#### STATE OF CONNECTICUT

#### SITING COUNCIL

Re:	The Connecticut Light and Power Company and	)	Docket 272
	The United Illuminating Company Application for a	)	
	Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and	)	
	Public Need for the Construction of a New 345-kV	)	
	Electric Transmission Line and Associated Facilities	)	
	Between Scovill Rock Switching Station in	)	
	Middletown and Norwalk Substation in Norwalk,	)	
	Connecticut Including the Reconstruction of	)	
	Portions of Existing 115-kV and 345-kV Electric	)	
	Transmission Lines, the Construction of the Beseck	)	
	Switching Station in Wallingford, East Devon	)	
	Substation in Milford, and Singer Substation in	)	May 13, 2004
	Bridgeport, Modifications at Scovill Rock	)	
	Switching Station and Norwalk Substation and the	)	
	Reconfiguration of Certain Interconnections		

### ERRATA PAGES FOR CHANGES READ INTO THE RECORD BY <u>APPLICANTS' WITNESSES DURING HEARINGS ON MAY 12, 2004</u>

The Connecticut Light and Power Company ("CL&P") and The United Illuminating Company ("UI") (together, the "Companies") submit the attached errata pages to document corrections to the pre-filed testimony of the Companies' witness. These corrections were read into the record by the Companies expert witness during the Connecticut Siting Council ("Council") hearing held in this docket on May 12, 2004.

### Errata Pages

• Correction to Exhibit 12 on page 15 of the Supplemental Testimony of William H. Bailey Concerning Site Specific Designs to Reduce 60-Hz Electric and Magnetic Fields  Corrections to pages 8 and 16 of the Supplemental Testimony of William H. Bailey Concerning Passive Regulatory Responses with Respect to 60 Hz Electric and Magnetic Fields

Respectfully Submitted,

Applicants,

The Connecticut Light and Power Company

Secuit n.1 By: Anne Bartosewicz

Project-Director, CL&P

cc: Service List

The United Illuminating Company

By; John J. Prete Project Director, UI

# SERVICE LIST Docket: 272

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

The Honorable Robert W. Megna State Representative – 97<sup>th</sup> District 40 Foxon Hill Rd. #54 New Haven, CT 06513

Julie Donaldson Kohler, Esq. Hurwitz & Sagarin, LLC 147 North Broad St. Milford, CT 06460

Ms. MaryAnn Boord First Selectwoman Durham Town Hall 30 Townhouse Rd. Durham, CT 06422

The Honorable Mary G. Fritz State Representative – 90<sup>th</sup> District 43 Grove St. Yalesville, CT 06492

Atty. Michael C. Wertheimer Assistant Attorney General Office of the Attorney General 10 Franklin Square New Britain, CT 06051

Ms. Trish Bradley, President Mr. Ed Schwartz, Treasurer Communities for Responsible Energy, Phase II 45 Ironwood Lane Durham, CT 06422 Anthony M. Fitzgerald, Esq. Brian T. Henebry, Esq. Carmody & Torrance, LLP 50 Leavenworth Street P. O. Box 1110 Waterbury, CT 06721-1110

The Honorable Al Adinolfi State Representative – 103<sup>rd</sup> District 235 Sorghum Mill Dr. Cheshire, CT 06410

Peter G. Boucher, Esq. Halloran & Sage, LLP 225 Asylum Street Hartford, CT 06103

Mr. Louis S. Ciccarello Corporation Counsel P. O. Box 798 Norwalk, CT 06856-0798

David A. Ball, Esq. Cohen & Wolf, P.C. 1115 Broad Street Bridgeport, CT 06604

The Honorable Raymond Kalinowski State Representative – 100<sup>th</sup> District P.O. Box 391 Durham, CT 06422

Mr. Bruce Johnson Litigation Attorney Office of Consumer Counsel 10 Franklin Square New Britain, CT 06051 Linda L. Randell, Esq. Bruce L. McDermott, Esq. Wiggin and Dana, LLP One Century Tower New Haven, CT 06508-1832

