Internet just by typing in

25

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY APRIL 24, 2012

1 whatever state you're interested in, California being the 2 most obvious and just CA energy storage or WA energy 3 storage. You can even go to different countries such as 4 Denmark, Germany, even China energy storage and find out 5 that everyone is saying the same thing. We've got to start 6 storing what we have already built, we don't need more 7 transmission lines and we don't need any power plants. So 8 you'll see that statement repeated and repeated and 9 repeated.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And for the final thing, I have included in the package is a copy of -- it gives you the link to the California ISO, it's caiso.com and you can look for today's outlook and you can see the massive amount of energy going to waste. It's like -- this original copy's got squares on it and every square is the equivalent of a Millstone or two or our world's largest fossil fuel power plants. In every square between the top curve and the bottom curve, which is a load, is totally going to waste, paid for and going to waste. I guess that's my statement. I'm going to leave you a copy of my request to deny this proposal and a copy for each one of you.

22 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Thank you. Next is Lori 23 Brown.

24 LORI BROWN: Good evening. My name is Lori

1 Brown L-O-R-I B-R-O-W-N. Thank you very much for letting 2 me speak tonight. I'm the executive director of The 3 Connecticut League of Conservation Voters. We're a 4 statewide non-profit environmental organization dedicated 5 to protecting the State's land, air, water open space and this includes policies that the State adopts on energy 6 7 issues and how they impact the resources in our State. I 8 am presenting some remarks from Tom Swarr S-W-A-R-R who is 9 our chair. He could not be here tonight so really, I 10 apologize to read this to you, I know it's not the best 11 way to present this but it will be fairly short. 12 We believe that the future vitality of 13 Connecticut depends on both reliable electricity supply 14 and responsible stewardship of our environmental 15 resources. Our organization does not have a formal 16 position on the Interstate Reliability Project and we 17 certainly don't claim to be experts with the technical 18 details of this project. 19 However, we do believe that the Siting 20 Council's review of this and other large infrastructure 21 projects is greatly strengthened by an open and 22 transparent process with all stakeholders present to fully 23 evaluate the impacts associated with the various 24 alternatives.

1 The Connecticut League of Conservation 2 Voters has received briefings from CL&P over the years and 3 in particular on this project and the status of its great 4 projects overall. And we do feel that the company's made a 5 very good faith effort to reach out to the environmental groups to hear concerns and to try to address them as they 6 7 moved forward with this project and to elicit feedback 8 from the groups. So I really do think that they have put 9 that effort into being proactive, straight forward 10 approach, supplying us with information and listening to 11 our concerns. 12 However, no amount of planning can ever 13 foresee every contingency that might be encountered during 14 an actual construction. So, despite the system level 15 benefits statewide we do recognize that the project's impacts are really felt locally, and so different advocacy 16 17 groups have different perspectives and different agendas. 18 And some of those priorities can be in 19 conflict, but that's why we think it is very important 20 that environmental advocates stay engaged in the process 21 before, during and after the decision of the Siting 22 Council. And that we need to insure that everything is 23 fully vetted and that the project both meets the needs of 24 the Connecticut citizens and preserves our natural

1 environment. 2 We do not attempt to speak for other 3 environmental groups. We do partner with a lot of groups 4 throughout the State. So we do hear and try to relay back 5 and forth information as best as possible. So everybody is at least at the table and understands what the issues are. 6 7 And then we wanted to basically recognize tonight just that CL&P has made an effort in their outreach and 8 9 communications and we ask of them and you to continue 10 these efforts as this process moves forward. 11 We do look forward to working with CL&P and 12 the other stakeholders involved, to make sure that during 13 any development or management phases of this project, how 14 we can learn together to adopt best management practices 15 and minimize any environmental impact. We have been doing 16 that with other major infrastructure projects in 17 Connecticut from transportation to other energy issues and 18 so very much would appreciate having more role as this 19 moves forward. Thank you. 20 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Thank you. Emil Coman? 21 EMIL COMAN: Good evening. My name is Emil 22 Coman C-O-M-A-N. I am a resident of Bolton. My son Jacob 23 goes to Mount Hope Montessori in Mansfield and I'm going 24 to summarize the statement that I am going to submit

online, my wife wrote this. We are very proud parents of a 1 2 child who has been blooming and blossoming in this school and we have been concerned the very first time when we saw 4 the power lines next to the school and we believe, we 5 think that other parents are concerned especially new 6 parents who are looking for a good place for their child. 7 This school has been molding children for 8 50 years and they are doing an unbelievable job especially 9 at this time when early childhood education is emphasized 10 in this state. I think we should be looking at the value 11 in other ways than just money and consider such needs as 12 the Mount Hope Montessori School. 13 I'm going to submit, again, another written 14 statement. Thank you for this opportunity and please 15 consider also the effects on schools and child care 16 facilities. Thank you. 17 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Thank you. Scott Welden? 18 SCOTT WELDEN: My name is Scott Welden, a 19 little tall for the short guy. Richard Scott Welden W-E-L-20 D-E-N, 25 Hawthorne Lane. I live there with my wife, three 21 children and my mother. And I would like to urge the 22 Council if additional lines need to go through Mansfield 23 to please reconsider urging or directing CL&P to use the 24 Hawthorne variation. This variation flattens an angle,

