SPECIAL TOWN COUNCIL MEETING

JULY 19, 1999

6:30 P.M.

A special meeting of the Wallingford Town Council was held on Tuesday, July 19, 1999 in the Robert Earley Auditorium of the Wallingford Town Hall and Called to Order by Chairman Robert F. Parisi at 6:32 P.M. Councilors Centner, Farrell, Knight, Papale, Parisi, Renda, Rys, Zandri and Zappala answered present to the Roll called by Town Clerk Rosemary A. Rascati. Mayor William W. Dickinson, Jr. and Assistant Town Attorney Gerald E. Farrell, Sr., was also present. Comptroller Thomas A. Myers' presence was not required at this meeting.

The Pledge of Allegiance was given to the Flag.

David Gessert, Chairman of the Public Utilities Commission distributed an abbreviated version of Pennsylvania Power & Light, Global's (PP&L) proposal to the Council and announced that copies are also available tonight for the public.

Mayor Dickinson informed everyone that the municipal comment period, the sixty days the Town has to review the proposal, has been extended to August 27, 1999 due to North Haven's possible involvement in this matter.

Raymond Smith, Director of the Dept. Of Public Utilities explained, this is the sixth presentation conducted on the merchant power plant proposal. The process was initiated in late 1997 and R.F.P.s (Request for Proposals) were solicited to see if anyone was interested in re-developing the Pierce Generating site . Six firms responded and PP&L was chosen by the Public Utilities Commission as the most suitable candidate to present the town with a proposal. The time clock has now been started on this project with the submittal of the Environmental Effects Report to the Mayor's Office. The process runs through a Siting Council and there is a number of permits that must be applied for and obtained in order for the project to continue moving along. There will be several more public hearings conducted on this project, giving the public the opportunity to re-visit the project, the process and provide input.

Mr. Gessert thanked the Council and public for coming out this evening. This is an issue that the PUC is moving cautiously on; it has been talked about for quite some time though there remains public misconception on the topic. He had received a telephone call at home prior to the meeting from someone who stated they would be attending the meeting because they did not think the Electric Division should be selling the operation to a company in Pennsylvania. As much as we have tried to get the word out on what is happening here, people remain confused on the issue. This is a good

opportunity for everyone to ask questions, we did have our consultant review the report and he has developed a number of questions which will be posed tonight. Hopefully, everyone will come out of here tonight with a better education of where we are at this point.

At this time Mr. Gessert turned the meeting over to Mark Lyons, of Pennsylvania Power & Light, Global (herein referred to as PP&L).

Mr. Lyons explained, this presentation is a little different than those given previously. They have been progress reports, more or less; a kind of conversation with the Town to gather input in the early design phase. The project is more finalized at this point but not completely finalized because we want to get your recommendations as part of the Siting Council process tonight. There has not been much of a change since February of this year with the design of the project. Legislation recently passed in June has expanded the list of municipalities' right to review a proposal. The law was written in such a way that any town effected would be allowed a sixty (60) day review period in which to analyze a proposal submitted to them for consideration.

Now that PP&L is considering the option of drawing its water from wells located in the town of North Haven, this brings another municipality into the mix which is the reason the sixty day review period has been extended. North Haven now has sixty days in which to review this portion or option of the proposal that is under consideration.

At this time Mr. Lyons recognized the firms and their respective members present this evening, which comprise the project team of the merchant power plant. They are as follows:

Developer/owner: PP&L, Global, Allentown, PA.

- Mark Lyons
- Donald W. Fields

Engineering/construction: Parsons-Brinckerhoff Power, Inc., Boston, MA.

- John Ballam, Lead Mechanical Engineer
- Andrew B. Boyd, Lead Civil Engineer
- Donald E. Cecich, Project Manager
- Roger J. Lemos, Vice President
- Jay Bednarz, Lead Electrical Engineer, Transmission & Distribution

Environmental analysis and permitting: TRC Environmental, Inc., Bloomfield, CT.

- Michael K. Anderson, Senior Principal Scientist
- Carl N. Stopper, Manager of Engineering Services

Legal Counsel: Pullman & Comley

- Atty. Lawrence Golden and associate

Mr. Lyons reviewed the:

- goals of the meeting
  * provide Town with latest information on the project
  * address questions/concerns about project and Environmental Effects Report
  * Town's written recommendations on project to Siting Council

- procedural background
  * past presentations on project (3/98; 6/98; 8/98; 11/98; 2/99)
  * design improvements to project in response to Town and State concerns
  * Environmental Effects Report filed with Mayor's Office 5/28/99
  * copies made available to Town officials and Town's Ind. Consultant and for public inspection at Town Hall & Wlfd. Elec. Div. Offices

- PP&L's background
  * subsidiary of PP&L, Resources, Inc., an 80-year old Fortune 500 company based in Allentown, PA.
  * company with a strong commitment to, and record in, community and environmental support
  * has a combined elec. Generating capacity of more than 8,000 megawatts
  * is developing 1,500 mw of projects throughout the country, and is purchasing more than 2,500 mw of utility capacity in Maine and Montana

- project team (see above)

- overview of project
  * electric generating station
  * electric switching station

- overview of project (cont.)
  * electric interconnection facilities
  * natural gas pipeline connection
  * cooling water facilities

- relationship between the town and project
  * project leases plant site from Town
  * project pays property taxes to Town
  * project buys potable water from the Town (possibly 200,000 gals./day)
  * project purchases waste water discharge services from Town
  * after the year 2004, project may sell elec. power services to Town

- project benefits
  * tax and lease payments
  * improvement of "brownfield" industrial site
  * jobs and indirect economic benefits
  * reliability improvements to electrical system
  * capital contrib. to East Street Yard upgrade
  * Water & Sewer Div. Revenues
  * potential supplier of elec. power services
  * to Quinnipiac River users and groups:
    - sponsorship of riverside multi-use nature trail
    - inc. In stream base flow in Wlfd. Improving recreational value and water quality
  * to CT. electric power market and resource base:
    - inc. supply of clean and efficient electrical power
    - inc. Competition in power market
    - utilizes a "brownfield" power plant site
    - eliminates an older inefficient and high-emissions plant
  * to CT. air quality :
    - significant reduction in air pollutants compared to existing power plants

- project impacts and mitigation measures
  * traffic, noise, dust generated by construction activities (shuttle crews from Cytec site - try to limit activities to daytime hours- calcium chloride for dust control)

- project impacts and mitigation measures (cont.)
    * generating and switchyard facilities
        - appearance of plant (brick-look w/o being overly-massive in appearance)
        - appearance of bldgs., structures, site
        - stack and cooling tower plumes
        - lighting
        - sound of plant during operations
        - air emissions
        - safety issues
        - water usage
        - waste water discharge
            - quantity and quality
        - storm water and flooding
    * electric interconnection facilities (will be subject of separate Siting Council application)
        - appearance of facilities
        - EMF impacts
    * cooling water facilities
        - impacts on water resources
            -stream flows
            - aquifers
    * impacts on wetlands
    * appearance of facilities
    * natural gas pipeline extension(s) (will be subject of separate state and federal environmental reviews

- future permitting activities
    * CT. Siting Council
        - full application for gen. facility to be filed in September (6 mo. Period)
        - full application for switchyard facility to be filed in 4th quarter of 1999 (12 mo. Period)
        - full application for elec. Transmission line to be filed in 4th quarter of 1999 (12 mo. Period)
    * Town of Wallingford
        - separate applications to P&Z, Wetlands Comm. Under CT. Gen. Statutes sec. 16-50X(d)
            - for generating facility
            - for switchyard facility
            - 65 day period for each facility

- future permitting activities (cont.)
    * Town of Wallingford (cont.)
        - application to P&Z, Wetlands Comm. for approval of water pipeline
    * CT. Dept. Of Environmental Protection
        - air permits and monitoring
        - water permits
            - water diversion permit
            - wastewater discharge permit
            - storm water construction & discharge permits
            - stream channel encroachment permit
        - noise regulations
    * Town of North Haven
        - P&Z, Wetlands applications for water line
    * U.S. Army Corps. Of Engineers (ACOE)
        - possible sec. 404 wetland permit for water line/trail

- development activities
    * possible project plan revisions
    * negotiate host community agreements
    * complete Electrical Interconnection Study
    * Support Siting Council, DEP, ACOE and local permit applications
    * develop fuel delivery plan

- project schedule

* file Siting Council application	9/99
* negotiate Town of Wlfd. Agreement	9/99-12/99
* Town (P&Z, Wetlands) facility location approval	11/99
* Siting Council certificate for generating facility	3/2000
* Siting Council certificate for trans. & switchyard facilities	12/2000
* DEP permits	1/2000-11/2000
* financial closing	12/2000
* detailed design and construction	3/2000-6/2000
* estimated commercial operation date	9/2002

Points of Interest

The following points were interjected on topics during the course of discussion:

With regards to the appearance of the site:

Dean Johnson, Johnson Land Design, stated that the goal was to make the site as compatible as possible with the residences across the street from the plant. There will be a screen of 8-10' high evergreen trees planted on 5' high mounds which will provide approximately 15' of screening for aesthetics. Flowering trees will be planted on the north end and left side down John Street. Shade trees will be planted in the front where overhead lines are absent. Two retention ponds will have their perimeters planted with various fruit trees and bushes for the benefit of wildlife in the area.

Mr. Lyons was of the opinion that it will be a very attractive site; an improvement over the existing conditions of the site.

With regards to the concern of water vapor plumes:

A plume visibility analysis has been performed using available meteorological data. It has been determined that 4,500 hours of the year, should the right meteorological conditions exist, a plume may be visible. It is anticipated that of the 4,500 hours, a plume would be visible above the stack for 344 hours. From the type of cooling tower design selected, it is expected that a plume would be visible for 3,200 hours. PP&L thought that to be a serious impact on the environment so they investigated cooling towers that would mitigate the visibility of the plume. Basically, a hyrdo cooling tower. The tower selected will reduce the hours of visible plume from the cooling tower to 90 hours a year. It is anticipated that the plumes will occur predominantly during the cold, wet periods of inclement weather. This will be a fully-mitigated hybrid cooling tower.

With regards to lighting concerns:

PP&L has designed lighting in full compliance with local zoning ordinances. It will have a minimal impact on the light that will be seen in the neighborhood. A .1 foot candle increase in lighting will occur. It will be minimal impact and full cut off lighting and in conformance with all regulations that we are aware of.

With regards to noise concerns:

State sound regulations require that it be no louder than 51dBA at night to a class A noise receptor which is a residential noise receptor. The regulations require that those measurements be taken pretty

close to the boundary of the plant. During the day, state regulations require that it be no louder than 61 dBA. From a class C receptor, which is the industrial sites around the back perimeter, 70 dBA is the limit. Mr. Lyons displayed a noise meter, a hand-held device which measures the decibels (dBA) of sound at any given time. He asked that everyone in the room be silent and took a reading with the instrument. To the average ear, the room was extremely quite yet a reading of 50 dBA was recorded by the device. This exercise was performed to give everyone an idea of how quite the plant is required to be in the residential area. He stated that the level of sound emitted from a refrigerator is equal to 51 dBA. The power plant visited by a few Councilors in upstate N.Y. measured 70 dBA on the noise meter yet when the Councilors came upon the site they remarked how quiet the plant was. The plane ride up to the plant measured 85 dBA on the meter. It was learned on that trip that incremental dBA raised the noise level exponentially. If you go up 10 dBA it is believed that the noise level is doubled. Through the use of various noise mitigation measures the plant will meet the State's noise requirements. By tucking certain components, expected to be large noise generators, behind other building components, a great deal of the noise they would emit, is mitigated.

With regards to safety issues:

PP&L has been in communication with the Fire Marshal. Hazardous waste nor materials will be kept on site. A certain amount of 19% aqueous ammonia for use in cleaning the air emissions will be used. Fire protection equipment and procedures have been reviewed with the Fire Marshal. PP&L have complied with all of his requirements.

With regards to water usage:

PP&L will obtain its cooling water from wells in North Haven. They expect to use between 2.5 and 3 million gallons a day of non potable cooling water from North Haven and another 200,000 gallons per day they are proposing to purchase from the Town for the balance of the plant usage. The amount of water PP&L is proposing to use in the plant daily does comply with the Water & Sewer Division's future plans. The detailed engineering has not yet been completed on the plant and the indications are right now that there will probably be no undue load on either wastewater discharge or water usage at the division. The topic of storm water discharge will be addressed later this evening. PP&L will perform exhaustive studies to make sure they are not creating a cone of salt water intrusion. The proposal is to do flow testing on test wells in the region during the low flow period, most likely September, when it is expected that the flows would be lowest and the impact of drawing 2.5-3 million gallons a day out of the wells would impact them the greatest. The tests are a requirement for obtaining a diversion permit. Two routes are being proposed; one traveling up the west side of the river and crosses back near Toelles Road and the other runs on higher ground on the east side of the river. What will the water line look like? It will take on the appearance of a linear trail. It will be a multi-use nature trail that, in itself, will have to comply with D.E.P. and other

permitting requirements. There are a number of permits that will have to be applied for, for the water line as well.

With regards to the electrical interconnection facilities:

PP&L is proposing to run a 345kV line or two; it has not yet been determined which will be the preferable course to take. Before PP&L came on the scene, the Town was proposing to run a third 115kV line to increase the reliability of the East Street yard from the plant site, down close to the landfill to interconnect with the existing 115kV line that runs east and west. PP&L is considering adding that third 115kV line to the town and run it underground to interconnect with the 115kV corridor. Another possibility would be that PP&L would substitute what is called an auto transformer for that third 115kV line which PP&L thinks would actually provide more reliability improvement than the third 115kV line. This would allow the Town to access the 345kV system as well. That will either be one 345kV line PP&L is running or two (345kV lines). There presently exists a 345kV line that runs north and south through the golf course that PP&L needs to interconnect with. PP&L will either run what is a long loop; taking a loop from that line and stretching it back to the plant so the line runs in and out of the plant; that is one possibility. It is referred to as a loop circuit. Another possibility is that PP&L would run one single circuit 345kV line out there and would require an interconnection facility, a switchyard, the same kind of facility you have on the site now, out close to this 345kV line somewhere. PP&L has identified a site that would be a good place to put this which is just to the west or northwest of I-91, near Pond Hill Road. It is a site that is a large parcel owned by CL&P. The electric transmission facility, itself, will be the subject of a whole separate Siting Council proceeding which will undergo a sixty day municipal review period and separate application. The applicant for that line will probably be Northeast Utilities (NEU) because they generally do the permitting for transmission lines and they own them. That has not changed much in the deregulated environment. It is expected that the process will begin early next year. PP&L is providing this level of detail, which is highly unusual in other power projects currently before the Siting Council, because most of their interconnection will run over land that they do not own. They are aware that this is an area of interest to the Council and Town so PP&L endeavors to provide as much detail as possible at a fairly early point in the process. PP&L and NEU will complete the detailed engineering of it and it will be proposed in an separate Siting Council process just as this generating facility is. Plan A seems to be, to run a single circuit 345kV line south to the 115kV corridor, make a left turn and run that line out to a parcel near Pond Hill Road where it would meet a loop that is stretched back from the 345kV west over I-91. There would be two sets of towers about 130' tall each, going from the golf course back over I-91 to the site west of I-91. There would be a row of steel monopole structures or towers in the order of 100-110' tall. Electrical engineering requirements dictate the height of the poles and the spacing of them.

With regards to the natural gas pipeline:

Algonquin Gas Transmission Company has proposed a number of alternative routes which will transport their product to the site. There are three options that are under consideration. Algonquin's preferred option would be to cut across the Quinnipiac River and join the line that runs up to Cheshire. They, too, will be the subject of state and environmental reviews including a State Siting Council proceeding and a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) proceeding. Algonquin will own and operate the gas line extension. The other two alternatives would run south and intersect with the line that runs south of Cytec.

Hurdles to overcome from a permitting perspective:

PP&L make be making possible project plan revisions in response to written recommendations they receive from the Town under this process. They have yet to negotiate the host community agreements and the Electrical Interconnection Study must be completed. Work remains to be done to support the Siting Council, DEP, ACOE and local permit applications and also to develop and finalize a fuel delivery plan. PP&L reiterated that the only fuel the plant will use is natural gas.

At this time Environmental Risk Limited (ERL) presented their questions and concerns to PP&L.

Mr. Smith introduced Mitchell Wurmbrand, Certified Consulting Meteorologist, Vice President and Project Manager hired by the Town to review the application and subsequent information submitted as part of the project. Mr. Wurmbrand's expertise lies in the area of air quality. He will address those questions/concerns dealing with air quality and noise impacts.

Mr. Wurmbrand introduced Rich Derosher, Senior Associate. Mr. Derosher is a trained hydrogeologist therefore he will be addressing questions/concerns dealing with water supply, water discharge, hazardous waste and other miscellaneous issues.

Environmental Risk Limited envisions their role in supporting the Town as having two main tasks; first, they will review and comment on submittals by the applicant. Secondly, they will work with the Town to ensure that the applicant addresses environmental concerns of the Town and to offer recommendations that may enhance environmental performance of the proposed facility. In reviewing the Environmental Effects report, they recognized they were dealing with a double-edged sword. The document is very preliminary in nature which left many questions unanswered. The positive aspect of the fact that it is preliminary in nature means that it is still early on in the process and gives the Town and ERL a chance to have meaningful input to the design of the project.

