

September 27, 2004

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

RE: Docket No. 272

Dear Chairman Katz:

On behalf of the Town of Branford, I would like to go on record as opposing the recent suggestion commonly referred to as the 'East Shore Route' discussed in conjunction with Docket 272. Above and beyond all technical and practical discussion, I question the legal aspects of the Siting Council being able to certify the route without the application having completed the necessary municipal consultation with the potentially impacted towns. As the council is aware, the Town of Branford is familiar with the consultation process and welcomes the opportunity to meet with the applicants on these very important issues.

As a municipality, Branford has always accepted its share of responsibility in terms of hosting the integral energy infrastructure of Connecticut and all of New England. Of the 398 miles of 345KV overhead lines in Connecticut, 3.2 miles reside in Branford.

In multiple reports filed with the Siting Council and ISO the utility companies have demonstrated that the use of the East Shore route would require the installation of an additional 345KV line.

The impacts of this additional line to Branford would be severe. The need to clear cut more than 100 acres of mature forest for the installation of this line would be environmentally devastating. Most of this cutting would be in Branford, along the important, ecologically sensitive Lake Saltonstall watershed. In addition, Branford electricity customers will be asked to absorb a portion of the \$150 to \$200 million in additional project cost related to the use of the East Shore route.

Letter to Siting Council
Page Two
September 27, 2004

Additionally, having worked as a design engineer in the arena of electro-magnetics for 25 years, I have monitored the many studies relative to adverse health impact and magnetic field radiation. There seems to be little compelling correlation to support what the opponents to the proposed route have placed into the record. Such inconclusive evidence constitutes a very poor argument to support the huge cost and environmental impact differential between the proposed route and the East Shore route.

Respectfully submitted,

John E. Opie
First Selectman