1 takes the line over road versus up into the yards of the 2 neighborhood. The variation maintains actually increases a 3 buffer of forested land between our homes and the lines. The impact on the value of our houses would be obvious. 4 5 I'm sure you have lots of paperwork including the map, but 6 you would see the obvious impact on the value of the 7 homes. This shift would help create a large parcel of 8 forested land between homes so for environmental reasons 9 alone it's a good move. One particular area that I would like to 10 11 spend a moment with is this, before my wife and I decided 12 to build at the site, we did extensive research on EMF 13 emissions, we were very concerned about that, our children 14 were very young at the time. And with all our research the 15 consensus that we came upon is that 300 feet is considered 16 a relatively safe distance but 300 feet less is an area of 17 great concern. 18 So, by conservative estimates looking at 19 the CL&P maps, the additional lines as CL&P proposes would 20 bring lines from a little over 400 to 280 feet to my home. 21 A little over 400 to 250 feet to one of my neighbors, about 600 to 370 close to the 300 foot level at one home 22

and from 320 feet to 200 feet to a fourth home, so the

existing -- myself and my neighbors, most of us would be

23

24

1 under the 300-foot area of concern. So for all those 2 considerations on the housing values, the environment, the positive impacts of the shift and the health of the 3 4 residents of the Hawthorne neighborhood, I urge the 5 Council to please urge CL&P to use the Hawthorne shift. 6 Thank you. 7 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Thank you. Diane Dorfer? DIANE DORFER: Hi, my name is Diane Dorfer 8 9 D-O-R-F-E-R. I'm on Exhibit D for what the town submitted 10 and also Map Sheet 9, if you would like to refer to that 11 while I am speaking. I live at 87 Bassett Bridge Road in 12 Mansfield. I own the Green Dragon Day Care. I am a 13 licensed home day care licensed by the State. I currently 14 care for five young children and three school-aged 15 children and I have two significant concerns I would like 16 to voice tonight. 17 One, regarding the access road that would 18 go to Pole Structure 9077 and the other regarding the 19 possibility of a property swap that Matt Hart had 20 mentioned. First, I ask that out of concern for the 21 children in my day care, the access road to the structure 22 be as far as possible from our property line. The noise, 23 dust and exhaust associated with the structure, with the 24 construction equipment would impede the use of our outdoor

play areas if the road runs directly along our property. We spend a lot of time outside. We're outside pretty much any kind of weather except for downpours and even the tractor that goes through the hay field to hay a couple of times a year causes some of the kids to cry. So, the equipment that I saw in that movie would terrify some of my children, so the further away it is from our house the better.

The second point of concern regards the property sought with CL&P, in response to my concerns over the effects of the project CL&P had provided us with a license agreement to a parcel of CL&P owned land adjacent and east of us, which is in Exhibit D, the town submitted. It is similar in area to our property that's under the right-of-way. I feel that this agreement is a good first step, but not a long-term solution. The agreement is renewed every five years and can be revoked at any time with 90-days notice. This lack of permanence does not allow us to us the land for day care uses as we intended for our back acre when we bought the property.

We do a lot of gardening with the kids, we have chickens, and sometimes we have other animals and our parents like that a lot. They like that their kids go home dirty. And not being able to use our back field limits

1 what we are as a day care.

require us to carry \$2,000,000.00 of insurance requiring us to pay an additional \$453.00 per year, more than we otherwise would -- I have this documented. So CL&P has expressed interest in a property swap, but you know, as I discussed, but is restricted by an MOU with DEEP for first right of refusal. I ask that the Siting Council or CL&P request that DEEP release the property allowing for the swap. The swap could be beneficial to all parties. CL&P would have unimpeded access to, and control over, land currently under easement and acquisition of our land would connect the CL&P properties on either side of us.

All our points of concern with the project would be alleviated by this swap in addition to the road not being so close to us. Earlier I have submitted letters of concern both on my behalf and some of my parents to CL&P so I assume that somewhere in the record you have that. I also have a copy of those today.

Underneath the power lines in the back, we get ground shocks on humid days if there's any moisture on the vegetation we get feel like insect bites. It took us a while to figure out what was really going on. Also, if I were to pick up a kid we shock each other. So, even though

currently the lines only cover part of that we'd have to go under that to get to the back half where the lines aren't. It's not pleasant and if the lines in the future cover the entire back half of our property, it pretty much renders it useless to us and also parents EMF concerns.

I would like to note that should the property swap occur, we would happily put our property, what would be currently owned by CL&P, under conservation restriction. That said the swap could be seen as neutral or even beneficial as far as DEEP is concerned as both parcels are prime agricultural land and in total more land than, excuse me. All told there would be more land under a CR at the end of the agreement.

I'd also like to note that I am not in support of putting the lines underground; I think it would be much more disruptive than having them above ground. Contrary to what Matt Hart presented, I have to disagree with the idea of the monopole. I think that concerns over the power lines are as much perceived as real and frankly the monopoles are unsightly. It makes it just seem so much more present because they are so much taller, whereas the H configuration is in line with what's already there and five years after the project is over might not be as noticeable as the big monopole. Thank you very much for

1 your time.

2 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Thank you very much.

3 Helene Marcy?

HELENE MARCY: Good evening, thank you. My name is Helene Marcy, but I'll spell the whole thing since it's confusing H-E-L-E-N-E M-A-R-C-Y. My daughter attends Mount Hope Montessori School and my son will be attending the school. I'm very concerned about the implications of the CL&P project on Mount Hope's future. Not only am I concerned about the construction, as she just mentioned, surrounding the project and the impact on the kids and parents days during that phase. But the proposed lines look much more obvious and imposing than the current lines and the new -- and would be closer to the kid's playground area.