Comments on the Draft Environmental Effects Report
PP&L Global's Wallingford Energy Project
ERL Project No. 07583-01

1.0 PROJECT EMPLOYMENT

Page 1-1 the number of new employees was stated as 12, however on page 2-23, 19 workers are identified (12 during the first shift, 4 the second shift and 3 the third shift). What is the real number of "new" employees? Will the project utilize or displace any existing Wallingford DPU employees?

Mr. Lyons, PP&L, answered: The plant would run three shifts. The day shift will be staffed by twelve people, the second shift by an additional four people and the third by an additional three for a total of nineteen around the clock; twelve at any given point.

Mr. Wurmbrand asked, with regards to the employees who will be selected for those positions, do you have an idea as to where those employees may be coming from?

Mr. Lyons, PP&L, answered, we will give all consideration we can to existing Wallingford Electric employees who apply for those jobs. We would favor hiring those people if they are qualified for the jobs.

2.0 DEMOLITION

Are explosives proposed for any portion of the Pierce Station scheduled for demolition? If so, what contingencies are in place to reduce vibration impacts on adjacent property owners?

Donald Cecich, PB Power, Inc. answered: there is no plan to use explosives during any demolition of the plant. A stack would be mechanically taken down with heavy equipment.

3.0 FACILITY LIGHTING

The existing lighting levels range from 0.14 to 0.44 foot-candles as described on page 2-5. The proposed lighting levels will increase from 1 to 2 foot-candles (page 2-15). The existing lighting level was rounded to 2 significant digits, whereas the proposed was not. The report states that the proposed lighting will result in an increase of 0.1 foot-candles (page 2-15) to the "horizontal" lighting level at the abutter property line. Discussion was presented on mitigating the effects by turning off the "yard area" lights, but there may be some opposition to the increase in lighting, especially given the topographical location of the facility.

Mr. Cecich answered: we are using full cut-off fixtures. We meet very stringent light trespass requirements for designing to the Illuminating Engineering Society Standards (IES), the recommended levels. The fact that the lighting levels are only increasing by .1 footcandle, we believe is fairly insignificant and would be difficult to perceive. PP&L will be shutting off yard lighting where it makes sense to do that. There is a certain amount of security lighting that has to be maintained on the roadway in the back. Again, PP&L is using the full cut-off fixtures. All lighting is directed downward, there is no light that will escape sideways. The overall impact on lighting is minimal.

Mr. Wurmbrand asked, over the existing lighting that is there today, obviously some of the residentials are more up on the hillside, are they going to have any increase lighting or is it all going to be directly to the ground?

Mr. Cecich replied, it will all be directed to the ground.

4.0 CONSTRUCTION

- **The number and type of truck traffic associated with the construction should be better defined regarding volume, truck routes, size, and other impact issues.**

Don Ceicich, PB Power, Inc. answered, all heavy equipment will arrive via Toelles Road through a new entrance that is going to be built onto the Cytec property. All the equipment will be marshaled in a storage area and then brought in at the appropriate time from the Cytec storage area down on S. Cherry Street to John Street and into the site. That will be done at pre-determined times. The employees that will be working on the site during construction will drive their vehicles to a parking area also located at Cytec. They will not be allowed to drive their vehicles onto the job site. This will be very seriously enforced as will deliveries. Deliveries will have to come through a marshaling area on the Cytec property which will keep trucks from showing up at the job site at inappropriate times when they should not be there. This will be very strongly enforced. We expect that during the peak construction, there will be between six and sixteen truck deliveries to the site, per day. It will not be the same number every day. As part of the next phase, as we move into preparation of the formal submittal to the State Siting Council, a more detailed construction plan will be provided with more details on the delivery and the overall construction plan.

Mr. Wurmbrand asked, do you have arrangements worked out with Cytec in terms of being able to access the site? Do we have some assurance that the access will be maintained during the time frame which you list for construction of the project; into the year 2002?

Mr. Lyons, PP&L, answered, we have an agreement in principal; we have not finalized our agreement with Cytec yet but I think we have covered all the major aspects of it. The construction of the roads and the laying out of the facility that we are contemplating will begin within the next thirty days.

- **Some construction will be located over the former ash disposal, coal storage, and wood chip areas. No environmental impacts were discussed. Are these materials to be excavated and removed? What contingency plans have been developed?**

Don Ceicich, PB Power replied, the amount of removal of soil from the site will be minimal. There is some excavation required for the foundations of the turbine building at this preliminary stage in the design. It is too early to say what the plan would be. In the next phase, we will propose to go out and take our own boring samples and analyze what is there. We have been able to review the preliminary information provided by the Town of Wallingford for the various mitigation for the oil storage tank that used to be there and for the coal. The preliminary review; we don't anticipate any major problems however we do need to conduct this additional evaluation of what is there, what would have to be removed and how it would be mitigated if it requires any mitigation.

Mr. Wurmbrand asked, you will also provide the back up support in terms of borings and the data that you discover in terms of that information?

Mr. Ceicich answered, we will gather that information and evaluate it. Any remediation costs associated with cleaning up the site, I want to make it clear, would not be part of the project costs. We assume that the Town would have to pay for any remediation of any environmental clean up of the site.

- **It is assumed that an application will be submitted to the Wallingford Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission for the construction of the facility. The report indicated that plans for the gas pipeline and electrical transmission lines will be presented to the Commission, but there was no indication in the report that the facility construction or water pipeline construction will be included in discussions with the Commission.**

Rich Derosher, ERL asked, PP&L has noted pipelines that will be constructed and the greenway that was proposed; are you also proposing to doing some borings along the pipeline centerline, where that will be and if there is any hazardous material or contamination associated with that pipeline, are you proposing any mitigations at this time?

Carl Stopper, TRC answered, as far as borings or investigations along the pipeline route; when the route is selected in conjunction with the Town of Wallingford and Town of North Haven what will be done is, first of all, a phase one investigation of what potential sources there might be for contamination along the proposed pipeline route and that any further investigations would be based upon the need for enforcing or reinforcing what ever information was collected during that initial review and file review for potential sources of contamination. That is something that would be done as part of a more detailed evaluation of the route in conjunction with other wetland impacts, archeological and cultural impacts ~~that might~~ be associated with the proposed ~~pipe~~line.

5.0 WASTEWATER ISSUES

- The wastewater estimates were based on average peaks and average daily readings at the WWTP. Averages may underestimate the demand on the WWTP. Thus, upgrades to the system may be required.

  Impacts on future wastewater usage should also be considered. The connecting sewer lines (page 6-12) should be evaluated prior to the issuance of a permit. If the connecting sewer line capacity requires upgrading, the upgrade of these lines should be the responsibility of the developer.

Mr. Derosher, ERL asked, are there any evaluations in terms of peak demands are averaging sometimes tends to.....can you just address the averaging versus peak demand time in terms of waste water treatment?

John Ballam, PB Power answered, the Town has provided us with the average peak flow for a single month. That is the order of resolution that we had in terms of comparing the impact of our waste ter discharge to the Town's system. Further clarification; that was the Town's highest average single month on record.

Mr. Derosher asked, in terms of capacity itself, I want to make sure that the connecting sewer lines themselves have the capacity in terms of the size of the lines from the facility to the treatment plant as well as also looking at, is there any upgrades that might be necessary as a result of the facility to the treatment plant itself?

Ed Wood, PB Power answered, we are working with the Town's Sewer and Water Division to evaluate those impacts now. It appears that the existing pipes that are in there are adequate to handle the flows that we are generating. We are going to be replacing them or relocating them to accommodate the new site layout that is proposed. If we have to increase sizes, we will. What we are currently looking at the impact on the treatment plant and we are working with them to develop a system to accommodate our flows in the plant, itself. WE are currently evaluating I/I possibilities to create the capacity to take the flows from the plant.

- The discharge temperature should be discussed as to the impact on the treatment plant. There may be biological impacts to the WWTP with increased temperatures.

Mr. Derosher asked, in terms of the capacity going into the treatment plant, itself, have you looked at the discharge temperatures that would be going into the treatment facility and is there any impact that would have to the existing facility?

John Ballam, PB Power, we have looked at the issue from the design to this date. We can ascertain that the temperature of the wastewater discharge stream to the treatment facility will not exceed 86 degrees Fahrenheit. In terms of the percentage or fraction of the flow from the Wallingford energy plant as compared with the total flow, in the worst case condition, which would be during the low flow situation of the Town sanitary system, to date we have looked at the case of the one month lowest flow and that seems to...in that case we represent about 15% of the entire flow rate and we are looking at about a 3 degree temperature rise to 86 degrees. That does not seem to indicate a problem. Recently we have been given more detailed information from the Town on the low flow; a more detailed, higher resolution data, so we will be looking at that in the coming days to see if there is any significant change.

At a later point in the presentation, Mr. Ballam expounded upon his remarks pertaining to the temperature of the waste water stream. He stated, when I referenced the 3 degree rise, I meant, to the average temperature of the existing waste water stream which, in this area, would be expected to be 66 degrees at that time of the year. I wanted to make sure the impression that we were raising the temperature from 86 degrees to 89 degrees; that is not what I meant. I am talking about 66 degrees to 69 degrees. The temperature of the water that the plant will be contributing to the waste water stream will not exceed 86 degrees. From our data that we have at this moment, that would result in a 3 degree rise to the combined waste water stream which would then rise from 66 degrees to 69 degrees. I apologize for any lack of clarity.

6.0 WATER PIPELINE

- **The development of the water supply pipeline corridor from the proposed well field to the proposed facility in coordination with a recreational trail is a nice benefit for the town. It appears from the report that the trail will be extended by the developers at no charge to the town. Is this correct?**

Mr. Derosher asked, from earlier discussion, in terms of the mitigating measures that might occur at the facility, itself, if there is any remediation, it seems that would be incurred by the Town, but if there is any mitigating measures in terms of hazardous material at the pipeline, would that be incurred by the developer?

Mr. Lyons, PP&L answered, for the pipeline itself, yes, that would be incurred by the developer.

Mr. Derosher asked, is the developer going to assume the cost in terms of that trail as well?

Mr. Lyons, PP&L, answered, we have not defined the exact contribution that we could make. It would be my hope that we could sponsor the construction of the entire breach to North Haven but that is subject to project economics. We have not talked about a specific figure yet.

- The discussion of Historic and Archaeological Resources did not include the installation of the water supply pipeline. The pipeline will be installed along the Quinnipiac River, where prehistoric campsites and other areas of interest may be located. It is stated in Section 3.2 that the proposed natural gas line could impact cultural resources, but there is no mention of the water supply pipeline.

. Derosher stated that this issue was addressed earlier in terms of the need for the studies that PP&L is proposing in terms of archeological resources as well as historical along the natural gas line as well as the pipeline. I don't think there is any further need in terms of, we will await the reports themselves in terms of what they will have to say.

- There is no mention of stream encroachment permitting issues in the discussion of impacts from the construction of the water supply pipeline or other items.

Mr. Derosher asked, are there going to be any significant impacts in terms of that encroachment on the stream itself?

Carl Stopper, TRC answered, as far as the pipeline is concerned, if it is constructed in conjunction with the linear trail, the impacts as far as the stream channel encroachment is concerned, as far as the pipeline itself, would be minimal, if non-existent since the pipeline would be buried. Obviously, the construction of the trail adds additional concern with respect to how the trail is constructed in conjunction with where the stream channel encroachment lines are, whether fill is being placed to construct the trail and those are issues that will have to be worked out, not only in playing out the proposed pipeline route but in conducting discussions with the D.E.P. on what they will accept as potential impacts with the trail construction. The pipeline, itself, would have virtually zero impact on flooding as a result on the fact that it is a buried utility structure. We have had preliminary discussions with the CT. D.E.P. on the stream channel encroachment line issues and have addressed some of these concerns with them in preliminary meetings.

- What contingencies are proposed for the water pipeline if hazardous waste is encountered during the excavation?

This issue was previously addressed.

7.0 WATER SUPPLY

The report states that the existing sources of water are sufficient to meet future demands (page 6-25). However, the report uses several different numbers in the analysis making it difficult to follow. The available yield of Wallingford's water supply system was defined at 9.08 MGD. Based on the numbers presented, this seems reasonable.

The analysis appears to be based on the system's design capacity (15.26 MGD) and not the available yield (9.08 MGD). Based on the projected 2010 maximum daily demand of 8.31 MGD and the current available yield 9.08 MGD, the margin of safety would only be 1.09, well below the 1.15 safety factor recommended by the Department of Public Utilities. Thus, based on the project water needs, the Town may require additional water supply by 2010.

The 1998 maximum daily demand was 7.15 and 7.39 MGD (June 30th and July 14th). The projected maximum daily demand by the plant would be 3.0 MGD (peak at 3.25 MGD). Thus, the maximum daily demand would be 10.15 to 10.39, which exceed the 9.08 MGD available yield. Thus, the statement on page 6-25 may not reflect existing conditions. To meet the Department of Public Utilities recommended margin of safety factor of 1.15 the available yield should be 11.95 MGD. An additional 2.87 MGD would be required to meet the proposed development and current demand and an additional 3.70 MGD would be required based on the year 2010 projections.

Mr. Derosher asked PP&L to speak in terms of the projected water needs in terms of the Town for the future, based upon the analysis you have done to date?

Carl Stopper, TRC answered, we need a little clarification on that particular question. The proposed water supply for the power plant for the cooling water needs will be coming solely from the well field located in North Haven. The cooling water needs for the plant will be met 100% by that supply. There are other in-house uses that will require a small amount of potable water from the Town of Wallingford's potable water system which amounts to about 200,000 per day, on the average. Those uses would be for the potable needs of the plant and for some small amount of water that is needed for boiler make-up on the steam side of the plant but those are pretty minor uses that will be required.

Mr. Derosher stated, in addition to looking at the well field itself, one comment in terms of looking at the potential we have this year in drought conditions, I strongly urge that the pumping tests be done during this period so a fairly decent analysis can be done. I understand September may be your time frame for that. The proposed yield we talked about is 2.5-3 million gallons per day. Have you had preliminary analysis that show that that, in fact, is achievable? Is there any detriment to the aquifer, itself, from the surrounding region as a result of that withdrawal?

Mr. Lyons, PP&L, answered, at this point in time we have evaluated preliminary information that the U.S. Geological Survey has published for the Quinnipiac River basin which we utilized that information to conduct a preliminary assessment of availability of water from that part of the aquifer. This is based upon actual pump testing information that is contained within the U.S.G.S. report and substantial amount of geotechnical boring data that is available from the area of the aquifer. At this point in time, without actually having conducted pumping tests and flow studies within the Quinnipiac River, we believe that based on this preliminary information that is available, there will be sufficient water supply from the aquifer and it will not have any measurable, detrimental impacts to the Quinnipiac River watershed in that area. Again, those are all subject to more detailed studies to be done, extensive data collection and this will all be subjected to the permitting process that the CT. D.E.P. will require as part of the diversion permitting application as well as there will be local reviews from the Town of North Haven's Wetland Agency, I am sure.

8.0 NOISE

8.1 Selection of Monitoring Locations and Modeling Receptors

- **Monitoring locations and receptors for the modeling of predicted noise levels were chosen at the same residential locations where noise monitoring was conducted. Regulation 22a-69-4(g) states that measurements to determine compliance shall be taken "about one foot beyond the boundary of the Emitter Noise Zone." The Emitter Noise Zone includes contiguous public streets, highways, railroads, etc. Do locations #1, #2 and #3 satisfy the criteria?**

Mike Anderson, TRC, answered, the noise analysis that we have done so far is based on preliminary design data of the facility and is not yet final. There will be a complete noise analysis done in which we have noise modeling and...some noise concentrations that will demonstrate compliance with the 51 dB, 61 dB and the 70 dB numbers that have been mentioned already here tonight. The specific locations of #1, #2 and #3, if they are, in fact, which I believe they are, at the residential areas, would be across the street from the one foot zone. The demonstration of compliance will be made ultimately at all of the places where it is necessary.

- Is there a rationale for the selection of locations #4-6?

Mr. Lyons, PP&L, answered, I don't know. It was done by Stone & Webster who was a partner in the project early on. I can only imagine that they were additional potential receptor locations that were identified. It does not seem to undermine the results to choose some extra receptor sites.

Mr. Wurmbrand stated, no it doesn't but as I said earlier, being that the document is so preliminary there were lots of issues although they may be minor that were unanswered by the report itself and this was just one of those technical issues.

Mr. Lyons, PP&L, replied, you can consider them additional receptor sites where existing noise was monitored.

Mr. Wurmbrand asked, can we get a copy of the Stone & Webster study?

Mr. Lyons, PP&L, answered, yes.

- How significant is the impact of wind direction on the sound level measured at a given receptor?

Mark Lyons, PP&L stated, if the wind is blowing towards you it would make a sound louder and if it were blowing in the other direction it would dampen the noise.

8.2 Modeling of Predicted Noise Levels

- When conducting the modeling, how was the noise from the new sources predicted?