Eric Knapp, Esq. Branse & Willis, LLC 41-C New London Turnpike Glen Lochen East Glastonbury, CT 06033-2038

Janice M. Small, Esq. Town Attorney Wallingford Town Hall 45 South Main Street Wallingford, CT 06492

Town of Westport c/o Ira W. Bloom, Esq. 27 Imperial Ave. Westport, CT 06880

Deborah L. Moore, Esq. Legal Department Meriden City Hall 142 East Main St. Meriden, CT 06450

Ms. Melanie J. Howlett Associate City Attorney Office of the City Attorney 999 Broad Street Bridgeport, CT 06604

The Honorable Themis Klarides State Representative – 114<sup>th</sup> District 23 East Court Derby, CT 06418 Charles Walsh Assistant Attorney General Attorney General's Office Juris. No. 402623 55 Elm Street, P.O. Box 120 Hartford, CT 06106

Franco Chieffalo General Supervisor First District Water Department P.O. Box 27 Norwalk, CT 06852

Monte E. Frank, Esq. Cohen & Wolf, P.C. 158 Deer Hill Avenue Danbury, CT 06810

Robert E. Earley Connecticut Business & Industry Assoc. 350 Church Street Hartford, CT 06103-1106

Timothy P. Lynch Deputy City Attorney City Attorney's Office 245 deKoven Drive, P.O. Box 1300 Middletown, CT 06457-1300

The Honorable William A. Aniskovich State Senate—12<sup>th</sup> District 15 Grove Avenue Branford, CT 06405

Senator Joseph J. Crisco, Jr. 17<sup>th</sup> District State Capitol Hartford, CT 06106-1591 Lawrence J. Golden, Esq. Pullman & Comley, LLC 90 State House Square Hartford, CT 06103-3702

The Honorable Kenneth A. Flatto First Selectman Independence Hall 725 Old Post Rd. Fairfield, CT 06824

Andrew W. Lord, Esq. Murtha Cullina LLP CityPlace I, 29<sup>th</sup> Floor 185 Asylum Street Hartford, CT 06103-3469

Richard J. Buturla, Esq. Town Attorney Berchem, Moses & Devlin, P.C. 75 Broad Street Milford, CT 06460

The Honorable Derrylyn Gorski First Selectwoman Bethany Town Hall 40 Peck Road Bethany, CT 06524-3378

David J. Monz Updike, Kelly & Spellacy, P.C. One Century Tower 265 Church Street New Haven, CT 06510

Honorable Leonard A. Fasano State Senator – 34<sup>th</sup> District 7 Sycamore Lane North Haven, CT 06473 Anthony M. MacLeod, Esq. Whitman, Breed, Abbott & Morgan, LLC 100 Field Point Road Greenwich, CT 06830

David A. Reif Jane K. Warren Joel B. Casey McCarter & English, LLP CityPlace I Hartford, CT 06103

Mitchell R. Goldblatt First Selectman Town of Orange 617 Orange Center Road Orange, CT 06477-2499

Joaquina Borges King Assistant Town Attorney Hamden Government Center 2750 Dixwell Avenue Hamden, CT 06518

William J. Kupinse, Jr. First Selectman Easton Town Hall 225 Center Road, P.O. Box 61 Easton, CT 06612

David R. Schaefer, Esq. Brenner Saltzman & Wallman, LLP 271 Whitney Avenue New Haven, CT 06511

## Correction to Supplemental Testimony of William H. Bailey Concerning Site-Specific Designs to Reduce 60-Hz Electric and Magnetic Fields Changes are Shown in Bold Type

ROW	Site Condition	ROW Edge (0')		Building Edge (-60')		Typical Structure Height (ft)	
		(mG)	(kV/m)	(mG)	(kV/m)	115 kV	345 kV
1	Existing Lines (For Reference)	5.0	0.54	1.4	0.09	57' 57' 80'	
2	Proposed Lines (For Reference)	8.5	0.47	3.3	0.06	80'	85'
3	Proposed Lines	7.8	0.46	3.2	0.07	90'	95'
4	Proposed Lines	7.1	0.41	3.1	0.08	100'	105'
5	Proposed Lines 345kV Vertical Line	8.3	0.20	3.8	0.27	80'	105'
6	Proposed Lines 345kV Split-Phase Line	2.3	0.40	0.5	0.08	80'	105'

