

172 Field Point Rd # 3
Greenwich CT 06830

October 5, 2017

Connecticut Siting Council
Ten Franklin Square
New Britain CT 06051

RE: Docket No 461A-Greenwich

Dear Members of the CT Siting Council,

I am writing to you to express my concerns about the process and the ultimate judgement of this docket. My experience at the September 5 hearing disappointed me greatly in the interrogatory process. I was hoping for a fair, open, yet spirited process that would provide an insightful examination of Eversource's proposal. What I saw and heard was often quite the opposite. It was one-sided. In my particular case, I felt I was treated unfairly. My right to cross examine the Town of Greenwich was cut off and silenced. Sadly, I was denied both my due process and my right to participate in proceedings that have a direct impact on me, the families in my community, and my town. I have to wonder about the fairness of your resulting decision given that the opposition's voice in this matter has been stifled.

After being cut off, I was chided for not having attended the August 29 meeting because I would have had heard what you had heard then. Due to personal issues, I could not. That said, no meeting transcript was available for me to catch up. I ask: Why wasn't the transcript made available before that meeting? How can I participate when the means for keeping abreast of the proceedings were not available?

Another aspect of this process that troubled me was seating Eversource's lead counsel at the same table where intervenors had to sit to ask questions. We also had to share the one microphone on the table. This creates a hostile environment for those opposing the applicant. Eversource's lead counsel's gruff and adversarial presence was intimidating. He used his seating position to his client's advantage, quickly challenging and silencing intervenors like me at the proceeding. Why was the applicant's counsel allowed to challenge his client's opposition so easily, while other parties and intervenors could not? Why are we to sit by quietly, powerless to object or challenge? We all have as much if not more personal interest in the proceedings as the applicant; in addition, we have to live with what the applicant wants and we have to pay for it despite our objections. This seating arrangement gave Eversource an unfair advantage and a disproportionate voice in these proceedings. Why couldn't you have provided a fairer, more participative process for the rate payers and residents who will have to live with the consequences of your decisions? The interrogatory process is already awkward for the public. Giving the applicant the ability to bully us disadvantages us even more.

In closing, as a Greenwich resident, taxpayer, ratepayer, and someone who will be personally impacted by your decision, I am concerned about how you will rule on this docket. My experience at the

September 5 hearing raises fears that your handling of the proceedings is telegraphing your decision. I sincerely hope that my fears are unfounded and that you will review this docket's facts without bias, exercising the utmost due care. I hope you will decide wisely.

For the record, I am against this proposal. Eversource has again failed to demonstrate the need for this project. Furthermore, Eversource has been unsuccessful in arguing that its transmission solution is the best option to replace aging equipment. Transmission's steep price tag to ratepayers and to our town as well as its environmental and physical impact makes Eversource's proposal even more unpalatable.

Sincerely,

Dwight Ueda
Field Point Estate Townhouses
Intervenor