Mike Anderson, TRC answered, the noise expert has not been available for the last several days. I have not been either since these questions came in. It is my recollection, and I can only say this as a recollection, is that the "generic" types of equipment, if you will, and the noise associated with them were used in the modeling, because this is a preliminary design, the most important thing we had to

determine first of all was, in fact, we could design a plant that would meet the noise requirements so conservative assumptions were made about the various noise-generating equipment and data for those noise were put into a sophisticated noise model. The specific further details that you request, I don't have at the moment but we will provide them.

- The report claims that the "results of the modeling indicate that, with an appropriate level of noise treatment, the facility will meet code noise requirements applicable for residential and industrial receptors."
  - ➢ The results of the modeling are not presented. What are the actual predicted sound levels before and after mitigation? Based on the background noise data, it is possible to increase the sound level by 10 dB and still meet the requirements, with the exception of the nighttime sound level measured at a Class A area. However, the note attached to Table 2-1 states that a 10 dBA increase in noise is "perceived as a doubling of the sound level." Is such a perceived increase in sound level expected?
  - ➢ The regulations allow for buildings or other structures that existed as of the effective date of RCSA 22a-69-1, which are remodeled or converted for adaptive use, to receive a permanent 5 dBA maximum noise level allowance above the standard for the noise emitter class of the new building. Will this project be eligible for this allowance, and if so, will the utilization of the allowance be necessary for the project to comply with the noise code requirements?

Mike Anderson, TRC reiterated, the modeling we have done is preliminary and it is our firm belief that the noise requirements of the State, which are incorporated into the air permit, will be met. The question of the 10 dB increase possibility and if I understand the question correctly, is because some of the receptor locations, the noise would be 10 dB below the 51 dB threshold or the 51 dB allowable amount. There is a provision in the regulation that no more than a 5 dB increase could occur in any one location so if it were already at 41 dB, you would only be allowed to go to 46 dB, not by a 10 dB increase. As far as whether such an increase of 10 dB is going to occur, the answer would be, no. Because 5 dB is the allowed limit.

Mark Lyons, PP&L stated, I understood the question to be that you thought we might increase the noise level during the day to the 61 dB?

Mr. Wurmbrand answered, correct.

Mr. Lyons explained, unlike a factory or some firm where you have substantial activity during the day and less activity at night, this plant will be designed to primarily run around the clock. We would expect the noise level, we have to comply with the daytime noise level of 51 dB at night. It is unlikely that the noise would increase during the day for any reason because the operation remains pretty much the same around the clock. If we comply with the 51 dB, we would expect it to be around that day and night.

Mr. Wurmbrand stated, reference has already been made to the 5 dB maximum allowance for existing buildings or structures, will this project be eligible for that allowance? If so, will you be utilizing that allowance in order to comply with the noise code requirements?

Mike Anderson, TRC answered, the 5 dB allowance would apply if the levels were at 46 dB. Then the whole 5 dB would be used up. If the existing back ground noise level was 51 dB, the addition of the new equipment has to not change that or actually, no, I see, it could go up by 5 dB from there. At this point I don't have a recollection of the exact notice. Unlike most of the other members of the project team, I have not been able to do much of anything on this since this material was received. My initial thought led me down the wrong path. To reiterate, we are in a preliminary analysis and not in the final analysis stage. The actual numbers and the isoplex, that is to say the contour lines of noise, will be provided when the complete design is done. We are getting down to the dotting of the "i's" and the crossing of the "t's" in terms of the detail of analysis and that has to be done when more details on the equipment design are available to us.

Mr. Lyons, PP&L added, we are aware that there are many different aspects of the noise regulations including the 5 dB increment level; we are subject to that. If it turns out that, looking at the ambient noise data that was collected before in the Stone & Webster study, there may be a receptor site where ambient noise was less than 46 dB, in which case we would be subject to only the 5 dB increments and we could not go to the 51 dB. If, in our final analysis, when we go for our permit, if it turns out that that is the case at any receptor, then yes, we would be subject to a lower than 51 dB limit, we would be subject to the 5 dB increment limit. We don't have the data yet but we will be subject to them when we finalize our application and we are aware of that.

Mr. Wurmbrand stated, I fully appreciate that the information to date is preliminary in nature, nevertheless, it is better to get these issues out in the open earlier, rather than later and I fully understand at this point in time you may not have complete answers to some of these questions.

8.3 Key Components to Noise Mitigation

- The report lists as a key component to noise mitigation the "enclosure of steam and combustion turbines with a carefully designed building." What is meant by "carefully designed?" Will it adhere to the Town's request to incorporate a brick façade?

John Ballam, PB Power replied, the discussion of "carefully designed"; in this context I would suggest that the elements of a carefully designed building is as follows:

1. Establishment of a clear understanding of the legal limitations and provisions for the allowable noise at the Wlfd. Energy project property lines.
2. A measurement of the existing sound-related conditions
3. Identification of levels and locations attributable to major sources associated with a project such as gas turbine filter housing, cooling tower, gas administered compressors, etc.
4. An analysis by a qualified acoustical engineer of equipment and establishment of general guidelines for the preliminary design including mitigation which would ensure that upon completion of the detailed design, the project would meet statutory limits at the property lines.
5. A preliminary plant design based upon this understanding
6. A detailed engineering including actual sources with all required mitigation with acoustical engineer's review and validation prior to proceeding.

Mr. Ballam continued, in terms of the specific question, the short answer is, yes. If the Town should so desire to go with an entirely brick structure, it could be designed and in such a way as to meet the required noise limits.

Mr. Lyons, PP&L added, it is my understanding that the reason the elevation looks the way it does right now.....we hired a professional architectural firm in Boston, MA to design the most attractive, least intrusive brick-looking structure because you wanted it to be in keeping with the existing look of the building. The parts that are non-brick are non-brick for acoustical reasons. If it is really the Town's strong desire to have a building that is made of nothing but brick, we can do that. The architect thought the rendering would be a better look for the building because it would not look as massive that if it were 100% brick. These are aesthetic considerations. If, at the end of the day people say, it has to be brick and nothing else, then we will do it. We strongly believe that this (rendering) is aesthetically a better look and tends to make some of the components disappear. In fact, it is a fairly large structure that does not look that large because of the way it is designed.

- Will all of the mitigation components listed be incorporated in this project?

- What level of mitigation is expected from each component?

This question was answered above.

- Were these mitigation measures considered in the modeling?

John Ballam, PB Power answered, the primary strategy for the mitigation of noise would be the general arrangements of the equipment and major sources on the site. So that those that could be shielded by less noisy components or by facilities or buildings, would be located towards the area with the higher limits. To be specific, that would include the cooling tower, which is the structure that cannot be completely enclosed. For the other major sources of noise, the gas and steam turbines, they can be enclosed and function so that was strategy that was employed for them. Going to a more detailed level, feature were incorporated in the cooling tower such as baffles and stacks and louvers which will also mitigate against the sound of falling water.

- No landscaping berm is proposed between Park and John Streets. How does this impact the noise to the neighborhood?

John Ballam, PB Power answered, landscaping berms are, in fact, really landscaping berms. They are there principally and only for visual impact, mitigation of visual impact. Because of the elevation of most of the sound sources, they would not function. They would have little or no vestible function as sound tenuators so they are not taken into account when we are designing the mitigation.

8.4 Appendix B

- Is it correct to assume that the Allegheny Ludlum facility referred to in the text is the Wallingford Steel Company referred to in Appendix B?

Mike Anderson, TRC, answered, it looks to me like it is the Allegheny Ludlum facility. There is a Wallingford Steel on Toelles Road but that is a different facility altogether.

- How are the "Controlling Noise Sources" determined?

Mike Anderson, TRC, answered, the people who did the noise monitoring were making their observations and those were their observations. I will have to check back with them to see exactly how they made them.

Mr. Lyons, PP&L asked for clarification on the question. The controlling noise sources for existing noise or for the proposed plant?

Mr. Wurmbrand answered, the proposed plant.

John Ballam, PB Power explained, most of the principal components of this power plant are standard and there is readily available manufacturer's data for the sound spectrum emitted by them. This is the information that was utilized in determining which were the controlling sound sources.

Mr. Wurmbrand stated, speaking from a layman's standpoint, noise impacts are very subjected. There may be loud noises that are quite pleasant and there may be softer noises that are quite irritating. I believe the developer will need to work with the Town to get a better understanding of the various noises that may emanate from this project. I see that an being an ongoing process. That is a statement that does not require an answer.

9.0 AIR QUALITY

- Background air pollutant concentrations were evaluated using CTDEP monitoring data for the period from 1994 through 1996 (Section 5.1.2.1). More recent data for the period 1995 - 1997 or the period 1996 - 1998 should be used. The 1997 data have been published by the CTDEP. 1998 data, although not yet published, should be available by contacting the CTDEP.

Mike Anderson, TRC, answered, the background air quality data; we did check with D.E.P., they had not yet published anything more recent than the 1994-1996 data when we prepared this although you can call up and ask for the data. The way in which they do background data, they average three years from the three nearest monitors and they don't change much from year to year because they are composite averages. Furthermore, since we identified, of all the pollutants for which we are doing modeling, only one has significant impacts and that is the only one for which background would be important. With all that said, as we go forward, we would use the most current data available.

- Section 5.2.4 states that 137 tons of NO_x offsets will be required at the 1.2 to 1 ratio. Table 5-2 says the potential NO_x emissions will be 126 TPY. By my calculation 1.2 X 126 TPY = 151.2 TPY. Why this discrepancy?

Mike Anderson, TRC, stated, I guess I messed up somehow but I will delve a little more into that. I do have to take personal responsibility for this. I went through all the numbers myself and I thought I had gotten all of the bugs out. It is a good time to give a little bit of background on some of these numbers. One of the things we do in the preliminary stages, we work up emission estimates that are going to meet al of the regulatory requirements, they are going to be conservative estimates so that we know we are not blind-sided by something that comes up in the future where we have underestimated what is going to happen. One of the things we routinely do in our preliminary estimates is add a 10% safety factor. I suspect is that this 10% safety factor was added in in one place and not in the other. It will either be the 126 tons emitted or only 114 tons. Even more so, that is assuming that every piece of combustion operates non-stop for 8,760 hours per year at full capacity so that the actual tonnage that is going to be emitted is going to be far less than this. In fact, because of the technology, you have to put a margin of safety in your estimates because you want to make sure that the control technology will always meet the air quality standards every minute of every day. The actual amount emitted may be far less and what we are talking about here are the regulatory numbers that are meant to fill all the appropriate boxes. At this point, the worst case estimate of the amount of tons that we need to obtain for offsets is 151 tons that you described. What we actually apply for in the air permit may be less than that.

Mr. Wurmbrand asked, do you know if there will be any offsets available from the Pierce Station?

Mr. Anderson answered, the magnitude of the offsets available from the Pierce Station will be quite small.

- What is the GEP height for the turbine stacks? Was a cavity impact analysis performed? How were direction-specific building dimensions for the ISCST3 refined modeling analysis determined, i.e., was BPIP used?

Mike Anderson, TRC answered, the calculated GEP stack height based on the structure heights and the GEP is a calculated value that is equal to the stack height plus one and one-half times the lesser of the height or projected width. It is 67.1 meters or 220'.

Mr. Wurmbrand stated, I don't believe the proposed stack height was that tall, therefore was the cavity impact analysis performed as part of the environmental effects report?

Mr. Anderson answered, the stack height as proposed is 132' which is just above the (undetectable statement) height and with a stack height that level, you don't need to do a cavity analysis.

Mr. Wurmbrand asked, did you use the BPIP model to develop direction specific building dimensions?

Mr. Anderson answered, yes.

- Section 5.2.5 concludes that the project will comply with state and federal ambient air quality standards. However, multiple-source modeling would have to be performed, at least for PM_{10}, to be able to make that conclusion. Impacts for the other criteria pollutants are apparently below significant impact levels.

Mike Anderson, TRC answered, the statement that is in the report is a matter of strong educated opinion but it is probably stronger than that in that if we don't meet the air quality standards, we won't build the plant. We are going to meet them and it is my judgment that we will, in fact do so, when the multi-source modeling is done and complete which goes through a fairly long process.

- What version of the ISCST3 model was used?

Mr. Anderson answered, the version used for this document was version 98-356. If I am not mistaken there is a more recent version and we will update to that one henceforth.

- Section 5.2.6.1 describes the results of a PSD visibility impact analysis that was conducted on the closest Class I area (Lye Brook). Visibility impacts on other areas were not addressed. According to a CTDEP memorandum from Jude Catalano to the SIPRAC Modeling Workgroup dated 11/15/91, PSD sources should also assess visibility impacts at the nearest Connecticut state park.

Mr. Anderson stated, TRC will be performing that analysis. Typically, we let Jude Catalano (CT. D.E.P.) do it but we will do it in this case.

- Why was the plume visibility analysis conducted using only one year (1974) of meteorological data? Five years of data were available because they were used for the cooling tower impact analysis. Also, why was 1974 used instead of one of the years used for the cooling tower impact analysis (1987 - 1991)?

Mike Anderson, TRC answered, if I had my druthers, everything would have been done with the 1970-74 data. In the CT. D.E.P. process, until recently, they required that 1970-74 data be used for all quality permitting. There have been some exceptions where they would allow more recent data and they were available and processed and met all the criteria and generally, that is defaulted to the 1987-91 data set that you mentioned. During the course of our work, as we struggle to put together between incoming data for doing analysis and getting to the point where we were, ourselves, comfortable with the outcome that we were getting, the years of data that were used were, in some cases, different. Although any given year of meteorological data would vary from any other given year, there will be more rainy days or sunny days or the winds will be stronger or lighter, in the course of a full year and in the course of five full years, you end up with a very similar-looking tribution of events. Particularly with regards to modeling such things as, in this case, visible plumes from the stack. Also, when Mark Lyons mentioned earlier about a visible plume, the only thing that is visible is condensed water vapor. There is no air pollution visible whatsoever. It is just the same phenomenon when you stand outside on a cold winter day and see your breath in front of you. That is the same phenomenon that you will see from the stack. Why was the visibility analysis conducted with only one year data? The analyst at the time felt that was sufficient to answer the question. We can certainly perform the analysis with four more years of data, 1970-73 data or the other five years of data. It is six of one or half-dozen of another but we can do all the years if it seems to throw more light on the matter.

Mr. Wurmbrand stated, we would recommend that a consistent, meteorological database be used for all the air quality and visibility impact analysis.

Mr. Anderson replied, and my preference would be 1970-74 just because that is the State's general way doing things. I realize that five years of more recent data might have some psychological appeal but it doesn't do much for me.

- The cooling tower impact analysis did not address predicted icing impacts or predicted drift deposition impacts. Why?

Mr. Anderson answered, my recollection is, and I will have to check into both of these points, but my recollection is that there aren't any icing events predicted and that is why they were not mentioned. The drift deposition, the cooling tower, itself, will be subject to a D.E.P. permit in which case will

provide those numbers. At the analysis stage several months ago we did not have an update to proceed at that time,

Mr. Wurmbrand asked, will the cooling tower be subject to a backed analysis?

Mr. Anderson answered, if the estimated emissions exceed the threshold that is required. It may very well be that it will not and emissions, therefore will be innocuous.

Mr. Wurmbrand asked, the statement has been made in the report and tonight that plumes that consist of water vapor are only visible during certain hours of the year. I think we should have further discussions over whether that statement is true. Certainly there are nighttime conditions where a vapor plume can be visible.

Mr. Anderson commented, I assume you are referring to things like, you can see the plume against a full moon or something of that nature and if it is requested that we analyze that phenomenon we can do that.

is concluded questions from Environmental Risk Limited.

At this time Mr. Parisi called for questions from department heads.

Questions Submitted by Departments Heads Pertaining to Project

David Gessert, Chairman of the Public Utilities Commission explained how there may be some repeat questions since each department head compiled a list of those issues of concern to them without having formal discussion on the topic with any of the other department heads.

The first set of questions addressed were submitted by Maryann Cherniak Lexius, MPH, RS and presented by Mr. Gessert.

ovide those numbers. At the analysis stage several months ago we did not have an update to proceed at that time.

Mr. Wurmbrand asked, will the cooling tower be subject to a backed analysis?

Mr. Anderson answered, if the estimated emissions exceed the threshold that is required. It may very well be that it will not and emissions, therefore will be innocuous.

Mr. Wurmbrand asked, the statement has been made in the report and tonight that plumes that consist of water vapor are only visible during certain hours of the year. I think we should have further discussions over whether that statement is true. Certainly there are nighttime conditions where a vapor plume can be visible.

Mr. Anderson commented, I assume you are referring to things like, you can see the plume against a full moon or something of that nature and if it is requested that we analyze that phenomenon we can do that.

This concluded questions from Environmental Risk Limited.

At this time Mr. Parisi called for questions from department heads.

Questions Submitted by Departments Heads Pertaining to Project

David Gessert, Chairman of the Public Utilities Commission explained how there may be some repeat questions since each department head compiled a list of those issues of concern to them without having formal discussion on the topic with any of the other department heads.

The first set of questions addressed were submitted by Maryann Cherniak Lexius, MPH, RS and presented by Mr. Gessert.

Water Quality And Air Quality:

1) Cooling Water

The currently proposed source of cooling water for the power plant are high production wells proposed in the Quinnipiac River tidal basin, located to the south in North Haven. Please be aware that a significant amount of industry has been located along the river basin historically. Since approximately 2.5 million gallons per day will be released as steam, we are concerned about any contaminants that will become airborne over the community. It is critical that the groundwater quality be determined as soon as possible in this planning process as pre-treatment of this well water may be necessary.

