

PHILIP M. SMALL  
direct dial: (860) 509-6575  
fax: (860) 509-6675  
psmall@brownrudnick.com

185 Asylum  
Street  
Hartford  
Connecticut  
06103  
tel 860.509.6500  
fax 860.509.6501

September 10, 2015

**VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL AND HAND-DELIVERY**

Mr. Robert Stein, Chairman  
Connecticut Siting Council  
Ten Franklin Square  
New Britain, CT 06051

**RE: Docket No. 192B—Towantic Energy, LLC Motion to Reopen and Modify the June 23, 1999 Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need Based on Changed Conditions Pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §4-181a(b) for the Construction, Maintenance and Operation of a 785 MW Dual-Fuel Combined Cycle Electric Generating Facility Located North of the Prokop Road and Towantic Hill Road Intersection in the Town of Oxford, Connecticut—CPV Towantic, LLC's Responses to Development and Management Plan Interrogatories, Dated September 4, 2015**

Dear Chairman Stein:

Enclosed are an original and fifteen (15) copies of CPV Towantic, LLC's Responses to the Connecticut Siting Council's Development and Management Plan Interrogatories, dated September 4, 2015.

Please contact Franca L. DeRosa, Esq. or me at (860) 509-6500 with any questions.

Very truly yours,

**BROWN RUDNICK LLP**



Philip M. Small  
Counsel for CPV Towantic, LLC

PMS/jmb  
Enclosures  
cc: Service List

62003840 v1-022345/0005

b  
r  
o  
w  
n  
r  
u  
d  
n  
i  
c  
k  
.  
c  
o  
m



CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that on this 10th day of September, 2015, the foregoing documents were sent via electronic mail, and/or first class mail, to the persons on the attached service list.

By:   
Philip M. Small



**SERVICE LIST OF PARTIES AND INTERVENORS**

<b>Status Granted</b>	<b>Status Holder (name, address &amp; phone number)</b>	<b>Representative (name, address &amp; phone number)</b>
Applicant	CPV Towantic, L.L.C.	Franca L. DeRosa, Esq. Philip M. Small, Esq. Brown Rudnick LLP 185 Asylum Street Hartford, CT 06103 (860) 509-6500 (860) 509-6501 — fax <a href="mailto:fderosa@brownrudnick.com">fderosa@brownrudnick.com</a> <a href="mailto:psmall@brownrudnick.com">psmall@brownrudnick.com</a>
Party	Jay Halpern 58 Jackson Cove Road Oxford, CT 06478 h: (203) 888-4976 <a href="mailto:zoarmonster@sbcglobal.net">zoarmonster@sbcglobal.net</a>  Peter Thomas 72 Towantic Hill Road Oxford, CT 06478 (203) 720-1536	
Intervenor	Town of Middlebury	Attorney Dana A. D'Angelo Law Offices of Dana D'Angelo, LLC 20 Woodside Avenue Middlebury, CT 06762 (203) 598-3336 (203) 598-7283 – fax <a href="mailto:Dangelo.middlebury@snet.net">Dangelo.middlebury@snet.net</a>  Stephen L. Savarese, Esq. 103 South Main Street Newtown, CT 06470 203-270-0077 <a href="mailto:attystephensavarese@gmail.com">attystephensavarese@gmail.com</a>



Intervenor	The Connecticut Light and Power Company (CL&P)	<p>Stephen Gibelli, Esq. Associate General Counsel The Connecticut Light and Power Company P.O. Box 270 Hartford, CT 06141-0270 (860) 665-5513 (860) 665-5504 –fax <a href="mailto:gibels@nu.com">gibels@nu.com</a></p> <p>John R. Morissette Manager-Transmission Siting and Permitting The Connecticut Light and Power Company P.O. Box 270 Hartford, CT 06141-0270 (860) 665-2036 <a href="mailto:morisjr@nu.com">morisjr@nu.com</a></p> <p>Christopher R. Bernard Manager, Regulatory Policy (Transmission) The Connecticut Light and Power Company P.O. Box 270 Hartford, CT 06141-0270 (860) 665-5967 (860) 665-3314 – fax <a href="mailto:bernacr@nu.com">bernacr@nu.com</a></p> <p>Stella Pace, Senior Engineer The Connecticut Light and Power Company Transmission and Interconnection Dept. P.O. Box 270 Hartford, CT 06141-0270 (860) 665-3569 <a href="mailto:paccess@nu.com">paccess@nu.com</a></p> <p>Jeffery D. Cochran Northeast Utilities Service Company 107 Selden Street Berlin, CT 06037 860-665-3548 <a href="mailto:cochrjd@nu.com">cochrjd@nu.com</a></p>
Party	Town of Oxford	<p>Kevin W. Condon, Esq. Condon &amp; Savitt PC P.O. Box 570 Ansonia, CT 06401 203-734-2511 <a href="mailto:condonsavitt@comcast.net">condonsavitt@comcast.net</a></p>
Party	Naugatuck Valley Chapter Trout Unlimited	<p>Robert M. Perrella, Vice President TU Naugatuck/Pomperaug Valley Chapter 278 W. Purchase Road Southbury, CT 06488-1004 <a href="mailto:johnnytroutseed@charter.net">johnnytroutseed@charter.net</a></p>