I'm worried about prospective parents driving down to visit the school, seeing those new, larger closer lines in addition to the existing lines together, and turning right back around before they even walk in the door to ask about them because they fear for their kids' safety. I don't think, honestly, that Mount Hope can survive the proposed project.

The school has been around a long time, over 50 years as Emil said earlier and is an established

1	and valuable part of the community. My family absolutely
2	loves the school and I would hate to see its doors closed
3	and so many kids denied a truly wonderful education
4	because of this project. Thank you.
5	CHARIMAN STEIN: Thank you. Stephen Bacon?
6	STEPHEN BACON: Good evening. Stephen Bacon
7	spelled B-A-C-0-N. I'm here tonight to address Field
8	Management Design Plan Alternative 7 commonly referred to
9	as the Hawthorne Alternative or Hawthorne Lane
10	Alternative. I am an attorney. I represent Christopher and
11	Jessica Duers, Scott and Christine Welden, Thomas and
12	Elmira Mindek and Wayne and Christine Hawthorne. My
13	clients reside at 21, 25, 27, 28 Hawthorne Lane here is
14	Mansfield. Although there's been an existing transmission
15	line through this neighborhood at Hawthorne Lane before my
16	clients homes were constructed, the proposed Interstate
17	Reliability Project contemplates the removal of a
18	substantial amount of tree and vegetated buffer between
19	these residences and the relocated transmission
20	facilities.
21	In response to this proposal and the
22	anticipated effects on their homes, these residents
23	initiated a process more than a year ago with Connecticut
24	Light and Power, the Mansfield Director of Planning and

1 Development, the Mansfield Planning and Zoning Commission 2 and the Mansfield Town Council to put into effect a plan 3 that would mitigate the impacts of this project on their homes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

With the cooperation of representatives from Connecticut Light and Power, my clients were able to fashion an alternative to the proposed route through their neighborhood. By shifting transmission facilities to the south Field Management Design Plans Alternative 7 would preserve the existing buffer on their properties and reduce the undesirable consequences that the project might otherwise impose on them.

There has been substantial progress to make this alternative a viable one, should the Siting Council eventually approve the project application.

First, this alternative requires that a portion of an existing conservation easement, held by the Town of Mansfield, be relocated to a different area of the neighborhood. After consideration by, and approval by, the Mansfield Planning and Zoning Commission, the Conservation Commission, the Open Space Preservation Committee, my clients have obtained approval from the Mansfield Town Council for the execution of an amended and restated conservation easement agreement contingent on approval by

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY APRIL 24, 2012

this Siting Council of this application and also approval
of the Field Management Design Plans Alternative 7. The
agreement and accompanied maps have been prepared and are
ready to be executed.

Second, the modification of easement required for this alternative has been prepared by CL&P's counsel and has been delivered to me along with survey maps that would eventually be filed in the land records should this alternative be approved.

Lastly, my clients and I have contacted their mortgage lenders and have commenced the process of complying with those lenders requirements, relative to the eventual execution of subordination agreements to subordinate all the existing mortgages to both the amended easement and the modification of easement with CL&P.

I have been involved with this matter only since January 30th of this year. A substantial amount of leg work has been done by my clients prior to my arrival. Their willingness to persevere despite countless meetings and bureaucratic red tape is a testament to their earnest desire to see the so-called alternative, Hawthorne Alternative; incorporated into the final product should the Siting Council approve this application.

It is our request that the Siting Council

1 see fit to approve Field Management Design Plans 2 Alternative 7, if this application is approved. Thank you. 3 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Thank you. Mike Palumbo? 4 MIKE PALUMBO: Hi, thank you for hearing me 5 today. My name is Mike Palumbo and that's P-A-L-U-M-B-O 6 and I'm not originally from Mansfield, in fact, I'm not 7 originally from Connecticut. I actually came here from New York to go to UConn 20-years ago and after graduation I 8 9 really could have gone anywhere, but I chose to stay here. 10 Today I work for the State of Connecticut 11 and my guys go to Mount Hope Montessori up there in the 12 Hollow. For five of the years, in the past 20 years I 13 lived in the Hollow. In fact, our deputy mayor, Tony Moran 14 was my landlord and we have remained good friends. 15 If you had asked me 20-years ago if it was 16 possible for a city kid like me to fall in love with a 17 little woodland community like the Hollow, I would have 18 told you no, but that's exactly what happened. 19 If you know the history of the Hollow then 20 you know that 50-some-odd years ago, the community was 21 more or less destroyed by the Van project and then again 22 with the power lines that went in all for the benefit of 23 towns south of here. And well I don't dispute the 24 necessity of that project, the effects were devastating,

1 it destroyed that community. I don't use that word 2 lightly, it destroyed it. 3 What's left of that community, what you see 4 there today are the remnants of that and it's taken about 5 50 years for it to recover and I use recover for lack of a 6 better word. There's not much business down there and what 7 is down there struggles to keep business going. 8 The impact on the residents and Mount Hope 9 Montessori and the park, as described by our town 10 officials, I think would be detrimental and I would just 11 encourage the Council to take into consideration the 12 proposals made by our town officials. Thank you very much. 13 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Thank you. Frank Johnson? 14 FRANK JOHNSON: Good evening. My name is 15 Frank Johnson. I am the president of MAC, the 16 Manufacturing Alliance of Connecticut. I live in Bristol. 17 I work in Waterbury. I'm sorry to say I'm not from this 18 part of the State because it is a beautiful part of the 19 State. And as someone who served as a zoning chairman in 20 my town for 20 years, I certainly don't envy any of you 21 the task that lies ahead, as you try to balance the needs 22 of the State of Connecticut versus the needs and desires of the local residents, but I'm sure you're up to the 23 24 task.