Carl Stopper, TRC answered, as far as the water quality issue, we have some water sampling data that we have collected from existing wells within the aquifer. Those are not fully representative of the water that will be taken from the precise location, the well field, as proposed. But we do have preliminary data on the water quality that would come from the wells. As part of any of the detailed studies that will be done later this summer, whereby a test well would be installed and pumping tests would be performed from that well, water quality samples will be collected and analyzed for a full range of parameters to assess both the impacts to the design of the power plant as well as emissions that might result from the cooling tower system.

Mr. Gessert asked, will you make that information available to us?

Mr. Stopper answered, yes.

Steam: **The atmospheric impact of the release of 2.5 million gallons of water per day as steam into the site neighborhood is of concern. The site is located in a valley. We have the following questions:**

a) Will the cooling tower stack heights be sufficient to remove steam and fog from the immediate neighborhood?

b) For individuals with allergies to molds and other chronic upper respiratory disorders, what information is available concerning humidity thresholds, which are important to prevent health problems?

Mike Anderson, TRC answered, the release of 2.5 million gallons of water a day into the air may sound like a prodigious amount and I do recall from a previous meeting in which the discussion of, if you are putting all that much water into the air, will it make it "rain" or it will be very, very moist in [illegible]t area? I know I went back to my office immediately and had someone do all these calculations and came up with the answer that the amount of water, even in this huge amount of water, and the calculation was that it was merely a drop in the bucket compared to the amount of moisture that is already in the air naturally, because that is the way the air is. It contains a huge amount of water vapor. I will provide the numbers in the future, I don't have them with me now. The cooling tower stack heights, be sufficient to remove the steam and fog; we have talked about the fogging, the

potential for fog. The cooling towers are not strictly stacks but cooling towers but they are a sufficient height to remove the steam and fog and the 98% mitigation beyond what a standard cooling tower would be, has already been discussed.

The amount of additional moisture added to the air may sound like a prodigious amount but, in fact, it is a not a very significant amount compared to the amount of moisture that is already in the air which, of course, varies from day to day. It should not have any significant effect.

In response to question b): Mike Anderson, TRC answered, that is a question that I don't have an answer to at the moment.

Mark Lyons, PP&L stated, when I talked about mitigation and impacts of the cooling tower, I neglected to talk about fogging. We talked about the visibility of the plume but our expert who analyzed the likelihood and visibility of the plume also looked at the likelihood of ground fogging from the cooling tower. The conclusion based on the data we used was that, in an unmitigated cooling tower, which is the tower we were looking at before, that there may be as many as four hours a year during which there will be ground fogging from that cooling tower. Under the new cooling tower we are looking at, it is basically zero hours. There would be virtually no ground fogging what so ever from the cooling tower we are looking at now.

Mr. Gessert asked, in the drawing we are looking at, it shows a yellow stack height that appears to be in the 135' range, I would assume, based on the height of the Pierce Plant. Then there is a penciled in higher stack. I assume you will tell me if we are going with the yellow one or the penciled in one?

Mark Lyons responded, we are going with the yellow one. My recollection is, please correct me if I am wrong, these drawings were done at a time when we initially thought, to be conservative we would need the taller tower but based on the air emissions stated that Mike Anderson (TRC) collected and developed in the preliminary modeling, it appears that the shorter stack is all that would be required.

Icing: **In a conversation with Joel Reinbold in February, we discussed safety hazards that can be created during cold months when inversions occur. During cold periods the steam plume can reach the ground and cause icing and residue. What information is available to prevent this problem?**

This question was answered previously by Mr. Anderson who stated that there would be no icing problem.

Maintenance: **A final comment concerning the cooling towers, the maintenance of the towers involves the use of biocides, algaecides and de-scalers. What information is available on such substances especially for people with chronic upper respiratory diseases?**

John Ballam, PB Power answered, at this time it is far too early to have a detailed water treatment regime having been developed yet but as it is developed, we will investigate this issue and report back to the Council on it.

2) Management of Noise and Vibrations

We understand that existing homes will be located in close proximity to the turbines. It is highly recommended that a trained noise consultant evaluate this proposal. Noise and vibrations may represent significant public health problems since the plant will be operational for twenty-four hours per day, having a continuous impact on the nearby neighbors.

John Ballam, PB Power answered, yes, for many reasons including that one. We have to this point and will continue to employ a trained acoustical engineer. As to the health effects that are mentioned, I, personally at this point am not aware of any active levels that we are talking about. But certainly that is something that a civil engineer would be aware of.

3) Dust management

During construction and during operation a dust management plan is needed. What information is available?

Mr. Gessert stated, we heard before that calcium chloride will be used as a dust inhibitor during the construction process.

Don Cecich, PB Power answered, that is correct. What it does is help us all to retain moisture and keep the dust level down. The mitigation measures for dust control will be addressed in the construction plan which will be forthcoming in the next phase. It was also mentioned that water would be used as required to keep dust down and also, over at Cytec, the lay down area and as part of some other activities that are going on at Cytec, the areas that we will be using over there will either be paved or will be covered with gravel so that dust will be mitigated over there.

4) Safety of the turbine itself

Again due to the close proximity of houses, what are the safe guards against explosion, and in the case of explosion, containment? This is important for local emergency preparedness and safety planning.

Don Cecich, PB Power replied, I will make an assumption that the concern is a fuel gas explosion. From that point of view, all of the fuel gas piping, burner management systems, controls, safeties, will be in strict accordance with all laws, ordinances, regulations, standards including the A.S.M.E. standards. They will all be reviewed thoroughly and designed by licensed professional engineers. From the point of view of inherent safety, this kind of system does not contain large stored volumes of natural gas. It is basically a feed through system. The gas enters and gets directed, completed contained in pipelines to the burners where it is burned and disposed of which greatly reduces the hazards of the system. All safeties and control valves are hard vented to the outside to avoid gas building up in an enclosed space and the combustion turbines and the other combustion devices all have burner management systems which upon loss of flame or ignition completely shut down the fuel gas supply.

Mr. Gessert asked, will there be shut-offs outside the plant should there be a problem inside the plant?

r. Cecich answered, yes and there may also be fire-side type automatic shut-off valves within the plant.

5) Thermal Pollution

According to the information provided by Ray Smith, the wastewater from the proposed plant will have a substantially increased water temperature. We also discussed the fact that the town's sewage treatment plant cannot tolerate the increase in temperature without killing the biologicals that treat and renovate the town's sewage. How will the heat be managed prior to discharge into the town's sewage treatment facility?

This issue was addressed earlier (see pages 14-15).

John Ballam, PB Power added, if it proves upon further analysis that this is a problem, then we shall have to address the problem.

6) Back-Up Fuel System

In my conversations concerning the siting council's requirements, I have learned that the council typically requires a thirty-day model plan to provide a back-up fuel source of oil. Is this requirement of a back-up contingency plan required of the proposed plant to be located in Wallingford? If so, more information is needed.

Mr. Gessert stated, to the best of my knowledge, we have been told definitely that there will not be back-up oil at that plant.

Mark Lyons, PP&L stated, that is correct. We are not proposing, nor do we plan in any way to use any fuel other than natural gas. There will be no fuel oil. The concern that the Siting Council has is legitimate; maintaining the reliability and availability of generating sources in the state. We believe those concerns can be met equally well through a study of the interruption of gas supplies. We think we can be just as reliable on 100% gas and we don't need fuel oil. We feel we can support our position that fuel oil is not needed and in any case if it ultimately were required by the Siting Council, we would not build the plant.

Mr. Gessert asked, you will have gas with gas back-up correct?

Mr. Lyons answered, that is correct.

(Insert cooling water line location here)

7) Cooling water line location

If the cooling water conduit pipe is to pass through the landfill area or other industrial properties, which have historical chemical contamination, worker protection will be of concern.

As an example, the Wallingford Health Department staff was recently involved in soil testing for a septic system on industrial property in the area of the landfill. The OSHA requirements for those individuals on site during excavation (including Wallingford Health Department personnel) was the wearing of full-face masks that were fit tested. The location of the waterline is critical and must be specifically defined with necessary precautions established by the engineer.

The environmental management of disturbed contaminated soils must also be considered. The DEP Oil and Chemical Spills Section may need to become involved in sites having historic contamination.

Carl Stopper, TRC stated that the Health Director's comments are fully acknowledged. In the process of planning the project, we will take the appropriate measures to both identify and provide the necessary health and safety measures for worker safety during any installation. I don't anticipate that the water line will actually be running directly through the landfill, itself. That may become a moot issue in itself.

1) On page 2-19 there is reference to recommendations for reducing noise. Is there a plan to implement these recommendations?

This has been addressed previously.

2) Page 6-28 there is reference to a "temporary" use of the public water supply as an emergency water supply. There is no further information defining "temporary".

John Ballam, PB Power answered, there are three possibilities in this particular case for use of Town potable water, one we have already discussed for normal operations. Another would be water for the suppression of fires. The third possibility is to work up an agreement or proposal with the Town of Wallingford to be able to avail the project of potable water to supplement the stored make-up water on the site during any time when the primary cooling tower water make-up supply, i.e., the pipeline, might become impaired. However, this would be something that would be a cooperative effort with the Town of Wallingford in which all the proper safeties and limitations upon the Town's system would be considered and complied with.

3) Although there is mention of wet/dry cooling towers that are now planned which are stated to reduce the visible plume by 98%, there is no additional data about these towers. Also, plume/icing problems are addressed concerning a change to wet/dry cooling towers. However, data that models night hours should likewise be included.

Mark Lyons, PP&L stated, the analysis of the plume visibility we know was done specifically based on the number of hours during which any plume or anything might be visible which is to say daylight hours and not inclement weather, that was a total of 4,500 hours a year. I believe the fogging analysis was done without regard to visible hours or not visible hours which is to say, I believe the conclusion that the fogging in an unmitigated tower would be no more than four hours a year was done with respect to all hours of the year. I will confirm whether or not that is the case. However, it doesn't change the conclusion that with the mitigated cooling tower we are proposing, we are looking at virtually zero hours and that would apply day or night. I will confirm whether the four hours from the unmitigated tower, the four hours that you might see fogging without mitigation, were done only during the visible hours. I don't believe that it was done with reference to visible hours. I think that is four hours total for the year.

4) Since noise levels are impacted by wind direction, local wind direction information should be included with variations shown for daylight versus night hours. Information in the proposal reflects Windsor CT information.

John Ballam, PB Power replied, wind direction and frequency was considered in the preliminary evaluation of the noise impact and mitigation measures.

Mr. Gessert stated, if Cytec has some information on wind patterns, it might be a little closer to what we deal with here, in Wallingford. It might be worth checking into.

Mr. Ballam stated, he would be glad to evaluate it.

5) I now understand that use of oil, as an alternative fuel is not an option at this site. If the Siting Council requires that an oil alternative fuel be available, it was stated at our June 17th meeting that this project will not go forward. This is point not clear in the "Draft" document.

This issue was addressed earlier.

6) As was mentioned in the above memo, the issue of the quality of the groundwater that is to be mined from the tidal reaches of the Quinnipiac River is not adequately addressed. Water quality testing is needed prior to approval of this source water. In addition to initial testing, a schedule for on-going testing must also be established. The withdrawal of 2.2 to 3.0 million gallons per day from an aquifer will create an extensive cone of influence around the well site. Ground water quality monitoring, as an on-going effort, is needed to protect the residents in the community from any future contaminants that may result from the daily rate of pumping. This concern is not addressed in the proposal before us.

Mark Lyons, PP&L stated, we will do exhaustive testing of the well water and what is in it. The constituents of the water during this flow testing period during the low flow this year, but we also acknowledge the need for continuous monitoring and we can provide continuous monitoring if, at some point, it appears that treatment of the water is necessary we can provide treatment. There are a number of ways we can do that. It does not appear on our preliminary samples that it will be required but if at any point in time during the usage of that water it becomes necessary to treat the water we do that. With regards to the "cone" of influence, Mr. Lyons acknowledged that it was a logical concern. He stated, we are aware of it. The fact is we plan to do flow testing at low flow periods when you would most expect that kind of intrusion to occur. We will see what the results of the test will be.

Carl Stopper, TRC added, in addition to monitoring the water quality from the pumping well over the long term, in addition to that there will be a monitoring well network associated with the well field that would be used to monitor not only the draw down in the cone of influence associated with the well field which this will be required by the diversion permit with the State of Connecticut but I would anticipate that there would also be some amount of water quality testing associated with the monitoring wells, upgrading so that in advance of the water reaching the well fields you would have water quality data upgrading the pumping wells and know in advance what the water quality would be entering the well field before you actually reached the cooling towers.

This concluded the questions presented by Health Director Maryann Cherniak Lexius.

The next set of questions to be addressed were submitted by Roger M. Dann, General Manager of the Water & Sewer Divisions and presented by Raymond F. Smith, Director of Public Utilities.

1. **The draft report does not provide sufficient information relative to the proposed utilization of the Town's water supply system in order for the Water Division to ~~access~~ assess its ability to provide the necessary flows and volumes. Does PP&L intend to provide more detailed information, as the Division has previously requested, including but not limited to seasonal and diurnal flow variations, required fire flows; volumes, duration and instantaneous flows proposed for the project's emergency supply needs, method of flow control, i.e., continuous versus intermittent flow?** .

John Ballam, PB Power answered, the short answer is, yes. This covers the same ground that I responded to earlier when responding to the question about emergency use of the Town's potable water supply. As the project becomes more clearly defined, we will be able to determine what level of fire protection and what suppression is required. Until we have done that, we will not be in a position to report to the town how much suppression water will be required and for what duration. In advance of that knowledge we will be trying to get from the Town information about the hydraulic capacity of the piping in the vicinity. I have been told that information does exist so we will request it. In terms of the variation of flow in the 150 gallons per minute (gpm) that is required for generation, i.e., when operating the gas turbines in the HRSG, we will be glad to provide that and I think we are probably in a position to give a at least seasonal and possibly a diameteral response to that at this time or in the near future.

2. **The draft report concludes that there is adequate capacity at the wastewater treatment plant to accept the estimated discharge volumes. This conclusion is flawed for two reasons. First, the discharge volumes are estimates only and do not appear to be based upon any actual water quality data at the donor site and therefore are made using generalized estimates of the potential cycles of concentration.**

Secondly, it fails to acknowledge the significant reduction in excess plant capacity available to support future growth associated with the commitment of up to .64 mgd of wastewater capacity to this project. Does PP&L intend to mitigate this impact through a program of I/I removal in order to retain sufficient excess capacity for future growth?

John Ballam, PB Power responded, at the time of the submittal and preparation of the environmental effects report, the project did not have at hand actual water quality test results from a well in the actual well field subsequent and so. And so the assumption of five cycles of our ability to not to have to go below five cycles of concentration in the cooling tower was an assumption; we thought a prudent assumption. Since that time we have received test results from a well, drawing from that particular well field and that assumption has been validated and confirmed. We feel that unless there is a radical change in our actual dedicated sample wells, we would be able to state that the project will not have to go below five cycles of concentration. I don't know if the Council needs elaboration on what that means to the waste water discharge or is it clear? The higher the levels of concentration in the cooling tower the less water needs to be blown down in order to meet water quality. That is a two percent reduction in the flow to the treatment plant. From the point of view of the impact to the treatment plant, the higher we are allowed to be able to cycle up the concentration in the cooling tower, the better for the treatment plant.

3. The draft report fails to discuss the individual discharge streams and the quality of the wastewater discharges proposed except to the extent of monitoring under a DEP discharge permit. However, in prior communications with PP&L the Sewer Division has consistently emphasized the need for PP&L to control its discharge quality, through treatment if necessary, such that it will not exceed current Sewer Division regulatory requirements or in any other manner cause detrimental impacts to the wastewater treatment plant. Does PP&L intend to comply with all requirements of the Sewer Division relative to wastewater discharge quality?

Mark Lyons, PP&L responded, yes.

Mr. Gessert asked Mr. Lyons to address the question of whether or not PP&L intends to mitigate the impact that a commitment of up to .64 mgd of wastewater will have on significantly reducing excess plant capacity available to support future growth, through a program of I/I (inflow/infiltration) removal?

Mark Lyons, PP&L replied, Mr. Ballam noted before that we had monthly peak period data for water usage and a monthly low period for outflow of effluent. All of our water and sewage data are based on monthly peaks. We have met with Mr. Dann recently and have talked about the desirability to getting some more refined peak data. Based on the data that we have today, it is our conclusion that there is sufficient capacity but we are also more than willing to look at I/I removal which appears to be a cost-effective way of reducing our discharge and if we are required to do that based on the best data we have available, we will do that.

4. The draft report does not mention the potential thermal impacts of its wastewater discharge to the wastewater treatment plant. In view of its proximity to the treatment plant and estimated discharge volumes, the possibility of impacting biological activity at the wastewater treatment plant exists. Does PP&L intend to analyze and mitigate, as necessary, this potential impact?

This issue has been addressed previously.