Intervenor	Town of Southbury	Ed Edelson First Selectman Town of Southbury 501 Main Street Southbury, CT 06488 (203) 262-0647 (203) 264-9762 – fax <a href="mailto:selectman@southbury-ct.gov">selectman@southbury-ct.gov</a>
Party	The Pomperaug River Watershed Coalition	Len DeJong, Executive Director Pomperaug River Watershed Coalition 39 Sherman Hill Road, C103 Woodbury, CT 06798 203-263-0076 <a href="mailto:LDeJong@pomperaug.org">LDeJong@pomperaug.org</a>
Intervenor (approved 06/07/06)	Raymond Pietrorazio 764 Charcoal Avenue Middlebury, CT 06762-1311 (203) 758-2413 (203) 758-9519 – fax <a href="mailto:ray@ctcombustion.com">ray@ctcombustion.com</a>	
Intervenor (approved 10/10/06)	GE Energy Financial Services, Inc.	Jay F. Malcynsky The Law Offices of Jay F. Malcynsky, P.C. One Liberty Square New Britain, CT 06051 (860) 229-0301 (860) 225-4627 – fax <a href="mailto:Jmalcynsky@gaffneybennett.com">Jmalcynsky@gaffneybennett.com</a>
Intervenor (Approved 11/13/14)	Borough of Naugatuck and Borough of Naugatuck Water Pollution Control Authority	Edward G. Fitzpatrick, Esq. Alicia K. Perillo, Esq. Fitzpatrick, Mariano, Santos, Sousa, PC 203 Church Street Naugatuck, CT 06770 203-729-4555 <a href="mailto:Fitz@fmslaw.org">Fitz@fmslaw.org</a> <a href="mailto:Alicia@fmslaw.org">Alicia@fmslaw.org</a>  Ronald Merancy, Chairman Water Pollution Control Authority 229 Church Street Naugatuck, CT 06770 203-720-7000 <a href="mailto:Rjm62159@aol.com">Rjm62159@aol.com</a>
Intervenor (Approved 1/8/15)	Wayne McCormack 593 Putting Green Lane Oxford, CT 06478 <a href="mailto:wayne@waynemccormack.com">wayne@waynemccormack.com</a>	



Intervenor (Approved 1/8/15)	Naugatuck River Revival Group, Inc.	Kevin R. Zak, President Naugatuck River Revival Group, Inc. 132 Radnor Avenue Naugatuck, CT 06770 203-530-7850 <a href="mailto:kznrreg@sbcglobal.net">kznrreg@sbcglobal.net</a>
Intervenor (Approved 1/8/15)	Westover Hills Subdivision Homeowners	Chester Cornacchia Westover Hills Subdivision Homeowners 53 Graham Ridge Road Naugatuck, CT 06770 203-206-9927 <a href="mailto:cc@necsonline.com">cc@necsonline.com</a>
Intervenor (Approved 1/8/15)	Westover School	Kate J. Truini Alice Hallaran Westover School 1237 Whittemore Road Middlebury, CT 06762 203-758-2423 <a href="mailto:ktuini@westoverschool.org">ktuini@westoverschool.org</a> <a href="mailto:ahallaran@westoverschool.org">ahallaran@westoverschool.org</a>
Intervenor (Approved 1/8/15)	Greenfields, LLC and Marian Larkin	Edward S. Hill, Esq. Cappalli & Hill, LLC 325 Highland Avenue Cheshire, CT 06410 203-272-2607 <a href="mailto:ehill@cappalihill.com">ehill@cappalihill.com</a>
Intervenor (Approved 1/8/15)	Lake Quassapaug Association, LLC	Ingrid Manning, Vice President Lake Quassapaug Association, LLC P.O. Box 285 Middlebury, CT 06762 203-758-1692 <a href="mailto:Ingridmanning2@gmail.com">Ingridmanning2@gmail.com</a>
Intervenor (Approved 1/8/15)	Middlebury Land Trust, Inc.	W. Scott Peterson, M.D., President Middlebury Land Trust, Inc. 317 Tranquility Road Middlebury, CT 06762 203-574-2020 <a href="mailto:wsp@aya.yale.edu">wsp@aya.yale.edu</a>
Intervenor (Approved 1/15/15)	Quassy Amusement Park	George Frantzis Quassy Amusement Park P.O. Box 1107 Middlebury, CT 06762 203-758-2913 x108 <a href="mailto:George@quassy.com">George@quassy.com</a>



