



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Ten Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051

Phone: (860) 827-2935 Fax: (860) 827-2950

E-Mail: siting.council@ct.gov

Web Site: portal.ct.gov/csc

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

May 14, 2021

Bruce L. McDermott, Esq.
Murtha Cullina LLP
265 Church Street
New Haven, CT 06510
bmcderrott@murthalaw.com

RE: **PETITION NO. 1406A** – Doosan Fuel Cell America, Inc. petition for a declaratory ruling, pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §4-176 and §16-50k, for the proposed construction, maintenance and operation of a grid-side 9.66-megawatt fuel cell facility and associated equipment to be located at 600 Iranistan Avenue, Bridgeport, Connecticut, and associated electrical interconnection to the United Illuminating Company's existing Congress Street Substation. **NuPower Bridgeport FC, LLC Reopening of this petition based on changed conditions pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §4-181a(b).**

Dear Attorney McDermott:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than June 4, 2021. To help expedite the Council's review, please file individual responses as soon as they are available. At this time, consistent with the Council's policy to prevent the spread of Coronavirus, please submit an electronic copy only to siting.council@ct.gov. However, please be advised that the Council may later request one or more hard copies for records retention purposes.

Any request for an extension of time to submit responses to interrogatories shall be submitted to the Council in writing pursuant to §16-50j-22a of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies

Sincerely,

s/Melanie Bachman

Melanie Bachman
Executive Director

MB/RM

C: Service List

Petition No. 1406A
Bridgeport 9.66 MW Fuel Cell Project

Interrogatories to NuPower

1. Referring to petition p. 13, how many residents attended the February 27, 2021 information meeting with the Seaside Village Homeowners Association? Who represented the leadership of the association? In general what were the concerns raised by the association and how were these concerns addressed?
2. Would the facility be visible from Seaside Village? If so, from what area(s)?
3. Describe intervening structures and land use between the proposed site and Seaside Village.
4. Would the proposed facility require a DEEP air permit? If so, how would the project be classified (ex. combined heat and power system or distributed generation) and which regulation applies?
5. What is the status of the thermal loop? Does NuPower/Doosan expect it to be constructed and operational at the same time as the proposed fuel cell facility?
6. The air emission table in Petition Attachment F includes a “High Grade Heat Utilization” parameter. Does this represent the thermal loop? If so, provide an air emission summary table that does not include heat utilization by the thermal loop.
7. Referring to Petition pp. 17 and 18- Air Emission Section – Table 1 and associated narrative, Clarify if the emissions are from each individual fuel cell unit or the cumulative fuel cell facility, and whether this includes the thermal loop. Please revise Table 1 accordingly or provide a new table.
8. What is the height of the proposed rooftop sound attenuation walls?
9. What is the anticipated reduction in noise levels from the facility by installing the sound attenuation walls? Exhibit M indicates the noise levels at the industrial property next door may exceed 70 dBA and noise mitigation is recommended.
10. Are there any concerns about inadvertent highway snow removal contacting the top of the facility and the cooling fans?
11. Referring to the Site Plans (GA 1.0), define the equipment abbreviations. What area contains the thermal loop equipment?
12. Referring to the Site Plans SP 1.0 and SD-1 are the site water discharge system and pump station part of the facility or is this existing City-owned infrastructure located on the parcel? If these are associated with the project, describe what is proposed.
13. The footnote on Petition p. 22 states NuPower has met with the DOT. When were the meetings and with whom? What topics were discussed during the meetings and were any recommendations provided?

14. Page 19 of the PURA decision for Docket 18-08-14 references a facility natural gas consumption rate of 84,000 cubic feet per hour. Is this consumption rate still applicable? Does the operation of the thermal loop alter the consumption rate?
15. Is the natural gas supply to the facility considered firm or would it be susceptible to interruption during extreme winter weather events?
16. Would the proposed transformers be dry-type or oil-filled? If oil-filled, will there be secondary containment measures for the transformers and/or alarms to provide notification in the event of low oil levels?
17. Are the proposed excess natural gas flow valves equipped with alarms to notify the operator of a problem? If so, will such alarm notification be transmitted to Southern Connecticut Gas and the local Fire Department?
18. Has the Petitioner discussed the proposed project with the local Fire Department and Emergency Responders? Are there sufficient city fire hydrants in the vicinity for fire response. Where is the closest hydrant?
19. Is the flood zone elevation data based on NAVD88?
20. Did NuPower receive comments from the notification to the abutters (Attachment H)? If so, summarize the comments.