5. The facility plan, as shown, indicates the use of aqueous ammonia in conjunction with the emission control system. Does the use of ammonia for this purpose result in a nitrogen load in the wastewater discharge? If so, this will need to be addressed in view of future denitrification requirements at the wastewater treatment plant.

John Ballam, PB Power replied, there will be no ammonia load at the sanitary system.

6. The location of storm water retention basin #1 should be reconsidered since in the current location, it will likely result in seepage/icing onto the Sewer Division driveway and may also be prone to failure due to the height of the embankment and sandy soils along the side adjoining the wastewater treatment plant.

Ed Wood, PB Power answered, we had discussions with Mr. Dann about modifying the site plan to lesser the likelihood that the water will actually get onto the road either by adding a drainage ditch along the road and putting a sub-drain in or actually shifting the location of the retention pond.

7. Numerous details of the site layout for the various utilities including water and sewer are not acceptable to the Divisions. Does PP&L intend to fully comply with all technical requirements of the Water and Sewer Divisions?

Mr. Wood answered, yes.

Mr. Smith explained, there was talk of re-routing some of the sanitary sewer lines that are on the west side of the Pierce Station property to make things fit. We have strong concerns about how they all will work.

This concludes the series of questions submitted by Mr. Dann.

Mr. Gessert next presented a number of questions submitted by Town Engineer, John Thompson.

(Insert 1-3 here)

1. The reduced plans; included with the DRAFT EER; appear to be relatively complete, and appear to provide sufficient information for our preliminary review.

2. The issue of how to handle traffic and parking during construction notwithstanding, the subject site upon completion, would be accessible to the Public roadway network (see further discussion under item #7).

3. In order to construct the new (relocated) John Street, between East Street, and the existing roadway to the Treatment Plant and the Recycling Center, existing John Street would need to be abandoned and a new Right-Of-Way established.

Mr. Gessert explained, John Street, in total, is not going to be abandoned but where it curves and goes around to the dump, that section of the road is planned to be re-done. There would be a new right-of-way established and a part of John Street abandoned.

4. Relocated John Street; if it is to be a Town road; would have to be constructed in accordance with the Town's standards for "Industrial Roads", along with inclusion of the appropriate storm drainage system, and the required vertical geometry.

5. The Applicant has graphically shown a fairly significant storm water retention area, located just south of their complex. Unless, it is presented in a separate document; or we've missed it as part of this preliminary review, the only information on this proposed facility are the statements:

   Storm water will be appropriately controlled and managed at the site to protect surface and ground waters of the State from pollution. Storm water discharge general permits will be obtained from DEP for both the construction activities and industrial activities associated with the operation of the plant. As part of these permits, SPPPs will be developed to address Storm water pollution during the construction of the facility and for the operation of the plant."

   Clearly, as this project moves forward; the Applicant will need to provide additional information, including the appropriate hydraulic and hydrologic studies and analysis. Additionally, as part of the Storm Water Management Plan, a long-term maintenance plan and agreement for the operation of the proposed Storm Water Retention Area, will need to be developed and executed.

6. Relative to traffic: Long-term, this proposed power plant project should have a very minor impact on traffic operations on the roadway network serving the facility. The applicant indicated that during normal operation, the facility will add approximately 15 to 16 new vehicle trips on the roadways during the morning (AM) and evening (PM) peak traffic hours.

7. Vehicular traffic during construction; consisting of construction workers and vehicles making deliveries to the construction site; could be rather substantial during the peak construction periods. Providing parking spaces for the construction workers, without adversely affecting the adjacent residential neighborhoods, it an important issue. The Applicant has outlined a proposal that involves the use of Cytec property to provide parking for the construction workers. This plan, and a neighborhood parking protection plan needs to be developed and agreed to, to minimize parking problems during construction. This matter should be coordinated with the Wallingford Polic Department to ensure that is is both practical and enforceable.

Mr. Gessert asked, is the project group aware of that criteria and what will be required with Inland Wetlands and Planning & Zoning in this area?

Andrew Boyd, PB Power answered, yes.

Mr. Gessert asked, are you prepared to comply with whatever Inland Wetlands and Planning & Zoning requests, right?

Mr. Wood answered, that is correct. We have preliminarily sized all of these facilities in accordance with the Town's requirements and as the design proceeds we will firm those numbers up and provide them.

Mr. Gessert stated, in discussions held with Police Chief Douglas Dortenzio, he has limited power to tell a construction worker that he cannot come down this street or park in a particular area. PP&L indicated earlier that they would enforce that with their employees and vendors to ensure those people are not parking in the wrong places and are using the appropriate parking lots.

Mark Lyons, PP&L agreed. He stated, we would not look to the police to enforce it, we would enforce it ourselves. If workers showed up at the plant they would be denied access and we would strictly enforce the traffic rules.

This concludes the series of questions submitted by Mr. Thompson.

At this time Raymond F. Smith presented a list of questions submitted by Linda Bush, Town Planner.

1. **A shuttle for construction workers in planned. How will it be enforced?**

This question was just answered above.

2. **There is no mention of the CYTEC road connection in the section on traffic.**

Don Cecich, PB Power stated, there will be a new access road off of Toelles Road that will come into the back of the Cytec property. I also mentioned that there are some things going on that are going to require that the road be paved through the property. The site is very, very tight. There is no room for storage of equipment and components so it is very critical to the construction schedule that all deliveries will be marshaled at the Cytec property and then brought into the site at the appropriate time. We have no room on the 12.5 acres we have for the power plant to store any components there so it is essential that we maintain very close control of deliveries and of workers coming and going from the plant.

3. **Storm drainage calculations are necessary.**

6. **The designated inland wetlands and floodplain, Figure 6-3, appear to be mislabeled.**

Mark Lyons, PP&L stated with regards to comment #3, we have storm drainage calculations here. We have two sets. We spoke with Linda Bush today and we told her that we would give her a set tonight.

With regards to comment #6, Mr. Lyons stated that he looked at Figure 6-3 and he does not know in what way it appears to be mislabeled but if it is, he stated that it will be fixed. It is not readily apparent in what way it is mislabeled.

Mr. Smith suggested that Mr. Lyons contact Ms. Bush to find out exactly what the problem is.

Ms. Bush agreed to meet with Mr. Lyons at her office to discuss the matter.

9. **There appear to be numerous conflicts between the proposed power plant and existing features in the field, i.e. the relocated John Street and the Town's existing pole line, their proposed substation and our existing substation, the southern detention area and existing Town utilities.**

Smith stated, we are aware of the conflicts and agree that they have to be addressed both in this layout and any future revision of the layout.

4. **It would appear that it is legal to have an average sound level of dBA 61 up to 10:00 p.m. How will this impact the densely populated neighborhood across the street?**

Mark Lyons, PP&L answered, in meeting our requirement for 51 dB during the evening, that will effect the sound level twenty-four hours a day. We would expect the sound level to be a 51 dB level while meeting all the other requirements of the State Noise Regulations rather than the 61 dB.

7. **The first paragraph on page 4-10 makes no sense. Why not put the water main in the already disturbed areas.**

Carl Stopper, TRC answered, the reference in 4-10 to the location of the proposed water main is in relation to an existing right-of-way that the gas company has that runs along the westerly side of the Quinnipiac River. I think the question is whether the water main could be placed within or adjacent to that existing gas transmission right-of-way. There are some issues associated with the location of the water main and also the proposed trail with respect to that particular location. We have reviewed that locally with the trail committee as well as had some discussion with the D.E.P. on this issue and there are some other issues associated with that westerly side that may not make it the most desirable location because the disturbance created by the proposed water line and the trail would not be right on top of the existing gas pipe line transmission right-of-way. It would be adjacent to it so there would be new disturbance associated with that as well as there are more extensive wetland areas along the westerly side of the river. There are some other issues that we are looking at as far as the location, whether it is on the east or west side.

5. **What will be the size and location of the noise barriers?**

Mark Lyons, PP&L answered, we are not planning to have any noise barriers per se, apart from the integral features of the building. If we did make them to comply with the noise regulations we would design them and locate them but right now it does not appear that they will be necessary. It appears by the strategic placement of the project components and the use of enclosures as you see on the plan that, with those passive mitigation measures, we will comply with the noise regulations and we won't need to put any extra noise barriers per se.

Mr. Gessert asked, will you be using the insulation or sound-deadening material inside the building to keep the noise from getting out.

John Ballam, PB Power answered, if they are required by analysis to meet the allowable limits, yes.

8. **How will property owners along the proposed new transmission line be notified?**

Mark Lyons, PP&L answered, the Siting Council specifies the process for notifying those abutters which is through mail inserts in utility bills. That is the statutory manner in which those abutters are

notified. If some additional notification process is desirable we will do it. We can identify those people and notify them personally.

Mr. Gessert pointed out that electric bills are printed on post cards therefore inserts will not work.

Mr. Lyons replied, we will identify the abutters on tax maps and will notify them individually.

This concluded the series of questions submitted by Linda Bush, Town Planner.

At this time, P.U.C. Commissioner Richard Nunn presented a few questions submitted by Police Chief Douglas Dortenzio which needed addressing.

1. The parking of contractor vehicles in the effected neighborhood is of continual concern. While this issue is solely related to the period of construction, it should be clear to the developer that a consolidated off-site parking plan must be established within the framework of the town's contract. Secondly, a penalty should be established that can be enforced through the contractual process. The police department has no authority to regulate contractors who avail themselves of legal parking spaces on the local roads. The matter must be dealt with contractually.

Mark Lyons, PP&L stated, the matter will be addressed contractually.

2. At the appropriate time in the project the developer should be advised that as the town's legal traffic authority (ref.: C.G.S. 14-298) I shall require the developer to install street signs and pavement markings on any new or revised roadways before acceptance of the street(s) by the town and/or conclusion of the project. Further, such signs and markings must conform to the provisions of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) with placement locations determined in conjunction with the Town Engineer based on overall roadway engineering considerations.

Mr. Lyons commented, PP&L intends to fully comply and looks forward to installing the signs. He went on to say, this is precisely the kind of input at this point and over the course of the future permitting process that we like to get and we fully intend to comply with all of those requirements.

This concludes the order of procedure with regards to questions raised by Town department heads.

A ten minute recess was declared at this time.

Mr. Parisi invited questions from the Town Council next.

Mr. Centner complimented everyone on a well-done proposal. He fully appreciated the attention that has been given to all of the concerns that have been stated here throughout these months of discussions, especially a significant effort being made to mitigate the noise, also to air quality, plumes, lighting, water quality and especially the plant architecture. He greatly appreciated the placement of the gas compressors on the gas line; that was one of the biggest concerns he had from touring the Bridgeport plant. He stated that he appreciated the people coming forward and the questions they had which illustrates to the people of Wallingford the genuine concern from all the department heads, public, his colleagues and those within the various groups that are putting this together what is going on with the plant. Finally, as Co-Chair of the (Quinnipiac) Linear Trail (Advisory) Committee, he does appreciate the opportunity to team up with the utility and power plant for the hopeful placement of a lengthy portion of the trail. It shows goodwill on behalf of a large utility to show community spirit. He is pretty excited by what he is seeing and hopes the project moves forward.

Mr. Farrell asked, with regards to potential pollution on the Pierce Plant site, in the soil because of the use of the plant in prior years, if we were not going forward with this project we would probably not be disturbing that ground ourselves. We might just leave it the way it is and potentially would not be incurring any costs for leaving things the way they are. If we are getting into a cost on that to permit this project to go forward, the strain of thought I got from the answers was that we would be asked to pick up the cost of that. What I am looking for is some answer that says that issue is negotiable because I think, looking at it, we would not necessarily be doing anything that would give us a cost on that site if it were not for this project. Is there an answer?

Atty. Lawrence Golden, Pullen & Comley answered, it is my understanding that there was an R.F.P. issued for the site which basically explained that the site and the property was acceptable for the type of project that was proposed and therefore there were no sub-surface pollution problems that would come forth with the development of the site as PP&L is proposing. PP&L is not willing to negotiate on that issue or absorb the cost of any remediation on site.

Mr. Farrell stated, what about getting to the issue of how much it is going to cost? It seems a related question that for us to put a price tag on how much this whole project is going to cost us, we need to know that the remediation is $10,000 versus $10 million. I have no idea what it would cost, I am not a scientist.

Mark Lyons, PP&L stated, we don't know what is there. We took this site as ready for this power plant through the R.F.P. process. Clearly an investigation needs to be done when we get to that point. I can't tell you what will be found and what the cost of the remediation will be.

Mr. Farrell asked, who is picking up the cost of the investigation?

Mr. Lyons answered, he imagined it would be a Town cost. PP&L came to the project on the understanding that the site is ready for our power plant.

Mr. Farrell pointed out, it is a brownfield, not a greenfield.

Raymond F. Smith, Director of Public Utilities stated, we have had some analysis done on this date of that plant. As you know we had an oil spill there a couple of years ago and that was totally remediated. Obviously, in the process of dismantling oil systems and all that, it will be a contractor's responsibility, totally. We will drain the tanks as much as possible but they will have to dispose of

William Cominos, General Manager of the Electric Division stated, we had an environmental review done on the site about four years ago and there were no issues at that time that were brought to our attention. There may be some issues now because we have put some wells in and we are picking up some hydrocarbons in those wells that may be coming from and off-site situation. We are looking at that. I am not aware of anything of a significant nature right now.

Mr. Farrell yielded the floor to his colleagues but stated, I think it is something that we are going to need to nail down.

Richard Nunn, P.U.C. Commissioner stated, I am not willing to state that it is not a negotiable situation. I would like to have PP&L and whomever address that. I am not prepared at this point to say the Town is wholly responsible for that. I would like to see it discussed in a greater depth. I am not saying that the cost should be borne by one party or the other, but I don't think at this point we should make the statement that if there is a responsibility for clean up that it is to fall entirely on the Town.

Knight asked for additional clarification on the auto transformer benefits.

Raymond Smith explained, an auto transformer allows a connection from the 345kV system into our transmission system with is 115kV system. That is precisely what an auto transformer does and will do for this project. It gives us access to the 345kV system which we don't have at this point. Right

now we have two lines serving that substation that go to the south. One goes over to Southington and Devon and the other goes to North Haven. This will enhance our reliability significantly.

Jay Bednarz, PB Power stated, we looked at the issue of putting in the third transmission line as requested by the Town to improve the reliability of that substation which it will do and do effectively. We also looked at other alternatives; the auto transformer being one. We thought the auto transformer actually provided more benefit to the Town than the single third transmission line brought into it. As Mr. Smith mentioned, it gives the Town access to the 345 grid and also gives the Town access to the two combustion turbines and the steam turbine generators which are connected to the 345 grid. It provides better voltage levels to the Town in all situations; not very much but it is a little bit better. In addition, it reduces the system loss on the electrical grid so it is a win/win situation I think. As far as the economics associated with the comparison between the 115kV and the auto transformer, it appears to be a wash at this point in time. There may be a difference one way or another but it is not evident at this point in time.

Mr. Knight asked, in a situation where the grid, where we are presently purchasing our power, should go down and this plant would be stranded with no place to send its output, are you saying that this gives us an opportunity to keep the lights on in Wallingford because we have a direct connection to the plant?

Mark Lyons, PP&L replied, we talked about this last time. If our plant were connected to the 115kV system, then our plant would go down. We have more power than can go through the 115kV system. The 115kV system is a small river and the 345kV is a bigger river. But what we are proposing is, we would go out on the 345kV system but currently the Town is only connected on the 115kV system. What the auto transformer does is bridges those two. It would allow in the case where the 115kV system went down, we could still stay on because we are still going out that bigger river and the Town would be able to access our power and the whole 345kV grid, which is a completely different grid than the 115kV grid. This is why it is significantly more reliable than a third 115kV line. A very creative suggestion was made by PB Power to look at the installation of this auto transformer which is not definite by any means because NEU has to approve its use, they have to do a short circuit analysis but it appears now that it will be feasible. If we can install that, right now there are two sources for the East Street yard and they are both 115kV lines. The proposal was to install a third 115kV line. What the auto transformer does is, now it makes our three generators and one or two 345kV lines additional sources for the East Street yard. Right now you have two sources. As proposed originally it would be three sources but now we have three generators and two 115kV's, that's five and then at least one 345kV line, that is six sources of power for the East Street yard so numerically you can see by increasing the number of sources available and the inherent increased

reliability of the 345kV grid or with the 115kV; it adds a substantial increase by virtue of all these new sources of power available to the East Street yard.

Mayor Dickinson stated, at the risk of complicating this, I think something has to be said and I want to have Mr. Smith verify.....when we talk about the Town having its lights stay on with greater certainty from having the auto transformer that, from the East Street yard would be, 70% or 80% of the Town?

Mr. Smith answered, under the best conditions, 80%, probably somewhere between 60% and 70% of the Town is served by that substation.

Mayor Dickinson repeated, under average conditions 60-70% of the Town is served. There are two other areas of Town on the outskirts that would not be served. It nothing to sneeze at, the 60-70%, but I just don't want it left on the record that the Town of Wallingford, in its entirety, will be served; that would not be the case.

Mr. Centner asked, what are the areas that will not get it?