Intervenor (Approved 1/15/15)	Middlebury Bridle Land Association	Nancy Vaughan Middlebury Bridle Land Association 64 Sandy Hill Road Middlebury, CT 06762 203-598-0697 <a href="mailto:ndzjavaughan@gmail.com">ndzjavaughan@gmail.com</a>
Intervenor (Approved 1/15/15)	Dennis Kocyla 28 Benz Street Ansonia, CT 06401 203-736-7182 <a href="mailto:Dennis3141@yahoo.com">Dennis3141@yahoo.com</a>	
Intervenor (Approved 1/15/15)	Naugatuck Valley Audubon Society	Sophie Zyla Jeff Ruhloff Carl Almonte Naugatuck Valley Audubon Society 17 Stoddard Place Beacon Falls, CT 06403 203-888-7945 <a href="mailto:NVASeditor@mail.com">NVASeditor@mail.com</a>
Intervenor (Approved 1/15/15)	Oxford Flying Club	Burton L. Stevens Oxford Flying Club P.O. Box 371 Woodbury, CT 06798 203-236-5158 <a href="mailto:bstevens@snet.net">bstevens@snet.net</a>

**Docket No. 192B**  
**CPV**  
**Development and Management Plan Interrogatories**  
**Set One**

1. Please respond to the following concerns/recommended revisions to Section (e) of the Development and Management Plan – Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (ESCP). Would CPV be amenable to incorporating these recommended revisions? If there are areas that CPV disagrees with or believes are not feasible to accommodate, please indicate why.

- a. Replace DMH G2 and DMH F2 or DMHG1 and DMH F1 with a storm water hydrodynamic separator.

**Response:** DMHF2 and F1 were part of the schematic plan set but have been eliminated from the D&M set, therefore this comment only refers to DMHG1 and G2. While a hydrodynamic separator can be added at either DMHG1 or G2, this addition would be unnecessary and unwarranted. Stormwater Wetland A is a primary treatment measure with a sediment forebay, emergent marsh area and micro-pool designed to treat 169% of the required Water Quality Volume (WQV). This WQV provides sufficient time for the particles to settle out.

Hydrodynamic separators are a permanent installation measure typically only effective at removing medium to coarse grained sediments and are not meant to be used for temporary sediment removal during the construction process, when these coarse grained sediments would most likely be present. The 2004 CT Stormwater Quality Manual (pgs. 11-10-1 & 11-10-2) states that the reasons for limited use include:

- Only moderate pollutant removal
- Cannot effectively remove soluble pollutants or fine particles
- Can be a source of pollutants due to re-suspension of sediment unless maintained regularly.

A much more effective “primary” treatment measure is the proposed Stormwater Wetlands, which the 2004 Manual indicates provides significant benefit for reduction of sediment, phosphorous, nitrogen and metals (pg. 11-P2-1).

- b. Replace rip rap pad on eastern side of property discharging into “drainage easement in favor of Lot 9A” with a storm water hydrodynamic separator.

**Response:** The riprap pad at the discharge point is designed to minimize stormwater velocity and should remain in place. While a hydrodynamic separator can be added further up the line at DMHB10 we feel that this addition would be unnecessary and unwarranted. Stormwater Wetland B is a primary treatment measure with a sediment forebay, emergent marsh area and micro-pool designed to treat 151% of the required Water Quality Volume (WQV). As noted above, the WQV provides sufficient time for sediment particles to settle out and the Stormwater Wetlands provide for a much more effective “primary” treatment measure.

- c. Replace CB B12, CB A7 and CB A21 with catch basins containing a 4-foot sump with hooded outlet or some form of “trash excluders” to minimize floatables and

hydrocarbons from getting into stormwater renovation areas. Would it be easier to clean a manhole than trying to clean up these materials from the forebay or other parts of the stormwater renovation area? Are the proposed catch basin details designed to restrict flow of floatables or hydrocarbons based on the proposed design?