1 I'm here this evening to speak in favor of 2 the CL&P proposal as it was presented, the Interstate 3 Reliability Project. Connecticut manufacturers along with 4 commercial customers and residential customers in the 5 State of Connecticut have endured high energy prices in the State of Connecticut for too long. 6 7 Manufacturers support infrastructure 8 improvements that will reduce electric congestion, help 9 alleviate costly FMCC charges and increase the reliability 10 of the grid. These infrastructure improvements are vital 11 if we hope to maintain and expand the manufacturing base 12 that's in Connecticut. 13 We continually hear the governor and 14 legislators and other elected officials talk about the 15 importance of manufacturing jobs, the multiplier effect 16 that those jobs have on the community and the amount of 17 benefit that comes from having manufacturing in 18 Connecticut. And part of what we need to have here is an 19 ever developing infrastructure that can support developing 20 industry. So these changes, these infrastructure proposals are important for Connecticut manufacturers because it 21 22 will correct some of the regional reliability problems

alleviate some of the congestion issues that we have in

that we have in the State of Connecticut. It will

23

24

Southern New England and it will provide the necessary reliability margin in the case of a generator or a power line going down.

Our ability to attract future business growth and expansion will rely in part on the assurance of long-term reliable electric supply. CL&P's proposal to use existing rights-of-way and above ground -- work above ground seems to make the most sense given the cost alternative of trying to go underground with these proposals.

So we support this reliability project as part of the new solution. These projects are expected to generate thousands of jobs over a period of time in the economy and more immediately will create at least 500 jobs in the construction of these projects and bring about \$2,000,000.00 in local tax dollars to the communities that are affected.

CL&P has been proactive in working with the manufacturing community, individual companies and the manufacturing community in general to try to improve the infrastructure in Connecticut. This is certainly a part of that overall solution and therefore, we support CL&P's application as it has been presented and I thank you for the opportunity to comment tonight.

1 CHARIMAN STEIN: Donald Hoyle? 2 DONALD HOLYE: My name is Donald Hoyle, 3 according to Hoyle, H-O-Y-L-E. I live at 125A Bassetts 4 Bridge Road. I speak both as a property owner and member 5 of Friends Mansfield Hollow. As a property owner, about 6 seven-years ago, I took advantage of putting photovoltaic 7 on my house. It was pushed by CL&P. The advertisement was 8 that if enough residents put photovoltaic on their homes 9 we could eliminate the need for peak because we would 10 supply it with the sun and that would help to eliminate 11 the sooty which I am happy to report that was eliminated. 12 I guess what I am suggesting is there's 13 other ways locally for towns to become more efficient or 14 not just more efficient but supply power in photovoltaic 15 on rooftops. I was at a DEEP panel a couple of weeks ago 16 and a creative proposal was if your home is on good site 17 then maybe you can combine with two or three other 18 neighbors and have the preferred site have the 19 photovoltaic put on it. 20 I am one that strongly believes we need to go to 21 alternative energies and if what I hear is right that 22 eventually this will be hooked up with Quebec 23 Hydroelectric, which I think is a positive. I think 24 hydroelectric is a source of energy. We have that

available in the Mansfield area at the Kirby Mills and I
hope the site committee is aware of the potential that
that has to supply, they say half of the energy needed for
our schools and public buildings. If more communities
could do that and combine it with solar I think we could
raise or provide a lot more of our electricity.

Representing Mansfield Hollow, I also attended another presentation by our Commissioner Esty at the University of Connecticut, the Teale lecture after integrating the need to put together the environmental concern and the economic concern and I also say we have an inspirational concern. And he said as a boy he was grateful that he was taken out into nature, taught to hunt, taught to fish and that this is something that we need to preserve for future generations.

And so I see Mansfield Hollow as one of our State parks that needs to be respected and realize we have a thing for the future there. My fear is that after the construction is done and I've looked at what's happened on Route 6 in Johnson, Rhode Island and if that's any example of the type of construction and I feel that for three or five years it will be a park that will not attract anyone to it and usually after three or five years, it becomes a forgotten item and so that would be another elimination of

one of our State parks. Thank you.

2 CHARIMAN STEIN: Thank you. George Jacoby?

3 GEORGE JACOBY: Thank you. George Jacoby, I

4 live at 32 Woodmont Drive in Mansfield, which is very,

5 very close to where the power line goes. As a matter of

fact, it's across the power line from the golf range that

he was talking about.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I speak as someone who has already been negatively impacted by the power line situation. A few years ago when that was going on in Columbia, I was hiking in a conservation area there. I was on top of a hill, basically the same altitude as the top of the poles when they set off one of the implosions that they do to connect the wires. It was by far the loudest noise I have ever heard in my life.

Since then, I have tonight, ringing in my ears 24-hours a day. So I'm here as someone who is alarmed by my personal situation. I'm also here as someone who understands that this region is completely full of hills with hikers on them, not just at Mansfield Hollow but on the trail and every place else in the area.