Mr. Smith explained, the two substations over on the north side of town, North Wallingford and Colony (substations) are off a different transmission line and would not be connected to this generation source or the 345kV system. Predominantly, from Barnes Park North, we can do some switching and pick up different sections but we just don't have enough capability to pick up the whole town. To further elaborate on that, Steve (Mr. Knight), so that you understand, in the event of a black-out such as we experienced in 1965, there is no guarantee that all the lights will stay on here. I don't want anyone to misunderstand and think that the lights will never go out. There is always that possibility. But as explained, the likelihood of having some supply to the East Street Substation is far better than it is today, with the auto transformer.

Mr. Zandri stated, at one time we talked about the 345kV line going out underground. I just want to get clarification on that. The 345kV line talked about tonight is going to go overhead, is that correct?

Mark Lyons, PP&L answered, yes. Our preferred configuration at this point would be to run the line or lines overhead. It is our belief that undergrounding the line would be cost-prohibitive.

Mr. Zandri asked, according to your plan you are also planning on using the existing 115kV right-of-way, at least I assume that is the one you are using that goes out toward Pilgrim's Harbor, for the 345kV line?

Mr. Lyons answered, yes.

Mr. Zandri asked, is that right-of-way large enough to accommodate the 345kV and also what is going to happen to the 115kV existing line that is on the right-of-way today?

Mr. Lyons answered, yes, the right-of-way is wide enough. NEU has looked at it in significant detail and what would happen is we would put the 115 circuit on the same pole as the 345 circuit.

Mr. Zandri asked, would that pole have to be any taller than the normal 345kV pole?

Mr. Lyons replied, it would actually be taller. It would be as tall as I indicated before which is between 100-120'; 110'.

Mr. Zandri stated, because you are talking about using the auto transformer, you are talking about n 345kV lines coming in on that pole.....

Mr. Lyons stated, actually, as I understand it, the auto transformer issue is quite separate from whether we line a loop circuit or a single circuit 345kV. Those are two different issues.

Mr. Zandri asked, if you have the loop circuit are you still going to put the 115kV line on that pole?

Mr. Lyons answered, yes, in the loop circuit configuration the 115kV would go on one of the poles and the other pole would simply have one 345kV. One pole would have a 345kV and 115kV line and the other would have a 345kV line. We have looked at this in detail and so has NEU.

Ms. Papale stated that she was one of the Councilors who had the opportunity to go up to Oswego, N.Y. to visit the power plant there. It was a help to us to have an idea exactly how they are run. I believe the one that is being proposed for Wallingford is half the size of the one in New York.?

Mr. Lyons answered, that is correct.

s. Papale asked, how would the noise level compare being half the size?

Mr. Lyons answered, it is difficult to make a direct comparison on the basis of the size. The noise readings we obtained from that plant were based on the noise mitigation measures and the noise requirements that they have to comply with. It has nothing to do with the noise limits we have to comply with or the mitigation measures we will perform. Our plant will be 51dBA, their plant, standing outside measured about 70dBA and at the fence line was 62 dB. You are correct in saying

that the Oswego, N.Y. plant was noisier than the Wallingford energy plant will be. It is an apples/oranges comparison.

Mr. Zappala asked Roger Dann, General Manager of the Water & Sewer Division, are we able to supply the 200,000 gallons of water a day?

Mr. Dann answered, 200,000 gallons per day, considering that it is taken more or less continuously rather than an intermittent basis, should not cause a problem as far as the water supply system.

Mr. Zappala asked, what you are saying is, we can supply the plant with 1.4 million gallons of water a week without a problem?

Mr. Dann answered, that volume is well within our available safety yield in the system and is within the hydraulic capability of the distribution system to supply to that particular site.

Mr. Renda stated, you are going to take all this water into the plant and when you discharge it, where is it headed? Especially if we have serious rain problems like we have had over the past few years? Where is the water going to go?

John Ballam, PB Power answered, the 200,000 gallons per day is primarily used as make-up water for the steam cycle. In every boiler turbine cycle, there is a certain amount of water that has to be bled off of the system in order to maintain water quality. This is the primary usage for this water.

Mr. Smith added, the discharge will go to the waste water treatment plant. That was one of the issues we talked about earlier. One of the options we would consider is some I/I removal to offset what this increase flow would bring to the waste water treatment plant.

Mr. Nunn was under the impression that Mr. Renda was inquiring about the water that we are bringing in from the wells which is many times that, is that what you were referring to, Frank?

Mr. Renda answered, yes, that is what I am talking about?

Mr. Ballam replied, the water we are bringing from the well is primarily make-up water for the water that has evaporated from the cooling tower. The cooling tower is the main method of rejecting heat from the turbine; the steam that comes through the turbine has to be condensed into water again so a certain amount of heat has to be removed from it and that heat is removed via the cooling towers. Water is taken from the cooling tower basin, is put through a heat exchanger where it takes heat from

the steam, the steam condenses to water which is returned to the cooling tower where it rejects heat to the air mostly by evaporation. That is why we need to make up the water.

Mr. Gessert stated, it is my understanding that about 2.5 million gallons goes back into mother nature in the form of water vapor and about .5 million gallons a day go to the Sewer Treatment Plant. Are those numbers accurate?

Mr. Ballam answered, yes they are. The reason we have to put water into the sanitary system is, if we continue to only supply water needed to keep the level of the cooling tower basin within limits, the water would continually concentrate as steam is driven off into the air. At some point then the amount of solids in water exceed the point where they can be used in a heat exchanger and you would get fouling; you would cease to do heat exchanging anymore. This goes to the whole issue of cycles of concentration that we talked about. In order to prevent that, we have to release some of the cooling tower water to the sewage system and bring in fresh water to keep the dilution level in the cooling tower basin within limits.

Mr. Rys stated, my concern is with the stacks. You will be producing 550 megawatts of electricity with how many turbines, two?

Mark Lyons, PP&L answered, three.

Mr. Rys asked, why do we need two stacks instead of one?

Mr. Ballam explained, the way in which the electricity is produced is from three separate sources. There are two gas turbines each driving a separate generator, two independent gas turbines, each with their own generator. The hot exhaust gas from these gas turbines go into a waste heat recovery boiler. The steam out put from these two boilers which have your two stacks is then directed into a steam turbine, into a common line which supplies the steam turbine. The steam turbine has no combustion path in it; no hot gas path, it is only steam so there is no stack associated with it. There is simply a condenser associated with it. We have to have two stacks because there is no way to combine two gas turbines into one HRSG (heat recovery steam generator), they each have to have their own.

Mr. Parisi asked, on page 5-7, "Facility Air Emissions and Control" the third last line which reads, "because the emissions of PM10, Ox and Co will be greater than 15, 40 and 100 tons per year, respectively. The facility is subject to PSD review. The project is also subject to non-attainment review for NOx because the emissions will be greater than 50 tons per year." Then you go over to page 5-8 and it says, "by using natural gas and the exhaust is passed through a catalytic material and a

few other things, the emissions are considerably lower." That seems contradictory and I don't understand why.

Mike Anderson, TRC stated, you are troubled by some regulatory mumbo jumbo and some technical problems which is understandable. The 15 tons of PM10, 40 tons of NOx and 100 tons of Co put the facility into the PSD, the prevention of significant deterioration regulatory pathway. That is a set of rules that address how much dirtier the air can get in areas where the air is clean for those pollutants. Dirty or clean means either above or below the standards. That, in and of itself, is a separate issue. With regards to the "non-attainment review for NOx" comment; that is another threshold that applies to nitrogen oxides. There are two regulatory pathways under which nitrogen oxides are addressed. One is the PSE pathway and the other is a non-attainment pathway. Nitrogen oxides, themselves, are not regulated as a pollutant because of a health standard but they are a precursor to ozone or smog. In that regulatory pathway the threshold is fifty tons per year. With regards to the issue of emissions control technology to reduce the nitrous oxides emissions and selective catalytic reduction; that is the technology that is applied to reduce the emissions to the level provided in the previous table. The selective catalytic reduction will reduce the emissions by 90% om what they would have otherwise been. I speak in rough terms, so instead 126, they would be almost ten times higher. Because of the fact that nitrogen oxides contribute to ozone smog, that is why it is subject to such stringent control and this level of removal is required. This facility will be as clean as any that has been permitted in this country.

Mr. Centner asked, what are we going to with all the equipment that is currently in the Pierce building, the steam turbines and such? What are we going to do with that?

Mr. Smith stated, obviously they will be taken out of service. The back end of the plant where the boilers are located, the developer plans to dismantle those, remove them from the site. The current fuel system would dismantled and removed. Any conflicting foundations and equipment, the stack, that will all come down. The question is, what needs do they have inside the building? They have not made a determination, they talked about leasing part of it, leasing it for storage and perhaps for administration and operation of the plant. I don't think they have gotten to that detail. If that occurs then they will have to gut the plant and take out all the piping, the turbines, condensers and the cooling tower would be removed. Inside the building, all the equipment that is there would probably be taken out, cannibalized, offered out if someone is interested, on a bid process to take it away.

here are some people who will buy an old turbine just to scavenge for the parts. It has no real value, it is 1950s vintage equipment and unless you happen to have something similar that you can steal some bearings or covers or something like that, it has very little application.

Mr. Centner asked, in the initial start up will this plant produce any excessive hydrocarbons or anything when we fire it up? Are we monitored for that? Is there a period when we monitor once stabilized? Does the start up period matter?

Mike Anderson, TRC answered, the start up and shut down cycle for these plants are a well understood part of the process. There is a certain amount of time the equipment.....you have a cold start a warm start and a hot start. The regulatory process is very stringent on the tons per year that can be emitted. On a ton per year basis it does not matter if those are emitted at start up, shut down, or the routine operations at full load, part load; they have to meet those standards for the tons per year threshold. So the ton per year indicated in the document is the number that must be achieved. Hydrocarbons in and of themselves are a catalyst to the ozone smog formation so that is why they are very stringently regulated. My experience has been with these plants that the nuances and what it is doing during the one hour period when it is starting up cold might be such that the regulatory agency might impose a period of monitoring. They would check what is happening during that period. That would have a separate threshold. The quantities that we are talking about is unnoticeable. Natural gas is a very clean fuel. There is not going to be a problem with films forming like there could be on a remote case with oil firing.

Mr. Farrell commented, with regards to the aesthetics of the plant, I suggest that PP&L try to put as much of it in brick as possible. That is one of the reasons the Pierce Plant blends so well into the landscape, it is because it is manufactured out of native brick. The Quinnipiac River Valley provided clay for most of the brick buildings in the area. It has a helpful quality in helping what might be a sore thumb sticking out in the landscape. With regards to the electrical towers that will be located in the CL&P right-of-way; how many will there be and exactly how will they be sited?

Jay Bednarz, PB Power replied, typically the 345kV monolithic poles are spaced from 700' to 1200' between spacings. It is about 2-2.5 miles from the plant to the golf course where the switching station will be.

Mr. Farrell asked, is it somewhere between four and six towers?

Mr. Bednarz answered, it is probably 16-20 in that distance. The distance between the poles will probably be 700'.

Mr. Farrell stated, out in that neighborhood we had people who strenuously opposed one single cellular tower. I guess they can't wait to hear they are getting sixteen.

Mr. Bednarz answered, it will be pretty close to what the existing 115kV structures are.

Mr. Farrell replied, they are much shorter though.

Mr. Bednarz added, the height of them is going to be less than what the existing 115kV and as far as the number, it will be approximately the same number of structures.

Mr. Farrell stated, the vast majority of people in Wallingford would never know that the present structures are there because the trees cover them. Trees are not going to cover 100' structures, they will be seen far and wide.

Mr. Bednarz stated, there will be some limited screening along the roads where they intersect. For most of the right-of-way there is not much you can do as far as screening that other than the growth that is off the right-of-way.

Mark Lyons, PP&L stated, there are quite a few trees in the surrounding area, in the corridor and there is no doubt that the towers we are proposing are taller but we were out there just recently and in most of the areas where I was looking around the right-of-way, the trees are in front of you. Even if se trees are twenty or forty feet tall, they effectively screen the right-of-way. It is not as if there aren't trees throughout the area that will play a large role in screening just as they do with the current towers. There is no doubt, the poles will be taller and there will be one instead of two but there is an existing power line out there and that is why we are using that area. I am not questioning that there will be some incremental impact but I am not sure it will be all that dramatic. We will have to take a look at it.

Mr. Knight recognized that the project is at a very preliminary stage in the examination of noise and that there won't be any hard data on what the noise generators....what impact they will have until the plant has actually been designed. He asked, when will the hard, organized data be available for the Council to review about the noise impact?

John Ballam, PB Power stated, the noise issue is broken up into two general categories; one is the background noise, what the present existing conditions are and the spacial distribution of things which you talked about first; I am not qualified to speak to that. Second is, what do we know about what we are going to add into the mix? ON that level, the equipment that we intend to use is, we have data which is probably over 90% representative right now on the major sources. In fairly short order, I believe, we will be able to put together a fairly detailed source map of the location and the quantity d the quality of the noise that will be emitted from the plant.

Mr. Knight asked, ERL, are you prepared to analyze data of that technical in nature?

Mitchell Wurmbrand, ERL replied, we will not be dictating to the developer what they should do with respect to noise mitigation. We will carefully review what they provide to us in their submittals to be sure we feel very comfortable that the noise standards that are promulgated by the state are, in

fact, going to be met. We also want to ensure that the Town and residents in the vicinity of the facility feel comfortable with the noise levels that they will be subjected to from this facility.

Mr. Knight responded, I certainly was not suggesting that you tell them how to design their plant, mostly that you receive the data you need in order to report back to us that you are satisfied that they are doing what has to be done.

Mr. Wurmbrand added, we have been talking to Mr. Smith about conducting some independent background noise measurements as well to verify some of the numbers that we have seen so far.

Mr. Zandri asked, with regards to employee parking during construction, you mentioned that you will be using Cytec as a staging area and also an area for the employees to park who will be working on the construction of the facility, what parking area at Cytec were you planning on using and what access roads would they be using to go to Cytec?

Mark Lyons, PP&L answered, the lot that we are proposing to use was actually suggested by Cytec. It is at the north end of their existing parking lot. There is an extra space there that will be paved over and that is what they suggested we use.

Mr. Zandri asked, you are talking about off of South Cherry Street?

Mr. Lyons answered, yes.

Mr. Zandri stated, there will be a considerable amount of traffic on S. Cherry St. and John Street in order to have access to that site.

Mr. Lyons answered, the workers will come in down John Street and down S. Cherry Street, park there and then get to the site from there by shuttle service.

Mr. Zandri suggested at the last presentation on the power plant that PP&L look into Toelles Road as a potential parking area for construction workers. He urged PP&L to consider the option once again.

Mr. Lyons asked, the commuter lot?

Mr. Zandri replied, I am not sure the commuter lot would be sufficient for the amount of employees you will have during construction but at least by using Toelles Road or some area off of Toelles Road, they can use I-91 as a means or Colony Street as a means to access that and stay off of the residential roads. That would be my recommendation to you; that you look into it as a second alternative to using Cytec's Cherry Street lot for parking.

Mr. Lyons agreed to look into the suggestion.

Ms. Papale stated, I was under the impression that because this plant would be in Wallingford, if there was an emergency we would be taken care of and now I am hearing differently.

Raymond F. Smith, Director of Public Utilities explained, it depends on the final arrangement that they select. If they are not going to provide an auto transformer, this plant will produce energy and ship it out on the 345kV system, we are not connected to that. Our increased liability in that case would come from building a third 115kV transmission line into the East Street Substation. Again, we talked about that substation only so it will not increase liability at the north end of town. If they do with an auto transformer configuration, Mr. Bednarz mentioned five or six methods by which power can come to the town, that enhances our ability to receive power during some of these abnormal events. At this point it cannot be viewed as an emergency generator system just for Wallingford, no. They have not made that decision. There are advantages and disadvantages to that. They have not decided which way they are going. When we looked at this project, we never anticipated that it uld be arranged as an emergency generator system. Our ability to serve would be enhanced by the rd circuit, what we require as a part of that construction program.

Ms. Papale stated, it was confusing to me because at one time I thought that was part of it (the deal).

Mr. Smith answered, it has been on and off the table during the course of all the discussions. Stone and Webster said that they looked at that and at one point they configured the system to have a steam generator feed into the 115kV system and that presented some other problems. They have had some discussions back and forth with NEU of what the impacts on the transmission system are. The load flows can probably be accommodated. I think the concerns currently are, what, during short circuit or fault conditions, happens to the systems? What other problems do we create in the connecting of the 345kV and the 115kV. I know they are evaluating that currently. In my view, if they could go the auto transformer route, that would be the absolute best but we never saw that as an absolute requirement for the project.

Richard Nunn, Public Utilities Commissioner asked, what are PP&L's plans at this time with regards to the auto transformer?

rk Lyons, PP&L replied, our plan is to have a short circuit analysis done. We have talked to NEU and we have proposed this to them. They need to be comfortable that it won't create any short circuit problems. We don't believe that it will but that analysis needs to be performed. On NEU's approval we will provide the auto transformer.

Mr. Zappala asked ERL, I know the final decision of what we should or should not do rests with the Council however, in reading PP&L's report, in your opinion, how would you rate it and is it sufficient

for the Council to make a decision on? To me, I feel like it is the first meeting we are having on the plant, the same as we had six meetings ago. Do you see this report as one which the Council can base their decision on whether or not we can support the proposal?