**Response:** Hooded outlets and 4-foot sumps will be added to the catch basin locations referenced above. While the anticipated post-development pollutant load of floatables and hydrocarbons is minimal, this proposed catch basin modification would provide for pre-treatment of stormwater prior to final treatment and retention in the proposed Stormwater Wetlands.

- d. Were the following soil results, i.e. laboratory testing from Geodesign Inc., considered in CPV's ESCP design?
- i. Gradations which indicate a fines content (finer than the #200 sieve) of approximately 31 to 53% are consistent with estimated permeability of the tested soils (Pg.5);
  - ii. Bottom of basins will be below groundwater levels (Pg. 5);
  - iii. Stormwater basins will be below seasonal high groundwater and will intercept water from the excavated geometry and will contribute some flow to the basins (Pg. 5);
  - iv. The North Slope will be cut at 3H:1V slope partially below groundwater levels (Pg. 5);
  - v. An approximated vegetated 3H:1V cut slope is anticipated to be stable, however it must be monitored during construction to allow evaluation of the need for underdrains and/or filter blanket below the vegetated surface (Pg. 6 – disclaimer for company); and
  - vi. The stabilized groundwater levels vary between depths of 2.4 and 14.8 feet below ground surface corresponding to elevations 856 and 818 (Pg. 4).

**Response:** Regarding 1.d.i – 1.d.vi; the soil testing and laboratory results were considered in the design of the Erosion & Sediment Control Plan and the D&M Plans are consistent with the findings of the GeoDesign report. The majority of the site excavation will be treated in Temporary Sediment Traps 2A, 2B and 3B, as shown in Phases 2 and 3 of the Erosion and Sediment Control Plans. These have been oversized and provide for 467%, 162% and 755% of the required sediment trap volume respectively. This will provide additional residence time for more efficient removal of the fines content in the existing soil.

Due to the very dense nature of the soils, the rate of groundwater flow and therefore the volume of groundwater flow into the temporary sediment traps will be minimal and will not have any measureable impact to the effectiveness of the traps.

Additionally, the Dewatering Plan & Details (sheet C318) of the plan set calls for additional erosion and sediment control measures that may be employed during the construction process:

AT THE DISCRETION OF THE CERTIFIED PROFESSIONAL IN CHARGE OF EROSION CONTROL INSPECTIONS, ADDITIONAL MEASURES SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED TO REDUCED TURBIDITY IF NECESSARY. THESE MEASURES MAY INCLUDE:

- FLOCCULANTS
- PORTABLE FILTRATION SYSTEMS
- PORTABLE SEDIMENT TANKS
- ADDITIONAL E&S MEASURES SUCH AS STRAW WATTLE LOGS
- JET-SPRAY HYDRAULIC EROSION CONTROL PRODUCTS

- e. Construction General Permit and 2002 Guidelines require reverse slope benches on slopes greater than 15' high and steeper than 3H:1V. If reverse slope bench is not provided, the General Permit requires engineered slope stabilization structures or a detailed soil mechanics analysis by a soils or geotechnical engineer:
- i. Slope on northern side of development has top slope elevation of 860' and toe of slope elevation of 821' – horizontal distance is 117' which exceeds 45' horizontal distance required in 2002 Guidelines.
  - ii. Slope on western side of development has top slope elevation of 830' and toe of slope elevation of 800' (around location of cul-de-sac) – horizontal distance of 90' which exceeds 45' horizontal distance. Original site boring results for B-101, B-102, B-103 and B-104 show groundwater elevation between 817.5' and 809.8' (no water at B-102 witnessed).
  - iii. Slope on southwest corner of development has top of slope elevation of 824' at berm and toe of slope elevation of 790' at CB E1 – horizontal distance of 102' which exceeds 45' horizontal distance.
  - iv. Slope on southeast side of proposed road has top of slope elevation at approximately 818' and toe of slope elevation of 778' – horizontal distance of 120' which exceeds 45' horizontal distance.
  - v. None of these slopes have reversed slope benches incorporated into their design.
  - vi. These slopes appear to be in non-compliance with the Preserve and Conserve Soils Land Grading requirements of the Erosion and Sedimentation Control Manual (5-2-5).

**Response:** The 2002 Guidelines referenced above state on page 5-2-5 that “For slopes steeper than 2:1, or when slopes are steeper than 3:1 **and** the change in elevation exceeds 15' without a cross bench, engineered structural design features shall be incorporated.”

The guideline calls for both conditions, steeper than 3:1 slope and change in elevation exceeding 15', to be met and all of the slopes referenced above are proposed at 3:1, therefore reverse benches or engineered structural design features are not required. Additionally, the geotechnical report prepared by GeoDesign Inc. (pg. 5) concluded that the 3:1 slopes will be stable.

