

April 18, 2007

10 Stepstone Hill Rd
Guilford, CT 06437

Mr. S. Derek Phelps
Executive Director
Connecticut Siting Council
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051

Re: Docket No. 326
CL&P's proposed substation at Stepstone Hill Rd, Guilford, Connecticut

Dear Mr. Phelps:

I attended the pre-hearing conference on procedural matters in your office on April 17, 2007, as a potential intervenor/party. At this conference, you extended the deadline for this filing and granted me permission to submit this filing electronically by noon on Thursday, April 19, 2007, and specifically waived the requirement of mailing twenty bound copies. I thank you for your consideration in this regard.

The purpose of this filing is to record some of my concerns regarding the proposed substation.

- 1) In response to Data Request CSC-01, Q-CSC-007, Applicant has stated that development of the facility will require the removal of up to 256 trees with 6-inch or greater diameters, as a conservative estimate. Applicant has not committed to any specific reforestation measures, even though they have indicated (Page L-4, Volume 1 of their Application) that they would develop and incorporate a landscape plan to mitigate for any potential views of the substation. Applicant should be required to develop, submit and obtain approval of such plan prior to the requested certificate being granted. An estimate of the number of full grown trees that would result from the proposed plantings must be included in the landscape plan.
- 2) In response to Data Request CSC-02, Q-CSC-002, Applicant has stated that if they are required to install an emergency generator (at a later date) at the substation, a propane-fueled unit would probably be installed. The environmental, safety and noise related studies incorporated in the present application do not take into consideration the impact of such a generator on the development. A commitment that CL&P would apply later as a separate petition to install such a generator when deemed necessary and that such petition would be available for

public review and comment should be entered into the record. Otherwise, the studies as presently submitted must be revised to take cognizance of the future installation of such a generator and the revised studies be made available for review and comment prior to CSC granting the certificate sought by the applicant.

I will question the applicant on these and other related issues during the hearing on Tuesday, April 24, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

Russi T. Suntoke