Mr. Wurmbrand replied, not at this time. I don't think you are being asked to make that decision at this point in time. The developer, as they have pointed out, have many submittals that they have yet to make and are required to make and you will have an opportunity to very closely review. As they continue to go forward with this process, the quality of the information that they provide to the Town hopefully will improve. I am sure they are looking to do that as well. At this point in time you cannot rely solely on this report nor should you. In the very near future, as they continue to go forward, you will have more information and better information on which to render your decision.

Mr. Zappala asked, how can the Council make a decision on one-third of the report? It does not have the issue of water source or transmission lines finalized yet.

Mr. Wurmbrand reiterated, you are not being asked to make that decision now. The information is insufficient at this time. Your question is premature.

Mr. Zappala stated, the sixty days (municipal review period) has supposedly started for which this body will have to say yes or no to the project.

Mr. Wurmbrand continued, the requirement is that the developer must enter into discussions with the Town at least sixty (60) days prior to submitting an application to the Siting Council. That is what they are attempting to do. They still have to come before the Town with respect to Planning & Zoning, the Wetlands Commission, those are separate submittals they have to make. That is just on the power facility. There are submittals they will have to make with respect to the transmission lines, etc. The Town also has the right to appeal any Siting Council decision.

Mr. Zappala asked, once the Council voted yes?

Mr. Wurmbrand answered, that is correct. You don't want to get into the position where you have to make legal appeals. Hopefully by that time you will have the quantity and quality of information whereby you can make a well-reasoned decision on this project. At this point you do not have that information.

Mr. Lyons stated, you are not being asked to vote on anything right now. The part of the process we are in is, we are required to provide the town with any technical reports we have on the project. During the sixty day process the Town is to make written recommendation to us. This is a review and consultation period. It is a heads up on our Siting Council application. Then we go before the

Siting Council and you have full rights to participate before the Siting Council on the application itself as well as the whole list of other permitting activities we are required to go through on each of the project components at the local, state and sometimes federal level. There are many, many more opportunities. Your decision comes down to the host community agreement. There are many opportunities to make your will known as this process unfolds.

Mr. Zappala stated, the power lines Mr. Farrell was talking about is as important as the plant, itself. I think we should know now what it going to happen, which way you are going, what impact it will have on the citizen of Wallingford. It is not something that should be thought about afterwards.

Mr. Lyons explained, again, for perspective, we are trying to provide significantly more detail on the transmission line than is normally provided in this phase of the generation facility application because we know how important it is to the Town. It is being paced in large part by what is going on with NEU who is performing very complex load flows to determine what the impact of our flow will be on the overall system. There is a lot of work that is going on right now. We are trying to expedite that work as much as we can. NEU has been very cooperative in working with us to try to provide more detailed information on the power line than would normally be done in this process. At the end of the day, it is not for us to determine how this plant is going to be hooked up. It will be determined by NEU and the Siting Council. We will make our recommendations but it is really the Siting Council who will permit this line based on engineering, economic and environmental considerations. This is the way we would like it to go, this is the way we will propose it to go but it has to go through a Siting Council process of its own.

Mr. Renda thanked the project group for a good presentation. We have to work together to make sure everything is straightened out; what we want and what you want.

Mr. Lyons stated, the project team has worked very hard to address every item of concern. This plant will be very attractive and won't be very noisy. We understand the need for more information and we are striving to present it.

Mr. Parisi commented that many issues of concern were raised tonight. He hopes someone is keeping track of them. He asked if that information will be forwarded to the Council or will there be another presentation similar to tonight's? Will we meet again or not?

Mr. Lyons answered, it will be up to the Council to meet again like this if they so choose but questions can be addressed in writing. Barring another meeting we will answer any written questions.

Mr. Parisi replied, that is fine. That is all you can do because I guess the minutes.....the issues will be picked up on the tape anyway.

Mr. Knight stated, earlier, it was mentioned that PP&L would seek a second supply of natural gas. That is not in the information tonight. Are you just as far along with Tennessee Gas Transmission as with Algonquin?

Mr. Lyons answered, no, we have had preliminary discussions with them and we think it is feasible to hook up to the Tennessee system but we don't have as much detail as we do with Algonquin. Our ability to hook up with them is uncertain right now.

Mr. Knight asked, can you give us any kind of time table when you might have concluded whether you can come to some kind of agreement with Tennessee Gas Transmission?

Mr. Lyons answered, that is one of our key development activities.

Mr. Zandri stated, you said earlier that the buildings, themselves, would act as a buffer for the noise from the facility and that you would also put in some material inside the buildings if needed, to meet the requirements of the state. What if the exterior walls of the facility met state requirements pertaining to noise but if you put material in it would lower the level even more, is that something you would consider doing if you had that capability?

Mr. Lyons answered, if it is economic to do so. We will be looking for opportunities to make any and all cost-effective noise reductions.

Mr. Zandri stated, I would like to know, if there is a possibility that putting additional material in the facility will reduce noise levels what would be the cost associated with installing such material? I, personally, feel that there may be some way, perhaps in the host agreement, to work out getting the additional materials installed if the price is right because noise is one of my biggest concerns and I would like us to do everything that is possible to reduce the level of noise to below that which is required by state.

Mr. Lyons commented, it is a great suggestion and we will look into it.

Mr. Zappala stated that he opposes the project. He, too, visited Oswego, N.Y. to see the plant. Even though it was twice the size, a plant half the size will still be monstrous regardless how it will be covered, with or without bricks. It is commercial or industrial and that area (in which the plant will be located) was so-designated fifty years ago but Wallingford has grown a great deal since that time and more and more people live in that area. We should be very concerned about that. I give you credit for trying to make the project attractive by tying in a linear park to it. It is a good gesture on your part but I am really not impressed. I don't think a plant belongs in the center of Wallingford. The plant in New York was beautiful but located on 180 acres of land, not on 12 acres of land. There are a lot of things we should be concerned about; the environment is the main one. If you go down

Route 5 and see the cooling towers the waste disposal plant has, you can imagine what a second tower will do. The transmission line poles you showed; all I can envision is the same poles along the Garden Stare Parkway in New Jersey. I don't want to see that in Wallingford.

Mr. Zandri asked, will the retention ponds that you will be planting shrubs around, the interior of them, be maintained on a regular basis so they do not become unsightly?

Ed Wood, PB Power replied, we will be developing a maintenance program which will go with all of the facilities at the site which will be given to the operator. We will be looking at what frequency these facilities will have to be maintained at.

Mr. Zandri stated, there are retention ponds throughout the community which, over time, have become unsightly....

Mr. Wood answered, these would be fenced in so that it is going to be very hard for shopping carts and other items to find their way into. There will be a maintenance program developed.

Mr. Zandri asked, as far as the wells in North Haven, are you going to own and operate them? There will be no compensation to anyone for the water that is being taken out of the aquifer? Is that true?

Carl Stopper, TRC answered, yes, that is true; there will be no compensation to any outside party for that water.

Mr. Zandri asked Roger Dann, I know we have a certain amount of capacity left for our sewage treatment plant, what percentage of that capacity will be taken up by this project?

Mr. Dann answered, the wastewater treatment plant has a designed capacity of 8 million gallons per day (mgd). At the point where our average flow for one year exceeds 90% of that, or in this case 7.2 million gallons per day, it is likely that we will receive an order from the state to begin the planning process ultimately leading to upgrading the capacity of the facility. What we are really looking at is the difference between what our highest recorded average daily flow has been and that 7.2 figure. Last year we had an average flow of 6.3 million gallons per day. The difference we are looking at is available capacity before we would begin a process of upgrade is about 1.9 mgd. This project, as it is proposed with some degree of uncertainty.....is proposing to take up on an average basis, something on the order of .5 mgd leaving .4 or 400,000 gallons per day remaining capacity.

Mr. Zandri asked, are we planning on getting any kind of contribution from the contractors here to offset any costs associated with additional capacity for the sewer plant?

Mr. Dann answered, in the questions I posed, I suggested the possibility of offsetting the use of existing capacity through perhaps an infiltration/inflow removal program. The intent of something like that would be to remove extraneous sources of flow into the system, those sources we don't want; storm water flow. In doing so we make available capacity within the facility so the impact of this power plant is mitigated and we retain excess capacity for projected future growth.

Mr. Parisi asked, doesn't the state require a certain amount of capacity or limit to how much we can treat and are we meeting or will we meet that standard?

Mr. Dann reiterated, at the point where we exceed 90% of the plant's design capacity, 7.2 mgd, we will then face an order from the state to begin the process of upgrading our facility. On the water side, the state looks for a margin of safety of about 15% on your safety yield There is not a corresponding figure that I am aware of for the wastewater side. If you take our most recent high flow period and add the input of this facility, we are getting to a point where there is not going to be a lot of excess capacity remaining, that is the reason to suggest either mitigation through an I/I program or perhaps there will be in the process of our discussions with the developer other possibilities that will come under discussion.

Mr. Zandri stated, our capacity is a concern of mine. Again, regardless of what method we use to obtain more capacity, there has got to be some sort of compensation from the project, at least I feel, to help us defray some of the costs.

Mr. Knight commented how he thought the questions Roger Dann had of the project would have been addressed long before getting to this stage of the process. He stated, I am looking at our Sewer Division as more customer-driven. I look at this potential project as a new customer. Some of the questions I heard from Mr. Dann, correct me if I am wrong, are you not getting information you need? Are you not having the communication you need, Mr. Dann, with the developers?

Mr. Smith replied, we have had a number of discussions, even when Stone & Webster was involved in the process, and had issued a number of communications saying, "these are the specifics that we are looking for". Even to this date of the report, some of that information was not forthcoming in fact, some of it we just received recently after Roger wrote his report. For instance, the temperature of the effluent, which is a critical item as far as we are concerned and we just received it. I don't know where it was in their list of things to do but it was there. It was always an issue, not that we had not communicated that to them.

Mr. Dann added, much of what I am looking for requires fairly detailed design effort to have taken place. It is kind of premature for the project to have evolved far enough to give me the detailed information that I am looking for. However, at this stage of the process where we are faced with a formal report and a comment period I think it is important for me to have highlighted those areas of

concern that remain to be addressed. To have the report indicate that adequate capacity is available in the water system without having detailed information from which I can validate or invalidate that statement makes it very difficult at this time and it is similar on the wastewater side. My comments are intended to indicate that there is a lot of detail that needs to be provided from which we can better evaluate the ability of the two utilities to provide the service that the project needs. I expect from what I heard this evening that is going to be forthcoming at a later time and at that point we will be better able to indicate to the Council where, if there are any remaining areas of concern, where those areas may be.

This concluded the questions of the Council.

At this time Mr. Parisi called for questions from the public.

Robert Sheehan, 11 Cooper Avenue asked, how will the air quality in that area be effected by your pollutants?

Mike Anderson, TRC explained, the impact with regards to the regulated pollutants will be below significance levels. It is safe to say that the impact with regards to those pollutants will be insignificant in the area. The other pollutants, the particulate matter, with a 10 micron size cut-off, will have to have impacts of less than 30 micrograms per cubic meter. What that says is, if there is a standard which pertains to health which is 150 on that same scale, the power plant cannot add more than 30 to the existing situation and under no circumstances can the total ever be over 150. The maximum particulate matter impacts will be indiscernible to anyone. The measurement instruments would discover a slight change but no one else will ever notice because they are well below the health standard. The amount of particles we are talking about in a cubic meter of air, if I held up a thimble full of them, you would not even be able to see them in the bottom of the vial; that is how much would be allowed in a cubic meter of air. The amount that is allowed for this power plant is one-fifth that amount.

Mr. Sheehan asked, has the air been tested down there recently?

Mr. Anderson answered, the existing facilities in the vicinity will be subject to computer modeling so that the air quality of that particular pollutant will be calculated based on all of the facilities that exist there. We have not put monitoring out there; it is not required by the State's permitting program. Everything that is down there, Cytec, the Resource Recovery Plant and any other that is in the State's inventory of being a significant emission source, is accounted for.

Mr. Sheehan stated, I have no fear that you will meet the air and noise pollution standards but I look at this as a quality of life issue. As the Mayor says regarding open space, we buy open space to

preserve the town's landscape for the next thirty, one-hundred years.....that philosophy could apply to this project. This project will effect all of Wallingford but mainly a high residential area. I don't think eleven acres of land is enough. If it was located out in the country somewhere, all well in good. Just because this is zoned for that use, it does not mean it has to go there and we have to have it. All the benefits to us are monetary in nature. I believe the quality of life is better than any benefit we will get from this project. If you are going to have another meeting, I wish you would publicize it more than this one has been. Three weeks ago in June, you said that was the last meeting and the public waited five hours tonight to get to the microphone. The same people are here, some residents left from East Street. I think you should consider the taxpayer of Wallingford and the public first, you people can wait. If we can wait five hours, you can wait five hours.

Mr. Parisi stated, I think it is important that we all hear the information that is presented. That is why the meeting was set up this way.

Mr. Sheehan stated, some people come here because they feel they just want to get something off their chest. I don't think they should have to wait five hours to do it.

Mr. Parisi reminded Mr. Sheehan that the public can come to any Council meeting and the Public Question and Answer Period, they would be more than welcome.

Fred Clark, Carriage Drive asked, with regards to the proposal for the back-up water for the cooling system; how much additional water to the 200,000 gallons per day originally proposed would you now you want for back up supply for cooling?

John Ballam, PB Power replied, I think that number is completely a question of a negotiation between the project and the Town. There is no set requirement for that. The range could be anywhere from virtually none to what ever the Town could supply within its limits. I don't the Town would be able to supply full back-up to the plant of 2.5 -3 million gallons per day and still meet the set asides that you have to have for the State yield. I see no technical reason why the Town and the project can't work together to come to some mutually-acceptable proposal.

Mr. Clark asked about the test flow of the well water; can a list of the contaminants that will be tested be supplied to the Town Council prior to the start of the testing?

Mark Lyons, PP&L answered, yes, most certainly. He asked Carl Stopper of TRC, how soon can we get a list of what we will be testing for?

Mr. Stopper answered, within a couple of weeks in advance of the testing.

Andy Kapi, 6 Deme Road stated, with regards to the margin we have left at the wastewater treatment plant, page or section #6-11 refers to a peak influent level that takes place generally in the month of March. That level is reported as 7.9 million gallons a day. It is assumed that the report is not talking about that level being maintained for thirty days in March but more along the lines of 4 or 5 day increments where there may be some thawing taking place or inclement weather. Given at that time of the year that the plant proposes to put in .43 million gallons a day, that puts us over the 8 million gallons be day level that we are permitted to operate at. What do we do in that short term?

Raymond Smith, Director of Public Utilities explained, the number that Roger Dann was referring to earlier, the 8 mgd average annual number; we do experience higher flows - in March of that particular year we did average almost 8 million gallons that also came down.....on a short term basis we have reached various flows as high as 30 million gallons for hours.

Mr. Kapi asked, functionally, it does not stop us in terms of how well the plant works?

Mr. Smith, yes.

Mr. Kapi stated, with regards to noise regulations, are you interpreting yourselves to be a modified structure so that part of the language which gives those modified structures a permanent 5 dB maximum noise allowance above the emitter class of the new use of the building? Which are you intending to identify yourselves; as a new use or a modified use?

Mike Anderson, TRC answered, I don't recall any discussions or attempt on our part to characterize the facility as a modified use project.

Mr. Kapi referred to a table on page 2-19 which speaks to the issue of lower sound levels in the 42-45 dB range occurring at night at shielded location #4.

Mr. Anderson explained, shielded location #4 is one of the sites that was mentioned that was not at the perimeter of the property but further away. At East Street locations #2 & 3 when the wind changed to southerly and Allegheny Ludlum was down wind and inaudible, the wind direction did have an effect on the period.

Mr. Kapi asked, when we have heard the number 51dBA referred to a couple of times, are you rring to any one particular site in general or on an average?

Mr. Anderson replied, the point that we have all been making is, the threshold for the noise is 51dBA that will be met or better than met at all off site locations within the structure of the regulation, one foot from the fence line as it may be. In addition to that, the maximum increase in noise at any

location that is well below 51dBA would have to be limited to no more than 5dBA. That is my understanding of the regulations, as best I recall them at this point.

Mr. Kapi stated, Mr. Lyons said that we would meet that 51DBA level at all occasions at all times. Is that correct?

Mr. Anderson answered, that was my understanding of that statement but I have to say, for example, at the point of 50dBA, and you have to deal with noise.....you just don't take 55 dB and add 55dBA and get 110dBA, because it is a logarithmic scale and if my recollection is correct, two 51dBAs might add up to a 53dBA or something like that. If the facility, itself, is producing 51dBA and the existing noise was 51dBA, you would end up with something like 53dBA. Don't hold me to the precision of those numbers but that, in principal, is how it works. The issue that I would see is, where there is a 50dBA measured already, I believe the regulations would allow a 5dBA increase but I would have to check back into that.

Carl Stopper, TRC added, there are some noises within the neighborhood that are going to be beyond the control of the facility. For example, vehicles moving up and down the street in front of the facility will generate noises in excess of the 51dBA threshold.

Mr. Kapi stated, we seem to waiver between what is a commitment or promise in one statement and then two minutes later someone asks a question about buffers and the response was phrased in terms "we will meet the regulations" and I am just wondering what it is you are committing to? We don't need informal language that seems to promise something. What do you intend to honor, the Statutory requirements regulations or something beyond that?