# Exhibit 11. Jewish Community Center: 15GW Case

Exhibit 12. Jewish Community Center: 27GW Case [Corrected Table]

ROW	Site Condition	ROW Edge (0')		Building Edge (-60')		Typical Structure Height (ft)	
		(mG)	(kV/m)	(mG)	(kV/m)	115 kV	345 kV
1	Existing Lines (For Reference)	30.8	0.60	6.5	0.09	57' 57' 80'	
2	Proposed Lines (For Reference)	29.0	0.46	11.1	0.06	80'	85'
3	Proposed Lines	27.0	0.47	10.8	0.07	90'	95'
4	Proposed Lines	24.6	0.42	10.5	0.08	100'	105'
5	Proposed Lines 345kV Vertical Line	32.8	0.24	14.5	0.28	80'	105'
6	Proposed Lines 345kV Split-Phase Line	12.2	0.38	3.0	0.08	80'	105'

Correction to Supplemental Testimony of Dr. William H. Bailey Concerning Passive Regulatory Responses with Respect to 60Hz Electric and Magnetic Fields – May 12, 2004 Changes are Shown in Bold Type

A. Only in a non-technical sense. The precautionary principle is embedded in both European and U.S. regulatory considerations and actions as a legal principle and therefore when applied by government agencies would seem to go beyond a "passive response."

The European Commission has identified the precautionary principle as a key tenet of environmental policy. **In the Rio Declaration on the Environment at The United** Nations Conference on Environment and Development, the precautionary principle is defined:

### Principle 15

In order to protect the environment, the precautionary approach shall be widely applied by States according to their capabilities. Where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing costeffective measures to prevent environmental degradation (UNEP, 1992)

The European Commission (EC, 2000) has provided guidance to decision makers on

the application of the precautionary principle. The Commission recommends:

- *Proportionality*. "Measures . . . must not be disproportionate to the desired level of protection and must not aim at zero risk."
- *Nondiscrimination*. "[C]omparable situations should not be treated differently and. . . different situations should not be treated in the same way, unless there are objective grounds for doing so."
- *Consistency*. "[M]easures . . . should be comparable in nature and scope with measures already taken in equivalent areas in which all the scientific data are available."
- *Examination of the benefits and costs of action or lack of action.* "This examination should include an economic cost/benefit analysis when this is appropriate and feasible. However, other analysis methods . . . may also be relevant."
- *Examination of scientific developments*. "The measures must be of a provisional nature pending the availability of more reliable scientific

Correction to Supplemental Testimony of Dr. William H. Bailey Concerning Passive Regulatory Responses with Respect to 60Hz Electric and Magnetic Fields – May 12, 2004 Changes shown in bold type

- Q. What are the bases for the standards and guidelines adopted by these states regarding transmission lines?
- A. For electric fields the goal of these guidelines and standards is to prevent contact shocks, particularly from large ungrounded vehicles parked under the conductors and to minimize field perception. The two states that enacted standards for magnetic fields thoroughly examined health and safety issues regarding fields from transmission lines but did not **conclude** that the pose a public health risk. The basis for limiting magnetic fields from transmission lines was to maintain the 'status quo' so that fields from new transmission lines would be no higher **than** those produced by existing transmission lines.
- Q. Have state health or transmission siting agencies recommended limits on electric or magnetic fields based upon new scientific information that has become available since the completion of the RAPID program and evaluation of the research by NIEHS?
- A. No. As shown in Attachment 4, the most recent standards that we could **find** for magnetic fields were published in 1990; and for electric fields it was 1996.
- Q. Would populations near the existing or proposed transmission lines on the proposed or alternative routes be identified as subject to adverse health effects as