



# STATE OF CONNECTICUT

## CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

1 CENTRAL PARK PLAZA • NEW BRITAIN, CONN. 06051

PHONE: 827-2604

PETITION NO. 171  
Wallingford, Connecticut  
Staff Report  
December 18, 1986

Petition No. 171 involves the construction and operation of a resource recovery facility in Wallingford, Connecticut. The project, known as the Wallingford Refuse-to-Energy Cogeneration Project, would be both a "qualifying cogeneration facility" and a "qualifying small power production facility" pursuant to the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978, as amended.

The purpose of the petition is to amend the Council's Petition 139 ruling of August 29, 1985. This ruling declared the facility to be exempt from Council jurisdiction because it did not meet the minimum generating capacity to qualify as a "facility" pursuant to section 16-50i(3) of the Connecticut General Statutes (CGS). CGS 16-50i(3) excludes from Council jurisdiction cogeneration facilities with a generation capacity of 25 MW or less.

Since the time of the Council's rulings, the project has changed in two respects relevant to this petition. First, Superior Resource Recovery Systems of Connecticut, Inc., (Superior) has replaced Citizens Resources Company as a partner in the project. Superior and Vicon Recovery Systems of Connecticut, Inc., are in the process of forming a limited partnership, Wallingford Resource Recovery Associates, L.P., to construct and operate the facility. Second, the project's maximum electrical generating capacity now may rise to 10.50 MW from its previous maximum of 9.14 MW. However, the petition states that the change in operating partners does not alter the status of the facility as a qualifying cogeneration facility and that under no circumstances would the maximum generating capacity exceed 25 MW.

The petition for the ruling was accompanied by an affidavit from the facility's project manager verifying that the facility continues to be a qualifying cogeneration facility and that its maximum generating capacity will be 10.50 MW.

Petition No. 171  
Staff Report

-2-

The Council has the option of processing the request as a new petition or as a petition to amend the earlier ruling, Petition 139. A new ruling would remove any uncertainties regarding the need for the filing fee submitted with Petition 171.

Joel M. Rinebold  
Senior Siting Analyst

JMR/go