The finished grade slopes will be staked in the field by a licensed surveyor during the construction process to ensure adherence to the proposed 3:1 slope construction.

- f. Geotechnical report shows high ground water table in the northern portion of the site. References indicate subsurface drainage into the slope above the 821' elevation. No underdrains have been proposed for the northern slope. Could this lead to destabilization of the toe of slope thereby creating potential for slope subsidence?
- i. 2001 report from Burns and Roe Enterprises, Inc. stated “For surficial stability of the detention pond slopes, it is recommended that the face of

the slope consist of a layer of riprap, placed over nonwoven geotextile fabric. The section should include crushed stone filter layer, to be placed between riprap and geotextile fabric; No. 357 stone....”

- ii. Current erosion and control measures based on phasing plans (I, II and III) call for: “Install erosion control blankets on any slopes steeper than 3:1 and hydro-seed all disturbed areas with slopes of 3:1 or less that are not subject to future construction disturbance.
- iii. This means northern slope towards Stormwater Renovation Area B, as currently designed, will have no reverse slope benches, no underdrainage for addressing a high ground water table, no erosion control blankets anywhere on the slope and no protection of the slope with a layer of riprap and geotextile fabric.
- iv. Seepage and water are big factors in many slope failures. If seepage or overland flow is causing or worsening the slope condition, use engineered measures whose strategy is to convey runoff, direct runoff and intercept groundwater – E&S Guidelines (4-5)

**Response:** The geotechnical report prepared by GeoDesign, Inc. specifically states “A slope stability analysis was carried out to determine the stability of the north slope with the proposed cuts. We have determined that the slope will have an acceptable factor of safety assuming natural seeded slope. In the event of seepage breakout on the slope face, measures can be taken during construction to intercept seepage below the seeded surface and direct flow to the basin.” (pg. 5)

In addition, the report’s conclusion states that “The 3:1 slope will be stable and will be monitored during excavation for the need of subdrains below the seeded surface.” (pg. 5)

As an additional protective measure to minimize the groundwater exfiltration into the slope area, CPV will add an underdrain along the top of the northern slope which will intercept groundwater and convey it to the east and the west, away from the cut slope.

- g. The plans indicate heavy reliance upon the use of filter fabric fence, including the following:
  - i. Geotechnical review of the site indicates between 31% and 53% of soils on site would pass through a #200 sieve.
  - ii. Silt particles between 0.05 and 0.002 mm in size and clay particles being less than 0.002 mm in size may not be effectively removed by the use of filter fabric fence. According to Michael Klein’s report to the Council, the erosion and control silt fence specified in the erosion control plan has an apparent size of 0.6 mm, more than 10 times larger than the silt particles and 300 times larger than clay particles.
  - iii. No details are provided on size of fabric opening in “Silt Sack Detail” for insertion into catch basins. If mesh opening is too large, significant portion of solids could pass through material and possibly exit the site.
  - iv. Based on Mr. Klein’s calculations, using the proposed silt fence at the perimeter of the site may not be very effective in controlling erosion within the applicant’s property boundaries.

**Response:** The plans do not indicate heavy reliance on filter fabric fence, the only areas that will use filter fabric fence as a primary sediment removal measure are the

eastern and western slopes of the site which encompass approximately 3.25 acres. The erosion and sediment control plans also include staked haybales behind the silt fence at the bottom of the eastern and western slopes for added sediment removal efficiency.

The remainder of the proposed construction area (19.25 acres or 85.5% of the total 22.5 acre construction area) will be routed to oversized temporary sediment traps for sediment removal. Additional erosion & sediment control measures that may also be employed during the construction process are cited above in the response to item 1.d.

Page 5-11-36 of the 2002 Guidelines indicates that the apparent opening size of silt fence shall be between 0.6 mm and 0.9mm (pg. 5-11-36). The plans specify a Mirafi 100x fabric with the smallest allowable apparent opening of 0.6 mm.

The opening size for silt sack material is .425 mm. Note that after travelling through the silt sack, stormwater will be routed through temporary sediment traps for additional sediment removal.

2. Confirm that the “Wildlife Mitigation Notes” (WMN) on Sheet C331 are fully consistent with the Wildlife Survey Results report dated July 14, 2015, or update the WMN accordingly.

**Response:** The Wildlife Mitigation Notes on Sheet C331 will be updated to be consistent with the Wildlife Survey Results report dated July 14, 2015.