Mr. Lyons responded, our commitment is to comply with the regulations. We all acknowledge that the Town Council, in the process of negotiating the host agreement, does have more leeway and if the Town were to request or require us to do something beyond strict compliance with the regulations, we would be more than happy to look at that and determine whether or not it is cost-effective for the project. At some point a continuing addition of requirements in the project will render it uneconomic. That is part of the negotiation process, for us to stay in close communication as to what is cost-effective and what is not for the project. At a minimum, we are committed to complying with the regulations.

The topic of air emissions was discussed next.

Mr. Anderson explained, the lowest achievable emission rate, the "layer" requirement, is something that is imposed on pollutants that contribute to a non-attainment situation and that is the case in ozone

throughout the State of Connecticut. If you are in an ozone non-attainment area, you have to keep your nitrogen oxide emissions to the lowest achievable emission rate. In addition to that you would have to purchase offsets from another facility that reduces the emissions at that facility or facilities in an amount 1.2 times the amount of the amount that you are proposing to put into the air at this facility.

That standard is the most stringent that can be applied. It comes under that Pathway of the Regulations called the non-attainment regulations. The BACT (Best Available Control Technology) standard is applied to all the other pollutants that are subject to the minimum amount of emissions of a permanent threshold. The determination of what the BACT emission rate is for _____ pollutant is done by starting with the layer emission rate for that pollutant and then you can eliminate having to do the layer emission rate for that pollutant and then you can eliminate having to do the layer emission, the most stringent emission rate, if you can show at this particular site that other environmental, economic, or energy factors would render it to be a bad idea.

Sulfur Oxides or acid rain as it is sometimes referred to was the next topic of discussion.

. Kapi asked, is there a higher level of mitigating control, a higher BACT standard for sulfur oxides?

Mr. Anderson replied, a power plant that operates on natural gas per megawatt is emitting the lowest amount of sulfur oxides per megawatt produced of any fuel combustion-type of power plant. The only thing one can do to eliminate the sulfur oxides altogether is to not generate the power or to use the nuclear, hydro or solar or one of the types of energy production that does not burn fuel. The technology that would be required to remove the minimum amount of sulfur that is put in the natural gas so that it would smell to begin with, would not be something that anyone in the industry would recommend doing.

Mr. Kapi pointed out that when he got to section 5 of the report dealing with emissions, there is not a single descriptive note on the amount of sulfur oxides that Cytec is permitted to discharge into the atmosphere and non of the other pollutants, the CRRA (CT. Resource Recovery Authority) Trash Plant, nothing about how many particulants they discharge.....and I found that curious. Thirty-four point four (34.4) tons of sulfur oxide is something that I am looking at for the first time. If I see a number that says Cytec is generating 76.8 tons, very nearly in the same location, that has more meaning. I would say that to be the case of every other pollutant on your listing. I am curious as to why that information wasn't included. You have to give these people (Council) a frame of reference. For the Council to make the kind of judgment they have to, they have to have the context and that includes every one of those placid facilities in that stretch that we know as our industrial row. I find it a glaring omission to give me and anyone else the grounding to understand what those types of numbers mean compared to other industrial uses.

Mr. Anderson responded, it is a very good suggestion. You are looking at a different style of reporting that pertains to the discipline that we are familiar with. What you are asking for is something that is not normally done at this stage of the process but it is a good question and can be readily provided, no problem.

Mr. Kapi stated, we cannot sign an agreement until these things have been played out further. Some of the uncertainty revealed tonight should be nailed down with precision. Would anyone here find it at all feasible or practical to be setting down a set of conditions in the community host agreement that depend on nuances of language? Given the contingencies and uncertainties and possible outcomes of elements of this project, would anyone here look to have us sign that agreement before these things come to fruition? I say that we can't do that. That is my suggestion.

Author Ohl, Seiter Hill Road stated, he lives in an area that just went through a tremendous experience with water on their streets (bad wells). We find that we, as homeowners, had to pay for the system and not the town. Consequently, I am asking this question; if a tremendous project coming in to our area, I wonder if any of the money has to come from me, the taxpayer, in addition to the fact that I had to pay for the water lines in my neighborhood? Secondly, I am thinking about the wells in our area. I find that 15% of our city water comes from wells and here, only ten miles away, we are going to be drawing 2.5 million gallons a day. Ten miles, not one hundred or one thousand, but ten. I am saying, if the city was so concerned about the water in our area, drawing that kind of water from ten miles away, how will it effect us? I also know that I have enjoyed paying the lowest electric rates in the whole state. Wallingford, having its own electric company, kept our rates down to a minimum. The reason, we were able to produce electricity if necessary, so we made deals. These people coming in (PP&L) want to produce electricity in our community. Will they give us wholesale rates for the next twenty-five years if our current supplier wants to stop? What happens if he stops and these people want to charge us retail and we will be back in a situation where our rates will be higher than ever before. What are we going to gain by this whole situation? These towers bring to mind a story of Bridgeport, CT. many years ago. The Gas Company wanted to put up a gas tower in the center of town. They got the law passed, brought in 500 employees and in forty-eight hours they put up a 150' gas tank in the center of Bridgeport which took thirty to fifty years to get down. I still have not heard how we are going to benefit from all of this. As it stands, from where I sit and what I hear, we are gaining nothing from this whole program.

David Gessert, Chairman of the Public Utilities Commission stated economic benefits would be derived; probably close to what Bristol Myers Squibb pays. We are looking at a very large taxpayer and customer of the Sewer Division. We are looking at a pretty good-sized customer who will improve the revenue stream of the Water Division. We are also looking at the potential of increased liability as explained earlier. Right now we have a contract with CMEEC to buy power until the year

2004. In the year 2002 or 2003 we will probably be negotiating another long term contract. One of the options will be to continue with CMEEC, negotiate with NEU or whoever is producing electricity under the name of NEU at that time, and certainly at that period of time, this plant will be a potential source of power for the Town should we decide to purchase it from them. It is another vendor we could go to that is pretty close to home that we could talk to about buying power. If anyone tells you this project is all pluses and no minuses, then they are a fool. I give the Council and the public and everyone else here tonight a lot of credit for spending hours and hours looking at not just the pluses but the minuses in trying to come up with what is best for the Town. I applaud everyone for their patience.

Michael Brodinsky, 45 Valley View Drive asked ERL, Table 5.2 says that there is 764 tons of pollutants that could be emitted. Do you agree that that would be completely undetectable to the people in the neighborhood?

Mitchell Wurmbrand, ERL responded, the issue is not whether the emission is undetectable but whether the concentration that ultimately is measured from that emission is undetectable.....

Mr. Brodinsky asked the question, if you were someone living in that neighborhood, right across the street, would you know that plant was there generating electricity because of the emissions? Would you sense any difference in the environment?

Mr. Wurmbrand answered, Table 5-6 shows where the developer provides impacts from those emissions and may have compared those impacts to various standards. The question is, are those impacts significant according to regulatory significance levels? With the exception of particulate matter of less than 10 microns, all of the pollutants that will be emitted from this facility are predicted to have an insignificant impact.

Mr. Brodinsky asked once again, if you were a neighbor, would you smell it?

Mr. Wurmbrand answered, no.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, would you sense it from increased humidity?

Mr. Wurmbrand answered, no.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, there would no absolutely no way that you.....

Mr. Wurmbrand corrected his statement saying, there may be questions of a water vapor issue; it is not a pollutant issue.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, putting the humidity issue aside, there is no way someone living in that neighborhood could smell it, see it or sense any of these emissions?

Mr. Wurmbrand answered, that is correct.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, are there any conditions under which these amounts may be increased from 764 tons? Any set of circumstances where that would go up?

Mr. Wurmbrand answered, what I believe the developer has put in here are numbers that they feel they will be held to by the D.E.P. I think the numbers are reasonable, based on what the D.E.P. is currently requiring. It is unlikely that the department will allow hiring emissions than what they have presented here.

Mr. Brodinsky had the following question of Mr. Lyons, in your view, when does the sixty day comment period expire for Wallingford?

Mr. Lyons answered, it has been extended to August 27th. The real question is, when can we file our application with the Siting Council? Until we can file our application, your comment period continues.

Mr. Brodinsky asked, PP&L would accept written recommendations from Wallingford or you would permit them to be filed with the Siting Council, even though it is beyond sixty days, when you filed your final application?

Mr. Lyons answered, certainly. I would accept written recommendations at any time.

Wes Lubee, 15 Montowese Trail asked Mr. Lyons, in order to comply with the State pollution standards, do you intend using offset emission reductions?

Mike Anderson, TRC answered, for nitrogen oxide pollutants the applicant will obtain the required emission offsets.

Mr. Lubee asked, what is the significance of this? Why are you using them? What does it accomplish?

Mr. Anderson answered, if you have an existing facility that is emitting, say, 1,000 tons per year for the sake of making up a number, and you have a new facility and you want to put in 200 more tons per year, you would have to reduce the existing facility by not only 200 tons down to 800 tons but then by .2 more. You would have to reduce the existing facility down to 700 or 720 tons so that there would be room for the new one of 200 tons and the sum total would be less than what you started with.

Mr. Lubee asked, why do you need it?

Mr. Anderson replied, because you are trying to reduce the pollution.

Mr. Lubee stated, by using offset emission reductions, you are not reducing pollution, you are just taking credits from another operation.

Mr. Anderson explained, because they reduce the emissions. Offsets have to be real and federally-enforceable emission reductions in actual emissions. They don't have to be at a facility down the street because ozone pollution is a regional problem.

Mr. Lubee asked, where will you be getting yours from?

Mr. Anderson replied, I can't answer that because it is something that is done through a contract agreement. But it will be done within the confines of the law as to how far away you can go.

Mr. Lubee asked, how far away does the law allow?

Mr. Anderson answered, because of the ozone problem, it allows a non-attainment area of equal or worse status of where you are. In that case, that covers most of the State of Connecticut; it covers all of the State and to the southwest of there.

Mr. Lubee asked, if you did not use these offset emission reductions you would not be in conformance with State standards?

Mr. Anderson answered, that is right, you would not get a permit.

Mr. Lubee added, then what you are doing, are you not, is taking this reduction from some other location far removed from Wallingford and crediting, or if you were emitting your 1,000, by bringing 200 from another location, as far as your relationship with the State is concerned, you are only at the 800 level, is that right? Instead of 1,000?

Mr. Anderson replied, if it didn't require a 1.2 factor, you would have reduced the emissions from 1,000 tons to 800 tons while you add the 200 tons for a total of 1,000 tons. Remember, the air pollution does the same thing that the law allows for the reductions. The air pollution crosses the air and that is why it is here; that is why it is a violation here. It is not because of the local emissions, it is because of the emissions over there.

Mr. Lubee stated, as far as we, in the Town of Wallingford are concerned, if we were to forget that you had this offset emission reductions, you are going to be emitting an excess amount of pollutants that would not be acceptable would you not have this credit from a remote location. Am I saying it incorrectly?

Mr. Anderson answered, I don't think you are saying it incorrectly. That is the way the regulations were set up, to accomplish the regional reduction in the pollution.

Mr. Lubee stated, what is disturbing to me and to others here in town is the fact that with a major pollutant, Cytec; one of the major ones in Connecticut, and we added the waste treatment burning plant and now we are thinking of adding this energy producing plant, I think collectively, we ought to be looking at what the impact is going to be not only on our own town but those towns to windward. We ought to ask the Council's consultants to look at that subject. The $50.00 per year that we, as individual homeowners are going to be saving, is not worth ruining our environment. That is something that ought to be examined collectively, not just isolating this one operation but what the other major polluters in our town together with this are going to be doing collectively.

Mr. Anderson answered, the permitting process requires just that collective look at the emission sources locally.

Mr. Lubee asked, what is PP&L currently using for its anticipated tax expense, real and property?

Mark Lyons, PP&L answered, for property tax, I believe the number fluctuates between about $2.5 to $3 million per year depending on which specific area you are looking at.

Mr. Lubee asked, is there any real estate tax on the building at all?

Mr. Lyons answered, that is total property tax; real and fixtures and personal property.

Mr. Lubee asked, has anyone in town figured out what our potential water income from this is going to be in addition to the $2.5 million in taxes?

Mr. Smith answered, no, we have not calculated it. We just have a flow chart and that can easily be accomplished.

Mr. Lubee asked, what will the potential sewer income be for the 500,000 gallons per day? How much will the lease be? As far as the lease is concerned, when will it expire? How long will it be?

Mr. Gessert answered, we are looking at a twenty year lease right now.

Mr. Smith added, they are looking at somewhere between twenty and thirty years. On the water side, I calculated $190,000 annually based on current water rates.

Mr. Lubee asked, when the lease expires at the end of twenty years, we will own part of the building and they will own part of the building. What happens? They are leasing the building and the land, right?

Mr. Smith answered, they are leasing the land to build something on that land. One of the stipulations we can put in to the lease agreement is that they have to return the property to greenfield, its current condition. Obviously, if the Pierce building is still there, it would stay there. Everything that they have erected or constructed would have to be removed and they would have to put up some kind of decommissioning fund to accommodate that.

Mr. Lubee raised concerns over the issue of remaining capacity at the sewage treatment plant. He asked, based on our normal growth rate, how much longer will that capacity last before we have topped out and the State asks us to begin looking for expansion?

Mr. Parisi stated, that question is in the mind of everyone tonight and I am sure it will be asked.

Mr. Lubee stated, I am asking that right now, if I may, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Dann replied, the short answer at this point in time is, we really don't know. We need to update our facility planning which is something that we have been working towards. The last time that was done dates back to the 1970s. What we have to look at is what the most recent growth patterns have been but realistically we need to go further than that and update our projections for the future.

Mr. Lubee asked, would it be possible to complete the study before the Council has to make its final decision?

Mr. Dann answered, probably not, given the time frames that I have heard. We would certainly take some other projections that we have for example from the water side and look to apply those to some extent to the wastewater side so that we could view that but that is clearly not as accurate as a complete wastewater planning document would be. The other thing to point is, when you look at a growth pattern, of course it can be relatively level for a long period of time and then something like this project appears and suddenly it is a step process. Over a decade it might appear to be an incline but it may, in effect, be a series of steps some of which in this case would be fairly substantial.

Mr. Lubee stated, no one is going to hold you to it but I hope you can get the Council some input on that subject before they make a decision because it could involve millions of dollars. Do you have that figure on the sewer income?

Mr. Smith replied, it should come out to about $500,000 a year. I have not discussed it with the developer.....we have a lease fee, we have the improvements that we are looking at in the electric distribution system which is well over $1 million.

Pasquale Melillo, 15 Haller Place, Yalesville suggested that PP&L come to a Town Council meeting with some sort of a technical noise gadget to simulate the noise that we can expect at the station if it is ever approved.

Mr. Parisi responded, it is a good idea but we don't have anything.....he doesn't have anything to do that. They can't reproduce that noise.

Mark Lyons, PP&L stated, I have a noise meter in my hand. It is a technical gadget which measures how loud it is and if we are all quiet, I will tell you what it says.....(the auditorium was silent at this time).....51.2 decibels and now that I am talking, it is 68dBA.

Mr. Parisi informed Mr. Lyons that Mr. Melillo was asking that they reproduce the sound of the generating plant here.

Mr. Lyons answered, that was it; if we are all quiet, you will hear it.

Mr. Melillo next asked questions surrounding the power lines.

Mr. Lyons explained, Northeast Utilities owns the power lines and we deliver the power to them at the high side of the transformer. At the switch yard we deliver the power and they transmit it for us and we sell it to our customers. It is done all the time.

Mr. Melillo suggested that PP&L work closely with the local, state and federal health departments regarding this project.

Mr. Lyons was not aware of any federal health department. He stated that PP&L will comply with every applicable regulation.

Mr. Parisi assured Mr. Melillo that PP&L is working with our health department as well as the State's.

Mr. Melillo asked Mr. Lyons, would your company be willing to pay for any altering that needs to be done to our water system should it require such once your plant begins operating?

Mr. Lyons answered, I cannot commit myself to anyone. I am not aware of what the numbers. Based on the best available information we have to date, there is sufficient capacity in the town water supply and wastewater discharge systems to accept what we would give to them. We would be an ordinary customer of the utility. If it turns out that the existing system does not have the capacity to accept us, to use the analogy, the bus is full and this customer has to buy a new bus, what we will look at is all available measures that we could take to either reduce what we are providing to the town or to find an alternative method to find our water or our discharge. If it appears that the current system cannot accept us, then we will pursue the least costly solution. It appears, right now, that the present system has plenty of capacity for us.

Mr. Melillo suggested that PP&L consider installing internal insulation in the construction of the building.

At this time Mr. Parisi thanked all project members present, along with Environmental Risk Limited staff, for their time and attention to detail.

Motion was made by Mr. Knight to Adjourn the Meeting, seconded by Mr. Centner.

VOTE: All ayes; motion duly carried.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 12:48 a.m.

Meeting recorded and transcribed by:

Kathryn F. Zandri
Town Council Secretary

Approved: _____
Robert F. Parisi, Chairman

Sept. 1, 1999
Date

Rosemary A. Rascati, Town Clerk

9-14-99
Date