So, I've written this up as a series of questions that I would ask CL&P and I hope that you would ask the same things of CL&P. What's the decibel level at

- 1 the bottom of the pole or a hundred yards or a quarter of 2 a mile? I would mention that I brought this up to CL&P at one of the town meetings last year and one of their 4 engineers told me he thought it was several hundred 5 decibels. 6 How do your workers protect themselves? How 7 is the sound baffled, if at all, away from the ground and 8 is the sound baffled horizontally as well as down toward 9 the ground? If not, what's the decibel level at the top of 10 the pole? 11 How is a nearby pedestrian warned? I 12 understand that they knock on doors and tell everybody in 13 the neighborhood when that stuff is going on. I wasn't 14 from that neighborhood. I had no idea. I would also ask 15 them, have you ever not used the implosion technique 16 because of adjacent population centers, or anything and I 17 would urge you to consider that in this situation and as a 18 last question I'd say this is to CL&P, have you ever been 19 influenced to change your construction methods by anything 20 other than legal means? Thanks for your time.
- 21 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Thank you. Wayne
- 22 Hawthorne?
- 23 WAYNE HAWTHORNE: Good evening. My name is
- 24 Wayne Hawthorne, H-A-W-T-H-O-R-N-E, 28 Hawthorne Lane.

1 I'll just try not to be too repetitive from what has 2 already been said about the Hawthorne Lane alternative. I just want you to know that we did start back in 2008 with 3 4 CL&P when they first came up with the overhead 5 transmission line proposal. And for some reason, a couple of years after that, or in 2008, it got dropped and then 6 7 it resurfaced again a couple of years ago. Since then we 8 have worked well with CL&P. I, like many others, would not 9 like to have power lines in my front yard. However, if 10 it's going to be approved it would a real positive to us 11 if we could get it moved to the south. 12 I saw your bus out there today, I hope 13 they explained the moving of the -- approximately 90 feet, 14 they have a 300-foot right-of-way which is good, but if we 15 could move the 300-foot right-of-way approximately 90 feet 16 to the south, it would run it over the cul-de-sac and over 17 an open field which I own and I would swap that land with 18 CL&P. 19 And right now we have a land swap between 20 two other homeowners in Mansfield on Hawthorne Lane, 21 that's sitting in escrow. If this is approved we can get 22 the right-of-way that we need over the conservation 23 easement and we would just swap land with CL&P. and they 24 have been very good with us and I would just hope from the

1 Siting Council that, if in fact, you do approve the 2 application that you consider the EMFs and the 3 environmental impact on how much better it would be if we 4 moved them away from the tree line and kept a buffer zone 5 between our homes and Hawthorne Lane. I would hope that you would make it mandatory that if you approve the 6 7 transmission lines, it would be mandatory that this 8 alternative be followed. Thank you. 9 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Thank you. Chris is it 10 Duers? 11 CHRIS DUERS: Hello, my name is Chris Duers, last name is D-U-E-R-S. I'm also a resident of Hawthorne 12 13 Land and I know we've gone over all the details. I got 14 involved in the effort when we moved to Hawthorne Lane a 15 couple of years ago, and as discussed it would be a major 16 -- it would be a pretty significant impact on everybody in 17 our neighborhood so rather going through the details 18 again, you might have also been visually able to see 19 today. 20 I would just suggest, with working on this 21 the past year or so, that the effort that has gone into 22 the plan for the alternative with my neighbors, with the 23 Town of Mansfield and the various councils and bodies that 24 work with the Town of Mansfield, the attorney that we've

1 employed and the drafting firm also that we have employed 2 to get a good plan together. My neighbors and also CL&P --3 that it really represents the best of what people can do 4 when a project like this is being planned, when the need 5 is being assessed, I also urge you very strongly to recommend the Hawthorne Lane alternative. It's just an 6 7 excellent example of what we can all do as we go ahead and 8 try to make the needs of the State and the area met -- the 9 energy needs of the State to meet those needs. Thank you. 10 CHARIMAN STEIN: Thank you very much. Peter 11 Orr? 12 PETER ORR: Hi, I'm Peter Orr, that's O-R-13 R. And I wish to express some concerns regarding the power 14 line work proposed to be done on my property in Thompson, 15 Connecticut. I live in Thompson at 260 Quanick Road, P.O. 16 Box 447. This property is on maps Volume 11, Maps 133 and 17 134 and I have approximately 100 acres in this area which 18 there are four proposed tower sets on this property. And 19 this is the property that exits Connecticut into Rhode 20 Island. My property line is the Connecticut Rhode Island 21 border. 22 I also lease farmland on Map V11, Map No. 23 116 on Heritage Road in Putnam. I am a dairy farmer in the 24 area and on all these properties I grow various crops and

1 so forth. And I and my farm derive income from these 2 farming activities. And I wish to know the details of the 3 procedures proposed to be used on the land, on the 4 property. I do not want my ability to farm to be 5 disrupted. I do expect the property to be returned to its native state and previous productive status. I would like 6 7 to know, again, the detailed procedures that CL&P plans to 8 do for the actual land before the plans are finalized, so 9 that input can be given before the procedures are finalized and left for the future. And I also expect that 10 11 there will be communication with the appropriate State and 12 local authorities with regards to these procedures. 13 I just mentioned terms as I'm mentioning 14 procedures, you know, the land is productive as in its 15 native state and once the land is disturbed with the 16 various procedures that are being proposed, such as pads 17 for construction materials, roads that are being -- I take 18 it from the description, leapfrogged with regards to 19 constructing access roads, putting in gravel and then 20 removing it, in that process we're disrupting the 21 productivity of the land. Once you disrupt the 22 productivity of the land, it potentially is gone forever 23 unless appropriate procedures are handled with regards to 24 how that process is done.

