

David R. Schaefer
Email: dschaefer@bswlaw.com

February 10, 2005

Ms. Pamela B. Katz
Chairman
Connecticut Siting Council
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, Connecticut 06051

Re: ***Docket No. 272 – Middletown-Norwalk 345kV Transmission Line***

Dear Chairman Katz:

I write this letter to make absolutely clear to the Siting Council the position of the Jewish Community Center of Greater New Haven (the "JCC") with respect to the proposed route which you directed the Applicants to map and provide the Siting Council with construction details with the respect thereto. Specifically, I am talking about the proposal to move the power lines from the existing right away, directly over a ball field, and closer to the in ground pool of the JCC Summer Day Camp (the "Jog Proposal").

JCC strongly opposes this proposed route which would "jog" the power line over the existing JCC Summer Day Camp. The JCC believes that such a proposal is in direct violation of Public Act 04-246 which requires that a buffer zone be established to separate a new power line from sensitive facilities, namely those which serve a large number of children, including camps and ball fields. The buffer zone must be at a minimum the width of the utility right of way. Therefore, any proposal to put new power lines over an existing ball field or licensed youth camp cannot possibly be in compliance with the statutory requirement that there be a buffer zone at least the width of the utility right of way.

Aside from the Jog Proposal being in direct violation of Public Act 04-246, the proposal makes no sense. While the Applicants stated otherwise during the hearing before the Siting Council on January 20, 2005, the Applicants own calculations of EMF levels submitted in this proceeding show that EMF levels directly under the proposed power lines are multiples higher than levels at the edge of the right of way and are at clearly unacceptable levels. The Jog Proposal would also have the adverse effect of moving the power lines closer to the in ground swimming pool and other camp facilities than they would be in their current location.

Ms. Pamela B. Katz
Page 2
February 10, 2005

There should be no confusion that not only does the JCC oppose this "Jog" Proposal but that the JCC believes that such a proposal would be in direct violation of Public Act 04-246.

Sincerely,

/s/ David R. Schaefer

David R. Schaefer

DRS:djm
02655/003 - 940382.doc

cc: Service List