1	And so I respectfully request the
2	Connecticut Siting Council to have CL&P go through the
3	details of the actual procedures that are going to be done
4	on the land. Thank you very much.
5	CHAIRMAN STEIN: Thank you. Paul Miller?
6	PAUL MILLER: Mr. Chairman, members of the
7	Council my name is Paul Miller, M-I-L-E-R. I have a
8	dairy farm in Woodstock, Connecticut. We lease property
9	from approximately seven property owners that own land
10	under the transmission lines, approximately 400 acres of
11	crop lands that we lease that the transmission lines go
12	over.
13	My biggest concern is timing of when these
13 14	My biggest concern is timing of when these transmission lines are going in. Is it going to be done
14	transmission lines are going in. Is it going to be done
14 15	transmission lines are going in. Is it going to be done doing the cropping years during the cropping season
14 15 16	transmission lines are going in. Is it going to be done doing the cropping years during the cropping season when we're going to have crops planted? Are we going to be
14 15 16 17	transmission lines are going in. Is it going to be done doing the cropping years during the cropping season when we're going to have crops planted? Are we going to be reimbursed for damages done to our crops when they come in
14 15 16 17	transmission lines are going in. Is it going to be done doing the cropping years during the cropping season when we're going to have crops planted? Are we going to be reimbursed for damages done to our crops when they come in and drive through them with their access roads and rip up
14 15 16 17 18 19	transmission lines are going in. Is it going to be done doing the cropping years during the cropping season when we're going to have crops planted? Are we going to be reimbursed for damages done to our crops when they come in and drive through them with their access roads and rip up the spaces for the towers?
14 15 16 17 18 19	transmission lines are going in. Is it going to be done doing the cropping years during the cropping season when we're going to have crops planted? Are we going to be reimbursed for damages done to our crops when they come in and drive through them with their access roads and rip up the spaces for the towers?  I'm very concerned about the crossing of
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	transmission lines are going in. Is it going to be done doing the cropping years during the cropping season when we're going to have crops planted? Are we going to be reimbursed for damages done to our crops when they come in and drive through them with their access roads and rip up the spaces for the towers?  I'm very concerned about the crossing of prime-ag lands, this transmission line from its being to

1	after the transmission lines are removed the
2	construction debris and the access roads are removed.
3	Many construction projects tend to have the
4	process of leaving construction debris behind whether it's
5	boulders or piles of dirt and we need to make sure that
6	this land is returned to productive crop land. I'm very
7	concerned about this and I would hope that you would share
8	our of have the Department of Ag share their knowledge
9	with you on how to return lands to their productive state.
10	And I will leave with you a copy of my comments. Thank
11	you.
12	CHAIRMAN STEIN: Thank you. Michael Weitz?
13	MICHAEL WEITZ: Good evening. My name is
13 14	MICHAEL WEITZ: Good evening. My name is Michael Weitz, W-E-I-T-Z. I reside at 447 Bassett Bridge
14	Michael Weitz, W-E-I-T-Z. I reside at 447 Bassett Bridge
14 15	Michael Weitz, W-E-I-T-Z. I reside at 447 Bassett Bridge Road. I own into the right-of-way of the power lines
14 15 16	Michael Weitz, W-E-I-T-Z. I reside at 447 Bassett Bridge Road. I own into the right-of-way of the power lines currently and I think we're all feeling, not in my
14 15 16 17	Michael Weitz, W-E-I-T-Z. I reside at 447 Bassett Bridge Road. I own into the right-of-way of the power lines currently and I think we're all feeling, not in my backyard scenario, we're here today because this project
14 15 16 17 18	Michael Weitz, W-E-I-T-Z. I reside at 447 Bassett Bridge Road. I own into the right-of-way of the power lines currently and I think we're all feeling, not in my backyard scenario, we're here today because this project will impact our property values and land use and the
14 15 16 17 18	Michael Weitz, W-E-I-T-Z. I reside at 447 Bassett Bridge Road. I own into the right-of-way of the power lines currently and I think we're all feeling, not in my backyard scenario, we're here today because this project will impact our property values and land use and the beauty of our area.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Michael Weitz, W-E-I-T-Z. I reside at 447 Bassett Bridge Road. I own into the right-of-way of the power lines currently and I think we're all feeling, not in my backyard scenario, we're here today because this project will impact our property values and land use and the beauty of our area.  I own a construction company. I went to
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Michael Weitz, W-E-I-T-Z. I reside at 447 Bassett Bridge Road. I own into the right-of-way of the power lines currently and I think we're all feeling, not in my backyard scenario, we're here today because this project will impact our property values and land use and the beauty of our area.  I own a construction company. I went to Eastern Connecticut State University. I decided to stay in

through that CL&P has done a good job about communicating to everybody, but once they get this right-of-way granted, who is there to police them, their actions and what kind of recourse will we have because things do happen during the construction process and as individuals we're going to have less rights than as some of the larger concerns that are being addressed here.

and I'm concerned about wells along the way and the disruption of water. I'm also concerned about foundations and structures, what will happen during that blasting time. Will there be proper monitoring? Will somebody come through and monitor the wells now to see what the flow rates are? What's going to happen to them if those flow rates are reduced? Are we going to be able to have recourse? Are we going to be able to be compensated if things are done that affect our properties in that way?

I'm also concerned with the guide wires because we're all talking about the poles and where they're going, but there are guide wires that will come out over 75 feet. How will that impact those areas in the clearing for those guide wires? How will the properties be left after the fact, I'm concerned with erosion, runoff and contamination.

So those are some of the things that I am concerned about as far as the construction goes. Some of the other things are just kind of points that I've been looking at over the time. I am a member of the local Chamber of Commerce and I know we need jobs in the area, but let's be real about this. How many local Connecticut companies and local people will be employed by this? For sure it's going to go out to the lowest bid and they'll be companies from out of state, so we'll be coming and doing the work and are we truly going to benefit from these people.

years and if you look at our phonebooks and if you have driven around today, you have noticed that in our area, there is no manufacturing basically left. Our need for electricity is not growing and you look at the amount of people that live here, it is strongly reduced. How are these lines going to be beneficial to the towns that it is going through? I don't mind helping my neighbor, but I don't want to bear the burden of the cost if our rates aren't going to be reduced in electricity and our needs are being met right now and we're going to bear the burden of the reduce in our property values to help generate electricity to other areas that might need it more. And

are there better routes to get this electricity there, then through our properties and affecting us.

And also just citing things that I have been reading in the Hartford Courant, this was in the opinion page Monday, April 23rd. And they're talking about micro-grids and fuel cells as being a better alternative to these large power lines which are also more susceptible to storm damage and other things that can happen. And in all the years that I have lived here, in terms of grid reliability, we generally lose power when people hit telephone poles.

I've never seen a major line go down and us have a grid problem in a while since we have been here. I think there have been a couple of incidents not due to the power lines themselves, but more in the transmission of the power. My concern is that we are trying to move this lines through Massachusetts and Rhode Island, but to what alternative sources are we moving them to and are they any cleaner sources than what we're using right now. Who is really going to benefit from this? We're thinking the infrastructure will really benefit us in the State of Connecticut or is it truly just going to benefit the people at CL&P to be able to increase their profits and really not help the consumer in any way, shape or form.

1 So just to recap, I hope that there will be 2 a way that the Siting Council or whoever is responsible, 3 will set up some sort of an arbitrator that as individual 4 property owners, we may be able to go to them if we sense 5 that there are things going on with the construction that 6 do not conform to what needs to happen, if people start 7 driving on my property in ways that they shouldn't be. And 8 also my last concern is one that is not really CL&P's 9 responsibility because we tend to have a lot of people who 10 like to litter along these power lines. I have on numerous 11 times had to go up and clean up from them. But with larger 12 access roads running through and no gates going up 13 anywhere, I'm, concerned with litter and people coming up 14 and coming into these properties which we own, and 15 possibly getting hurt and having a lawsuit and other 16 things of that nature happening. 17 So I do hope that you will help us set up 18 ways that as individuals we will have a way to go through 19 arbitration and be compensated if quidelines are not met 20 and construction tends to go haywire. Thank you for your 21 time. 22 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Thank you very much. 23 Kathleen, is it Tonry? 24 KATHLEEN TONRY: Thank you for your work

POST REPORTING SERVICE HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 here on behalf of Connecticut citizens. My name is 2 Kathleen Tonry, T-O-N-R-Y. I'm a professor at UConn and a 3 parent of a four-year old currently at Mount Hope 4 Montessori School and hopefully a future parent as well. 5 You'll have to excuse my breathlessness because I am a little over eight-months pregnant. That's part of the 6 7 reason that I'm here tonight. What I'd like the Council to 8 consider is the relationship between risk and choice that 9 will adversely affect the Mount Hope School. 10 When my husband and I were looking for 11 preschool options for our daughter a couple of years ago, 12 we discovered that public options in this area are pretty 13 limited. And so, they are pretty much oversubscribed. So 14 we first starting looking at Mount Hope out of necessity 15 and it was one of three area options. 16 We ultimately decided for Mount Hope 17 because of the curriculum, the teachers and the delightful 18 outdoor space and we now feel very fortunate to have found 19 it. But now as you look ahead to the future of this baby 20 on the way, I'm looking forward to being a Mount Hope 21 parent for many years to come. But this project makes this 22 project a fraught one. 23 CL&P unfortunately simply cannot assert 24 that there is no risk to our most vulnerable population.

Indeed, since the early '90s, there have been persistent and well publicized concerns about a possible correlation with childhood cancers, especially childhood leukemia and these are admittedly weak correlations. And I understand that we all have to do our collective part to try to accommodate the risks and challenges of our need for reliable energy and the business and manufacturing needs of the State as a whole. But I hope you'll agree that if you would choose to place our most vulnerable population, preschool children, at risk, even if that risk is a slight one or one that hasn't been thoroughly correlated.

State statute to present a variation for projects like this one near day cares and schools. So my point is that it will be difficult to imagine choosing to place my child in a situation where there is a risk, however slight that risk may be. For me as a parent, it's not just about aesthetics or perception; it is not necessarily a NIMBI argument, although I think we have heard a lot of good reasons why those arguments can be considered. But rather again, about this balance between risk and choice that parents face as they think through crucial options for children.

So, in short, I really doubt that Mount

1 Hope Montessori can survive if the proposed plan for 2 overhead lines proceeds. Thank you for listening to our 3 concerns. 4 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Sorry, Barbara Byron? 5 BARBARA BYRON: Good evening. My name is 6 Barbara Byron; I'm a long-term resident of Mansfield 7 Center. I also have concerns about the proposals and many 8 of the people here have echoed some of these concerns. 9 One of these concerns is about, mostly the 10 health concerns, EMF cause changes on cellular levels that 11 aren't fully understood now and I don't think even the 12 range, the safety range, these things aren't really well 13 understood. I don't have any personal connections to the 14 Mount Hope Montessori School, but I'm concerned about the 15 children there. There are correlations with childhood 16 leukemia. 17 A couple of years ago my daughter was 18 looking for a home to buy in the Mansfield area and we

looking for a home to buy in the Mansfield area and we found a beautiful home which was better than any of the others we saw, but there were overhead transmission wires running right along by it. And after much consideration and study, we decided not to buy the home. It's perhaps a coincidence, but we later found out that the man living there suffered from Parkinson's.

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 I also -- the Mansfield Town has recently 2 upgraded the center and puts lights and walkways in and I 3 also think that running these large overhead wires would 4 destroy the charm of the area. And mainly the concern is 5 with health concerns and that's what I have to say. 6 CHARIMAN STEIN: Thank you very much. Ed 7 Hall? 8 ED HALL: Good evening. My name is Ed Hall, 9 H-A-L-L, 35 Mansfield Hollow Road in Mansfield Center. I 10 have the privilege of looking at three structures from my 11 home. I've lived on the property for 65 years as of next 12 month and when the power company came through in the late '60s to widen their right-of-way, I wasn't greatly in 13 14 favor of it. 15 I hadn't started building a home where it 16 is now, but I had a plan to do that. They also said they 17 would come back with another set of wires on the same 18 right-of-way. They are about 30 years behind when they 19 projected in the late '60s, but I feel for the Montessori 20 School, my neighbor, adjoining property. But they came 21 after the wires were there. Most people that are suffering 22 from it did, but that's not significantly important, I 23 don't think now. I do know the power company was 24 thoughtful in foresighted enough back in the '60s to get a

1 right-of-way wide enough and use one side of it, so they 2 do have a place. 3 I'm not an expert on whether they need the 4 transmission line, but I'd like to think that if they are 5 going to spend two-hundred-million dollars to build it, 6 they probably do have a need for it. I do know that what 7 they did in the late '60s early '70s, they cleaned up 8 after the contractors, left everything better than they 9 found it. There were no problems of any sort. 10 I'd urge you people to take into account all 11 these factors that people have mentioned. And most of them 12 have mentioned provision that would make life better for 13 them, which I think should be included if at all possible. 14 Thank you very much. 15 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Thank you, sir. Ron 16 Manizza? 17 RON MANIZZA: Good evening. My name is Ron 18 Manizza, M-A-N-I-Z-Z-A. I live at 456 Bassett Bridge Road 19 in Mansfield Center. I am also the vice president of the 20 Friends of Mansfield Hollow State Park, a local 21 organization that helps maintain the park and keep it in 22 its pristine condition that it is right now. I have 23 concerns, obviously, as a resident who is right next to 24 the power lines. I will be losing all of my trees.

Although, CL&P first showed me an artist's rendition of
what would be removed from in front of my property. I then
got the specifications to measure directly from the power
lines out to the edge of where they're going to do the
clear-cut and it will be all of the trees.

I have brought this up in front of our Town Council. They are very aware of it. I would like you to seriously consider what Matt Hart has told you about trying to protect our town in the best way possible. We realize that these lines are going to half to go through for what reason, in our area, we don't know because this power is not going to benefit us in any way.

I want you to consider a monopole system that will raise the lines higher and be much safer than what we have right now or a possibility of an underground system which I know is going to be more expensive.

The lines that currently exist on the properties, as they are going through, are old. They leak badly. They make a lot of noise during humid weather, during rain storms and during snow storms. You can hear the obvious leak of the antiquated lines. If they were to put in a monopole system, as they have in some sections of Mansfield Hollow, they would be able to use a smaller footprint, not have to widen the lines, not have to remove

1 all the trees and be able to utilize both sides of the 2 monopole system. Currently there is a monopole in Mansfield Hollow of which they only use one side of the 3 4 pole. And now they are proposing to put a double power 5 line through -- double pole line next to that. 6 I think you need to really take a look at 7 this and see what the best way is to put up the most 8 efficient system that will be the least devastating to our 9 area. Thank you very much for your time and welcome to the 10 Town of Mansfield. 11 CHAIRMAN STEIN: Thank you and that 12 exhausts the list of speakers. Before closing I just want 13 to remind you that, although the public session is ending 14 now, public comments in writing can still be sent to our 15 office, actually until after 30 days of the last 16 evidentiary hearing date. 17 The first evidentiary hearing date is on 18 Monday, June 4th, as I mentioned beginning at 11:00 at 19 Central Connecticut State University. And note that 20 although the public is not allowed to speak at the 21 evidentiary portion of these proceedings, you're welcome 22 to attend and to listen and gather information on the 23 project. And the Siting Council will, in fact, use that 24 opportunity to try to elicit answers to many of the

1	questions that have been raised today.
2	Again, there are, I think, still people
3	from CL&P in the back if you want to talk to them after
4	the hearing.
5	So, thank you all for your participation
6	and please drive home safely. Thank you.
7	
8	(Whereupon, the hearing adjourned at 9:05
9	p.m.)